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I acknowledge the difficulties of working with a text in translation. Except where noted, I have relied on the English translation of *The Brothers Karamazov*. For the purposes of this study, I have chosen Ralph Matlaw’s revision of Constance Garnett’s translation of *The Brothers Karamazov*, and I adopt the spelling of all Russian names used in that edition. When quoting from other sources, I maintain the spelling used in that source.

Matlaw’s revision of *The Brothers Karamazov* clarifies several key terms and restores the patronymics and the stylistic characteristics of Dostoevsky’s Russian. For example, Victorian genteel biases in Garnett’s titles "A Judicial Error," "A Corrupter of Thought," and "The Breath of Corruption" are changed to "A Miscarriage of Justice," "An Adulterer of Thought," and "The Odor of Corruption." Matlaw is also careful to preserve light and fire imagery, changing Garnett’s "Passionate Heart" to "The Confessions of an Ardent Heart." Matlaw restores the servant attitude of Smerdyakov by the addition of numerous "sirs" present in the original Russian and presents the repetitious and inept language of the Prosecuting Attorney. Finally, Matlaw deletes the last line of the Garnett translation, the second "Hurrah for Karamazov" because it is an implied and
inaudible chorus in the Russian.

This edition of *The Brothers Karamazov* is also critically acclaimed. In *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Gene Fitzgerald praises the Matlaw revision, stating that through Matlaw's "changes and corrections, he almost always improves her text and thereby produces the best English translation of *The Brothers Karamazov* now available" (274). In *Choice*, a reviewer also recommends this version as the "most reliable text" published (989). In addition to these recommendations, Victor Terras has chosen the Matlaw revision as the primary text for his extensive analysis of the work in *The Karamazov Companion: A Commentary*. 
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CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW

Expressing the culmination of his struggle with faith, Fyodor Mikhail Dostoevsky wrote to Apollon Nikolayevitch Maikov in 1870 of his plans for his final novel, *The Brothers Karamazov*: 1

The fundamental idea, which will run through each of the parts, is one that has tormented me, consciously and unconsciously, all my life long: it is the question of the existence of God. (Letters 190)

For Dostoevsky, the "question of the existence of God" illuminates the meaning of being human, a meaning which he found only through faith. As Ernest Simmons notes, "the whole novel is pervaded with a search for faith--a search for God. This search for God is the central 'idea' of the novel" (265). Appropriately, Dostoevsky’s epigraph for the novel is a scriptural quotation that suggests a process of moving toward spiritual fulfillment: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit" (xii). *The Brothers Karamazov* traces this movement toward faith that will result in "much fruit." The characters of Zosima and Alyosha are Dostoevsky’s greatest attempts to portray faith and goodness.

1
Critics often reject, however, the validity of these characters, interpreting the Inquisitor's view of faith as Dostoevsky's. In examining Dostoevsky's treatment of faith in *The Brothers Karamazov*, these critics focus solely on "The Grand Inquisitor," neglecting to take into account the emphasis on Christian love present throughout the whole of the book (Cox 192). Dostoevsky states his purpose of presenting a viable Christian ideal in a letter to N. A. Lyubimov: "If it ['The Russian Monk'] succeeds, I shall have done a good deed: I shall compel them to recognize that a pure, ideal Christian is not something abstract but is graphically real, possible, obviously present . . . The whole novel is written for its sake" (*The Brothers Karamazov, "Backgrounds and Sources"* 761). Furthermore, Dostoevsky states in a letter to Doctor A. F. Blagonravov, "You judge very rightly when you opine that I hold all evil to be grounded upon disbelief" (*Letters* 257-58). Since Dostoevsky intends for the "whole novel" to justify Christian faith, it is my intention to examine Dostoevsky's treatment of faith within the context of the entire novel—not limited to only "The Grand Inquisitor" or "The Russian Monk."

My thesis is that the three Karamazov brothers, as a collective personality, represent the fundamental needs of man and the corresponding aspects of faith, each brother being an individual study of the necessity of integrating soul, heart and mind into faith. Portraying a fragmented
and isolated aspect of faith, each brother suffers as a result of the exclusive nature of his faith. As they confront suffering and a sometimes harsh reality, the brothers' partial faiths merge, creating a more complete idea of faith. Through the movement of each brother from an isolated view of faith toward an integrated one, Dostoevsky restores a proper balance between soul, heart and mind in faith, rejuvenating faith in a modern world that tended to emphasize solely the intellect.

Chapter Two will introduce the brothers as a collective personality by exploring their highly distinctive personalities and the nature of the complex plot. Isolating a particular personality trait in each brother, Dostoevsky builds each conception of faith almost exclusively around that specific trait. Alyosha almost exclusively pursues the spiritual retreat of the monastery; Dmitri is characterized by sensual passion; and Ivan is the epitome of reason. Thus, in the beginning of the novel, the three brothers represent fragments of one complete man--Alyosha representing the soul, Dmitri the heart and Ivan the mind, although separately each progresses to become more fully human. Dostoevsky also shows the negative side of this trinity with Father Ferapont representing a rule-oriented and fanatic side of Alyosha’s faith, Fyodor representing the extreme degeneration of Dmitri’s sensual passion and Rakitin representing the petty, egoistical, amoral side of Ivan’s intellectualism. No growth occurs in these characters.
because they refuse to release their narrow conceptions of life.

In Chapter Three, I will use the three fundamental human needs, as outlined by Ivan in his poem "The Grand Inquisitor," to establish a comprehensive definition of faith. These fundamental needs, corresponding to the three aspects of the personality, are each represented by one of the three brothers. The solutions presented by the Inquisitor for these fundamental needs prove to be deceptive, both in their sources and in their meanings. The Christian view presented in the novel does not reject miracle, mystery and authority, although this view does reject the Inquisitor's interpretation of these terms. An alternative answer for faith that affirms miracle, mystery and authority is developed throughout the novel, specifically in Father Zosima's teachings and in the chapter titled "The Elders."

In Chapter Four, the reasons for excluding Smerdyakov from the collective personality will be presented. Smerdyakov serves not as a full brother in the Karamazov family, but as a diabolic extension of Ivan. He illustrates that the logical result of Ivan's theories is indeed crime.

Chapter Five will illustrate the breakdown of each brother's faith through a crisis that is created by the fragmented view of faith that each brother has. Alyosha's faith in God's "higher justice" is shaken because no miracles are revealed through Father Zosima's death (317). He is devastated by the mocking jeers of the crowd at the
elder's premature, foul decaying odor and the absence of any miracles. Dmitri's sensual passion rules his actions, eventually leading to his arrest for his father's murder.

In the three "Torments" of Dmitri's soul during the preliminary investigation, Dmitri's faith in his passionate sincerity and honor suffers a severe blow when he is forced to take responsibility for his decadence. Ivan's faith collapses when he is faced with the reality of pursuing his intellectual theories--the murder of his father. Rebelling against God in order to assert his freedom, Ivan falls into a self-bondage that leads to insanity.

In Chapter Six, I will show how the crises that all three brothers face force them each in turn to develop a fuller dimension of faith. Alyosha integrates reason into his faith while he struggles with Ivan's intellectual questions. Furthermore, Alyosha moves toward the passionate action of Dmitri, although his action is controlled, when he becomes involved in the love triangle of Dmitri, Katerina and Ivan and in the affairs of the children. There is also a hint that he will marry. Dmitri integrates both the intellectual aspect of Ivan through his philosophical debates with Rakitin and the spiritual aspect of Alyosha through his reliance on God in prison. Ivan moves toward the sensual action of Dmitri when he tries to save Dmitri through giving evidence at the trial even though he knows the evidence may endanger himself. The final effect of
integrating the soul, heart and mind in faith is that of active love.
Notes

1All references to the text of The Brothers Karamazov are from the Matlaw revision of Constance Garnett’s translation (Norton, 1976) and will be indicated by a parenthetical citation of only the page numbers.
CHAPTER II

THE THREE BROTHERS AS A COLLECTIVE PERSONALITY

The highly distinctive personalities of the brothers and the nature of the complex plot suggest that the brothers form a collective personality. The brothers represent three divisions of the personality: soul, heart and mind. Richard Peace asserts that this collective personality is an expansion of the usual central hero of Dostoevsky's earlier novels:

> It is as though the central figure so typical of Dostoyevsky's previous writings is ultimately unable to withstand its own dichotomous inner tension and has here broken apart into separate and distinct facets; in Alyosha we have the soul; in Dmitri the emotions; in Ivan the intellect. (229)

Thus, the three Karamazov brothers, as a tri-partite personality, become the hero of The Brothers Karamazov.

Dostoevsky had several possible sources for a tri-partite conception of man. He owned a copy of the 1858 edition of Saint Isaac of Niniveh's sermons (Terras 22). In this book, Isaac of Niniveh perceives three stages of knowledge. The first stage of knowledge, knowledge of the body, esteems rational wisdom and denies divine providence, thus vulnerable to "constant anxiety and fear regarding bodily things" that cannot be rationally explained (248).
The second stage of knowledge, that of the soul, "turns toward meditation and psychic love," treasuring beauty and honor (250). The third stage of the spirit is the culminating stage of knowledge which is not reached by "the apperceptible practice of works but by the thought of the intellect"; in this stage, knowledge "stretches itself upwards and clings to faith by thinking of the world to be and love of the promises and investigation concerning the hidden things--then faith swallows knowledge, gives anew [sic] birth to it, wholly spiritual" (250). Considering Isaac of Niniveh's division of knowledge into three stages and the emphasis on love and a renewed vision of the world, Terras notes that Isaac of Niniveh "seems to have had a more than casual influence on the religious doctrine expressed in Father Zosima's writings" (22).¹ In this scheme, Ivan relies solely on reason or knowledge of the body, Dmitri embraces beauty or the knowledge of the soul, and Alyosha perceives the mystical unity of all things, the knowledge of the spirit.

Another possible source for the tri-partite conception of man is the Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyov, Dostoevsky's personal friend. Terras asserts that Dostoevsky attended some of Solovyov's lectures and that he was "well acquainted" with Solovyov's book Discourses on Godmanhood (20). In this book Solovyov develops a conception of man in "three basic modes of being": the spirit which "perceives and feels only insofar as it wills,"
the mind which "wills and feels only insofar as it perceives" and the soul which "represents and wills only insofar as it senses" (162-63). Mochulsky suggests that Solovyov's "philosophical schema influenced the technique of the novel's structure": Dmitri moves the action of the novel as he primarily senses, Ivan prepares the theory for parricide as he primarily perceives, and Alyosha quietly opposes Dmitri's violence as he primarily wills (598-99).

Although Dostoevsky had two possible sources for the collective personality of the brothers, the text itself is the best evidence for this collective personality. Zosima describes his faith in immortality in terms of the three human faculties of soul, mind and heart:

*I feel how my earthly life is in touch with a new infinite, unknown, but approaching life, the nearness of which sets my soul quivering with rapture, my mind glowing and my heart weeping with joy.* (271)

The aspect of the soul, not tied to the body, perceives the divine and is capable of Christ-like love. The aspect of the heart differs from that of the soul in that it includes the broad gamut of emotions experienced in the body including the extremes of joy and sadness in addition to the extremes of physical love and sensual lust. Isolating a particular aspect of the personality, either soul, heart, or mind, in each brother, Dostoevsky builds each almost exclusively around that specific trait. Thus at the beginning of the novel, the brothers, although separately fragments, together represent one complete man—Alyosha
representing the soul, Dmitri the heart and Ivan the mind.

The first aspect of the brothers' collective personality is represented by the spirituality of Alyosha. He adopts the monastic life "simply because at that time it struck him, so to speak, as the ideal escape for his soul struggling from the darkness of worldly wickedness to the light of love" (13). In the next chapter, the narrator re-emphasizes the spiritual nature of Alyosha's retreat to the monastery: "this path . . . presented itself to him as offering an ideal means of escape for his soul from darkness to light" (20). In contrast to Dmitri's vague eyes, Alyosha has clear "wide-set dark gray, shining eyes" and a "thoughtful" and "serene" look about him—all of which reflect his spiritual nature (19). Terras notes that his lack of concern at "whose expense he was living" is a "monkish trait" (Companion 133, n92). Furthermore Alyosha is called "angel," by Fyodor early in the novel (18) and by others throughout the rest of the novel. Alyosha even has an angelic influence on his degenerate father, remaining "chaste and pure" in the midst of "a very sink of filthy debauchery" (13). He awakens Fyodor's "moral side . . . which had long been dead in his soul" (16-17). The extent of Alyosha's spirituality is made clear when the narrator informs the reader that after one year in the monastery, Alyosha "seemed willing to be cloistered there for the rest of his life" (12).
In contrast, Dmitri is characterized by sensual passion, representing the body with its drives, senses and passions. His passion encompasses two extremes, including lust and debauchery in addition to a love of beauty that involves his "intuition, empathy and imagination" (Terras, "Art of Fiction" 198). Fyodor learns that Dmitri is "frivolous, unruly, of violent passions, impatient, and dissipated" (7). Dmitri's lifestyle is reflected in his "thin" unhealthy face, "hollow" cheeks and the "vague look" in his "rather large, prominent dark eyes" (58). Mochulsky observes that Dmitri's "sunken cheeks and the vague expression of his dark eyes" are an expression of his sensuality (610). Dmitri's actions also reflect his life of passionate abandon. He fights Captain Snegiryov and also attacks his own father, kicking him in the face with his heel. In the wild drinking and carousing at Mokroe, "an absurd chaotic confusion followed, but Mitya was in his natural element, and the more foolish it became, the more his spirits rose" (408). To the exclusion of reason and spirituality, Dmitri satisfies the sensuality of the body.

Ivan is the epitome of reason; he is "a logician and rationalist, an innate skeptic and negator" (Mochulsky 598). The only physical description of Ivan in these early chapters is his shuffling gait which may "hint at his intellectual shuffling" (Peace 227). Instead of giving a lengthy physical description of Ivan, the narrator concentrates on Ivan's ability to reason. The narrator
ironically notes that Ivan "began very early, almost in his infancy (so they say at least), to show a brilliant and unusual aptitude for learning" (10). Furthermore, Ivan's enterprise to publish the "Eye-Witness" paragraphs "alone showed the young man's practical and intellectual superiority over the masses of needy and unfortunate students of both sexes" (10). Ivan also contributes "brilliant reviews of books," becoming "well known in literary circles" (11). By the basis of his reasoning, Ivan condemns the suffering in the world and also the God who created that suffering. To the exclusion of emotion and spirituality, Ivan centers solely on the life of the mind.

Although each of the brothers centers on an exclusive, fragmented aspect of their collective personality, the unity of their collective personality appears in their desire for their father's death and in their guilt for his murder. All three brothers are guilty for their father's murder, even though Smerdyakov actually commits the crime. Mochulsky observes that, in this sense, the three brothers become one character:

The main hero of Karamazov is the three brothers in their spiritual unity. . . . on the spiritual plane the three parallel lines converge: the brothers . . . experience a single tragedy, they share a common guilt and a common redemption. (598)

Alyosha's passivity that does not stop the murder results in his guilt for the murder. After meeting the Karamazov family in his cell, Zosima charges Alyosha to be near both of his brothers (68). Alyosha intuits that a "great
catastrophe was about to happen" and resolves that "Even if my benefactor must die without me, anyway I won't have to reproach myself all my life with the thought that I might have saved something and did not, but passed by and hastened home" (204). Alyosha only finds Ivan, however, and forgets about Dmitri, wondering later how he could "so completely forget his brother Dmitri, though he had ... only a few hours before, so firmly resolved to find him" (245). Zosima charges Alyosha again to find Dmitri, warning him that he may still "have time to prevent something terrible" (264). But again Alyosha forgets, wrapped in misery over his elder's death: "he had entirely forgotten his brother Dmitri, about whom he had been so anxious and troubled the day before" (317). Alyosha’s passive response to Zosima’s charges implicates him in his father’s murder. Dmitri’s "destructive passion" (Mochulsky 598) which forms his guilt erupts in the scene in which he attacks his father. Dmitri passionately declares, "If I haven’t killed him, I’ll come again and kill him. You can’t protect him" (127). Rakitin believes that Zosima’s bowing to the ground before Dmitri is a prediction of both the "crime" and the "criminal" (69). As Terras notes, "Dmitry is adjudged guilty even before there has been a crime" (Companion 159, n181). Terras also points out that Dmitri commits the crime in his head. The passage "I’d rather everyone thought me a robber and a murderer ... " (345) literally translates

Let me rather stand before him, whom I murdered and robbed, a murderer and a
thief, and so before all people, and go to Siberia, than that Katia would have the right to say . . . (Companion 278, n22)

The literal translation suggests that Dmitri has already committed the crime. Furthermore, in a drunken letter to Katya, Dmitri assures her that, if he cannot borrow the money, he will resort to murdering his father to repay the three thousand rubles. Through his passion, Dmitri is guilty of his father's murder.

Ivan condemns his father in thought. Ivan's announced decision to go to Chermashnya becomes symbolic of Ivan's moral choice to desert father, allowing him to be murdered. Wasiolek points out that the root "Cher" is the root of the Russian word, "dark"; thus Ivan symbolically chooses moral darkness when he plans to go to "Chermashnya," which means "dark wood" (173). In the scene in which Fyodor lies moaning on the floor after Dmitri has attacked him, Ivan's quick response to Dmitri, "You've killed him," is, according to Terras, "wishful thinking on Ivan's part" (Companion 185, n195). Later Ivan upholds his right to wish for his father's death to Alyosha (131), but after the second interview with Smerdyakov, Ivan takes responsibility for his wishful thinking:

he remembered for the hundredth time how, on that last night in his father's house, he had listened on the stairs. . . . Yes, I expected it then, that's true! I wanted the murder, I did want the murder! (584)
Ivan is intellectually responsible for the murder of his father.

All three brothers suffer crises for their guilt. Each brother’s crisis has the same structure. Terras points out that Ivan suffers through three interviews with Smerdyakov, Dmitri through three torments of his soul in the interrogation and Alyosha through the three temptations provided by Father Ferapont, Rakitin and Grushenka (Companion 107). Thus, each brother faces three trials. During these series of three trials for each brother, a change in appearance occurs for all three brothers. Ivan’s physical sickness coincides with his realization that Smerdyakov committed the murder under his approval. Smerdyakov points out that Ivan’s face is "sunken" and that his eyes are "jaundiced" with the whites being "quite yellow" (589). Likewise, the culminating point of the tormenting interrogations for Mitya is signalled by his physical appearance: he "looked at them [the prosecutors] almost vacantly. His face now expressed complete, hopeless despair" (470). In a similar manner, Alyosha’s serene countenance also changes when he confronts the absence of miracles surrounding his elder’s death. Rakitin observes that Alyosha’s face is "quite changed" and lacks his "famous mildness" (319).

The brothers’ collective personality is further emphasized by their shared Karamazov sensuality. Alyosha identifies this Karamazov sensuality as a "crude, unbridled, earthly force," freely revealing that he also has this
Karamazov nature (202). Rakitin refers to Dmitri as a "sensualist," and extends the label to Ivan and Alyosha, reminding Alyosha that he shares in this Karamazov sensuality. Dmitri evokes Schiller to define this Karamazov sensuality as the "sensual lust" of "insects"—"All we Karamazovs are such insects, and, angel as you [Alyosha] are, that insect lives in you, too" (96). Alyosha admits his Karamazov sensuality to Dmitri while he explains that he blushed because he is "the same" as Dmitri is (98). Also Ivan’s love for Katerina is attributed to the "Karamazov recklessness of his passions" (579). Ivan speaks of this Karamazov sensuality as "that thirst for life regardless of everything" which is "not a matter of intellect or logic, it’s loving with one’s inside, with one’s guts" (211-12). Peace affirms that Ivan, "intellectually convinced of the pointlessness of existence, is nevertheless intoxicated by life" (236). Later Ivan more clearly identifies this thirst for life as "Karamazov baseness," which Alyosha interprets as "debauchery" (243). Dmitri expresses the same thirst for life despite his despair over losing Grushenka to her officer, declaring to Pyotr Ilyich, "I was fooling about the bullet! I want to live. I love life!" (379). Alyosha also affirms a strong love of life, saying to Ivan "I am awfully glad that you have such a longing for life . . . I think every one should love life above everything in the world" (212). The strong Karamazov sensuality and love for life that all three brothers acknowledge underscores their unity.
The collective personality of the brothers is also highlighted by the extensive use of patronymics. At several points in the novel, the patronymics are repeated extensively, emphasizing the connection among the three brothers. For example, after the narrator introduces Fyodor's two marriages, he establishes the kinship between the three brothers in the conclusion of Chapter iii of the first book—using Ivan Fyodorovich three times, Dmitri Fyodorovich two times and Alexey Fyodorovich once—in the last three paragraphs of the chapter (12). Madame Khokhlakov also emphasizes the brothers' family unity, mentioning all three brothers almost in a single breath:

And your brother Dmitri Fyodorovich, what do you think of him?—my goodness! Alexey Fyodorovich, I am forgetting, only fancy; your brother is in there with her, not that dreadful brother who was so shocking yesterday, but the other, Ivan Fyodorovich." (165)

At the conclusion of Madame Khokhlakov's conversation with Alyosha, she again mentions all three brothers within a single paragraph (169). The patronymics continue to be emphasized in the chapter "A Laceration in the Drawing Room"; Ivan Fyodorovich is repeated 14 times, Alexey Fyodorovich 19 times, and Dmitri Fyodorovich 6 times (169-78). During the conversation with Ivan at the gate, Smerdyakov highlights the advantage of Fyodor's death for all three brothers: "Ivan Fyodorovich, reflect that then neither Dmitri Fyodorovich nor yourself and your brother, Alexey Fyodorovich, would have anything after the master's
death" (253). And finally, in the "Epilogue" all three brothers' patronymics are used several times within the first three paragraphs. Although only the passages which use all three brothers' patronymics in close proximity are noted, the patronymics are extensively used throughout the novel and serve to draw the reader's attention to the unity of the three brothers.

In addition to similarities that all the brothers share, the brothers' collective personality is also emphasized through the parallels of the brothers. Ralph Koprince notes that "the three principal groups of background characters reflect the dynamic and operative traits of the three brothers" (348); the monks share Alyosha's religious faith, the peasants share Dmitri's passion and sincerity, and the townspeople share Ivan's intellectualism (344, 346). The number "three" also provides other parallels both between all three brothers and between Ivan and Dmitri: the three thousand rubles--the price of murder for Ivan and the price of honor for Dmitri (Peace 245); the three kinds of love--Dmitri's "passionate" love for Grushenka, Ivan's "love from vanity" for Katerina, and Alyosha's active love for Father Zosima (Terras, Companion 76); and the three chapters in which Ivan confesses which are parallel to Dmitri's confession, "The Brothers Get Acquainted," "Rebellion," and "The Grand Inquisitor" (Peace 225). Several other instances establish the unity between Ivan and Dmitri. Alyosha is struck by the "strange resem-
blance" of Ivan to Dmitri: "Ivan turned suddenly and went his way without looking back. It was just as brother Dmitri had left Alyosha the day before" (245). Dmitri's label of "scoundrel" is echoed by Ivan while he contemplates his father's death and calls himself a "scoundrel" (526). Dmitri's question, "am I not a bug" (97), parallels Ivan's later statement, "I am a bug" (224). As Terras points out, "the insect imagery links Ivan to his brother Dmitry" (Companion 225, n169).

The two brothers, Ivan and Alyosha, are linked through the label "clever." The word "clever" becomes the primary label for Ivan at the end of "The Grand Inquisitor," in his conversations with Smerdyakov and in the recurring statement "it's always worthwhile speaking to a clever man." The word "clever" in this statement, also used as a chapter title, is the same Russian word that Lise uses to describe Alyosha. In the Russian text of the novel, "clever" in the chapter title is "umnym," and "clever" used by Lise to describe Alyosha is "umnyi" (Bratvia Karamazovy 359, 284). Both versions literally mean "intelligent, wise, sensible" (Wheeler 840), but in the context of the novel, "clever" takes on additional significance. The word "clever" is first used by Fyodor, acknowledging those "who have discovered that God is dead and who use this knowledge to their advantage" (Terras, Companion 183, n172). Alyosha also confirms that "the clever people" are only atheists (242). The reference to Alyosha as "clever" links him with
Ivan, also setting up Alyosha's later intellectual struggles with his fate in the chapter "A Critical Moment."

Dostoevsky shows the negative side of this trinity through doubles of the three brothers. Father Ferapont is a negative exaggeration of Alyosha's faith, representing a rule-oriented, fanatic spiritualism. Goldstein notes that Ferapont reveals "the perversions and evils of Christianity" and represents "religion carried to its logical extreme" (331). He takes Alyosha's desire to seek the monastery as a retreat from darkness to an extreme, staying in a solitary cell, rarely speaking to anyone, and not involving himself in the customary worship of the monastery. Father Ferapont is so obsessed with evil spirits that Father Paissy makes the telling comment: "You cast out the evil spirit, but perhaps you are serving him yourself" (314). As Terras notes, "Father Ferapont has not the slightest fear of devils. But, like these devils, he fears Christ and the sign of the cross" (Companion 193, n28). Father Ferapont distorts faith, substituting for it a spiritualism that is obsessed with evil and with rules. Considering one's diligence in fasting to be the greatest measure of faith, Ferapont carries Alyosha's abstinence from eating sausage to an extreme when he even abstains from eating bread. Furthermore, Ferapont gloats in the premature decaying of Zosima's body, in contrast to Alyosha's extreme distress at the absence of miracles surrounding his elder's death.
Father Ferapont replaces Alyosha’s acceptance of and love for others with a condemning, rule-bound spirituality.

Just as Ferapont is an exaggeration of Alyosha’s spirituality, Fyodor represents the extreme degeneration of Dmitri’s sensual passion. Fyodor and Dmitri are both at home with wild, sensual orgies and carousing. The majority of the insect imagery concerns Fyodor and Dmitri, linking them together. Fyodor is referred to as a "noxious insect" (83); Dmitri also refers to himself as a "noxious insect" (97, 383). Ivan calls them both "vipers" (129). While Dmitri seeks "resurrection and renewal" from the "filthy morass" of his sensuality (344), Fyodor only playfully admits that he has "sinned too much," wondering about the hooks and ceiling of hell (18-19). Fyodor’s sensuality has no hint of the honor or love of beauty that Dmitri’s sensuality contains.

Rakitin is the double of the third aspect of the brothers’ collective personality, representing the petty, egoistical, amoral side of Ivan’s intellectualism. Dmitri calls Rakitin "clever," using Ivan’s label (556). Both Rakitin and Ivan feel the need to persuade others to adopt their philosophies: Rakitin influences Kolya and Ivan, Smerdyakov. Rakitin also tries to lead Alyosha to sensual sin in "A Critical Moment" (320) in the same way that Ivan tries to lead Alyosha to rebel against God in "Rebellion" (224). Just as Ivan believes that he truly loves mankind and yet exhibits the cruel behavior toward Maximov, Rakitin
believes himself to be "a man of the highest integrity" (75), although the narrator notes that "he was a practical person that never undertook anything without a prospect of gain for himself" (321). Rakitin attempts to snare Dmitri with philosophical and intellectual debates, but he represents only a shadow of Ivan's intellect; Dmitri tells Alyosha that "Brother Ivan is not Rakitin, there is an idea in him" (561). Rakitin is a shallow version of Ivan.

Thus, Dostoevsky also creates a negative collective personality with Father Ferapont representing the soul, Fyodor the heart and Rakitin the mind. No growth occurs in these characters because they refuse to release their narrow conceptions of life.
NOTES

1 Victor Terras in *A Karamazov Companion* points out other influential tenets of Saint Isaac of Niniveh such as his advocacy of free will, his theodicy and his description of hell (23).

2 Other references to Alyosha as "angel" are by Dmitri (93-94, 96), by Fyodor (129-30), by Madame Khokhlakov (176, 178), by Lise (178), and indirectly by Rakitin (319). Alyosha is also referred to as "cherub"—a variation on "angel" by Grushenka (333, 335), by Dmitri (561) and by Ivan (618).

3 Terras comments that "in the original, the indefinite pronoun *kakoi-to*, 'some kind of, a certain,' qualifies the assertion of Ivan's early brilliance. At this early stage this would seem to be merely another detail of the narrator's tentative diction. But it starts a pattern of innuendo which undermines Ivan's position and stature" (*Companion* 131, n67).

4 The diminutive form of "literary circles," *kruzhok*, is used here, suggesting "a more narrowly defined body than *krug*, 'circle.' . . . Together with another *dazhe*, 'actually, even' (omitted in the translation), this makes for another subtle put-down" (*Terras, Companion* 131, n73).
The Russian word "sladostrastnik" is a compound of sladokis, 'sweet,' and strastnyi, 'passionate,' hence literally 'he who has a passion for sweetness' (Terras, Companion 160, n187). The word is very close to the Russian word for "lust," sladostrastie (Terras 166, n6).

William Rowe notes other occurrences of "threes" in his article, "Crime and Punishment and The Brothers Karamazov: Some Comparative Observations" in the Russian Literature Triquarterly 10 (Fall 1984): 331-342.

Dmitri calls himself a "scoundrel" on pages 344-45, 385, 463, and 465, to mention a few references.

Kolya admits that he has "often talked to Mr. Rakitin" (524).
CHAPTER III

DEFINITION OF FAITH

Dostoevsky defines faith in The Brothers Karamazov by exploring the manner in which the various facets of man's personality—mind, heart and soul—contribute to a clearer understanding of faith. In this process he voices rigorous doubts about faith in order to arrive at an understanding of faith that can withstand the modern disdain for religion. Defining the issue in terms of "faith in man" and "faith in God," Solovyov lays the philosophical groundwork for Dostoevsky's handling of faith:

The old traditional form of religion arises from faith in God, but does not pursue this faith to its limit. Contemporary civilization outside of religion arises from faith in man, but even it does not pursue its faith to the limit; consistently pursued and brought to their ultimate realization, both these faiths—faith in God and faith in man—are united in the sole, complete, and integral truth of God-manhood. (quoted in Mochulsky 567)

In the two pivotal chapters of the novel, "The Grand Inquisitor" and "The Russian Monk," Dostoevsky pushes to the limit faith in man and faith in God, asserting that "the whole book will serve as an answer" to "so powerful a rejection of God as exists in the Inquisitor and the
Dostoevsky presents the "powerful" arguments in the "The Grand Inquisitor" in groups of threes, echoing the tripartite personality of the brothers. Roger Cox analyzes these groups of threes as "the three temptations of Jesus; man's three fundamental needs; and the three ways of satisfying those needs--miracle, mystery, and authority (195). The Inquisitor presents man's basic needs as: "(1) someone to worship, (2) someone to keep his conscience, and (3) some means of achieving universal unity" (Cox 195). Thus, the Inquisitor poses three basic human questions, argues that Christ's answer to those three questions--through rejecting his three temptations--is inadequate, and proceeds to solve the dilemmas posed by the three questions.

The first fundamental need of man is the need to worship someone, preferably one whom all worship in community. The Inquisitor links Christ's denial of this need with His denial of the first temptation, His refusal to turn stones into bread in the wilderness:

Choosing bread, Thou wouldst have satisfied the universal and everlasting craving of humanity individually altogether as one--to find someone to worship. So long as man remains free he strives for nothing so incessantly and so painfully as to find someone to worship. (234)

By miraculously providing man with an unlimited supply of bread, Christ would have insured man's grateful worship since man would no longer have to toil for his food. Also
through the miracle of supplying the bread, Christ would demonstrate conclusively that He was the only one worthy of their worship, thus satisfying man's "craving for community worship" (234-35). By Christ's not meeting this need for someone to worship, the Inquisitor contends that He rejects miracle, specifically the miracle of turning stones into bread, and creates for man an "awful freedom" (234).

The need to worship someone is a need of the soul, the aspect of the personality that Alyosha represents. His worship of Father Zosima is all-consuming. The narrator establishes that Alyosha reveres Zosima, a holy man "to whom he became attached with all the warm first love of his insatiable heart" (13). The extent of Alyosha's love is confirmed in the chapter titled "A Critical Moment":

```
the love that lay concealed in his pure young heart . . . had . . . been concentrated . . . on one being . . . his beloved elder. (317)
```

This love takes on the characteristics of worship; Alyosha "trembled for him [Zosima], for his glory, and dreaded any affront to him" (26). He reveres the elder Zosima as the one who "carries in his heart the secret of renewal for all" that will result in the coming of the "true Kingdom of Christ" (24). Alyosha's primary need, in the beginning of the novel, parallels the first human need outlined by the Inquisitor--someone to worship.

The second basic need of man is to have someone to keep his conscience. By rejecting the second temptation to throw Himself from the pinnacle of the temple, Christ does not
test His immortality or test God. The Inquisitor declares that the standard that Christ has set is too difficult for men:

Is the nature of men such, that they can reject miracle, and at . . . the moments of their deepest, most agonizing spiritual difficulties, cling only to the free verdict of the heart?

According to the Inquisitor, Christ's fall, unharmed, from the pinnacle of the building would have demonstrated His victory over death; however, He again desires "faith freely given" and refuses to enslave man by taking away his freedom not to believe.

The need for a keeper of one's conscience correlates with the burden of the heart that Dmitri experiences. A little pouch of money hidden on Dmitri's chest, just above his heart, symbolizes a struggle of conscience for Dmitri, the pouch reminding Dmitri of "the shame he carried upon it [his breast], that weighed so heavily on his conscience" (366). This question of honor, whether he is a scoundrel or a thief, torments Dmitri; he confides to the prosecutors, "That's just what's made me wretched all my life, that I yearned to be honorable" (436). Dmitri also expresses the burden of keeping his own conscience in the extremes of the "beauty of Sodom" and "the beauty of the Madonna" (97). He vacillates between an attraction to lustful sensuality and the lofty beauty of poetry. He sees the dilemma of his conscience in terms of "riddles": "Too many riddles weigh men down on earth. We must solve them as we can, and try to
keep a dry skin in the water" (97). Dmitri's struggle with honor and beauty as well as his sensuality illustrates man's need for someone to keep his conscience.

The third basic requirement of man is "the craving for universal unity" (238). The Inquisitor points out past attempts in history to "organize a universal state" (238). Rejecting the devil's last gift of "Rome and the sword of Caesar," Christ also rejects universal unity: "Hadst Thou taken the world and Caesar's purple, Thou wouldst have founded the universal state and have given universal peace" (238). Again Christ allows man freedom, not forcing him to participate in a universal state founded on coercion.

This need for universal unity is taken up by Ivan, the intellect of man. He does not accept God's world because of its injustice, especially the suffering of children. His poem "The Grand Inquisitor" expresses this desire for universal unity and happiness. Ivan's intellectual desire for justice and happiness among men exemplifies the final human need presented by the Inquisitor, the need for universal unity.

In outlining the three fundamental needs of man, the Inquisitor sketches the essence of human nature. He highlights "the absolute and eternal nature" of the three temptations of the devil, claiming that they express "the whole future history of the world and of humanity" and that they unite "all the unsolved historical contradictions of human nature" (233). Terras notes, however, that "the
devil's offer is a ruse whose attractiveness appeals to a limited, all-too-human intelligence. . . . The 'absolute and eternal' is in Christ's answer to the devil" (Companion 232, n233). The Inquisitor further claims that if Christ had recognized the value of the devil's temptations, He would "have accomplished all that man seeks on earth—that is, someone to worship, someone to keep his conscience, and some means of uniting all in one unanimous and harmonious anthill" (238). Zosima does not disagree with this view of the needs of man; Cox comments that "the assumptions about human nature held by the Inquisitor on the one hand and by Dostoevsky's Christianity on the other are identical" (199). Terras also believes that "Ivan and Zosima are . . . in essential agreement about the state of the world" (Companion 49). Zosima and the Inquisitor agree, however, only about these fundamental needs of man.

As Dostoevsky pursues faith in man in "The Grand Inquisitor," he shows the inadequacy of the Inquisitor's answers to major human needs. Analyzing the present condition of science in the modern world, Father Paissy notes the inability of science and the modern world to escape Christian ideals:

the science of this world . . . has . . . analyzed everything divine . . . After this cruel analysis the learned of this world have nothing left of all that was sacred of old. But they have only analyzed the parts and overlooked the whole. . . . Yet the whole still stands steadfast before their eyes . . . For even those who have renounced Christianity and attack it, in their inmost
being still follow the Christian idea, for hitherto neither their subtlety nor the ardor of their heart has been able to create a higher ideal of man and of virtue than the ideal given by Christ of old. (155-56).

Zosima echoes some of the same sentiments as Father Paissy, saying:

in science, there is nothing but what is the object of sense. The spiritual world, the higher part of man's being is rejected altogether . . . The world has proclaimed the reign of freedom . . . but what do we see in this freedom of theirs? Nothing but slavery and self-destruction. (292)

The Inquisitor illustrates Father Paissy's theory when he denies the divine to side with the "dread spirit of death and destruction," but he does not reject Christ's ideal of love (240). Openly admitting a commitment to "slavery and self-destruction" that Zosima perceives in the world, the Inquisitor claims that he will "accept lying and deception, and lead men consciously to death and destruction, and yet deceive them all the way" because of his "incurable love for humanity" (242). Sandoz aptly summarizes the situation: "the entire enterprise rests upon a conscious intellectual swindle enforced by moral sanction" (50). The Inquisitor still seeks to establish Christ's kingdom; he just has adopted a different method to do so. Ivan admits this to Alyosha: "And note, the deception is in the name of Him in Whose ideal the old man had so fervently believed all his life long" (242). Ivan in the previous chapter, however, pronounces judgment on the ability of man to love without
faith in God, and, consequently, also passes judgment on his Inquisitor who claims to love men without believing in God:

To my thinking, Christ-like love for men is a miracle impossible on earth. ... One can love one's neighbors in the abstract, or even at a distance ... But even then we would not love them.

(218)

The Inquisitor's actions toward Christ support Ivan's view of the impossibility of love without Christ. Cox notes the strangeness of the Inquisitor's reaction to perfect love--condemning it to burn in the auto-da-fe (195). The Inquisitor chooses to reject Christ, but not his love--a view which even Ivan considers tenuous.

Dostoevsky's placement of "The Grand Inquisitor" within the novel also damages the Inquisitor's views. Preceding the poem, Ivan "shows his strength of will by breaking off with Katerina Ivanovna who wishes to be his 'grand inquisitor'" (Rosen 353). Thus, he shows that he is capable of bearing the burden of free choice that he claims is impossible except for the very few in "The Grand Inquisitor"; Ivan demonstrates his need--and possibly mankind's need--to be "unlike the submissive majority" (Rosen 353).

Immediately after "The Grand Inquisitor," Ivan gives Smerdyakov the approval to murder his father in the chapters titled "For a While a Very Obscure One" and "It's Always Worthwhile Speaking to a Clever Man." Rosen brings the reader's attention to the incongruity of Ivan's actions: "After Ivan's noble obsession with the suffering of mankind it is surprising that he should add to that suffering by
killing his father" (353). Rosen concludes that this action of Ivan "becomes a damaging commentary of the meaning of 'The Grand Inquisitor'" (353). Two historical inaccuracies further damage the credibility of the "The Grand Inquisitor." Catteau points out that the Inquisitor's face should have been veiled and that the phrase "ad majorem Dei gloriam" (229) is used by the Jesuits, not by the Dominicans who actually carried out the Inquisition (246). Terras adds that the "The Grand Inquisitor" is "not a good poem, and . . . not good rhetoric either" (Companion 92), identifying the "melodramatic, rhetorical, and simply phoney traits which identify the Grand Inquisitor as the self-projection of a much too self-assured, egotistical, emotionally immature, albeit brilliant young man" (Companion 51). The credibility of the poem suffers through its placement and inaccuracies.

The Inquisitor's solutions to the needs of man--miracle, mystery and authority--are further invalidated by the references in "The Grand Inquisitor" to the false prophet of Revelation. Cox points out that the book of Revelation is the "source of the Inquisitor's most characteristic language and imagery . . . where it is associated with 'the false prophet'" (194). The word "mystery" appears four times in Revelation (1:20, 10:7, 17:5, 17:7) with the last two citations referring to the false prophet. Another allusion to Revelation occurs when the Inquisitor outlines his plan to deceive man in order to establish community
worship. Revelation also speaks of the beast who will deceive all humanity and who will force "all, both small and great, both rich and poor, both free and slave" to worship him (13:11-17). The beast, "with tears of blood," is mentioned in "The Grand Inquisitor" with the Inquisitor himself astride the beast holding a cup labeled "Mystery" (238). Another image in the "The Grand Inquisitor" is of a "harlot who sits upon the beast, and holds in her hands the mystery" and who is dressed in royal purple (240). These images closely correspond to the harlot, clothed in purple and scarlet, astride her beast; she is "drunk with blood," holds a "cup full of abominations" and has "a name of mystery" written on her forehead (Rev. 17:3-6). This affinity with the false prophet of Revelation casts aspersion on the Inquisitor's claims.

Although the Inquisitor proposes to meet man's needs through miracle, mystery and authority, he actually "is the one who rejects miracle, mystery, and authority, and proposes instead to meet man's needs by magic, mystification, and tyranny" (Cox 195). The Inquisitor accuses Christ of denying miracles, even though Christ accomplishes the miracle of raising the young girl from the dead while the Inquisitor watches. From this situation it is evident that the Inquisitor "means something quite different from the kind of act that Christ performs when he first appears on the scene" (Cox 200). Instead, the Inquisitor offers the following as a solution to man's need to worship someone:
Receiving bread from us, they will of course see clearly that we take the bread made by their hands from them, to give it to them, without any miracle. They will see that we do not change the stones to bread, but in truth they will be more thankful for taking it from our hands than for the bread itself. (239)

Although the Inquisitor claims that miracle is one of the foundations of his philosophy, he clearly denies miracle in this passage, instead referring to some kind of sleight-of-hand or magic in which the people willingly accept deception. Cox notes that the justification for this pseudo-miracle appears within the text of "The Grand Inquisitor" (201):

And as man cannot bear to be without the miraculous, he will create new miracles of his own for himself, and will worship deeds of sorcery and witchcraft. (236)

Cox continues that the Inquisitor backs himself into a corner when he concludes that Christ performs a "superhuman act in rejecting 'miracle'" (201). Supernaturally, Christ resists the temptation of the devil to turn the stones into bread. Ultimately, the Inquisitor "condemns Christ for performing the miracle of rejecting 'miracle'" (Cox 201). The deceptive use of the word "miracle" weakens the Inquisitor's argument against Christ.

The Inquisitor is also deceptive and inconsistent in his assertions about "mystery." Although he claims that Christ rejects mystery (236), he allows that Christ's coming for the elect is a mystery: "Canst Thou really have come only to the elect and for the elect: But if so, it is a
mystery and we cannot understand it" (237). The Inquisitor does not take a consistent stand against Christ. He continues his logic in a rather strange manner:

And if it is a mystery, we too have a right to preach a mystery, and to teach them that it's not the free judgment of their hearts, not love that matters, but a mystery which they must follow blindly, even against their conscience.

(237)

Cox interprets this passage as saying that "Christ erred . . . by rejecting mystery; but still Christ presents a mystery, and if he did, so can we" (204). But the mystery that the Inquisitor poses is one which can be understood, a mystery which contradicts man's conscience (Cox 204). The Inquisitor is proud that he has "again led [men] like sheep," like a blind, unthinking herd that does not heed its conscience (237). The Inquisitor really advocates "mystification" to replace the Christian mystery (Cox 204).

The Inquisitor's credibility is further damaged when he substitutes the word "authority" for his tyranny. Cox notes that the Inquisitor "correctly observes man's need for submission to something higher than himself" (206). The Inquisitor, however, incorrectly reasons that since there needs to be submission, then the authority shall be his (Cox 207). The Inquisitor speaks of the absolute power that he and the other inquisitors will possess:

They will tremble impotently before our wrath, their minds shall grow fearful . . . we shall set them to work . . . We shall allow or forbid them to live with their wives and mistresses, to have or not to have children—according to
whether they have been obedient or disobedient. (239-40)

Every moral, relational and occupational decision will be made by the Inquisitor. He will even control the people's mood vacillations from sadness to happiness "at a sign" (239), establishing tyranny over every thought and decision of the people. As Mochulsky states, the Inquisitor "began with loving mankind and ended by transforming men into domestic animals. In order to make men happy, he took away everything human from it [sic] ... the hero of the Legend ended with the idea of limitless despotism" (620). With "limitless" power and authority, the Inquisitor corrupts his authority into absolute tyranny. Dostoevsky exposes the inadequacy of the Inquisitor's claim through the Inquisitor's deceptive use of language.

Contrary to the Inquisitor's assertions, the Christian viewpoint presented throughout the novel does not reject miracle, mystery and authority as answers to man's three fundamental needs. In "The Elders" the need to "find some one or something holy to fall down before and worship" is presented as a universal need of the peasants (24). In contrast to the Inquisitor's view, however, miracles are not the ground of this worship. The Inquisitor reverses the relationship between miracle and faith (Cox 39). In "The Elders" the narrator establishes the Christian view of the relationship between miracles and faith: "faith does not, in the realist, spring from the miracle but the miracle from faith" (20). The narrator adds that even Zosima's fame is
not increased primarily through miracles—"the elder [Zosima] had won over many hearts, more by love than by miracles" (310). Even Alyosha's "unquestioning faith in the miraculous power of the elder [Zosima]" is not ultimately grounded in the miracles that Zosima performs, although the absence of miracles at his elder Zosima's death does force Alyosha to reevaluate the relationship between miracles and faith. Rosen explains that Alyosha kisses the earth "in acknowledgment of the true miracle—not the false miracle of coercive power, of Zosima's bones not stinking—but the true miracle that arises each day in each person when he freely follows the verdict of his heart and prefers doing good to doing evil" (361-62). The relationship between faith and miracles is clearly demonstrated when the narrator describes the peasant women's faith, noting that the "miracle of healing" was founded on the "implicit belief that it would come to pass" (39).

The greatest miracle presented in the novel is that of Christ-like love. Ivan identifies this miracle through negation: "Christ-like love for men is a miracle impossible on earth" (218). Even Zosima sees true love as difficult: love "is hard to acquire, it is dearly bought, it is won slowly by hard labor. For we must love not only occasionally, for a moment, but forever. Everyone can love occasionally, even the wicked can" (298). Cox identifies two reasons for seeing Christ-like love as a miracle; the first reason is that Christ-like love is "unmotivated," and the
second is that "it produces a total transformation of the one who gives it and sometimes even of those who receive it" (201-02). The ending of the "The Grand Inquisitor" illustrates both points. Christ loves the Inquisitor "in spite of the fact that he is not lovable" (Cox 201). Cox comments on this "essential difference" between Christ and the Inquisitor: "the Inquisitor despises the most lovable of men; Christ loves the most despicable" (202). Christ's expression of his love, softly kissing the Inquisitor, transforms the Inquisitor's intentions. Instead of burning Christ at the auto-da-fé as he had declared he would, the Inquisitor merely releases Christ without punishment. Ivan observes the lingering effect of Christ's transforming love, commenting that "the kiss glows in his heart, but the old man adheres to his idea" (243). Christ's love has a transforming effect on the Inquisitor, softening his hard-hearted intentions to burn Christ at the stake. Alyosha's love also has a hint of this Christ-like quality since he awakens a sense of morality in his degenerate father--although this moral sense is not strong enough to reform Fyodor--while Alyosha lives with his father (16-17).

The other miracles presented in the novel, such as the Gospel account of turning the water into wine, are not expressed in order to create faith, but are expressed as an overflowing of love that increases man's joy. Cox raises the question that if "the primary Christian miracle is that of love, how does Dostoevsky account for the apparently
magical acts recorded in the gospels, such as Christ's turning the water into wine?" (203). In "Cana of Galilee" Alyosha suddenly realizes the purpose of these miracles: "He worked His first miracle to help men's gladness" (338). As Cox notes, "such miracles [turning water into wine], then, were performed . . . not to create men's faith, nor to alleviate their grief (as the Inquisitor would have it), but to augment their already existing joy" (204). Thus, the need to worship a holy ideal is accepted by Jesus since He works to increase man's joy, but His miracles do not create faith. Instead faith springs from the greatest miracle, that of Christ-like love. Cox describes this relationship as circular: "Christlike love for men is a miracle; behind the miracle is faith; behind faith is penitence" (203). Zosima's theme "All are responsible for all" is the penitence necessary to begin this circle of faith.

Just as miracle is not rejected as an appropriate solution for the need to worship someone, so also the Christian view in the novel does not reject mystery as a solution for man's need to have someone keep his conscience. The tradition of the elders in the Orthodox Russian church does accept man's basic need to have someone keep his conscience in the form of "confession to the elder by all who have submitted themselves to him" (22). The narrator comments that Zosima has the ability to tell "from an unknown face what a newcomer wanted, and what was the suffering on his conscience" (23). Contrary to the In-
quisitor's methods, however, the elders do not teach man to
go against his conscience, but to heed the "law of Christ
speaking in his conscience" (55). Zosima speaks of the
people being "lost without the word of God, for their soul
is athirst for the Word and for all that is good" (273). In
fact, Zosima even declares that the world has lost sight of
the truth, "since the whole world has long been going on a
different line, since we consider the veriest lies as truth
and demand the same lies from others" (280). This state-
ment, which appears in "The Russian Monk," speaks directly
to the Inquisitor's method of deceptively presenting lies as
truth. Instead of deceiving the people, Zosima advocates
that priests need only "drop a tiny seed [of the Word of
God] into the heart of the peasant . . . and it will live in
his soul all of his life . . . in the midst of the foulness
of his sin, like a bright spot, like a great reminder" (273-73).
Also implicit in the repeated statement "all are
responsible for all" is a sense of morality provided by the
conscience. Clearly, the need to have someone keep one's
conscience is upheld throughout the novel.

The Inquisitor also falsely charges Jesus with
rejecting mystery as a means of meeting this need of man.
Zosima asserts that "if you love everything, you will
perceive the divine mystery in things" (298). His use of
the term "mystery" differs from that of the Inquisitor,
meaning "something contrary to understanding" rather than
blindly going against one's conscience (Cox 204). The
"divine mystery" that Zosima claims that one will find through love is the Christian mystery of immortality. Dostoevsky's choice of the miracle in the "The Grand Inquisitor"—that of bringing the young girl back to life—addresses the Christian mystery of immortality (Cox 205). This mystery of immortality is echoed in Alyosha's dream, when he experiences a "kind of a resurrection" (Cox 205); "He had fallen on the earth a weak youth, but he rose up a resolute champion" (341). Alyosha perceives this mystery as "a sense of the wholeness of things" and sees that "the mystery of the earth was one with the mystery of the heavens" (337, 340). Through the dream Alyosha "becomes convinced of Zosima's (and by implication his own) immortality" (Cox 205).

Referring to the Bible as a source for his concept of mystery, Zosima presents the Bible as "a mold cast of the world and man and human nature, everything is there, and a law for everything for all the ages" (271). Zosima confirms the biblical usage of mystery, praising the Bible as a book that presents a "mystery" in which "passing earthly show and the eternal verity are brought together" (271). Zosima sees the Bible as the standard for all of life, that "all creation and all creatures, every leaf is striving to the Word, singing glory to God, weeping to Christ, unconsciously accomplishing this by the mystery of their sinless life" (274). By the same standard men do not live a sinless life. Thus, the reasoning behind "all are responsible for all" is
that "if I had been righteous myself, perhaps there would have been no criminal standing before me" (300). The recognition that everyone is "to blame for everyone and for all things," will help man to avoid pride and to learn to love. Mikhail, Zosima’s "mysterious visitor" (283), is an example of the pride that refuses to take responsibility for his sins. From pride, fearful of "other people’s respect," Mikhail "develops arguments in favor of living a lie, which we have heard from the Grand Inquisitor earlier. But here their wretched, self-serving nature is revealed nakedly" when Zosima reads scripture that exposes Mikhail’s motivation for continuing to live a lie (Terras Companion 254, n97). Dmitri also attributes to God his refusal to take the opportunity to kill his father (370). As Rosen comments, Dmitri’s restraint, given his motivation, his need for money, the opportunity, and the weapon, is not theoretically plausible: Dmitri illustrates that "men enslaved by passion—-the presumed subjects of the kingdom of the Grand Inquisitor--are shown to have the inner strength to overcome their passion" (362). Ivan is an example of a man who refuses to accept morality and God, yet is irrationally driven to confess his role in the murder (Rosen 362). This force in Ivan illustrates the power behind Zosima’s teaching quoted earlier: "all creation and all creatures, every leaf is striving to the Word" (274). Zosima upholds that the mystery of a divine connection between all that establishes
meaning and makes everyone responsible for everyone else
frees man from his base nature.

The mystery of immortality is the primary Christian
mystery that is presented in the Bible. Cox points out that
Paul addresses immortality in the following chapter of I
Corinthians:

Lo! I tell you a mystery. We shall not
all sleep, but we shall all be changed,
in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,
at the last trumpet. For the trumpet
will sound, and the dead will be raised
imperishable and we shall be changed.
For this perishable nature must put on
the imperishable, and this mortal
nature must put on immortality. (15:51-
54)

The epigraph of the novel, John 12:24, also points to the
mystery of immortality. The text of John 12:24 reads
"Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall
into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it
bringeth forth much fruit" (xii). In the New Testament,
this mystery of the necessity of death in order to bear
fruit is taken up in the discussion of immortality in the
previously cited chapter of I Corinthians. The passage
explains that the death of the grain of wheat is analogous
to the physical death which leads to spiritual life:

But some one will ask, 'How are the dead
raised? With what kind of body do they
come?' You foolish man! What you sow
does not come to life unless it dies.
And what you sow is not the body which
is to be, but a bare kernel, perhaps of
wheat or of some other grain . . . What
is sown is perishable, what is raised is
imperishable. It is sown in dishonor,
it is raised in power. It is sown a
Dostoevsky is most likely familiar with this passage since he had marked I Corinthians 15:42-44 in his copy of the New Testament (Kjetsaa 55-56). As Cox notes, "the epigraph, which is taken from the words of Jesus and which symbolizes the mystery of immortality, may surely be taken as evidence that the Inquisitor is wrong in asserting that Christ rejected mystery" (206).

Dostoevsky illustrates the Christian mystery of immortality through the spiritual resurrections of Ilyusha, Markel, Zosima and Mikhail in "artistic pictures" (Rosen 355). Through Ilyusha's death, "he has provided for all the boys a good, sacred memory which they will carry into life, and which may save them from wickedness"--an illustration of Ilyusha's corn of wheat dying and bearing much fruit (Goldstein 332-33). Rosen notes that in the stories of Markel, Zosima and Mikhail the "psychological motivation" is absent and that "this omission was deliberate" (357). In the case of Markel, who was aware that he would soon die, Dostoevsky does not give the motivation or the means that lead to Markel's sudden acceptance of Christianity; the narrator deals with Markel's transformation rather briefly in the following remark: "A marvelous change passed over him, his spirit seemed transformed" (267). Markel's spiritual resurrection, which occurs during Easter, the season of Christ's resurrection, is shrouded in mystery. The same mystery is preserved in Zosima's change of heart,
since his conversion also draws on the seed analogy presented in the epigraph. Also during the Easter season, Zosima "consciously received the seed of God's word" in his heart (270). That seed does not die and bear fruit until the episode when Zosima feels penitent for striking Afsany. Again no motivation for the change is given; his sudden unexpected change is revealed through phrasing such as "all at once I knew what it [Zosima's guilt] was" and "it was as though a sharp dagger had pierced me through" (276, 277).

After two weeks of agonizing over his decision to confess, Mikhail listens to Zosima read John 12:24, the epigraph of the novel and, suddenly, in the next hour, resolves to confess publicly his guilt. Dostoevsky leaves the actual details of his decision a mystery. Thus, Dostoevsky indirectly posits examples of lives transformed through the Christian mystery against the Inquisitor's mystification.

Revealing the close connection between miracle and mystery, Zosima claims that the only way to be convinced of immortality is through active love. In answer to Madame Khokhlakov's doubts, Zosima tells her that she will become convinced of her immortality "by the experience of active love" (48). He continues that "insofar as you advance in love you will grow surer of the reality of God and of the immortality of your soul" (48). Cox explains Zosima's reasoning: "Christ has shown by his example that if one loves enough, then the belief that love is stronger than death becomes a part of reality and not just a fine senti-
Cox clearly sums up the relationship between the miracle of Christ-like love and the mystery of immortality: "Part of the miraculous efficacy of love is that it creates the conviction of immortality, the mystery which the Inquisitor, not Christ rejects" (206). Throughout the novel, a warm affirmation of the mystery of immortality is established, an effective counterpoint to the mystification that the Inquisitor proposes.

The third need of man, the need for universal unity, is met by authority—or tyranny in the Inquisitor's scheme. The Christian view opposes tyranny, but upholds authority as a means for establishing universal unity. In his three temptations, Christ demonstrates his respect for authority; as Cox notes, Christ "declares that he submits himself to the authority of God and to that authority alone" (208). This submission to God's authority is faith and "refusal to submit is rebellion" (Cox 208). At the heart of universal unity is a need for a universal authority. Dostoevsky declares that God is the universal authority.

Both Zosima's and Alyosha's vision of future harmony involve the establishment of God's kingdom. The narrator, expressing Alyosha's dream for universal unity, says of Zosima,

He carries in his heart the secret of renewal for all: that power which will, at last, establish truth on the earth, and all men will be holy and love one another, and there will be no more rich nor poor, no exalted nor humbled, but all will be as the children of God, and
the true Kingdom of Christ will come.
(24)

Zosima also expresses a similar desire for unity, speaking of "the grand unity of men in the future, when a man will not seek servants for himself, or desire to turn his fellow creatures into servants . . . but . . . will long with his whole heart to be the servant of all, as the Gospel teaches" (296). Zosima seeks universal unity as a goal just as the Inquisitor does, but his basis for establishing unity is quite different than the Inquisitor's. The first characteristic of the Christian view of unity is that submission is voluntary. In the tradition of the elder in Russia, one does "renounce" his will and "yield it to him [the elder] in complete submission," but this "novitiate . . . is undertaken voluntarily" (21). Also in "The Russian Monk" the narrator emphasizes the unforced nature of the offering of the peasant woman which is made "by way of penance voluntarily undertaken" (263). The second characteristic of Zosima's vision of universal unity is God's universal moral standard to which all are held accountable. Zosima claims that the world wants "to base justice on reason alone, but not with Christ"; however, he also points out that "if you have no God what is the meaning of crime" (294). In Zosima's view, establishing true justice would be impossible without Christ's moral standard. He later addresses those who scorn morality: "When will you build up your edifice and order things justly by your intellect alone, without Christ?" He elaborates that these "aim at justice, but,
denying Christ, they will end by flooding the earth with blood, for blood cries out for blood, and he that taketh up the sword shall perish by the sword" (297). The Inquisitor plans to take the sword of Caesar to build his kingdom of universal peace and happiness; Zosima prophesies that this kingdom will only promote more bloodshed, reigning through violence. Instead Zosima advocates that one should "always decide to use humble love" rather than force (298). The third characteristic of the Christian view of unity is the equality of all; Zosima believes that "equality is to be found only in the spiritual dignity of man" (295). On the spiritual plane all men become equal while matters of the world--wealth, position, and property--do not matter. Authority, then, becomes a matter of servanthood. "The Russian Monk" gives two examples of this kind of authority. Markev seeks to be a servant of his servants (268). After striking Afsany, Zosima wonders, "What am I worth, that another man, a fellow creature, made in the likeness and image of God, should serve me?" (277). Before he realizes man's intrinsic worth, Zosima, as an officer, sees soldiers as "cattle" and describes himself as a "cruel, absurd, almost savage creature" (274). The mature Zosima has an entirely different view of man: "One who does not believe in God will not believe in God's people. He who believes in God's people will see His Holiness too" (273). With this realization, Zosima no longer perceives man as a herd of animals. Eight years later, Zosima meets Afsany again with
"a loving kiss" from "softened hearts"--a kiss that celebrates the "great human bond" between them and expresses a "grand and simple-hearted unity" (296).\(^{11}\) Alyosha’s dream in "Cana of Galilee" also celebrates a new community--one that "in opposition to the socialist anthill, is built on personality and love" (Mochulsky 630).

Zosima’s most direct attack against the world’s view of freedom and unity--an indirect attack against the Inquisitor’s plan for world unity--condemns the "slavery and destruction" caused by the fulfillment of unlimited desires and acquisition of material things (292). Zosima states the philosophy of the world as being: "you have desires and so satisfy them, for you have the same rights as the most rich and powerful. Don’t be afraid of satisfying them and even multiplying your desires" (292). In the same way the Inquisitor will allow the people to sin so that they may satisfy their desires (240). Zosima points out that man will be in "bondage to the habit of satisfying the innumerable desires he has created for himself" and the result will be "isolation" and a lack of concern for the rest of humanity (293). In contrast, Zosima offers the monastic life as a way to free one from "the tyranny of material things and habits" (293). The result is "freedom of spirit" and "spiritual joy"--both cornerstones in Zosima’s plan for universal unity and brotherly love (293). Ultimately the three needs of man are satisfied by miracle, mystery and authority, but not in the way the Inquisitor defines the
terms. All three solutions lead to love; the miracle of Christ-like love is accomplished through faith; the practice of love leads to an assurance of immortality, the primary Christian mystery; and submission to the God of love establishes the authority needed to realize the universal unity of man. Zosima emphasizes the importance of love in the following statement of his faith:

If only your penitence fail not, God will forgive all. . . . Man cannot commit a sin so great as to exhaust the infinite love of God. . . . If you are penitent, you love. And if you love you are of God. . . . Love is such a priceless treasure that you can redeem the whole world by it, and expiate not only your own sins but the sins of others. (43-44)

The approach to faith starts, then, with penitence, or submission to God's authority, when one assumes "responsibility for one's own sins" (Cox). The process continues since submission to God's authority results in love, a miracle, and the love will result in an assurance of immortality. Zosima confirms the circular nature of faith, saying that "insofar as you advance in love you will grow surer of the reality of God and of the immortality of your soul" (48). All three aspects of faith are dependent on each other. The movement of each of the Karamazov brothers illustrates the incorporation of the fuller nature of faith into their lives. Alyosha struggles with his faith that is based only on miracle, Dmitri with his faith that grapples only with mystery and the extremes of his conscience, and Ivan with his faith that struggles only with authority and
the submission of his intellect to authority.
Notes

1 D. H. Lawrence opposes this view, believing that the "Inquisitor speaks Dostoevsky's own final opinion about Jesus" (91). Another critic, Vasily Rozanov, asserts that Dostoevsky sides with "the wise and dread spirit" (175-76). Philip Rahv holds the middle ground, stating that Dostoevsky "takes his stand with Christ," although he "neither doubts or denies the malign wisdom" of the Inquisitor (270).

2 Typical of critics who side with the Grand Inquisitor is Ernest Simmons' view that Zosima's philosophy is "one of stagnation, of failing power, of idleness and beggary which amounts to the debasing of life. . . . It is a negation of the whole ideal of progress" (293).

3 Wasiolek argues that the Inquisitor's love is not invalidated by the fact that he sees "mankind as weak and slavish" (166).

4 Terras discusses Ivan's "destruction as an author" in "The Art of Fiction" (199).

Dostoevsky had marked Revelation 17:1-12 in his New Testament (Kjetsaa 77). Other references to Revelation in "The Grand Inquisitor" include the "first resurrection" on page 237 (Rev. 7:4-8); Jesus' words, "I come quickly" quoted on page 228 (Rev 3:11); and the huge star that falls to the earth on page 228 (Rev. 8:10).

Wasiolek disagrees, stating that the Inquisitor's arguments are logical and not contradictory (166-71). Another critic, Edward Carr, asserts that "Ivan's denunciation of God remains more powerful and more cogent than the defense which is put into the mouths of Zosima and Alyosha" (287).

Terras points out that the truth of the claim that "man cannot bear to be without the miraculous" is demonstrated in Book Seven, chapters i-ii (Companion 234, n269).

Zosima's emphasis on nature is often viewed as either animistic or pantheistic. Roger Anderson notes the "difficulty of labelling them [Zosima's teachings] as unambiguously Christian" and "his disturbing tendency, by Christian standards, to worship the earth and all forms of creation as being endowed with holy meaning" (272-73). Within the Orthodox tradition, however, Dostoevsky expands the icon, which is a "dynamic manifestation of a redeemed and harmonized world, constant reminders of its glory and beauty," to include not only works of art, but all of creation (Zernov 34). Dennis Slattery explains that the
icon "promotes an awareness of the bond between earth and God and bears witness to a hope for redemption, while at the same time it dignifies the actual and the finite. Hence the earth itself may be said to take on an iconic character through its constant process of nourishing and sustaining life . . . a natural analogue of the maternal iconic image" (197). Slattery also points out that "in Russian thought the earth has traditionally been endowed with religious significance and regarded as holy in the way that icons are holy" (197).

The Inquisitor also speaks of men as animals, describing them as "fawning" and whining (239). Men are compared to chicks cowering near the hen and as "geese" (239, 242).

Despite Zosima's warm affirmation of the individual in his relationship with Afsany, Joyce Carol Oates declares that the individual does not exist in Zosima's Christianity and also concludes that "Zossima's religion is then the same religion as that of the Grand Inquisitor" (212).
CHAPTER IV

THE EXCLUSION OF SMERDYAKOV FROM THE COLLECTIVE PERSONALITY

Smerdyakov, although possibly a half brother to Dmitri, Alyosha and Ivan, does not enjoy the status of a full brother in the novel. Smerdyakov’s mysterious background, the omission of his patronymic throughout most of the text and his lack of Karamazov sensuality distinguish him from his brothers. Also Smerdyakov’s narrowness contrasts with the love of life that the three brothers share. Instead of being a full brother in the Karamazov collective personality, Smerdyakov is a diabolic extension of Ivan, illustrating that the logical result of Ivan’s theories is indeed crime.

Smerdyakov’s father is never identified in the novel.1 His mother, Lizaveta, unable to speak, could not identify the father. The town, attempting to “find out who was the miscreant who had wronged” Lizaveta, suspects Fyodor because of an earlier incident in which he boasts that he could "look upon such an animal as a woman" (88). One reveler in the group challenges Fyodor to act on his assertion. Although Fyodor "swore" that he continued to accompany the group, thus not carrying out his boast, "no one knows for certain [what he did], and no one ever knew" (88). The fact
that Lizaveta climbs Fyodor’s garden fence and has the baby in his garden also points to Fyodor as the father; however, the possibility that the escaped convict Karp is responsible for the rape exists. Even though Fyodor does not contradict the rumors that he is Smerdyakov’s father, he does "vigorously" deny "his responsibility" (89). The townspeople are quick to add Fyodorovich to Smerdyakov’s christened name, Pavel (89), but this action does not necessarily mean that Fyodor is Smerdyakov’s father. The fact that this patronymic is rarely used also is a telling comment on Smerdyakov’s parentage.² Fyodor does not "object" to the patronymic and is "amused," but still does not reveal whether he is the father. He invents the nickname "Smerdyakov" for the boy from his mother’s nickname "Smerdyaschaya."³ When Smerdyakov develops epilepsy, Fyodor takes "an active interest in him, [sends] for a doctor, and trie[s] remedies" (113). This paternal interest does not prove, however, that Fyodor is the lackey’s father. Bringing up the fact that Fyodor never "cares" for his other sons, Terras claims that this paternal interest "may actually prove that he does not consider the boy to be his son. If his conscience were not clear on this score, perhaps he might have been afraid to show such solicitude" (Companion 178, n130). Terras attributes the mystery surrounding Smerdyakov’s "real father" to suspense (Companion 107), adding that "the ambiguity regarding
Smerdiakov's father is not resolved by the notebooks either" (Companion 32-33).

In addition to the rumor that Fyodor is Smerdyakov's father, various other stories of Smerdyakov's origin are presented in the novel. Saul Morson posits that Smerdyakov is also a changeling since he is born on the night of the burial of Grigory's son (236). Grigory explains Smerdyakov's birth, saying that "Our little lost one has sent us this, who has come from the devil's son and a holy innocent" (89). At one point, Grigory tells Smerdyakov that he "grew from the mildew in the bathhouse" (112). This proverbial expression, which Dostoevsky learned in prison, means "'you came from nowhere,' but in this instance the metaphor is partly realized, as Smerdiakov was born in Fiodor Pavlovich's bathhouse" (Companion 178, n128). Smerdyakov believes that he has no father: "I am descended from the stinking one and have no father" (206). Dmitri presents a different version of Smerdyakov's origin; Dmitri's phrase "he has the heart of a chicken" (448) literally means "he was born of a chicken" (Companion 325, n121). Again the metaphor is realized when Dmitri immediately calls Smerdyakov a "puling chicken" (449). None of the versions of Smerdyakov's birth rely on fact; rumor and personal opinion surround his birth.

Smerdyakov's kinship with Dmitri, Ivan and Alyosha is even more questionable since Dostoevsky does not emphasize the patronymic of Smerdyakov as he does with the other
brothers. His patronymic occurs only one time in the entire novel as Marya, his betrothed, refers to Smerdyakov as "Pavel Fyodorovich" (205). The omission of Smerdyakov's patronymic sets him apart from the rest of the Karamazov brothers.

Furthermore, Smerdyakov does not share in the Karamazov sensuality. He has no desire for women--none of the Karamazov sensual lust that even Alyosha admits to. The narrator describes him as having "as much contempt for the female sex as for men; he was aloof, almost unapproachable, with them" (114). Fetyukovich refers to Smerdyakov's dislike for women and the 3000 rubles set aside to fulfill Fyodor's lust: "The destination of that sum [the 3000 rubles] . . . must have been hateful to him [Smerdyakov]" (701). Terras identifies Fetyukovich's assumption: "The three brothers, lovers of women like their father, could at least understand the old man's infatuation. Smerdiakov, who has the face of a eunuch and hates women, must have found his master's passion merely contemptible" (Companion 429, n260). When Fyodor suggests that Smerdyakov marry, Smerdyakov expresses his revulsion for women, turning "pale with anger" (114). In addition to a lack of desire for women, Smerdyakov exhibits other traits of a eunuch. Twice his face is described as "emasculate": in the first reference (247), the Russian word is *skopcheskuiu*, an adjective meaning "eunuch-like" derived from the word "eunuch" or *skopets* (Terras Companion 240, n348). In the second
reference (573), the word for "emasculate" is skopcheskoe, also derived from the word "eunuch" (Companion 376, n186). Exhibiting another characteristic of a eunuch, Smerdyakov sings in a "sugary falsetto" (205). Although Smerdyakov is apparently betrothed to Marya Kondratyevna when he comes to live with them, Peace maintains that the circumstances do not contradict the image of Smerdyakov as a eunuch. His betrothed’s name carries special connotations: "Marya not only suggests the Madonna figure important to both Flagellants and Castrates, but the patronymic Kondratevna . . . seems to imply that Kondratiy Selivanov, the founder of the sect of Castrates, is her spiritual father" (262). Thus, the allusions to Smerdyakov as a eunuch and as one who dislikes women establish that he does not share in the elemental Karamazov sensuality; again Smerdyakov is set apart from the unity of the Karamazovs.

In addition, Smerdyakov does not exhibit the characteristic Karamazov love of life. In contrast to the three brothers, Smerdyakov does not love people or life. Grigory tells Martha that Smerdyakov "does not care for you or me . . . and he doesn’t care for anyone" (112). Fyodor comments on Smerdyakov’s lack of love, saying to Ivan "I know he can’t bear me, nor anyone else, even you, though you fancy that he has a high opinion of you. Worse still with Alyosha, he despises Alyosha" (120). Smerdyakov is the only character in the novel that "despises" Alyosha. Fyodor is also surprised to discover Smerdyakov’s lack of imagination
when the lackey reads N. V. Gogol's *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* and comments with a frown that the stories are "untrue" (113). Smerdyakov's "extraordinary fastidiousness" in both his eating and dress reflects his rather limited, constrained attitude toward life (113-14). Peace further analyzes the "narrowness" of Smerdyakov: "His nature is not open to beauty; he does not know the thirst for life; he does not know the torments of sensuality" (237).

The absence of psychological motivation for the lackey’s actions and words also suggests a position of secondary importance of Smerdyakov. Robert L. Belknap gives an example of this lack of psychological motivation: "Had Ivan’s interviews with Smerdjakov been told with insight into Smerdjakov’s as well as Ivan’s uncontrollable waverings and gropings, he would have become a weak, vicious valet fulfilling certain morbid cravings in an erratic way" (86). Thus, the restrained nature of Smerdyakov, the absence of a Karamazov love of life and the absence of psychological insight into his character distinguish Smerdyakov from the Karamazov brothers, suggesting that he is not even their half-brother.

Instead of emphasizing the kinship of Smerdyakov with the brothers, Dostoevsky emphasizes his diabolic nature. Smerdyakov is associated with evil through several parallels with the devil. Terras notes that Smerdyakov performs a type of "black mass" over dead cats (*Companion* 54). Grigory catches Smerdyakov performing one of these masses:
Smerdyakov "was very fond of hanging cats, and burying them with great ceremony. He used to dress up in a sheet as though it were a surplice, and sing, and wave some object over the dead cat as though it were a censer" (112). Grigory also hints at the diabolical in Smerdyakov when he tells the lackey, "You’re not a human being" (112). Wasiolek points out that Ivan confuses Smerdyakov with his devil in the third interview when Ivan calls him a "phantom" and that the devil appears to Ivan "at precisely the moment Smerdyakov dies" (176). Ivan also refers to the devil as a "phantom" (604) and the devil refers to himself as a "phantom" (609). Harry Slochower suggests a close relationship between Smerdyakov and the devil, noting that the "appearance of the devil is Ivan’s partial awareness of the unconscious role which Smerdyakov played in his life" (267). Another connection between Smerdyakov and the devil is established through the shared label "lackey"; Ivan addresses the devil as "lackey" (604, 615) which reminds the reader of Smerdyakov (Terras Companion 387, n307). And the devil and Smerdyakov both share a love for France; the devil liberally sprinkles French phrases into his conversation, and Smerdyakov studies a French exercise book, planning on going to France with the 3000 rubles (Belknap 40).

Furthermore, Smerdyakov shares in the devil’s roles as "tempter and seducer" (Terras Companion 54). He tempts Ivan to abandon his responsibility to stay and protect his father, he leads Ilyusha to torture a dog by feeding it a
morsel of bread containing a pin, he misinforms Dmitri of the time of the meeting at the monastery, and he tempts Dmitri's murderous passion, deliberately revealing the secret code of knocks. Belknap identifies Smerdyakov as a "motiveless malignity"--an appropriate label for the devil--in these actions (72). Ivan senses Smerdyakov's role as a tempter in the chapter titled "For a While a Very Obscure One." Ivan finds himself acting against his will:

'Get away, you wretch. What have I to do with you, fool?' was on the tip of his [Ivan's] tongue, but to his profound astonishment he heard himself say, 'Is my father still asleep, or has he woken up?' He asked the question softly and meekly, to his own surprise, and at once, again to his own surprise, sat down on the bench. For an instant he felt almost frightened. (247-48)

In this passage Terras believes that Ivan is "driven by a mysterious evil force" (Companion 241, n351) and that this scene "creates the impression . . . that Smerdiakov is Ivan's evil demon, perhaps the devil himself" (241, n352). Smerdyakov continues to control Ivan's reactions in the three interviews (577, 581). Ivan blurts out, "Damn you! Speak out what you want" (238). "Damn you" literally translates "Eh, the devil" from the Russian E. chort (Terras Companion 241, n356). Terras explains that "since Russian has no article, only the context can determine whether Ivan invokes 'the devil' or addresses Smerdiakov 'you devil.' Ivan's recurring mention of the devil, particularly in Smerdiakov's presence, is symbolically significant" (241, n356). When Ivan begins to suspect Smerdyakov's role in
the murder, another phrase links Smerdyakov to the devil. Ivan says, "Well, it was the devil who helped you" (598).

Ivan's realization that he did want the murder is coupled with a determination to kill Smerdyakov (585, 587); Terras notes that this desire is possibly "the expression of a subconscious urge to rid himself of the Smerdyakov (the devil, that is) in himself" (Companion 380, n230). In the scene in which Smerdyakov produces the 3000 rubles, Terras suggests that Ivan's "insane terror" as Smerdyakov reaches down into his stocking stems from the anticipation of the appearance of "the devil's cloven hoof" from the stocking (Companion 382, n254). Parallel scenes link Smerdyakov and the devil where Ivan senses their presence, which both times is described as irritating, tormenting and worrisome (246, 601). Further establishing Smerdyakov's diabolic nature, Ivan also refers to Smerdyakov with traditional imagery associated with the devil, calling him a "viper" (590) and a "reptile" (591). Dostoevsky emphasizes Smerdyakov's diabolic nature through these parallels with the devil.

In addition to being a cohort of the devil and possibly the devil himself, Smerdyakov is also an extension of Ivan. Nicholas Berdyaev perceives their relationship as being connected by "mysterious lines whose roots are hidden in the depths of their unconscious life" (26). This connection between Smerdyakov and Ivan is demonstrated several ways in the novel. Smerdyakov's routine changes with Ivan's coming to live with his father: "Smerdyakov had often waited at
table towards the end of dinner, and since Ivan’s arrival in our town he had done so every day” (116). In "The Controversy" Fyodor points out Smerdyakov’s attachment to Ivan: "‘Ivan,’ cried Fyodor Pavlovich suddenly, ‘stoop down for me to whisper. He’s got this all up for your benefit. He wants you to praise him. Praise him!’" (117). Terras comments that this whispered "praise him" "establishes the fateful relationship between Ivan and Smerdyakov" (Companion 180, n145). In a scene in "Over the Brandy," Fyodor temporarily forgets that Alyosha’s mother also is the mother of Ivan: he says to Ivan, "What mother are you talking about? Was she? . . . Why, damn it! of course she was yours too! Damn it! My mind has never been so darkened before. Excuse me, why, I was thinking Ivan . . . He, he, he!" (125-26). Fyodor’s lapse into laughter suggests some wicked thought, possibly the thought that Lizaveta was Ivan’s mother. Joyce Carol Oates observes that "the father is thinking that Ivan had no mother, being inhuman, or that he is the son of Lizaveta and therefore identical with Smerdyakov" (208). Both interpretations connect Ivan with Smerdyakov, who is also called inhuman. Another indication of the connection between Smerdyakov and Ivan is the deferential plural "they" which Smerdyakov uses only in references to Ivan when he speaks to Marya; he refers to Dmitri and Fyodor in the ordinary singular (Terras Companion 214, n53). Both Ivan and Smerdyakov respond to Alyosha’s question about Dmitri’s whereabouts with an allusion to the
book of Genesis. Smerdyakov responds with "It's not as if I were his keeper" (208); Ivan echoes his statement, saying "Am I my brother Dmitri's keeper?" (213) The integral link between the two becomes clear through Ivan's depression, which is of a "casual, external character" (246); Ivan realizes that the cause of his depression is Smerdyakov:

Ivan Fyodorovich knew that the lackey Smerdyakov was on his mind . . . Just before, when Alyosha had been telling him of his meeting with Smerdyakov, he had felt a sudden twinge of gloom and loathing, which had immediately stirred responsive anger in his heart. Afterwards, as he talked, Smerdyakov had been forgotten for the time; but he still had been in his mind, and as soon as Ivan Fyodorovich parted from Alyosha and was walking home, the forgotten sensation began to obtrude itself again. (246)

Both on a subconscious level and a conscious level, Smerdyakov and Ivan are closely related.

Furthermore, Smerdyakov becomes a diabolic extension of Ivan, illustrating that the logical result of Ivan's theories is indeed crime. As Berdiaev states, the purpose of Smerdyakov is to translate "the godless dialect" of Ivan "into action" (152). Slochower maintains a similar position, believing that Smerdyakov "embodies the principle of destruction itself, receiving its sanction from Ivan's conceptual dialectic" (265). Thus, the lackey reveals the inherent evil in Ivan's philosophy. Smerdyakov himself admits that he was a tool of Ivan's: "I was only your instrument, your faithful servant Licharda, and it was following your words I did it" (590). Terras explains that
Licharda "was a willing tool in the murder of his master" (Companion 381, n248). In the third interview Smerdyakov reminds Ivan that Ivan's philosophy was the basis for his father's murder--"You said 'everything was lawful'" (592). Smerdyakov even admits that "everything was lawful" was the basis for his plan to steal the 3000 rubles to go abroad:

I did dream of it [beginning a new life abroad with the 3000 rubles], chiefly because 'all things are lawful.' That was quite right what you taught me, for you talked a lot to me about that. For if there's no everlasting God, there's no such thing as virtue, and there's no need of it. (599)

Smerdyakov emphasizes Ivan's role in the murder--"you are still responsible for it all, since you knew of the murder, sir, and charged me to do it, sir, and went away knowing all about it" (594). Smerdyakov actually lives out Ivan's theory that everything is allowable.

Smerdyakov's suicide also comments on Ivan's philosophy, especially the impossibility of living out that philosophy. L. A. Zander views Smerdyakov's suicide as the result of the inadequacy of Ivan's philosophy; he notes that "apparently Smerdiakov could not believe in God, but could not go on living in his condition either--hence his suicide" (quoted in Terras 55). By the second interview Smerdyakov has recovered from his illness and is studying French in order to pursue his dream of "beginning a new life with that money in Moscow or, better still, abroad" (599). Yet Smerdyakov is not able to live out his plan to begin a new life that is founded on murder and deceit. The change in
Smerdyakov’s physical appearance is the first signal of the impossibility of living out his new plan. In the last interview, there is a "great change in his [Smerdyakov’s] face; he was much thinner and sallower. His eyes were sunken and there were dark circles under them" (589). He has been reading a religious book, The Sayings of the Holy Father Isaac the Syrian,--even though he still doesn’t believe in God (599)--and gives Ivan the money he had stolen. Ivan is surprised: "But why do you give it [the money] to me, if you committed the murder for the sake of it" (599). But Smerdyakov avoids Ivan’s question, saying that "he doesn’t want it" (599). Terras offers an explanation for Smerdyakov’s sudden change of heart and ultimately his suicide:

> With faith in God, a man can accept his guilt and bear suffering. Without faith, guilt will crush a man--which is the danger Ivan Karamazov is in, and to which his disciple Smerdiakov succumbs. A man with guilt and without faith may commit suicide, rejecting life, the gift of God given him once in all eternity. (Companion 75)

Evidently Smerdyakov is unable to live with his conscience since he seeks to start a new life with money gained from the murder of his master.

Smerdyakov’s parallels with the devil, established earlier, and his role as an extension of Ivan comment on the practical consequences of Ivan’s philosophy--the unrestrained evil that his philosophy produces. His suicide confirms the evil of Ivan’s philosophy; reality does not
sustain the theory that "all is lawful." His role in the novel is not that of a full partaker in the Karamazov personality; rather, he serves as an extension of Ivan, his purpose being to illustrate the real consequences of Ivan’s theories.
Notes

1Mochulsky operates on the assumption that Smerdyakov is Fyodor's son, thus seeing him as a "fatal dichotomy" to the three brothers (598). The parallels between Smerdyakov's birth and the night of Fyodor's murder support this view (Wasiolek 181).

2Terras notes that "in Russia, a fatherless child will normally receive his or her godfather's name for a patronymic" (Companion 169, n34). Fyodor may be seen as a godfather, rather than the real father, in the townspeople's view.

3The verb "smerdety" means "to stink" (Wheeler 746). Smerdyakov is referred to several times as the stinking lackey. Since Smerdyakov is very careful about his appearance and clothes, Wasiolek concludes that "the implications of his name are purely moral" (225).

4Smerdyakov misinterprets Marya's phrase "you've gone so deep" and thus launches into a justification of his birth. Terras explains that this Russian phrase, proizoshli, translates literally as "you've gone all the way through"; however, Smerdyakov responds to the literary usage of the word, meaning "(1) 'to happen, to transpire' and (2) 'to originate, to be descended'" (Companion 213, n41).
5 References to Smerdyakov as a "lackey" include pages 120, 205, 246, 536 and 537.

6 Other references to the devil in Smerdyakov's presence are on pages 251, 576, 589 and 598.

7 Dmitri also inadvertently links Smerdyakov with the devil, saying "the devil must have killed my father" (449) and that "the devil" must have opened the door to the garden (572). Terras comments that both of these statements are "almost literally true" (Companion 326, n124; 375, n181).

8 Dmitri also experiences Smerdyakov's presence in his head, as he cannot think of anyone else who may have committed the murder except Smerdyakov (448).

9 Licharda is "a devoted servant in the popular folk tale 'Prince Bova.' Licharda serves his master, King Gvidon, faithfully--but also the king's wicked wife, Militrisa (from Lat. meretrix, 'prostitute[']), when she plots to murder him" (Terras Companion 242, n362).
CHAPTER V

THE BREAKDOWN OF EACH BROTHER’S FRAGMENTED FAITH

Indirectly illustrating the three dimensions of faith preached by Father Zosima, Dostoevsky traces each brother’s movement toward the ideal that Zosima presents. Dostoevsky establishes the inadequacies of the Inquisitor’s view of miracle, mystery and authority by presenting a crisis for each brother, each of whom then lives out an enactment of the Inquisitor’s false understanding of miracle, mystery and authority. The crises the brothers face force them to reevaluate their position of faith while they each move from a faith that results in bondage to one that results in freedom.

Alyosha’s faith is undermined by the lack of miracles surrounding Zosima’s death, revealing a faith that is based on miracles. Alyosha’s life has revolved around the elder, and, consequently, he is devastated by the mocking jeers of the crowd at the foul, decaying odor and the absence of any miracles. His father, Fyodor, predicts that Alyosha will face some sort of trial in the monastery: "You will burn and you will burn out; you will be healed and come back again" (19). Experiencing a kind of trial by fire, Alyosha faces reality at the premature decaying of Father Zosima.
Striving to satisfy his need to worship, Alyosha has based his faith on his love for Zosima and the miracles that Zosima performs. The narrator suggests that Alyosha's faith is tied up in his love for Zosima and in miracles: "Alyosha had unquestioning faith in the miraculous power of the elder" (23). Alyosha expresses the extent of his devotion for Zosima to Lise, saying, "If you knew, Lise, how bound up in soul I am with him!" (202). He prefaces this remark with the statement: "And perhaps I don't even believe in God" (202). The narrator adds, "There was something too mysterious, too subjective in these last words of his, perhaps obscure to himself, but yet torturing him" (202). Alyosha himself questions whether his faith will survive his elder's death, implying that Alyosha has faith in Zosima and his "miraculous power" rather than having faith in God.

After his elder dies, Alyosha experiences the crisis of faith that he has anticipated. The narrator describes this crisis: the absence of miracles at Zosima's death "exerted a very strong influence on the heart and soul of . . . Alyosha, forming a crisis and turning point in his spiritual development, giving a shock to his intellect, which finally strengthened it for the rest of his life and gave it definite aim" (308). The narrator carefully identifies the cause of this crisis:

To Father Paissy's sorrowful question, 'Are you too with those of little faith?' I could of course confidently answer for Alyosha no, he is not with those of little faith. Quite the contrary. Indeed, all his trouble came
from the fact that he was of great faith. . . . If the question is asked: 'Could all his grief and disturbance have been only due to the fact that his elder’s body had shown signs of premature decomposition instead of at once performing miracles?' I must answer without beating about the bush, 'Yes, it certainly was.' (316-17)

Again the narrator emphasizes the point that Alyosha’s faith is centered on miracles. Terras comments that "the full impact of ‘the odor of corruption’ becomes clear. Alyosha is caught in the web of the second temptation of Christ (Matt. 4:5-7), since he allows his faith to depend on a miracle" (Companion 265-66, n43). The narrator tries to justify Alyosha’s misplaced faith, saying:

But again it was not miracles he needed but only 'the higher justice' which had been in his belief outraged by the blow that had so suddenly and cruelly wounded his heart. And what does it signify that this 'justice' looked for by Alyosha inevitably took the shape of miracles to be wrought immediately in the ashes of his elder? (317-18)

However, the narrator succeeds in emphasizing Alyosha’s faith in miracles. Alyosha’s faith in God’s "higher justice" is shaken without revealed miracles, pointing to a faith that is dependent on miracles (317).

In addition to struggling with his belief in miracles, Alyosha also faces the intellectual question of justice that Ivan raises in "Rebellion." Alyosha feels a "vague but tormenting and evil impression left by his conversation with his brother Ivan the day before" (318). Rakitin perceives that Alyosha is "rebelling against Him" (319); at this point
Alyosha rebels against God just as Ivan does. Alyosha even echoes Ivan's words: "I am not rebelling against my God; I simply 'don't accept His world'" (319). Terras comments that "the connection between Ivan's rebellion and Alyosha's own version of the same is made explicit" (Companion 267, n55). In Alyosha's statement of rebellion, Koprince sees Alyosha moving "away from the naive and unexamined faith of the child and toward the skepticism of the thinking youth" (348). Rakitin is quick to take advantage of Alyosha's rebellion, offering Alyosha sausage and vodka, taking him to visit Grushenka and hoping to see "Alyosha's fall 'from the saints to the sinners'" (321). Alyosha's borrowing of Ivan's conclusion about God and his actions of rebellion reveal the depth of Alyosha's doubts.

Similar to Alyosha's crisis of faith in miracles, Dmitri's faith in man's conscience suffers a severe blow when he is confronted with his decadence. Because Dmitri cannot understand the mystery of beauty in which there is "the ideal of the Madonna" and "the ideal of Sodom," he abdicates all responsibility to follow God (97). Dmitri recites three stanzas of Schiller's poem "The Eleusinian Festival" to Alyosha, emphasizing that he is an example of the "man in deepest degradation / Ceres beholds everywhere" (95). The poem awakes Dmitri's conscience, but does not reform him:

I always read that poem about Ceres and man. Has it reformed me? Never! For I am a Karamazov. For when I do leap into the abyss, I go headlong with my heels
up, and am pleased to be falling in that degrading attitude, and consider it something beautiful. And in very depths of that degradation I begin a hymn of praise. (96)

The distinction between degradation and spiritual beauty blur for Dmitri, with the desire for degradation swallowing up his spiritual ideals. He even refers to the battle between the two kinds of beauty: "The awful thing is that beauty is mysterious as well as terrible. God and the devil are fighting there and the battlefield is the heart of man" (97). Although at this point Dmitri sees beauty as "ambiguous," Jackson maintains that Dostoevsky presents man—not beauty—as "ambiguous" because man "experiences two kinds of beauty—not only the true higher beauty, but also a low order of aesthetic sensation ('beauty in Sodom') which he calls beauty" (64). Wasiolek explains this double meaning of beauty in Dostoevsky's moral world; the value of an act as either evil or good rests on "the choice . . . of the act for self or for God" (56). An act done for self is then evil and an act done for God is good. The beauty of Sodom is destructive, while beauty viewed as God's provision is redemptive. Wasiolek concludes that "without God, the Dostoevskian hero is condemned to meet only himself, no matter how beautiful his intention, no matter how 'good' his act" (56). Living out a mystery that is contrary to his conscience, Dmitri pursues the ideal of Sodom and "meets" only his decadence. Admitting his progression toward vice, he says, "I can't endure the thought that a man of lofty
mind and heart begins with the ideal of the Madonna and ends with the ideal of Sodom" (97).2

Even though Dmitri begins with lofty ideals, he ends up a lover of "vice" (97) and finds only bondage in his sensual passion. Admitting this bondage to Alyosha, Dmitri declares himself to be a "low creature with uncontrolled passions" and realizes that he spent Katerina's money because "he could not control himself" (108). In his pursuit of Grushenka, Dmitri finds himself sinking in a "filthy morass" that is "revolting" to him, yet still controls his actions. Dmitri, "with intense and genuine anger at himself," confesses to Alyosha that he "can't restrain his debaucheries" even though he is betrothed to Katerina (105-06). The narrator speaks of Dmitri's "terrible hands"; Terras notes that his hands had "thrice smitten a father: Snegirov, Grigory, and Fiodor Pavlovich" (Companion 296, n193). Dmitri's "horrible fury of hatred" for his father almost results in an actual murder since Dmitri "suddenly pulled the brass pestle out of his pocket" (370). Although Dmitri does not kill his father, he does strike Grigory with the pestle and believes that he has killed Grigory. At this point, Dmitri realizes that the result of going against his conscience leads to disorder. He tells Pyotr Ilyich "I have never liked all this disorder. . . . I'm talking of a higher order. There's no order in me, no higher order" (382). Dmitri realizes his need for someone to keep his conscience, the need to follow his conscience rather than not follow it.
During the torments of his soul in the interrogations, Dmitri takes responsibility for his decadence. Dmitri faces the incongruencies of his life, telling the prosecutor and the district attorney that "You have to deal with a man of honor, a man of the highest honor; above all—don't lose sight of it—a man who's done a lot of nasty things, but has always been, and still is, honorable at bottom, in his inner being" (436). The investigators do not recognize his sincerity and honor. They do hold Dmitri responsible, however, for his wild, violent actions and his threats to kill his father for the 3000 rubles, ignoring the ideals that Dmitri cherishes. For example, the district attorney treats Dmitri as a criminal, pursuing Dmitri’s motive for snatching up the brass pestle; Dmitri responds by "feeling more and more ashamed at having told 'such people' the story of his jealousy so sincerely and spontaneously" (443-44). Also the prosecutors ignore Dmitri’s distinction between "scoundrel" and "thief" (465). The next step of the interrogation, the examination of Dmitri’s clothes, symbolically reveals the decadence of his life, while he is "gradually stripped naked even morally and spiritually" (Terras, Companion 327, n135). Dmitri’s undressing forces him to recognize his guilt for his decadent life: "when he [Dmitri] was undressed he felt somehow guilty in their presence . . . and that now they had a perfect right to despise him. . . It was a misery to him to take off his socks" (456). Taking off his dirty socks and underclothes
symbolizes the moral dirt of Dmitri that is now exposed.

Dmitri's greatest agony in these series of torments comes when he reveals his secret of the pouch of money and is not believed by the investigators. His lies and wild words have finally caught up with him; now that Dmitri is telling the truth, he is not believed. Dmitri lapses into complete despair because his faith in honor--both his own and that of the investigators--collapses.

Just as Dmitri's faith in his honor crumbles when he faces reality, Ivan's faith in his intellect breaks down when he is faced with the reality of pursuing his intellectual theories without any absolute authority. Explaining his faith in his intellect to Alyosha, Ivan cites tragic examples of suffering children and concludes, "It's not that I don't accept God, you must understand, it's the world created by Him I don't and cannot accept" (216). According to Wasiolek, Ivan accepts God so that he can rebel against him (162). Ironically, Ivan denounces rebels and rebellion in "The Grand Inquisitor" (236-37) and yet becomes one himself in the chapter entitled "Rebellion."

Pride is the foundation for Ivan's atheistic position that all things are allowable: "egoism, even unto crime, must become, not only lawful but ... the inevitable, the most rational ... outcome" (60). Ivan even admits his pride will take precedence over truth, saying that "even if parallel lines do meet and I see it myself, I shall see it and say that they've met, but still I won't accept it"
He again discloses his proud self-will in his stand against God, saying that "I would rather remain with my unavenged suffering and unsatisfied indignation, even if I were wrong" (226). Inadvertently exposing his pride in "The Legend," he recites, "Thou did lift them up and thereby taught them to be proud" (239). Terras comments that Ivan "is right in that Christ had told men that they were God's children and immortal. This paradox suggests that the real, satanic pride is that of the Grand Inquisitor [and also of Ivan], who exalts only himself, while Christ exalted mankind" (Companion 235, n289). The fact that Ivan might be the murderer of his father does not set well with his pride; he feels "something very deep down . . . burning and rankling in his soul. His pride had suffered cruelly all that month" (587). Smerdyakov tells Ivan, "Your pride made you think I was a fool" (599). The devil plays to Ivan's pride, telling him that if man will just give up his conscience, "we shall be gods" (620). In fact Ivan does attempt to remake the world in "The Grand Inquisitor" (Wasiolek 171). Although Ivan protests that this view is the devil's and not his, Alyosha does not believe him: "'And not you, not you?' Alyosha could not help shouting, looking frankly at his brother" (620). Dmitry Tschizewskij points out that the idea of "man-god" or "higher man" contains "the possibility of the transformation of the self-consciousness of a 'higher man' into 'satanic pride' . . . if his consciousness does not contain inner forces that control him.
This 'willfulness' necessarily leads to crime" (quoted in The Brothers Karamazov, "Essays in Criticism" 798). Through his pride, Ivan establishes a freedom of unrestrained self-will, a freedom that for him eventually leads to the murder of his father and rebellion against God and society.

Ivan is not able to sustain his proud self-will, however, and succumbs to fear. Admonishing Ivan for his weakness, Smerdyakov says, "You were bold enough then, sir. You said 'everything was lawful,' and how frightened you are now" (592). Robert Wharton identifies the cause of Ivan's crisis--"experience . . . vividly and unrelentingly suggests to Ivan that his father's murder manifested his own will rather than God's" (580). Terras notes that Ivan is not able to sustain the role of "man-god" (Companion 382, n256). Ivan’s words to Muisov come back to haunt him: "it will be difficult for him [the criminal], to say: 'All men are mistaken, all in error, all mankind are the false Church. I, a thief and murderer, am the only true Christian Church'" (34). Ivan cannot live with an amoral attitude toward crime. "The disintegration of his [Ivan’s] theories of life and religion" is caused, in Ernest Simmon’s view, by the realization of this moral guilt for his father’s murder (286). In the face of his guilt in the murder of his father, Ivan is unable to maintain his proud self-will as absolute.

Ivan argues that without faith in immortality, it is not even possible for men to love their neighbors (60). In
a letter of N. L. Osmidov, Dostoevsky explains his reasoning for the impossibility of love without faith in immortality:

Now suppose that there is no God, and no personal immortality . . . Tell me then: Why am I to live decently and do good, if I die irrevocably here below? If there is no immortality, I need but live out my appointed day, and let the rest go hang. And if that's really so (and if I am clever enough not to let myself be caught by the standing laws), why should I not kill, rob, steal, or at any rate live at the expense of others? For I shall die, and all the rest will die and utterly vanish! (233-34)

Ivan's inability to love is apparent in his actions. He acts cruelly on several occasions. Surprising even Fyodor with his cruelty, he violently punches Maximov in the breast (81). After receiving Lise's letter, he laughs "mali-ciously" and calls her a "wanton woman" (568). Terras points out that "Ivan, who blamed God for the suffering of innocent children, is now himself 'insulting' a child, instead of helping her" (Companion 374, n163). In his cruelest act, Ivan almost murders a peasant, knocking him down and leaving him to freeze to death (588). Also Ivan thinks that Lise's fancy of eating pineapple compote while watching a crucified child die is "nice" (552-53). As Koprince notes, Ivan changes from "the socially concerned skeptic who writes 'The Grand Inquisitor' to the sadist and sensualist who believes in Lise's pineapple compote" (348). Ivan's inability to love is also seen in his relationships with others. Except for limited contact with Alyosha and Smerdyakov, he maintains a remote attitude toward people.
Ivan admits to Alyosha that he has "no friends" (215). When Ivan is faced with his father's impending murder, he is unwilling to be drawn into the complex drama developing around him and flees to Moscow to maintain his remoteness. Although Ivan says that he is "awfully fond of children" (219), Terras comments that "Ivan, unlike his brothers, will do nothing to show that it [his fondness for children] is true" (Companion 221, n130). Terras also sees a direct relationship between Ivan's estrangement from God and his resulting estrangement from men: "Ivan's alienation from God has led to his alienation from his fellow men" (51).

Father Zosima tells an anecdote about an elderly doctor to Madame Khokhlakov that illustrates Ivan's position; the "clever" doctor says,

'I love humanity,' he said, 'but I wonder at myself. The more I love humanity in general, the less I love man in particular, that is, separately, as single individuals. In my dreams,' he said, 'I have often come to making enthusiastic schemes for the service of humanity, and perhaps I might actually have faced crucifixion if it had been suddenly necessary; and yet I am incapable of living in the same room with anyone for two days together, as I know by experience. . . . But it has always happened that the more I detest men individually the more ardent becomes my love for humanity. (48-49)

Thus, the aloofness of Ivan's character reflects the isolation of his rational philosophy. Zosima projects the future for one such as the doctor, saying that he "will not attain to anything in the achievement of real love; it will all get no further than dreams" and that his "whole life
will slip away like a phantom" (49). Ivan's life parallels this course just described; his love for man is seen only in his poetry and his consciousness is invaded by a "phantom." Implied is the difficulty that he has in developing relationships, Ivan says, "I believe it's always best to get to know people just before leaving them" (210). Ivan, the human being, withdraws into himself because he is unable to love.

Ivan's descent into insanity emphasizes the precarious nature of his faith in reason. Rebelling against God in order to assert his freedom, Ivan falls into self-bondage and is no longer in control of his actions. Unable to accept his responsibility for suffering, even though he is guilty of his father's murder, Ivan experiences a split personality. In his conversation with Smerdyakov in "For a While a Very Obscure One," Ivan finds that he feels one thing and does another, feeling angry and indignant with Smerdyakov, yet speaking "softly and meekly" (258). "To his astonishment," Ivan laughs at the end of the conversation with Smerdyakov, moving "in a nervous frenzy" (254). He cannot even deny the reality of his demon even though he wishes to do so. Terras indicates that Ivan suffers the "practical consequences" of a "world based on human reason," and the novel shows "a destruction of Ivan the human being" as well as "a refutation of his philosophy" (48-49). Panichas also sees Ivan's suffering, not as symbolic of his inherent evilness, but as the "result of a corruptive, pervasive process of wrongdoing and the tyranny of a
"Euclidean earthly mind" (20). Ivan's attempt to cope with his world by the faith of reason leads to a bondage in which there is no difference between reality and illusion.

All three brothers face the limitations of their faiths through their individual crises. Faith based on miracle breaks down when Alyosha confronts the premature decomposition of his elder Zosima. Faith based on mystery—one that is contrary to the conscience—disintegrates when Dmitri descends into despair at his inability to prove his honor to the investigators. Faith based on authority, that of the tyranny of self-will, crumbles when Ivan realizes his responsibility for his father's murder.
Notes

1Valentina Vetlovskaya posits an interesting claim about Zosima's premature decaying: the odor "signifies that the 'stink of sins,' his own and others, no longer burden the elder" (224, n17).

2Lise also pursues the "ideal of Sodom," telling Alyosha, "I want to do evil" (550). The fact that a child, the fourteen-year-old Lise, consciously pursues evil is a direct counterpoint to Ivan's case for justice for innocent suffering children. Ilyusha, even younger than Lise, also takes responsibility for "killing Zhuchka," believing that his illness is the result of his cruelty (506).

3The Russian mytarstva, translated as "torments of the soul," is a term of orthodox eschatology, referring to the twenty trials administered by evil spirits that a human soul encounters after death on its way to heaven (Terras, Companion 316, n43).

4V. E. Vetlovskaja presents a convincing discussion of Dostoevsky's refutation of Ivan's opinions through argumentum ad hominem and argumentum ad rem.
Ivanov phrases Dostoevsky's logic in a slightly different manner: "Where atheism has been elevated to the practical norm of social existence, Dostoevsky holds that this entails first of all a detoriation of the moral sense, and subsequently its complete extinction. For morality not founded on religion is not capable . . . of maintaining even the independence, much less the absoluteness, of its own values" (31).
A REJUVENATION OF FAITH

The individual crises of the brothers reveal their fragmented and narrow conceptions of faith that is unable to withstand the pressures that each brother faces. The crises force each brother in turn to integrate a fuller dimension of faith into their lives. Since each brother incorporates a fuller understanding of faith into his life, the brothers move from being only one aspect of the collective personality into becoming more fully human with each brother realizing a fuller understanding of faith.

Alyosha realizes a more complete understanding of faith through his suffering over the loss of his beloved elder Zosima and the lack of miracles surrounding the elder's death. Grushenka breaks through Alyosha's "vague irresponsiveness of his spiritual condition and the sorrow that overwhelmed him" (327) with her sincere pity. Alyosha explains, "I came here to find a wicked soul--I felt drawn to evil because I was base and evil myself, and I've found a true sister, I have found a treasure--a loving heart" (329). In his acceptance of his own responsibility for evil, Alyosha discovers that God empowers all who believe, even the wicked, to love.
In his vision in "Cana of Galilee," Alyosha realizes the proper relationship between miracles and faith. Alyosha no longer depends on miracles to sustain his faith: "But even this thought of the odor of corruption, which had seemed to him so awful and humiliating a few hours before, no longer made him feel miserable or indignant" (337). While Alyosha listens to Father Paissy read about the marriage in Cana of Galilee from the Bible, he is struck by Christ's love. The miracle of turning water to wine becomes a symbol of Christ's love—"'He who loves men loves their gladness, too'" (338). In his vision, Alyosha sees Christ who "has made Himself like us from love and rejoices with us" (399). This vision of love purifies and restores Alyosha's soul; he feels "that something firm and unshakable as that vault of heaven had entered into his soul" (340-41). As Vetlovskaya comments, Alyosha sees a link of love between everyone in the dream: a "loving union with people . . . in his soul eliminates the contradiction between love of god and love of people" (225). Instead of having faith in Zosima's miracles, Alyosha's faith becomes grounded in surety of Christ's love.

Alyosha's growing understanding of faith continues when he incorporates Dmitri's passion of the heart into his faith. Alyosha is aware of "the wholeness of things" while he begins praying before the coffin (337). The previously unintelligible words of his elder Zosima—"Water the earth with the tears of your joy and love those tears" (340)—make
sense to Alyosha. As Wasiorek explains, "The Elder, who has been humbled, takes the hand of Alyosha, who has rebelled against the humbling, and together they are wedded in Christ's joy, the joy of forgiveness by the acceptance of forgiveness" (179). Alyosha's response to the love and forgiveness of Christ is tears of love and joy, an ecstasy of which "he was not ashamed" (340). Alyosha's tears are a part of the starets (elder) tradition, in which the mind was consciously subordinated to the passions of the heart: this tradition "primarily emphasized the heart and the efficacy of sentiment" and valued "spontaneous weeping . . . as a spiritual gift, a mark of divine grace; the gift of tears became the key to all ascetic activity" (276). Alyosha's expression of spiritual passion, though, does not lead to ascetism and isolation; Alyosha couples this spiritual passion with Dmitri's action, although in contrast to Dmitri Alyosha does control his action. The narrator describes the active nature of Alyosha's transformation: "he had fallen on the earth a weak youth, but he rose up a resolute champion" (341). Through the realization that "all are responsible for all," Alyosha's faith moves from a holy reverence and awe for Father Zosima based on miracles to a joyous assurance of Christ's love that he extends to all.

The symbols of candles and light accompany Alyosha's spiritual renewal. Light, sun and slanting rays are used in a religious context throughout the novel. The candles that Rakitin calls for when he brings Alyosha to visit Grushenka
signify spiritual renewal. Matlaw interprets the candles in this as "a symbolic counterpart to the spiritual illumination that Grushenka undergoes" (quoted in The Brothers Karamazov, "Essays in Criticism" 867). Likewise "a light dawns in his [Alyosha’s] face" when he realizes that Grushenka reaches out to his despair over Zosima’s death. A metaphor of light refers to Alyosha's spiritual transformation: "something glowed in Alyosha’s heart" (340).

Alyosha has to struggle with the intellectual doubts of Ivan before he can realize this truly vital faith. The narrator describes his vision as involving his intellect: "it was as though some idea had seized the sovereignty of his mind" (341). The word "idea" may echo the "Word" that Ivan refers to in "Rebellion": "I believe in the Word to Which the universe is striving, and Which Itself was 'with God,' and Which Itself is God" (216). Terras notes that the "Word," the Russian word Slovo, translates from the Greek word used in John 1:1 which means "'word' as well as ‘rational order,’ 'reason,'" (Companion 219, n110). In John 1:1 the Word also refers to Christ himself. Whether or not "idea" refers to the "Word," Alyosha does experience an "idea" that drives away the previous doubts that Ivan had raised. L. A. Zander comments that "If it [Alyosha’s transformation] were simply a matter of feelings or sensation, the power that took possession of . . . Alyosha could not have had this active, compelling character or have been described as eternal and unshakable" (17). Alyosha’s
faith is grounded not only in experience but also in his intellect.

As Alyosha comes to integrate spirituality with the active passion of Dmitri and reason of Ivan, the result is a life of integrity and love. Symbolically, he departs the monastery within three days "to sojourn in the world," a parallel with the three days before Christ's resurrection. In a sense, Alyosha lives out his own spiritual resurrection, extending his love to many, as a mediator in the love triangle of Dmitri, Katya, and Grushenka and also in the reconciliation of Ilyusha, Kolya and the schoolboys. Alyosha's relationship with Kolya is a good example of Alyosha's fuller understanding of faith. He helps Kolya work through his intellectual doubts, when he calmly counters Kolya's attacks on God. Kolya asserts that man can love without believing in God, citing Voltaire as an example. Alyosha replies, "Voltaire believed in God, though not very much, I think, and I don't think he loved mankind very much either" (523). Alyosha is willing to discuss faith with Kolya intellectually. In addition, Alyosha encourages Kolya's passion and conscience, telling Kolya: "here you are not ashamed to confess to something bad and even ridiculous" (527). Furthermore, Kolya admonishes himself for his proud behavior toward Ilyusha, "crying and no longer ashamed of it" (531). And Alyosha also encourages Kolya spiritually, answering Kolya's question about eternal life with a warm affirmation. The evidence for Alyosha's enduring faith and
deep humanity lies in the many lives that he touches with his healing love.

Just as Alyosha’s suffering leads him to God, Dmitri’s wild pursuit of sensual passion also leads him to God through the suffering that such a life produces. Dmitri’s spiritual renewal is foreshadowed by the parallels of his life to Zosima. Both were in the military, led a wild life, and fought a duel (6, 277). Koprinse further notes that both were officers, "both served in the Caucasus" and both are wrongly judged, Dmitri for his father’s murder and Zosima for his premature decaying (349). In light of these parallels, Goldstein perceives Zosima’s bow to Dmitri as acknowledging a "man whose course of suffering was to parallel his own" (330). Furthermore, Zosima urges Alyosha "to play the same role in Dmitrij’s life that Markel had played in his" (Goldstein 330). Unfortunately, Alyosha abandons his responsibility to his brother Dmitri.

Dmitri’s spiritual rejuvenation begins when he controls his passion in not killing his father. Dmitri attributes his control to God (370). He later learns that he did not kill Grigory and crosses himself "three times," declaring that he has a "new life, new heart" (433) and that he feels "like a new man" (434). In the second phrase, Terras notes that the translation is "correct insofar as the meaning of Dmitry’s words is concerned, but it fails to bring out the implied Christian symbolism"; the literal translation of "I feel like a new man" is "I am risen from the dead" (Com-
panion 318, n57). After plumbing the depths of despair and humiliation during the interrogations, Dmitri also has a vision as Alyosha does. In his dream he recognizes that he is responsible for suffering while he wonders why the babe is cold and hungry; the theme "All are responsible for all" is the primary message of his vision and it stirs love in Dmitri, just as it did in Alyosha. The symbols of spiritual illumination in his dream are light and snow: "And his [Dmitri's] whole heart glowed, and he struggled towards the light, and he longed . . . to go on and on, towards the new, beckoning light" (479). The white snow in his dream symbolizes his spiritual purification, in contrast to his dirty underclothes that signified his moral guilt. Dmitri also tells the prosecutors of his good dream "with a new light, as of joy, in his face" (480). Dmitri's response to the suffering of the babe is to "do something for them all," to alleviate suffering through his acts of love.

Facing the depths of evil in himself, Dmitri transforms his wild recklessness into a passionate pursuit of faith. He begins to follow his conscience. Hating his father's unbelief, he tells the investigators that "there was something in him [Fyodor] ignoble, impudent, trampling on everything sacred, something sneering and irreverent" (436). Dmitri also tells the prosecutors that "one must die honest" (466). Dmitri's love for Grushenka is no longer only sensual: "In the past it was only those infernal curves of hers that tortured me, but now I've taken all her soul into
my soul" (563). Confiding to Alyosha before the trial, he says, "I've found in myself a new man. . . . [this new man] would never have come to the surface, if it had not been for this blow from heaven. . . . One cannot exist in prison without God" (560). Dmitri now controls his passions through his conscience and his belief in God.

Dmitri even begins to question the existence of God on a philosophical level in debates with Rakitin. Despite Rakitin's intellectual arguments, Dmitri finds the concept of goodness and love irreconcilable with a world that denies the existence of God. Dmitri explains to Alyosha the benefits of understanding his faith intellectually: "it was perhaps just because ideas I did not understand were surging up in me, that I used to drink and fight and rage. It was to stifle them in myself, to still them, to smother them" (561). Dmitri even grapples with the concept of man-god versus God-man: "Perhaps it's you [Alyosha] that is superior and not Ivan. You see, it's a question of conscience, question of the higher conscience" (563). "Superior," in the original, is vysshei chelovek, "superior man" while "higher conscience" translates "superior conscience," vysshei sovesti" (Terras, Companion 372, n145). Thus, Dmitri affirms the man controlled by God (Alyosha) rather than the man who makes himself into a god (Ivan). Dmitri's experiences lead him to a faith that is willing to wrestle with intellectual questions about God, without reason's becoming the final authority in spiritual matters.
Dmitri struggles with his conscience, again, when he considers whether to accept his penal sentence in Siberia or to escape. He feels the responsibility to live out a "tragic hymn to God, with Whom is joy" (560), but also is worried that he will not be able to marry Grushenka as a convict, that he would commit suicide without her (564). Katerina cuts to the core of the issue, asking Alyosha if he considers Dmitri’s planned escape "unchristian" (720). Alyosha explains to Dmitri that

you are not ready, and such a cross is not for you. . . . If you have murdered our father, it would grieve me that you should reject your cross. But you are innocent, and such a cross is too much for you. . . . Your refusal of that great cross will only serve to make you feel all your life an even greater duty, that constant feeling will do more to make you a new man, perhaps, than if you went there. (723)

Alyosha sees that Dmitri’s newfound faith is not strong enough to bear punishment as an innocent man. Even though Dmitri plans to escape, he still accepts his guilt. "But I shall condemn myself, and I will pray for my sin forever" (724). This thirst for a "reformed and virtuous life" gives Dmitri the strength to face his guilt, to leave his dissipated life and to move on to a productive life with Grushenka, working the land in America.

Ivan, who is tormented by his conscience in much the same way as Dmitri is, decides not to live by his theory "all things are lawful" after his third meeting with Smerdyakov. Along with his resolution to take respon-
sibility for his guilt and to testify at Dmitri's trial come "something like joy" and "unbounded resolution" (600). As in Dmitri's dream, the snow in this scene symbolizes spiritual renewal. Ivan shows the firmness of his decision to abandon his theory that all is lawful when he helps the peasant that he had knocked unconscious earlier. His resolution to accept his responsibility changes his behavior toward others.

Ivan's change of behavior does not last, however, since he decides to put off going to the prosecutor until the next day. Ivan's response to his decision reveals that he may have been doubting his resolution: "'Everything together tomorrow!' he whispered to himself, and, strange to say, almost all his gladness and self-satisfaction passed in one instant" (601). Immediately upon arriving home, Ivan senses the presence of the devil. Intuiting that Ivan's resolution is vulnerable, the devil begins to attack it and taunts him with phrases such as "that great resolution of yours . . . " (604). Ivan "savagely" reprimands the devil, but then realizes that "Scolding you, I scold myself. . . . You just say what I am thinking" (605). Ivan's response reveals the hesitations he has about his resolution to "defend" his brother and "sacrifice" himself. The devil also tempts Ivan's pride, trying to get him to confess so that he will be praised for being a "generous soul" who saved his brother (620). At the end of the conversation with the devil, Ivan again lapses into bondage to his intellect, graphically
described as "chains" that "seemed to fetter his arms and legs" (617). Significantly, the candles have burned out; Ivan’s spiritual illumination also has burned out.

With Alyosha’s presence after his nightmare, Ivan again takes steps toward spiritual renewal. He says that he "likes" Lise and that he "loves" Alyosha’s face, the first time Ivan has admitted any affection for anyone (619). Ivan’s pride, however, is strong; he struggles between following his conscience and God or rebelling. Alyosha perceives that Ivan is struggling with "the anguish of a proud determination ... God, in Whom he disbelieved, and His truth were gaining mastery over his heart, which still refused to submit" (622). Alyosha is sure that Ivan will testify and prays that "he will rise up in the light of truth" (622). Even at the trial, Ivan vacillates between knowing "something interesting" and knowing "nothing particular" (650). When he is asked to testify "according to his conscience," Ivan laughs (620). Ivan asks to leave since he has "nothing particular to tell the court" (651). After "four steps" toward the door, however, Ivan produces the money and testifies (620). He tries to save Dmitri even though his evidence at the trial is disregarded as insane ravings. With the words "Give me a drink for Christ’s sake," Ivan invokes Christ, instead of the devil, for the first time (652). Terras notes that "the commentators of PSS^3 suggest that ‘water’ is here a symbol of the ‘living water’ of faith" (Companion 410, n102). Ivan’s calling upon
Christ along with water, the Christian symbol for faith, suggests that Ivan does finally make a decision for God, although he does not recover from his sickness by the end of the novel. Ivan, with his attempt to communicate the truth at the trial, faces reality instead of withdrawing into his own world. In doing so, Ivan leaves his aloof, intellectual world where crime is permissible and moves toward a God-centered world where there is right and wrong.

The crises that all three brothers face force them to admit their spiritual need for miracle (Christ-like love), the need of the heart for mystery (immortality) and the intellectual need for authority (the absolute authority of God). Since the brothers live out the Inquisitor's false view of miracle (magic), mystery (mystification) and authority (tyranny), each brother encounters the limitations of the Inquisitor's views that result in a crisis that threatens to destroy faith. Thus, the brothers move from a separate expression of a single need as they represent a collective personality to an individual expression of all three needs. In all three brothers, spiritual renewal begins with an awareness of their need for someone to keep their conscience, ultimately met by the mystery of immortality that gives meaning to morality. When they become aware of their sin, they also realize that they are responsible for creating suffering and chaos; their need for universal unity leads them to submit to God's authority. This submission to God's authority, then, leads to the
miracle of Christ-like love, since the need for someone to worship is met by Christ himself, who in turn enables them to practice Christ-like love. Although all three brothers move toward a whole understanding of faith, Alyosha is the only brother who realizes a complete integration of soul, heart and mind. By combining the strengths of all three brothers—those of soul, heart and mind—Dostoevsky revitalizes the concept of faith. Alexander Gibson believes that Dostoevsky shows the truth of Christianity through "its verification in practice" (200). Consequently, faith is defended and expands in the novel from a variety of partial faces, each isolated and fragmentary, to one that Dostoevsky believes is comprehensive and adequate for all of life.

Thus, through the individual and collective movements of the three brothers, Dostoevsky shows that ultimately "the hero is the spirit of God acting through all the Karamazovs" (Rosen 363). The end of the novel warmly affirms the unity of faith:

'Certainly we shall all rise again, certainly we shall see each other and shall tell each other with joy and gladness all that has happened!' Alyosha answered, half laughing, half ecstatic. (735)

Kolya responds, "And always so, all our lives hand in hand! Hurrah for Karamazov!" (735) "Hurrah for Karamazov" celebrates not only Alyosha's faith, but also his brothers' movement toward faith.
Notes

1 Vetlovskaya also adds that this contradiction is the one overcome by Aleksey the Man of God, a source for the character of Alyosha (225).

2 Alyosha remembers his mother holding him before a holy image with the "slanting rays" (repeated twice) of the sun streaming in an open window (13). Zosima is called "light" (42), Alyosha escapes from darkness to "light" (20), "light" shines from Christ’s eyes (229), Smerdyakov moves from the cellar into "God’s light" (260), Zosima’s room is lit by candles and lamps (263), and the sun refers to Christ (338-339). Other references include pages 269, 270, 271, 301, 356, 438, 479, and 480.

3 PSS is an abbreviation for Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh, a seventeen volume set of the collected works of Dostoevsky.
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