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This paper explores the dialectical concept of love in Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* through Katerina and Grushenka, the heroines, and Dmitri Karamazov. Dostoyevsky's dialectic is most accurately described by the terms Eros and Agape, as defined by Denis de Rougemont in *Love in the Western World.*

Chapter One examines the character of Katerina and establishes that although her love is ostensibly Agape, her most frequent expression of love is Eros. Chapter Two establishes that Grushenka's most frequent expression of love is Agape although ostensibly Eros. Chapter Three demonstrates how each woman personifies a pole of Dmitri Karamazov's inner conflict, and then traces his development with regard to his relationship to each woman.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. KATERINA IVANOVNA: THE TRAGIC FIRE OF EROS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. GRUSHENKA: THE LIGHT OF AGAPE</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. DMITRI KARAMAZOV: THE CONFLICT BETWEEN</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE MADONNA AND SODOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Fyodor Mikhail Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* is, on one level, the final stage of the evolution of the author's concept of personality and experience. Dostoyevsky's exceptional men and women face the question of how to be in a society which offers no standards and no models to emulate. The social and political chaos of nineteenth-century Europe and Russia and the chaos of the disintegrating, fragmented family, morally and ethically destitute, are metaphors of the awesome freedom that the Dostoyevskian character must confront. Alone, amidst incipient nihilism, this individual determines value with each decision he makes. Personality, then, becomes the focus of attention, and the dynamic interaction with others becomes the method of defining the self. The most fundamental type of interaction, given the absence of social order, is love between the sexes. Analysis of the sexual love experience is a means of discovering the inter-relationship between personality and value.

*The Brothers Karamazov* explores the complex psychological, social, and theological implications of love. To an extent, every character is defined by love: it is central to the personalities of the Karamazov brothers and their immediate associates, and it is at the heart of each of the numerous subplots. The concept of love that underlies *The Brothers*
Karamazov is a dynamic concept, a dialectical concept that characterizes the romantic relationships of the novel's heroines, Katerina Ivanovna and Agrefena Svyetlov, "Grushenka." Analysis of Katerina's and Grushenka's relationship with Dmitri Karamazov, and other men as well, reveals that this love dialectic is most accurately described by the terms Eros and Agape, as defined by Denis de Rougemont in *Love in the Western World*.

De Rougemont's *Love in the Western World* is a study of the history of love in the West through myth and literature. According to de Rougemont, the Western concept of romantic love derives from the conflict of two fundamentally antagonistic religious views of life: pagan and Christian. Eros, or passionate love, is pagan in origin and characteristic of an Eastern attitude of mind; Agape is Christian in origin and characteristic of a Western habit of mind (2, p. 72). These antagonistic views of life came into conflict during the twelfth century in Europe when Christianity was imposed upon peoples whose "spirit . . . was still pagan" (2, p. 77). Despite determined persecution, paganism persisted in the rhetoric of courtly love poetry and permanently affected the character of Western romantic love.

Pagan, or Eros-dominated love, assimilates Greek and Celtic mythology and the Persian religion known as Manicheanism. The ancient Greeks deified desire, man's most "fundamental and mysterious emotion"; thus, Eros represents desire "that
never lapses, that nothing can satisfy, that even rejects and
flees the temptation to obtain fulfillment in the world,
because its demand is to embrace no less than the All. It is
infinite transcendence, man's rise into his God" (2, p. 64).
Platonic love was a divinely inspired transport that carried
the lover by degrees of ecstasy to the one source of all that
exists and culminates in the absorption of the self into the
divine (2, p. 63). From Manicheanism and Celtic mythology,
paganism derives its dualistic interpretation of man and
creation, according to de Rougemont. Manicheanism claims that
the "god of Darkness" who holds sway over all temporal creation
and the "god of uncreated and timeless Light" are locked in
struggle, and all creation derives its energy from one of
these sources (2, p. 66). Moreover, Manichean dogma asserts
that the soul, a creation of the god of light, is imprisoned
in the body, a handiwork of the god of darkness, and longs to
escape the body to reunite itself with the divine, hence the
transcendent desire personified by Eros. The desire for
transcendence is complicated by the fact that Eros takes the
guise of woman and symbolizes ambiguously the "light" of
eternal desire and the temporal, sexual attraction of Night.
(In dualist mythology, the god of darkness lured angels to
earth and trapped them in physical bodies by tempting them
with a beautiful woman). This contradiction is apparently
resolved, according to de Rougemont, by conceptualizing Night
as uncreated Day; thus, de Rougemont concludes that the "yearning for light was symbolized by the nocturnal attraction of sex" (2, p. 66). Nevertheless, a paradox remains: woman symbolizes the object of supreme desire, but possession of woman, i.e., submission to sexuality, is antithetical to the yearning for transcendence, and herein is the tragic quality of Eros. Woman must be pursued, but she must not be possessed. Death is the only goal of Eros, for only death releases the soul from the physical world. Eros craves becoming rather than being, feeling rather than acting, and narcissism kindles its fire.

Opposed to paganism is the Christian view of life. Due to the incarnation of Christ, Christianity emphasizes the importance of the present, of temporal life. Thus, Christianity makes symbolic death the first step in the beginning of a new life in the temporal world. Belief in the Incarnation brings death to the old, egocentric, isolated self and rebirth to a new self that actively loves his neighbor despite his shortcomings and in full knowledge of them. This Christian concept of love is called Agape, and it is symbolized by the marriage of Christ and the Church. Agape restores mutuality to human love through marriage and liberates one from egoism and isolation: "Agape brings no fusion or ecstatic dissolving of the self in God" (2, p. 73). Instead, the act of communion demonstrates man's love of God and his neighbor. Agape emphasizes action in the present, outward movement; its essence is humility.
The conflict between paganism and Christianity in the twelfth century occurred partially as a reaction against the Christian doctrine of marriage. The sacrament of marriage meant fidelity and monogamy; however, up to this time, marriage was largely only a practical institution. According to de Rougemont, concubinage was a widely accepted practice. Christianity spread by force, not faith, in Western Europe; thus, forced converts had to live by a code in which they had no faith. Open rebellion meant certain death, but paganism sustained its influence over minds predisposed to it through the sublimation of religious heresy in the cult of passionate love. Courtly love poetry, poetry that glorifies and extols love outside marriage, first appeared during the twelfth century in Southern France concurrently with the great Heresy of the Cathars, a dualistic religion with its roots in the Manichean and Gnostic sects (2, pp. 81-82). This heresy was a great threat to Christianity and was vigorously persecuted. De Rougemont refuses to grant that the timing and location of these two major events could be mere coincidence, but he does not assign to them a one-to-one historical correspondence. Instead, he theorizes that courtly love poetry evidences "a revolution of the Western psyche" (2, p. 129). The "lady" of courtly love poetry symbolizes the reappearance of the pagan, "symbolical East" as the anima or feminine principle in Western man (2, p. 129). Consequently, from the twelfth century to the present, Western romantic love is characterized by the tension between Eros and Agape.
In tracing the history of passionate love in literature from the thirteenth century to the present, de Rougemont observes that through secularization Eros has gradually degenerated, and a "tragic reversal" of the myth has occurred. When love of Lady ceased to symbolize "Supreme Love," it became merely the symbol of impossible love of woman; yet, due to its religious origin, it retained the illusion of "the liberating glory of which suffering remained the sign" (2, p. 179). However, instead of liberating one from the senses, the original intent of Eros, intensification of emotion resulted. In short, emotional intensity was substituted for mystical transcendence as Eros became secularized.

Justification for applying the terms Eros and Agape, as defined by de Rougemont, to The Brothers Karamazov derives from two sources: the influence of Romanticism, particularly German Romanticism, on Dostoyevsky; for Russian literature has no courtly love tradition, as Berdyaev notes (1, p. 112), and Dostoyevsky's profound love of Christ. It is through German Romanticism that the conflict was conveyed to Dostoyevsky. According to de Rougemont, German Romantics "without exception revived the courtly theme of unhappy mutual love" (2, p. 230). Dostoyevsky was heavily influenced by several German Romantics, including E. T. A. Hoffman, but his abiding German influence was Frederich Schiller, whom Dostoyevsky refers to as "our own national poet" (7, p. 220). Dostoyevsky's admiration of
Schiller began with his viewing a production of Die Räuber in Moscow at the age of 10 and climaxed in his famous Pushkin speech in which he names Schiller, Cervantes, and Shakespeare as "geniuses of immense creative magnitude" (3, p. 977). While a misplaced student in the St. Petersburg School of Engineering, Dostoyevsky began his study of Schiller. Dostoyevsky's youthful idealism and his temperament, which fluctuated between feverish ecstasy and severe melancholy, partially contributed to his admiration of Schiller. Reality offered Dostoyevsky little as an adolescent; he felt ill at ease in the company of his peers and preferred to read Shakespeare, Pushkin, Lermontov, and Schiller rather than interact with his classmates. Likewise, as an adolescent, Dostoyevsky had no associations with women other than his mother and sisters and was consequently uncomfortable with young ladies. Even as a young man prior to his imprisonment, his relations with women were either idealized or sordid. Schiller's poetry of the heart touched the soul of the unhappy, socially awkward young Dostoyevsky. While still a student, Dostoyevsky entitled one of his early writing experiments Maria Stuart after the play by Schiller (7, 217). Dostoyevsky was never to outgrow the impact of Schiller during his formative years, and he continually refers to Schiller or his concepts in his major novels.

Several facets of Schiller's work strongly attracted Dostoyevsky. Undoubtedly, Schiller's dualistic heroes and
heroines exerted a strong influence on Dostoyevsky, himself a dualist. According to Ilse Graham, Schiller's dramatic heroes are characterized by division: "either they have flouted conscience and reason in the name of unbridled nature, or they have denied or repressed feeling and instinct in the name of principle and reason . . ." (6, p. 308). As in Dostoyevsky's work, suffering awakens the Schillerean hero to his inner division. Confrontation with the repressed or denied aspect of the dualist's being in another person provides the context for the polemical presentation of ideas that is fundamental to the work of both men. For the Schillerean hero, sacrificial death is the final state of transformation, the ultimate aesthetic experience. Life is an elaborate preparation for death. Schiller's monistic view of the fulfillment of life and his emphasis on death as the hero's ultimate aesthetic experience clearly reveal the pagan quality of his work. Dostoyevsky's tragic, dualistic heroines specifically reflect the influence of Schiller's paganism that is also apparent in his love poetry.

H. B. Garland asserts that Schiller's love poetry is "sensual love poetry in which the author is more interested in his own reactions than in the object of his love" (5, p. 43). In Phantasie an Laura, one of the odes to Laura, a woman presumed to be Schiller's landlady in Stuttgart, the persona declares that infinite, burning desire results from Laura's
kiss. "Deep red flames" burn the persona's cheeks; the 
"body seeks to fuse with body, soul to blaze in a combined 
glow" (5, p. 42). The language of the poem is clearly 
reminiscent of the rhetoric of courtly love poetry. The poet 
emphasizes burning desire and self-annihilation through 
fusion, the impetus of courtly love poetry. Again in 
Dostoyevsky, this egocentric attitude toward love is charac-
teristic of his proud heroines, as well as of some of his heroes. 
For example, Katerina burns most fiercely with love for Dmitri 
with every new obstacle to their union.

Schiller's attitude toward Greek civilization also 
informs Dostoyevsky's attitude toward it. Schiller looked 
nostalgically to the Greeks for a model of the wholly inte-
grated man. Likewise, many of Dostoyevsky's heroes dream the 
"Golden Age dream" of the Greek archipelago where all is 
harmonious and peaceful; but this idyllic, pagan dream is 
forever interrupted by the insidious appearance of a tiny 
spider or fly whose presence jolts the dreamer to the harsh 
realization that this naive innocence is forever lost. 
Dostoyevsky's successful heroes must finally rouse themselves 
from the dream of perfection and actively seek harmony in 
life, not death.

Despite the pagan qualities of Schiller's work, 
Dostoyevsky identified him as a "thoroughly Christian poet" 
(7, p. 216). Probably this identification of Schiller as a
Christian poet can be attributed to Schiller's deep concern for the morality of art. Schiller's early desire to become a minister, which was thwarted by Karl Eugen, the Duke of Wurtemberg, was in part compensated by his discovery that art is essentially moral. Dostoyevsky's identification of Schiller as a Christian poet is perhaps most fully expressed in his assessment of George Sand as a Christian poet, albeit not an orthodox one. In The Diary of A Writer, Dostoyevsky remarks upon the occasion of Sand's death that

... she was, perhaps, the most Christian among all persons of her age--French writers--even though she did not confess Christ (as does a Roman Catholic). She based her socialism, her convictions, her hopes and her ideals upon the moral feeling of man, upon the spiritual thirst of mankind and its longing for perfection and purity, and not upon 'ant-necessity.' All her life she believed absolutely in human personality (to the point of its immortality), elevating and broadening this concept in each one of her works; and thereby she concurred in thought and feeling with one of the basic ideas of Christianity, i.e., the recognition of human personality and its freedom (consequently, also of its responsibility). Hence, the recognition of duty and the austere moral quests, and the complete acknowledgments of man's responsibility (3, pp. 349-50).

Juxtaposed to Dostoyevsky's attraction to Eros is his profound love and admiration of Christ which he developed as a child through reading the scripture, temporarily lost sight of during his Petrachevist period, and rediscovered during his four years' imprisonment in Siberia at Omsk. In a letter dated 27 August 1849 to his brother Mikhail from the fortress of Peter and Paul in St. Petersburg, where Dostoyevsky was
detained while awaiting his mock execution, he requests some reading material, "But best of all would be the Bible (both Testaments)" (4, p. 50). Ernest J. Simmons (8, p. 59) notes that the New Testament was the only book Dostoyevsky was permitted to retain at Omsk. The rediscovery of Christ during this most arduous, severe period of his life precipitated a spiritual regeneration that helped preserve his sanity and comfort his suffering.

Life for Dostoyevsky at Omsk was humiliating and dangerous, physically and morally debilitating. Estranged from the common convicts as a nobleman, Dostoyevsky constantly endured harassment from them as well as from guards. Dostoyevsky's first letter to Mikhail on the eve of his departure from Omsk for Semipalatinsk describes the hostility he daily encountered from the common convicts: "They are rough, angry, embittered men. Their hatred for the nobility is boundless; they regard all of us who belong to it with hostility and enmity. They would have devoured us if only they could" (4, p. 59). Harassment, incredibly horrible living conditions, and the denial of his freedom to write continually threatened Dostoyevsky's tenuous grasp on life, and, in fact, the psychological and physical stress of imprisonment did severely impair his health for the remainder of his life. Within this hell, Christ was Dostoyevsky's one source of hope and strength. The extent of the impact that Christ had on Dostoyevsky is apparent in the
often quoted passage from a letter to Mme. N. D. Fonvisin, wife of a Decembrist, in which he relates his famous "creed":

I believe that there is nothing lovelier, deeper, more sympathetic, more rational, more manly, and more perfect than the Savior; I say to myself with jealous love that not only is there no one else like Him, but that there could be no one. I would even say more: If anyone could prove to me that Christ is outside the truth, and if the truth really did exclude Christ, I should prefer to stay with Christ and not with truth (4, p. 71).

Though skepticism plagued Dostoyevsky throughout his life, the model of Christ remained a constant source of light and hope for him.

Thus, underlying the poles of Eros and Agape which animate the heroines of The Brothers Karamazov is the tension between Dostoyevsky's attraction to Christ as the exemplum of Agape and his attraction to the pagan impetus of Eros.
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CHAPTER I

KATERINA IVANOVNA: THE TRAGIC FIRE OF EROS

Little criticism is devoted to the study of Katerina Ivanovna and Grushenka Svyetlov, and much of that is lacking in some respect. In his Dostoievsky, Nicholas Berdyaev, for example, considers that the female character throughout Dostoevsky is only an extension or reflection of her male counterpart, and, therefore, "woman never appears as an independent being for . . . Dostoevsky was interested in her solely as a milestone on the road of man's destiny" (1, p. 112). Berdyaev further asserts that there is no "great woman among them, not a single female type with any value of her own" (1, p. 113). This extreme view leads to erroneous conclusions about the significance of woman and of love in Dostoevsky's work, and it disregards Dostoevsky's keen insight into the feminine personality. The tendency in more recent criticism is to categorize the women according to various "types," and while this method may be helpful to a point, none of Dostoevsky's women, or men for that matter, actually fits into a single category. This shortcoming is especially evident in Nathan Rosen's "Chaos and Dostoevsky's Women," an article in which Rosen divides Dostoevsky's women into one of three categories: "the possessive mother," "the
eternal victim," and "the virginal aristocrat" (4, p. 274). However, this approach fails to explain the personality and the complex motivation of Dostoyevsky's women because it relies only on their superficial attributes. The broader categories of F. F. Seeley's divided personalities and whole personalities (5, p. 301) are more satisfactory, but again the use of categories suggests a rigidity that is not characteristic of Dostoyevsky's men or women. A notable exception, with regard to Katerina, is Edward Wasiolek's work. In his article, "Aut Caesar, Aut Nihil: A Study of Dostoyevsky's Moral Dialectic," Wasiolek focuses on the motivation of the relationship between Dmitri and Katerina (7). Wasiolek's conclusion that the choice to serve God or self determines ultimately the morality of one's actions is a more accurate way of viewing the characters and their actions.

Perhaps it is not surprising that little attention is given to Katerina and Grushenka in light of the fact that The Brothers Karamazov is brimming with many complex personalities as well as complex ideas. However, both of these women are well-drawn figures, excellent subjects of study to get to the heart of Dostoyevsky's concept of personality and experience, for love is their fundamental motivation, and love is at the center of Dostoyevsky's view of the world. Analysis of Katerina and Grushenka reveals that the Eros-Agape conflict motivates both women, but that Katerina's most frequent expression of love is Eros, while Grushenka's most frequent expression is Agape.
Katerina Ivanovna's ethereal appearance reflects dramatically her tragic, proud, Eros-dominated character. With her pale, elongated face, sharply accented by the glowing black of her eyes, hair, and dress, she is the sublime image of tragic beauty. She is a well-educated aristocrat, an extraordinarily tall, statuesque young woman whose carriage imparts nobility, pride, and determination; not a trace of frivolity is to be seen in her demeanor. Though a virgin, she does not convey innocence, and despite her youth and beauty, she gives the impression of being asexual. Her fiery eyes and the lines of her mouth betray the intense suffering that is the brand of Eros. Hysteria and nervous attacks are symptoms of the self-destructive potential of her narcissistic desire for self-exaltation through suffering. Indeed, Katerina's appearance denotes an all-consuming passion for the ultimate transcendence of death.

As a result of the influence of Eros, which manifests itself as pride and egoism, Katerina solemnly envisions herself as a sacrificial virgin impelled to martyrdom. Dmitri recalls that his first impression of her is not that of an "'innocent boarding-school girl but a person of character, proud, and high principled'" (3, p. 109). That she is sincere is unquestionable, but the outcome of her quest for martyrdom is subverted by narcissism and masochistic pride. Self-exaltation motivates her to sacrifice; consequently, her sacrifice
becomes a mode of damnation, not of salvation (7, p. 91). Katerina's plight illustrates the "tragic reversal" of the divinizing passion of Eros of which de Rougemont speaks. She is a victim of the secularization of the desire for mystical transcendence. Lacking a religious context, but possessed by a desire for sacrifice, Katerina seeks those experiences which provoke intense emotion. Others are merely catalysts for her inner life. Because she refuses to admit that the impetus of her sacrifice is egoistic, she lives a dishonest life, and her deception manifests itself in her theatricality, particularly apparent in the many ostensibly benevolent acts that she performs.

Mme. Holakov and her adolescent daughter Lise, Katerina's close, female companions, mirror the destructive potential of Katerina's egoism. Lise Holakov's pathological personality and her psychosomatic paralysis demonstrate the debilitating effect of the monstrous sense of pride that she shares with Katerina. Like Katerina, Lise is a hysteric who must suffer, so she continually rejects mutual love and respect and pursues that which will degrade her. In this respect, Lise's relationships to Alyosha and Ivan parallel Katerina's relationships to Ivan and Dmitri. Unable to reciprocate Alyosha's unselfish love, Lise teases him and throws herself wantonly at Ivan to punish herself. Mme. Holakov, likewise, reflects an important aspect of Katerina's egocentric personality. Mme. Holakov entertains
dreams of giving up all her worldly possession and ministering to humanity, but her ministry is destined to remain a dream because she fears that her efforts will not be rewarded with public praise and recognition. In dreams she loves the abstraction called humanity, but in reality she is repulsed by the actual suffering of individuals. Father Zossima admonishes her that:

"... love in action is a harsh and dreadful thing compared to love in dreams. Love in dreams is greedy for immediate action, rapidly performed and in the sight of all [italics mine]. Men will even give their lives if only the ordeal does not last long but is soon over, with all looking on and applauding as though on stage" (3, p. 62).

Mme. Holakov's dilemma is Katerina's dilemma: both desire sacrifice so long as it does not go unnoticed and results in their divinization. "Active love," genuinely unselfish love, is impossible for both because their motivation is self-serving. At the root of their dilemma is a lack of faith in God and immortality, which, according to Dostoyevsky, precludes genuine love of one's fellow man. In this respect, Katerina and Mme. Holakov resemble Ivan's Grand Inquisitor.

Ivan's Grand Inquisitor epitomizes the man-god whose claim to love humanity and to desire to end its suffering masks disbelief in God and contempt for the individual. The Grand Inquisitor enslaves the masses of humanity with the bread of worldly comfort and thereby deprives them of the freedom to seek God through meaningful suffering. The Grand Inquisitor
states that he, that is, the Roman Catholic Church, succumbed to the temptation of the "'wise and dread spirit, the spirit of self-destruction and non-existence'" (3, p. 232), to enslave mankind by "'miracle, mystery, and authority'" (3, p. 235) to save them from themselves. The Grand Inquisitor's dogma is predicated upon exploitation of man's weakness and dependency. Lacking belief in God, the Grand Inquisitor and Katerina would usurp the role of the heavenly father and keep mankind subordinated as children of tyrannical parents (6, p. 133). Like the Grand Inquisitor's bread giving, Katerina's benevolence elevates her in her own mind to apotheosis and keeps those around her subordinated to her. Examination of Katerina's relationship to her father, Dmitri Karamazov, Ivan Karamazov, and Grushenka will illustrate the pervasive, destructive influence of Eros on her and those she touches.

Katerina's first attempt at self-sacrifice occurs when her father, the lieutenant-colonel, is rightfully accused of misuse of government funds. Unable to produce the money, which he lost through gambling, the colonel attempts suicide rather than admit his guilt and face humiliation, but his attempt is foiled by his elder daughter. In the face of inevitable disaster, Katerina assumes the role of mother to her weakened father and accepts a clandestine offer of 4,500 roubles from Dmitri Karamazov, a brash young lieutenant in her father's regiment. In view of her two prior hostile
encounters with Dmitri and his reputation as a reckless cad, why does she accept his offer?

In "Chaos and Dostoyevsky's Women," Nathan Rosen describes Katerina as a "virginal aristocrat" who is "uncompromising in the nobility she demands of her hero, and [whose] pride [in] self-sacrifice is uppermost in her mind. She conceives of life as nobility, duty, obligation..." (5, p. 274). Undeniably, Katerina's father's plight appeals to her sensitive romantic nature, and the ideal of sacrifice motivates her, but is nobility her foremost demand of her hero? Katerina's father has behaved irresponsibly and like a coward by attempting to commit suicide rather than face the consequences of his actions. Katerina's willingness to sacrifice herself demonstrates compassion, but it also foreshadows her perverse aspirations to martyrdom. An inordinate sense of pride causes Katerina to seek primarily weakness in her heroes so that by contrast her nobility will be heightened. A selfless sacrifice for a noble cause focuses attention primarily on the cause and only secondarily, if at all, on the martyr; but a sacrifice for an apparently unworthy cause focuses attention on the martyr. Rosen's assessment of Katerina is accurate so far as it goes, but it is an inadequate explanation of Katerina's demand of her heroes. Nobility attracts her, but she exploits weakness. Katerina does not fully comprehend the extent of her desire for power through sacrifice
until the unexpected outcome of the meeting with Dmitri and her father's death, which whet her appetite and foreshadow the incestuous quality of her relationship with Dmitri, whom she attempts to reduce to her hero-child.

The incestuous impetus of the relationship between Dmitri and Katerina is reinforced by similarities between Katerina and Dmitri's mother (6) and by similarities between Katerina's father and Dmitri. Both Adelaide, Dmitri's mother, and Katerina are beautiful, fiery tempered, idealistic aristocrats who need to dominate their men. Likewise, Katerina's father and Dmitri share significant similarities: both are proud military men who exaggerate their importance and are fond of gambling, entertaining, and being the center of attention. In addition, both are basically good at heart and easily humbled and manipulated by Katerina. However, the incestuous nature of Dmitri's and Katerina's relationship is significant figuratively rather than literally. Incest is the primary cultural taboo and represents inverted sexual expression and arrested emotional development at the infantile stage. Metaphorically, Dostoyevsky equates incest with the temptation to give up one's freedom to satisfy one's physical needs and thereby suggests that this temptation is a primary taboo in his world. Dmitri's triumph over his inclination to violate literally foreshadows his eventual acceptance of freedom; however, the seductive power of the taboo confronts Dmitri when Katerina comes to his lodging for the money.
Katerina thoroughly expects and desires to be raped when she appears at Dmitri's apartment for the 4,500 roubles. Being raped would give her the advantage in her relationship with her father and Dmitri, as Dmitri intuits while he observes her. Furthermore, rape is the only kind of interaction that Katerina understands--either one overpowers or is overpowered. Going to Dmitri, then, does not actually comprise a genuine sacrifice from Katerina. She anticipates that she will yield her flesh and use her submission to manipulate her father. But in the actual moment of confrontation with Dmitri, Katerina is helpless, afraid, and nervous. Her adult charade falters, and Dmitri perceives her vulnerability. Recognition of her vulnerability is an insult to Katerina, for pride will not allow her to acknowledge that she can be humbled. Had Dmitri raped her, she could leave with her proud armor intact and laugh in Dmitri's face if he should propose to her. Dmitri intuitively grasps Katerina's ironic nature, and her vulnerability simultaneously whets his sensual appetite and humbles him. Finally, after a great inner struggle, Dmitri overcomes his desire to rape Katerina and gives her the money with a long bow. In light of Dmitri's insight into Katerina, his bow has two-fold significance: on one level his action demonstrates great inner strength, and on another, it is a cruel insult. Katerina is visibly shaken by Dmitri's action. She reciprocates his gesture with a bow which expresses her gratitude for the money
and is her way of saying touche'. Katerina interprets Dmitri's conduct only on the level of insult and makes avenging that insult her reason to live.

For six weeks after her encounter with Dmitri, Katerina lives in seclusion and has no contact with Dmitri, who assumes the affair is finished. Katerina isolates herself from him because she is indebted to him, and to pursue the relationship would place her in a submissive role. Dmitri does not attempt to force himself on her despite the fact that he has just given her his last 5,000 roubles. From Dmitri's conversation with Alyosha in the garden, it seems that this fact made no impact on him. However, the situation alters as soon as Katerina inherits a fortune, shortly after her arrival in Moscow.

Katerina's sudden inheritance allows her to repay her debt to Dmitri and once again assume the dominant role, exemplified by the tone of her marriage proposal. The transfer of the money signals Dmitri's subordination to Katerina, for money is the primary means of oppression in Dostoyevsky's fiction. Manipulation of another by means of money is a form of rape because it is a violation of one's freedom. Her marriage proposal to Dmitri confirms this:

"I love you madly, . . . even if you don't love me, never mind. Be my husband. Don't be afraid. I won't hinder you in any way. I will be your chattel. I will be the carpet under your feet. I want to love you forever. I want to save you from yourself" (3, p. 114).
The letter bristles with irony. It is no marriage proposal; it is a command to enter into slavery. Obviously, Dmitri will be the "chattel" and the "carpet." Katerina's desire to save Dmitri from himself echoes the Grand Inquisitor's attitude toward mankind. Katerina rationalizes that she loves Dmitri out of gratitude for the kindness he showed her, but covertly she desires to revenge herself on him by taking advantage of his intemperance. Pride prevents Katerina from yielding in sex, so natural motherhood is impossible for her; consequently, she must reduce her hero to a child (6, p. 134). Like a possessive mother with a prodigal son, she will indulge his excesses and bind him to her through guilt. Her seeming generosity will torment Dmitri so that his only release will be to commit some vile act against her for which he must be forgiven. As his guilt increases, his acts will become more vile, and the baser he becomes the more magnanimous she will appear. Katerina's masochistic pride transforms forgiveness and sacrifice into weapons of revenge and damnation. Dmitri's acceptance of the marriage proposal reveals that he is highly susceptible to Katerina because he considers himself unworthy of her.

The physical, social, moral, and financial distance that Katerina promotes between herself and Dmitri indicates the kinds of pleasure she derives when the object of her desire is unattainable. In de Rougemont's analysis of the Tristan
myth, he observes that "what they need is not one another's presence, but one another's absence . . ."; for "what they love is love and being in love" (2, p. 43). The many self-imposed physical obstructions which occur in the Romance of Tristan and Iseult have their counterpart in the psychological barriers between Dmitri and Katerina. The incest taboo, the encouragement of their rivals, Ivan and Grushenka, Dmitri's hollow promise to reform, and Katerina's encouragement of his insults parallel the following elements in Tristan and Iseult: 1) Tristan's giving up Iseult to King Mark after drinking the love potion, 2) Iseult's return to King Mark after three years in the forest with Tristan, 3) and Tristan's marriage to Iseult of the White Hands, all actions which intensify their passion at the expense of love. The exchange between Dmitri and Katerina in their final visit underscores the fact that suffering for its own sake is the basis of their relationship. She refers to Dmitri as a "'sore place in her heart'" (3, p. 691), and menacingly exclaims that the "'past is painfully dear'" (3, pp. 691-692) despite their new loves. She commands Dmitri to love her forever since she will love him forever. Like Iseult, all she needs is the passionate dream; thus, her parting is dictated by the passion that inflames her. Only by not possessing Dmitri can she vow to love him forever. Dostoyevsky entitles this farewell meeting "For a Moment the Lie becomes Truth." Ironically, their love is most intense at this moment.
Money is the primary means by which Katerina perpetuates her neurotic relationship with Dmitri. She first exercises her power over him with 3,000 roubles that she entrusts to him to mail to her half sister in Moscow, though she could easily send the money herself, because she knows that he will spend it. Aware that the money symbolizes their neurotic attachment, Dmitri accepts it and spends half of it on a wild spree with Grushenka in Mokroe. The other half, around his neck like an umbilical cord, represents complete dishonor or the possibility to redeem his honor. Later, Dmitri associates taking Katerina's money with Perhotin's theft of twenty cents from his mother, which he stole as a child and returned three days later. Dmitri's belief that he can only repay his debt to Katerina with money from his mother's estate reinforces his incestuous, neurotic tie to Katerina (6, p. 134). Katerina's use of money to enslave Dmitri is pervasive: she gives money to the Snegiryov family to compensate for Dmitri's abuse of the father of this destitute family, she pays for Dmitri's expensive lawyer, and she handles the money for Dmitri's and Grushenka's proposed escape to America. Katerina's charitable behavior toward the Snegiryov family is purely selfish, for she neither visits the poor family nor attends Illusha's funeral. Her bread giving is in sharp contrast to the emotional support that Alyosha gives the family.
The relationship between Dmitri and Katerina begins to deteriorate when Dmitri recognizes the destructive, narcissistic quality of their love. In his confession to Alyosha in the garden, Dmitri remarks of Katerina that "'She loves her own virtue, not me'"; (3, p. 114) and he requests that Alyosha convey the news of the broken engagement to Katerina. Dmitri insists that Alyosha repeat his exact words, which provoke Katerina's extremely violent reaction. To explain the violent effect of this message, Edward Wasiolek's translation (8) is more helpful than Garnett's.* Immediately following Alyosha's disclosure of Dmitri's message, Katerina instructs Alyosha to deliver two hundred roubles to the Snegiryov family, a reward for Dmitri's most recent insult. She follows this move with another act that illustrates her possessive mother role and her determination to force her sacrifice on Dmitri.

As Katerina's influence over Dmitri wanes, she makes a mother's appeal to Grushenka to help her to regain control of him. Thinking that Grushenka is a stupid, easily deceived girl, Katerina arranges a meeting with her and tries to buy her off with chocolates and flattery. Assuming the role of a gracious queen, Katerina feigns cordiality and even slavish

* In his Dostoevsky, Edward Wasiolek states that the phrase "to bow out" is the closest equivalent to the Russian verb klanyat'sya, which means "'good-bye'" by bowing. This translation recalls the humiliation Katerina felt with Dmitri's first bow, whereas Garnett's "he sends you his compliments" fails to convey the double entente of the message (p. 158).
love for Grushenka and parallels her unhappy love affair with the Pole to her own affair with Dmitri. Katerina's obsequious behavior does not deceive Grushenka. The she-devil responds with a mawkishly sweet parody of Katerina's performance. Toying with Katerina as a cat toys with its prey, Grushenka plays Katerina for a fool and exposes her charade. When Katerina realizes that she has been made the fool, her gracious façade crumbles. Hysteria and rage overwhelm her, and she ends the meeting by shouting derogatory names at Grushenka and attempting to beat her, but Grushenka departs triumphant. The scene is truly one of the best in the novel.

Katerina's unhealthy effect extends to her relationship with Ivan, Dmitri's younger half brother. Initially, Ivan falls deeply in love with Katerina when he visits her in Moscow on Dmitri's behalf. This curious method of courtship suggests that early in their engagement, Dmitri sought to free himself of Katerina. Pretending to be unaware of Ivan's love, Katerina treats him as her confidant and torments him by making a grand production of forgiving Dmitri in his presence. She fears Ivan's love because, unlike Dmitri, Ivan cannot be dominated; for he shares Katerina's uncompromising sense of pride. The brutal exchange between the two in "A Laceration in the Drawing Room" defines the "self-lacerating" (3, p. 175) love that Katerina has for Ivan and Dmitri.

In this exchange, Katerina vows to watch over Dmitri for her entire life with a vengeance usually reserved for one's
bitterest enemy. Significantly, too, this vow comes on the heels of her confrontation with Grushenka, which has merely sparked her passion to burn more intensely. She exclaims ironically:

"... even if he marries that creature... whom I can never, never forgive, even then I will not abandon him... but I will watch over him all my life... When he becomes unhappy with that woman... let him come to me and he will find a friend, a sister... but he will learn at least that that sister is really a sister, one who loves and has sacrificed her life for him. I will gain my point... I will be a god to whom he can pray" (3, p. 177).

Clearly, a desire for revenge and suffering motivates Katerina's vow to maintain her vigil over Dmitri. Ironically, she refers to herself as a sister to Dmitri, which in reality indicates a drive to absorb his identity into her own rather than to be a help to him in adversity. Ivan sarcastically retorts:

"In anyone else this moment would be only due to yesterday's impressions and would be only a moment. But with Katerina that moment will last all her life. What for anyone else would be only a promise is for her an everlasting, burdensome, grim perhaps, but unflagging duty. And she will be sustained by the feeling of this duty being fulfilled. Your life, Katerina, will be spent in painful brooding over your own feelings, your own heroism, and your own suffering" (3, p. 178).

And later he adds:

"She revenged herself with me and on me all the insults which she has been continually receiving from Dmitri ever since their first meeting. For that first meeting has rankled in her heart as an insult--that's what her heart is like!... But believe me, Katerina, you really love him--that's your 'laceration.'... You love him for insulting you. If he reformed, you'd give him up at once and stop
loving him. But you need him so as to contemplate continually your heroic fidelity and reproach him for his infidelity. And it all comes from your pride. Oh, there's a great deal of humiliation and self-abasement about it, but it all comes from pride . . ."(3, p. 180).

These painfully perceptive remarks underline brilliantly the narcissistic drive for self-exaltation that motivates Katerina. Following these observations, Ivan announces his imminent departure for Moscow. Faced with his sudden assertiveness and departure, Katerina seeks comfort in theatrics. Her mood changes swiftly from despair to pleasure, and she claims cruelly that this is because Ivan will be able to explain her plight with Dmitri to her aunt and half sister upon his return to Moscow. Unable to face the truth about herself, Katerina reverts to acting to inflict the last wound of this verbal duel. However, her repressed guilt overcomes her after Ivan's departure, and she becomes hysterically ill. Not until Dmitri's trial does she acknowledge her true feelings for Ivan and Dmitri.

What suddenly prompts Katerina's hysterical outburst during Ivan's testimony at Dmitri's murder trial? When Ivan takes the witness stand and recounts Smerdyakov's confession of the murder of Fyodor and his own tacit complicity and guilt, Katerina is overwhelmed by the selflessness of his act and his suffering. According to the narrator, for the first time in her life, she sacrifices herself for another person; however, it is significant that Katerina's acknowledgment of her love
for Ivan occurs when he is near death and most dependent on her. Although she does experience a moment of self-revelation, it is incomplete, for it does not penetrate her defenses and expose the core of her being, and, therefore, it is not regenerative.

Katerina's outburst in the courtroom follows her first testimony in which she played the role of the faithful, though scorned, lover, who sacrificed her honor and reputation to save the brute who deceived and insulted her. Her testimony placed Dmitri temporarily in a sympathetic light because she testified as though she had of her own impulse run to Dmitri for the money to save her father. Her attempt to save Dmitri from the punishment of the law is a covert attempt to save him for her own punishment and is met with Dmitri's tearful cry, "'Why have you ruined me?'" (3, p. 617). However, when she is confronted with Ivan's suffering, she is desperate to save him, so she sacrifices her selfish desire to "save" Dmitri. She produces the letter that Dmitri wrote her in a drunken rage in which he outlined a plan to murder his father, the evidence that ultimately condemns him to Siberia. In her vindictive outburst, Katerina admits that her earlier testimony was lies, but she claims that she lied to save him because he hated her! She exclaims ironically that "'... he only wanted to marry me because I inherited a fortune, ... He was convinced that I would tremble with shame all my life because I went to him then. He felt that he had a right to
despise me forever for it, and be superior to me--that's why he wanted to marry me!" (3, p. 625). Her betrayal of Dmitri to save Ivan is a double-edged sword for both. Katerina's testimony, which condemns Dmitri to Siberia is, to an extent, liberating for him. By exposing her hatred and avenging herself, Katerina frees Dmitri to accept responsibility for himself and suffer the consequences of freedom.

Katerina's impulsive sacrifice for Ivan is too little, too late. It is highly questionable whether her sacrifice will have a regenerative effect on her or Ivan since she never breaks out of her old behavior pattern. After the trial, she confesses a presentiment that as a result of her "unhappy" (3, p. 685) nature she will not be satisfied until she drives Ivan away from her. Her quarrel with Ivan over the plan for Dmitri's and Grushenka's escape to America illustrates that she has not overcome her morbid compulsion to twist the meaning and intent of every act. Katerina reacts violently to the news that Grushenka will accompany Dmitri abroad, and Ivan interprets this to mean that Katerina still desires Dmitri. Katerina refuses to explain her reaction or to ask forgiveness for her rudeness. Despite his suspicion that Katerina still loves Dmitri, Ivan entrusts the money for the escape to Katerina because he foresees his illness. Touched by the unselfishness of this gesture, Katerina declares that she wanted to "'fall at his feet in reverence'" (3, p. 685).
Instead, she flies into a fury because, as she rationalizes, she fears that Ivan will misinterpret her joy. Ironically, her furious reaction insures that Ivan will misinterpret her intention; thus, by her proud, unyielding behavior, she insures that he will eventually abandon her. Misinterpretation of her behavior is precisely what she desires.

For Katerina, in whom Eros is dominant, love sharpens and heightens the division of her personality. Although she makes the gestures and speaks the language of Agape, her self-deception and rationalizations undermine her psyche and widen the fissure in her personality which is reflected in the discrepancy between her language and her actions. Katerina's psyche responds to the ever-present threat of exposure of her repressed guilt with hysteria, violence, and nervous attacks, and it is highly likely that she will suffer a total personality disintegration similar to that of Ivan, whose personality is torn apart by the conflict between rationalizations and actual feelings. The absence of faith in God and immorality is the root of Katerina's Eros domination. As noted in the introduction to this study, the drive of Eros is toward divinization, and this impetus, together with self-will and pride, account for Katerina's denial of God and immortality. Narcissism and incipient nihilism result from her attempt to fill the vacuum of disbelief with self, and the closer Katerina comes to her notion of apotheosis, the more alienated
she becomes. In conjunction with this urge to absolute power is the subliminal urge to self-destruction. Tragically, by killing God, one gradually kills oneself, as the suicides of the self-willed Svidrigalov, Stavrogin, and Natalya Filippovna confirm. Katerina is well on her way to self-destruction.
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CHAPTER II

GRUSHENKA: THE LIGHT OF AGAPE

Agrefena Svyetlov, or Grushenka, is one of Dostoyevsky's heroines who is often given only cursory attention in Dostoyevsky criticism. In *Characters of Dostoyevsky*, Richard Curle comments that "Grushenka promises to be the more interesting of the two [Katerina and Grushenka], especially at that sugary interview with Katerina... but, later on, love and disaster make her heavily solemn and her personality fades into individual nullity" (1, p. 217). Since Curle finds Grushenka's least representative traits interesting, no doubt he is disappointed by her subsequent development.

On the whole, little criticism is devoted solely to Dostoyevsky's heroines. Even F. F. Seeley, in his prudent study "Dostoyevsky's Women" (4), encounters difficulty with Grushenka. He places her in the category of women with "schism in the soul" (4, p. 303), but he qualifies this by stating that the disintegration process, only just started, appears to be reversed by her engagement to Dmitri (4, p. 303). Seeley focuses on the personalities of Sonia Marmeladova and Natalya Filippovna as extreme examples from his two categories of women. In a novel brimming with complex personalities as is *The Brothers Karamazov*, it is not surprising that Grushenka
receives little attention, for her appeal and charm are relatively subtle in contrast to the other major figures of The Brothers Karamazov. Consequently, many of the observations about her are inadequate. Grushenka is the female complement of Dmitri Karamazov, and as such, she deserves a close examination in order to illumine her character and explain her influence on Dmitri. Like Dmitri, Grushenka is capable of baseness, but at heart she desires goodness; and despite her callous, cruel demeanor, she exudes life, warmth, and innocence. Also, like Katerina, her personality and behavior are the result of the tension between the forces of Eros and Agape, brought into conflict by the humiliation she has suffered. However, the manifestation of Eros in Grushenka is defensive rather than offensive (4, p. 301). Hurt and humiliation have given her a cruel façade that is easily penetrated by the least bit of genuine kindness to release the basic warmth and compassion of her personality.

In contrast to Katerina, Grushenka is from the poor but respectable class of clerics and deacons who abound in Dostoyevsky's oeuvre. Nothing is known of Grushenka's formal education, but, without doubt, she has not had an education comparable to Katerina's. Grushenka's knowledge is intuitive knowledge of the heart, knowledge that she has gained by her wits. At seventeen, after her unhappy love affair with a Pole, Grushenka was expelled from her family as a harlot. Despite
this harsh treatment, she apparently harbors no bitterness toward her family. In fact, her suicide attempt indicates that she shared their condemnation of her. Grushenka's affinity with the peasant class is demonstrated by her intuition, self-reliance, love of the earth, and defensive pride which resembles that of Illusha Snegiryov, the consumptive child who throws rocks at his one-time friends to compensate for his shame over his father's public humiliation.

Grushenka's sensuality, her childlike innocence, and her Russian beauty further deepen the contrast between her and Katerina. The first visual impression that the reader has of Grushenka reveals some contradictions in her nature which are the result of the distorting effect of Eros. Although Grushenka has the tall, broad-shouldered stature of a Russian peasant woman, her movements are feline. Thick, luxurious brown hair, long lashes, and sable brows complement her feline identity. The feline characteristics associated with Grushenka denote a pagan element of her character that manifests itself as fertility and sexuality. Her exaggeratedly sensual, full-figured, soft, supple body suggests an overripe fruit (4) that is on the verge of rotting; yet, underneath this exaggerated sensuality, Grushenka is a child-bearing, strong, hard-working Russian--the eternal earth mother.

*According to Richard Peace, in Dostoyevsky, the nickname Grushenka derives from "grushenka," which means "juicy, little pear" (p. 231).
Alyosha's remark on the nature of her beauty underscores this identity. He states that "'Connoisseurs of Russian beauty could have foretold that this fresh, still youthful beauty would lose its harmony by the age of thirty, would 'spread'; that her face would become puffy, and the wrinkles would very soon appear on her forehead and around her eyes; her complexion would grow coarse and red'" (3, p. 143). Grushenka's attraction, as Harry Slochower observes, lies in her earthy productivity, not in her seductiveness (6, p. 135). Grushenka's particularly Russian, maternal beauty stands in sharp contrast to Katerina's Western, asexual beauty.

Further evidence of Grushenka's life-giving potential is the childlike innocence of her bright eyes. Unlike the technically virginal Katerina, Grushenka retains a sense of innocence and childlike joy despite her fallen condition. Alyosha observes that the "soft, babyish joy" of Grushenka's eyes gives her face an "expression of child-like good nature, and this look [makes] one happy" (3, p. 143). Throughout the novel, light is associated with Grushenka, especially through her eyes. This light identifies her with Alyosha and Dmitri as one who is capable of a spontaneous, humble expression of love and compassion. In addition to reflecting her uncorrupted soul, Grushenka's childlike demeanor identifies her as one of the novel's children who must attain independence from adult domination. The Pole-Samsonov-Fyodor Karamazov triangle
represents the father figures from whom Grushenka must free herself. That she will in time successfully achieve her independence is suggested by her recently gained financial and sexual independence from the dying Samsonov, her old benefactor and surrogate father. An extension of her relationship to Samsonov, Fyodor Karamazov does not pose a serious threat to her coming of age. Grushenka flirts with Karamazov out of spite and to distract her thoughts from the Pole, the real obstacle to her emotional growth. Her neurotic attachment to the Pole has stifled her psychological growth since the age of seventeen and promoted her dependency on father figures. Just the thought of the Pole reduces Grushenka to a "snivelling cry-baby." Before she can become an integrated, responsible person, she must free herself of her bondage to the Pole. In this respect, Grushenka's predicament parallels Dmitri's situation with Katerina, his surrogate mother. The similarity is heightened by the fact that the slavery of both is perpetrated by money: Samsonov bought Grushenka to save her from suicide; Fyodor Karamazov wants to buy Samsonov's place with 3000 roubles; word of Grushenka's wealth brings the Pole back to reclaim her; and Dmitri finds himself subordinated to his father and Katerina as a result of his inheritance from his natural mother. However, neither Grushenka nor Dmitri loves money for its own sake. Dmitri describes money as an "accessory" (3, p. 107), while Grushenka states
that Dmitri and she are bound to waste money and would be better off working the land. Despite their apparent indiffer-
ence to money for itself, both allow themselves to be tyran-
nized by it, but both eventually reject the slavery that it represents in favor of the responsibility of freedom.

Grushenka's relationship to her Polish officer sets the forces of Eros and Agape into conflict and determines the development of her personality up to the moment of her con-
fession to Alyosha. The narrator explains that at seventeen Grushenka was a timid, shy, consumptive cry-baby (3) who fell in love with a rakish Polish officer who abused her love and abandoned her. However, Grushenka does not belong to the group of meek victims that includes Sonia Marmeladova (Crime and Punishment) and Sofia Dolgoruky (A Raw Youth). Grushenka consciously sacrificed her family and honor for love that she believed was reciprocal. Sonia and Sofia were victimized by others who made no pretense of love. Grushenka is victimized by her pride, not by the Pole. When the Pole abandons her, pride overcomes her, and she attempts to punish herself by drowning. The difference between Sofia and Sonia and Grushenka is that humility is a constant in Sofia and Sonia, while Grushenka fluctuates between pride and humility.

Grushenka's suicide attempt and her subsequent isolation signal the influence of Eros, for, like the impulse to rape, the impulse to suicide alienates one from humanity. In the
initial phase of her isolation, shame and despair preoccupy her. In a short time, however, she grows to love her pain even more than she ever loved the Pole. Her withdrawal from the world and her masochistic enjoyment of pain result from her refusal to forgive herself and the Pole and form a defensive barrier against another hurt or love. Pride irritates her wounds and transforms her melancholy into the desire for revenge. As her isolation becomes satisfying, she grows hard-hearted and begins to accumulate money.

Hoarding sex and money and oppressing others with them are narcissistic, egocentric acts which identify Grushenka with the Eros-dominated, tyrannical parent figures of the novel. In Dostoyevsky's world, wealth is the paramount symbol of oppression, and acquisition of wealth is tantamount to rape, for money reduces human beings to property. Money allows Grushenka to oppress others who are weak and thus to compensate for her feeling of inferiority. Her trade in bad debts with Fyodor Karamazov parallels Katerina's apparently benevolent use of her sudden inheritance, which results in Dmitri's bad debts to her. Along with hoarding money, Grushenka hoards her sex, which results in the distortion of her earthy fertility as repulsive voluptuousness. Like money, sex becomes a means to oppress others. By arousing men to a feverish pitch and rejecting them, Grushenka further satisfies her desire to impose her will on others; and the more
manipulative she is, the more justified she feels in not forgiving herself. Thus, the cycle is self-perpetuating.

Anticipation of her reunion with the Pole precipitates an emotional crisis in Grushenka. She longs for revenge, but she also fears that she will "creep back to him like a beaten dog" (3, p. 326). Having grown to love suffering and to feel herself worthless, she fears that she will succumb to the Pole out of masochism. At the same time, she fantasizes that the possibility of a new beginning with her old lover exists. She confides to Alyosha that she has been under terrible stress since she first heard from the Pole because she does not know what she wants. Grushenka's ambivalence toward the Pole reflects her ambivalence toward herself. Once freed of her self-condemnation via Alyosha's compassion for her, Grushenka can forgive herself and the pathetic Pole, even after his insulting behavior at Mokroe.

The dominance of Agape in Grushenka is reinforced by her spiritual kinship with Alyosha. Alyosha remarks early in the novel that he fears Katerina but that he regards the dreaded Grushenka with curiosity. In his first encounter with Grushenka at the debacle at Katerina's house, Alyosha is struck by the contradiction between Grushenka's voluptuousness and her innocence. When he goes to her on the evening of Father Zossima's death "'to find a wicked soul'' (3, p. 323) because he felt "'drawn to evil'' (3, p. 323), the reader at once recognizes the irony of this statement. In fact, what
Alyosha finds is a "'true sister . . . a loving heart'" (3, p. 323). At this meeting, Alyosha observes directness, simplicity, and good nature in place of her voluptuousness. Again he reacts with curiosity rather than fear despite her flirtation with him. This fateful meeting climaxes with Alyosha's and Grushenka's mutual catharsis. Both are at turning points in their lives: both are tormented by doubt and both seek the compassion of a loving heart. Grushenka's genuine compassion for Alyosha, who is numb with grief and despair over Zossima's death, pulls his soul out of its hell. Likewise, Alyosha's compassion for Grushenka frees her to begin a new life and commences his ministry of active love in the world, following Father Zossima's exhortations.

Grushenka confesses that her feelings for Alyosha are ambivalent. On the one hand, she considers Alyosha her conscience and attributes to him her self-condemnation; consequently, she desires to defile him in order to punish herself and confirm her sinfulness. On the other hand, she loves Alyosha because he represents that humble, loving aspect of herself that longs to emerge but cannot overcome her pride. Alyosha's forgiveness and compassion for Grushenka symbolize her forgiveness of herself. She exclaims that Alyosha's pity has "'gone straight to her heart'" (2, p. 328) and that despite her nastiness, she believed that "'someone like you would come and forgive me . . . and really love me, not only with a lustful love'" (2, p. 329).
Critic E. J. Simmons (5, p. 340) remarks that it is difficult to accept the abrupt change in Grushenka's nature, and he supports his contention with reference to Dostoyevsky's notes for this section of the novel, which, according to Simmons, indicate that Dostoyevsky had originally attached more significance to Grushenka's transformation: that he had intended to make the meeting between Grushenka and Alyosha longer and that he had even entitled the section "Grushenka" in the notes, though it is called "Alyosha" in the novel. In response to Simmons' criticism, one would suppose that Dostoyevsky's understated handling of the event in the novel reflects his general toning down of Grushenka's character to emphasize her special relationship to Alyosha rather than to de-emphasize the importance of the experience for both Alyosha and Grushenka. Moreover, in explaining the abruptness of the transformation, Simmons fails to take into consideration the self-revelatory experience, one of the major devices for character development that Dostoyevsky uses consistently throughout his novels. Dostoyevsky describes this moment in several works as comparable to that moment before death when the prisoner faces the scaffold--a description no doubt based on his own confrontation with the firing squad. This self-revelatory moment precedes the metaphoric death of the old self and rebirth of the new. The reader has been prepared for this moment in Grushenka's life by the fact that she has
been in an emotional crisis since the novel's action began, as well as by Father Zossima's account of his brother Markel's transformation and his own, Dmitri's confession to Alyosha, and Ivan's confession to Alyosha at the tavern. Following Grushenka's self-revelatory moment are Katerina's quasi-revelation in the courtroom, Ivan's confession in court, and Alyosha's revelation at the reading of "Cana of Galilee." Furthermore, Grushenka's transformation is merely initiated by her confession to Alyosha, and it remains in process at the novel's conclusion.

Grushenka's romantic life is further complicated by her relationship to Dmitri, a relationship that is outwardly characterized by violence and egoism. Their relationship commences when Dmitri seeks Grushenka out to beat her because she plans to sue him on the basis of an IOU that she obtained from his father. Ironically, Dmitri suffers the violence. He describes Grushenka's effect on him by using the images of a storm and plague, which foreshadow the symbolic death that awaits them:

"I went to beat her and I stayed. The storm broke. It struck me down like the plague. I'm still plague-stricken and I know that everything is over, that there will never be anything more for me. The cycle of the ages is accomplished" (3, p. 116).

This violent imagery also points up the purely egoistic interest that they have in each other: Dmitri's obsession with his
"ideal of Sodom," as embodied by Grushenka, is motivated by a desire for sensual gratification; and Grushenka's interest in Dmitri derives from her desire for revenge on the Pole and men in general. As a consequence of their self-centered motives, their three-day revelry in Mokroe at Katerina's expense is a false rebirth, and they return unchanged. Nevertheless, from her first meeting with Dmitri, Grushenka is torn between the state of freedom represented by Dmitri and the state of slavery represented by the Pole. Her indcision is reflected in her tacit approval of the rivalry between Dmitri and Fyodor and in her farewell message to Dmitri, in which she exclaims that "'Grushenka has fallen to a scoundrel, and not to you, noble heart'" (3, p. 329).

Grushenka's relationships to the Pole and Dmitri change drastically on her second trip to Mokroe. The exhilarated Grushenka arrives at Mokroe expecting a joyful reunion with her ex-lover, but the Pole's haughty, cold manner douses her hopes as though a pail of dirty water had been emptied on her. Disappointed and hurt, she perceives that the Pole, with his wig and "puffy, middle-aged face" (3, p. 385), is not the falcon that she loves, but an old gander like Samsonov and Fyodor Karamazov. By the time Dmitri arrives at Mokroe, Grushenka is irritable and impatient with the Pole's and his companion's condescending behavior. Dmitri's sudden appearance and the contrast between his warmth and the Pole's
coldness reveal to Grushenka that Dmitri is her falcon. Confronted with Dmitri's selfless concern for her happiness and his willingness to step aside for her first and rightful lover (3), Grushenka perceives that Dmitri's love for her is not self-serving, but her realization is bittersweet. At once Grushenka curses the senseless waste of five years of her life spent in brooding, and she is overcome with remorse for her spiteful torment of Dmitri and his father. At the same time, she drinks Dmitri's champagne and quietly savors the taste of freedom and love. Sitting alone watching the peasant girls dance, she alternately calls Dmitri to her and sends him away in a kind of courtship ritual that rekindles Dmitri's hopes of winning her love. The celebration at Mokroe then becomes a wedding feast, albeit somewhat bawdy and pagan, for Dmitri and Grushenka.

Significantly, Grushenka's and Dmitri's wedding celebration occurs simultaneously with Alyosha's mystical experience of the "Marriage at Cana." The allegory of Christ turning the water into wine at the marriage feast of the poor couple symbolizes man's resurrection to a new life through Agape. In his dream-like trance, Alyosha associates the wedding imagery of the biblical story with Grushenka and Dmitri; in fact, without the context of the allegory, the full significance of the events at Mokroe is incomprehensible. The ritual of marriage symbolizes man's creation of a new
beginning through the act of communion, the discovery of one's neighbor (2, p. 73). This new beginning for Dmitri and Grushenka is poignantly captured in the moment just before Dmitri's arrest when Grushenka, dozing on the couch, dreams of riding through a moonlit, snowy night with Dmitri and awakens with Dmitri tenderly kissing her bosom, hands, and dress. Likewise, Alyosha's vision of the resurrection climaxes with his symbolic marriage to the earth and departure from the monastery. In a highly sensuous, ecstatic moment, Alyosha falls weeping with joy on the bosom of the earth and vows to love her forever. Finally, Alyosha's vision of Father Zossima at the wedding feast represents the consummate rebirth in immortality. Thus, these three experiences represent the progressive stages of man's rebirth through Agape. The concurrence of Grushenka's and Dmitri's wedding with Alyosha's vision harkens to spiritual rebirth for the three.

Although Grushenka's transformation begins simultaneously with Alyosha's, her transformation is not totally realized at this moment. After Dmitri's arrest, Grushenka is ill for five weeks. This illness contrasts with her-five year illness which followed her affair with the Pole. Obviously, the healing effects of love are more immediate than the effects of Eros. Unconscious for a week, Grushenka awakens as a new person: no longer plump, proud, and full of self-pity, the new Grushenka is "thinner, a little sallow . . ." and a look of "firmness
and purpose" indicates her "steadfast, fine, and humble determination" (3, p. 511). Furthermore, despite all the misfortune she suffers, she retains her cheerfulness. Ironically, the humility of love has resulted in changes that cause her to physically resemble Katerina, but the important distinction is that her determination is of humble origin.

Love, first expressed by Alyosha then by Dmitri, frees Grushenka to express her compassion for others, which is apparent in her behavior toward Alyosha, the Pole, and Maximov. Initially, Grushenka's hostility toward Alyosha is simply a projection of her hostility toward herself and belies her overflowing love and respect for him. Likewise, her love and respect for Alyosha and Father Zossima reinforce her belief in God; and although she is at first unable to forgive herself, her spontaneous outpouring of sympathy for Alyosha in his darkest hour demonstrates her ability to show compassion. Similarly, Grushenka's treatment of the Polish officer after his exposure as a swindler and an opportunist illustrates her forgiveness of one who has deeply hurt her. When Grushenka realizes that Mussyalovitch is destitute and ill, she visits him and provides him money and food despite his continued arrogance and pomposity. In addition, Grushenka extends her compassion to the homeless and ill Maximov, who lodges with her from the time of Dmitri's arrest. Once Grushenka has forgiven herself, it is possible for her to express the humble, forgiving, compassionate love that is the essence of her being.
Due to the humble, compassionate core of Grushenka's being, even her seemingly bad behavior leads to the spiritual transformation which harmonizes her internal with her external image. Almost unconsciously, Grushenka moves toward rebirth even as she seeks irrevocable ruin. When she forgives herself, she acknowledges her responsibility for suffering in the world and begins the transformation of her non-redemptive suffering to meaningful, regenerative suffering.

The contrast between the effects of Katerina's and Grushenka's behavior dramatically illustrates the existential nature of experience in Dostoyevsky's world. As a consequence of Katerina's denial of God, every action that she performs, no matter how benevolent it appears, is self-serving and only generates destruction. Genuine sacrifice must serve the best interest of the other and, by so doing, it serves God. To be sure, Katerina suffers, but without God and fellowship, her suffering is destined to be meaningless. She will burn herself out, but unlike the phoenix, she will not be reborn from her ashes. In contrast, Grushenka's development illustrates how humility and compassion can redeem the destructive Eros drive. As long as Grushenka chooses to serve self, her life is miserable, her suffering is meaningless, and she creates emotional chaos for those around her. However, the experience of love prepares her for communion with the beloved and the integration of her personality.
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


Dmitri Karamazov, eldest son of Fyodor Karamazov, is a passionate man of action whose search for selfhood is embodied in his quest for love. Dmitri's search for love is complicated by the conflicting forces of Eros and Agape, the "ideal of Sodom" (1, p. 106) and the "ideal of the Madonna" (1, p. 106), personified by Grushenka and Katerina. However, due to his inaccurate understanding of the nature of experience and lack of values, Dmitri's perception of these women is distorted: his perception of Katerina as Madonna leads him to the brink of symbolic incest and real patricide, while his perception of Grushenka as Sodom culminates in a liberation for himself from the dark isolation of egoism and a spiritual rebirth. Analysis of Dmitri's development through his relationship to both women reveals that selfhood, as well as love, is an ongoing process that is never concluded. The best that man can hope for is a dreamlike epiphany in which, for an instant, the conflict between appearance and reality is resolved.

The quest for love is an important aspect of Dmitri's being because of his stormy, insecure childhood. Dmitri is Fyodor's only child from his short, ill-fated marriage to his
first wife Adelaide, a beautiful aristocrat. Adelaide, a progressive, somewhat George Sandian woman, married Fyodor against her family's wishes because the drama and romantic allure of the forbidden elopement and marriage appealed to her imagination and because she thought that she was marrying a "bold, ironical spirit of that progressive age" (1, p. 18). Shortly, the curtain fell on her melodrama, and she perceived that Karamazov was an opportunist buffoon worthy only of contempt. At the age of three, Dmitri became an orphan: his mother abandoned him and ran away with a destitute divinity student to St. Petersburg, where she subsequently died of typhoid or starvation; and Fyodor began a year-long drunken sexual orgy completely oblivious of his son's existence. For a year Dmitri was cared for solely by his surrogate parents, Gregory and Marfa, Fyodor's household servants. At the age of four, he was taken into the care of relatives of his mother in Moscow. Dmitri had no further contact with his father until he reached adulthood. For Dostoyevsky, Dmitri's plight as an orphan symbolizes the predicament posed by freedom. Man is alone; natural family ties are arbitrary and inconsequential until he discovers that his true family is all humanity.

Rejection by his parents and an insecure childhood result in Dmitri's confused self-image and his ambivalent feelings toward his mother. On the one hand, Dmitri idealizes his
mother, and it seems that he thinks that she was justified in abandoning him when she abandoned his father because he shares his father's "insect"* nature, that is, his depraved sensuality (4). On the other hand, Dmitri also shares his mother's nobility, sensitivity, and romantic nature; consequently, he resents her for leaving him. Dmitri's unresolved ambivalent feelings toward his mother arrest his emotional and psychological development and subordinate him to his idealization of her. Dmitri's confusion about himself is apparent in his attempts during adolescence and early adulthood to prove that he is both hero and insect.

As his long determined stride and commanding presence suggest, Dmitri is a strong man of action who never hesitates to follow his convictions or his impulses. His intelligence is intuitive, not rational; hence, he leaves high school before graduation to enter military school because military school offers him the possibility to distinguish himself by his actions, to gain prestige, and to enjoy the comraderie of a quasi-family. (Keep in mind that Father Zossima's life, particularly during his military years, closely parallels Dmitri's life.) In an effort to compensate for his feelings of inferiority, Dmitri makes himself a center to which people gravitate by his gregarious, extroverted, extravagant behavior.

*In his Dostoevsky: Essays and Perspectives, Robert Lord states that the name Karamazov signifies "black beetle" (p. 229).
His sexual prowess, extravagant celebrations, and reckless duels win him the admiration of the ladies and the friendship, if not respect, of his comrades. As an officer, Dmitri enjoys a notoriety that bolsters his romantic self-image but does not completely assuage his self-doubt.

Dmitri's behavior in the military also promotes his image as a wanton sensualist. Although he states that he enjoys looking for gems in the back alleys, it seems that in conversation about himself, he consciously exaggerates the sensual aspect of his personality. In fact, there are only two instances of his questionable behavior related in the novel—the incident with Katerina and his flirting with the girl on the sleigh ride—which are offset by the account of his relationship with Katerina's half sister, the actual outcome of his encounter with Katerina, and his behavior toward Grushenka. His conscious attempt to prove that he is the epitome of worthlessness parallels Grushenka's conception of herself as a harlot to justify her feeling that she is unworthy of forgiveness. Only after fate has struck him is Dmitri ready to seek forgiveness, a sign that he has overcome his destructive pride. When the action of the novel begins, Dmitri is already thoroughly entangled with Katerina and Grushenka and striving to unravel the paradoxical, mysterious attraction these two women have for him.

In "Confessions of a Passionate Heart—in Verse," "—in Anecdote," and "—Heels Up," the three brilliant chapters
which comprise Dmitri's first confession to Alyosha in the garden adjacent to his father's house, Dmitri exposes a dimension of his personality heretofore unknown. Although Dmitri protests that he is uneducated, anti-intellectual, and ineloquent, he describes the fundamental dilemma of his life through his recitation of excerpts from two poetic works by Frederich Schiller. That the hot-blooded soldier chooses poetry, particularly Romantic poetry, as the medium of his confession reinforces the conclusion that he is a man ruled by his heart, not his head, as well as that he has secretly developed the refined aspect of his personality that accounts for his sensitivity. The images of Schiller's stanzas describe the impulses that torment Dmitri.

Schiller's Das Eleusische Fest and An die Freude (5, p. 222) depict man's insect-saint dualism through the opposing images of man and nature, light and darkness, isolation and community. Das Eleusische Fest characterizes the bestial, or insect, element of man's being through the imagery of a cave-dwelling nomad who wanders in darkness ravaging his fellow man. The hostile, lonely forest is a metaphor for the isolation of this hunter's world. Lust for power motivates the hunter's choice of weapons over tools and prompts his abuse of the fertile plains. Egoism pits one man against another; consequently, individuals live in fearful isolation. Violence is the outcome of his existence. Even
the influence of Ceres, the earth goddess, is incapable of transforming this beast, of "[purging] his soul of vileness" (1, p. 105). At the conclusion of these stanzas, Dmitri is in tears, overcome with despair at this degraded image of man. Although, as his name indicates, Dmitri is one of the children of Ceres (5, p. 222), her pagan influence alone is insufficient to bring Dmitri out of the depths of his degradation. The effect of these stanzas, in fact, is to encourage Dmitri's self-pity.

Juxtaposed to the images of darkness and death in Das Eleusische Fest are images of light and life. Dmitri rallies from his distraught condition as he recites the An die Freude, "Hymn to Joy," which extols the creative life force that infuses nature. In contrast to man's actions in the world, nature's efforts tend toward organic, orderly relationships that culminate in beauty and harmony and inspire Dmitri with hope. The problem for Dmitri is how to reconcile his insectness with his saintliness in order to "attain to light and worth."

Dmitri describes his heart as a battlefield where God and the Devil are fighting, "'where the boundaries meet and all contradictions exist side by side'" (1, p. 106) in an effort to depict the struggle caused by his paradoxical attraction to Katerina, whom he identifies with the Madonna, and to Grushenka, whom he identifies with Sodom. Dmitri's confused perception of these women illustrates his attempt to deny his existential responsibility for determining the value of his actions.
Dmitri's ideal of Katerina as Madonna is romantic and derives from his idealization of his mother; as such it is also incestuous and Eros-dominated. Dmitri conceives of Katerina as a goddess of virtue; the image of Ceres descending Mt. Olympus and being scorned corresponds to Dmitri's deification of Katerina. Ironically, this lofty ideal of the Madonna strengthens Dmitri's poor self-image because although he is set ablaze by contemplation of her loftiness, he inevitably falls short of it and ends by being immersed in self-pity. Moreover, his romantic idealization of the Madonna subordinates him to his insect nature and makes him dependent upon Katerina as well as his disgusting father. Likewise, the incestuous element of his attraction reinforces the Eros impetus of this Madonna.

Recall the physical, social, and psychological similarities between Katerina and Adelaide, Dmitri's mother, enumerated in Chapter I. Upon meeting Katerina, Dmitri is instantly threatened by her indifference to his "heroic" exploits. After all, his mother left him for a divinity student, not a cavalier. Dmitri's premeditated plan to get even with Katerina can only be explained by his love-hate for his mother which Katerina suddenly brings to consciousness in him. The symbolic rape of his mother through Katerina is a distortion of his unresolved oedipal desire, which, in turn, symbolizes the attraction of remaining a man-child. This distortion is
apparent in his comment that his hatred for Katerina was only a "'hairsbreadth from the maddest love'" (1, p. 112). Dmitri's identification of the flame of Eros with the light of salvation reflects his desire to see value as a function of culture rather than of the individual. However, by the time of his confession in the garden, he has begun to doubt this as he has begun to perceive the destructive power of his relationship to Katerina, but he is reluctant to admit the latter for fear of its implications about the former.

In his discussion of Katerina with Alyosha, Dmitri rather maliciously remarks that "'She loves her own virtue, not me'" (1, p. 114). Despite his attempts to persuade himself that his insight is erroneous, he perceives that Katerina's virtue is her vice; her efforts to save him mask her desire to see him perpetually fallen so she can contemplate her own perfection and virtue. Dmitri's urgent request that Alyosha plead with his father for only 3000 roubles to repay his "debt of honor" (1) to Katerina and thereby "draw his soul out of hell" (1, p. 117) reflects the degree to which Katerina torments him. Unfortunately, Katerina's manipulation of Dmitri's pride causes him to believe that only money--the fatal link between them--can end his hell, when in reality his frantic search for money hastens disaster. The allusion to drawing one's soul out of hell brings to mind Grushenka's recitation of the parable of the old woman who
gave an onion to a beggar woman. For Dmitri, as for the old
woman, only a genuine act of compassion, no matter how insig-
nificant it seems, can free him from his hell. Later, at his
interrogation at Mokroe, Dmitri confesses that Katerina hates
him and consciously entrapped him with money to gain revenge.
Moreover, he rationalizes that the burden of this debt
accounts for his savage behavior. By referring to himself as
a savage, Dmitri alludes to the poem with which he began his
confession, and this strengthens the argument that his tie
with Katerina has brought him to the depths of degradation as
scoundrel, thief, and almost a murderer. As long as he
believes he must redeem himself materially, his disgrace
wreaks havoc in his life. Obsession with his own wounded
pride creates a tempest in him that incites furious activity
and clouds his perception. Anticipating the enslavement to
his baseness that would be inevitable if he continued his
relationship with Katerina, Dmitri tries to escape her influ-
ence by breaking their engagement, an action which suggests
the theological implications of his connection to Katerina
and Grushenka.

The garden setting in which Dmitri announces his plan to
break his engagement evokes the image of Eden and the biblical
account of The Fall. Dmitri's fall from Katerina to Grushenka
contrasts Dostoyevsky's interpretation of The Fall with the
Roman Catholic view as expounded by the Grand Inquisitor.
In the traditional view, man fell from a state of perfection and oneness with God to a state of sin that alienated him from God. Man was denied union with God in this state of sin and promised reunion in Heaven by grace. In Dostoyevsky's theology, man's fall is the expression of his freedom, and freedom, not perfection, is the quality that likens man to God. Thus, man must fall to rise in order to affirm his freedom, hence his godliness. Dmitri's ecstatic mood at the crucial moment of his decision to break with Katerina and leap headlong into chaos in pursuit of Grushenka is an affirmation of the necessity of the fall. Dmitri's choice of the awesome unknown of freedom, represented by Grushenka, over the stasis of slavery is an attempt to triumph over his insect nature; although on a conscious level, Dmitri thinks that he is abandoning himself to his sensual nature. The challenge of leaping into chaos with the hope of winning Grushenka's love leaves him drunk with life and freedom and inspires his "'Glory to God in the world/Glory to God in me'" (1, p. 102).

Paradoxically, Dmitri's relationship with Grushenka leads to his acceptance of freedom and responsibility and the transformation of the impetus of his personality from Eros toward Agape. Initially, Dmitri's relationship to Grushenka is dominated by Eros; he desires her primarily to satisfy his lust, and because his motivation is self-centered, his perception of her is distorted. However, as Dmitri becomes more
involved with her, he is forced to analyze and re-define the motives and consequences of his actions. As Dmitri's intuition about Katerina and Grushenka becomes conscious, he begins to perceive that beneath the patina of Eros that characterizes Grushenka shines the soft brilliance of Agape. The climax of his relationship to Grushenka is their ecstatic dreamlike marriage at Mokroe, a metaphoric marriage of the intuitive and rational, Eros and Agape, which culminates in Dmitri's acceptance of the responsibility of freedom.

That Dmitri intuits that his salvation is enmeshed with Grushenka is apparent in his actions, despite what he says about her. Although he is bitterly jealous of his father, he anxiously waits for Grushenka to choose between him and his father, demonstrating that he genuinely respects her freedom and does not want to force himself on her as Katerina would force herself on him. Also, the regenerative power of the relationship is symbolized by the outward movement that characterizes it. The first trip to Mokroe foreshadows the end of their isolation in egoism and their union with humanity.

The turning point in Dmitri's conscious understanding of himself and Grushenka occurs when he almost murders his father. With his leap over the fence into Fyodor's garden in search of Grushenka (7), Dmitri descends into the center of the "beast pen,"

*In his Dostoevsky, Edward Wasiolek states that the name of the town, Skotoprigonevsk, is an adaptation of the Russian word skotoprigonny, that is, "beast corral" or "beast pen" (p. 181).
the bottom of the abyss of sensuality, and again he must make a choice. Assured by his father's excited response to the secret knock that Grushenka is not with him, Dmitri is suddenly overcome with revulsion for his father, whose grotesque silhouette in the window reflects his moral depravity. Dmitri barely quells his hatred and his impulse to murder, and he later remarks that "'God was watching over me then'" (l, p. 361). However, just as he does not escape his encounter with Katerina guiltless, neither does he escape the garden guiltless. While astride the fence attempting to escape, Dmitri strikes old Gregory as the servant attempts to restrain him.

Striking Gregory is a highly significant act because it is first a literal manifestation of the suffering that Dmitri has caused by his ostensibly honorable behavior, and being guilty of striking Gregory externalizes Dmitri's guilt for desiring his father's death and desiring to rape Katerina, both violations of Mother Earth for which he must atone. Furthermore, the transmutation of Dmitri's symbolic guilt into literal guilt signals the raising to consciousness of his subliminal awareness of his responsibility and guilt. This act temporarily snaps Dmitri out of his frenzy and sparks a moment of genuine compassion for the injured old man. He tries to attend Gregory's wounds, but thinking him dead and the situation hopeless, Dmitri leaps the fence and continues his frantic search for Grushenka. When he reaches her lodgings, the import of his action stuns him.
The events that occur in Fyodor's garden, compounded by the news of Grushenka's departure for Mokroe to be reunited with her Polish lover, have a sobering effect on Dmitri. He is transformed from a raging maniac to a gentle, affectionate child upon hearing Fenya's account of her mistress's activities. Moved by Grushenka's farewell message for him to "'remember forever how she had loved him for an hour'" (1, p. 364), Dmitri suddenly resolves to "step aside" (1, p. 364) for the sake of Grushenka's happiness. Dmitri's immediate and total acceptance of the Pole's place as Grushenka's rightful lover is drastically different from his response to his father's bid for her. His attack on Gregory has forced Dmitri to see beyond himself, and his decision to place Grushenka's happiness above his own foreshadows his eventual subordination to the will of God. However, although Dmitri exhibits an emerging altruism, remnants of the influence of Eros remain.

Simultaneous with his decision to step aside is his decision to commit suicide, a gesture of self-will and Eros. His decision is motivated in part by pride and in part by guilt. The positive significance of Dmitri's suicide plan is that it indicates his consciousness of guilt and the need to suffer; however, in choosing suicide, Dmitri usurps the role of God as divine arbiter of justice. The assumption that he can "'set his life in order'" by himself denies the existence
of God, the possibility for atonement, and the possibility for forgiveness. His romantic notion of the suicide—a night of revelry followed by greeting "golden-haired Phoebus" at dawn with a bullet in his head—further stresses the influence of Eros on this impetuous decision. Ironically, these concurrent decisions prove contradictory. With the decision to step aside, Dmitri experiences a resurgence of love and a reverence for life that his decision to commit suicide negates. By the time he reaches Perhotin's to reclaim his duelling pistols, he has begun to reflect on his decision, and he is troubled by the fact that his suicide plan does not bring him peace. Later, on the ride to Mokroe, his will to live and love grow stronger as he nears Grushenka, and he surmises that suicide cannot atone for the past deeds that torment him. His prayer that he be spared God's judgment and condemnation to hell reveal that he has a premonition of the suffering that lies ahead for him and that he is afraid for himself.

Seeing Grushenka upon his entrance into the tavern, Dmitri is flooded with a rush of warmth and tenderness. The childlike submissiveness and nonviolence that characterize Dmitri at this time denote the emerging influence of Agape. Recognition that Grushenka does not love the Pole renews Dmitri's hope that she will reciprocate his love and prompts him to try to buy off the Pole. This action unmasks the Pole's low intentions, but it momentarily jeopardizes Dmitri's hopes.
However, his gallant defense of Grushenka and the decisive manner in which he rids the group of the swindling Poles reassure Grushenka that his action was in her best interest. Following the exposure and banishment of the Poles, the wild Dionysian marriage celebration for Dmitri and Grushenka begins.

Yet, Dmitri and Grushenka participate in the actual celebration only peripherally, for both are overwhelmed by their own feelings which have been prompted by a tacit acknowledgment of their love. The consciousness that his greatest moment of joy is at hand is bittersweet, for it is tempered by a burning consciousness that he must live and suffer. Alone on the balcony of the tavern, Dmitri momentarily reconsiders shooting himself, but he quickly dismisses this cowardly notion. In anticipation of the martyrdom that awaits him, he voices Christ's appeal to "'Let this fearful cup pass from me.'" Then Dmitri returns to Grushenka, who alone is his light and hope, and in a state of ecstatic delirium that coincides with Alyosha's dream vision of the Marriage at Cana, the lovers experience a moment of communion. The warring factions of Dmitri's being are united by love, even as Alyosha experiences a mystical resolution of his conflict between faith and doubt through the revelation of divine love. Both experiences point to spiritual rebirth for the brothers.

The dreamlike quality of this moment of communion is significant because it denotes the transitoriness and the
fantastic quality of reality that is so elemental to Dostoyevsky's fiction. There can be no permanent marriage of Heaven and Hell in Dostoyevsky's world because freedom denies final resolution or transformation. Value is determined with each decision the individual makes. Life is a riddle because one must constantly attempt to see beyond appearance to determine motivation. Thus, for Dostoyevsky's characters, reality is a function of consciousness. Hence, Dmitri's concern for whether he is telling the truth. Dostoyevsky heightens the impact of his statement of the existential nature of experience by juxtaposing this tender, poignant love scene with Dmitri's arrest for murder. The interrogation which follows is a test of Dmitri's willingness to serve God.

Dmitri's interrogation at Mokroe produces his most intense struggle with Eros and Agape, the gradual conquest of pride by humility. The three-part confession marks the stripping away of all the vestments of the old Dmitri and the birth of a new man in him. During the first part of the questioning, Dmitri protests his innocence vigorously. On the surface, he is innocent of the actual murder, but on a metaphysical level, he is guilty. Sparked by joy over his love for Grushenka and the news that Gregory is alive, Dmitri thinks of his own happiness and attempts to preserve it. His protest of his literal innocence is self-deception. Dmitri's
joy also prompts a naive attitude toward himself and his interrogators: he tells the story of the incident in the garden frankly and believes that since he is a man of honor, his accusers will accept his word as truth. The problem is that his sense of honor is really his sense of pride, and because his words are not yet in harmony with his inner being, they are false, though they are ostensibly true. Initially, he speaks to the accusers as though they are friends on an equal footing, but as the interrogation continues, Dmitri loses his equal footing with them. Ironically, the officials' disbelief of the literal truth forces Dmitri's confrontation with the truth that lies beyond circumstances.

During the second phase of questioning, Dmitri approaches closer to the truth, but as he does, he becomes alienated from his interlocutors, who respond to his revelation of the intimate details of his rivalry with his father over Grushenka with cold insensitivity. Pride and anger swell in Dmitri, and he becomes so exasperated that he deliberately makes statements that misrepresent his motives. Throughout this phase, Dmitri tries to think of these men as his brothers, but the aloofness and smugness with which they respond to him make him intractable, impress upon him the great gulf between them, and foreshadow his eventual total subordination to them.

Also during this phase of the investigation, Dmitri reveals that part of his ill-temper results from the fact that
this interrogation is an enactment of a terrible recurring nightmare in which he is stalked by someone he fears tremendously and from whom he is forced to hide in degrading ways. The pursuer in this persecution dream is that repressed guilt that terrorizes the façade of his honorable self and forces an awareness of his degradation upon him and from which he tries unsuccessfully to hide. This dream anticipates the eventual revelation of the secret of his relationship with Katerina that he has attempted to hide from himself and others. His interrogators take on the role of his subconscious and force him to expose his degradation.

The final stage of Dmitri's ordeal with his pride occurs when he must reveal the source of the money he suddenly acquired on the night of the murder. Before he supplies this information, Dmitri is forced to strip naked in front of his accusers. The exposure of his body and his dirty underclothes are humiliating and painful for him, particularly because his feet are ugly. Stripped to utter nakedness and to the core of his being, Dmitri can no longer hide the moral baseness that identifies him with Schiller's savage. In addition, taking off his clothes symbolizes the stripping away of the last vestige of the old Dmitri in preparation for the birth of the new. Dressed in ill-fitting clothes borrowed from Kalganov, an added source of embarrassment, Dmitri confesses his dishonorable conduct with regard to Katerina.
In Dmitri's words, the confession of his relationship with Katerina exposes him to a "'far greater disgrace than the murder and [robbery] of [his] father..."" (1, p. 439) and that Siberia would be better than confessing it, but confess it he does. Why is this incident so painful for Dmitri? It torments him because it recalls his shameful intention to humiliate and degrade Katerina, and it represents her triumph over him, for she reduced him to a thief. The calculated baseness of his reserving half the money to elope with Grushenka compounds the disgrace. His horror of being a thief is so painful to him that he lies about the amount of money he spent the first time at Mokroe to conceal the existence of the 1500 roubles. This final revelation of his most private shame is the ultimate test for Dmitri, and it is met with derisive laughter and incredulity. Ironically, the full significance of the confession is apparent only to Dmitri, for it brings about a moment of self-revelation during which he openly confronts his true guilt and his motives. Along with self-awareness comes an awareness that the external situation is hopeless. Gazing out the window on the morning of his planned suicide, Dmitri finds that dismal gray rain clouds conceal the "light of golden-haired Phoebus." The flame of Eros has been extinguished by tears of penitence; the new light of Agape is about to dawn.

The images of Schiller's poem by which Dmitri presented his dilemma find their complement and resolution in his dream
of "The Babe," which follows the conclusion of his interrogation. After it, Dmitri falls asleep and experiences a symbolic death and rebirth. Analysis of the imagery of "The Babe" illustrates Dmitri's development from isolated egoist to sacrificial brother of mankind.

The setting of the dream is the barren Siberian steppes, where Dmitri was once stationed as a soldier. The steppes become Dmitri's personal symbol of the violated earth as well as of his past. From a troika, Dmitri reviews his past in a new perspective. The time is early November, and it is snowing, sleet ing, and bitterly cold. Dmitri is conducted through this dream by a compassionate peasant who represents the healthy component of Dmitri's being. As Dmitri rides through the steppes, he sights a burned-out peasant community in the distance, a microcosm of all human suffering. The village is in complete disintegration: homes are destroyed; no men are present; only a few sickly, starving women and a crying baby remain. Dmitri is struck by the pathos of the vision of the freezing infant at its mother's dried-up breast. This Russian Madonna and Child are Dmitri's synthesis of the pagan image of Ceres and the Christian image of the Virgin and the Christ Child. The synthesis of these archetypes in the Russian peasant woman and child reflect Dmitri's experience of Father Zossima's particularly Russian Christianity which incorporates Christ's
teaching of "active love" and a pagan reverence for Mother Earth. Mother Earth and the Holy Mother are essentially identical in Dostoyevsky's view. Dmitri responds to this dream with a passion of pity such as he had never felt before, and he longs to do something to alleviate the suffering of the mother and child. Dmitri reacts strongly to the dream, for he identifies with the babe on two significant levels: insofar as he is guilty, the suffering child reveals to him his responsibility for violating innocence and Mother Earth (Katerina, Gergory, Captain Snergiyov, and Illusha); and insofar as he is literally innocent of murder, his identification with the child represents his identification with Christ's sacrificial love of mankind. In addition, Dmitri's identification with the babe symbolizes his rebirth. No longer a child of man, Dmitri is reborn a child of God, a spiritual brother. Having broken the bondage of self, Dmitri perceives a new light beckoning to him in his darkest hour, the light of Agape embodied in Grushenka.

In Dostoevsky and the Novel, Michael Holquist's thesis is that The Brothers Karamazov is "about four young men, each of whom ... must first overcome the dilemma of his status as son, must cross the mine field between that condition and its opposite state, fatherhood" (3, p.176). Based on this thesis, Holquist interprets Dmitri's dream of "The Babe" as a dream of "assuming a kind of paternal responsibility" (3, p. 187). But Holquist concludes that Dmitri does not experience
full parenthood because his child exists only in a dream (2, p. 188). In Holquist's opinion, only Alyosha makes the transition from son to father. However, from this reader's point of view, the important transition is from son to brother, and Dmitri's dream marks his first true experience of brotherhood.

That this supreme moment of transfiguration also occurs in a dream further strengthens the notion that reality is a function of consciousness, a belief that Dostoyevsky expressed in a letter to N. N. Strachov: "I have my own idea about art, and it is this: What most people regard as fantastic and lacking in universality, I hold to be the inmost essence of truth" (2, p. 166-167). Through consciousness, the disparity between appearance and reality is resolved; thus, Dmitri awakens from his dream resolved to accept his need for punishment. Dmitri will suffer for the sake of the heavenly father and the earthly father. Likewise Dmitri accepts the verdict of the peasants at his trial as a mere formality because in his heart he has already accepted God's judgment that we are all guilty, "'we're all cruel, we're all monsters, we all make men weep and mothers and babes at the breast..." (1, p. 465). With this admission, Dmitri experiences the "law of Christ speaking in his conscience" that Father Zossima claims is the only punishment that "'does preserve society ... and does regenerate and transform the criminal ...'" (1, p. 67).
However, Dmitri still faces the choice whether to go to Siberia and sing his hymn to God or to flee to America with Grushenka.

Dmitri's quest for love and selfhood are temporarily realized through his relationship to Grushenka. Love of her humbles him, opens his eyes to the suffering of others, and impresses upon him his responsibility for suffering in the world. Once the blinders of egoism fall from his eyes, he is ready to exchange the meaninglessness of suffering for its own sake, the basis of his relationship with Katerina, for suffering that leads to redemption. As a result of their love, both Dmitri and Grushenka experience a moment of self-revelation that liberates them from the tyranny of Eros and unites them in spiritual brotherhood with humanity. Despite the suffering and separation that still awaits them at the conclusion of the novel, Dmitri's admission that "... through her I've become a man" is a powerful statement of Grushenka's regenerative influence on him. In contrast, Katerina remains unregenerate and burdened with the heavy load of pride. Unable to overcome her fierce pride, she refuses to forgive or to be forgiven. When Dmitri asks her forgiveness for the suffering he has caused her in their last meeting at the prison hospital, she insists that the pain of their relationship is what she desires to remember. Dmitri and Katerina could only feed the fires of each other's base inclinations, whereas Grushenka
and Dmitri encourage the truly noble and loving instincts of each other and consequently experience genuine personality integration.

Dmitri's responses to Katerina and Grushenka demonstrate the existential nature of experience in Dostoyevsky's world. Despite their protests, Dostoyevsky's exceptional men and women are doomed to freedom, and rejection of this responsibility is paramount to a denial of God and can only end in disaster. Each individual must accept the responsibility of determining the value of his actions in the present by his choice to serve self or God (6). Dmitri's reluctance to accept this law, echoed in his complaint that man is "'too broad,'" is reflected in his futile attempt to identify absolute virtue with Katerina and absolute evil with Grushenka.

Initially, Dmitri is not willing to admit that virtue is not what it seems in Katerina. In an effort to judge experience as either black or white, Dmitri eagerly accepts Katerina's language of Agape as white. Even as he breaks away from her, he refuses to see her motives for what they really are. Unable to admit that he is equally responsible with Katerina for their love-hate relationship, Dmitri refuses to see that Katerina's virtue is her vice. This reluctance to see that "'white' may indeed be "'black' and vice versa underscores his temptation to succumb to the tyranny of language, the expression of the rational, and to remain a child-man.
Nevertheless, while his rationality ascribes virtue and goodness to Katerina and encourages his subordination to her, his heart urges him toward what his mind calls shameful.

Dmitri is, above all, a man ruled by his heart, and his heart leads him eventually to salvation. Dmitri's choice to serve Grushenka heralds his readiness to serve God. Significantly, however, the novel is open-ended; no final resolution of Dmitri's or Grushenka's fate is possible because at every moment a situation demands a decision. Even after his conviction and sentencing to Siberia, other major choices, for example, the choice to escape to America, await him. The choice to escape to America greatly disturbs Dmitri because despite all the counsel he has, he cannot with certainty anticipate what he will do. He claims that he will go to America, but at the end of the novel, Alyosha tells the young boys that Dmitri will go to Siberia. Although the reader cannot predict how Dmitri will choose, it seems logical to assume that Alyosha has read Dmitri's heart, as he has many others. Because Dmitri is a man of humble heart concerned with honesty, Dostoyevsky implies that there is considerable hope for him.
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