CHAPTER - 1V

Psychological Analysis of Crime and Punishment in Dostoevsky

The brief analysis of crimes in the fictional world of Dostoevsky, in the previous chapter, leads to the concept of punishment imposed by the author on his criminal characters. While analyzing the various aspects and circumstances of crime, he draws our attention to the inequality of the punishments inflicted for the same crime. He asks is it possible that men so differently situated can feel in an equal degree the punishment inflicted. He also argues that it is not only the inequality in punishment that matters but the consequences of the punishment have to be considered.

Dostoevsky contends that most of the time people look at crime as a physical act based on facts and forget about the psychological influences and effects of crime on the criminal mind. Hence, for Dostoevsky, punishment is not exactly legal punishment, but it is the suffering of a guilty conscience. Consequently, Murin of The Landlady who is presented as a murderer is not punished legally. At the end of the story, when Ordynov wants to know what has happened to Murin, the police inspector Yaroslav Ilyitch informs Ordynov, “Murin, Murin! No, he was a worthy old man, quite respectable. He could not have been one of them. Just three weeks ago he went home with his wife to their own parts.”

But there is penitence in him, as the police inspector Yaroslav tells Ordynov, in their first meeting, “You know, they say the man was once rich. He traded, as most likely you have heard. But through various unfortunate circumstances he was reduced to poverty; many of his barges were wrecked in a storm and lost, together with their
cargo. His factory, which was, I believe, in the charge of a near and dear relation, was equally unlucky and was burnt down, and the relation himself perished in the flames. It must be admitted it was terrible loss! Then, so they say, Murin sank into tearful despondency; they began to be afraid he would lose his reason, and, indeed, in a quarrel with another merchant, also an owner of the barges plying on the Volga, he suddenly showed himself in such a strange and unexpected light that the whole incident could only be accounted for on the supposition that he was quite mad, which I am prepared to believe. I have heard in detail of some of his queer ways. They say in a fit of madness he made an attempt on the life of a young merchant, of whom he had before been very fond. He was so upset when he recovered from the attack that he was on the point of taking his own life; so at least they say. I don’t know what happened after that, but it is known that he was several years doing penance.”

Here, Dostoevsky’s intention is not to punish him legally, but to make him to understand his crime and thereby suffer for his sin.

Similarly, Svidrigailoff of Crime and Punishment who is responsible for the death of his wife, his servant Philip, and a young maid, commits suicide unable to bear the burden of the moral responsibility of his crimes. When Rascolnikoff says, “People say you have killed Marfa Petrovna.” He replies, “I hardly know how to answer it, although my conscience is perfectly at ease on the subject. Every customary formality has been gone through most minutely; the inquest has proved that the dead woman died of an apoplectic fit brought about by a bath she had taken after a copious meal at which she had drunk nearly a bottle of wine. Nothing else has been discovered. No, this is not the matter that causes anxiety. But, several times, especially when posing towards St. Petersburg, I asked myself if I had not morally
contributed towards this misfortune, either by having irritated my wife or in some similar manner. I have come to the conclusion that this could not have been the case.”205 This shows in spite of his demonic behavior Svidrigailoff feels that he has morally contributed for the death of his wife.

Later unable to bear the burden of his guilty conscience like a mad man he wanders about from place to place. The nightmare on his return home – that of a five year old, innocent girl transforming herself into a brazen French harlot is what finally destroys the meaning of life for him. “Suddenly he fancies he sees the long black lashes of the little sleeper gently move; beneath the half-closed eyelids there seemed a tendency to some cunning, sly, in no wise childish twinkle. Can the child be awake and only pretend to sleep? Yes, her lips smile – they quiver as with a desire to check a laugh. But now she throws aside constraint – she merrily laughs – there is, in that small face, a bold, brazen, luring look, without one trait of youth, for it is the face of a French harlot. Suddenly she opens both eyes wide – they gaze at Svidrigailoff with a lewd and amorous look – they ask, they smile. Nothing so repugnant as this childish face, whose youthful traits betoken lust. What! at such an age? He cries a prey to horror. ‘Can such things be?’ and now she turns on him her pained face with outstretched arms. ‘Accursed thing’! Exclaims Svidrigailoff with a cry of horror; he raises his hand to strike her, and at the same moment he wakes.”206 It brings out the facts that even the most innocent and pure seems irresistibly to take on the appearance of corruption and invite him to defile it.

But he is, however, not altogether devoid of the spark of goodness, although he does not have the Christian ideal of salvation. Before he commits suicide he helps Dounia, Rascolnikoff’s sister, and the girl he intends to marry. Then he goes to
Sonia and informs her that he has provided substantially for her and her step brothers and sisters. Dostoevsky writes, “He thereupon went straight to Sonia’s place” and says, “I shall perhaps be going to America, and, as in all probability this will be our last interview, I have a called to settle a few things. … As far as your sisters and brother are concerned, they are provided for; the money I destined for each of them has been entrusted by me to safe hands. Here are, in addition, for yourself, three five-per-cent bonds, representing a sum of three thousand rubles.” He also gifts her several thousand rubles and advises her to accompany Rascolnikoff to Siberia. He says, “Take it, Sophia Semenovna, and do not, I beg, raise any further objections, as I have no time to listen to them. Rodion Romanovitch has but a choice of two alternatives: either to blow his brains out or to go to Siberia. And when he goes to Siberia, you are going with him, are you not? In that case you will require money – you will require money from him, do you understand? The sum I offer you is meant for him, through you as an intermediary.”

In spite of his acts of charity he is not saved, because he cannot overcome his passion. Suicide is the only thing he has now left to will for himself. “There was the building surmounted by the belfry. Svidrigailoff now took the revolver from his pocket and cocked it.” Before the soldier could realize what he is doing, Svidrigailoff said to him, “Never mind, my friend, the place will do very well; if anyone should ask you, say I’ve gone to America! He pressed the barrel of his revolver against his right temple and pulled the trigger.” He commits suicide, symbolically, in front of a building surmounted by the belfry.

Then Rogozhin (The Idiot), who murders Nastasya Fillipovna, in his passion to possess her, was punished by the authorities and was sent to Siberia for fifteen
years of imprisonment. Before he was convicted, for two months he suffers from brain fever. As soon as he is recovered, he was interrogated by the police. Dostoevsky writes, “When after many hours the doors were opened and people came in, they found the murderer completely unconscious and raving. It came about that at about eleven o’clock next morning. Rogozhin’s flat was broken open in the presence of the police. Matters were greatly facilitated by the evidence of the porter, that he had seen Parfyon Semenovitch the previous evening going in at the front door with a visitor and seemingly in secret. He gave straightforward, exact, and fully satisfactory evidence on every point. He did not contradict his adroit and eloquent counsel, who proved clearly and logically that the crime committed was a consequence of the brain fever which had set in long before its perpetration, as a result of the troubles of the accused. But he added nothing of his own to confirm that contention, and as before, clearly and precisely maintained and recollected the minutest circumstances connected with the crime. In view of extenuating circumstances he was sentenced to only fifteen years penal servitude in Siberia.”

Dostoevsky concludes that he heard his sentence grimly, silently, and dreamily.

Later in *The Possessed* Stavrogin, who says that he is a womanizer, confesses his crime to bishop Tikhon. He feels morally responsible and guilty of the murder of his wife Mary Lebyatkin and the death of Liza. Before his suicide he writes to Dasha Shatov, “I’ve told you much about my life. Not everything, though. Not even you. By the way, I confirm to you that I do feel guilty for my wife’s death, and it troubles my conscience. I also feel guilty about Liza.” Further he writes that there is no other option for him but to kill himself. “I know I ought to kill myself, to sweep myself off
the earth like some pernicious insect. But I am afraid of suicide because I am afraid of showing generosity.\textsuperscript{211}

Much later in \textit{The Brothers Karamazov}, \textbf{Dmitri Karamazov} who attempts on the life of his father, was deported to \textit{Siberia} for twenty years. He accepts his penal punishment for his \textbf{moral crime}. Later, at the trial, Dmitri accepts the \textbf{punishment}, because he wished to be punished for his \textbf{guilty conscience}. He says, “I want to suffer and by suffering I shall be purified. Perhaps I shall be purified gentleman? But listen for the last time; I am not guilty of my father’s blood. I accept my punishment, not because I killed him, but because I meant to kill him and perhaps I really have killed. Still I mean to fight it out with you to the end, and then God will decide.”\textsuperscript{212}

Ultimately \textbf{Fyodor Pavlovitch Karamazov} was \textbf{murdered} by his step son Smerdyakov for his \textbf{debauchery}. In his murder Dostorvsky seems to question, can a man like Fyodor should be allowed to live defiling earth. Dmitri says earlier, “Why is such a man alive? Can he be allowed to go on defiling the earth?”\textsuperscript{213} In his murder Dostoevsky supports the view that such a man must be killed.

Here, except Murin, Rogozhin, and Dmitri Karamazov all the others die in one way or the other. Though Murin was not punished legally there is penitence in him. Rogozhin, and Dmitri Karamazov accept their punishment willingly, and they were deported to Siberia. Whereas Svidrigailoff and Stavrogin commit suicide, Captain Lebyatkin, Fedka, and Fyodor Pavlovich are murdered. In this regard all these characters Murin, Svidrigailoff, Rogozhin, Stavrogin, Captain Lebyatkin, Fedka, and Fyodor Pavlovich who are presented as men of \textbf{pleasure of Rousseau}, and have committed crime in one way or the other, are punished, accordingly to their crime.
But Dostoevsky’s interest lies not in these men of pleasure; rather he concentrates upon the moral crime and guilty conscience of his characters.

Hence, a keen observation of Murin’s character reveals the fact that Dostoevsky’s intention is not to present Murin as a murderer, but he is presented as a man of pleasure of Rousseau. As a traditional Russian with vast experience in practical life, Murin considers Katerina as a thing of pleasure. So it is Katerina who confesses that she is a murderess, and not Murin. She says, “I am corrupted, they have corrupted me, they have ruined me. I have sold my soul for a moral sin. I am under a curse, I am a murderess; my mother cursed me! I was the ruin of my own mother. I hid her in the damp earth.” In this sense Katerina emerges as the real murderess, who commits a moral crime by helping Murin to murder her parents. She feels that she is a senseless, shameless girl who sold her soul for moral sin. She is conscious of the fact that she sold herself to a wicked man, a cut throat robber.

She instigates Murin to murder her father and remains indifferent to the pleas of her dying mother. It is this social indifference that Dostoevsky condemns and hence makes her to suffers. She is continually tormented from the thought that her prayers will not reach the saints, and they will not save her from cruel grief. She says, “I always fancy that a storm is gathering around me, that harm is coming to me, that evil things will tear me to pieces and torment me, that my prayers will not reach the saints, and they will not save me from cruel grief. My soul is torn, my whole body seems breaking to pieces through crying… then I began praying again, and pray and pray until the Holy Mother looks down on me from the icon, more lovingly. Then I get up and go away to sleep, utterly shattered; sometimes I wake up on the floor, on my knees before the icon.” Katerina, who is presented as a victim of Murin and all
the dark forces that he represents, also becomes a victim of her inability to conquer
the enjoyment that she derives from her enslavement and degradation.

After the murder she elopes with Murin, her father-cum-husband, and remains
subjugated to him. But still she wants to be relieved of from the clutches of Murin,
and wants to escape from him. Her inability to escape from the mysterious control of
Murin transfers her grief into a source of happiness and pleasure. She confesses,
“What do I care for my mother, though I shall never have another mother in this
world? What do I care that she cursed me in her last terrible hour? What do I care for
my old golden life? What do I care that I have sold myself to the evil one and
abandoned my soul to the destroyer, that for the sake of happiness I have committed
the unpardonable sin? Ach, that is not my grief, though in that great is my ruin! But
what is bitter to me and rends my heart is that I am his shameless slave, that my
shame and dishonor and disgrace are dear to me, shameless as I am, but it is dear to
my greedy heart to remember my sorrow as though it were joy and happiness; that is
my grief, that there is no strength in it and no anger for my wrongs!...”216 Here,
Dostoevsky explores, in the character of Katerina, the subtle and unhealthy enjoyment
that can be derived from self-laceration and self-purification.

Later, when Ordynov fails in his attempt to kill Murin, “A look of amazement
seemed to come into Katerina’s face, but at the same time anger and contempt were
reflected with the same force in her eyes. … Katerina stood pale, deathlike, and
immovable; her eyelids were closing; her face was convulsed by a vague, insufferable
pain; she hid her face in her hands and, with a shriek that rent the heart, sank almost
breathless at the old man’s feet…. The old man seized her in his powerful arms and
almost crushed her on his breast.”217 This behavior of Katerina brings out the duality
and the contrast in her appearance, which V. Yermilov identifies as a shift from social to psychologism. Here, Dostoevsky anticipates more recent psychological theories especially Sigmund Freud.

Dostoevsky, also, uses Katerina to unfold the impact of the two leading intellectual movements of the time - Slavophilism and Westernism on realistic and sensitive Russian soul. He uses Katerina- the landlady, to criticize Slavophilism and Westernism in her relationships with Murin and Ordynov. Katerina, who finds comfort with Murin, is unable to get rid of the voice of her Sovest reminding her of her transgression and haunting soul. She suffers as a Russian woman due to a sensitive soul rooted in the traditional values of Russia.

Katerina becomes a symbolic representation of Russian soul enslaved by century’s old national and religious tradition, which has become intoxicated by self laceration and enjoyment of humiliation lacking the power to renounce the oppressive tradition, and Katerina becomes, simultaneously, a victim of both the movements. She is exploited by Murin, the follower of old faith. At the same time it is her crave for material gains, that is, the pearl necklace, which she receives from Murin; and indifferent attitude towards the moral convictions advocated by the environmental doctrine of the Westerners in favor of individualism, lead her into the enslavement. Here, Dostoevsky reveals the impossibility of finding happiness in the material comfort achieved through unethical means.

Thus, in The Landlady, Dostoevsky establishes the basic theme of his later works, the struggle of the crushing human personality. The guilt after transgression and the longing for salvation emerges as the crime and punishment in the weltanschauung of Dostoevsky in his later works. Such a sense of shame for
transgressing the moral convictions is dealt with in its all diversities in his later characters. Later, in his post-Siberian works he explores the subtle psychological impulses and motivation behind the crime, and brings out the rift between thought and actions of the criminal. Consequently, in Notes From Underground, which is a long confession of a moral crime, committed by the nameless protagonist, Dostoevsky brings out the inner turmoil of the hero.

As said earlier, knowing very well of his failures, the underground man believes in his own right to vengeance or in the success of his revenge. But soon he realizes that revenge will lead to nothing and writes, “Remember I spoke just now of vengeance. (I am sure you did not take it in) I said that man revenges himself because he sees justice in it. Therefore he has found primary cause, that is, justice. And so he is at rest on all sides, and consequently he carries out his revenge calmly and successfully, being persuaded that he is doing a just and honest thing. But I see no justice in it, I find no sort of virtue in it either, and consequently if I attempt to revenge myself, it is only out of spite.” According to him it is a purification of the most stinging and painful consciousness that elevate and purify man.

He confesses that he cannot explain who it is precisely that he is mortifying by spite. He says, “I was a spiteful official. I was rude and took pleasure in being so,” and later says, “Of course, I can’t explain who it is precisely that I am mortifying in this case of my spite: I am perfectly well aware that I cannot ‘payout’, I know better than any one that by all this I am injuring myself and no one else.”

He understands if he opens his eyes to his real normal interests then at once he would cease to do nasty things and there is something like holy and exalted in suffering. He says, “Perhaps suffering is just as great a benefit to him as well-being.
Man is sometimes extraordinarily, passionately in love with suffering, and that is a fact. There is no need to appeal to universal history to prove that suffering means doubt, negation and man will never renounce real suffering, i.e. destruction and chaos. Suffering is the sole origin of consciousness.”

If given a chance he says that he will prefer exalted suffering to cheap happiness.

Later Dostoevsky writes in the *Diary of a Writer* “If the pain is genuine and sharp, it will purify us and make us better. In fact, having ourselves become well, we will improve our environment and will make it better. This alone can rectify it, because escapism from one’s own compassion for the sake of evading personal suffering and wholesale acquittals is easy.”

The Underground man suffers for his misdeeds, he says, “I was ashamed (even now, perhaps, I am ashamed): I got to the point of feeling a spite of secret abnormal, despicable enjoyment in returning home to my corner on some disgusting Petersburg night, acutely conscious that that day I had committed a loathsome action again, that what was done could never be undone, and secretly, inwardly gnawing, gnawing at myself for it, fearing and consuming myself till at last the bitterness turned into a sort of shameful accursed sweetness, and at last – into positive real enjoyment! Yes, into enjoyment, into enjoyment! I insist upon that. I have spoken of this because I keep wanting to know for a fact whether other people feel such enjoyment. I will explain; the enjoyment was just from the too intense consciousness of one’s own degradation.” These words of the underground man, who is not exactly a man of flesh and blood, expresses the torment of duality of mind. This justifies the workings of a conscience.
Soon after Liza’s departure the underground man realizes that from revenge one will suffer a hundred times more than he on whom he revenges. He says, “A minute later I flew like a madman to dress, and ran after her.” He wanted to “Fall down before her, to sob with remorse, to kiss her feet, to entreat her forgiveness! I longed for that, my whole heart was being rent to pieces, and never, never shall I recall that minute with indifference. Should I not begin to hate her, perhaps, even tomorrow, just because I had kissed her feet to-day? Should I not torture her? … And will it not be better? I mused fantastically, afterwards at him, stifling the living pang of my heart with fantastic dreams. Will it not be better that she should keep the resentment of the insult forever? Resentment – why, it is purification; it is a most stinging and painful consciousness! To-morrow I should have defiled her soul and have exhausted her heart, while now the feeling of insult will never die in her heart, and however loathsome the filth awaiting her – the feeling of insult will elevate and purify her … by hatred… perhaps too, by forgiveness.”

After his realization he is capable of feeling every refinement of all that is good and beautiful. He believes that the enjoyment was just from the too intense consciousness of one’s own degradation. Man loves to do ugly deeds knowing well he should not commit such deeds. He says that man himself is responsible for his misdeeds. Hence he writes, “So it’s (Notes) hardly literature so much as a corrective punishment. I have spoiled my life through morally rotting in my corner, through lack of fitting environment, through divorce from real life.”

Here, Dostoevsky concentrates upon the dualistic feelings of hope and humility in the underground man. He explains in the rebellious act of the underground man how much repressed wrath and irreconcilable offence, pride and
thirst for vengeance may lie hidden under the outward guise of humility. He says, “Surely by now you must realize that I shall never forgive you for having found me in this wretched dressing-gown, just as I was flying at Appollon like a spiteful cur. The savior, the former hero, was flying like a mangy, unkempt sheep-dog at his lackey, and the lackey was jeering at him! And I shall never forgive you for the tears I could not help shedding before you just now, like some silly woman put to shame.” This attitude of the underground man shows how cruelty constitutes self castigation, and how injured vanity takes revenge through love.

Through his internal monologue Dostoevsky explores psychologically the underground man, who gives a better insight into his character. He establishes the doctrine of self-purification through suffering as a means to bring change in the society. The use of monologue also reveals the soul that is divided, and split personality. It is a self-questioning device which amounts to an easy way of bringing to the fore, the psychological state of character as well as the consciousness. Later this duality becomes an essential element in every fully developed character. It becomes a part of life itself.

According to Dostoevsky every human being carries a germ of opposite emotions in him. All love contains its element of hate, suffering its element of pleasure, and humiliation the element of pride. It clearly shows that Dostoevsky, much earlier to Freud, was aware of the fact and understood the role of the unconscious in man. He knew how shame leads a man to frustration and how through his actions one attempts to appease it. His underground man also explains how pride is the expression of insecurity and shame. He had a lucid knowledge of the duality exhibited by the human psyche and its consequences.
The same technique is used later to bring out the suffering in the nameless pawnbroker of *The Meek One*. Dostoevsky presents the nameless pawn broker, the protagonist, as a man who has lost his mental capacity. He writes, “He is in bewilderment and has not yet had time to collect his thoughts. He paces his rooms and tries to make sense of what has happened, ‘to collect his thoughts to a point’. Besides, he is an inveterate hypochondriac, of the sort that talks to himself.”226 After the death of his wife the pawn broker recalls his first meeting with the girl, his association, and marriage to her. He says that the girl often visited his pawn shop to pledge petty articles, and later he learns that she is an orphan who lived with her aunts.

Later the pawn broker noticed her because of her meekness, and gradually befriends her. They discuss literature, especially *Mephistopheles*. When he learns about the aunts trying to sell her to the fat shop-keeper in the pretext of marriage he offers to marry her. He says that he married her because he wanted to be her *liberator*. He writes, “She had slaved for the aunts for three years, … in the end they were intending to sell her to a man of fifty-five, … it was then she began coming to me often, so as to place advertisements. I knew that the fat shopkeeper was in any case more disgusting to her and that I standing there at the gate was a deliverer.”227 Here, Dostoevsky points out that the nameless pawnbroker, a forty-one year old retired government officer, marries a young girl of sixteen because as he says a feeling of inequality captivated him. He says, “I also liked various thoughts, for instance, that I was forty-one and she had just turned sixteen. This captivated me, this feeling of inequality, very sweet it was, very sweet.”228 On the other hand the girl marries him because she simply could not find work to feed herself.
After the marriage the pawnbroker tortures her with his benevolent silence. Later he justifies his act saying, “To her raptures I responded with silence, benevolent, of course. … So, then, I’ll tell the truth, I won’t be afraid to stand face-to-face with the truth: it was her fault, her fault!” Unable to bear the torture the girl rebels against him. She befriends his enemy from the regiment and learns about the humiliating incident of his life, and insults him. He recalls, “Here was simply a creature thrashing about, so as to insult me in any way possible, but, having decided upon such filth, she could not bear the disorder. And how could she, so pure and sinless, she, with her ideal, be tempted by Yefimovich or anyone else you like among those high-society creatures? … I satisfied myself only too well as to how much she hated me then, but I also satisfied myself as to how chaste she was.”

She even tries to kill him when he was asleep. He recalls, “She was standing by the table holding the revolver in her hand. She came to the bed and stood over me. … She was looking at me, right into my eyes, and the revolver at my temple.” He did not stop her from evil doing because he wanted to take revenge on her. He says, “In my life there was one terrible external circumstance, which until then, that is, until that very catastrophe with my wife, had weighed on me every day and every hour – namely, the loss of my reputation and this retirement from the regiment. In two words: there had been a tyrannical injustice against me.”

After this incident the girl feels guilty and falls ill and unable to bear the torture of guilt conscience confesses her crime. He recalls, “But suddenly she came up to me, stands in front of me, and, clasping her hands, began saying to me that she was a criminal, that she knew it, that her crime has tormented her all winter, torments her still … that she values my magnanimity only too highly.” In spite of the murder
attempt the pawnbroker looks after her. He says that, “she was ashamed that I was still her husband, looking after her, still as if I were a real husband.”$^{234}$ He notices a strange pensiveness in her, not silence, but real pensiveness.

Later he becomes desperate and seeks her forgiveness, but the stern astonishment in her eyes is what finally destroys him. He says, “This sternness, this stern astonishment, all at once demolished me: ‘so you also want love? Love?’ … Everything in me shook, and I simply collapsed at her feet. Yes, I fell at her feet. … She was terribly ashamed that I was kissing her feet, and she kept pulling them away, but I at once kissed the place on the floor where her foot had been. … She saw that and suddenly started laughing from shame (you know how one can laugh from shame). Hysterics were coming, I could see that, her hands twitched …” He says, “Let me kiss your dress … let me worship you like this all my life.”$^{235}$ This act of the pawnbroker reveals the fact that she was defeated but not forgiven. Here we can notice that the pawnbroker loves her at the same time hates her.

Then the pawnbroker realizes his mistake, for he says, “Don’t despise anyone, I’ve felt the same pinch myself and even worse, and if you now see me in this occupation, after all I’ve endured it.”$^{236}$ Her suicide drives him mad and he fails to understand why she committed suicide, and like the underground man, he too regrets his deed. Later he says, “It was also a mistake that I looked at her with rapture; I should have restrained myself, because rapture is frightening. But, after all, I did restrain myself, I didn’t kiss her feet anymore. I never once showed that … well, that I was a husband – oh, it never even entered my mind, I only worshipped. I suddenly said to her that I delighted in her conversation and that I considered her incomparably, incomparably better educated and developed than myself. And if this hadn’t
happened, everything would have been resurrected.” This **duality** of his nature finally leads to his mental disorder

But by the time he realizes this and comes home with future plans she has jumped out of the window. He says, “I remember only the tradesman: he kept shouting at me that, ‘a handful of blood came out of her mouth, a handful, a handful!’ and showing me the blood right there on the stone.” This act of the girl holding an icon to her breast, and jump out of the window suggests some sort of **meek, humble** suicide. Here what matters is his realization, for he regrets his deed and says “I wore her out – that’s what.”

Hence the pawn broker who drives her to suicide is neither punished by the **authorities** nor by the **natural law**, but suffers from a **guilty conscience**. He says, “What your laws to me now? What do I need your customs, your moral, your life, your state, your faith for? Let your judge, judge me, let them take me to court, to your public court, and I’ll say I recognize nothing. The judge will shout: ‘Silence, officer!’ but I’ll shout back at him: ‘Where did you get such power now that I should obey you? Why did dark **insensateness** smash what is dearest to all? Why do I need your law now? I separate myself. Oh! It makes no difference to me! Only people, and around them silence – that’s the earth! ‘People, love one another’- who said that? Whose testament is it? ” These words of the pawn broker clearly depict the **insensateness** of the world around.

Through his nameless pawn broker Dostoevsky also attacks the ideals of the **deterministic** and **materialistic** West with venom that exposes his own vile and debased character while explaining his own irrational assertions of **free will** and **individuality** that can be later traced in **Nastasya** of The Idiot. Nastasya, just like
Katerina of *The Landlady*, is presented as a *wonderfully beautiful* woman. He writes, “The portrait (of Nastasya) was indeed that of a *wonderfully beautiful* woman. She had been photographed in a black silk dress of an extremely simple and elegant cut; her hair, which looked as though it were dark brown, was arranged in a simple homely style; her eyes were dark and deep, her brow was pensive; her expression was passionate, and, as it were, disdainful. She was rather thin in the face and perhaps pale.”

In spite of her education Prince Myshkin notices some elements of rustic nature left within her. He notices that, “Apart from the inelegance of the class of people with whom she sometimes associated and to whom she must therefore have been attracted, she displayed other very strange propensities. She showed a sort of savage mingling of two tastes, a capacity for being satisfied and putting up with things and means of which one would have supposed that a well-bred and refined person would not admit the existence.” She loves in her own *rustic* way without any polish of the *western* culture.

This description of Nastasya brings out the contrast in her appearance. He writes that Afanasy Ivanovitch Totsky her seducer made arrangements for her education. He appointed, “A respectable and cultivated elderly Swiss governess, experienced in the higher education of girls and competent to teach various subjects besides *French*, was engaged for her. Little Nastasya began to receive an education on the broadest lines.” This brought a great change in her, but still remains as a *Russian woman*. Later he presents her as a woman who is unable to get rid of her *Russianness* despite her *modern* upbringing and too much education.
When Nastasya learns that Totsky is getting married to some other girl she wants to take revenge on him. As she is humiliated by Totsky, she suffers from an extreme sensitivity of her lost dream of chastity and honor. Hence, she wants to take revenge upon him by selling herself to Rogozhin, for hundred thousand rubles. “This friends, is a hundred thousand rubles in this dirty bundle”, says Nastasya addressing the company of people who have gathered in her home for her naming day. “This afternoon he (Rogozhin) shouted like a madman that he would bring a hundred thousand this evening, and I’ve been expecting him all the time. He was bidding for me: he began at eighteen, then he suddenly passed at one bound to forty, and then this hundred here. He’s kept his word!” Then she throws that money into the fire. “The fire which had flamed up at first between two smoldering brands was smothered by the bundle being thrown onto it.” Here we can understand that Nastasya sells herself not for the sake of money but out of malice.

This action of Nastasya, in the historical context is the result of the environmental doctrine advocated by the progressive thinkers of the nineteenth century, such as Belinsky and his followers. Dostoevsky writes, in the Diary of a Writer, “Treasuring above everything reason, science and realism, at the same time he (Belinsky) comprehended more keenly than anyone that reason, science and realism alone can merely produce an ant’s nest, and social harmony within which man can organize his life. … Still as a socialist, he had to destroy Christianity in the first place. … Family, property, personal moral responsibility – these he denied radically. Doubtless, he understood that by denying moral responsibility of man, he thereby denied also his freedom; yet, he believed with all his being that socialism not only does not destroy the freedom of man, but on the contrary restores it in a form of
unheard of majesty, only on a new and adamantine foundation.” Further he writes, “However, making man dependant on any error in the social organization, the environment doctrine reduces man to absolute impersonality, to a total emancipation from all personal moral duty, from all independence; reduces him to a state of the most miserable slavery that can be conceived.”

Soon after her decision to marry Myshkin, she realizes that she not suitable to him. She goes with Rogozhin not because of love towards him, but to escape from Myshkin, or rather to save Myshkin. She finds it extremely difficult to get along with Rogozhin’s rustic character. In fact she hates him, and tries her best to humiliate him. She considers Rogozhin as the lowest of the low. But by accepting Nastasya as princess, Myshkin who is presented as a man of progressive thoughts, in fact denies her the opportunity for salvation through penance. Myshkin who fails in his attempt to absolve Nastasya, loses his mental balance. The narrator writes, “When after many hours the doors were opened and people came in, they found the murderer completely unconscious and raving. Myshkin was sitting beside him motionless on the floor, and every time the delirious man broke into screaming or babble, he hastened to pass his trembling hand softly over his hair and cheeks, as though caressing and soothing him. But by now he could understand no questions he was asked and did not recognize the people surrounding him.”

His life in the Swiss sanatorium both before and after the action of the novel clearly shows his withdrawal from human society. Dostoevsky introduces him as returning from Switzerland. He writes, “The readiness of the fair young man in Swiss cloak to answer all his companion’s inquiries was remarkable. He told them he had been a long while, over four years, away from Russia, that he had been sent abroad
for his health on account of a strange nervous disease, something of the nature of epilepsy or St. Vitus’s dance, attacks of twitching and trembling. When, in answer to his enquiry, ‘Well, have they cured you? He answered, ‘No, they haven’t.’

Later Myshkin debates the ambiguities of disease and health within himself. He foresees the momentary ecstasy among other things that he always had one minute just before the epileptic fit. He writes, “When suddenly in the midst of sadness, spiritual darkness and oppression, there seemed at moments a flash of light in his brain, and with extraordinary impetus all his vital forces suddenly began to work at their highest tension.” Thinking of the moment later, when he was all right he says, “That all these gleams and flashes of the highest sensation of life and self-consciousness, and therefore also of the highest form of existence, were nothing but disease, the interruption of the normal conditions.”

True to his Christ-like decision to mix with the affairs of the world, he confesses to Ippolit that he is always been a materialist. Myshkin is always ready to blame himself for the sins of others. When the young nihilistic invaders slander him mercilessly before his friends, he senses their ruthless intention but turns angrily upon himself. “He felt too sad at the thought of his ‘monstrous and wicked suspiciousness’. He felt that he would have died if anyone had known he had such an idea in his head, and at the moment when his guests walked in, he was genuinely ready to believe that he was lower in a moral sense than the lowest around him.”

Myshkin is divided between his humanity and his similarity to the lesser people like Keller and Lebedyev. Lebedyev who makes a full confession of his sins to Myshkin, about the confusion in him of the noble and the base, the undercutting of every noble intention by an insidiously base counter-motive, decides to make use of
the opportunity for his profit by asking Myshkin for money. Myshkin helps knowing very well that it is wrong. Here Myshkin is concerned with his own double thoughts, and says, that of late he had blamed himself for two extremes, for his excessive ‘senseless and impertinent’ readiness to trust people and at the same time for his gloomy suspiciousness. He says, “I reproach myself most of all for it. You might have been telling me about myself just now. I have sometimes even fancied” Myshkin went on very earnestly, genuinely and profoundly interested, “That all people are like that; so that I was even beginning to excuse myself because it is awfully difficult to struggle against these double thoughts; I’ve tried.”

The examination of his divided temperament reveals that much of him is capable of being truly similar to those around him. His reaction to the people around him clearly shows that he is half-saint and half-man. It is this double of Myshkin that misleads Aglaya. He chooses Nastasya over Aglaya with an intention of mutual lacerations, which brings out the fact that he has returned to his self-sacrificing enthusiasm. He says, “That unhappy woman is firmly convinced that she is the most fallen, the most vicious creature in the whole world. Oh, don’t cry shame on her, don’t throw stones at her! She has tortured herself too much from the consciousness of her undeserved shame! And, my God, she’s not to blame! Oh, she’s crying out every minute in her frenzy that she doesn’t admit going wrong, that she was the victim of others, the victim of a depraved and wicked man. But whatever she may say to you, believe me, she’s the first to disbelieve it, and to believe with her whole conscience that she is … to blame.”

He understands why again and again she has deserted Rogozhin after promising to marry him. “His conviction of Nastasya Filippovna’s condition did not
waver; but for that condition all her behavior now would have seemed to him enigmatic and unaccountable. But he genuinely believed that her recovery was possible. This analysis of Nastasya’s madness by Myshkin is brilliant in its probing accuracy. He is quite truthful in telling Yevgeny Pavlovitch that he loved Nastasya truly and sincerely. But in his love for her there was an element of the tenderness for some sick, unhappy child who could not be left to shift for itself. His view of Nastasya Filippovna’s spiritual and mental condition later saves him from his perplexities.

But unfortunately Myshkin himself becomes responsible for driving Nastasya into Rogozhin’s murderous hands. Because after killing her Rogozhin tells Myshkin that it was him that she is afraid of. He says, “She shook her finger at me on the stairs – it was you she is afraid of. She was mad with terror in the train, and it was her own wish to stay the night here. … He’ll find me there as soon as its daylight, she said, but you’ll hide me and early tomorrow morning we’ll set off for Moscow.” She fears death with Rogozhin less than life under Myshkin’s all-discerning, all forgiving eye.

Ultimately he was forced to withdraw to his sanctuary where he can safely commune with himself and make literal the symbolic distance between himself and the world. He writes, “Yevgeny Pavlovitvh took the warmest interest in the luckless ‘idiot’s’ fate and by his care and efforts Myshkin was taken back to Dr. Schneider’s in Switzerland. … But Dr. Schneider frowns and shakes his head more ominously every-time; he hints at a permanent derangement of the intellect; he does not yet say positively that recovery is out of question, but he allows himself phrases suggestive of most melancholy possibilities.”
Unfortunately his whole-hearted and liberal love towards Nastasya denies her the opportunity for realizing her transgression, and accepting for salvation through suffering. Prince as a representative of the progressive men of the time is held interestingly responsible for driving her to the knife of Rogozhin. Nastasya’s murder by Rogozhin clearly sends the message that wicked environment cannot be changed overnight, but only through consistent efforts.

Nastasya decides to remain Rogozhin’s mistress, for she cannot tear herself away from him as she has a sense of guilt within her. For her Rogozhin becomes a means of suffering, giving a sort of pleasure. She knows well that she cannot escape from the two terrible eyes of Rogozhin, and he will kill her. Still she cannot tear herself away from him. Finally she meets with her anticipated end with Rogozhin’s knife. This tragic end of Nastasya reflects the failure of the ideas the characters followed. Her tragic end has its roots in the moral crime of her past life with Totsky and his luxuries. “People asserted afterwards that it was at this moment Nastasya Filippovna went mad. She was still sitting down, and for some time looked about her with a strange and wondering gaze, as though she could not take it in and were trying to grasp what had happened. Then she suddenly turned to Myshkin and with a menacing frown stared intently at him, but that was only for a moment; perhaps she suddenly fancied that it was all a joke, a mockery.” Here, Nastasya’s suffering is not physical but moral.

Though Prince Myshkin absolves Nastasya of her moral responsibility and elevates her to the level of princess in a moment, Nastasya by the laws of life will not accept the logic, reason and love of prince. Here, Dostoevsky firmly believes that adherence to moral values enables an individual to remain virtuous in a wicked
environment. He advocates Christian teaching of salvation through suffering as means for those weak sinners who failed to stand the environment.

Similarly Katerina Ivanovna, who tries to take revenge on Dmitri Karamazov, in The Brothers Karamazov, suffers from her guilty conscience. In her first appearance, in the trial scene, at the end of the story, she gave most favorable evidence to Dmitri. When she realizes her love for Ivan she feels that she is duty bound to save him. Hence she appears in the court for the second time and gives evidence against Dmitri. She makes various baseless allegations and produces the letter written to her by Dmitri as mathematical evidence. She says, “There is more evidence I must give at once. Here is a document, a letter … take it, read it quickly, quickly! It’s a letter from that monster … that man there, there!” She pointed to Mitya, “it was he who killed his father, and you will see that directly. He wrote to me how he would kill his father! But the other one is ill, he is ill, he is delirious!” Her confession relieves her conscience of her guilty feeling, and brings her back to ordinary life.

With this evidence she decides to buy back her lost honor, but her attempts to buy back her lost honor leads her to further humiliations. Her lofty human feeling of love turns out to be a means of revenge and hatredness. Her self-affirmation and pride lead to her self-abasement and humiliation. Her shame of lost honor is not limited to the actual fact of receiving the money from Dmitri and bowing down to him, but it goes beyond that. The crust of the issue lies in her conscience. When she took the money from Dmitri she thought that she would never be in a position to repay the money. It is her sense of guilt that held her close to Dmitri, and not a genuine love.
She realizes Ivan’s love towards her only after her confession and regeneration. Once, after her confession she is relieved from that sense of guilt, Dmitri becomes nothing.

Later when she visits Dmitri in the hospital she seeks his forgiveness. Seeing him, “She flew impetuously to him. She seized him by the hands, and almost by force made him sit down on the bed. She sat down beside him, and still keeping his hands pressed them violently. Several times they both strove to speak, but stopped short and again gazed speechless with a strange smile, their eyes fastened on one another.” Then she says, “My forgiveness is no good to you, or yours to me; whether you forgive me or not you will always be a sore place in my heart, and I in yours.” She stopped to take breath, “What have I come for?” she began again with nervous haste, “To embrace your feet, to press your hands like this – to tell you again that you are my god, my joy. … Suddenly she pressed his hand greedily to her lips. Tears streamed from her eyes.” This action of Katerina shows her true repentance. But Grushenka’s words, her proud lips spoke, not her heart, reveal her true color. Here, it becomes clear that Katerina; in order to make Dmitri pay for his humiliations, willingly puts herself to a great deal of pain and sacrifice.

This leads to the fact there is much similarity between the crimes committed by the sensualists as well as the men with ideas. If the sensualists use their body, the men with ideas use their mind, which can be further traced in the character of Liza of Notes from Underground.

Dostoevsky presents Liza as a young girl, who came from Riga- a small town, to St. Petersburg aspiring a new life, but falls into the mire of prostitution. The chance encounter of the nameless Underground man with Liza, the young twenty year
old prostitute reveals another important aspect of modern free life. When the underground man asked Liza why she left home she hints at some mysterious infamy saying that what if it was even worse there. Then he frightens her with the information that after a year she will be worthless, she will go a step lower to some other house. And in another year to a third house, always lower and lower, and in seven years’ time she will die at the hands of customers, who do not even know how to caress a woman without first giving her a cuff or two.

He says, “You will never buy your freedom. They will see to that. It’s like selling your soul to the Devil … And besides … perhaps I, too, am just as unlucky – how do you know – and wallow in the mud purpose, out of misery? You know, men take to drink from grief; well, maybe I am here from grief. Come; tell me, what is there good here? Here you and I … came together … just now and did not say one word to one another all the time, and it was only afterwards you began staring at me like a wild creature, and I at you. Is that loving? Is that how one human being should meet another? It’s hideous, that’s what it is!” But Liza who is not prepared for suffering as means of salvation snapped out in the rude abrupt tone that, “Not all married women are happy.” For her, as the underground man says, brothel-life is a sort of free-life leading to a progressive future, and he seems to be so bookish, one who speaks like out of a book.

Through Liza Dostoevsky unfolds the plight of young girls carried away by liberal ideas and free thinking, and condemns such free living. He draws our attention to such young ladies who leave their parents and join Communes. He also brings out the attitude of the individualistic man towards such unfortunate ones. Dostoevsky hints at that family discords need not be always due to external factors
such as poverty, but human factors. Often they are due to lack of faith in God and love, and inherent psychological factors of man. According to him young girls cannot solve their problems by leaving their parents and taking refuge in communes or elsewhere outside their family. He considers life in communes is similar to that of a brothel, where young girls like Liza enslave their soul, over which they are powerless, together with their body.

Later Sonia of Crime and Punishment also wants to suffer for her sin. Sonia who is presented as a girl of sixteen, a Russian Magdalene, is not as innocent as she appears to be. Dostoevsky explains under what circumstances she became a prostitute. As Marmeladoff, her father says, “When she was grown up, she read a few novels. Mr. Lebeziatnikoff lent her Ludwig’s Physiology, not long ago. She found it very interesting and even read us a few passages aloud. This all the intellectual culture she had had.” Later he says that Sonia accepted her position as revenge against the malicious people around her. Marmeladoff continues, “Since then, owing to an unfortunate occurrence and a denunciation emanating from malicious persons, attempting to avenge herself for some pretended want of respect, my daughter, Sophia Semenovna, has been entered on the register.”

These words of Marmeladoff show that Sonia is a rebel, who follows the prevailing progressive ideas of Mr. Lebeziatnikoff.

Later, at the death of her father, her appearance draws our attention. Dostoevsky writes, “A girl made her way quietly and timidly through the centre of the crowd. She too was in rags and her clothes worthless, although decked out for the street with all the glaring prominence of her kind…. Her gaudy attire, her colored silk dress with its absurd train, the light boots, the parasol (quite unnecessary at night), her
little round hat trimmed with flaming scarlet feathers, all made a striking figure in such a scene."261 This description of Sonia in her first appearance tells what exactly she is.

Sonia consciously becomes a victim of progressive ideas of Lebiziatnikoff, who argues with Looshin that her condition is woman’s normal state. He says, “In a society as it is, such a kind of life is not quite a normal one, because it is unnatural; but in future society” he says, “it will be normal, because it will be free. Even now she has a perfect right to give way to it, she was wretched, and why not dispose of her own free will of what is after all her capital? In future society, I may as well tell you, capital will be of no earthly kind of use, but the position of the gay woman will be of quite a different character, and will be rationally regulated.” He believes that such is woman’s normal state, and under that condition her (Sonia’s) doings are an energetic protest against society. “I esteem her with consequences, I regard her with delight.”262

According to Lebiziatnikoff, the man of modern ideas, who fights for the cause of women liberation, the question of female modesty is a useless and even an absurd thing. He says that he can fully understand the girl’s reserve with reference to himself, considering that by using her liberty she only exercises her right. He says, “We seek liberty for women, and you only think – whilst leaving untouched the question of female modesty, a useless and even absurd thing. … If she, of her own free will, were to say to me: ‘be mine’, I should be delighted, for the girl pleases me.”263 These radicals believed that, woman’s liberation would be possible through liberal living in communes.
Dostoevsky asserts that according to Christian belief, man is bound to be rebellious, and a rebel can redeem through suffering. Hence, through Sonia he admits that man is born to rebel and bound to be tempted to transgress, which can be traced, later, in Rascolnikoff’s rebel against the society. Hence Rascolnikoff says to her, “Have you, also not acted – as I have done? You, also, have exceeded – you have had pluck for that – you laid hands on yourself – have destroyed a life – your own. That is the same thing. You might have lived by your talents – your understanding.”

Dostoevsky tells us what saved her from her punishment is her realization of sin. He writes, “No! That which up to the present has prevented her from throwing herself into the canal has been the fear of sin and its punishment.” Rascolnikoff also realizes that, “Sonia’s position was an exceptional social phenomenon, but was not that all the more reason that shame had killed her at the outset of such a life, a life against which her former state, as well as her relatively high mental culture, ought to have nauseated her? Had she perhaps a taste for debauch? Surely not! – vice had not affected her character; her body only was soiled.” Hence, for Dostoevsky a transgressor should earn his/her regeneration through suffering, which is seen in Sonia. When she realizes the consequences of sin, is ready to face the punishment.

It is this passive and submissive ways of Sonia that makes Rascolnikoff to confess his crime and redeem himself. When Rascolnikoff says, “Of course I was wrong to kill the woman, but all I did was to kill some ignoble malevolent vermin.” Sonia replies, “But yet the vermin was a human being.” These words of Sonia reveals the fact that in spite of a prostitute she proves herself to be more humane, guided by heart, rather than by intellect. She arouses his moral conscience who says
that he has taken a human life whether good or bad. In fact she is an antithesis of Rascolnikoff, whose **Napoleonic** theory lead to his down-fall and alienation from mankind. Rascolnikoff confesses his crime to Sonia because she has the basic faith in the goodness of **Divine Providence**.

She voluntarily follows Rascolnikoff to **Siberia** because she wants to **suffer** and, thereby expiates her **sin**. Being under the influence of old church morality, it had been extremely difficult for her to keep herself alive. She out lived her transgression because of her faith and awareness of the transgression. This awareness makes her to forgive and love other sinners. Thus, for Dostoevsky, Sonia who sold herself and Rascolnikoff who killed two defenseless old women are in fact the victims of the **Western** ideas of the nineteenth century. Here, Dostoevsky presents Rascolnikoff and Sonia as representatives of two opposing concepts namely **intellect** and **emotion**; **mind** and **heart** respectively.

Unlike Sonia, Rascolnikoff fails to outlive his crime and is being tortured by his conscience. He is introduced in the beginning of the story as a man suffering from **hypochondria**. Dostoevsky writes, “For some time past he had fallen into a state of nervous depression akin to hypochondria. He had withdrawn from society and shut himself up, till he was ready to shun, not even merely his landlady, but every human face. … Man holds the remedy in his own hands. … I should like to know what people fear most. I do nothing and so I talk. I have acquired this habit of chattering during the last month, while I have been lying for days together in a corner, feeding my mind on trifles. Come, why am I taking this walk now? Am I capable of that? Can **that** really be serious? Not in the least. These are mere chimeras, idle fancies that flit across my brain!”

268
Soon after the murder his mental capacity abandons him and forgetfulness sets in. He suffers terribly from the conflict between the **humanness** and the **reason** within him. Dostoevsky writes, “Little by little his mind became diverted by other thoughts, and he lapsed into a kind of reverie; at times the murderer seemed to forgot his position, or rather the most important part of it, and to concentrate his attention on trifles. … He stood stock-still, not daring to believe his eyes; the door of the lodging, the outer door which opened on to the landing, was open; it had been neither locked nor bolted!”

Rascolnikoff loses his rational thinking and ruminates on the pessimistic consequences of the crude and selfish murder. He writes, “He sunk on the couch again, exhausted; another fit of intolerable shivering seized him and he mechanically pulled his old student’s cloak over him for warmth, as he fell into a delirious sleep. He lost all consciousness of himself. … He looked all round, trying to make sure he had forgotten nothing. He suffered cruelly from this conviction, that everything, even memory, even the most elementary prudence, was abandoning him.” He wants to know, “Can that be the **punishment** already began? Indeed, indeed, it is!”

The commission of crime aggravates the disorientation and personality disorder of Rascolnikoff. He writes, “Rascolnikoff lay on the coach a very long while. At times he seemed to rouse from this half-sleep, and then he noticed that the night was very far advanced, but still it never entered his head to rise. Soon it began to brighten into day, and the dawn found him in a state of stupefaction, lying motionless on his back. … He says I must really be losing my senses.” Here, Dostoevsky presents Rascolnikoff as man who is in one form of delirium or the other, from the beginning till the time he confesses his crime.
Rascolnikoff goes through the bitter solitude after his crime as he has abandoned all that is human, and loses faith in his idea. The visit of his mother and sister brings in him the futility of his despicable act. He regrets the deed and says that there is no definite motif to his crime. Soon after the commission of crime he throws the purse in a hole without looking into it. “He bent down to the stone, managed to turn it over after considerable effort, and found underneath a small cavity. He threw in cases, and then the purse on the top of all.”272 This action of shows that he himself does not know why he killed the old lady because he never looks into the purse or the articles he took from the old woman.

In this condition he revisits the scene of crime. “He went on, his eyes fixed on the ground, until all of a sudden he started, as if someone had whispered in his ear. Raising his eyes he saw that he stood before the house, at its very gates. Quick as lightening, an idea rushed into his head, and he marched through the yard and made his way up the well-known stair case to the fourth storey. … He reached the fourth landing and paused before the murdered woman’s room in doubt. The door was open, after wavering a little he went straight in. the room was being done up, and in it were some workmen. This astonished him – indeed, it would seem he had expected to find everything as he had left it, even to the dead bodies lying on the floor. But to see the place with bare walls and bereft of furniture was very strange! He walked up to the window and sat on the sill.” He went out and even pulls at the bell again and again listening and thinking. Then without his knowledge he says to the workers, “The floor has been washed. Are you going to paint it? Where is the blood?”273

This psychological description of Rascolnikoff’s struggle involves him in an intimate delineation of the subconscious. This brings out the duality in his character.
Dmitri Prokovitch Razoumikhin, his friend, tells Rascolnikoff’s mother that, “I have known Rodion for the last eighteen months; he is gloomy, morose, proud, and haughty. Of late (though the germs may have been brooding in him previously) he has become suspicious and hypochondriacal. He is kind and generous, but cannot bear to show his feelings, and would sooner appear brutal than expansive. Sometimes he does not appear hypochondriacal in the least, but simply cold and absolutely unfeeling.”

From this description of Razoumikhin, one might almost say that he is extremely taciturn, and there exist in him two natures, which alternately get the upper hand.

He feels that everything and everybody is against him. Sometimes he will lie in bed doing nothing. Sometimes he indulges in raillery, not because he is not of a sarcastic turn, but rather because he disdains to waste his words. He never cares to hear what anyone has to say, and takes no interest whatever in what is occupying the attention of everyone else at that time. Above all, he behaves as if he has a high opinion of his own ability, not altogether without justification. He realizes that it is not a human being but it was a principle that he has destroyed. “I wished to complete the thing as quickly as possible. It was not a human being, it was a principle I destroyed! The principle I have destroyed, but I could not step over it. I am no farther than before.”

Later, when, Rascolnikoff dreams the repetition of the murder of the old woman. He dreamed that he was in the street, it was already getting late, and darkness was increasing. “Suddenly he stopped, and noticed that, on the opposite pavement, somebody was beckoning to him.” He follows him who enters into a large house, but once within, the man vanishes. “At the same moment, he fancied he saw, in a corner, some woman’s garment hanging from the wall between the cupboard and the window.
… Now cautiously removing it, he observed a chair; upon the chair sat the woman, her head bent low, her body crouching – the face he could not see. He knew it was Alena Ivanovna. … He gently slips the axe from off its noose and, twice repeated blow, strikes at her skull. But more strange still, she keeps her seat just as before, just like a statue. … The woman laughs. Suddenly it struck Rascolnikoff that the room door was open; there also was laughter, whispering. Now, with a demon’s power he struck, and struck, struck again. Yet laughter grew and whisper grew. He wished to run – the room was filling, the door stood open, and on the landing and on the stairs – here, there, and everywhere – people, living people, they looked, looked on in silence. His heart stood still, his feet were leaden – he tried to cry out, and woke.”

Suddenly he was awakened and saw Svidrigailoff standing before him. He writes, “He breathed with an effort, but he fancied he was still dreaming, when he perceived, in the doorway of his room, a man whom he had never seen before, and who was carefully watching him. Rascolnikoff had not as yet time to open his eyes wide before he once more closed them. Lying on his back he scarcely moved. ‘Am I still dreaming’? He thought, and gently raised his eyelids to cast a timid glance at the stranger.” The man introduced himself as “Arcadius Ivanovitch Svidrigailoff,” who says later that “they are the feathers of the same bird” Here, Dostoevsky brings out a close psychological relationship between Rascolnikoff and Svidrigailoff.

Later Svidrigailoff tells Rascolnikoff that, at times he too is haunted by the ghosts of his wife and manservant. He says, “Marfa Pertrovna appears to me. She has already done so three times. The first time I saw her was on the very day of her burial, an hour after my return from the churchyard. I saw her again on my journey, the day
before yesterday she appeared to me at daybreak; her last appearance occurred two hours ago.”

Later in *The Idiot* Ippolit the young **nihilist** also has the same feeling. In his confession to Myshkin, before his suicide, he writes that he has seen the apparition of Rogozhin. He writes, “Suddenly my door opened and Rogozhin walked in. He walked in, shut the door, looked at me without speaking, and went quietly to the chair standing just under the lamp. I was awfully surprised and looked at him in suspense. Rogozhin put his elbows on the little table and began to stare at me without speaking. So passed two or three minutes, and I remember his silence greatly offended and annoyed me. … I remember that he looked at me once or twice very sarcastically. I saw the same sarcastic look in his face now, and it was that which offended me. That it actually was Rogozhin and not an apparition, and hallucination; I had not the slightest doubt at the beginning. I never thought of it, in fact.”

It clearly indicates, like Svidrigailoff, Ippolit also suffers from **spiritual** despair, for he writes, “Well, this peculiar incident which I have described so minutely was the cause of my making up my mind. What helped to bring about that ‘**final decision**’ (of suicide) was not logic, not a logical conviction, but a feeling of repulsion. I could not go on living a life which was taking such strange, humiliating forms. This apparition degraded me. I am not able to submit to the gloomy power that takes the shape of a spider.”

Similarly Rascolnikoff who goes through a bitter solitude after his commission of crime feels like committing suicide. Frustrated with his immoral actions, he suffers from a physical and mental breakdown. Dostoevsky writes, “Rascolnikoff made straight for the --- Bridge, and, stopping in the middle, leaned over the side and gazed
abstractedly at the scene before him. He felt almost too weak to stand there, and would have been grateful to lie down in the road or anywhere. Inclining over the water, he mechanically looked at the last rosy reflection of the setting sun, at the rows of houses which were darkening in the gathering twilight, and at a window afar off, which, catching the sun’s last rays, sent a stream of flame into the dark waters of the canal. Now his head became giddy, his eyes saw blood, and everything—houses, passers-by, carriages—went round and round. Suddenly he shivered violently, thereby perhaps saving himself from another swoon.”

Here, Dostoevsky presents both Rascolnikhoff and Svidrigailoff as equally cynical in their own way, and both conform to the Romantic tradition of Schiller. Svidrigailoff represents a type of Nietzschean superman, who feels that the world is an essentially evil place. He is of the opinion that in order to be in tune with the world, one must essentially be evil. When Rascolnikoff asked him whether he has a more consoling idea of eternity, Svidrigailoff’s sinister reply, “Sent a shudder through Rascolnikoff’s veins. Svidrigailoff looked up, looked the young man hard in the face, and burst out laughing. ‘Is it strange? He exclaimed. ‘Half an hour ago we had as yet not met—we looked upon each other as enemies, a something unpleasant had to be settled between us; this unpleasantness has not been touched upon, and we positively end by philosophizing! Did I not say that we were birds of a feather?’”

If Sonia represents the human and compassionate side of Rascolnikoff’s duel personality, Svidrigailoff represents his negative side. Dostoevsky writes, “Perhaps he felt the need of someone else than Svidrigallov, and merely clung to the latter as a kind of makeshift? Would Sonia have been the better of the two? But, why go now to Sonia? To see her tears once more? Besides Sonia frightened him; Sonia represented
in his eyes a form of irrevocable sentence, a sentence beyond appeal.”283 In the course of his confession and subsequent development Sonia and Rascolnikoff emerge as the representatives of Slavophilism and Westernism, Christian Orthodoxy and Enlightenment, and Russia and The West respectively.

The two theories of Rascolnikoff – Napoleonic motif of everything is permitted for an extraordinary man born out of despair; and his desire to be a benefactor of humanity lead him to commit the murder. For Rascolnikoff Napoleon stands for two things – everything is permitted in a society, and as the symbol of godlessness; and revolt against the tradition and religion. He wanted to help mankind by eliminating such enemies of humanity. It is his half baked idealism that influenced him to kill the old woman. The crime of Rascolnikoff emerges from the idea of the bourgeois superman, who stands above the concepts of good and evil. As said earlier, as a student, Rascolnikoff has written an article on crime in which he expresses his view that man has a right to commit crime and desecration of everything that is sacred. Guided by rational ideals, he tries to replace the old values with a new value, as was the fashion of the day, violating the existing order. Rascolnikoff murders two defenseless women as his first step of anticipated Napoleonic journey to the glorious future becomes a victim of Western ideas of nineteenth century. Later Dostoevsky writes in the Diary of A Writer that his characters “Suffer from the contemporary chaos of life. Because of the failure to comprehend the things taking place all around which their conception became disintegrated.”284

In his aspiration to become a Napoleon, Rascolnikoff takes the route of protest against the society to show his sense of bitterness, injury, humiliation, scorned dignity and despair. The rational Rascolnikoff asserts that man has a right to commit
crime, and desecration of everything that is sacred. He believes in violating the existing order of the day. Guided by his rational ideals, he tries to replace the old values with a new one. Hence, he says the old damned woman is a louse, whose murder is not worth a twinge of conscience. He believes that he can efface the murder by thousands of good deeds later.

Rascolnikoff evolves a theory of his own to solve immediate personal problems first and problems of humanity in general later. He says, “This is really what I maintained: An extraordinary man has a right – not officially, be it understood, but from and by his very individuality – to permit his conscience to overstep certain bounds, only so far as the realization of one of his ideas may require it. … According to my theory, if Kepler’s or Newton’s inventions had, in sequence of certain obstacles, not been able to get into vogue without the sacrifice of one, ten, a hundred, or even a larger number of intervening human impediments, Newton would have had the right – nay, would have been obliged – to do away with these few, these hundred men, in order that his discoveries might become known to the whole world. This does not imply, however, that Newton had a right to assassinate at his will or fancy any living thing, or to steal daily in open market.”285 Here, Rascolnikoff seems to be influenced from the Western theories advocating materialism, and individualism; especially Hegalian theory of two types of men: the common mass and the super hero destined to lead the former. He believes in the Utilitarian Ideology of the greatest happiness for the largest number of people.

But the unintentional murder of Lizevita, half witted-step-sister of Alyona, explains the fact that whatever the cause of revolt it brings only misfortunes to the socially depraved and disinherited. This gives a true picture of man kinds suffering
and explains the ugly, anti humanistic ideas and moods of that society. Whether Rascolnikoff acted on the theory of superman, who makes his own moral laws and subjective to no external code or on the theory that ethics being purely rational and utilitarian, the killing of ‘A vile loathsome vermin’ is an act of vice, the hollowness of the theory is exhibited in the result. The tragedy of Rascolnikoff is the collapse of the principle on which he has acted.

He realizes the difference in destroying a besieged town in the name of expanding ones kingdom and his killing of the old woman. “When I asked myself if a human creature was so much vermin, I comprehended that it was not so for me, but for some audacious individual who would not have questioned such an idea, and would have gone on his way without vexing himself about such a thing. Why, the very fact of asking myself: ‘would Napoleon have murdered this woman?’ was sufficient proof that I was no Napoleon. At last I gave up looking for subtle justifications. I wished to commit murder without casuistic argument- to do only for myself, and nothing else! Even in so terrible a thing, I scorned beguiling my conscience. When I committed murder, it was not to relieve my mother’s misfortunes, nor to devote to the wellbeing of humanity the power and wealth which, in my opinion, such a deed ought to help me to acquire.”286 He becomes a prey to a gloomy fanaticism. Thus, Dostoevsky arouses the question whether it is our cynicism or the premature exhaustion of intellect and imagination in a society that is sinking into decay.

Tortured by his own mind, ultimately he goes to the police station, and meets Porphyrius Petrovitch, the police detective. Porphyrius plays a very significant role in the spiritual regeneration of Rascolnikoff. He asserts that any person who has the
intellectual potential should serve for the betterment of the society. He sees in Rascolnikoff a potentially great man who has deceived himself by adhering to the radical western ideas. He says, Rascolnikoff who is in his prime is, “Like all young people, appreciates above all things, human intelligence. Intellectual smartness and abstract rational deductions entice you. … But, to continue, acuteness of mind is, in my opinion, a very fine thing; it is to all intents and purposes an ornament of nature, one of the consolations of life by means of which it would appear a poor magistrate can be easily gulled, who, after all, is often misled by his own imagination, for he is only human. But nature comes to the aid of this human magistrate! There’s the rub! And youth, so confident in its own intelligence, youth which tramples under foot every obstacle, forgets this!”²⁸⁷

When, Razoumikhin casually refers to the socialist doctrine of crime, which according to him, “A protest against a badly organized social state of things, and man is driven to commit crime in consequence of the irresistible influence of environment, and nothing else.” Porphyrius seizes the opportunity and draws Rascolnikoff into a discussion of his article on Crime. He finds Rascolnikoff’s article quiet interesting, and gives a detailed analysis of his article. He wants a clarification and tells Rascolnikoff, “That there are men in existence who can, or more accurately, who have an absolute right to commit all kinds of wicked and criminal acts – men for whom, to a certain extent, laws do not exist.”²⁸⁸

Later says that he is grieved to observe that “there is a moral right to shed blood – this opinion I find you support, even defend, with fanaticism. This is, in fact, the main point of your article. Moral license or authority to kill is, to my mind, even more terrible than official legal authority to the same effect.” When he wants to know
whether Rascolnikoff has come across such men, Rascolnikoff replies that, “That I neither consider myself a Mahomet nor a Napoleon, nor anyone like them; consequently I am not in a position to enlighten you as to what I should do if I were in their shoes.”

In their second meeting Porphyrius realizes that Rascolnikoff is the murderer, but however did not arrest him. He takes that opportunity to advice Rascolnikoff to revaluate his Nietzschean theory of the superman. Porphyrius wants to check whether Rascolnikoff has any moral or religious foundation. When Rascolnikoff accepts his conclusion, the latter asks him whether he believes in, “New Jerusalem!

Rascolnikoff replies, “I Do”

“And – do you believe in God?”

“I do” repeated Rascolnikoff.

“And in the resurrection of Lazarus?”

This conversation shows that Porphyrius is satisfied that Rascolnikoff is not entirely without redemption.

This conversation can be later traced in The Possessed, where Stavrogin asks Shatov whether he believes in God or not. Stavrogin says to Shatov, “I wanted to find out whether or not you yourself believe in God.”

Shatov replies, “I believe in Russia and in the Russian Orthodox Church. … I believe in the body of Christ. … I believe that His coming will take place in Russia. … I believe. …”
“But in God? Do you believe in God?” For this Shatov could only reply “I – I shall believe in God.” 291

Much later in The Brothers Karamazov, similar conversation takes place between Fyodor, Ivan and Alyosha. It leads to the fact that in Dostoevsky there is a close relation between religion and criminality.

Later, Porphyrius torments Rascolnikoff with self incriminating questions and ironic statements. He says, “Don’t run away with the idea that I am setting up as your instructor – God forbid that I should presume to teach anything to a man who treats criminal questions in the public press! … I assure you that in actual practice such are really the case; men vary much, although, unfortunately, our methods are same for all. … I take notice of the man I fancy guilty, if I do not have him arrested, if I in way set him on guard – but if the unfortunate creature is hourly, momentarily, possessed by the suspicion that I know all, that I do not lose sight of him either by night or by day, that he is the object of my indefatigable vigilance – what do you ask will take place under these circumstances? He will lose his self-possession, he will come of his own accord to me, he will provide me with ample evidence against himself, and will enable me to give to the conclusion of my inquiry the accuracy of mathematical proofs, which is not without its charm. … The man, I mean, is intelligent, but he has nerves which are over-strung. My educated friend would prefer going to prison, rather than be in the midst of such surroundings. He won’t escape – not only because he won’t know where to go to, but especially, and above all, because he is mine from the psychological point of view. In virtue of a natural law he will not escape. He is like a butterfly close to the candle. My man will hover incessantly round me in the same
way as the butter fly gyrates round the candle. Liberty will no longer have any charm for him, he will grow more and more restless, more and more amazed.292

This argument between Rascolnikoff and Porfyrius Petrovich brings out the subtle ideas which porfyrius Petrovich used to bring change in Rascolnikoff with a keen penetrating psychological insight and interrogation. He says, “I subjected you, as now fully acknowledge, to cruel torture, I do not wish that you should take me for an ogre. … I also greatly enjoyed the article you have published. The article was evidently written some sleepless night under feverish conditions. … I admit that the ravings and sayings of a person suffering from delirium should not be taken too seriously.”293 If Sonia changes Rascolnikoff with her submissiveness, Porfyrius tries to change him with his keen psychological insight and interrogation. Here, Porfyrius intention is not to arrest Rascolnikoff and send him to Siberia as a criminal, rather he wants to help and rehabilitate the criminal, thereby, make him a useful member of the society.

Once the crime is committed Rascolnikoff experiences a decisive break, both spiritually and psychologically, from the rest of the humanity. Ultimately he confesses his crime to Sonia. He says, “You remember what I wished to tell you yesterday? I would tell you who it was that killed Elizabeth. … I know it because I am very intimate with him.”294 The inner battle in him suggests he has mistaken himself for an extraordinary man forgetting that in reality he is just a conscientious ordinary man. He says to Sonia, “I was ambitious to become another Napoleon; that was why I committed a murder.”295

Rascolnikoff goes to Sonia because he sees in her the symbol of all the suffering of humanity. Sonia represents in his eyes a form of irrevocable sentence, a
sentence beyond appeal. He **kisses her feet** saying, “I did not bow down to you, personally, but to suffering humanity in your person. I thought neither of your dishonor nor of your faults. I thought only of your great sufferings.” This act of Rascolnikoff is later repeated by Zossima of *The Brothers Karamazov* who bows down to Dmitri anticipating his approaching sufferings. When Dmitri asked the people gathered, pointing at his father, “Why is such a man alive? Tell me, can he be allowed to go on defiling the earth?” Zossima suddenly rose from his seat, moved towards Dmitri and sank on his knees before him. “The elder distinctly and deliberately bowed down at Dmitri’s feet till his fore head touched the floor.”

Sonia arouses his moral conscience who says that he has taken a human life whether good or bad. When Rascolnikov says that, “of course I was wrong to kill the woman, but all I did was to kill some ignoble malevolent vermin.” Sonia replies, “But yet the vermin was a human being.” He confesses his crime because he has lost his faith in ideas, and wanted to re-establish his contact with mankind. “I can tell you! But I was exasperated and would not. Yes, exasperated is the word. Then I took to my rooms as the spider does to its corner. You knew my den – you visited me once, I think. Do you know, Sonia, that man’s mind becomes paralyzed in small poky rooms? How I used to detest the place! And yet I could not leave them. I stopped there whole days, always in bed, unwilling to read, indifferent even to food.”

He says that the real reason was not money to quit his education. He acted on ripe reflection and not on immature thought. It is the complete lack of moral principles that are shattered to their foundations. He says, “I know that it was Satan who was tempting me. I know all. Whatever you may say to me, I have said to myself, over and over again, whilst dreaming in the dark. Oh! The inner struggles I
have had! How unbearable the reflections were, and how I longed to throw them off forever! Do you think that I went thither like a hare-brained madman! Far from it, I acted on ripe reflection, and that was my loss! This is a sure sign of mental disorder.

Sonia realizes that he has become a prey to a gloomy fanaticism, and commands him “Go forthwith, go this very moment to the nearest public place, prostrate yourself, kiss the earth you have strained, bow down in every direction, and proclaim at the top of your voice to the passers-by, ‘I am a murderer’! And god will give you peace again.” In the beginning he refuses to submit himself to law. Later he goes to the market place and declares himself to be murderer.

By this act Dostoevsky explains that Rascolnikoff’s punishment is almost over. “The anguish of the last few days had hardened his heart to such an extent, that he felt satisfied to find himself yet open for another kind, and gave himself entirely up to this one.” This demonstrates the process which will occur again and again in his characters. This action of Sonia can be later traced in the words of Shatov of The Possessed, who says to Stavrogin, “You married her (Mary Lebyatkin) to satisfy your passion for cruelty, your passion for remorse; you went through with it for the mental sensuality. It was a deliberate laceration of the nerves. Hence, kiss the earth – drench it with your tears and ask for forgiveness!”

Rascolnikoff has committed a crime in thought, i.e. he has transgressed a principle. He felt an irresistible urge to humble the pride of the progressive intelligentsia, their rationalism, their divorce from living nature, from the sphere of feeling and emotion. As he put it, reason alone, unleavened by Christian love of one’s own fellowmen, the love preached by Sonia can lead into spiritual wilderness.
Soon after the crime, the punishment, not the judicial or legal one but the real and relentless self punishment begins. Hence, “Sincere sorrow overpowered him, his eyes filled with tears. He knelt in the very middle of the place, bowed earthwards, and joyfully kissed the miry ground. After having risen, he knelt down once more.” A small boy who noticed him exclaims that he looked like a pilgrim bound to Jerusalem. “He is a pilgrim bound for Jerusalem, lads” added a slightly respectable man, “he is taking leave of his children and his native land; he is wishing everybody good-bye, even to St. Petersburg and the ground of the capital.”

It strengthens the conviction that humanity in the sense of humanness is impossible without god. There is no way out from the immeasurable sufferings of mankind. According to Dostoevsky, this one act of Rascolnikoff brought all the sincere confession in him. Rascolnikoff’s salvation is directly dependent upon his ability to suffer. Earlier Rascolnikoff argues that, “Suffering is neither permitted nor forbidden in their case. They may suffer, if they pity their victim. Suffering is part and parcel of extensive intelligence and a feeling heart. A man who is really great, it seems to me, must suffer considerably here below.” Failing to bear the burden of conscience, Rascolnikoff finally surrenders to punishment. He decides to redeem his sin, not only in the eyes of law but also in the eyes of god. As Porpyrius says, “Suffering is a very good thing, suffer, therefore! Suffering is a grand thing.” Later Dounia also says, “In offering to expiate your offence you are washing half your crime.”

The epilogue speaks of the consequences of alienation and religious redemption. In the beginning of his prison life his reason could not comprehend why all prisoners are so fond of young Sonia, while they hated him. Here, Dostoevsky
brings in a duel between Sonia’s faith in God, and Rascolnikoff’s denial of God and His law. Sonia writes, “Even upon her announcing the death of his mother, which, no doubt he anticipated, he showed no signs of emotion. He seemed to comprehend his situation thoroughly, and manifested no astonishment at anything in a life so different from his former one. He performed his duties without repugnance. To his food he was indifferent.”

Dostoevsky asserts that his shame arose not from his hair and chains but from his bitterly wounded pride, in fact he was ill from wounded pride. He still believed that his crime is just an error. He says, “And why does my behavior appear so guilty? He continued to himself. ‘Because is it a crime? What does the word the Crime mean? My conscience is easy. My act was, decidedly, unlawful. I certainly broke the letter of the law, and shed blood. Well, let the letter of the law take my head, that’s all. Undoubtedly, many benefactors of humanity, who have not inherited power, but attained to it, should have been punished for the very first of their steps; but these people prevailed, and are justified, whilst I have not known how to shape my steps; consequently, I was wrong in making the attempt.”

It is the dream that changes his views. He saw in that dream a virus sweeping over the country that causes it’s victims to suffer a madness. People think that they are the sole possessors of truth. They cannot get along and they tear each other apart. He writes, “The whole world was desolated by an unknown and terrible plague, which coming from the interior of Asia, spread over all countries; all perished except a few elect. Parasites of a new character, microscopical beings fixed their home in the human body. But this animalcule were breathing creatures, endured with intellect and will. Persons affected became immediately man. But strange to say, the stricken were,
at the same time, imbued with a strong sense of their own good judgment, never did they believe themselves so strongly endowed with wisdom and intellectual vigor or scientific conclusions and moral perception so correct as now. Whole villages and towns, the entire population became tainted, and lost their reason. …”

This dream of Rascolnikoff speaks in itself the prophecy of Dostoevsky that mirrors the twentieth century disease ridden modern world. Good and evil are confused and people end up murdering each other. Most terrifyingly, he says, at the end when everything was destroyed only a few remained. “Of the whole world only a few remained; these were the pure and elect, predestined to found a new race, to inaugurate the new life and purify the earth; but the chosen were not recognized. None knew their voices or heard their words.”

This vision re-demonstrates Dostoevsky’s fear that atheism will abolish all grounds of authority. It suggests that chaos reigns over the world. It ushers in the triumph of unchecked quests for personal happiness and for Western theoretical schemes for social and political justice that will reduce the world to a chaos of competing egos and theories.

Rascolnikoff becomes an embodiment of the universal truth of the anguished youth. It leads to the fact that it is such indignation of society that leads to Rascolnikoff’s disbelief in God. He appreciates his human intelligence and says that he doesn’t believe in God and there is no God. “Lord, let it be over soon.” He was about fall down on his knees to pray, when a fit of laughter seized him. “I must trust myself, not to prayers.” As Porphyrius says, “Moral rights to shed blood- this opinion I find you support, even defend, with fanaticism. This is, in fact, the main point of your article. Moral license or authority to kill is, to my mind, even more terrible than official legal authority to the same effect.”
Rascolnikoff falls ill and realizes his mistake. His revulsion to Sonia turns to love, which brings in an ecstasy in him. For the first time he was truly happy in his life. The change in his character is the culmination of months of suffering. Dostoevsky writes, “He thought of this change, and said, ‘perhaps all will now change. He knew the unending affection which had ended all her sufferings. Yes; and what were now all these torments of the past! All – even his sin, and sentence, and exile, all – appeared to him, as if they had occurred, or were swept away.’” Rascolnikoff realizes that the moral right to shed blood is more terrible than official legal authority. His focus shifts from the inner conflict within the individual caused by socially conditioned attitudes to the struggle of the individual with his own character.

Gradually his suffering, accompanied by her love and sacrifice makes him to realize that the consequences of his thinking could be worse than the horrible plague. This realization leads to his subsequent redemption and regeneration. The change in his character is the culmination of months of suffering. Sonia brings in him a complete change through her perseverence and revokes his faith in God. His reading of New Testament reveals his new found love for mankind. The story of Lazarus brings in him a Lazarus like resurrection.

It is Sonia who brings in a complete change in him through her perseverance and revokes his faith in God. “Life – full, real, earnest life, was coming, and had driven away his cogitations. Under his pillow lay the New Testament. He took it up mechanically. The book belonged to Sonia; it was that same from which she had read to him of the raising of Lazarus. At the commencement of his confinement he thought that she would pester him with religious teaching, and force the book upon
him; but, to his astonishment, she never spoke of religion, nor ever mentioned the Scriptures.”

His reading of New Testament brings in him a drastic change and reveals his newfound love for mankind. The story of Lazarus brings in him a Lazarus like resurrection. Rascolnikoff’s final realization of his love for Sonia summarizes the moral of the Christian philosophy that through love of Christ comes eternal life. Here, what Dostoevsky meant is that one should seek happiness in sorrowful sufferings. He concludes, “They did not know that a new life is not given for nothing; that it has to be paid dearly for, and only acquired by much patience and suffering, and great future efforts.”

According to Dostoevsky this split in Rascolnikoff’s personality is born out of the gap between the demands presented to him by his human qualities and those presented by the inhuman laws of an unjust social system. Hence the essence of Rascolnikoff’s crime lies in the determination to discover the good, the good based on self–assertion instead of self-submission. He writes, “He was about fall down on his knees to pray, when a fit of laughter seized him, I must trust myself, not to prayers. I am so much atheistically vermin more, because for a whole month I have been pestering divine providence taking it to witness that I am contemplating this attempt, not with view to material gain; but with an ulterior purpose.”

Thus, in Crime and Punishment, Dostoevsky is concerned with neither the physical crime nor the legal punishment of Rascolnikoff rather he draws our attention to the moral crime and suffering guilty conscience in his characters. The essence of Rascolnikoff’s crime lies in the determination to discover the good, the good based on self – assertion instead of self-submission. The novel characterizes the
entire spiritual glow that radiates through all the action of the novel. It also illuminates the darkest recesses of the minds of those tormented and suffering men and women. It shows that crime does not spring from social causes, but focuses on such social causes of crimes that provoke man in a capitalist society. Ultimately, Rascolnikoff was deported to Siberia to undergo punishment, only to be reformed of his moral offence. Later Dmitri Karamazov of The Brothers Karamazov who suffers from a guilt feeling was also deported to Siberia to be reformed.

This aspect of purification through suffering can also be noticed in Stephan Verkhovensky and Nikolai Stavrogin of The Possessed who suffer for their crime. Dostoevsky introduces Stephan Verkhovensky as a liberal idealist, whose name is mentioned almost in the same breath as those of Chaadyav, Belinsky, Granovsky, and Herzen. Stepha Verkovensky introduces himself as ‘a professor’ and gathered a circle of friends around him that included people like Liputin, Shatov, Virginsky, Lyamshin, Tolkachenko, and Erkel, who met twice a week in his home.

Mr. Verkhovensky also influences Nicolai Stavrogin, who is introduced as a paragon of beauty. The narrator writes, “Mr. Verkhovensky, didn’t hesitate to make a friend out of even such a small child, and as the boy grew, any gap that may have existed between them seemed to disappear. He reportedly woke his ten- or eleven-year old friend in the middle of the night and tearfully poured out his wounded sensibilities or even shared some family secrets with him, which, of course, was quite unforgivable. Then they would sob in each other’s arms. Thus Mr. Verkhovensky has managed to touch the deepest – seated chords in the boy’s heart, causing the first, still undefined, and sensation of the undying, sacred longing that a superior soul, having once tasted, will never exchange for vulgar satisfaction.”
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Later it was rumored that young Stavrogin has suddenly plunged into wildest dissipation. It was not the usual complaint of drinking and gambling, but the debauchery of a savage reckless youth like ‘people run down by his horse, and his brutal behavior toward a lady’. There was something obviously unnatural about his behavior. He had become a terrible bully and went around insulting people for the sheer joy of it. The writer says that it is the **double** in Stavrogin which makes him to pull the harmless Gaganov’s nose, bite the governor’s ear, marry Mary Libyadkin, and rape the little girl.

Gaganov is one of the most venerable members of the club, who has the habit of saying, ‘ah, no, I won’t let them lead me by my nose!’ The narrator writes, “Suddenly, without any provocation, our prince committed several unprecedented outrages, different from anything one would have imagined, not at all usual run-of-the-mill things. These were completely inane, unprovoked, childish outbursts of spite. God knows what made him do what he did. … Stavrogin who had been standing in a corner, walked up to Mr. Gaganov and, suddenly thrusting out his hand, caught the old gentleman’s nose between his index finger and thumb and pulled him along a few steps behind him.” Later people said that they had, “Observed his face while he was pulling his victim behind him agreed that it was almost dreamy, ‘as though he’d lost his mind.’”

In another incident he bit the governor’s ear just for the joy of it. The governor says to Stavrogin, “I know you have a kind and noble heart, Nikolai, you’re a well-educated man and you’ve been in contact with the upper crust of society … and now everything has taken such a strange and dangerous turn! Let me tell you, as an old family friend, as an old relative sincerely concerned for you, whose words should
never be taken the wrong way.” These words of the old man irritated Stavrogin. “Suddenly a sly, sarcastic expression flashed across his face. Looking around he leaned toward the governor’s ear. … The governor suddenly realized that, instead of whispering some interesting secret into his ear, Stavrogin had caught it between his teeth and was biting the upper part of it quite hard. The old man trembled all over, and his breath failed him.”

Soon after this incident he was arrested and imprisoned, but two in the morning, “The prisoner, who had been very quiet until then and had even slept for a while, suddenly started stamping and pounding on the door with his fists. He wrenched the iron grating from the window – a feat requiring unnatural strength – broke the glass, and cut his hands. When the officer of the guard arrived with his men and the keys and ordered the cell unlocked so his men could overpower and tie up the maniac, Nikolai Stavrogin turned out to be suffering from an acute attack of brain fever.” Thus, the inner anti-thesis of pride and self-humiliation forms the keynote of Stavrogin’s character. This duality in his character contains a desire to inflict others and thereby a desire to undergo a pain.

Later Stavrogin, who has an ‘uncanny talent for crime’, influences Shatov and Kirilov who can be considered as the two emanations of the spirit of Stavrogin. They got their ideas of atheism, nationalism or socialism from him, while he himself is not committed to any of these ideologies. Shatov says, “There was no conversation between us; there was a teacher saying great words and a disciple who had risen from the dead. You’re the teacher and I’m the disciple. You were sowing those ideas about God and Russia in me, you were poisoning Kirilov’s mind, the wretched maniac. You implanted all sorts of lies and other drivel in his mind and brought him
Kirilov who believes in religion and superman ideals kill himself to prove that he has conquered the fear of death. He says, “Real freedom will come when it doesn’t make any difference whether you live or not. That’s the final goal. … Life is pain, life is fear, and man is unhappy. Now everything is pain and fear. Now man loves life because he loves pain and fear.” He argues that God is the pain of the fear of death. According to him, “He who conquers pain and fear will be a god himself. And the other God will disappear. Then there’ll be a new life, a new man – a new everything. … He wants to have supreme freedom must dare to kill himself. He who kills himself just to kill fear will become a god immediately.”

Here, Kirilov argues that for a Christian the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death; whereas for a superman the last enemy to be overthrown is the fear of death. Hence, Kirilov can be considered as the logical issue of the ethical theory of Rascolnicoff, and with his fantastic logic, as a rebel against morality. This argument of Kirilov can be later traced in Ivan of The Brothers Karamazov.

Shatov, who recognizes ‘Socialism is healthier than Roman Catholicism’, whose ideology comes from Stavrogin, becomes a victim of revolution. He sees socialism as a form of atheism because it dreams of a society based on science and reason and which is opposed to the Russian spirit which is linked to Orthodox Christianity. He says, “Not one single nation has, as yet, based its life on reason and science, except for a few moments, and then out of sheer stupidity. In its very essence, socialism is godless – it proclaimed in its very first statement that it aims at an organization that does not presuppose God; that is, an organization based on principles of reason and science exclusively. But reason and science have always performed, and still perform, only an auxiliary function in the life of peoples, and it
will be like that till the end of time.”³²⁵ Later, a year or so before, Shatov also joined
the group. “He was a former university student who had been expelled from the
university after some scandal. As a boy, he had been one of Mr. Verkhovensky’s
pupils. When abroad, Shatov radically altered his former socialist convictions and
jumped to the other extreme. He was one of those Russian idealists who, once struck
by some overwhelming idea, become obsessed by it, sometimes for the rest of his life.
He cannot ever really grasp it, but he believes in it passionately, and his life becomes
an uninterrupted series of agonizing pangs.”³²⁶

Shatov learns his ideologies when in abroad in the company of Stavrogin. In
his argument with Stavrogin he says, “France, during all her long history, has been
nothing but the incarnation and elaboration of the concept of Romish god and if she
is now gone over to atheism – which they call socialism over their – it is only
because even atheism is healthier than Roman Catholicism.”³²⁷ Later a similar
argument can be seen in The Brothers Karamazov, where Miusov the liberal idealist
in his anecdote says, “We are not particularly afraid of all these socialists, anarchists,
infidels, and revolutionaries; but there are a few peculiar men among them who
believe in God and Christians, but at the same time are socialists. Those are the
people we are most afraid of. They are dreadful people! The socialist who is a
Christian is more to be dreaded than a socialist who is an atheist.”³²⁸ Hence, for
Shatov the problem of revolution is essentially a question of God and Religion, and
man’s place in the Universe. Consequently the revolutionaries think that he is a threat
to their conspiracy – not materially but ideologically.

Soon after the murder, one by one, all the revolutionaries were arrested. The
narrator writes, “Lyamshin immediately rushed out of the house and of course heard
what was being said all over the town. Without thinking any further, he took to his heels, running straight ahead of him. … Apparently, at daybreak he attempted to kill himself, but failed. Then he suddenly jumped up and ran off to the police.  

At the police station it came to light that the tragedy involving Shatov and Kirilov, the arson, the death of the Lebyatkins, and so on, were all only subsidiary acts in the implementation of the master plan. Lyamshin confesses in the police station that behind it all stood Peter Verkhovensky with his secret organization, The Movement, the mysterious network. Stavrogin in his discussion with Shatov also says that the entire society is essentially one man – Peter Verkhovensky. He says that Peter is too modest in claiming to be only an agent of the organization. For him Peter is essentially a fanatic. “Actually, Peter had certain plans in which he wanted to use his father. I believe he wanted to drive him to despair and then involve him in a certain scandal, for special reasons that I shall discuss later. He was full of schemes and calculations, most of them really fantastic.

When asked what had been the point of all those crimes and outrages, Lyamshin explained that they were trying ‘systematically to undermine the foundations of the existing order, to bring about the disintegration of social structure and the collapse of all moral values, which would cause general demoralization and confusion. Then the broken, decaying society, sick and in full ferment, cynical and godless, but thirsting for some guiding idea and for self-preservation, could be taken over when the banner of revolution was raised, making use of the vast network of Fives, which, in the meantime, would have recruited more and more new members and probed the weak spots for their attacks.’ He believed, “Peter Verkhovensky had only been trying to test, for the first time, the ability of the organization to wreak
havoc and that the results would indicate to him what his further program should be and what plan of action should be given the other Fives.”

Later other revolutionaries were also arrested. “That same day, of course, they (police) also arrested Virgisky and, Virginsky immediately confessed everything. … Liputin managed to get to Petersburg and was only picked up two weeks later. … Tolkachenko, caught somewhere in our district about ten days after he’d fled town.”

Peter, who plots the murder, never comes to the forefront and escapes without any punishment. The narrator says, “Peter picked up his bag, his rug, and his book and moved quite willingly into the first-class carriage. Erkel helped him. The third bell rang. ‘Well, Erkel,’ Peter said hurriedly, shaking Erkel’s hand through the carriage window for the last time, ‘they’re waiting for me to start that game’. And that was the last Erkel saw of his Peter Verkhovensky.”

Here, Dostoevsky presents Peter as a double edged knife who says, “I have a knife hidden in my boot just like Fedka.” He pretends to be a socialist, but admits that he is a crook. He says, “In reality, I’m a crook and not a socialist, ha, ha, ha! I have them all at hand already: we have the teacher who makes the children entrusted to his care laugh at their God and at their families; we have the lawyer defending the well-educated murderer because he has reached a higher stage of development than his victims and couldn’t get hold of their money without killing them; … the juries who acquit criminals are all working for us; the prosecutor torn by his anguished fear of not being liberal enough does us a service.” For him “Crime is no longer insanity but the soundest common sense- indeed, almost a sacred duty or at least a noble gesture of protest. The Russian god has already capitulated to cheap liquor.” Under
his guidance, politics becomes a catalyst speeding the moral break-up of Russian society. Here, Peter is presented not just as a crook but as a man thirsting for political power.

Later Fedka, the escaped convict also says about Peter, “You’re not even fit to polish Kirilov’s boots because he’s a learned man and you're nothing but a foo.” He spits on Peter’s face, and there is unmistakable scorn and determination in Fedka’s manner. Then he says, “Mister Peter, seeing as how you lied to me from the very beginning the way I see it you’re a no-good crook. To me you’re some kind of a human louse. … And do you know what you deserve for having stopped believing, in your black heart, in the true God and Creator? You’re nothing but a pagan, no better than a Tartar or idol-worshiper.”

Peter contradicts Shigalov’s theory who wishes to propose his own system of world organization on which he has devoted all his energy. Shigalov says that his study of social organization will supersede the present one in the future society. He always seemed to be expecting the end of the world. If Liputin merely hoped that one day Utopia might be established, Shigalov was sure of the day and hour when it would happen. Like Rascolnikoff he offers as a final solution the division of mankind into two uneven categories. He writes, “One-tenth will be granted individual freedom and full rights over the remaining nine-tenths, who will lose their individuality and become something like a herd of cattle.”

Shigalov refuses to participate in the murder of Shatov. In his refusal we feel that at last one person is not ready to commit the shameful act. But Shigalov does not participate in the crime not because he is revolted by the act itself but because the
murder is not required by his scheme. He says, “I have come here with the sole objective of protesting against the contemplated act and of disassociating myself from it as this moment—which, for some reason you consider a ‘moment of danger’ to you. I am leaving not because I fear that ‘danger’ nor out of sentimental feelings for a man with whom I have no wish whatever to exchange kisses, but because this affair, from beginning to end, is harmful to my program. … I would like to call your attention to the fact that I am not Fourier. The fact that you confuse me with that sentimental, syrupy, abstract mumbler only proves that, although you have had my manuscript between your hands, you’re still completely unacquainted with it. … now, if you meant to threaten me for tomorrow or the day after, I repeat again that shooting me will only bring you more trouble: whether you kill me or not, sooner or later, you’ll have to accept my system anyway.”

In this sense, he is worse than Peter. It clearly depicts that Shigalov is neither hot nor cold; but for him a man like Shatov does not exist. The only reality he acknowledges is the reality of his doctrine. He has become the ideological man in his ultimate, most terrible form.

Soon after Stephan Verkhovensky leaves Mrs. Stavrogin as he is too proud to accept her charity. He could not stay with her as a humble dependant. “He left as on his own will and, carrying high ‘the banner of the great idea,’ he was going to die for it on the road! That is exactly how he must have felt and how his action must have looked to him.” In his confession to the gospel vendor Mr. Verkhovensky says, “My dear, I have lied all my life. I never spoke for the sake of truth, only for my own sake, and I always knew it, I only really see it now. Ah, where are the friends on whom I have inflicted my insulting friendship all my life? Ah, and all the rest— is it possible that I’m lying even now; indeed, I’m quite sure I am. The main trouble is that
I believe myself even while I’m lying. The most difficult thing in life is to live without lying and – and not to believe in one’s own lies.”

He confesses that for the last thirty years he has not read the gospel. He requests her to read from the passage in St. Luke about the swine, the demons going into the pigs and getting drowned, and the lot of them. She reads, “And there was a herd of many swine feeding on the mountain … then they went out to see what was done; and came to Jesus, and found the man, out of whom the devils were departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind … just as it did that other madman possessed by demons; and all those demons, all that filth festering on the surface, will themselves beg to be allowed to enter the swine. Indeed, they may have entered them already! It’s us, us and the others – my son Peter and those around him; and we’ll all hurl ourselves from the cliff into the sea and I’ll be the first perhaps.”

Ultimately he dies of brain fever. “Mr. Verkhovensky was working himself up into a state of violent agitation that was too much for his waning strength.” He believes, “There exists something infinitely more just and happy that I is enough to fill me with a limitless joy and pride, whatever I may be and whatever I may have done! … The law of human existence consists of man’s always having something infinitely great to worship. … Every man, whoever he may be, needs to bow before the fact that the Great Idea exists. Even the most stupid man needs something great. Peter – oh, how much I want to see them all again! They don’t know that the eternal Great Idea dwells in them too.” After this, three days later he dies.

Here, Dostoevsky presents Stephan Verkhovensky with a double purpose. He wanted to laugh at the beautiful souls of useless liberals and to prove that the
progressive humanists of the 1840s were responsible for the socialist leanings of the following generations. In Stephan Verkhovensky Dostoevsky exposes the incongruity between the words and deeds of these designers of human destiny and lack of human touch in their ideas. It is precisely on that account that Dostoevsky rejected their ideas. He clearly sends the message that revolution never turns out to be humane and civilized affair. Hence he made them to suffer, especially Stavrogin.

Stavrogin was also forced to suffer and take the moral responsibility of his evil deeds. In his confession to Bishop Tikhon he says, “He suffers from strange hallucinations especially at night; that he seemed to see or feel close to him some evil creature, mocking and ‘rational’ which took on a variety of personalities and characters, but which he knew was always the same creature.”343 In his long letter of confession to Bishop Tikhon, he accepts his punishment. He brought many copies of the letter and wants to distribute it for all people. “These sheets are meant for circulation” he says in a breaking voice, “If just one man reads them and understands them, I won’t conceal them from anyone any longer. I’ve decided that. You – I don’t really need you at all, because that’s the way I’ve decided myself.”344

He wants people to look at him which will be his last resort to come out of his guilt feeling. He feels that the act, raping of twelve year old Matryosha is so humiliating that he feels that he is even unworthy of death. He says, “I would have given my body to be torn to pieces if only it could be undone. It is not my crime that obsesses me, what I cannot stand is that moment.” He commits suicide as he was not able to bear the storm in his life. He says, “It was then that I decided – but for no special reason at all – to cripple my life and make the most loathsome mess of it that I possibly could. For a year before that, I had been thinking of suicide, but now I
decided to do something better than that. … I had never experienced anything like it before. Was it what they call remorse or a feeling of guilt? I pitied Matryosha and my pity extended into madness, and I would have given my body torn to pieces if only it could be undone. It is not my crime that obsesses me; it is not even that I regret her dying so deeply. What I cannot stand is that moment, and since then I have relived it almost every day, and I know perfectly well that I am doomed.”

He has that urge to be punished in him, would not bother about legal punishment but what matters is the internal guilt. According to Tikhon that document came straight from a mortally wounded heart. He says, “It is a penance and your natural need for it has overcome you. The suffering of the creature you wronged has so shattered you that it has brought home to you the problem of life and death, so there is still a hope that you are now on the great.”

Mrs. Stavrogin found him dangling just by the door of the attic in his room. “Mrs. Stavrogin hurried up the narrow stairs with Dasha behind her. But when she stepped into the cubicle, she let out a scream and fainted. The citizen of the Canton of Uri was dangling just by the door. On the table there was a scrap of paper with the words, ‘Accuse no one, I did it myself’ written in pencil. Next to it on the table there was also a hammer, a piece of soap, and a large nail, apparently in case the other one hadn’t held up. The strong silk cord on which Nikolai Stavrogin had hanged himself was lavishly smeared with soaps. All this indicated that to the last second he was in full possession of his mental faculties and had acted with premeditation. After the autopsy, all our medical experts rejected any possibility of insanity.”

In Stavrogin one can notice his spiritual force to become the ideologist of religious slavophilism of shatov, of the revolt against god of Kirilov and of the
revolution of Peter. But unable to bear the blows and the spittle he chose the way to
death. Here the motive for his suicide is not only his own crime, but the crimes of his
doubles. Like a madman he reveals his agitation with uncharacteristic simplicity. He
was not at all ashamed of the fear with which he spoke of the apparition that haunted
him. He says, “It’s myself in various forms – nothing else. But my adding that last
phrase may lead you to believe that I’m really not so sure about whether it’s just
myself and not the Devil. Of course, I see him, just as clearly as I see you.
Sometimes, though, I see him without being sure that I do – and yet, I do see him. …
Of course I see him, just as clearly as I see you. And sometimes I don’t know what the
truth is – whether it’s him or me. None of it makes any sense. But why should it be so
difficult for you to assume that it’s the Devil! … I’ll declare openly and unblushingly
that I do believe in the Devil; that I believe canonically in a personal, not an
allegorical devil”348

This argument of Stavrogin can be later traced in the character of Ivan
Karamazov of The Brothers Karamazov, which once again tells the story of a murder,
a parricide. The murder of Fyodor by his illegitimate son is a revolt against society,
suggesting symbolically, the death of fatherland by his sons for ill treating their
mother. As said earlier in chapter three, Ivan did not commit any crime in the real
sense, but he suffers for his moral crime. He influences Smerdyakov, the illegitimate
son, to commit parricide and thereby becomes responsible for the crime. Dostoevsky
establishes a close relationship between Ivan and Smerdyakov in their first meeting
when Fyodor Pavlovitch says to Ivan, “It’s you he’s so interested in. What have you
done to fascinate him?” Ivan replies, “Nothing whatever. He’s pleased to have a high
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opinion of me; he’s a lackey and a mean soul. Raw material for revolution when the
time comes.” 349

Ivan who cares only for his intelligence suffers from his absolute solipsism.
When Fyodor says, “It’s more likely Ivan’s right. Good Lord! To think what faith,
what force of all kinds, man has lavished for nothing, on that dream, and for how
many thousand years. Who is it laughing at man? Ivan! For the last time, once for all,
is there a God or not? I ask for the last time?”

Ivan replies, “And for the last time there is not”

“Alyosha, is there a God?” Alyosha replies, “There is.”

“Ivan, and is there immortality of some sort, just a little, just a tiny bit?”

“There is no immortality either”

Alyosha says “There is God and immortality. In God there is immortality.”

“Who is laughing at mankind, Ivan?”

“It must be the devil,” said Ivan smilingly.

“There would have been no civilization if they hadn’t invented God”350

This conversation of Ivan with his father and Alyosha proves that he fails to
discover the proofs of the world, of God, or even Satan. It proves that intelligence by
itself is the source of all evil, and ultimately of despair. Genuine goodness can only
be reached by those who plunge deep down to the bottom and somehow find God. He
shows how men who do not believe in God end up by believing in their own omnipotence.

Though Ivan is presented as a rationalist, he is a man who is more concerned with the meaning of life than with life itself. In his argument with Alyosha he says, “I have a longing for life, and I go on living in spite of logic. Though I may not believe in the order of the universe, yet I love the sticky little leaves as they open in spring. I love the blue sky, I love some people, whom one loves you know sometimes without knowing why. I love some great deeds done by men, though I’ve long ceased perhaps to have faith in them, yet from old habit one’s heart prizes them. … I want to travel in Europe, yet I know I am only going to a graveyard, but it’s the most precious graveyard. … Faith in their work, their truth, their struggle and their science, that I know I shall fall on the ground and kiss those stones and weep over them. I shall not weep out of despair, but simply because I shall be happy in my tears, I shall steep my soul in emotion.”

This outburst of Ivan clearly brings out the double in him. The double says, “Owing to man’s inveterate stupidity, this cannot come about for at least a thousand years, everyone who recognizes the truth even now may legitimately order his life as he pleases, on the new principles. In that sense, ‘all things are lawful’, for him. What’s more, even if this period never comes to pass, since there is anyway no God and immortality, the new man may well become the man-god, even if he is the only one in the whole world, and promoted to his new position, he may lightheartedly overstep all the barriers of the morality of the old slave-man, if necessary.” He says that there’s absolute nothingness.
Later at the end of the story in the trial scene the prosecutor also says that Ivan is known for his spiritual audacity. He says, “The elder (Ivan) is one of those modern young men of brilliant education and vigorous intellect, who has lost faith in everything. He has denied and rejected much already, like his father. He never concealed his opinions, quite the contrary in fact, which justifies me in speaking rather openly of him now, of course, not as an individual, but as a member of the Karamazov family. Smerdyakov, at the preliminary inquiry told me with hysterical tears how the young Ivan Karamazov had horrified him by his spiritual audacity. Everything in the world is lawful according to him, and nothing must be forbidden in the future – that is what he always taught me.”

Smerdyakov, who worships Ivan, in a certain sense, can be considered as a double of Ivan. Ivan himself admits his agreement with Smerdyakov on this point. After parting from Alyosha as he went home to Fyodor Pavlovitch’s he was overcome by a strange and insufferable depression. As he approached the house the apprehension of the new and unknown certainty found place in his heart. He wonders, and tries not to think what made his depression so vexatious and irritating that had a kind of casual, external character. He feels, “Is it loathing for my father’s house? … Some person or thing seemed to standing out somewhere, just as something will sometimes obtrude itself upon the eye, and though one may be so busy with work or conversation that for a long time one does not notice it, yet it irritates and almost torments till at last one realizes, and removes the offending object.” As he arrived home, suddenly Ivan realizes what is fretting and worrying him. He says, “On a bench in the gateway the valet Smerdyakov was sitting, enjoying the coolness of the evening, and at the first glance at him Ivan knew that the valet Smerdyakov was on
his mind, and that it was this man that his soul loathed. It all dawned upon him suddenly and became clear.\textsuperscript{354}

Here, Dostoevsky displays an inner link between Ivan and Smerdyakov, and establishes some sort of understanding between them. He writes that there was, in fact, something surprising in the illogicality of some of Smerdyakov’s desire, which are accidentally betrayed and always vaguely expressed. “But what finally irritated Ivan most and confirmed his dislike for him was the peculiar revolting familiarity which Smerdyakov began to show more and more markedly. Not that he forgot himself and was rude; on the contrary, he always spoke very respectfully, yet he had obviously begun consider – goodness knows why! – That there was some sort of understanding between him and Ivan Karamazov. … Where are you going? You won’t pass by; you see that we two clever people have something to say to each other”\textsuperscript{355}

These remarks of Smerdyakov clearly show the dominance of Ivan’s double on him. When Smerdyakov suggested Ivan to go to Chermashnya as he will be having a long fit and most probably Dmitri will murder his father, a sort of shudder passed over Ivan’s face. He suddenly flushed, and demanded, “Then why on earth do you advice me to go to Chermashnya? What did you mean by that? If I go away, you see what will happen here.” Later he says, “And couldn’t I be sent for from Chermashnya, too – in case anything happened? … Only Moscow is further and Chermashnya is nearer … to save my going so far out of my way that you insist on Chermashnya.”\textsuperscript{356}

After this conversation at the gate Ivan indirectly gives his consent for the murder of their father.
Smerdyakov, who is presented as a patient crook has planned murder for years, succeeds in murdering Fyodor Pavlovitch. He plans perfectly and waits for an opportunity, and leaves no clue. It was his patient waiting that bears him the fruits of his much awaited revenge. He explains how he murdered the old man and says with a contemptuous smile, “You know of yourself, for a fact, that it wasn’t I murdered him. And I should have thought that there was no need for a sensible man to speak of it again. … It was all that going to Chermashnya. Why! You were meaning to go to Moscow and refused all your father’s entreaties to go to Chermashnya – and simply at a foolish Chermashnya word from me you consented at once! What reason had you to consent to Chermashnya? Since you went to Chermashnya with no reason, simply at my words, it shows that you must have expected something from me.”

Ivan is ashamed of Smerdyakov and thereby recognizes his own guilt. He feels guilty of being an accomplice in crime. He says, “Yes, I expected it then, that’s true! I wanted the murder, I did want the murder! Did I want the murder? Did I want it? I must kill Smerdyakov! If I don’t dare kill Smerdyakov now, life is not worth living!”

Just like Stavrogin, Ivan also suffers from the same feeling unable to bear the torture of dilemma Ivan loses his sound mind. Ivan’s moral crisis is displayed in his nightmare in the appearance of his double – the devil. Here, Dostoevsky probes deep into the unconscious double, which later was recognized by the Freudians as the Id. He sees an apparition of himself, “Listen, Ivan suddenly got up from the table. I seem to be delirious … I am delirious, in fact, talk any nonsense you like, I don’t care! You won’t drive me to fury, as you did last time. But I feel somehow ashamed … I want to walk about the room … I sometimes don’t see you and don’t even hear your voice as I did last time, but I always guess what you are prating, for its I, I myself speaking, not
you. Only I don’t know whether I was dreaming last time or whether I really saw you. I’ll wet a towel and put it on my head and perhaps you will vanish into air.”

This is a clear indication that all these characters suffer from **spiritual despair** with nothing to look forward to. They are too sensual to have a spiritual insight.

The appearance of the **double** of Ivan brings out the rift between his relation between **church** and **state**. His argument shows the consequences of the denial of freedom to man in favor of happiness. It explains the condition of Ivan whose soul is ripped by the contradiction of which he is perfectly aware, but which he is not able to resolve. Ivan who cannot believe in **God** nevertheless believes in **Evil**. Hence, the **Devil** says, “I am told, for there’d be nothing without you. If everything in the universe were sensible, nothing would happen. There would be no events without you, and there must be events. So against the grain I serve to produce events and do what’s irrational because I am condemned to. For all their indisputable **intelligence**, men take this farce as something serious, and that is their tragedy. They **suffer**, of course … but then they live, they live a real life, not a **fantastic** one, and for **suffering is life**. Without suffering what would be the pleasure of it? It would be transformed into an endless church service; it would be holy, but tedious. I **suffer**, but still, I don’t live, I am **x** in an indeterminate equation. I am a sort of **phantom** in life who has lost all beginning and end, and who has even forgotten his own name.”

Later in Smerdyakov’s suicide Dostoevsky establishes the fact that persons severely afflicted with epilepsy are always prone to continued and morbid self reproach. They are tormented by pangs of conscience. Alyosha informs Ivan that, “An hour ago Smerdyakov hanged himself. He was told by Marya Kondratyevna, that Smerdyakov has taken his own life.” She says, “I went in to clear away the samovar
and he was hanging on a nail in the wall. On Alyosha’s inquiring whether she had informed the police, she answered that she had told no one, but I flew straight to you, I’ve run all the way. When Alyosha ran with her to the cottage, he found Smerdyakov still hanging. On the table lay a note: ‘I destroy my life of my own will and desire, so as to throw no blame on anyone.’

Ivan’s subconscious is revealed through his hallucination or delirium which he undergoes when he is ill. In his hallucination Ivan meets the Devil which he tells twice as himself. Ivan says to Alyosha, “The devil! He’s taken to visiting me. He’s been here twice, almost three times. He taunted me with being angry at his being a simple devil and not Satan, with scorched wings, in thunder and lightning. But he is not Satan: that’s a lie. He is an impostor. … You would have driven him away. You did drive him away Alyosha, when you arrived. And he is myself, Alyosha.” Here, we can feel that Smerdyakov is not just similar to Ivan but is in him. Later after the murder, a consciousness awakes in Ivan’s soul, and sees the devil sitting in him.

The prosecutor Ippolit Kirillovitch argues that, Smerdyakov had a fit because of depression, he was afraid when Ivan left him. He says “He spoke to me himself of his spiritual condition during the last few days at his father’s house. … Smerdyakov whose health was shaken by his attacks of epilepsy, had not the courage of a chicken.” When Dmitri frightened him he disclosed the secret signals to him. “In that capacity he deceived his master. … He was naturally very honest and enjoyed the complete confidence of his master, ever since he had restored him some money he had lost. So it may be supposed the poor fellow suffered pangs of remorse at having deceived his master, whom he loved as his benefactor. Persons severely afflicted with epilepsy are, so the most skillful doctors tell us, always prone to continual and morbid
self-reproach. They worry over their ‘wickedness’, they are tormented by pangs of conscience, often entirely without cause.” Further he argues that Smerdyakov had, “A strong presentiment that something terrible would be the outcome of the situation that was developing before his eyes. When Ivan was leaving for Moscow, just before the catastrophe, Smerdyakov besought him to remain, though he was too timid to tell him plainly what he feared. He confined himself to hints, but his hints were not understood. It must be observed that he looked on Ivan Fyodorovich as a protector, whose presence in the house was a guarantee that no harm would come to pass.”

Ultimately, Ivan torments himself with a guilty conscience, and dies of brain fever. Katerina Ivanovna says, “He tortured himself, he was always trying to minimize his brother’s guilt and confessing to me that he, too, had never loved his father, and perhaps desired his death. Oh, he has a tender, over-tender conscience! He tormented himself with his conscience! He told me everything, everything! … one day he came to me and said, ‘if it was not my brother, but Smerdyakov committed the murder, perhaps I too am guilty, for Smerdyakov knew I didn’t like my father and perhaps believed that I desired my father’s death.”

At end of the story it is Dmitri who is exiled to Siberia for the crime which he did not commit physically, but to accept the torture of public accusation and public shame. He wanted to be punished for his guilty conscience as he wished the death of his father. He says, “I want to suffer and by suffering I shall be purified. Perhaps I shall be purified gentleman? But listen for the last time; I am not guilty of my father’s blood. I accept my punishment, not because I killed him, but because I meant to kill him and perhaps I really have killed. Still I mean to fight it out with you to the end, and then God will decide.”
Dmitri is saved because at the decisive moment the grace of god falls upon him. Though he is a man of evil passions, and capable of murder he won’t kill. The prosecutor says, “He seems to represent Russia as she is. Oh! He is spontaneous, he is a marvelous mingling of good and evil, he is a lover of culture and Schiller, yet he brawls in taverns and plucks out the beards of his boon companions. He dislikes paying for anything, but is fond of receiving, and that’s so with him in everything.”

It is his unshakable faith in god that saves him. But he becomes a victim of circumstantial evidence and suffers. On the other hand Ivan has merely incited Smerdyakov to commit murder; still he is not blessed because he has faith neither in God or immorality. Here, Dostoevsky argues that in virtue of a natural law the criminal won’t escape punishment.

It is true that Dmitri did not commit physical murder but his moral conscience yields place to the sins of all mankind. In spite of his passion and materialistic attitude he stands as a devout Orthodox Christian. Through Dmitri, Dostoevsky advocates the Christian moral teachings. Accordingly all men are equally in fault to one another, and even the innocent, i.e. one who is not guilty, must also accept His punishment. The criminal with a guilty conscience will definitely surrender to the judicial law by virtue of a natural law, to expiate his crime.

Hence, he advocates punishment not that of the legal variety, but that of Internal Guilt. He says that self inflicted punishment is the best punishment. “To a man who is sensitive, cultured and of delicate conscience; what he feels after the crime kills him more surely than the material punishment. The judgment which he himself pronounces on his crime is more pitiless than of the most severe tribunal. He expresses his feeling that the human heart and the quality of a man’s soul are more
important than the endured humiliation.”

Self imposed punishment is like as one touching a wound to better feel its pain. Hence, Dmitri says, “I want to suffer and by suffering I shall be purified”

The punishment of Dmitri also explains the suffering of innocents who become victims to circumstantial evidence. Dmitri suffers for no fault of his own and goes through all the indignation and torments of earthly law. In his punishment Dostoevsky asserts that a transgressor has to pay for his salvation through suffering as punishment. Salvation through suffering is possible only when the transgressor becomes aware of the transgression and voluntarily accepts the punishment.

Here, Dostoevsky explains the existence of two truths – the judicial and the human; and exposes the inherent falseness of the power. He brilliantly counter poses two mutually exclusive logics – the truth of the law and that of man. He proves that however perfect the truth of the law is not the real truth. The human truth is the providence of the Orthodox Church and its ecclesiastical courts. It is this church that is the custodian of morality in a world in which morals have gone by the board. In other words Dostoevsky asserts that the secular law may be quite insignificant before human truth, the only genuine truth. This is what Ivan questions in his article on the jurisdiction of the church.

As an ardent propagandist of the Orthodox Church Dostoevsky hints at the religious solution as the only possible way of overcoming the curse of individualism. He deals with individual will and the aspiration of the superman. We witness a struggle between god and devil taking part in man’s unprotected heart. He realizes the danger of sin and amorality that is laid at the door of religion. He believed in the innate moral religious character with its instinctive need to believe in Christ and
God. He believed that only Orthodoxy can bring about a universal brotherhood, and is capable of guarding humanity against the triumph of Smerdyakovism.

In Ivan, Dostoevsky brings out his profound philosophical and religious ideas and provides answer to all the questions raised in his earlier characters. Ivan is the embodiment of amorality, a man drawn to the slogan later raised by Nietzsche - ‘everything is permitted’. He demonstrates the process of violation of law, trauma, self knowledge and peace which occur again and again in his characters. Dostoevsky links up this amorality of revolt against religion with Ivan who is a mixture of all Dostoevskian characters right from Katerina of The Landlady.

In case of all these characters direct or indirect influence of Western ideas lead them to transgress. After transgression all of them become extremely aware of their transgression, which makes them humane and humble to accept other sinners as their brothers. Varvara’s reflection in Poor People “I know I am not going to a paradise, but I have no other choice. God knows whether I shall be happy, my fate is in His holy, inscrutable power. I am sure you will understand my wretchedness what will be, will be; as God’s will. Good deeds never go unrewarded, and virtue will sooner or later be rewarded by the eternal justice of God" echoes in all his works. Her unshakable faith in God is reflected in all his criminal characters.

Whether it is crime committed by sensualists for material gains, or the moral crime or the crime committed by the intellectuals there is much similarity in their ends. The only difference between them is that the sensualists use their body as instrument of pleasure and the intellectuals their mind. Hence, he makes them all to suffer from a guilty conscience. He provides proof that a doubter in god cannot but
be a **criminal**. Hence, his interest lies on the **inner criminality** which eventually leads to **retribution**; and **punishment** is complete surrender to **God**.

The idea of service to humanity, of brotherly love, and the solidarity of mankind that he proclaim in his works, which is dying in the world, have a profound influence on the **twentieth century** writers. His concept of universal human struggle to understand **God** and **self**, the **moral** and **philosophical** questions recurs quite often in **modern literature**.
to the edge of insanity. Go and have a look at him now; go and admire your creation.”

In Kirilov the problem of superman is transformed into the religious key. Unlike Rascolnikhov, Kirilov is a half mad superman, who wishes to overthrow God, and put himself in His place. He wishes to overthrow/replace God, and become man-god. His argument with Stavrogin is significant to understand this philosophy.

“And when did you find out you were so happy?”

“I don’t remember. I was just pacing the room. It’s not important. I stopped the clock. It was two-thirty-seven in the morning.” Kirilov didn’t answer the question. After a while, he said:”They’re bad because they don’t know they’re good. When they know it, they won’t rape the little girl. They must find out that they’re good, and then they’ll be good to the last, the lot of them.”

“So, since you’ve found out, you must be good now?”

“Right, I’m good.”

“I must say I agree with that,” Stavrogin said frowning.

“He who succeeds in teaching men that they are all good will ends the world.”

“He who tried to teach that was crucified.”

“He’ll come and his name is man-god.”

“God-man?”

“No, man-god – that’s the great difference.”

“I wonder now, was it you who lit that lamp before the icon?”

“It was I.”