Patrick Durkin

Nietzschean Types in *The Brothers Karamazov*

139817 –Dr. William Angus

11th February 2019

For the Masters of Arts, English

Abstract

Nietzsche and Dostoevsky were contemporaries, and Nietzsche especially was known to admire Dostoevsky's work. Both authors were interested in the study of the basis for human morality, and the search for a redirection of human morality; one in which the problems they saw with the current understanding of acceptable behaviour according to laws, religion and might is right, could be melded in with their own beliefs and struggles with their own mortality and morality.

Although Nietzsche's collection of essays *The Genealogy of Morals,* (1887) was written 7 years after Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* (1880), it is interesting to note that the main character types that Nietzsche believed created hierarchies that developed and sustained the morality of his time, appear in the form of the main characters in *The Brothers Karamazov*.

This thesis will be looking at the *The Brothers Karamazov* through the different character 'types' and the resulting psychomachia of the three legitimate brothers, the older brothers Dmitri and Ivan, and especially that of Alyosha, the youngest brother. The thesis will focus on both elder brothers' evolution of thought and action through the progress of the novel, and, importantly, on each brothers' interactions with Alyosha and the turbulent state of mind they regularly leave their younger sibling in.
The final chapter of the thesis will concentrate on Alyosha and his journey throughout the novel, from his parting of ways with Zosima to his talk with the young boys by the stone. This journey, I believe, will be the one that extracts the idea of Dostoevsky's true morality seen in the novel.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

"If they drive God from the earth, we shall shelter Him underground."

- Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*

“What would this life be without immortality? If the spiritual is not behind the material, to what purpose is the material?”

- Walt Whitman, *Discussion*

Many have been the words written about Dostoevsky and his trials and turmoils on the religious front. What type of Christian was he? How did his orthodox upbringing come through in his novels? Was Dostoevsky a Christian at all or indeed an atheist at heart? The questions have been myriad throughout the centuries since his death and have been part of the development of different stages, forms, and methodologies of scholarship over the years. There are those who claim he must be scrutinised only through a close reading of his texts, and those who feel the times he lived in must be examined to elicit a more comprehensive understanding of the meaning in his works. This thesis will take the idea that it was all the influences, from intellectual atheism to religious fervour that creates a psychomachia that can be seen throughout the novel.

This debate over methodology began primarily with a warming in East and West relations in the late twentieth century as Russian and Western scholars started working more closely together. As a result, there has been an eclectic mix of scholars: scholars

of the East and the West, scholars who look at Dostoevsky through a religious viewpoint, and scholars who take a more philosophical view of scrutinising his work.

This mirrors how Dostoevsky himself was torn between the new, revolutionary thinking coming out of Western Europe that was prevalent in Russian intellectual circles at the time and his own very orthodox upbringing. It was a form of psychomachia, a tugging apart of the psyche due to opposing forces, working on the author, that can be seen working in *The Brothers Karamazov*. In 'Thesis V. Religious Polemic in Narrative Form: *The Brothers Karamazov*,' from his book *Dostoevsky and the Dynamics of Religious Experience*, Malcolm V. Jones describes this as "a situation where the extremes of religious faith and atheistic conviction appear to have reached a stalemate" (108). Though it is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is interesting to note the dualism that Dostoevsky struggled with throughout his life and the psychomachia that permeates his last great novel.

The novel takes the reader through the turmoils of the family Karamazov, most especially the trials and tribulations of the three legitimate brothers: the oldest—Dmitri Fyodorovich Karamazov (Dmitri), the middle brother—Ivan Fyodorovich Karamazov (Ivan), and the youngest —Alexei Fyodorovich Karamazov (Alyosha). As the text progresses, the reader comes across many types, especially typical Russian types, that develop or contradict Alyosha's journey to his spiritual peace. In 'Nietzsche's Understanding of a Good Life: Seeking More Than Happiness,' Marcella Tarozzi Goldsmith defines Nietzsche's types as "a given model of existing human being that can be described in its essential traits."

Jones examines “the vulgar literalism of old Karamazov and Smerdiakov [...] the secular liberalism of Miusov and Rakitin, the commitment of faith and living the life of active love in Alesha and Zosima, the poetical paganism of Dmitri, the uneducated and superstitious piety of Grigory and Marfa, the radical agnosticism or atheism of Ivan and the careerist motivation of Rakitin” (108). Jones also notes how the reader sees examples of the Russian tradition of the holy fool, martyrs for faith, sectarianism, hagiography, folk religion and Christian socialism, among others. It is clear that *The Brothers Karamazov* is saturated with very typical character types, and it will be shown later that this was done purposefully by the author.

What this thesis proposes to do is to examine religious discourse in Dostoevsky’s novel, *The Brothers Karamazov*, and what it has to say about morality from a religious perspective, especially concerning the route of the three brothers, and most especially, the hero of the story, Alyosha. This thesis will be based on the belief that as Dostoevsky’s culminating novel, it was also the culmination of the development of religious discourse in his works. Often it is his previous, great works that are held up and examined for their conversation on religious morality. *Demons*, *Notes from the Underground*, and *The Idiot* are all well documented by scholars over the ages for the speculations on religious morality they hold. What makes *The Brothers Karamazov* important in the discussions on religious morality portrayed in Dostoevsky’s novels is not its similarities to these previous novels, but instead, the subtle changes it shows when applying some of the same themes, character types, and symbolism.

Indeed, the changes of theme, character, and action from the previous novels will briefly show a critical, fundamental change in this discourse in his final novel. This thesis will examine how many of the meanings and ideas that are taken and interpreted from the previous works end up being either evolved or, in fact, overturned, as the author's progression of spiritual thought developed in his works. "The evidence should be found in Dostoevsky's last novel [...] in the nothingness where cosmic despair or an experience of a transcendent reality may equally be found" (Jones 103). This changing of the import of these ideas, themes, and symbols that have been so prominent in previous novels adds credence to the notion that the religious discourse in the novel was about finding a new direction for religious morality to move in. It is about finding a new way forward for a modern looking world, but a way that still incorporates some of the old religious thinking, with the new Western intellectualism. This overturning of old ideas from previous texts blends with his combining of the old character types to create a new religious outlook and morality.

This thesis will examine this great novel through the lens of one of Dostoevsky's great contemporaries, and one whose thinking he would have been acutely aware of and discussed in the literary circles in which he socialised, discussed, and debated. Friedrich Nietzsche was one of the most prominent writers of the nineteenth century, and one of the leading proponents of the "God is Dead" line of thinking common in his time. This very clash of temperament is shown clearly in *The Brothers Karamazov* and can be used to help us trace the discourse on religion throughout the novel, along with the types that are more clearly delineated in Nietzsche's work.

Nietzsche is as well known for his work on the historical development of human morals and his pressing claims for the need for a new understanding of morality, away from the old ruling principles determined for centuries by the overbearing overlords of Church, army, and land-owners, and the more modern phenomenon of intellectualism. The nature of his insight and way of looking at morality and its development is also a culmination of his thinking, and Dostoevsky's outlook on religious morality and the way he portrays his characters, along with their contemporary nature, allows for an exciting and revealing comparison to be made. Specifically, regarding the novel, the thesis will, thus, explore how these character types are used as part of the discarding of the old thinking on morality and religion. Through this evolution, a new "type" rises, and along with it, a new type of religious morality. While these character types not only having struggles of psychomachia of their own throughout the novel, they also tug at the psyche of the "hero" of the story, the youngest brother of the three, Alyosha. Through the constant tug of the wants and ideas, indeed the morality of each of his family's "types," Dostoevsky develops his portrayal of a religious understanding throughout the novel. Thus, there is importance in studying the commonalities between Nietzsche's use of "types" in his work *On the Genealogy of Morality* and Dostoevsky's use of several familiar character types in his great work. This thesis will compare and contrast the two works and use them to develop an understanding of what the result of the discourse on religious morality is portrayed in his last book, *The Brothers Karamazov*.

Janko Lavrin, in 'A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky' tells us that "they were also individually torn between strong religious temperament and that strong

anti-religious attitude which was so frequent a phenomenon of the age they lived in" (160). Lavrin also tells us that "another feature both of them shared was largely a result of the inner war each had to wage against the 'complexes' and contradictions in his self-divided consciousness" (161). So, the two authors not only shared an understanding of how "types" have dominated the religious morality passed down through the centuries, but they also shared a common striving for truth pitted against a background of very religious disposition.

Thus, my research question is: "To what extent do the characters of *The Brothers Karamazov* mirror the 'types' described by Nietzsche in *The Genealogy of Morals*, and what view does this give us into Dostoevsky's discourse of religion in the novel?"

This thesis will examine the idea of types that Nietzsche developed and explained more explicitly, and the psychomachia that these types display. It is the psychomachia that impacts the main character, Alyosha, and forms the position of this thesis—the idea that in the novel *The Brothers Karamazov*, Fyodor Dostoevsky portrays a new kind of thinking. It is a new kind of thinking for his time and place, that moves away from the revelatory and "ascendance to the afterlife" spirituality, to an understanding of a kind of spiritual wholeness attainable while still in human form, walking this earth. In this, Dostoevsky moves from mimesis in his portrayal of many basic Russian types, to mathesis in the developing of new types for the modern Slavic world to follow and become. This thesis takes the position that the real spiritual outlook depicted by the hero of the novel, Alyosha, is actual a more eastern, Buddhist outlook rather than the Orthodox or other types of Christianity proposed by the majority of

theological scholars or the nihilistic atheism suggested by others. There is no research to indicate that Dostoevsky had any understanding of the Buddhist religion itself. In 'Buddhism and The Brothers Karamazov,' Michael Futrell states that the author "had some contact with the mystic and warrior Muhammad, but [...] his public pronouncements must seem far from Buddhism" (156). Thus, this work does not take the position that *The Brothers Karamazov* explicitly states a Buddhist belief. Instead through Dostoevsky's use of Nietzschean types and the psychomachia that they display, this new understanding of religious morality developed in the novel displays remarkably similar attributes to eastern Buddhist thought.

This thesis will examine this question through a thesis constructed in two main parts. Part One will develop a line of thinking that will be a wide exploration of religion and Russianness in the novel. The first section of Part One will involve a detailed look at past and current thinking on the religious morality, or lack of it, portrayed in Dostoevsky's novels, as well as at some of the methodologies used to study this through some prominent scholars of the various approaches. The purpose of this is to show the vast variance that has been displayed throughout the years on what religious morality has been shown in Dostoevsky's works, and what the religious discourse in the novels is actually saying. Presenting this wide range of methodologies is useful, as it is in *The Brothers Karamazov* where this plethora of approaches and ideas come together to form a more uniting, and ultimately enlightening, discourse on religious morality. This sets out the central position on the question: the religious discourse in *The Brothers Karamazov* develops into a more Buddhist outlook on life, than either Orthodox

Catholic, nihilist or atheist. This proposal will be sustained and advanced in the second central part of the thesis with a more complete depiction of how the novel is showing this position. Also, the thesis defines the school of Buddhist thought that will be used to compare and contrast to the outlook of the religious discourses throughout the novel. This understanding of Buddhist thought will be used later in Part Two as this thesis dissects the action and dialogue of the novel more completely.

In order to do this, an understanding of the history and usages of the term psychomachia will be given next, as well as the definition and usage of the terms of this thesis. It is through this struggle between two vastly opposite positions and all they entail that the belief or denial of the existence of God is one that drives the main characters. Using this definition will set the basis for the more advanced thinking on the use of psychomachia in the novel in Part Two, as it is this psychomachia that, by the end of the novel, ultimately leads Alyosha to an understanding of his religious position.

The last section of Part One will contain a comparison between Nietzsche's and Dostoevsky's writing, and, most importantly, between their works, *The Genealogy of Morals* and *The Brothers Karamazov*. There will be a general introduction to the understanding of the idea of types both works show. Here the thesis will portray how the two can be shown not just to contain these similar understandings on not only the idea of "types" but also the certain "types" that have influenced societal thinking (be it moral or religious) over the centuries. Leading on from this analysis of types will be Part Two of the thesis, where the study of how the use of these types in The Brothers

Karamazov, and the psychomachia they bring about, leads to to a religious discourse in the novel more centered around brotherly love.

Here I will be looking at the first collection in Nietzsche's work, in the *Preface*, which highlights the roles of the ruling orders that have defined and enforced the morality that have been passed down through the centuries up to the point of writing. This thesis will compare these ruling orders through the characters that Dostoevsky had previously displayed in his work. There is a very Russian character to these types that Dostoevsky uses, but they still fit well with the overall idea of Nietzsche's. The types are very transferable from a broader European setting to a more Orthodox Russian environment. Hence, when Carol Apollonio tells us that the characters in *The Brothers Karamazov* are all "quintessentially mid-nineteenth century Russians" who are "grounded fully in their historical space and time as well," there is no clash between Nietzsche's types displayed from a broader setting, and Dostoevsky's more centralised type (24).

Part Two will consist of the main body of the thesis and will individually break down character types in the novel to show how Dostoevsky used this way of writing to portray a spiritual stance in the novel. It will develop, through the psychomachia Alyosha had to endure, presented to him by his two brothers, driven by the "types" from Nietzsche's *The Genealogy of Morals*, what we can discern to describe Dostoevsky's original take on religion.

The first way it will develop this will be by comparing the portrayals of the two oldest Brothers Karamazov with the second and third thesis of Nietzsche's book. I will

look at how the second thesis ‘‘Guilt,’ ‘Bad Conscience’ and the Like” compares neatly with the role of Dimitri in the novel. Here, Nietzsche’s type of a restricted thinker who does what they “ought” and the “un-egoistic instincts” contrasts very well with the passionate and wildly unpredictable Dmitri (8). The third thesis, ‘What is the Meaning of Ascetic Ideals?’ compares very well with the second brother, Ivan. This thesis discusses philosophers, thinkers and artists and how they are “stifling of vitality,” which fits very well with Ivan’s demise and lethargy throughout the novel (178).

The first focus will be on Dmitri and how his form of psychomachia was between the soul and the mind, and which should have dominance in determining his actions. After comparing this character with the ideas from Nietzsche’s second thesis, the focus will turn to examining the effect Dmitri’s passionate outbursts and seemingly illogical actions have on Alyosha. The eldest brother's influence will represent one side of the psychomachia that leads Alyosha to his religious understanding at the end of the novel. Dmitri’s type will be seen to be posing that of the person driven by inner beliefs and one who acts on those beliefs, often to his undoing.

Next, Ivan will be looked at in much the same way, except from the other side of Alyosha’s psychomachia— as the intelligent, God-denying philosopher. Ivan’s struggles are much more the classical literary idea of psychomachia, with actual devils appearing to him (whether as psychosis or not) and his refusal to live in any world where a God would allow such suffering as Ivan details.

By comparing and contrasting both the brothers to the types in these works, this thesis will show how Dostoevsky has appropriated universal character types in his

novel, and that these were similar to the ones Nietzsche later discussed in his work. Once this is established, the central resolve of the thesis is founded: “In *The Brothers Karamazov,* Dostoevsky portrays a religious discourse based on two main worldly factors, both tussling with an idea of humanity’s understanding of a belief in God and all that it encompasses, tugging at the essence of humanity”. Humanity, in this case, is represented by his new type of Everyman, Alyosha, and the secular forces represented by the intellectualism of Ivan and the passion-driven Dmitri. The development of this new type of Everyman is brought about by the clashes of the effects of modern philosophical argument versus passionate and innate belief that drives the discourse on religious morality. It is these clashes that ultimately move Alyosha to his understanding of his place in a world that so complexly disputes the role and even existence of a God in this world. It is through these confrontations that Alyosha discerns the need for a brotherly love that must start with the people.

PART 1

2. Religion and *The Brothers Karamazov*

"The gap between Dostoevsky's proclaimed beliefs and the way he depicts the problem of religion [...] is our current critical workplace."

- Carol Apollonio, 'Dostoevsky's Religion: Words, Images, and the Seed of Charity'

As his last work, it is natural to view *The Brothers Karamazov* as some endpoint in a long and profoundly thoughtful argument concerning humanity's understanding of the idea of the existence of God and the morality that comes from pursuing such ideas. However, to approach reading *The Brothers Karamazov* as the culmination of Dostoevsky's long and winding path on his discourse of religious morality, would involve an all-encompassing study of his previous works, which is outside the scope of this thesis. Instead, this thesis will only briefly look at interpretations and understandings of the religious discourse in Dostoevsky's previous novels and some of the symbolism, character traits, and themes that are common throughout the earlier works and his final novel. In this way, the changes that occur in these ideas between the previous works and *The Brothers Karamazov* can shine a light on the direction the psychomachia of Alyosha describes in terms of religious morality.

Also, this section of the thesis will examine the methodology of the scholarship around Dostoevsky's work and the many influences on his work that have been noted by a range of different critics. Through this, it will set up the central argument in the

thesis that these influences are also continuously seen in Dostoevsky's final work, and that they contribute to the portrayal of the youngest Karamazov brother as being pulled towards a morality defined by his own religious understanding.

The first part of this is to examine the multiple opinions and outlooks on the subject of religious morality throughout Dostoevsky's works, which have always been a much-debated topic of discussion, especially regarding his later books. It has become a subject of even more debate in more recent scholarship, with some critics moving towards a theophanic criticism, while others find the method too limiting or even self-fulfilling. In discussion of this type of criticism, in the introduction to *Dostoevsky Studies 13,* Susan McReynolds states: "Theophanic criticism currently enjoy[ing] great popularity among Western and Russian Dostoevsky critics" but that it is also one of the "most influential critical approaches" (6-7). Authors who are seen to use this methodology, such as Robin Feuer Miller and Carol Apollonio are mentioned here (and will be discussed in the latter stages of the thesis) as are also critics who oppose it, such as Steven Cassedy and Rudolph Neuhauser who "cautions against a trend in Russian Dostoevsky scholarship towards stripping away the artistic dimensions of Dostoevsky's texts" (8).

There was a vast array of Western intellectual thought being transfused into Russia during the early and mid-nineteenth century. Received wisdom about religion tended to point a Russian intellectual of Dostoevsky's generation in the direction of one of two main sets of thinking: firstly, the humanistic line of thought that produced Feuerbach and the many "Lives of Jesus," or, secondly, a very "Slavophile, nationalist

view of Russian Orthodoxy as the lone true system of religious belief on earth" (Cassedy 115). Their influence on the movement of Dostoevsky's spiritual and philosophical thinking cannot be denied. Philosophers such as Hegel, Nietzsche, and Kant were discussed in the main centers and literary circles of Russia. Javro Lankin, in 'A Note on Dostoevsky and Nietzsche' tells us that Dostoevsky was "a follower of the atheist Belinsky, but also joined the Petrashevsky circle," two influences that would have been very aware of the radical intellectual thought coming from Western Europe (3). In his book *Dostoevsky's Religion*, Steven Cassedy states that "any Russian who came of age in the 1840s might have thought about these questions and issues with religion. Many of them were framed by West European, Primarily German thinkers" and goes on to say "others were framed by Russian thinkers who were either directly borrowing from Western European thinkers or adapting ideas of these thinkers to their own national context" (27). Socialism, Nihilism, as well as Nietzsche's famous statement "God is dead," were all ideas Dostoevsky would have grappled with in his conversations and communications with friends and in the greater literary circles of the time.

Regarding the author's position on God and Man, or, conversely, what the author says about God and Man, Dostoevsky saw "the significance of religious issues for the intelligentsia of the 1900s" and he intuited "the inner contradictions of their religious belief and their incompatibility with the more forthright piety of the established church" (Bird 20). But also, for Dostoevsky, this philosophical debate transformed into a conflict that was between the new thoughts of the period dictating that God is dead, or that humanity invented God, and his strong Orthodox Christian beliefs. The tangled mess

that is often perceived to be his beliefs, as Cassedy references that “we can never pin him down to a consistent set of beliefs,” can be ascribed to this large influx of thought during a flourishing period of intellectualism in Western Europe and while Russia is clinging to the set of very Russian Christian Biblical interpretations (114). Cassedy also tells us of the author’s “relationship with Russia’s reigning progressive literary [...] critic of the 1840s, Vissarion Belinsky [...] [who] read much of the philosophy that was in vogue among Russian intellectuals during the 1830s and 1840 and discussed it with Dostoevsky” (42). But from Gerald J. Sabo, in “The Dream of a Ridiculous Man: Christian Hope for Human Society,” he states how Dostoevsky kept a copy of the Russian New Testament by his bedside and that the “significance of the New Testament during those four years was confirmed by Dostoevsky’s (second) wife as well as its role in his life until the very day of his death” (49).

Dostoevsky saw “the significance of religious issues for the intelligentsia of the 1900s” and he intuited “the inner contradictions of their religious belief and their incompatibility with the more forthright piety of the established church” (Bird 20). This understanding of the two opposing sides of religious morality played a major role in Dostoevsky’s themes in his novels.

These two polar opposite philosophies form a kind of psychomachia, tugging between Dostoevsky’s search for truth and his belief in the Russian Orthodox idea of Jesus Christ as the saviour. In ‘Fyodor Dostoevsky and Friedrich Nietzsche: Power/Weakness,’ Ekaterina Poljakova mentions that, though Dostoevsky strongly believes in “Christian truth, he also found himself profoundly affected by a rival

perspective in the world - the truth of its scientific-atheistic interpretation," while Caryl Emerson states that the novel has "on the one side, the Holy Spirit, moving through the detached and unfamilied Zosima [...] And on the other side, human beings who in Mikhail's judgment also represent a living truth" (Poljakova 122; Emerson 155).

It is this intersection, or this overlap, between the humanistic and the devotional that is where any understanding of Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* must come from. It is in the clash between "God is dead" and Jesus Christ as "the way, and the truth, and the Life" (John, 14.6) that we can hope to seek a fuller understanding of the direction the discourse on religious morality takes through his final novel. Much like Alyosha in *The Brothers Karamazov*, Dostoevsky had a dual understanding of morality and had to combine and fuse aspects of each, as well as discard what, deep down, did not gel with his own understanding to come up with his own answer to the religious and moral struggle of his role as well as all humanity's role on this earth.

A lot of the struggles Dostoevsky might have faced when coming to terms with his own understanding of God and religion would have been in working through the permeating ideas that either God is dead or that he was only a manifestation of human consciousness in the first place. Hegel was someone that Dostoevsky sought out, as evidenced in letters to his brother asking for copies of the philosopher's work. According to Cassedy, Hegel "more than anyone was responsible for reducing religious experience to a phenomenon of human consciousness" (33). He also would have been aware of Schleiermacher in circles that discussed the ideas of Nietzsche, whose philosophy was that "the essence of religion is neither thinking [that is, metaphysics] nor

acting [that is, morality], but intuition and feeling" and "there can be no God without the world" and also Kant, who put it more bluntly, "the saviour is nothing more than an idea formed in human reasoning" (Cassedy 31-32).

But pulling against these thoughts Dostoevsky had his robust Orthodox upbringing and beliefs. Carol Apollonio tells us that "Fyodor Dostoevsky was a Russian Orthodox believer for whom the image of Christ was a 'symbol of faith' so powerful that he would choose it over proven truth" (23). These beliefs were not only in Christ as the saviour, but two other convictions which the author had with him throughout his life. The first was in the power of icons, as Apollonio says: "Eastern Orthodoxy, of course, gives primacy to the icon as a conduit to religious experience" and also of the Bible as the true word of God and capable of enabling prophecy (28). Dostoevsky had his New Testament by his bedside and would turn to random pages and interpret them as prophecy dictating what would happen in his life that day. Sabo tells us that on the day of his death, Dostoevsky, after being read a passage from Matthew's Gospel, "concluded that he was going to die, and his wife should not hold him back from this happening" (48). Jones states that the author's last novel is a situation where the "extremes of religious faith and atheistic conviction appear to have reached stalemate" (103).

However, rather than an apparent stalemate between the two, they act as catalysts to form a new type. As Cassedy later notes about the novel, it is "clearly fundamental to religion [...] but bears no peculiar connection with Dostoevsky's own native tradition" (146). Rather, it is describing how "man will be reborn definitively [...]

into another nature" (117). This pulling apart from two sides of the author's ideas and beliefs on God and religion is the psychomachia that leads Alyosha down his path of understanding his own religious ideas and morality. But even though a new type is formed, it still holds aspects of both the old Orthodoxy and the new intellectual atheism as well as the unique Russianness that permeates throughout Dostoevsky's novels. Apollonio describes how "Linda Ivanits demonstrates the centrality of the charitable impulse in Dostoevsky's novels and traces its roots to the religion of the common people" (32). Even though Futrell mentions that Dostoevsky's "sensitivity to the emotional, aesthetic and visionary aspects of religion overcom[e] his Christian and Russian exclusiveness," which agrees with the idea of a new type being formed, Lavrin also states in "A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky" that the author was "still tormented by the old doubter or skeptic in him, he clung [...] to Slavophilism and to the kind of rootedness in the native soil" (Futrell 3; Lavrin 169). Moreover, he notes that religious and psychological perspectives of both the modern and pre-modern world of Russia and other parts of the world to discover that the traditions or ideas indigenous to the writer's native Russia, surprisingly, are not always the dominant ones (Lavrin 191). Apollonio tells us that his "protagonists embody prototypes from the Gospels, the lives of saints, folklore, and patristic literature, but they are also quintessentially mid-nineteenth century Russians" (24). So Alyosha, is being formed, from the semblances of the previous types that it is moulded. He is a new Russian everyman, with a new conceptual understanding on what ideas and morals will form the basis for modern thinking. As Bird says,

“Dostoevsky’s goal was [...] to deepen and strengthen the very fact of individual consciousness and being in Russia” (Bird 24).

Along with this is Dostoevsky’s anxiety “to demonstrate such simultaneity in humanly embodied secular narrative” (Emerson 171). It is in this account that the author portrays “a proper mix within it of philosophy and faith” in which the new type of Everyman emerges (172). This pulling apart from two sides of the author’s ideas and beliefs on God and religion is the psychomachia that leads Alyosha down his path of understanding his own religious views and morality. The psychomachia brought forth by the two distinct types of his brothers compels a new understanding of how life must be lived. In ‘The Passion of Dmitri Karamazov,’ Carol A. Flath mentions that Dostoevsky “suggests the impossibility of earthly justice but compensates for this harsh truth through a vision of transcendent joy” (584). This thesis suggests that more than just compensating for lack of earthly justice, this transcendence is more of a new type of religious position that is proposed through the discourse of religion in the novel. The ultimate psychomachia of the novel, manifested in Alyosha, is the guide to religious morality *The Brothers Karamazov* delivers. Alyosha’s pathway shows a belief in the spiritual goodness of Christ, mixed with a need to actually live his life in this world and seek spiritual fulfilment whilst still here on earth. As Zosima says, “what is the word of Christ without an example” (Dostoevsky 267).

A much more worldly type of understanding comes from this pressure cooker of the radical western thought and old Orthodox values. It is “precisely the anguished ambiguities of faith” that lead to this formation of a new morality (Lesic-Thomas 776).

The new understanding is one of a paradise that can be lived on earth, without waiting for paradise after death. Futrell in 'Buddhism and The Brothers Karamazov' states that there are "some features of the book [that] bear comparison with certain aspects of Buddhism" while Harrison in 'The Numinous Experience' says that "Dostoevsky's major novels converge around the ruling idea of personal transformation [...] it intimates a nascent awareness of a higher self that coheres with the integral vision of transcendence" (Futrell 1; Harrison 388). This, combined with Robert Bird telling us "Dostoevsky's goal was [...] to deepen and strengthen the very fact of individual consciousness and being in Russia," captures Alyosha's newly formed understanding at the end of the novel, where brotherly love supersedes all else (24).

The thrust of this thesis will be that this outlook is arrived at through the psychomachia Alyosha endures from his two brothers. Furthermore, this thesis will maintain that these brothers were both written as character types, very similar to the ones later described in Nietzsche's *The Genealogy of Morals* and that the religious discourse in *The Brothers Karamazov* culminates with the creation of a new type, a modern Everyman for a particularly Russian point of view. This new Russian Everyman is, of course, Alyosha, and he represents the pathway that is needed to be taken for a new religious morality to come into existence. Malcolm Jones points this out in saying that Dostoevsky's "work is not 'permeated' with the spirit of Orthodoxy. They do all, in different ways, show the presence of new shoots of faith appearing in the atheistic gloom" (152).

There are distinct moments in the novel when the beliefs of Orthodoxy are either shown in a ridiculous light or strongly questioned. This questioning often occurs in the first part of the novel, especially in the monastery where the monks are divided over specific issues or shown to be quite petty. Many of the monastery's inhabitants form factions against the idea of Zosima's being an elder, while others show fanatical devotion by fasting or remaining in solitude or even by claiming to see demons everywhere. These questioned ideas are highlighted by the fact that, instead of the miraculous preservation of Zosima's body that many were expecting as a sign of his sainthood, the monk's body decays more quickly than others and very soon lets off a distinct foul odour. Yet, with the intellectuals in the novel, Ivan, who goes mad, Smerdiakov who kills himself and the smug lawyers and atheists like Muisov, Western philosophical thought is not shown to be the answer either. Dostoevsky wrote that atheism "could not be disproved point by point; to counter it, an entire 'artistic picture' was required" (Emerson 155).

All of these portrayals are important as they form the background for Alyosha's traumatic upheavals as he makes his way into the world. Zosima sends him out into the world and on the religious quest to find himself and his religious moral position. Both his legitimate brothers represent two sides pulling at his beliefs and ideas the same way Dostoevsky was. Ivan, the intellectual and debater on religion, God, and the futility of it all, can be seen to represent the philosophers and thinkers whose thought pervaded the intellectual circles of Russia during his formative years. He represents the radical new thinking that "took Western Europe's spiritual relativism to the next level" (Cassedy 47).

Whereas, Dimitri is the passion, and the feeling; he is the man who acts and speaks in wild rage or love torn desperation. He represents the belief side, the part of a religion that does not come from rational thought or informed debate, but the feeling and intuition that Schleiermacher dismissed so easily. He has the mad revelations, like in the Gospel of Matthew, "through which God speaks to humans with positive life-changing messages" (Sabo 49). Through being pulled on both sides by his familial psychomachia, Alyosha comes to his path, that of a content almost blissful serenity with the world and his place in it. Grigori Pomerants says it best: "Dostoevsky believed in universal harmony, on earth" (23).

"On earth" is important to the new Everyman that is formed. The idea of waiting for death to find spiritual unity is cast aside in *The Brothers Karamazov*. In the Orthodox model, there is a distinct difference between life on earth and a heavenly paradise; there is a "qualitative difference between this side and that" (Cassedy 123). In place of "the state of fusion and synthesis where the I is annihilated" is an ability to acquire an inner peace and transcendence here on earth, while still living (120). Unlike in previous novels, the idea of transformation into a nothingness or non-entity is discarded. This transformation is best shown in the idea of epilepsy, which was described in previous novels to represent characters who are capable of achieving a transcendence on earth, but only at the cost of their own consciousness or the obliterating of the "I." Prince Myshkin in *The Idiot* is the perfect example of this. However, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, the epileptic fit is discarded as a means of transcendence. Rather, it is used as part of the ploy that Smerdiakov enacts in order to

murder Fyodor Pavlovich. It is also apparent in the lack of any mention of visions or miracles by any credible character in the novel. Much like Nietzsche's goal to "breed a slow and severe constitution, impervious to being overwhelmed by new stimuli" that Simon Townsend describes, *The Brothers Karamazov* moves away from this idea of instant transformation and into the idea of a blissful love here on earth. (Townsend 10). Gone is the "hysteric [...] devoid of unified and strong character" in place of the ability to obtain paradise here on earth, through an ability to take on the sins of your brothers, and an unconditional love (6).

As Caryl Emerson tells us, "the emphasis is on man's psyche rather than on God's grace" (158). The ability to reach enlightenment and peacefulness in this life to attain that god-like state of bliss, is where the novel takes us. Rather than seeing our earthly lives as being either devoid of any religious meaning and therefore morality, or as being a game of waiting for the next life to enjoy spiritual peace, *The Brothers Karamazov* takes us on its journey to display a unique new stance, forged through the world of the old types and thinking. Malcolm Jones understood this when he described this overwriting of the old understanding thus; it is "the idea of the sacred, an awakening to a previously hidden or suppressed reality that is superordinate to the established secularism of the modern mind" (398).

This awakening is an understanding that it is here on earth that the rewards of paradise are to be found, not in another realm where one must lose oneself in order to gain entry. The new religious morality that is displayed is one of an active love for everything and everyone. This active love is why Emerson says that the "irrational

recovery of the ability to love was Dostoevsky's most precious point of faith" (157). However, as Poljakova tells us, "the all-encompassing guilt of the world is to be acknowledged" (130). Also, one must make oneself responsible for the guilt of the world. This is akin to Alyosha's understanding of accepting the world and its weaknesses, while still being able to move forward on a path of peace and love. A new morality and understanding must be born, and this is why it is that Alyosha is the true hero of the story. After all, it is his journey to discover for himself what his religious outlook must be that is the heart of the novel. It is through him, starting with his leaving the monastery at the request of Zosima, that we can trace a path of struggle mixed with passion and fraught with opposing ideas that lead to this new religious morality. Emerson mentions that Roger Anderson calls Zosima "surely eccentric as a Christian monk but fully persuasive as a mystical pantheist" with a "cosmic interconnectedness" (165).

This idea of interconnectedness would not be new to many of Orthodox faith. Furthermore, the idea that we are all guilty and that only an active, everyday love could overcome was not a novelty. Justin White in 'The Russian Orthodox Response' tells us how the great critic and Orthodox Church leader, Father Serge, says that "most members of the Orthodox tradition would read Dostoevsky and claim that he is Orthodox" (1). However others, like Lesic-Thomas, state that "as a number of critics have pointed out, Zosima's and Aloysha's ethics, in its practicality, is not greatly concerned with God," while Apollonio says that "neither Orthodox symbols, dogma, and

ritual, nor the iconic image of Christ figure prominently in the writer's great novels" and that "Christ is absent in image and sign" (Lesic-Thomas 785; Apollonio 23).

So, the novel is not about attaining heaven in the next world, but an understanding that it is in this world that paradise must be found, and to do that, Zosima "speaks of 'touching of other worlds' as a necessary component of our survival in this one" (Emerson 171). Futrell points out that "prominent in Zosima's transformation from military officer to monk was his realisation that 'we don't understand that life is paradise'" (3). It is as Poljakova argues that in "the idea of 'active love' in *The Brothers Karamazov*, the Russian writer wanted to express something different" (135).

Pomerants sums up this new understanding well, which comes from the meeting of such distinct ideas in the novel, saying that "the universal harmony about which Dostoevsky prophesied does not in the least signify the utilitarian prosperity of people on this present earth but rather the beginning of that new earth where truth abides" (23). This is the perception that is built up in Alyosha as he witnesses the travails of his brothers in *The Brothers Karamazov* and is the ultimate new religious morality developed in the novel.

3. Types in Dostoevsky and Nietzsche

"Dostoevsky's heroes can be martyrs for the idea, but they are not in any sense, marionettes of the idea."

- Carl Emerson, "Zosima's 'Mysterious Visitor'"

Seven years after Dostoevsky finished *The Brothers Karamazov,* Friedrich Nietzsche released *The Genealogy of Morals* in 1886. The two seemed to share an understanding of the zeitgeist of the period which was how the morality of society had been shaped by certain "'types" down the centuries. In *The Brothers Karamazov,* Dostoevsky's characters fulfilled many of these roles as types that twenty years later Nietzsche was to define more precisely in his work. The similarities between the more specifically delineated roles of the types in Nietzsche's three theses and the portrayal of the main characters in Dostoevsky's work is a main theme of this thesis. This thesis will be investigating how Dmitri, Ivan, and the Elder Zosima, as well as some of the peripheral characters, all align with a type from each of Nietzsche's three theses and how the third Karamazov, Alyosha, did not. This thesis will show that the two authors shared an understanding of the role of certain ruling types in defining their contemporary religious morality. Because the youngest Karamazov, Alyosha, did not fit into any of these types both authors described, he was, thus, able to display a new path for modern Russian religious morality. Before elaborating on this conclusion, it is first necessary to understand both Nietzsche's and Dostoevsky's use of types in their works.

Nietzsche believed that all people had traits that could evolve in different ways, with certain traits dominating depending on the society that they lived in. This echoed

what Dostoevsky had portrayed twenty years earlier in his work with the lives of Ivan and Dmitri upon their return to their home town in Russia. Both writers understood that the inherent characteristics of people were shaped by the society around them. Both authors also understood that certain attributes of each person were preferred in that type, but did not always come to prominence. The two also displayed a thinking that what was a desirable trait in one breed of person was not always a preferable characteristic in a different type.

However, there were noteworthy differences between Nietzsche's and Dostoevsky's use of types. While Nietzsche penned his three theses as a more scientific discussion of the evolution of society's morals created by specific, defining aspects of humanity's natures, Dostoevsky brought to life characters whose individuality was still hampered by their own defining types. The sides of their personality, which dominated this type, were molded by the different communities they had lived in. The other difference between the two texts is that Nietzsche's treatise outlined the roles each type had played in the forming of religious morality through the centuries as well as his dislike of such a system. On the other hand, Dostoevsky not only uses his cast to perform a mimetic role in characterising these traits, but also provides an answer in the mathesis role that Alyosha performs by defining a new type of religious morality for Russia.

Nietzsche did not believe that a person's nature was the only thing that controlled their behaviour and actions. He also saw that nurture, or the role of the society that a person developed in, was vital in controlling which aspects of a person's type came to

play the dominant role in their life. Dostoevsky understood this also and had illustrated this two decades before in his description of the lives of Ivan and Dmitri Karamazov, as well as the Elder Zosima.

In the preface to his theses, Nietzsche explains that *The Genealogy of Morals* is a culmination of much of the thinking and work up to that date, and that his ideas "have grown riper, clearer, stronger, more complete" (2). The theses are his "thoughts concerning the *genealogy* of our moral prejudices" after he "gave up looking for a *supernatural* origin of evil" (2, 4). These theses investigate "under what conditions did Man invent for himself those judgements of value, 'Good' and 'Evil'?" (4). Nietzsche wants to look at the "real *history of morality*" so that the reader can understand that there is no "*blue vacuum of heaven*" but rather that the whole area of morality is "*grey"* (10). By this he is referring to previous philosophies (in particular "English theories") that have run to a certain script concerning the development of human morality (11). Rather than believing that one suits all form of morality passed down by the institutions over the years, Nietzsche thought that "type facts partially explains the beliefs and actions, including moral beliefs and actions, of the person whom those type-facts characterize," and, even more than that, "which type someone belongs to can (though needn't) evolve over the course of her lifetime" (Alfano 418). This is similar to the understanding Dostoevsky had depicted with his story of the three brothers Karamazov. The brothers wrangled with a society whose morals had been decided by conventions from organisations that only recognised morality based on their own type. This is why Dostoevsky's characters have "rich individuality" and "depart from the typical in the

sense of the statistical average"; they are there to represent how the contemporary Russian world can no longer be constrained by ethics passed down based on a small number of ruling types' understandings of how life must be lived correctly (Bird 19).

The old ideas of good and evil were challenged by both writers: Nietzsche with a "treatise extolling the virtue of a peculiarly anti-modern type" and Dostoevsky with a novel that "creates life, a life in such full amplitude as did not exist before him" (Townsend 1; Bird 17). *The Brothers Karamazov* sees the two older brothers struggle to discover their true selves in Skotoprigonyevsk, where "the remnants of ideological types are cast together in a spectacular, renewing explosion" (Bird 25). Because both Ivan and Dmitri had been brought under the influence of some of the morality deciding types that had dominated Russian society's ethical decisions on right and wrong, they were unable to break free and present "new shoots of faith" and who all but die "at the burning point of (their) inner struggle between good and evil" (Jones 152; Apollonio 20). In writing about Camus's *The Plague,* Lesic-Thomas says that the "reshuffling of characters and ideologies allows for a humanist moralist to emerge out of Dostoevsky's vision" (5). However, this thesis contends that this is what Alyosha did also. It was through witnessing the inner turmoil his brothers faced with the dominant types of their personality that Alyosha reshuffled his understanding of morality to come up with "a synthesis with everything. "Love everything as yourself*"* idea of brotherly love enacted firstly by that great Russian being, the peasant (Cassedy 117). Clearly, Dostoevsky turns away from the mimesis of his characters who cannot break free of society's

morals bound by their types and presents the mathesis effect of the new morality envisioned by Alyosha at the end of the novel.

Both writers understood there was a far more complex and changeable amount of personalities existing in the world. Alfano notes that there is an amazing amount of types for Nietzsche “not just a binary distinction between higher and lower, master and slave, noble and contemptible,” while Townsend tells us that Nietzsche “describes multiple higher types, with incommensurable physiological and psychological characteristics, and that attempts to collapse these into one type obscure the richness of his thought” (Alfano 419; Townsend 1). Alfonso goes on to say that “the vast majority of people’s evaluations are foisted on them by their society and culture” and that “Nietzsche clearly thinks that drives change in the face of social pressure and evaluation” (1). This is why the German philosopher treatises against current moral standings. The contemporary definitions of good and evil and right and wrong were developed by limited sets of types to suit their own purposes and ends. It is these ruling types of military, clergy, landowner or intellectual that has defined morality according to their own limited understanding. They have handed down rules on how to live to the masses of people, without having any understanding of how they really live or who they really are. Thus, the common people are not able to flourish amongst these sets of rules that they don’t really understand.

The most obvious example of this sort of common person in *The Brothers Karamazov* is Fyodor Karamazov’s servant Grigory, who blindly follows the tenets of faith and behaviour handed down to him by his masters, as when he saw his wife dance

and horrified at the inappropriateness of it for one of her station, beats her for the first and only time in their life (Dostoevsky 100). Grigory is the most basic portrayal of a simple type, whereas the two elder Karamazov brothers display much more complex characters. Yet they still battle to establish normal relations in their town because of their non-conformity with the established morality of the time. The Karamazov brothers are, as Robert Bird describes, the "positive types either languish on the brink of rebirth without fully achieving it or perish at the hands of more potent historical forces" (26). Further to this Bird goes on to discuss the creation of values through literature in Russia: "Dostoevsky's goal was [...] to deepen and strengthen the very fact of individual consciousness and being in Russia. Literature in Russia […] inscribes values into culture through ascetic creation" (24). As Ekaterina Polijakova expounds about Dostoevsky, "his writing, in many ways, an experiment with the idea of love, as it is incarnated in the figures of concrete people" and that "it is along these lines that Nietzsche interpreted the 'redeemer type' and this also was under the influence of Dostoevsky" (121, 128).

Dostoevsky does this by displaying the failure of the current morality, embedded in society by a few indistinct types. He portrays this through the simpleminded following of Grigory, but in a more complex way with Ivan and Dmitri, who are two higher types who cannot fulfill their potential. It is only Alyosha, who breaks free of any morality handed down over the centuries who, by "searching for 'a *new* greatness of man, a new untrodden path to his enlargement" emerges as a new type for Russian morality to follow (Townsend 16).

4. Russianness

"'Stay!' cried Fyodor Pavlovitch, in a transport of delight. 'So you do suppose there are two who can move mountains? Ivan, make a note of it, write it down. There you have the Russian all over!'

'You're quite right in saying it's characteristic of the people's faith,' Ivan assented, with an approving smile.

'You agree. Then it must be so if you agree. It's true, isn't it, Alyosha? That's the Russian faith all over, isn't it?'

'No, Smerdyakov has not the Russian faith at all,' said Alyosha firmly and gravely.

'I'm not talking about his faith. I mean those two in the desert, only that idea. Surely that's Russian, isn't it?'

Yes, that's purely Russian,' said Alyosha smiling."

- Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Brother Karamazov*

The Brothers Karamazov, though loved all over the world, is quintessentially a Russian novel. That it can be translated into a moral lesson in so many different countries and cultures speaks to the brilliance of the writing and human morality, without taking away from the unique Russianness of the story, characters, and society that confronts Alyosha and his brothers. In fact, it is this Russian society that both Dmitri and Ivan fail to fit into; it is the lens through which Alyosha sees his brothers' failures and thus develops his understanding of a need for a more loving, living morality that embraces all, rather than the few.

The novel may be looked at through the way in which the two older Karamazovs slowly unwind mentally in this Russian community, but also through other aspects of Russianness which are displayed throughout. The first aspect will be inspected in this chapter by examining the many tales delivered through the novel, many which centre on the speaker's take on morality and goodness. What becomes apparent through these stories is that there is a disregard for life within them, as murderers and thieves are reformed, but the harm left behind by them is not undone. Secondly, the role of monks, wealthy landowners, and intellectuals within the society of the time will also be analyzed here, as the role of the monastery overlooking the town and the apparent strong relationship between these men of God and the townspeople and their morality is active in the book. Thirdly, the sense of the Russianness of the novel will be examined in the attitudes and beliefs of the peasants and other minor characters. This chapter will look at how there is no real clear brotherly feeling of universal love amongst the Russian people in the novel and that this is a spur that moves Alyosha on to his discoveries. Primary among these characters will be the opposite personalities of Smerdyakov and Grigorii, who are the extremes that need unifying, as Alyosha realises. The last part will examine how Alyosha's need for a more active love is deeply rooted in this Russian society, and that it is only through the Russian people that it can be changed. This final piece will examine this idea by looking at the progression of the youngest brother Karamazov's life with the characters mentioned above. Also, the passing of his wisdom to the boys (Kolya in particular) at the stone represents a succession of the new Russian understanding of religious morality in the novel.

In ‘Dostoevsky’s Religion: Words, Images and the Seed of Charity,’ Carol Apollonio expresses the belief that there is a distinct Russianess to all of Dostoevsky’s work. She says that “his protagonists embody prototypes from the Gospels, the lives of saints, folklore, and patristic literature, but they are also quintessentially mid-nineteenth century Russians” (24). Lavrin agrees with this idea, saying of Dostoevsky that although “he was still tormented by the old doubter or sceptic in him, he clung fervently to Christ [...] to slavophilism and the kind of rootedness in the native soil” (169). This sentiment is echoed by Alyosha in the novel when he says “for real Russians the questions of God's existence and of immortality, or, as you say, the same questions turned inside out, come first and foremost, of course, and so they should.” (Dostoevsky 256). Zosima also exhorts to his fellow monks a similar idea based on the unifying of the Russian people: “Is it so inconceivable that grand and simple-hearted unity might in due time become universal among the Russian people?” (352).

However, Michael Futrell, in speaking specifically of the novel, takes this idea further. In ‘Buddhism and The Brothers Karamazov,’ he suggests this same idea, but adds that Dostoevsky tries to go beyond the purely Russianness of his religion, describing “Dostoevsky’s sensitivity to the emotional, aesthetic and visionary aspects of religion overcoming his Christian and Russian exclusiveness” (Futrell 3). This meshes well with the idea that the great Russian writer is trying to develop a new Russian type of morality. The new type is embedded in the character of Russia and its deep connection to Orthodox Christianity but must go beyond the previous restrictions on morality developed by the old orders.

One of the most significant points in which the novel displays the holes which have developed in the old morality pervading the Karamazov brothers' contemporary Russia is in the attitude towards murder and thievery displayed in many stories told by the characters. All these stories end in some moral tale that the speaker feels represents a moral stance at least for some section of Russian society. What each of the tales fails to take account of, however, is that the livelihood or even life of some person or persons has been taken away, and the old morality of these tales fails to account for them. In most cases, the stories are exuberant in the saving of a soul in a future life. None of the stories take into account the damage done to people living on this earth. These tales are the exact opposite of what Alyosha envisages in his theory of a living love for all humanity and a paradise on earth.

The Elder Zosima gives an example of this kind of thinking when he quotes a popular motif from the Bible. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit" (Dostoevsky 343). It is a theme repeatedly echoed in the novel, where life on earth is lived for the joy to be received in the next life. Zosima, nearing death, still believes that the purpose of life is to prepare for the afterlife, as he states, "And now I feel God near, my heart rejoices as in Heaven [...] I have done my duty" (346). Even more glaring is the abundance of stories in the novel which are considered examples of good morality, where a murderer or thief finds salvation after their crime. Though the murderers and thieves are improving their future selves, the tales take into no account the suffering of others that they caused. Emerson tells us how "only the criminal, at the last minute

before his death, selfishly reaps relief" and that "repentance over the murder is a very muffled theme" (162; 167). It seems a "muffled theme"' on purpose, as these stories are used to display the inadequacy of the old morality.

In *The Brothers Karamazov*, there are several stories that portray the goodness of God or an understanding of how the criminal turned his or her life around. For example, one tale starts, "Not long ago in Petersburg a young man of eighteen, hardly more than a boy, who carried on a small business as a costermonger, went in broad daylight into a moneychanger's shop with an ax"; others tell of misused servants slaying their masters, of babies slaughtered, or ex-lovers robbed and killed (827). However, the central theme or reason for these stories is not to establish pity for the victims or to declare that new ways must be found to stop these type of crimes. These tales display the weaknesses in the old ideas of goodness and evil in contemporary Russia. The old ideas include aspects of honour which Dmitri still holds onto when he declares that he may be a murderer, but never a thief.

Even during the trial, this lack of empathy for those who truly suffer under this ethical regime becomes clear. In trying to defend the actions of Dmitri and explain how Fyodor Karamazov's demise could easily not be truly parricide, the defence lawyer tells the following story:

Not long ago a servant girl in Finland was suspected of having secretly given birth to a child. She was watched, and a box of which no one knew anything was found in the corner of the loft, behind some bricks. It was opened and inside was found the body of a new-born child which she had killed. In the same box were

> found the skeletons of two other babies which, according to her confession, she had killed at the moment of their birth (843).

He starts his conclusion with the following question: “Gentlemen of the jury, was she a mother to her children?” (843). As in the other tales distributed throughout the novel, the emphasis is on the individual who perpetrated the crime, rather than those whose lives were hurt or taken by that crime. Whether it be a monk, a poet/philosopher or one of the landed classes relating the tale, none of them dwells on the impact of the atrocity on the victims. These fictions merely enforce the power of the contemporary morality over a real feeling of humanity amongst the people.

These stories permeate the novel and lay one of the groundworks for Alyosha’s revelations. They shine a light on how some of the defining moralities of the time are based around living life for the upcoming life after death, thus diminishing each human’s time here on earth. This idea in *The Brothers Karamazov* is derived from the close connection between the monastery, the monks, and the people of the town, which is representative of all Russian society-- all strata of society have connections to the monks and their religious viewpoint. As Babushkina says, “the novels of Dostoevsky have three distinct characteristics: they are connected to death, they involve the hunt for money, and they establish certain power relations” (538). It is this need for possession and power that are ideas Alyosha rebels against in his revelations.

Foremost amongst the types who cultivate this type of morality in his Russia are his old mentors. The monks of the monastery interact with all layers of society, whether in bequeathing ideas of repentance and the ability to be saved or in debating and

arguing against more atheistic trains within the town. What is essential is that all three of Nietzsche's principal types (the clergy, the intellectual, and the commander) interact with each other and are seen influencing the peasant classes.

The meeting behind the cloister walls is an early example of all the types meeting and a harsh lesson for Alyosha in the ineptness of these ruling strata of society. The reader witnesses the behaviour of Fyodor Karamazov who is described by Babushkina as "a drunkard, debauchee, and voluptuary [who] is concerned only with himself, money, and pleasures" (536). Fyodor Karamazov is constantly mocking and making a fool of himself; the father of the three brothers has come from nothing to be wealthy land-owner and displays the no-good type of person who can prosper under the morality fashioned by the old types. Despite all his antics and tomfoolery, Fyodor Karamazov does make a salient point to the monks about the wealth of success of their monastery. He says regarding their fortunate life, "And who has provided it all? The Russian peasant, the labourer, brings here the farthing earned by his horny hand, wringing it from his family and the tax-gatherer! You bleed the people, you know, holy fathers" (Dostoevsky 94). This concurs with Townsend's analysis of Nietzsche's understanding of "bound spirits" -- those members of society who acquiesce to the will of the more powerful. He states that, "Nietzsche calls them 'bound spirits' to describe conformist individuals who passively absorb the values of their community" and later "traditionally aristocratic societies fit this mould" (Townsend 2). In this scene, we not only have the major types that Nietzsche later defines, but also the first indication of the discontent at the way power has been distributed in the town/society. It is the first time in the novel

the lower classes and their strength is mentioned in front of Alyosha, and it comes at a time when he also witnesses the bedlam caused by all of the types being unable to find a cohesive unity amongst themselves. Interestingly, it is Alyosha's father Fyodor who has moved from the lower classes to wealthy landowner, that speaks this. He is a forerunner of the complexities to come in the novel.

Later, Zosima also confirms the strength of the peasantry but has not moved away from the idea that it must be the monks who help guide them in their morality: "The salvation of Russia comes from the people. And the Russian monk has always been on the side of the people. We are isolated only if the people are isolated" (Dostoevsky 349). It is indicative of the goodness shown by many in the room during the melee, such as the intellectuals Ivan and Musiov, the commander Dmitri, the landowner Fyodor Karamazov, and the various clergy. Despite the discord, none can reach outside of their type and find an understanding that might indicate they need to change their understanding of morality. This meeting is a clear indication for Alyosha that there is something wrong with how his present community has developed. He sees the power distributors who, according to Lavrin, bring "the masses to that infantile level where no problems arise and where, in any case, comforting prefabricated 'truths' are provided for" (169). In this context, the youngest brother Karamazov has his first insight as he falls to the ground outside the monastery. He realises that through ordinary people, true morality will be found. With this revelation comes an understanding of the wedding at Cana, the first miracle of Jesus, which is performed not for the powerful, but

for the common people gathered at a wedding in which Jesus is participating as one of them.

This is the first step in the young monk moving away from the unthinking beliefs of the bound spirits, “so called because they assume their values from habit and unreflective faith. Bound spirits believe they are predestined for a particular occupation, and this confidence and satisfaction in their role in society make them resistant to change and outside influence” (Townsend 4). From the women visiting the monks who fall in ecstasy or slumber in peace merely from touching a priest’s robe to the antics of the courtroom, Alyosha sees the influence of the ruling types over the easily influenced lower strata of society and observes that this is not where true morality for Russia must come from. Hence, the novel does display the types that Nietzsche was later to define, but in a very Russian context and a very Russian character. Alyosha must overturn this Russianness of the old morality in order to invent a new type of all-encompassing love to be lived every day by his people. It is a brotherly love that starts with the idea of never forgetting the good that is in the world and always remembering the times of true friendship and companionship.

It is with what is often called the real people of Russia in the novel that Alyosha begins his description of how life must be lived. Alyosha turns away from the old morality makers and, with his generous heart and spirit, attracts the lower class boys to hear him. Through the great peasantry of Russia, this new understanding must be built up, which is why the examples of religious attitudes amongst them often appear in the book. There are minor stories scattered through the novel, but also there are the polar

opposite religious views of Smerdyakov and Grigory, which mirror, in a way, the attitudes of Ivan and Dmitri.

Early in the novel, it is exposed that Grigory, Fyodor Karamazov's valet, had a significant role in the bringing up of Dmitri, while Ivan strikes up a strange kind of friendship with Smerdyakov, his supposed half-brother, who is also a servant in the Karamazov household. Both pairings have similar attributes amongst themselves, with Grigory and Smerdyakov being more extremely Russian in their attributes. This acts to highlight the Russianness of the morality, as there are flickerings of each of the servants in the two brothers.

Smerdyakov, like Ivan, has a disdainful air about his intellectualism but is even more vehement in his belief that the Russian people are foolish. He says of them: "They are swindlers, only there the scoundrel wears polished boots, and here he grovels in filth and sees no harm in it. The Russian people want thrashing" (Dostoevsky 246). He has an even more extreme chip on his shoulder than Ivan has carried around with him, believing that "I could have done better than that. I could have known more than that, if it had not been for my destiny from my childhood up" (245). Ivan even talks of Smerdyakov in a demeaning way, unaware of the similarities between them. "'He's a lackey and a mean soul. Raw material for revolution, however, when the time comes [...] He's storing up ideas,' said Ivan, smiling" (143). Smerdyakov, like Grigory, is a more archetypal Russian than the brother; he can be paired up against and compared to, Ivan. The unclaimed half-brother reminds others of a painting because of his deep Russian contemplativeness. In the novel, Dostoevsky writes of of Smerdyakov, and his

intense hoarding of impressions and images, describing it as a common Russian peasant attribute:

> "Those impressions are dear to him and no doubt he hoards them imperceptibly, and even unconsciously. How and why, of course, he does not know either. He may suddenly, after hoarding impressions for many years, abandon everything and go off to Jerusalem on a pilgrimage for his soul's salvation, or perhaps he will suddenly set fire to his native village, and perhaps do both. There are a good many 'contemplatives' among the peasantry. Well, Smerdyakov was probably one of them, and he probably was greedily hoarding up his impressions, hardly knowing why." (136).

Townsend says of Smerdyakov that "his goal is to breed a slow and severe constitution, impervious to being overwhelmed by new stimuli," which once again highlights the extreme Russianess of the boy (10). Ivan is thoughtful like this too often, but not in quite the broad way that Smerdyakov is portrayed here. While following Ivan's travails in the novel, the shadow of the more deeply Russian Smerdyakov is always near him.

The servant likes to play word games with theology also as does Ivan with his Grand Inquisitor and other theories he espouses through the book. Smerdyakov likes to taunt Grigory with baffling theological questions like, "Oh, nothing. God created light on the first day, and the sun, moon, and stars on the fourth day. Where did the light come from on the first day?" (133). This passage not only shows Smerdyakov at his atheistic best but also displays the archetypal loyal but unthinking servant that Grigory represents.

On hearing this question, the old valet is struck dumb, and can only react in the simple way he knows how: “Grigory was thunderstruck. The boy looked sarcastically at his teacher. There was something positively condescending in his expression. Grigory could not restrain himself. ‘I'll show you where!’ he cried, and gave the boy a violent slap on the cheek” (Dostoevsky 133). Like Dmitri, who also follows a code of conduct quite blindly, Grigory lashes out at people that are beyond his understanding and do not fit into his code of how people should be. He also beats his wife Martha after he sees her dancing, after which she never dances again. Grigory is the archetypal servant, of whom Townsend explains in ‘Beyond the Myth of the Nietzschean Ideal-Type’ where he states that they “cling tenaciously for years to almost intolerable ‘situations, places, residences, company’ once [Grigory] had found himself in them unwittingly. For clinging to them is preferable to ‘feeling them as capable of being changed. Nietzsche termed this strategy ‘Russian Fatalism’” (10). When he did not seem to know what year it was and was teased by Ivan (in another example of the shadows of Smerdyakov), Ivan jokes that maybe Grigory could use his fingers to count. Grigory replies, “I am a servant,” and suddenly, in a loud and distinct voice states, “If my betters think fit to make game of me, it is my duty to suffer it” (Dostoevsky 754).

Grigory is a more extreme example of the devout but unthinking Russian, as is seen in his often confused understanding of myth and theology:

> “‘Why not?’ asked the priest with good-humoured surprise.
>
> ‘Because it's a dragon,’ muttered Grigory.
>
> ‘A dragon? What dragon?’

Grigory did not speak for some time. ‘It's a confusion of nature,’ he muttered vaguely, but firmly, and obviously unwilling to say more” (101).

Grigory is an extreme example of what Lesic-Thomas describes, citing A.P. Vlaskin who argues that the “true bearers of Orthodox “ethics in Dostoevsky’s novels are in fact the minor characters of servants and peasants [...] who do not ask themselves about the nature of God and his creation, but simply strive to lead a good and responsible life through their love of Christ” (779). However, because of his inconsistent theology and behaviour, Grigory also highlights the distorted morality that has been passed down by the governing types. The servant is not like the other poor peasants in the novel, whom Apollonio argues are “often signals [of] Dostoevsky’s coded images of grace: a squalid garret with its impoverished family, the apparently drunk man on the bed, the rickety furniture piled with rags, the teapot, the crumbly black bread, the ever-present candle, the pale, sickly woman, the down-trodden husband, the toddler, the newborn baby” (34). These are the peasant types that Alyosha will hope can be the saviours of Russia, so as they do not become the confused followers that Townsend describes above. The passage below highlights the plight of these types under the rules set by them for their life by their betters:

However, Grigory decided then, once for all, that ‘the woman's talking nonsense, for every woman is dishonest,’ and that they ought not to leave their old master, whatever he might be, for ‘that was now their duty.’

‘Do you understand what duty is?’ he asked Marfa Ignatyevna.

‘I understand what duty means, Grigory Vassilyevitch, but why it's our duty to stay here I never shall understand,’ Marfa answered firmly.

‘Well, don't understand then. But so it shall be. And you hold your tongue.’ (97)

Smerdyakov and Grigory display extremes of the moralities which are pervading Russia at the time of the novel and help define, in a more obtuse way, how the old moral ideas are not fitting with a new modern Russia. These two provide a more extreme example of the clashes Ivan and Dmitri will have within themselves in their struggles to fit into this world.

Ultimately, it is through witnessing his older brothers’ travails that Alyosha learns what is wrong in his world and society. Alyosha sees both Ivan and Dmitri fail dramatically in their endeavours. The youngest brother knows that they are both good people, with good hearts and capable of great love, and comes to understand that there is the heavy weight of society’s expectations beating them down. Alyosha perceives that in order for good people like his brothers to prosper in a new Russian society, morality and what it is based upon must change.

The Brothers Karamazov displays a stark portrayal of a Russian society whose distinction between right and wrong, and good and evil is not always straightforward. Through the different struggles that Alyosha witnesses in his time after the monastery, he sees the way forward that Russia must go. Alyosha sees that there must be a living love every day, where, even in times of despair, the goodness in the past will still be part of a person’s makeup and see them through the troubled time. This is how all living together as brothers will make a better world. The pure Russianess of his vision is that

he understands it must now start with the old morality makers, which Nietzsche was later to define in his work. It is to the young and those of less power that Alyosha turns to spread his message. There is no better display of this new Russian morality than when Alyosha urges the boys not to forget the death of their friend, and in doing so turns around the understanding of a burgeoning Russian soul in the young Kolya.

In Alyosha's early encounters with Kolya and in Kolya's antics, Kolya is portrayed as a boy who is struggling to find his identity from when he was young. He proclaims beliefs he has heard from others around the town: "'Oh, I've nothing against God. Of course, God is only a hypothesis, but [...] I admit that He is needed ... for the order of the universe and all that ... and that if there were no God He would have to be invented,' added Kolya" (622). While he also, at the age of 13, declares himself to be a socialist to both Alyosha and his friends, and above many of the present modes of knowledge at his school -"'Yes, universal history! It's the study of the successive follies of mankind and nothing more. The only subjects I respect are mathematics and natural science,' said Kolya" (603). He is a young man wanting to make an impact and to be recognised for his talent and intelligence. It is clear that he can be influenced, but not just by any average person. It is people of intelligence and personal authority that he is drawn to such as Ratikin and Alyosha. He even wants to emulate Dmitri at one stage, which horrifies Alyosha. Alyosha declares that this is not the way for the young Kolya, as the type of suffering Dmitri has taken on is wrong.

There is a change in Kolya as Alyosha's good-heartedness influences him more. Kolya recognises the path that he has been on is wrong:

> What kept me from coming was my conceit, my egoistic vanity, and the beastly willfulness, which I never can get rid of, though I've been struggling with it all my life. I see that now. I am a beast in lots of ways, Karamazov' and declares that it is Alyosha whom he will follow - 'There is only one man in the world who can command Nikolay Krassotkin—this is the man.' Kolya pointed to Alyosha. 'I obey him, good-bye!' (631).

Kolya represents the hope of the young Russians who can follow a new path and determine a new kind of morality based on brotherly love, and founded from the strengths of the working classes. Alyosha recognises all of this in Kolya, as well as the heavy influences that have been weighing on his decisions and the direction he wants to take in life. In a simple yet telling sentence, Alyosha sums up his feeling on the new morality to Kolya: "'You are like everyone else,' said Alyosha, in conclusion, 'that is, like very many others. Only you must not be like everybody else, that's all'" (627). Alyosha recognises the connectedness of humanity and how a new morality will come from the common people. However, he is also aware that this time has only just begun, and in order to create a new reality, Kolya cannot be influenced by those who have developed under the old morality rules.

Pointedly, Kolya, after becoming enamoured with Alyosha's kind heartedness, continues on one of his usual jaunts where he teases and tricks peasants, but runs into one who is brighter than Kolya expects. This is an indication for the boy of the potential of these working class people. It can be seen as a foreshadowing of Alysoha's

foundation of his new belief in the peasant classes. As Alyosha mentions importantly near the end of the novel,

> "'It's your luxurious life,' said Alyosha, softly.
>
> 'Is it better, then, to be poor?'
>
> 'Yes, it is better'" (655).

Throughout the novel, the strictures of Russian morality and its failures are seen across a broad spectrum of the society represented by the town. However, faith in the ability and strength of the Russian people to forge a new morality is the outcome of this for Alyosha in *The Brothers Karamazov.* The difference for Alyosha is that this new understanding must not come from the traditional sources of ethical guidelines, but from the people of the soil, the pure blood of Russia who are the peasants.

PART 2

5. Zosima

"Zosima's reconstituted life is overall so placid that we tend to forget how unresolved certain portions of it are."

- Caryl Emerson, "Zosima's Mysterious Visitor"

The Elder Zosima is a much-debated pivotal figure in *The Brothers Karamazov.* Emerson queries if "the elder Zosima [is] a sufficiently vigorous, convincing rebuttal of the 'extreme blasphemy' of the Grand Inquisitor" while Andrea Thomas, in 'The Answer Job Did Not Give,' maintains that "Zosima's teaching is quite vague, even more so when it comes to specific allusions to God himself" (Emerson 155; Lesic-Thomas 786). Steven Cassedy, in *Dostoevsky's Religion*, believes that the monk "in his life has followed the formulaic Dostoevskian trajectory from impetuous, proud sinner to humble man of God" while in 'A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky,' Janko Lavrin states "that his creed is remote from Russian Orthodoxy, representing […] a type of nature mysticism" (Cassidy 136; Lavrin 391). All of these various ideas on the Elder Zosima not only show how the monk's role in the novel has been interpreted in widely different ways, but also emphasizes his importance to the thematic drive of the novel. Whether as a natural mystic, a reformed sinner, or a Christ-like figure, his influence is paramount on the hero of the story, the youngest Karamazov, Alyosha. It is Zosima who, after nurturing Alyosha during his time in the monastery, urges the young man to go out into the world. It is Zosima who sees that Alyosha cannot fully develop his own concept of religious morality hidden behind the cloistered walls. As a result, this part of the thesis

will examine Zosima's role in delivering Alyosha to the fates and whims of his two brothers. Firstly, however, it will look at the connections Zosima has and does not have to Nietzsche's priestly type. The differences and commonalities which he rejects when advising Alyosha contribute to the dynamic and seemingly conflicting discourse revolving around Zosima. Secondly, it will analyze how the monk's life was a mirror opposite of Alyosha's, in terms of the direction both of their lives advanced in.

Zosima has similarities but also strong differences with the morality deciding type of Nietzsche's first thesis ''Good and Evil' 'Good and Bad.'' Unlike Nietzsche's type, Zosima does give considered and rational answers, while also never deeming to speak for others but only himself. Also, Nietzsche held in disdain the priestly caste that would deem to defer to a higher power in reference to discussions on morality and the idea of right and wrong. In *The Brothers Karamazov,* Zosima rarely refers to Christ or God directly but tends to discuss how actions on this earth can have logical consequences for the spirit. Where Zosima does conform to the priestly caste type is in sequestering himself away behind the monastery walls, very rarely receiving visitors, and being held in an almost saint-like reverence by many of the parish faithful. However, his influence on Alyosha, and his understanding that Alyosha must follow a different path, led to the youngest Karamazov's revelation of how a morality based on love and compassion is for the here and now, rather than something that will help one attain the kingdom of heaven.

Part of the reason for Zosima not quite fulfilling the role of a new Russian type was that though he led an adventurous and interesting life, it was a life that ended with

him behind the walls of the monastery. The monk had developed his own interpretation of how life must be lived, but did not apply this understanding in the world, which was his major failing. Thus, he could not break out of the old type. However, by counseling Alyosha to go out and join his brothers, he sets the young monk on the pathway to assimilating his experiences into a new Russian religious morality.

a. Zosima's similarities and differences to Nietzsche's priestly type.

The first way Zosima does not resemble Nietzsche's priestly type was how his discussions were grounded in earthly reality, rather than in metaphysical theorising. The Elder gave out practical advice that would benefit people while here on earth. When he did discuss spiritual matters pertaining to belief, it was following a logical pattern that belief should bring, rather than urging the faith in the first place. Zosima very rarely actually refers to God or Christ at all in his discourse.

While Emerson questions whether "the elder Zosima [is] a sufficiently vigorous, convincing rebuttal of the 'extreme blasphemy' of the Grand Inquisitor," she also tells us that Zosima "allows no miracles, for example, and hardly mentions God or the mission of the church" (156). Lesic-Thomas declares that "in order to attain the blessed state in which Zosima appears to exist perpetually, Zosima's teaching is quite vague, even more so when it comes to specific allusions to God himself" (786). What these quotes show is how Zosima does not adhere to the priestly type of Nietzsche, who felt that "the Church certainly is a crude and boorish institution, that is repugnant to an intelligence with any pretence at delicacy, to a really modern taste" (33). In fact, Zosima is very much in accord with this analysis of the Church. Zosima does use intelligent and rational

discussion when providing advice, rather than advising to appeal to God for miracles. As with the cases of soothing a mother over a lost child, counselling a parent hoping for the return of a son coming home from wars, Zosima does not appeal to a higher power. In the first case the Elder describes what the logical process should be if a belief in God is held and uses this to soothe the mourning mother. In the second instance, he instructs the waiting parent on the many possible reasons for a delayed return and to wait a few more days. Zosima's advice proves correct, and many whisper of a miracle, but it was the Elder merely following a logical thought process, rather than channeling divine intervention. *The Brothers Karamazov* continues to highlight Zosima's lack of reliance on the divine to provide the answers on this world, with a description of his attitude to prayer: "In his fervent prayer he did not beseech God to lighten his darkness but only thirsted for the joyous emotion, which always visited his soul after the praise and adoration, of which his evening prayer usually consisted" (Dostoevsky 173).

By speaking in a rational way without alluding excessively to the need for faith, Zosima did not fulfill one of the main characteristics of the priestly type, that of using unprovable metaphysical debate to put their point across. The Elder based his discussion on actions to take in the present that would alleviate suffering, rather than relying on God to heal pain. When Zosima did speak of reliance on God, it was to urge the listener to follow that faith to its logical conclusion, and thus gain peace from the belief. In this way, Zosima does not resemble the normal priestly type described by Nietzsche. While discussing this way, he was also very humble when putting forward his views. Unlike the priest type of the German philosopher, the Russian Elder did not claim

to be able to speak for others in his discourses. This character difference is important for it leads the way for Alyosha to follow in a more rational understanding of his place in the world. The narrator in the novel describes Alyosha as quite rational-minded as he remarks that “Alyosha, was not a fanatic, and […] was not even a mystic” (14).

One of the chief attributes of all of Nietzsche’s morality creating types is that they presume to be able to speak for the masses based on some outside idea of authority, be it martial, political or religious. It was this higher authority that they claimed that allowed them to enforce their own understanding of morality on the rest of society. One of the most striking aspects of Zosima’s teachings was that he did not try to force people to conform to edicts and dogma. Zosima did not enforce rules and regulations, but preferred to teach through examples and stories. Throughout the beginning chapters of *The Brothers Karamazov,* the revered monk is prepared to sit and listen and let others talk, and let them come to their own understandings. This is so with his stories as well, where he will relate stories from his life, but is content for his listeners to draw their own conclusions.

Emerson best describes the elder’s methods: “His teachings are compiled after his death by a disciple and designed to speak abstractly (without hostile interruptions) to a community of reverent readers, in a voice that resounds self-confidently from within” (156). Lavrin sees in Zosima someone who has moved away from boring dogma to being a teacher who portrays ideas of love through his stories: “Zosima’s teaching has nothing to do with the gloomy and ascetic tradition. On the contrary: it is an affirmation of joy and beauty through all-embracing sympathy and love” (170).

Zosima not only uses his tales to enable listeners to come to their own idea of morality, he also urges that they devote time to reading other similar tales of goodness and understanding. In the novel, he tells some of his devotees that with “the man of God and, greatest of all, the happy martyr and the seer of God, Mary of Egypt— [...] you will penetrate their hearts with these simple tales. Give one hour a week to it in spite of your poverty, only one little hour” (Dostoevsky 324). In this way, instead of lecturing people and instructing them on actions they must take derived from scripture, Zosima does not align with Nietzsche’s claim that the priestly cadre twist words to behold the audience to do their bidding. The German philosopher says that priests are “virtuosos of black magic, who can produce whiteness, milk, and innocence out of any black you like: have you not noticed what a pitch of refinement is attained by their *chef d'œuvre*, their most audacious, subtle, ingenious, and lying artist-trick?” (Nietzsche 49). Zosima explains his humble approach as he relates one of his stories: “Am I worth it, that another should serve me and be ordered about by me in his poverty and ignorance? And I wondered at the time that such simple and self-evident ideas should be so slow to occur to our minds” (Dostoevsky 352). He never wants to be a proponent of the darkness Nietzsche speaks of as we see when Zosima states when serving their flock, “work without ceasing [...] And if you cannot speak to them in their bitterness, serve them in silence and in humility, never losing hope” (357). The monk does not urge his followers to pursue acts derived from someone else’s understanding of godliness, but rather to think and learn from examples put in front of them. Through this philosophy, he wholeheartedly agrees with Nietzsche, who decries usefulness based on ungodly

pretensions: “The standpoint of utility is as alien and as inapplicable as it could possibly be, when we have to deal with so volcanic an effervescence of supreme values, creating and demarcating as they do a hierarchy within themselves” (20).

With his humble approach to his teaching, Zosima defies the definition of the priestly type who believe they have the authority from a higher power to determine morality and impose dogma. This, along with the monk's logical way of discussing the consequences of faith rather than urging blind belief, run contrary to Nietzsche’s type. Zosima’s advice was worldly advice. It was counselling that urged his audience to take worldly steps to gain peace, rather than rely on a miracle. Zosima was a monk who had learnt that it is in this world that true tranquility can be found. Unfortunately, the elder, after moving onto the path towards wisdom, then sequestered himself away behind the cloister walls, thus realizing one of the main traits of the canonical type.

Nietzsche was extremely critical of the priestly class not just for its belief in a higher power and the authority they took from that power. He was also critical of the type for believing they can bestow morality on the people while themselves living a sheltered life behind closed doors away from the travails of the ordinary person. It is this part of the priestly type that Zosima can be identified with, which means that he ultimately fails to define a new Russian morality.

In ‘On the Very Idea of Justifying Suffering,’ Christopher Janaway describes Nietzsche’s attitude towards the necessity to live and be a part of humanity’s trials. He says that “a life cleansed of suffering is not bad in itself for the sufferer, and that a life cleansed of suffering would be incapable of a kind of enrichment necessary for

well-being" (167). But Zoisma's way of suffering is not one lived with the common people. By sequestering himself away in the monastery, which "was a delayed reaction to his brother Markel's death," Zosima fails to use his knowledge consistently to help people in the world and also fails to develop himself more (Emerson 156). In Nietzsche's point of view, he has failed to continue to say yes to life, thus mirroring the very character traits Nietzsche criticizes in the priest type (Nietzsche 43).

By entering the monastery Zosima felt he was freeing himself from the bonds of the world and a kind of morally perfect life, which Nietzsche disputes emphatically. Nietzsche says,

It is true, perhaps, that this instrument which had stood the test of a thousand

> years for the moral regeneration of a man from slavery to freedom and to moral perfectibility may be a two-edged weapon and it may lead some not to humility and complete self-control but to the most Satanic pride, that is, to bondage and not to freedom (25).

Zosima however, in the words of Emerson, "comes to us an already consummated thing, quite 'ready-made,'" and does not develop any more in the novel (157). This points to his mistaken belief that secluding himself in the monastery was the correct decision. Harrison points out that "Dostoevsky's major novels converge around the ruling idea of personal transformation [...] it intimates a nascent awareness of a higher self that coheres with the integral vision of transcendence" (388). Zosima's transcendence ultimately led to his failure, as he did not use it to develop others and himself more fully. The monk himself recognises this in one of his discussions with his

fellow brothers: “From the very fact of coming here, each of us has confessed that he is worse than others, than all men on earth […] And the longer the Monk lives in his seclusion, the more keenly he must recognize that” (Dostoevsky 177).

Overall, Zosima was close to being able to define a new Russian morality, but by ensconcing himself behind the monastery walls, he failed to become one with the people, which is where the new morality begins. Zosima does not manage to embrace a true brotherly love starting with the peasantry and their strength. Although he has many differences with the characteristics of that type, by keeping his teaching grounded in reality and earthly actions, it was this hiding away that ultimately led to his failure to be a true light to lead a new understanding of what morality is. However, like Alyosha’s brothers, whom Zosima sends Alyosha out to be with, Zosima’s failure to break free fully from his type guided the youngest Karamazov on his path to enlightenment. Unlike the two brothers though, Zosima was aware of his failings, and he understood that Alyosha must not follow the path he had followed himself. It was Zosima who set Alyosha on the path to true understanding.

b. Zosima and Alyosha: Setting Forth on the Path to Enlightenment

By enclosing themselves behind closed walls, the monks of the monastery in *The Brothers Karamazov* were not able to provide a true exemplar of morality for the people of the town to follow. Only through occasional visits were any of the town and country folk able to gain any peace of mind from the wise elders. The monastery is full of examples of men who consider themselves the holiest of the holy, whether through fasting or the seeing of demons. However, these same holy monks prove to be bitter,

jealous, and petty and provide no relief for the people of the town. Through their isolation, the priests do not develop themselves either and are stuck in their old understandings of morality which they do not challenge, preferring to ridicule other monk's ideas of religious goodness. It is the knowledge of this that makes Zosima tell Alyosha that he must leave the monastery. The Elder nurtures Alyosha through his time in the monastery, but as his death approaches, Zosima send Alyosha out into the world where true understanding can be gained. As he is understanding his own failings to truly bestow his idea of peacefulness to the world, Zosima sets Alyosha out on a path that is the exact opposite of his own life. Zosima sets upon the path to wisdom and serenity through his interactions and troubles in the world, but then settled into a life in the monastery. Whereas the monk urges Alyosha to do the opposite. Zosima believes Alyosha has gained all he can from his time behind the walls, and now he must go and develop a true understanding of morality the only possible way- by living amongst the people. Zosima says to his followers "when the oppressed, down-trodden, and overpowered say to themselves with the vindictive guile of weakness. "Let us be otherwise than the evil, namely, good!" (Nietzsche 28).

The monks of the monastery prove themselves to be the exact idea of what Nietzsche so disliked of the priestly caste. Although there are many good men amongst the monks, the ones who have the most say or wield the most power are the ones who are self-satisfied in their own sanctity. The monastery is a microcosm of exactly what Nietzsche describes happens when this type are allowed to determine morality. Believing in their own purity, the monks, in general, do very little to guide others towards

enlightenment. Rather, these men of God prefer to moralise about the actions and beliefs of others and believe that their way of life is holier and purer than the others. There is little brotherly love behind the walls; there are mostly factions and followers, and a lot of dislike and pettiness and the taking of moral high grounds.

Nietzsche details his dislike for the priestly caste as having “a touch of pessimistic jealousy, the mistrust of disillusioned idealists who have become gloomy, poisoned, and bitter” which fits very well with the antics and dispositions of some of the more prominent monks in the monastery (15). Alyosha realizes that the young student Rakitin is dishonest and actually a thief at heart, though he proclaims to be otherwise. Other monks join into factions and gossip and complain behind each others backs, but are too petty to speak aloud how they feel. One of the parts highlighting this in *The Brothers Karamazov* is a description of the sessions held by the elder. The “sessions attained no good object, but actually to a large extent led to sin and temptation. Many of the brothers disliked going to the elder, and went against their own will because everyone went, and for fear they should be accused of pride and rebellious ideas” (Dostoevsky 173). There is a distinct lack of humility and goodness within the monastery. And yet, as Nietzsche points out, “they name themselves, for instance, ‘the truthful’” (24).

Other leading monks, who are revered by some, believe in their own godliness because of the frugality of their existence, an existence which does little to help others. Father Fearpoint exists on “4 pounds of bread every three days” and is also believed to be visited by the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove (Dostoevsky 182). In the novel, he is

described as “that aged monk so devout in fasting and observing silence” but also as bitter and “antagonistic to Father Zosima and the whole institution of elders which he regarded as a pernicious and frivolous innovation” (179). Other monks claim to see demons everywhere, which in their minds, implies that they are holier than all the other monks, including the Abbot, who has demons crawling all around his rooms. The glee with which Zosima’s fast decaying body is greeted by many of the monks shows the ill feeling and spitefulness contained in the abbey. Father Losif claims, quite happily, that “it shows that God has not deemed him worthy of such glory—that is the belief in Athos, a great place, where the Orthodox doctrine has been preserved from of old, unbroken and in its greatest purity” while younger monks push and shove to see the failure of the elder’s miracle in death (368). They claim, with glee, that “his teaching was false; he taught that life is a great joy and not a vale of tears” (369). Nietzsche describes it as the monks believing in “hate 'unrighteousness,' 'godlessness';” and that “what they believe in and hope is not the hope of revenge, the intoxication of sweet revenge (—‘sweeter than honey,’ did Homer call it?), but the victory of God, of the *righteous God* over the 'godless,'” when the philosopher clearly believes it is the opposite (50). He portrayed the priestly caste locked away from the world as such:

> They are miserable, there is no doubt about it, all these whisperers and counterfeiters in the corners, although they try to get warm by crouching close to each other, but they tell me that their misery is a favour and distinction given to them by God, just as one beats the dogs one likes best (49).

He best describes this as a social disease that has spread among the priestly caste, of which the monastery is a microcosm in his thesis:

In those cases where the highest caste is at the same time the *priestly* caste, and in accordance with its general characteristics confers on itself the privilege of a title which alludes specifically to its priestly function. It is in these cases, for instance, that 'clean' and 'unclean' confront each other for the first time […] There is from the outset a certain *diseased taint* in such sacerdotal aristocracies [...] in the habits which prevail in such societies—habits which, *averse* as they are to action, constitute a compound of introspection and explosive emotionalism […] consider too the whole metaphysic of the priests, with its war on the senses, its enervation, its hair-splitting (28).

It is within this hostile environment that Alysoha first seeks wisdom and a path to peace. Though he has always been a loving person, it is the Elder Zosima that Alyosha has the most love in his heart for. Through Zosima's peaceful example and story telling, Alyosha starts on his pathway to wisdom. As one of the most revered but also controversial figures in the monastery, Zosima keeps Alysoha away from most of the pettiness within the walls. However, as his death approaches the Elder knows that Alyosha must find true understanding in the world outside the monastery walls. He understands that this is not that place where true goodness is to be found, as the fighting and pettiness is more about claims to goodness than true love coming from the heart. In this sentiment, he shows agreement with Nietzsche's disregard for how the ideas of good and bad, or high and low were developed by this type. As Nietzsche puts it,

> "The judgment 'good' did *not* originate among those to whom goodness was shown. Much rather has it been the good themselves, that is, the aristocratic, the powerful, the high-stationed, the high-minded, who have felt that they themselves were good, and that their actions were good, that is to say of the first order, in contradistinction to all the low, the low-minded, the vulgar, and the plebeian" (18).

The monks in the monastery are a microcosm of this clambering to define oneself as good and others as bad. Only the priests who have gained power and disciples in the monastery can command others to follow their dicta on what is holy. Thus, the Elder Zosima realises the need to send the young monk Alyosha out into the world to truly discover morality.

In the novel, much of Zosima's wisdom was gained from his youth and young adulthood where he experienced many things. It is through these experiences that the monk teaches and realizes that this is what Alyosha is lacking. By acknowledging that it is in society that true learning and teaching takes place, Zosima is realising that he has not fully broken free of the priestly mode. Therefore, Zosima knows that Alyosha must go out amongst the people of the town and most importantly his family. It is this reversal of the path that Zosima led that is an indication that a new type of morality needs to be found, and not one that is determined by what resembles the priestly type.

In the novel, Alyosha has found a love that he cherishes: "The fact is that all the love that lay concealed in his pure young heart for every one and everything had, for the past year, been concentrated—and perhaps wrongly so—on one being, his beloved

elder" (Dostoevsky 40). It is this "and perhaps wrongly so" that meshes with the idea that seclusion behind cloistered walls is not the way forward for religious morality in Russia. Alyosha has not brought his love to the world around him, and therefore cannot influence circles that would benefit from his benevolent nature. Lesic-Thomas communicates that both "Zosima and Aloysha have a practical need to make life more bearable for others," but this need was satisfied in Zosima by his entering the monastery, a path he sees is incorrect for Alyosha (788).

Zosima actually equates Alyosha as his brother, saying, "For had he not come into my life, I should never perhaps, so I fancy at least, have become a monk and entered on this precious path. He appeared first to me in my childhood, and here, at the end of my pilgrimage, he seems to have come to me over again" (Dostoevsky 313). So rather than the brother whose death belatedly brought Zosima inside the cloistered walls, in a reversal of his own life, it is the Elder sending his new found brother out into the world. This reversal of his own path in life emphasizes the need to create a new religious morality, as Zosima realizes the morality that helped create his path is no longer enough for a new Russia. It is a reversal of the old morality that has been handed down to the lower classes. Instead, it will be built up from the Russian peasantry.

From within society, rather than secluded away and pontificating behind walls, it is best described in the following from the novel:

‘What then, you don't believe it,’ he said. ‘You preach it and don't believe it yourself. It will come, but not now, for every process has its law. It's a spiritual, psychological process. To transform the world, to recreate it afresh, men must turn into another path psychologically’ (335).

This creating of the world anew is what Zosima hopes for Alyosha. The Elder hopes it not just for his young student, but also for the whole Karamazov family. A new morality will do no good hidden away from the people.

Thus, Alyosha’s family have already in a way started a psychomachia on him, as it is the incident in Zosima’s cell that sets about the decision Zosima makes. The turbulent meeting involving all the Karamazov’s helped Zosima see that life behind walls was not a way to change the world’s morality. Of this meeting, Emerson comments that for Zosima “this placid, relatively unproblematic life contains one episode that has more than its share of anger, cruelty, crime, doubt, years of awful suffering and unresolveable ethical confusion” (160). This, too, is a direct reversal of Zosima’s life, as it was the turmoil caused in a town that preceded him entering the monastery: “Here is recrimination, the collapse of the family, the falling away of communally expressed love, all capped by Zosima leaving town in an aura of disgrace” (168). Alyosha, however, is leaving the monastery to enter and interact with a collapsing family full of recrimination. Zosima is sending Alyosha out into a world of trouble and tribulation to heal and develop understanding amongst others- to create a new, much needed morality in the Karamazovs. As Father Paissy reminds him, “‘Understand, Alexey, that if you return to

the world, it must be to do the duty laid upon you by your elder, and not for frivolous vanity and worldly pleasures'" (173).

By despatching Alyosha from the monastery, Zosima acknowledges that there are indeed weaknesses in the priestly type. If a new religious morality for Russia is to be offered, it is not to come from within the walls of a monastery. Zosima knows from his own experience that true wisdom comes from being amongst family, friends and other people. It is through experiencing love and friendship, trials and tribulations, and deceit and ill intentions amongst all levels of Russian society that Alyosha can truly see what is needed to successfully live a moral life. By discharging the youngest Karamazov from the cloister walls, Zosima is sending Alyosha out into the world to find his own form of religious morality. In sending Alyosha out to live his life in a direct reversal of his own, the character of Zosima suggests that the priestly type cannot provide a contemporary morality for the people. It is this act that begins Alyosha's road of love and turmoil, as he is cast into the pathways of his two extreme brothers.

5. Ivan Karamazov's intellectual type, and his effect on Alyosha

a. Introduction

Ivan Karamazov is the second of the three brothers and one whose heavily atheistic leanings burden Alyosha's mind. By understanding Ivan as a type of Russian that is similar to the poet/philosopher type from Nietzsche's *The Genealogy of Morals* it is easier to see his role in leading his brother, Alyosha, down his path of becoming a new type of Russian Everyman. Through Ivan, Alyosha discovers new understandings. To better convey the path of Ivan and his influence on his brother, this section of the thesis will be looking at three main points about the middle of the three Karamazov brothers. Firstly, it will examine Nietzsche's discussion on the role of philosophers and poets in creating contemporary moralities, then showing the many correlations with this in Ivan's discussions and behaviour in *The Brothers Karamazov.*

The second part will more closely examine Ivan's behaviour and the possibilities he held to becoming a role model for a new, modern Russian religious morality. This part will include a kind of psychomachia that the brother went through himself as he tried to discover his own truths about the world that the three brothers lived in. After having examined these influences on Ivan, this chapter will then look at the vital role that he played, as one half of the psychomachia that Alyosha experiences, in leading

the younger brother down a path of enlightenment and contentment with his place in, and understanding of, the world.

b. Ivan: Part One – Commonalities with Nietzsche.

In Nietzsche's *The Genealogy of Morals* in his third thesis "What is the meaning of Ascetic ideals?", the writer describes the many characteristics of the thinker type and their role in creating modern ideas of morality, which he feels need to change. Many of these characteristics are portrayed by Ivan throughout the novel. These traits of the poet/philosopher type are essential to the development of Ivan's character and his central role in helping form Alyosha's understanding of his place in the world. It is through the common traits between Nietzsche's poet/philosopher and Ivan that, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, an idea of a new type of religious morality forms and with it, the new type of Russian man that will teach these ideas. There is also a desperation for God to exist while also willing nihilism on the world, a lack of ability to truly love in the world, and walking through life as a spectator rather than as an active participant. These, along with others, will be analyzed to form the core part of Ivan's inability to develop himself into the new type that, I suggest, the novel sets out to create.

The first commonality between Nietzsche's third thesis and the character of Ivan is how the poets' and philosophers' intellectualism is seen as an attempt to pose as being too good for this world as if these thinkers are there to confirm their own existence, rather than to argue for an actual form of moral existence. Nietzsche describes this as "a kind of 'flair' and instinct for the conditions most favourable to advanced intellectualism" and that "the philosophic spirit had [...] to masquerade and disguise itself" (121). He goes on to add that the "ascetic ideal has for a long time

served the philosopher as a superficial form, as a condition which enabled him to exist" (147). Ivan is portrayed this way throughout the novel; he is seen as arrogant by many of the other characters and often leaves people angry or frustrated with his detached manner. He talks of people degradingly, as when he ponders on Smerdyakov: "'Is it possible that a miserable, contemptible creature like that can worry me so much?' he wondered, with insufferable irritation" (293). In his story of "The Grand Inquisitor," his contempt for humankind is evident when he has the title character say, "We have corrected thy work and have founded it upon miracle, mystery and authority. Also, men rejoiced that they were again led like sheep" (282). Here we see just how much Ivan is very much like Nietzsche's artistic type, in the way he portrays a kind of "Lordship over sufferers in his kingdom" (162). Moreover with all his talk and tricky wordplay he, "does not deny 'existence,' how he rather affirms thereby his existence and only his existence" (136). Nietzsche goes on to display his dislike for this type of intellectual and the effect they have had on Europe, asking "how many crutches of righteous indignation for the help of these flat-footed intellectuals, how many comedians of the Christian moral idea would need to-day to be exported from Europe, to enable its air to smell pure again?" (206). This righteous indignation mirrors Muisov's indignation at the airs Ivan puts on when discussing morality and religion. Muisov indeed feels scorned by the arrogant intellectual, as do others when trying to have discussions with him; the other characters in the book can feel Ivan's dividing of people into realms of "higher" and "lower," of which the middle brother Karamazov obviously holds himself in the first category while putting most others in the latter. He fulfils Nietzsche's poet/philosopher character type

well: “The ascetic scorn of one’s own reason making this decree, there is a domain of truth the higher must not degrade itself to be the tool of the lower” (161). As a part of this posing and demanding part of Ivan’s character, he is often seen as only a spectator of the world, another trait Nietzsche discusses explicitly in his third thesis.

Ivan looks at the world with an aloofness that frustrates and maddens other characters in the book. In agreement with this artist type portrayed in Ivan, Nietzsche tells us that the artist “only considered art and beauty from the standpoint of the spectator, and […] thereby imperceptibly imported the spectator himself into the idea of the ’ ‘beautiful’”(130). He also mentions that “we get from our philosophers, from the very beginning, definitions on which the lack of a subtler personal experience squats like a fat worm of crass error” (130). Nietzsche talks of this type being “excluded” from life by their own reason (152). This exclusion of oneself from the life around one is a characteristic that Ivan displays throughout the novel, where he displays his cold nature and his “cold smile” (Dostoevsky 285). Miusov is also highly frustrated by this nature of Ivan’s: “He had had intellectual encounters with Ivan before and he could not endure a certain carelessness Ivan showed him” (60). In “Beyond the Myth of the Nietzschean Ideal-Type,” Simon Townsend tells us of Nietzsche’s artist type that “his relationship with the community is not always harmonious” (7). Ivan is constantly staring off into the distance or coldly walking away from people. “Ivan shrugged his shoulders contemptuously, and turning away stared at the road. Moreover, they did not speak again all the way home” (Dostoevsky 97). Based on Nietzsche’s harmonious description

of the thinker type, Ivan is a man who is “not easily disturbed by enmity, he likes not to be disturbed by friendship […] a type which forgets or despises easily” (Nietzsche 140).

This progress of Ivan is mirrored precisely by Nietzsche who speaks of “a self-negation and self-elimination on the part of the artist, who till then had devoted all the strength of his will to the contrary, namely, the highest artistic expression of soul and body” (125). By being only a spectator in the world, one who eliminates part of himself from participating in society, Ivan denies himself the ability to love or was possibly never capable of it in the first place.This lack of a real ability to love is a central theme in Nietzsche’s third thesis and is essential to Ivan’s role in “*The Brothers Karamazov”*. Ivan displays this lack when he says that, “It is a shame to be happy! There is too much misery” (160). Nietzsche tells us that in this type, “there exists a real irritation and rancour on the part of philosopher towards sensuality”and that “the ascetic priest himself will scarcely prove himself the happiest champion of his own ideal” (134, 149). From early on in his childhood, Ivan had been this way in that he “struggled with poverty for his first two years in the university, maintained himself by his own efforts, and had from childhood been bitterly conscious of living at the expense of his benefactor” (Dostoevsky 16). Nietzsche talks of the “the elimination of the will altogether, the switching off of the emotions all and sundry” (153) which agrees with Fyodor Karamazov’s description of his son: “But if Ivan loved him, I should be afraid for myself at his loving him. But Ivan loves nobody. Ivan is not one of us. People like Ivan are not our sort, my boy. They are like a cloud of dust.” (Nietzsche 153; Dostoevsky 190).

Ivan is not only bereft of the ability to love, but he also does not see beauty in life the way Dmitri and Alyosha do. He is like the artist-genius that is made possible by “the ability not to react to stimuli” (Townsend 2). He fits Nietzsche’s idea of the artist who does not know of the magic of love and “can even look at female statues “without interest” (131). Ivan defines this part of his nature well when explaining his idea of what it means to be alive: “‘I know that I am only going to a graveyard, but it's a most precious graveyard, that's what it is! Love life more than the meaning of it?’” (Dostoevsky 252). Here Ivan is showing how the thinking side of him outweighs the actual living of life. In “Fyodor Dostoevsky and Friedrich Nietzsche: Power/weakness,”Ekaterina Poljakova explains this lack of love in Ivan well. She says that, “although speaking in the name of love, he suddenly observes that he is utterly unable to understand how Christ’s commandment to love one another’s neighbour could ever be fulfilled” and that “for Ivan as well as for Nietzsche, the impossibility of neighbour-love follows from the questionable nature of compassion” (Poljakova 124-125). By being denied any real form of love from an early age and by throwing himself into his studies and concentrating on his mind while ignoring his heart, Ivan seeks other forms of satisfaction, which ultimately lead to his downfall. One of the main protagonists of his downfall is his inability to understand fully himself what his position on religious morality is, in other words, if indeed a God exists, or if the world is nothingness.

Ivan revels in these polar opposites. At different times in the novel, he describes wishes for a total nothingness for humankind, then also displays a desperate need for

God to exist. These polar opposites are often described in Nietzsche's thesis. He mentions how, as an artist “he would sooner will nothingness than not will at all,” and Nietzsche also says the artist “talks of their peace in nothingness” (121). Whereas, the philosopher/artist “became now an oracle, a priest […] from henceforward he talked not only music, did this ventriloquist of God, he talked metaphysic” (130). What Nietzsche is saying about this type is that they not only have these polar opposites, conflicting views within themselves of the world, but that they are a vital part of them. In fact, they revel in the juxtapositions. He tells us how “they worship that painful and superfluous contrast”and that the artist/philosopher type will constantly be “veering round into his own opposite” (123, 122).

These fundamentally contradictory parts are something we see in Ivan consistently throughout the book. In his introduction in *The Brothers Karamazov,* both lay people and clergy think that his thesis is supportive of their side of the argument: “What was most striking about the article was its tone and its unexpected conclusion. Many of the Church party regarded him unquestioningly as on their side. And yet not only the secularists but even atheists joined them in their applause.” (Dostoevsky 11). Both in his actions and his talk, the poet/philosopher brother prevaricates, is often uncommitted, and does not have a firm sense of his moral understandings, especially religious ones. In relation to this type mentioned by Nietzsche, “some sagacious persons opined that the article [Ivan’s thesis] was nothing but an impudent satirical burlesque” (11).

In the book, Ivan is also unable to truly decide a position for himself on the world's morality, which is the result of the type's inability to have a true grasp of religion. In his talks with his youngest brother Alyosha, Ivan denies the existence of God and immortality, but also says, "'It is not that I don't accept God […] it's the world created by him I don't and cannot accept" (279). Sometimes he is clear that on his beliefs:

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

'There is no immortality either.'

'None at all?'

'None at all.'

'There's absolute nothingness then. Perhaps there is just something? Anything is better than nothing!'

'Absolute nothingness.' (145)

Whereas at other times he prevaricates:

'It must be the devil,' said Ivan, smiling.

'And the devil? Does he exist?'

'No, there's no devil either.' (145)

Ivan's language is full of if's and maybes when discussing the existence of God and its effect on the religious morality of the world.

Ivan does have what Nietszche calls "an incarnate wish for an existence of another kind, an existence on another plane" (155). In "The Answer Job did not give: Dostoevsky's *Brat'ia Karamazovy* and Camus's *La Peste*" Andrea Lesic-Thomas argues that "Ivan's morality […] is intensely Christian; his God is deeply involved in human

affairs and responsible for the wickedness of mankind" (788). This goes against the deeply atheistic discussions Ivan has and points to the weaker side of his personality coming out. Again, despite his declarations that there is nothing and life is pointless, Ivan shows his need for something more when he says to Alyosha, "The centripetal force on our planet is still fearfully strong, Alyosha. I have a longing for life, and I go on living in spite of logic" (Dostoevsky 252). He has that same clash that Dostoevsky had in his own life, as Grigori Pomerants describes, when discussing Ivan's story of "The Grand Inquisitor" that Christ's conversation with the Grand Inquisitor is a kind of analogy of Christ's clash with the truth in Dostoevsky's religious creed (21).

All of this fits with one of Nietzsche's summaries of the poet/philosopher who has "his tendency to doubt, his tendency to wait […] his tendency to analyse, search, explore, dare, his tendency to compare and to equalise, his will to be neutral and objective" (143). This tendency, this prevarication, and lack of a concrete understanding of his own beliefs torment Ivan throughout the novel. This prevarication is also linked with another problem Nietzsche points out in this type that Ivan represents: the inability of the philosopher/poet to see themselves as not part of their own storytelling or philosophy making. They cannot keep their fictions or thoughts divided from their theoretical musings.

This lack of understanding of the separateness of his writing and stories from other roles he should perform or be part of in life contributes to the character's future development down a path to madness. Nietzsche, in "What is the Meaning of Ascetic Ideals?" often mentions the poet/philosopher type's inability to separate their art and

their life. He discusses “the highest artistic expression of soul and body” but goes on to say that it is also the highest expression “not only of his art; of his life as well” (125). Throughout *The Brothers Karamazov,* Ivan displays this tendency to become too intermeshed with his own thinking. It is an integral part of his character and contributes to his other traits, described earlier, of aloofness and seeming arrogance.

In ‘Secrets Dark and Deep in Dostoevsky,’ Dina Babuskina tells us that “Ivan’s secret is a rebellion against God, or, as Albert Camus puts it, ‘against his conditions and against the whole of creation’ (29). Here is a good summary of how Ivan does not merely philosophise about the existence of God and the effect the absence of God would have on human morality. As Ivan is portrayed is mirrored in Nietzsche’s description of this type of philosopher, - “he became now an oracle, a priest [...] from henceforward he talked not only music, did this ventriloquist of God, he talked metaphysic” (130). Ivan really does want to rebel and is not merely talking; he is taking his philosophical discussions onto a deeper level, one that pervades his entire being. With his other attributes in common with Nietzsche’s artist/poet/philosopher type, this helps drive him mad.

Nietzsche says about this characteristic of the type that it is “as though the artist himself actually were the object which he is able to represent, imagine and express” and explains how, being unable to extract himself from his own writings or work, the artist or philosopher type experiences horrors that they cannot reason their way out of (126). Babuskina says that “what Ivan experiences is an existential terror of being something that he blames and the inability to escape his own being” (541). Nietzsche goes on to

show that there are two distinct elements that are common when parts of this disconnect between real life and the fictional life created by an artist develop. They are, firstly, focusing on children, as facilitating the artist's only real ability to feel emotion, and, secondly, that the stories and language of the writer become more disgraceful and erratic. Ivan often only is prepared to discuss his ideas on religious morality through the idea of the suffering of children, much like Nietzsche notes is very common in the morality-spouting philosopher character type. When first describing his understanding of morality to Alyosha, Ivan says, "'I meant to speak of the suffering of mankind generally, but we had better confine ourselves to the sufferings of the children'" (Dostoevsky 260). It is the theme he constantly refers to throughout his discussions and rants during the progress of the novel saying, "'All the religions of the world are built on this longing, and I am a believer. But then there are the children, and what am I to do about them? That's a question I can't answer'" (267).

Babuskina points out that "the most sensitive part of Ivan's rebellion is the suffering of children, the justification of which he fails to find in the Christian religion and the idea of primary sin" and that Ivan would reject the whole world based on a single tear from a child (541). Even his story, 'The Grand Inquisitor,' starts off with a dead child and a mother wailing and pleading for help:

> The dead child lies hidden in flowers. 'He will raise your child,' the crowd shouts to the weeping mother. The priest, coming to meet the coffin, looks perplexed and frowns, but the mother of the dead child throws herself at His feet with a wail. 'If it is Thou, raise my child!' (Dostoevsky 273).

The erratic nature of the writing is a sign of another commonality between Nietzsche's type and Ivan in the novel. It is the idea of the two sides of a nature fighting against each other, which is a significant theme in this thesis and so will be looked at more closely in Part 2 of this section. Nietzsche analyzes that what we witness with the artist/philosopher type is a "vehemence of language [...] and images of anguish and protracted revulsion" (132). Ivan's language deteriorates through the novel, especially towards his father and Smerdyakov, and becomes foul and abusive. His image of the devil is one that personally repulses himself. It is a sign of this brother coming apart and, along with the many previous similar character traits, heightens the psychomachia that affects him so much.

Ivan does develop a kind of psychomachia, much like Nietzsche often mentions in his third thesis. The parallels between the two are often and close. When Nietzsche describes the poet-philosophers in that they find themselves "sinking and living himself into the terrible depths and foundations of medieval soul-contrasts" and how the artist is constantly being torn between two extremes, he also describes how it can lead to the person experiencing a rupture, or a mental break (126). He states that "it will be appreciated that he can at times get tired to the point of despair of this eternal 'unreality' and falseness of his innermost being […] and attempts to have real existence" (127). This tired desperation meshes well with the descent of Ivan into madness through the course of the novel.

As Lesic-Thomas explains that "Ivan consists of two in completely different characters" (784). There is the one side seeking an outlet, seeking a road back to the

orthodoxy of his culture, trying to believe that there is a God, an Eternity, and thus grounds for maintaining some form of morality. On the other side, there exists the stronger part of his personality. This is the side that rejects all in favour of the cold hard light of reason and logic. Ivan is what Nietzsche describes as one of those "beings who are sound in mind and body, who are far from reckoning their delicate balance between 'animal' and 'angel'" (123). Ivan wrestling with his beastly nature often, whether it is throwing peasants aside in his anger, or rumbling with anger and desperate to beat either Smerdaykov or his father. However, after each of these episodes, he is stunned and cannot fathom how he, as such a "high" person, could be prey to such beastly ideas and actions. Ivan suffers from an intense dislike of many aspects of humanity, what Nietzsche talks about as "the product of an insane hate of knowledge, mind and flesh" but also "a curse on flesh and spirit in one breath of hate" (124). His constant mood swings and abrupt changes throughout the novel are in synchronisation with Nietzsche's descriptions of the troubled artist/philosopher type.

Ivan Karamazov cannot shrug off his worldly rationales enough to revel in the glory of believing in God, as Alyosha and Zosima can. This mental struggle that Ivan fails to win within himself is a core part of his failure to become and define a new Russian type, but also what makes his influence on Alyosha so strong. In 'What is the Meaning of Ascetic Ideals?' Nietzsche contrasts this between the intellectual second Karamazov brother who could not manage to find the balance between the two sides of his conflicting inner troubles and the more spiritually guided Alyosha. Ivan constantly snarls and growls angrily, as in these three examples:

"'Philosophical reflections again?' Ivan snarled malignantly" (Dostoevsky 726).

"'Is there a God or not?' Ivan cried with the same savage intensity" (727).

"'Not for one minute,' cried Ivan furiously. 'But I should like to believe in you,' he added strangely" (730).

Ivan "wishes to escape from a torture" with "a spirit who is sure of himself speaks softly," which perfectly defines the difference between the eldest and youngest brothers Karamazov (Dostoevsky 133, 139). Ivan is a direct contrast to the peace and tranquillity achieved by Alyosha. This psychomachia that Ivan goes through, and his inability to cope with it or find outlets for it, bring about his ultimate downfall into despair and madness and displays why he was unable to become the new Russian type for a new kind of religious morality. Moreover, instead of forging ahead as the new type, Ivan falls into a circular trap of thinking and debating with himself that ultimately leads to his madness, which Nietzsche describes "seeks by every means in its power to maintain its position and fight for existence; it points to physiological depression and exhaustion, against which the most profound and intact life-instincts fight ceaselessly with new weapons and discoveries" (154). In one of Ivan's most famous passages, he describes himself and his own thinking behind his drive towards despair and madness:

'I would rather remain with my unavenged suffering and unsatisfied indignation, even if I were wrong. Besides, too high a price is asked for harmony; it's beyond our means to pay so much to enter on it. And, so I hasten to give back my entrance ticket, and if I am an honest man, I am bound to give it back as soon as possible. And that I am doing. It's not God that I don't accept, Alyosha, only I most respectfully return Him the ticket (269).

By failing to discover harmony within the two conflicting parts of his nature, and rejecting anything but cold, hard logic as his pathway, Ivan fails to reach his potential but does act as a guide in Alyosha's understanding of the world and its morality as well as the right pathway for him. Lesic-Thomas describes the clash of these two parts of his personality in a different, but in a congruous way: "The inability to love combined with abstract and intense pity was one of the causes of Ivan's descent into madness" (786). Part 2 of this thesis on Ivan will investigate how close Ivan came to being a revolutionary type. Firstly, Ivan could have been the new Russian type, but for the influences of his psychomachia. This failure represented in connection to Nietzsche's types signals the writer's understanding of how modern-day morality needed to be moved away from the old morals defined and enforced by redundant types. This part of the thesis will then discuss the religious morality Ivan was trying to discover. It will then move to look at the central idea of the thesis, which is that the two elder brothers made Alyosha confront a psychic struggle within himself, through which he identified his own moral understanding of the existence of God. Overall, this part of the thesis will concentrate on Ivan's substantial impact on Alyosha throughout *The Brothers Karamazov*.

c. Ivan: Part Two - His Role in the forming of a New Russian Type

Ivan could have been this construction of a new type of Russian type, but in the end, his personality, split between a desire for a belief in immortality and the hard logic side

of him, became too much for him and led to his madness and delirium. By portraying Ivan this way, Dostoevsky suggests that he is part of the old types that must move aside for the new modern human to pave a new way forward in religious morality, a uniquely Russian religious morality.

Robert Bird, in 'Refiguring the Russian Type,' contends that to a generation, "Ivan *became* typical to a far greater degree than he *was* typical" which lends an understanding to how close Ivan's character was to forging a new type to lead a contemporary Russia into a newfound morality (20). Far from doing this, however, Ivan's inability to escape the trap of reason in his own mind and not create harmony within, meant he failed to reach the potential the two sides of his psychic tussle offered him. Instead, Ivan remained too entrenched in the old intellectual type, a type that Townsend describes as "not only is the artistic genius only one amongst multiple higher types, but he is a counter-productive role model in the context of the specific challenges posed by modern conditions" (2). Despite his constant struggle and obvious torment, Ivan does not find the balance that is needed to elevate himself into a new type of man and remains "one of the previously fixed types of the contemplative man "something he cannot, in the end, bear (Nietzsche 147). Unlike Alyosha, who passes through torment to a new understanding, Ivan only fulfils half of Nietzsche's proclamation that "every-one who has ever built a 'new heaven' first found the power thereto in his own hell" (147). Ivan does create his own hell but is unable to use the other parts of his personality to counter the side of him driving this descent into madness. He gives hints, however, about his struggle throughout the novel, especially when he is talking with his brother,

Alyosha, or when he is contemplating with himself as in the scene where he was taking the train to Moscow. On this train, he desperately wants to be a new type and believes he can be so but is cast into gloom because in his deepest mind, Ivan Karamazov knows that he is never going to fulfil that role:

At seven o'clock Ivan got into the train and set off to Moscow ‘to a new life, new places and no looking back!’ But instead of delight, his soul was filled with such gloom, and his heart ached with such anguish, as he had never known in his life before” (Dostoevsky 308).

While talking with his brother, he hints at his inability to honestly be who he could be, as two conflicting sides of his personality tear him. He shows this confusion when describing his respect for Alyosha, the opposite of himself in many ways:

‘But in the end, I have learned to respect you. The little man stands firm, I thought. Though I am laughing, I am serious. You do stand firm, don't you? I like people who are firm like that whatever it is they stand by, even if they are such little fellows as you’ (251).

Robert Bird mentions how both Ivan and Dmitri both failed in their pursuit of oneness and harmony in their very Russian society. He says “their catastrophe is not merely a personal one, however, for their ideas - the critical humanism of Ivan and the romantic individualism of Dmitri - were ones that inspired large portions of Russian society” (24). In the context of the novel both of these failure to become a new Russian type came through their failings to harmonise both competing parts of their personalities. Alyosha was also influenced by both, and they caused him to fight his internal struggle, out of

which he came victorious. So, in the plot of the novel, Ivan, though not winning his own personal battle, did contribute to the emergence of a new type of human morality in the form of his brother Alyosha's new found understanding of morality. Ivan's influences, however, preyed on his mind too forcefully, and he was unable to find the path forward between the two. These two strong influences on Ivan's character were that which ultimately helped tear him apart as he struggled with his understanding of the world.

These competing sides that added to Ivan's psychomachia were, on the one side, the new western intellectualism, most villainously represented by his probable half-brother, Smerdyakov. Meanwhile pulling against him on the other side was the need for a religious truth that he could not shake. Like his two brothers, Ivan had these influences from an early age. There was a wealthy relative, Muisov, who had travelled to Western Europe and brought back ideas of atheism and modern Western thought. Ivan also excelled amongst the scholars during his time at university. An early influence on the other side was the servant Grigory, the old orthodox follower who often did not struggle with the deeper understandings and problems of religious thought but instead practised strict devotion to the rituals and rules of the Church. Lesic-Thomas, in particular, noted Ivan's mental struggles with the two sides of himself, saying that "the only way one can get Ivan Karamazov out of this entanglement is by pronouncing the banal truisms that contradictions and incoherences are a part of human nature; or by saying that Ivan is not only paranoid, but also suffers from multiple-personality syndrome" (783). Lesic-Thomas also tells us that "just like Ivan, the Job of Jung's interpretation realizes the contradiction between God's pretension to justice and

universal truth, and the reality of his actions and creation" which displays clearly the inconsistencies Ivan is debating within himself (781). There is this very indication from the start of Ivan's prevarication and inability to fully say for sure his beliefs when he reacts to his newspaper article: "Many of the Church party regarded him unquestioningly as on their side. And yet not only the secularists but even atheists joined them in their applause. Finally, some sagacious persons opined that the article was nothing but an impudent satirical burlesque" (11). The article is a great example of the intellectual Ivan not claiming any real position on a topic.

Throughout the book, Ivan is continually wearied or angry and slowly being driven mad. Often, Ivan is contemplating, but not understanding his mood. "There was nothing strange in his being depressed; what was strange was that Ivan could not have said what was the cause of it" (Dostoevsky 292). He also has sudden changes of demeanour, sharp turns in conversations, and abrupt leavings: "'Quite so, quite so,' cried Ivan, with peculiar eagerness, obviously annoyed at being interrupted. Ivan suddenly laughed and got up. His hat was in his hand" (206).

Smerdayakov was a character who confounded Ivan often, and he knew that because he was like Ivan, where "their intellect did affect all this, simply because it was the dominant instinct" (Nietzsche 137). He used this to toy with Ivan's conscience and furthered his depression, anger and madness. Whenever he conversed with this intelligent and dangerous half-brother, Ivan's body language portrayed his intense discomfort that Smerdyakov forced on his intellectual side. Numerous times the second Karamazov brother is angry and confused, where he "sat scowling, both his fists

convulsively pressed on his knees or snarling, ‘That's as much as to say, It's always worthwhile speaking to a sensible man,’ eh?” (Dostoevsky 696, 697). It even brings Ivan to the point of murderous intent: “He let go of the bell and rushed off to Smerdyakov. ‘I shall kill him, perhaps, this time,’ he thought on the way” (701). Babuskina details that it is, in fact, Smerdyakov who in the end drove Ivan insane. She says, “Smerdyakov did not make a public confession, and the only person sharing the secret, Ivan Karamazov, has to lose his mind in order for the secret to remain hidden" (538). Smerdyakov represents the vilest aspects of Nietzsche’s intellectual type. He is the one who has “the physiological struggle of man with death (more precisely with the disgust with life, with exhaustion, with the wish for the ‘end’” and who lives on “on such a soil of self-contempt, a veritable swamp soil, grows that weed, that poisonous growth, and all so tiny, so hidden, so ignoble, so scary” (Nietzsche 154).Here “teems the worm of revenge and vindictiveness” (157). So, it is through the stronger side of Ivan’s personality, under the manipulation of his half-brother, that Ivan is not able to fulfil a role of becoming a new type of Russian, but descends slowly into madness.

In Lesic-Thomas’s understanding of Camus’ reading of *The Brothers Karamazov,* he feels the author sees these brothers as heroically fighting against irrational religious ideas. Lesic-Thomas tells us that “Camus insists on reading [...] [Dostoevsky’s] rebels [...]not as tragic, amoral, faithless villains but as positive, even inspirational heroes of the rebellion of the human spirit against the absurdity of existence and against the God of Christianity" (775). Though Ivan can in some way be seen to be a hero in that he did help steer Alyosha onto his path, this thesis contends that through his inability to escape

the intellectual need of his personality, Ivan does not actually achieve any positive, heroic status at all. His pathway was only able to help lead his brother to a new understanding of religious morality.

In the end, Ivan is driven to madness through sheer exhaustion of his constant internal battle, which Townsend explains as “the more exhausted one is, the more difficult it becomes to recognise the extent to which one’s thoughts and actions are steeped in and conditioned by this exhaustion” (10). And Ivan was exhausted, as the other side of his personality, desiring a form of religious truth to exist in the world, would not let him fully take to the other side of rational atheism.

This religious truth Ivan was looking for is, strangely, best displayed by the character of the devil that he talks to within his delirium and the story of “The Grand Inquisitor.” In this story, Ivan relates how the title character derides the need for a real God, as he understands that people just need to believe while they do not actually need a real God. Babushkina analyzes that “The Great Inquisitor of Dostoevsky announced the notorious formula of the fundamental needs of the human being: mystery, miracle, and authority. This triad is the core of the power over people” (539). Ivan here is showcasing his intelligence while also displaying his struggle with the idea of a moralist God. Ivan lost his battle with himself as he was not able to see past the manipulation of the Church and reach into himself to find the good in his heart that he so wanted to believe in. But he can not believe against his will as he asks, “‘What’s the good of believing against your will? Besides, proofs are no help to believing, especially material proofs. Thomas believed, not because he saw Christ risen, but because he wanted to

believe, before he saw'" (Dostoevsky 720). However, Ivan cannot find the equilibrium that his brother eventually does, as Grigorii Pomerants, in *'*Russian Thinkers on Dostoevsky,*'* explains is needed: "A counterbalance to the Grand Inquisitor is belief in the sense of eternity, a sense we find in the depths of our own hearts in hours of love, contemplation, and prayer" (27). He goes onto explain that "Christ's conversation with the 'Grand Inquisitor' is a kind of analogy of Christ's clash with the truth in Dostoevsky's religious creed" (21). So, Ivan is detailing his frustration of this clash within, while also giving us an indication of why he will not be able to break free from his intellectual atheist side. Like Ivan, "The Grand Inquisitor is plagued by love for humans no less than Christ. However, it is precisely this love that sets him up against God and His promises" (Poljakova 132). The Grand Inquisitor gives us an insight into the tragedy of Ivan, which is the tragedy of being unable to let his heart have more say in the argument for the dominant side of his personality. It is his head that rules here and leads to his downfall.

Similarly, with his visions of the devil, Ivan wishes that the apparition was a more dignified version of him. Ivan still cannot break out of the wish for an old type of religious belief, witnessed here by his desire for the devil to be more sophisticatedly dressed. Ivan's devil, which is the product of his mind, even admits that there is a third presence, that of God. Nevertheless, Ivan himself will never be able to see him because of his type of personality:

'Who is he? Who is here? What third person?' Ivan cried in alarm, looking about him, his eyes hastily searching in every corner. 'That third is God

> Himself—Providence. He is the third beside us now. Only don't look for Him, you won't find Him.' (Dostoevsky 704).

In his own mind, Ivan knows deep down what he secretly yearns for, but also that he is unable to allow himself to go with this side of his personality because of his domineering intellectual side. This is the side that is too strong to allow him to become a new type to display a new type of religious morality. In the increasingly fevered discussion with his devil, Ivan admits to understanding his dilemma and how the one side of his personality is the problem for this:

'Never for one minute have I taken you for reality,' Ivan cried with a sort of fury. 'You are

> a lie, you are my illness, you are a phantom. It's only that I don't know how to destroy you and I see I must suffer for a time. You are my hallucination. You are the incarnation of myself, but only of one side of me [...] of my thoughts and feelings, but only the nastiest and stupidest of them' (721).

So both of these episodes concerning Ivan give insight into the torment that he is going through and also the type of human he actually wished to be. In Caryl Emerson's 'Zosima's 'Mysterious Visitor': Again Bakhtin on Dostoevsky and Dostoevsky on Heaven and Hell,' the author states that "a major burden of the novel is to test the correctness of the Grand Inquisitor's view of humanity" (155). The troubled prevaricating of Ivan and the uncertainty he displayed, despite his strong intellectual side, shows the other side to the argument— the side of a passive belief in God and morality. Ivan's scene with the devil, one of the last in which we see him, shows the dilemma that tears Ivan apart. It is

his desire to, but lack of ability to merge the two into a new type. Ivan's dominant side never lets him understand his potential to be this new type.

Alyosha knows that Ivan "never hid the fact that he wished the death of his father, though he would never commit the murder nor would he allow it to happen" (Babushkina 535). However, Alyosha also believes that Ivan's heart will always overrule his head in this matter and that he is not actually capable of doing it. By witnessing the torments of his brother, Alyosha learns about the world and the trials and tribulations it can impose on people. It is through his interactions with Ivan and Dmitri that Alyosha is able to form his own take on religious morality. He understands the need for a combination of challenging new thinking and beliefs, as well as the older passively accepted faith of the old Russian people. Alyosha, on having met his brother only recently and witnessed his travails, believes Ivan could too: "'No, I am not angry. I know your thoughts. Your heart is better than your head'" (Dostoevsky 680). Alyosha is sure that his brother has it in him to let the side wishing for a religious morality to believe in be stronger than his intellectual atheism. Ultimately, however, Alyosha sees his brother fail, which indicates to him about what side of his personality he needs to let be dominant, while not wholly denying the other side. Alyosha learns more about this witnessing Dmitri's clashes within himself also.

Townsend describes that "the often exhausted mistakenly try to alleviate their misery through psychological and spiritual illusions, rather than paying attention to its roots in their physiological constitution "which properly describes Ivan's progress throughout the novel (11). So, it is an exhausted Ivan that Alyosha despairs over by the

end of the novel. It is an Ivan who had constantly been bringing up these illusions in the form of stories like the Grand Inquisitor and about the misery of children, but an Ivan whose stories never found their way out of the intellectual argument to find some peace at the heart of them. So, by failing to give voice to the Christ figure in The Grand Inquisitor, or properly refute the devil in his discussions, Ivan fails to reach his potential to realise a new religious morality. The effect of this on his brother Alyosha is that it tears at him as he tries to guide both Ivan and Dmitri to peacefully reconcile themselves with the world and their place in it. But, even as Alyosha "waited for his brother to come nearer to him," Ivan declares to him, near the end of the novel, "'I can't endure prophets and epileptics—messengers from God especially'" (Dostoevsky 28, 680). This leaves Alyosha despairing that his brother should be so dominated by the intellectual side of his personality. At the same time, witnessing this allowed the younger brother a sight of a side of the modern world that surrounded him, and Alyosha needed this experience in order to develop his own understanding of religious morality.

d. Ivan's Effect on Alyosha

During the course of the novel, Alyosha's emotions run to the limits in his conversations with Ivan. Sometimes he is gleeful, but often he is bewildered, worried and confused: "'Whom do you mean—Mitya?'" Alyosha asked, bewildered" (Dostoevsky 679). Also, we see Alyosha's beliefs trembling due to his interactions with Ivan -

"His new something was the harassing impression left by the conversation with Ivan, which now persistently haunted Alyosha's mind. At this moment it haunted him.

Oh, it was not that something of the fundamental, elemental, so to speak, the faith of his soul had been shaken" (310).

Throughout *The Brothers Karamazov,* Alyosha is also running back and forth between his two brothers, trying desperately to understand their struggles and help them on their seemingly destructive paths. The role of Ivan in this, especially, confounds and dismays him. Alyosha cannot believe that his brother has such an atheistic outlook on life and desperately tries to help him onto a more spiritual outlook on life that involves a belief in the goodness of God and the world itself. The younger brother constantly discovers things in Ivan that he desperately wishes others and Ivan himself could see: "'I don't know what you are asking me,' said Alyosha, flushing. 'I only know that I love you and at this moment wish for your happiness more than my own!'" (205). Also, he goes on to say, "'I do love you, Ivan. Dmitri says of you—Ivan is a tomb! I say of you, Ivan is a riddle. You are a riddle to me even now'" (251).

However, it is the side of his personality, the side reflecting the new Western thought of the times, that continually wins within Ivan, even though Alyosha tries his best to counter his arguments. Emerson notes that in the story of The Grand Inquisitor, it "is armed with miracle, mystery, authority but (as Alyosha notes gleefully) all are fraudulent" (173).

Importantly, though Ivan is challenging him and giving him long pause for concern and the need to consider the idea, Alyosha is able to understand this need for contemplation while still holding onto his core beliefs inside him. He is able to adapt these new ideas into them in order to be able to come up with a religious understanding

of this new world he is experiencing. Ivan's challenging of Alyosha, though it caused upset and often despair in the younger brother, deepened his understanding of the world and how a new kind of assimilation was needed with the intellectualism and atheism present in his world. We see this clearly in Alyosha's discussions with Ivan over the misery of a child:

'But that it was essential and inevitable to torture to death only one tiny creature—that baby beating its breast with its fist, for instance—and to found that edifice on its unavenged tears, would you consent to be the architect on those conditions? Tell me, and tell the truth.'

'No, I wouldn't consent,' said Alyosha softly (Dostoevsky 269).

Though saddened not only by the story and more so, the fact that Ivan considers religion in the light of such theoretical imaginings, Alyosha is able to come out of his meetings with Ivan with new knowledge of the world outside the monastery. He can stand up to the challenge faced by people in his contemporary world so, despite his descent into madness, Ivan is able to move his younger brother onto a path of new understanding.

This descent into madness spurred on by the manipulations of the even more cynically intellectual type of Smerdyakov ultimately shows Ivan's failure to reach an understanding of the new world that is emerging. It is witnessed with fright by the youngest Karamazov brother, who often had reactions similar to this one where he "turned rather pale, and looked silently into his brother's face" (689). However, these reactions are used as teaching through which Alyosha can find a new path. So Ivan

cannot become the new type of the Russian world. Although he, in the end, can only be a form of mimesis of the old type of intellectual, his effect is to help steer Alysoha onto his own path, a path of mathesis, where he uses the tugging at his psyche to gain a new understanding, pushed and pulled from the other side by Dmitri.

7. Dmitri Karamazov's Sufferer Type and His Effect on Alyosha

"They submitted themselves to punishment, just as one submits oneself to a disease, to a misfortune, or to death, with that stubborn and resigned fatalism which gives the Russians, for instance, even nowadays, the advantage over us Westerners, in the handling of life."

- Friedrich Nietzsche, ''Guilt', 'Bad Conscience', and Related Matters'

a. Introduction

Dmitri Karamazov is the eldest of the three legitimate Karamazov brothers. Like the middle brother Ivan, he has a large bearing on the youngest brother's journey once Alyosha leaves the monastery. Also like Ivan, Dmitri's behaviour causes concern and despair within Alyosha, but ultimately teaches the youngest Karamazov brother important lessons about life and how it needs to be lived. Dmitri is on the other side of Alyosha's psychic struggle from Ivan. Whereas Ivan's struggle was against a cold and atheistic nature that did not let him release the full potential of his more spiritual

yearning, Dmitri's struggle was against his passionate and impulsive nature. He is a man torn between the world of the noble sufferer his soul cries out for him to be and that of the commander type for which he was so respected in the army and amongst his friends. He is the most worldly of the three brothers in that he is the one who takes the most actions, rather than Alyosha, who has spent most of his young adulthood contemplating in a monastery, and much more than Ivan, who spends his time debating with himself and others. In fact, Ivan could hardly decide whether to take concrete action, like his indecision about taking the train to Moscow. In contrast to his brothers, Dmitri is the one that lives his life in taverns and loving women. He is the one who has wild parties and throws money around on spending sprees, and he is the one who yearns to perform noble acts and suffer for humankind. It is this torn nature that his younger brother witnesses. Throughout the novel, although Dmitri's actions cause Alyosha distress, when seen against Ivan's atheistic philosophizing, it helps the youngest brother understand a new pathway that must be forged to establish a way to live in their contemporary world. By witnessing his two brothers' opposite dominating personalities, Alyosha is able to come to an understanding of the type of religious morality needed in this new world. Following from the thesis examining Ivan's role in helping Alyosha come to his understanding, this thesis will now look at how Dmitri let the dominant passionate side of his personality lead him into an unfortunate trial and jail, thus enabling Alyosha to gain a better comprehension of how this world needs to be navigated. By seeing the extremes of the two types, Alyosha realises the new morality must come from the Russian people, and not be handed down to them by these types.

Part One will start by examining the type in Nietzsche's third thesis from *The Genealogy of Morals* that corresponds with Dmitri. In ''Guilt', 'Bad Conscience', and Related Matters,' Nietzsche describes a proud and strong type who wants to make rational decisions. It is also, however, a type that wants to suffer and take on pain for the relief of any of their fellow human beings. Furthermore, the thesis will depict the many correlations that these characteristics have with Dmitri's behaviour all through *The Brothers Karamazov*, specifically between the eldest Karamazov brother and the sufferer type of Nietzsche's second thesis. It will show how Dmitri was like a "man of the bad conscience [who] exploited the religious hypothesis so as to carry his martyrdom to the ghastliest pitch of agonised intensity" (Nietzsche 112). Zosima, in the scene in his cell, was the first to notice this in Dmitri. He states, "I seemed to see something terrible yesterday [...] as though his whole future were expressed in his eyes. A look came into his eyes—so that I was instantly horror-stricken at what that man is preparing for himself" (Dostoevsky 313). Mark Alfano, in 'An Enchanting Abundance of Types: Nietzsche's Modest Unity of Virtue Theory,' describes how it can be the higher types, the types that come from a noble or ruling class background and the type that Dmitri was, that can suffer more. Alfano states that, "I suppose one could claim that *being a sufferer* is a type, but it seems more appropriate to say that people of *any* type can suffer. Perhaps some types are more susceptible to suffering than others (Nietzsche seems to think that higher types are especially susceptible)" (429).

There are many characteristics Dmitri shares with this type. These attributes are a juxtaposition of the shutting of mental doors and a free spontaneity, a penchant for

always calculating the future, the making of promises along with a feeling of responsibility, and a sense of honour while also harbouring bad feelings towards people the type consider “less” than themselves, as in people who do not conform to their code of honour. They do this while conversely going out of their way at times to help people who could be termed ‘fools’ or ‘buffoons’. The last and one of the strongest resemblances Dmitri has with this type comes from the title of the thesis, ‘‘Guilt’, ‘Bad Conscience’, and Related Matters’ and that is related to how his conscience preys on his mind.

Part Two will look more closely at Dmitri’s own form of psychomachia, at how he was split between his impulsive, passionate side and his weaker side that desired to be a stronger and a more considered decision maker. This part of the thesis will show how Dmitri’s more passionate side leads him to the desire to become a sufferer for humankind, and that it won out over his more rational side. By looking at the important trial scene, the thesis will depict how many of the personalities at the trial also fit into Nietzsche’s description of this type.

The thesis will then examine the effect Dmitri had on Alyosha, and the troubles and travails it caused the younger brother. This section will conclude with two important narrative events related to this. Firstly, it will provide a description of how Dmitri’s failure to incorporate both sides of his personality resulted in him being thrown into jail and after a lively trial found guilty and sentenced to hard labour in Siberia. By considering Dmitri’s sentencing to hard labour in Siberia and the trial preceding it, the thesis will show how Dmitri’s was unable to successfully bond the two sides of his personality, the

commander versus the sufferer. The thesis will show how this resulted in Alyosha learning more about how his path in navigating this world should go. The thesis will show that it is because of Dmitri's passionate side, which leads to his need to suffer for humankind, that this disgrace happens to Dmitri.

This will then lead into the section on Alyosha, which is the crux of the thesis. This will exemplify how the youngest brother Karamazov, after witnessing the psychomachia of his two elder brothers, found his own understanding of what religious morality must be like to make sense of the complicated world the brothers Karamazov lived in.

b. Dmitri: Part One – Commonalities with Nietzsche.

The first trait that Dmitri Karamazov shares with the type in Nietzsche's second thesis in ''Guilt', 'Bad Conscience,' and Related Matters' is that of a forgetfulness that is ironically purposeful. It is a kind of subconscious shutting of the mental doors in order for the person to be able to go on living their lives in blissful ignorance of their behaviour and actions. Nietzsche states that this type needs "the temporary shutting of the doors and windows of consciousness, the relief from the clamant alarums and excursions, with which our subconscious world of servant organs works in mutual cooperation and antagonism; a little quietude, a little *tabula rasa* of the consciousness, so as to make room again for the new" and also that they can have "no knowledge of the past, and no wish to know it" (Nietzsche 61). Dmitri personifies this idea in his inability to bring his past actions into consideration when making decisions. He often believes that he will

chart a noble course and does not stop to consider how he has gone off track before. It is most exemplified in his repeated attempts in the novel to pay back the 3000 rubles to Katrina Ivanova, where he refuses to acknowledge how, in the past, his nature has driven him into wild spending sprees. Caryl Emerson's 'Zosima's 'Mysterious Visitor,'' gives a good summary of Dmitri's character. "The basic human unit everywhere acts like Dmitri Karamazov before his arrest: impulsive, profligate, self-absorbed, perhaps an earnest seeker but undisciplined, and willing to be deceived" (Emerson 155). Dmitri must live his life with this deception about himself in order to be happy. As Nietzsche explains: "there can exist no happiness, no gladness, no hope, no pride, no real *present*, without forgetfulness" (Nietzsche 62).

As a result, Dmitri displayed this trait of being able to shut off memories from himself, which allowed him to continue down his pathway without the purposeful reflection and thinking that might have enabled him to chart a more sensible course. Part of this willing forgetfulness was the spontaneity which marked another major aspect of the eldest brother's personality.

Dmitri's unthinking spontaneity often led him into trouble, both in his military career and in his hometown of Skotoprigonyevsk. He fights duels, gets wildly drunk after spending days in drinking bouts, lavishes money around, and brutally attacks people. Yet, his spontaneity lives in his warmer side; he impulsively performs charitable acts, makes snap decisions that highlight his better nature and effuses warm emotions suddenly to friends and family. This is apparent in Dmitri's feeling for Grushenka when "all was confusion, confusion, in Mitya's soul, but although many things were goading

his heart, at that moment his whole being was yearning for her, his queen, to whom he was flying to look on her for the last time. One thing I can say for certain; his heart did not waver for one instant" (Dostoevsky 459). Clearly, Dmitri is a passionate man, and this dominant side of his personality often gets him into trouble. He is easily provoked into some extreme actions. Townsend, in 'Beyond the Myth of the Nietzschean Ideal-Type,' states that the "modern man's weak character means that he is easily influenced and moved by stimuli, as he seeks to fulfill his 'fundamental desire' for the war within him to end" and that "moderate bound spirits here find [...] rampant and undisciplined expression" (Townsend 7, 8). This "undisciplined expression" is portrayed by Dmitri throughout the novel, whether it is drunken bouts, rushing around madly scaring and confusing people, or making rash decisions that leave his brother, Alyosha, dumbfounded, and at times wondering about Dmitri's sanity: "'Mitya, dear, what's the matter with you?' cried Alyosha, jumping up from his place, and looking keenly at his brother's frenzied face. For one moment the thought struck him that Dmitri was mad" (Dostoevsky, 130). Dmitri exhibits this spontaneous side of his character constantly throughout the novel, and the lack of thought that goes into a lot of his actions causes much of the harm that befalls him and his family. Conversely, from the other side of his personality, he shares the trait with Nietzsche's type of always wanting to calculate options for his behaviour and predict what the future will hold based on these unperformed actions.

As a result, Dmitri's character traits of forgetfulness and spontaneity somehow combine to create his plans of action, the outcome of which he can only assume will be

positive. These plans are often thought through very quickly, without much recall of the past or any attempt to factor in outside influences that may not react the way he intends them to. This is a very common trait of this conscience bearing type of Nietzsche's, and it is one that directs Dmitri's actions throughout *The Brothers Karamazov*. Nietzsche explains how this is a trait of the suffer type, who "see[s] the distant as present and to anticipate it, to fix with certainty what is the end, and what is the means to that end; above all, to reckon, to have power to calculate" which is exactly how Dmitri rationalises his plans. Nietzsche goes on to explain how this enables the sufferer to continue moving forward in what they think is a positive way: "how thoroughly must man have first become *calculable, disciplined, necessitated* even for himself and his own conception of himself, that, like a man entering into a promise, he could guarantee himself *as a future*" (Nietzsche 63). Dmitri is always plotting and planning in *The Brothers Karamazov*, especially in the context of winning back the love of his life, Grushenka, while remaining honourable to Akterina by repaying the money she entrusted him with. Even when he is arrested, he is calculating a future for himself and his love and not understanding the force of the charges against him. Thus, Dmitri exhibits a need to calculate the future so that he is able to pursue his goals. They are quickly made calculations, brought on by the unconstrained side of his personality. This, combined with his absent-mindedness about his previous actions and his spontaneity, brings about the trials and tribulations of Dmitri in the novel, ultimately leading to his sentencing to hard labour in Siberia. It is because of these traits together that Dmitri feels he can make promises that he just is not able to keep.

If Dmitri had been more reflective and less impulsive, he would have realised that it is more than likely that he would be unable to keep the many promises he makes to himself or to others. It is through this wild and unconstrained part of his nature that he gets himself into trouble with the law and ends up unable to explain a large amount of circumstantial evidence against himself. This very idea of being able to make promises is one of the roots of Dmitri's personality. He is constantly looking to the future and believing in an ideal that is unrealistic without taking into account past behaviours. Dmitri is regularly making promises to his brothers, to people he is seeking financial help from, and mostly, to himself. He fools himself with these assurances that he will rise from his present predicaments that are prevalent throughout the course of the novel. An example from the novel is when Dmitri imagines his way out of his troubles: "Of this different, reformed and 'virtuous' life ('it must, it must be virtuous') he dreamed feverishly at every moment. He thirsted for that reformation and renewal. The filthy morass, in which he had sunk of his own free will, was too revolting to him" (Dostoevsky 407*)*. Another example is when talking to Fenya about his troubles, Dmitri quickly comes up with a solution to his situation, which he accepts immediately without afterthought: "At Fenya's first words, it had sprung from feeling, and been adopted in a flash, with all its consequences" (460).

This passage from above fits in perfectly with Nietzsche's own understanding of the type, where "we find a man with his own, independent, enduring will, whose prerogative it is to promise-- and in him a proud consciousness quivering in every muscle of what he has finally achieved and incorporated, an actual awareness of power

and freedom [...] the consciousness of this rare freedom and power over himself and his destiny, has penetrated him to his lowest depths and become an instinct" (Nietzsche 37).

Dmitri's promises, to himself and others, are the culmination of the aforementioned parts of his paradoxical personalities: his calculative versus his impulsive nature. His unthinking belief that he can fulfill these promises, however, drives most of the action around Dmitri. Joined to this sense of being able to positively satisfy the outcomes his words deliver is a sense of responsibility that Dmitri has throughout the novel. Because he is unable to carry through on many of the promises he has made, of what he feels like he must do, this conflict exists within Dmitri. Throughout the novel, Dmitri is trying to find ways to perform up to the standards of noblesse oblige. However, his passionate side that usually wins over his calculated plans to perform responsibilities causes him to rethink and make new plans, with the same lack of forethought and planning. Babushkina explains the main responsibility the eldest brother Karamazov feels: "explaining the origin of the sum found in his pocket, Dmitri would be forced to compromise Katerina and her father by telling the circumstances of the shameful loan" (542). Dmitri will not announce to the world how Katerina had come and offered herself in order to procure the money (an offer turned down by Dmitri). It is a characteristic that made Dmitri loved when he was in the army and still respected in the town despite many of his foolish actions. It is linked to his ideas of honour and respect that also define this type. In other words, "this is simply the long history of the origin of *responsibility*. That task of breeding an animal which can make promises,

includes […] the more immediate task of first *making* man to a certain extent, necessitated, uniform, like among his like, regular, and consequently calculable" (Nietzsche 63).

Thus, Dmitri does share this need to be a responsible citizen with the Nietzschean type, but it is the side of his personality that cannot win over his much stronger impulsive nature. This part of his character that needs to be responsible is the same part that honours what he sees as other noble souls. This character also despises and acts violently to those he considers beneath him. We see Dmitri perform "one of those actions of which only Dmitri Fyodorovitch would be capable in his anger [...] and in his passions!" when he drags the captain into the street by his "wisp of tow," gets into a duel during his army years, and curses his father as a low creature (Dostoevsky 211). This went to the point that "in his despair he was on the point of attacking [a] sleeping man" when he was disgusted with a drunken peasant (419). As Nietzsche explains, "with this mastery over himself he is necessarily also given the mastery over circumstances, over nature, over all creatures with shorter wills, less reliable characters" (64). The German philosopher describes how the ancient history of this moralistic type is that of the need to inflict punishment, using the many examples from German history to make his point: "German genius in the field of punishment!, impaling, ripping apart and trampling to death by horses ('quartering'), boiling of the criminal in oil or wine" (67). It is the need to punish, an ancient need that has defined much of the contemporary morality that Dmitri exhibits so strongly. Dmitri even recognises it in himself when he says, thinking of his father, "'I don't know, I don't know,' he had said then. 'Perhaps I

shall not kill him, perhaps I shall. I'm afraid he'll suddenly be so loathsome to me at that moment'" (439).

Lavrin describes how Nietzsche has split the contemporary human into two types, of which Dmitri fits into the "masterful" category, the one with the need to punish, and the type who follows the stronger type. This is why he divided mankind into two categories: into an *elite* of masterful men strong enough to be a law unto themselves and a great herd of common people whose function is to be ordered about and obey (Lavrin 170). We see this in Dmitri's fury he unleashes on the drunken Captain, pulling him by his moustache in the street. However, when he meets someone he considers worthy of his respect, someone who is of the higher type, Dmitri accepts them as equals and will bestow any honour on them. The best example of this is with Katerina's father, the General, for whom he pays three hundred roubles to help him escape prison. Though the General has performed an unfavorable deed, Dmitri does not see him as vile and comes to his aid because he is of the "higher" type. He transfers this understanding of honour to the General's daughter and will do nothing to dishonour her. Dmitri embodies the type that Nietzsche will later define, in that he has "goodwill among people of about equal power to come to terms with each other, to come to an understanding again by means of a settlement, and with regard to the less powerful, to *compel* them to agree among themselves to a settlement" (Nietzsche 80).

When faced with a person he considers to be of honour, Dmitri is effusive in his praise and exaggerated in his gestures. However, when he meets someone he considers to be a lower type, or who has engaged in a behaviour that Dmitri finds

displeasing, he can be withering in his denouncement of the person and violent in his conduct towards them. The commonality between these two actions is that Dmitri lets his passion get the better of him-- in his effusiveness and in his withering disdain. Nevertheless, though he often is violent and aggressive towards people he believes to be lower types or have performed an act he considers unworthy, Dmitri also can go to the other extreme and be overly generous in trying to come to the aid of that person. Much of this unpredictable behaviour of Dmitri can be explained by the last feature that he shares with a Nietzsche type. Dmitri Karamazov's conscience often leads him to make these bizarre turnarounds in his attitude and behaviour, and it is attached to the reasoning side of his personality. This is an important type as it is in the title of Nietzsche's thesis, ‘‘Guilt', 'Bad Conscience', and Related Matters," and it is the other strong part of Dmitri's personality,

All of this is very typical of Dmitri, especially the polar opposites attitudes and behaviours he displayed. But Dmitri also shows empathy in these situations, and he can turn from withering to loving towards the same person. These same actions can even occur within minutes of each other and also towards the same person when Dmitri has a change of mood. Dmitri has a contradiction in his behaviour in that sometimes he is overly concerned to help out people whom he would normally consider not worth giving the time of day. Instead of berating them Dmitri goes to extremes to try and come to the aid of somebody he would normally consider a fool. His treatment of peasants can be disdainful and even violent, but on the other hand, "people used to tell, laughing at Mitya, how he had given champagne to grimy-handed peasants, and feasted the village

women and girls on sweets and Strasburg pies" (Dostoevsky 452). In his dealings with the Captain he dishonoured in public, he wants not only to make amends, but express profoundly his belief that the Captain is a better person than himself.

Nietzsche explains these actions as the conscience that pervades through this reasoning type, and how even as they belong to the master class, the members of this set can also long to be a "sufferer." This is one who, though aware of their superiority as defined by contemporary morals, wills himself to take on the role of a Christ-like figure who suffers for humankind. This type, at times, is aware of the pain in the world and their "anger is kept in bounds and modified through the idea that every injury has somewhere or other its *equivalent* price" (Nietzsche 70). This instant change in Dmitri is clear in his conversation with Fenya where Mitya has that change of temperament that so defines him and causes such anguish in Alyosha: "Mitya stood for a moment, then mechanically sank on to a chair next to Fenya. He sat, not reflecting but, as it were, terror-stricken, benumbed. But suddenly, as gently and mildly as a gentle and affectionate child, he began speaking to Fenya as though he had utterly forgotten how he had scared and hurt her just now" (443).

Overall, Dmitri Karamazov can be seen to have many characteristics similar to the ones Nietzsche has described in *The Genealogy of Morals.* He can be spontaneous and when he feels the need to calculate actions to guide the future, it is done somewhat rapidly. He has feelings of responsibility and honour, but is able to do this through the ability to forget things that have happened in the past, which means he does not use this understanding of himself in his ill-made calculations. With this, comes his penchant

for making promises as well as the effusiveness he will show to people depending on whether he feels they have acted honourably. Most of these problems can be explained by the fact that Dmitri has his own psychomachia, which will be examined in the next part through a study of the characters of these types at his trial and how Dmitri came close to being a new type. Lastly, it will look at how Dmitri, like his brother Ivan, in failing to become a new type by finding a balance between the two sides of his personality, showed his younger brother Alyosha what is needed to navigate a new path of religious morality in the modern world.

c. Dmitri: Part Two-- His Role in the Forming of a New Russian Type

Much of the plot of *The Brothers Karamazov* is based around Dmitri Karamazov's psychomachia and his inability to find a balance between the two sides of his personality. It was the passionate need to be a sufferer type that dominated his more rational side, and this led him through a chain of events that made it seem all but impossible that he did not kill his father. Part Two will study more closely this tug of war between his passionate side and his more rational thinking side. It will discuss his failure to find harmony between the two, and show how this greatly affected Alyosha, but also how it helped Alyosha deepen his knowledge of the world and how it needed to be navigated. While doing this, this thesis will also examine closely the trial of Dmitri, and how the many characters in that trial are part of the same type as Dmitri, in that they demand for someone to suffer for a crime. This will be for the purpose of showing how Dmitri, in the trial, not only displays the characteristics of his type so clearly, but also it shows how he actually conformed to being a member of the set who were prosecuting

and defending him, rather than a sullen, angry outsider. This will then lead into a discussion on Alyosha, his path towards enlightenment, and how his brothers showed him an understanding of how both sides of a personality must find some harmony.

Dmitri's psychomachia consisted of his stronger passionate side vying against his rational side. The psychomachia was a fight of his more serious "commander" type part of his personality that won him so much respect during his time in the army versus the spontaneous passionate side that drew him towards wanting to suffer for humanity. Townsend explains that while in Nietzsche's understanding, neither side should totally dominate, he "extols the virtues of achieving independence from stimuli and exemplary self discipline, in an attempt to profit from the fertile conditions provided by widespread chaotic and contradictory drives" (Townsend, 15). In *The Brothers Karamazov,* Dmitri himself is aware of the possibilities when either of his conflicting personalities dominate: "There was another possibility, a different and awful ending" (Dostoevsky, 407). Dmitri, while reflecting on Grushenka's possible choice, echoes an understanding of his own deeper characteristics that are extreme and could take his fate in any direction. Nietzsche describes well how this passionate side of a character like Dmitri needs to "vent" to escape from the conflicting rational side. He describes, "his *instinct of freedom* forced into being latent—it is already clear—this instinct of freedom forced back, trodden back, imprisoned within itself, and finally only able to find vent and relief in itself; this, only this, is the beginning of the "bad conscience" (Nietzsche 104). Consistently throughout the novel, Dmitri behaves with his passionate side driving him, and with very little foresight, which leads him into difficult situations.

This change is often the cause of Alyosha's despair for his brother. Aloysha sees his older brother going between the extremes and not finding any balance. Occasionally, however, Dmitri does find some symmetry as when he says:

> 'Why am I pleased with myself? I'm a scoundrel, but I'm satisfied with myself. And yet I'm tortured by the thought that I'm a scoundrel, but satisfied with myself. I bless the creation. I'm ready to bless God and His creation directly, but [...] I must kill one noxious insect for fear it should crawl and spoil life for others [...] Let us drink to life, dear brother. What can be more precious than life? Nothing!" (Dostoevsky 455).

This gives Alyosha hope.

Dmitri's rational side gained him a feeling that he was honourable from other people, but was constantly dominated by his passionate side. As a result, he made spontaneous decisions, which would end up in long drinking bouts, duels, and helpless love entanglements. Like that of his brother Ivan, Dmitri's psychic struggle was also made harder by other characters in the book. In Dmitri Karamazov's case, it was by Katerina Ivanova, who loved Dmitri but also caused him torment, and Grushenka, whom Dmitri's passionate side told him to follow. An understanding of Dmitri's psychomachia can be seen in how the two women contrast so much, with the rational side being represented by Katerina, and Dmitri's more passionate side being represented by Grushenka.

The two women in Dmitri's life during the course of the novel are the sensible and beautiful Katerina, who most people think would make a wonderful choice for a wife, and the more free-spirited Grushenka. The fact that it is Grushenka that Dmitri wants to marry is a telling sign that he let his passionate side dominate over his more rational, commander type side. Two instances from the novel in which we witness this are the following: "At the sight of Grushenka, Mitya's jealousy vanished. He flew home, washed, combed his hair, brushed his clothes, dressed" (427). Furthermore,the second example is as follows: "All was confusion, confusion, in Mitya's soul, but although many things were goading his heart, at that moment his whole being was yearning for her, his queen, to whom he was flying to look on her for the last time. One thing I can say for certain; his heart did not waver for one instant" (459). By looking at Dmitri's relationship with Grushenka and Katerina, it is clear that he has let his passionate side dominate too much, and by letting it dominate, he falls into trouble.

The characters in the trial, including Grushenka and Katerina, all bear a strong resemblance to the different aspects of the Nietzschean type that Dmitri represents. This type, Nietzsche says, was developed by the need to deliver punishment, so a trial is a fitting place to meet these types of characters. In yielding to the court's judgement, Dmitri does not take himself out of the group that consists of these types. By accepting the verdict, Dmitri is actually confirming his membership of the group. This is one of the core characteristics of this type that Nietzsche presents in ''Guilt', 'Bad Conscience', and Related Matters.' He tells us that the guilty party is "secure because he has entered into pledges and obligations to the community in respect of these very injuries and

enmities" (Nietzsche 81). Dmitri does accept his fate while in the courtroom, thus making him fulfill two of the main requisites of this type-- accepting himself as part of this group through his admission that he must take up this punishment and displaying the need to be a sufferer:

> "Even there, in the mines, under-ground, I may find a human heart in another convict and murderer by my side, and I may make friends with him, for even there one may live and love and suffer. One may thaw and revive a frozen heart in that convict, one may wait upon him for years, and at last bring up from the dark depths a lofty soul, a feeling, suffering creature; one may bring forth an angel, create a hero!" (Dostoevsky 668).

Nietzsche explains this conjunction of the two ideas neatly in the following paragraph:

> 'That sinister and perhaps now indissoluble association of the ideas of 'guilt' and 'suffering.' Because the *infliction* of suffering produces the highest degree of happiness, because the injured party will get in exchange for his loss (including his vexation at his loss) an extraordinary counter-pleasure: the *infliction* of suffering—a real *feast*, something that, as I have said, was all the more appreciated the greater the paradox created by the rank and social status of the creditor" (73).

Dmitri aligns himself with those in the courtroom by saying, "'That's my conviction—not conviction, but feeling. A man ought to be magnanimous, and it's no disgrace to a man! No disgrace to a hero, not even a Cæsar!'" (Dostoevsky, 671). Lavrin suggests that "Nietzsche could think of human society only in terms of a rigorous organisation, a kind of military community set up according to the strictest rank of order," which is seen in the pecking order of people in the courtroom itself, like the many layouts of most audiences today still (169). First come the judges sitting on their raised dais, followed by the lawyers with their cunning and intellect. The wealthy citizens of the town are seated in the best areas with the best views, all the way to the least of the viewers, crammed in a gallery, and then those who had to wait outside.

On the other hand, the result of the court does bear very little resemblance to the truth as the reader knows it and becomes a spectacle of moralising by both lawyers, to the delight of the crowd, a type which Nietzsche describes later: "And yet they go in for the history of morality: of course, this must logically end in results that have a more than brittle relationship to the truth" (Nietzsche 39). Nietzsche's type in this second thesis evolved from the need for punishment, the need to identify as a debtor to whom the creditor must have their due. When civilizations became more advanced, more discrete definitions appeared in the law books. This is described by Nietzsche:

> "And this to such an extent, that a *high* degree of civilisation was always first necessary for the animal man to begin to make those much more primitive distinctions of 'intentional,' 'negligent,' 'accidental,' 'responsible,' and their

> contraries, and apply them in the assessing of punishment. That idea—the wrong-doer deserves punishment *because* he might have acted otherwise" (69).

This mirrors the antics and clever word plays and situations set up by the lawyers to explain either Dmitri's guilt, by the prosecution, or his innocence, by the defence. As Nietzsche puts it, "here it was that individual confronted individual, and that individual *matched himself against* individual" (79). The crowd, filling the courtroom to the brim, loved the spectacle.

The women in the courtroom are mostly on Dmitri's side, while the majority of the men believe him to be guilty. The women want to indulge in "the most aristocratic luxury of letting its wrong doers go *scot-free"* while the men seek to "sanctify *revenge* under the name of *justice"* (Nietzsche 83, 84). But they all revel in the performance, with people even coming from St. Petersburg to witness the trial. It is a sensation across Russia and fits with Nietzsche's maxim that "as it grows more powerful, the community tends to take the offences of the individual less seriously" (82). The whole trial becomes more of a circus, with dramatic entries by Katerina and Grushenka, gasps from the audience, long drawn out speeches from the lawyers, and outbursts from the accused. The trial gives us a microcosm of a world Nietzsche would later describe, the world of the commander/sufferer type, and by wanting to take on punishment for the good of humanity, Dmitri firmly sets himself as part of this type.

Emerson analyzes Dostoevsky's intentions in *The Brothers Karamazov.* "His challenge to us-- that we prove we are not Dmitri and do not require prison to be our

best selves" (Emerson 155). It is in jail that Dmitri comes to the realisation of where the course of his actions have taken him. Gone is the need to sacrifice himself as a talisman for humankind, and the cold hard reality sets in. Gaol is the final harsh reality that spurs Dmitri to use his more rational side. The eldest brother Karamazov's commander side begins to take more control, as Dmitri realises he cannot take this punishment of banishment to Siberia and be without his love.

Thus, the trial of Dmitri Karamazov not only presents us with more of the same type, described later by Nietzsche and that Dmitri resembles, it also strengthens his association with the group with his admission to accept the court's ruling. However, it is during the trial that Dmitri comes closest to letting his rational side overrule his more passionate side, when he displays some understanding of how he has reached this stage and what he needs to do. Dmitri has more meditative thinking after the trial, which is what he has needed to do throughout the novel. It is by giving himself more time to consider his actions and ponder how he has reached where he is that he could have become a more successful, new type of Russian. Robert Bird tells us how both brothers failed to become this new type:

> "Their catastrophe is not merely a personal one, however, for their ideas-- the critical humanism of Ivan and the romantic individualism of Dmitri-- were ones that inspired large portions of Russian society [...] Despite boundless potential, they have both delimited their personalities in terms of particular ideas or stereotypes that have closed off their development" (24).

Whilst failing throughout the course of the novel to reach their potential, the two eldest brothers Karamazov come together, finally, to plot an escape for Dmitri on his way to Siberia. This scene is a symbolic moment in the novel as these two brothers, who have both been at war with themselves and been opposed to each other due to their different temperaments, join together to use the best of themselves to help free Dmitri. The fusion of the two could point to a successful outcome in the end for all because the more dominant sides of each personality has been subdued to a greater cause. Ivan finds love for his brother, while Dmitri must actually use his reason and intelligence rather than let passion derail him. This last segment in which we see the two older brothers Karamazov plotting represents the union of the two segues into the story of Alyosha and his newfound understanding of what it means to live in this world. After witnessing his brothers' travails and the outcomes of these, Alyosha is prepared to deliver his understanding of religious morality and what it means for the Russian people.

So, although Dmitri does at times let his weaker rational side come through, he does not quite do this enough in the novel, and still reverts to letting his passionate side dominate. It is this side that Alyosha tries to placate in the course of *The Brothers Karamazov*, much to the younger brother's anguish and strain. Alyosha is continually running back and forth to find his older brother Dmitri. Always, after finding him, he is left with strong and disturbed emotions by the words and actions of Dmitri. Often, it is worry and despair that fills Alyosha, as he sees his brother leading down a pathway that could lead to his ruin, as in his reaction to Katerina's situation: "What worried Alyosha

more than anything was that, incredible as it seemed, his brother appeared pleased at Katerina Ivanovna's humiliation" (Dostoevsky 170).

Most despairingly for Alyosha, Dmitri, at times, seems in danger of losing his soul when he is discussing with Alyosha:

> 'Why is it all over with you? You said so just now,' Alyosha interposed.
>
> 'Why is it all over with me? H'm![...] The fact of it is […] if you take it as a whole, I am sorry to lose God—that's why it is.'
>
> 'What do you mean by 'sorry to lose God'?' (664).

At other times, however, there are times when he feels happy after leaving his brother. These are when Dmitri has shown his more rational side, and thus spoken more lucidly to his brother, giving Alyosha hope and joy that Dmitri is going to be all right. One instance is where Dmitri calls Alyosha an angel for his guidance: "'Goodbye, my angel. You stood up for me, just now. I shall never forget it. I've a word to say to you tomorrow—but I must think about it'" (155). Poljakova explains this neatly: "In contrast to Ivan's love of humanity, the passionate love of the two brothers and of their father is something very concrete" (127).

But Mitya is still too frantic and his mind races too fast, which causes such distress in Alyosha. Often we see that scenes where Dmitri "started, leapt up, but sat down again. Then he began at once speaking with loud, nervous haste, gesticulating, and in a positive frenzy" (Dostoevsky 412). So Alyosha, disturbed and

upset by his brother's erratic behaviour and often undecipherable talk, struggled to help Dmitri find a more harmonious balance in his nature. It is the witnessing of the turmoil created in his brother's life that helps Alyosha move on his own path towards a more harmonious oneness of his own nature. The youngest brother never gives up on Dmitri, and always believes in his innocence, as when Alyosha says: "'But I never doubted that some higher feeling would always save him at the fatal moment, as it has indeed saved him, for it was not he killed my father,' Alyosha said firmly, in a loud voice that was heard throughout the court" (766).

Alyosha knows his brother well, and pleads with him not to become the sufferer that Mitya means to be:

> "Listen, brother, once for all,' he said. 'This is what I think about it. And you know that I would not tell you a lie. Listen: you are not ready, and such a cross is not for you. What's more, you don't need such a martyr's cross when you are not ready for it. If you had murdered our father, it would grieve me that you should reject your punishment. But you are innocent, and such a cross is too much for you" (863).

It is by believing so firmly in the goodness of his brothers, but also having to witness both their fates and understanding how they came about that allowed Alyosha to find his own concept of how this Russian life must be lived. It is through the love, hope and turmoil that Alyosha goes through that he understands what religious morality he needs to follow to live a good life. It is through the path of discovery that Alyosha takes that a

new Russian morality, beginning with the strong character of the country's peasantry, is laid out in the novel. This idea will be the context for the next section.

6. Alyosha Karamazov and his development into a new Russian type

"Will anyone look a little into—right into—the mystery of how ideals are manufactured in this world? Who has the courage to do it? Come!"

- Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*

The story of *The Brothers Karamazov* is the tale of three brothers whose lives become intertwined when they all meet up again in their hometown after hardly knowing each other as boys. Most of the action revolves around the plights of the two older brothers and the turmoil that their actions create within the youngest brother, Alyosha. It is this turmoil that creates insight into how the world outside the monastery walls works and how life needs to be lived to successfully navigate it. It is not until he is released into the world outside the shelter of the monastery that Alyosha is able to develop this new conception.

Before this release into the trials and tribulations of his family's world, Alyosha had been sequestered away in the monastery with the many Elders and monks. As discussed in the "Zosima" section, this religious place had grown stale and was full of jealousy and spite between groups of monks vying for the most respect as the "holiest" of the brothers. By leaving the monastery, Alyosha moves away from these people who display many of the characteristics of the type from Nietzsche's first thesis, ''Good and Evil,' 'Good and Bad.''

As the reader witnesses the youngest brother Karamazov making his way through the complex stages of life with his brothers' struggles, Alyosha displays all the characteristics that contradict this type from Nietzsche's first thesis. Firstly, Alyosha continues to go about without the need for any possessions or goods. Alyosha was always like this, even as a young boy, and on leaving the monastery, he continues this lack of need for material goods. Secondly, Alyosha never entered into the petty philosophising that passed between the monks who were sequestered away in the cloisters, and once out in the world he strongly urges against it in his brother Ivan. Also, the youngest brother Karamazov also displays his belief in the actual good of a person that comes from inside that person. He does not believe in good as being determined by utility.

These understandings are developed in Alyosha by the mental struggles he witnesses his brothers going through, which brings him to the realisation of his own conception of religious morality, and from this Alyosha learns that the truth is not the most important aspect of life even though discussions on truth are crucial. On the other hand, Alyosha sees his middle brother Ivan's ability to forget and how it is affecting Ivan's decisions. The youngest brother Karamazov sees the essential goodness in his eldest brother but also realises that this passionate type that dominates Dmitri's personality is taking him down a dangerous path in life.

It is through the psychic struggles of his brothers that Alyosha realises how life is to be lived. Alyosha makes two vital discoveries. Firstly, one must find peace oneself; secondly, this world is to be shared with everyone, no matter what type they are. After

leaving the seclusion of the monastery and its petty arguments and backstabbing, Alyosha realises that the morality he seeks is one that stems from the belief in humankind. He comes to realise that if humankind treats everyone like brothers and sisters, and never forgets the goodness they have seen in the world, then life can be lived easily. Morality will follow from that. Alyosha, like Zosima, does not mention Christ in his philosophy; he does not mention the need to seek for truth constantly, and he does not believe that humans must suffer for each other.

The monastery that Alyosha was considering devoting his life to was full of monks who bickered and spent their lives away from any real contact with the outside world. Because of this, the elder, Zosima urged Alyosha to leave the place so he could discover how life worked outside the gates of the cloisters. The Elder understood that Alyosha could not develop a true morality sequestered within the walls of the monastery. Zosima also realised, after witnessing the debacle that was the attempted reconciliation between Fyodor Karamazov and his son Dmitri, that Alyosha was needed in the outside world, thus forcing him out of the monastery.

In Nietzsche's writing, it is clear that the emphasis is that morality should be evolving from the people it is being forced upon, rather than rulers of different types announcing it from "higher" places, secluded away from the pains of the world. His description of the priestly types handing down of euphemisms for goodness, which hide the weak character behind them, epitomises the need for Alyosha to leave the monastery:

"The impotence which requires not, is turned to 'goodness,' craven baseness to

> meekness, submission to those whom one hates, to obedience (namely, obedience to one of whom they say that he ordered this submission—they call him God). The inoffensive character of the weak, the very cowardice in which he is rich, his standing at the door, his forced necessity of waiting, gain here fine names, such as 'patience,' which is also called 'virtue'"(Dostoevsky 48).

Alyosha has many good characteristics, such as humility and charity of heart, but he has not had them tested. By being hidden away from the tests of society, he has not been able to evolve his thinking into how to best help the world. Upon hearing that he must leave the cloisters, the young monk is miserable, but a revelation strikes him as he understands the purpose of his dismissal in accordance with the words of his Elder, who had bidden him "sojourn in the world." Alyosha realises:

> "'Ah, yes, I was missing that, and I didn't want to miss it, I love that passage: it's Cana of Galilee, the first miracle.... Ah, that miracle! Ah, that sweet miracle! It was not men's grief, but their joy Christ visited...'There's no living without joy,' Mitya says.... Yes, Mitya.... 'Everything that is true and good is always full of forgiveness,' he used to say that, too'" (Dostoevsky 404).

Alyosha realises that he is being sent out to find the joy, not just the pain, of his family. Cassedy states that, "Alyosha, having undergone his own spiritual crisis, finds the truth and is restored to wholeness" after this episode (140). However, Alyosha was enlightened at this point but had not fully developed into wholeness. This came later. This first understanding outside the walls begins a journey that takes him through the turgent waters of his brothers' strifes and ends up with him declaring his new

understanding of how to find that joy, to the young boys at the stone. He knows he has a struggle ahead of him, but as recommended in Nietzsche's thesis, this is the only way to learn from true suffering. The German philosopher asks, "Who would not a hundred times prefer to be afraid, when one at the same time admires, than to be immune from fear, at the cost of being perpetually obsessed with the loathsome spectacle of the distorted, the dwarfed, the stunted, the envenomed? And is that not our fate? What produces to-day our repulsion towards 'man'?— for we suffer from 'man'" (Nietzsche 42).

Pojavinka likens this need to understand the world to Christ's ability to teach, as we see when "only after Jesus refused Satan's temptations, did He go out into the world to preach the kingdom of heaven" (132). Alyosha must remove himself from a place where "a resentment experienced by creatures who, deprived as they are of the proper outlet of action, are forced to find their compensation in an imaginary revenge" and find where he is needed (Nietzsche 34). Zosima says to Alyosha, "'You will have many enemies, but even your foes will love you. Life will bring you many misfortunes, but you will find your happiness in them, and will bless life and will make others bless it—which is what matters most. Well, that is your character'" (Dostoevsky 314). The Elder sees the path is not always rosy, but knows the young student has the character to build from the turmoil. Pomerants tells us that "Alisha's nature is active above all yet unclouded and serene at the same time" (24). This coincides with the need in the novel of a morality based on inner goodness, not outward displays of morality. Pomerants describes this idea of Dostoevsky's thus: "The universal harmony about which

Dostoevsky prophesied does not in the least signify the utilitarian prosperity of people on this present earth but rather the beginning of that new earth where truth abides" (23).

It was this departure that enabled Alyosha to interact with his brothers and to witness their vicissitudes. It was for this reason that Zosima ordered his charge to leave the monastery. The Elder himself did not quite manage to evolve into a new type of Russian. As analyzed in the "Zosima" chapter, he had lived his life and then moved to the seclusion of the monastery. This move meant he was unable to develop a new conception of how to live life according to new Russian morals.

Zosima had charted a path that was the reverse of what he was urging on Alyosha. The Elder had lived an interesting life, in which he learnt much about humanity. This life, in many ways, had both aspects of Dmitri's and Ivan's lives that were occurring outside the monastery at the time in which the novel is set. In this way, Zosima is aware of the brothers and what they are going through as well as Alyosha's need to witness this to encourage a more enlightened awareness of the world. Alyosha despairingly acknowledges this, and doubts his ability to enact change.

> "'My brothers are destroying themselves,' he went on, 'my father, too. And they are destroying others with them. It's 'the primitive force of the Karamazovs,' as Father Païssy said the other day, a crude, unbridled, earthly force. Does the spirit of God move above that force? Even that I don't know. I only know that I, too, am a Karamazov.... Me a monk, a monk!'" (Dostoevsky 241).

Later in the novel we see that "the conviction that a great inevitable catastrophe was about to happen grew stronger in Alyosha's mind with every hour" (243). The Elder

Zosima knows the place for Alyosha is out in the world, and that the monastery would never allow him to develop his own moral ideas. Zosima says to him:

> "'You are more needed there. There is no peace there. You will wait, and be of service. If evil spirits rise up, repeat a prayer. And remember, my son' —the elder liked to call him that— 'this is not the place for you in the future. When it is God's will to call me, leave the monastery. Go away for good' "(79).

Emerson tells us how Bahktin says that "The Dostoevskian hero is always in front of a mirror...he is looking at himself and at his own reflection in another's consciousness'" (164). Through others' consciousnesses, Alyosha indeed develops his concept of morality. It is through the many people who come across his path, but mostly it is through his two brothers, Ivan and Dmitri, and the way their conscious minds play havoc with their lives. By witnessing the psychomachia of the two, Alyosha sees his pathway forward.

With Zosima acknowledging that Alyosha needs to be free of the constraints of the monastery, the young monk was able to go out into the world to develop and display attributes that were the antithesis of what Nietzsche decried in his first thesis. The first of these attributes was the lack of need to have material possessions or be a possessor in any way.

It was noted from an early age that Alyosha had little need for money. After he left the monastery, he displayed this lack of want to be a "possessor" in more ways than just lacking a desire for material possessions. While running around town trying to aid his brothers with the troubles, Alyosha also developed an appreciation of not "owning"

or “possessing” people through a dominating personality, or even through a portrayal of weakness to ensnare the other. This developing appreciation was best shown in the novel through Alyosha witnessing his brothers’ relationships with Grushenka and Katerina Ivanovna. Alyosha’s developing understanding of the need to let all people be free to be the best they can ,was best displayed through his humble relationship with the often hysterical Liza Khokhlakov.

Robert Bird, in discussing the lawyers and their performances during the trial, mentions how Alyosha stood out from the rest of the people present and was unable to be manipulated by the barristers. He says that “the prosecutor's psychological myopia results in dismissive stereotyping, but in Alyosha’s case, it leads to utter fantasy. Alyosha simply does not fit any of the patterns extant in Russian society” (Bird 27). This statement is essential for two reasons. The first is that it exemplifies how the youngest Karamazov is something new to Russian society, therefore making him able to display a new type of morality. Alyosha, in being immune to the wiles and trickery of the prosecutors, shows himself able to promote new ideas without being beholden to the old ways. The second reason is how it shows that Alyosha can be this new Russian type. One basis for his ability to do this is his complete lack of need to be an “owner.”

From Alyosha’s early life onwards people noted that he was without a care in the world and that he could either turn up in a strange town with plenty of money, or completely broke, and it would not make any difference to him. If he possessed plenty of money, the feeling was he would give it all away at the first impulse, while if he were broke, people would shelter and feed him because of his gentle nature. This makes him

stand out in stark contrast to the performers and posturers in the courtroom - the lawyers, judges, witnesses and even the audience. Alyosha's humble and honest testimony in the trial is the first time he can break through all the problems that have besieged his family's life. Here, during his giving of evidence, he shows that despite all worldly pressure to disagree, he still believes in brotherly love and the goodness of Dmitri: "'I am afraid to say that I did. However, I never doubted that some higher feeling would always save him at the fatal moment, as it has indeed saved him, for it was not he killed my father,' Alyosha said firmly, in a loud voice that was heard throughout the court" (Dostoevsky 766).

Alyosha is reaching a point where he is starting to obtain a fuller understanding of Russian moral culture. While showing up the courtroom with his apathy towards owning physical property, he also displays no need to own a moral superiority. This is seen early in the novel when he is described thus:

There was something about him which made one feel at once (and it was so all his life afterwards) that he did not care to be a judge of others—that he would never take it upon himself to criticise and would never condemn anyone for anything. He seemed, indeed, to accept everything without the least condemnation though often grieving bitterly (14).

Here is a quintessential point about Alyosha and his move towards a new religious morality. He did not need to feel he was a rank above people by putting them down, but rather he accepted everyone as they were. Even in the microcosm of the monastery he was quite oblivious to the nature of many of the meaner-spirited monks, and accepted

all equally, though he loved Zosima far more. He had no desire to rise to power, to hold sway over others, either in the monastery or in the town. He also had no need to possess people and would also not let other people claim some form of ownership over him.

With his brothers, there is a pure love that does not require any of them having any power over Alyosha, or vice versa. Both Ivan and Dmitri revel in their brother's company and though often disagreeing with and challenging each other, are respectful of the stances each takes. This is one of the attributes desired when Zosima felt Alyosha needed to learn from being in the world. In the monastery, "when you choose an elder, you renounce your own will and yield it to him in complete submission, complete self-abnegation" and this was not a desired state for the young boy's free soul (Dostoevsky 24). In the town, people like Madame Khokhlakov, Katerina Ivanova, and Grushenka all tried to take the young Karamazov under their wings. Often on leaving, they would demand that he must come again soon, or if he was in town, a message would arrive insisting he come at once. Although Alyosha would accede to these requests, these women were never able to feel they possessed or had control over him. The same goes for the monk Rakitin, who tried to manipulate Alyosha's thoughts and in that way possess power over him. The young monk, however, saw through him quickly. The best example of Alyosha's non-possessiveness is in his interactions with the sickly young Liza Khokhlakov. After many performances and hysterics, Alyosha is still gentle and kind towards her and does not take advantage of her weakness in any way. Also, he does not give in to her demands if something more is pressing:"'Don't dare to go

away like that!' Lise was beginning. 'Lise, I have a real sorrow! I'll be back directly, but I have a great, great sorrow!' And he ran out of the room" (213).

On the other hand, he is prepared to do anything for her because of the love in his heart. Most importantly, when she cries from the engagement, Alyosha gives her his blessing and leaves her to follow her own path. The youngest Karamazov in no way wants to own her and turn her will to his. Alyosha, unlike the contemporary Russian society of the time, moves away from this need to own, either materialistically or in having power over others, which becomes an essential understanding in his philosophy.

This lack of need to be a possessor in any form was one of the ways in which the trials and tribulations of his brothers helped Alyosha towards his understanding of the world and how it needed to be traversed in order to lead a successful moral life. Characters that revolved around or intersected in his brothers' lives exhibited the need to possess things such as money, fame or even other people. It was by witnessing this that Alyosha could start to develop his philosophy. Furthermore, there were more troubling aspects of his brothers' lives that helped impel Alyosha forward on his path to enlightenment.

The first of these revelations was from witnessing Ivan's infatuation with delving into 'the truth.' Alyosha continually saw Ivan wrestle with his conception of truth and how his brother could not come to a balance within himself. Alyosha saw his brother struggling between intellectualising ideas of God and morality and a want to believe in God unequivocally. Through Ivan's inability to find harmony within himself between

these ideas, Alyosha was able to realise the path to goodness and true morality did not lie in an overly structured moral philosophy.

Alyosha's awareness of the quandary that Ivan was creating for himself only developed over time. Lesic-Thomas notes that "Aliosha has no immediate response to Ivan's argument," and several times in the early stages of the novel, Alyosha was confounded by Ivan's intellectual theorising (782). The younger brother is pained to see his sibling creating such a mental framework in which to view the world. Ivan is a forerunner of Nietzsche's declaration that "we are tired of man" (44). It is the idea that Ivan has lost his belief in humankind that is the true cause of mental and emotional anguish in Alyosha.

Ivan and Alyosha do debate the existence of God and eternity, on which Ivan prevaricates as the two sides of his personality wrench at him. But it is the failure to see the joy in the world that truly distresses Alyosha. Within a very short space of time Alyosha witnesses his brother going from a kind of innocence to a much more troubling air. "Ivan smiled suddenly quite like a little gentle child. Alyosha had never seen such a smile on his face before" very quickly becomes: "'You speak with a strange air,' observed Alyosha uneasily, 'as though you were not quite yourself'" (Dostoevsky 261). Alyosha is witnessing the gentle love that he knows that Ivan has within him, only to see it turn very quickly into a darker mood as the overly powerful rational philosophising side of his personality gains control. The youngest Karamazov tries to tell his brother: "'There's a great deal of love in mankind, and almost Christ-like love. I know that myself, Ivan'" (266). Meanwhile Ivan delights in toying with Alyosha's turmoil. "'Bravo!' cried

Ivan, delighted. ‘If even you say so.... You're a pretty monk! So there is a little devil sitting in your heart, Alyosha Karamazov!’” (266). Alyosha replies the only way he knows how to show his love, by, in a kind of plagiarism of Ivan’s story, kissing his older brother on the lips (290). As in Nietzsche’s writing years later, Alyosha realises that it is in fellowship and love of humanity that a new morality must be founded. Nietzsche writes about this: “A glimpse of a man that justifies the existence of man, a glimpse of an incarnate human happiness that realises and redeems, for the sake of which one may hold fast to the belief in man!” (44).

In ‘Fyodor Dostoevsky and Friedrich Nietzsche: Power/Weakness,’ Ekaterina Poljakova describes this connection of understanding between the two writers as heralding “nothing less than a new geological epoch, the epoch of ‘the man-god’ is needed. This proceeds from the awareness that humans themselves are divine, that they are gods” (126). Alyosha, as he witnesses his brother’s demise, sees this slipping from his brother’s grasp. Even Ivan himself is aware of that he is losing something great. He says, “‘Don't taunt me with having rebelled against God. I don't want to feel angry with you, so you must be kinder, too, I've lost a treasure such as you have never had” (235). Ivan, deep down, knows that he has lost the ability to love; he knows that he has lost the ability to fulfill his potential - the potential that could see him as a new type that defines a modern religious morality for Russia, to find a paradise here on Earth.

By witnessing a version of the petty quarrels made large in the world outside the monastery, Alyosha was able to determine that this was not the way forward for a new type of Russian morality. The youngest brother understood that it must play some part

in the development of this idea, but that it could not come to dominate the idea. This was the understanding that he gained from his brother's psychomachia, one which pushed him forward in his way to his own understanding of a new Russian religious morality. Like Ivan, the eldest brother Dmitri, while losing the potential to become a new Russian type as explained in the chapters regarding Dmitri and Ivan, also pushed Alyosha forward in his conception of what type of ideas were needed for contemporary Russia. Townsend writes on this need to elevate society: "The plurality of higher types and the way in which the epithet 'higher' relates to the ability of an individual to elevate a society by countering some of its dominant tendencies" (3). But it is not only with his older brother's dominant side that Alyosha must struggle, but also with the oldest brother Dmitri. Many times in the novel, Alyosha, for his brothers' welfare reacts:

> "'Ivan!' he cried desperately after him. 'Come back, Ivan! No, nothing will induce him to come back now!' he cried again, regretfully realizing it; 'but it's my fault, my fault. I began it! Ivan spoke angrily, wrongly. Unjustly and angrily. He must come back here, come back,' Alyosha kept exclaiming frantically" (Dostoevsky 210).

What Alyosha derived from observing Dmitri's psychomachia was that there is no goodness that is derived from "acts" only. Alyosha felt no compulsion to search for good deeds enacted by his brother. He knew that deep down his brother was good and did not see goodness as attached to the idea of utility. In this way, Dmitri helped Alyosha understand the wrongness of the idea when Dmitri was judged by his actions and not by

his heart. Dmitri Karamazov helped Alyosha distance himself fully from judging the goodness of a person by the outcome of an action. In this way, Alyosha becomes the complete opposite of Nietzsche's definition of the type.

Dmitri's passionate side led him into ruin, and like Ivan, this dominant side drove Alyosha to despair. Dmitri's unpredictable behaviour causes Alyosha concern: "Stop, Dmitri,' Alyosha interrupted again with great anxiety" (125). "Alyosha looked after him, unable to believe he would go away so abruptly" (170). Alyosha sees such goodness in his brother. It is a goodness that made Dmitri popular in the different walks of his life. After all, even early in the novel we hear about Dmitri's "gift of making himself loved directly and unconsciously was inherent in him, in his very nature" (15).

With this nature and the fact that "Alyosha brought with him something his father had never known before: a complete absence of contempt for him and an invariable kindness," Dmitri has a chance to bring forth the new type that he can be, the side of him that can show tremendous love for all humankind (99). It is this side of Dmitri that Alyosha continues to believe in when he "made up his mind to wait. He felt that, perhaps, indeed, his work lay here" (11). Even after hearing of Dmitri's despicable act against the Captain, Alyosha believes that Dmitri's inherent goodness can retrieve the situation. He tells the Captain that his brother "'will beg your forgiveness, he will bow down at your feet in the middle of the market-place,' […' with glowing eyes" and indeed Dmitri does offer his younger brother hope when he too believes he can make amends (224).

But Dmitri's dominant type comes through, and he forges ahead down a pathway of making unrealistic plans that make no allowance for his previous behaviours. In describing this type Nietzsche explains how they have a "lack of prudence, such as a vehement and valiant charge, whether against danger or the enemy, or as those ecstatic bursts of rage, love, reverence, gratitude, by which at all times noble souls have recognised each other" (37). Alyosha must time and again see his brother fail to reach his potential because of this. Dmitri does not tap into the well of goodness and kindness contained within him, but falls prey to the idea that his ill-thought-out acts can repair damages he has caused. Like Nietzsche describes later in his work, Dmitri feels of altruistic acts that "simply because, as a sheer matter of habit, they were praised as good, [they] came also to be felt as good—as though they contained in themselves some intrinsic goodness" (37). Dmitri even asks the Captain about befriending his son: "'Ah, how I would like to make friends with your boy!' he cried. 'If you could arrange it'" (Dostoevsky 277). As Nietzsche defines in this type, Dmitri thinks this is how he will repair the damage he has done. This belief in utility and "good acts" as the essence of goodness means Dmitri will not break out of the type as he does not understand the reverse of the equation. Nietzsche says that "good" in the sense of "with aristocratic soul," "noble," in the sense of "with a soul of high calibre," "with a privileged soul" is a development which invariably runs parallel with that other evolution by which "vulgar," "plebeian," "low," are made to change finally into "bad" (23). It is precisely this lack of understanding of his type and dominant side that confines Dmitri to perform the kinds of acts he did against the Captain in the first place. This trait of the eldest Karamazov

equates with Nietzsche's understanding of the actions of the noble military type: "The pathos of nobility and distance, as I have said, the chronic and despotic esprit de corps and fundamental instinct of a higher dominant race coming into association with a meaner race, an 'under race,' this is the origin of the antithesis of good and bad" (20).

Dmitri's spontaneous turns of spirit and misunderstanding of a goodness that comes from within, along with Ivan's walking down a loveless path, create havoc within Alyosha, who in turn begins to become forgetful. He is in turmoil as he tries to juggle his brothers' needs. For instance, "several times afterwards he wondered how he could, on leaving Ivan, so completely forget his brother Dmitri, though he had that morning, only a few hours before, so firmly resolved to find him and not to give up doing so, even should he be unable to return to the monastery that night" (Dostoevsky 291). "He remembered afterwards how, on that terrible day, he had entirely forgotten his brother Dmitri, about whom he had been so anxious and troubled the day before; he had forgotten, too, to take the two hundred roubles to Allusha's father, though he had so warmly intended to do so the preceding evening" (376). Dmitri's personality has a strong effect on Alyosha, and by becoming like him, Alyosha understands his brother's dilemma much more strongly. It is with the strong understanding of where Dmitri is going wrong that later on Alyosha is able to start declaring his version of a new religious morality for a Russia.

Alyosha comes to realise more and more that "his brother Dmitri could be made uhappy, terribly, completely unhappy: there was trouble awaiting him and even more so that his brother is unable to cope with these pressures" (159). Alysoha comes to

understand that this side of Dmitri is the stronger but that it cannot continue to dominate if his older brother is to reach his potential. He says to Dmitri, trying to dissuade him from taking on this suffering for humankind:

> "'You are not ready, and such a cross is not for you. What's more, you don't need such a martyr's cross when you are not ready for it. If you had murdered our father, it would grieve me that you should reject your punishment. But you are innocent, and such a cross is too much for you'" (863).

Alyosha is desperate for his brother to break away from this type. He does not want to see him foolishly believe in taking on suffering for all humanity, thinking that this old moral understanding will bring him his salvation. Alyosha, during his time outside the monastery, understands that it is through goodness in the world that true love can be found, not by a passionate need to suffer in a gesture for all humankind that actually carries no benefit for anyone.

The second brother Karamazov failed in his endeavour to bring harmony into his life. By noticing this, Alyosha comes to the realisation that too much passion without a more balanced rational side is also not the way forward to develop a new morality. Along with his brother Ivan's inability to meld the two sides of his personality into a harmonious whole, Dmitri's example to Alyosha moves the youngest brother forward in his understanding of the world and what is needed, in terms of principles, to navigate it. Interestingly, before the final scene where Alyosha is able to espouse his understanding to the small group of boys, the reader last hears of the two brothers huddled together

and developing a plan to free Dmitri on the way to Siberia. This harmony that Ivan and Dmitri display for the first time foreshadows Alyosha's understanding of the new understanding of unity that is needed in contemporary Russia.

Throughout the novel, both the elder brothers Karamazov display very little liking for each other. Ivan even detested Dmitri, and Dmitri thought of Ivan as a stone. The two are even thought to be at odds over the hand in marriage of Katerina Ivanova. However, by the end of the novel, the two are plotting together in some form of brotherly harmony.

The idea in *The Brothers Karamazov* that a new morality must be discovered and lived is best described by Grigorii Pomerants, who details Dostoevsky's depiction of an ideal Russia thus: "The universal harmony about which Dostoevsky prophesied does not in the least signify the utilitarian prosperity of people on this present earth but rather the beginning of that new earth where truth abides" (23). The coming together of the brothers in a type of harmony foreshadows Alyosha's revelations to the boys by the stone. Pomerants continues on, describing Alyosha's nature "Alesha's nature is active above all yet unclouded and serene at the same time," which is the exact type of spiritual soul needed to see the movement forward for Russia (24). It is Alyosha's active but serene nature that allows him to have witnessed all the troubles his family had been through, and thus "he leads us through sickliness up to the threshold of a new beauty" (25).

Even Nietzsche extols this type in his writing, espousing that it is the peaceful, almost Buddhist type that can lead the way forward. Mark Alfano, in "An Enchanting

Abundance of Types," tells us that, like Alyosha, "such types represent, for Nietzsche, the creation of new values by those who initially represent them, and who thus give them their names" (420). Alyosha knows that he has just started his journey into understanding at the beginning of the story:

> "'No, it's not too far,' said Alyosha warmly (obviously the idea was not a new one). 'The ladder's the same. I'm at the bottom step, and you're above, somewhere about the thirteenth. That's how I see it. But it's all the same. Absolutely the same in kind. Anyone on the bottom step is bound to go up to the top one'" (115).

Alyosha has been through a lot after his leaving the monastery, and he has learnt about contemporary human nature. While talking to Lise, who maintains that people will revel in the murder of a father by a son, he realises that "there is some truth in what you say about everyone," which is part of his process to his new understanding (657). In determining his pathway through the world, Alyosha realises that there will always be trials for people and this must be taken into account. The young monk never stops aching in his heart for his brothers' struggles, as seen in the following passage: "Alyosha went out in tears. Such distrustfulness in Mitya, such lack of confidence even to him, to Alyosha […] He was as much worried about Ivan as about Mitya, and more than ever now" (675). But despite all this, Alyosha sees hope in the unity of humankind. He realises the world can not go on trying to possess material gains and even people, and that like his brothers, it can unite and create a brotherly harmony on earth.

This harmony that is shown at the end of the novel represents a coming together in brotherly love that has been impossible previously due to the brothers'

temperaments.and it is not until the types come together that a unity happens. This coming together foreshadows Alyosha's speech at the stone, where all the disparate parts that have been tugging at the younger brother's psyche fall into place. Tellingly, Alyosha makes no reference to Christ, has very little rationalising to do, and urges the boys to, above all, remember. He wants them to remember all the good things, to carry in their hearts the joy of fellowship that they experience throughout their lives. Alyosha has learnt from the trials and tribulations of his Elder from the monastery, and his two brothers' struggles. The youngest Karamazov has learnt from the Elder Zosima's words "and in very truth, so soon as men understand that, the Kingdom of Heaven will be for them not a dream, but a living reality" (335).

With the speech at the stone, Alyosha shows all that he has learnt, summarised in a simple philosophy for the boys to follow. All the turmoil that has existed in his life has brought him to this realisation. This started with the meeting in the monastery involving all the Karamazovs, then the death of the Elder Zosima and Alyosha's leaving the monastery. The turmoil was compounded by the erratic behaviour of his two brothers and their dominant personality traits. What the speech at the stone demonstrates is how Aloysha has learnt to look for a pure harmony in life, away from the turmoil of conflicting character traits. Also, critically, it involves discussions with young boys who are not corrupted by too much debate, overly wrought passion or dogmatic teachings. It is because of this that Alyosha can spread his message freely to the next generation of Russians, represented by these innocent, loving children.

This matches Townsend's description of Nietzsche's outlook in search of a new morality. Townsend says that "Nietzsche places all his investigations into higher types firmly in the service of the present, the philosopher's 'secret' is that he always looks forward, searching for 'a new greatness of man', a new untrodden path to his enlargement" (16). Alyosha is capable of modelling a new greatness for humankind. Robert Bird says that "what he is teaching, above all, is the image of a nonexistent, vague, yet credible 'beautiful man'" while Lesic-Thomas tells us that "Aliosha's goodness and innocence allow him to approach and alleviate the actual suffering of the children in the novel" (Bird 25; Lesic-Thomas 787). It is this innate goodness, along with the lessons he has learnt from witnessing his brothers' unruly dominant sides, that allow Alyosha to see the shining light of a new way to behave towards each other. This change in how human morality might be determined is exemplified when Kolya meets Alyosha outside: "His charming face always had a good-humoured expression, but there was a gentleness and serenity in his good-humour. To Kolya's surprise, Alyosha came out to him just as he was, without an overcoat" (Dostoevsky 599). Alyosha is not only peaceful and full of love, he is throwing off the overcoat of the previous ideas and morality passed down through the various types that came to dominate society. These are the types that Nietzsche would write about a few years after *The Brothers Karamazov* was published-- the types that Dostoevsky represented so well in the famous novel.

The new morality is not to be determined by the dominant types and their characteristics. Forgetfulness is not the way forward, and Alyosha urges the boys to do

the opposite and always remember: "'Let us always remember how we buried the poor boy at whom we once threw stones, do you remember, by the bridge? [...] with most important things, if we attain to honour or fall into great misfortune—still let us remember how good it was once here, when we were all together, united by a good and kind feeling which made us'" (875). It is by remembering the goodness that lies in everyone that a new pathway is forged. It does not have to be the people in power or the church, the military type or the landowner that set the rules for behaviour and define what is 'good' and 'bad'. The youngest Karamazov has seen how "moral," "altruistic," and "désintéressé" are concepts of equal value but knows that it is the sharing of inherent goodness that will right the wrongs of the world (Nietzsche 21). It is not power and possessions that should determine a person's worth, but their value as a truly good person who wants to share that goodness. This is far different from the way morality has been brought about as envisaged by Nietzsche, who dismays at the hold the strong have over the lives of the weak through their strength and domination. Nietzsche speaks of them thus: "They call themselves in perhaps the most frequent instances simply after their superiority in power (e.g. 'the powerful,' 'the lords,' 'the commanders'), or after the most obvious sign of their superiority, as for example 'the rich,' 'the possessors' (that is the meaning of arya, and the Iranian and Slav languages correspond)" (24). These are no grounds for defining a new morality for Alyosha, as witnessed by his disappointment at Ratikin's duplicity: "Alyosha, who was attached to him, was distressed to see that his friend Rakitin was dishonourable and quite unconscious of being so himself, considering, on the contrary, that because he would

not steal money left on the table he was a man of the highest integrity" (Dostoevsky 89). Alyosha, throughout the book, witnesses the strife running through his family and wishes for better for them. This is how he develops his understanding that a new approach to life must be taken. The deep thinking in a crisis that Alyosha needed to do can be seen in the following passage: "'One reptile will devour the other,' Ivan had pronounced the day before, speaking in anger of his father and Dmitri. So Ivan looked upon Dmitri as a reptile and perhaps had long done so. Was it perhaps since he had known Katerina Ivanovna? That phrase had, of course, escaped Ivan unawares yesterday, but that only made it more critical. If he felt like that, what chance was there of peace? Were there not, on the contrary, new grounds for hatred and hostility in their family? Moreover, with which of them was Alyosha to sympathise?" (Dostoevsky 204).

This idea is echoed at the end of the book when Alysoha reacts to Kolya wanting to sacrifice himself for truth: "'Oh, if I, too, could sacrifice myself some day for truth!' said Kolya with enthusiasm. 'But not in such a cause, not with such disgrace and such horror!' said Alyosha" (869). Alyosha does not want Koyla to sacrifice himself to the old truths and morality; he wants him to move forward in love and comradeship. "'You are like everyone else,' said Alyosha, in conclusion, 'that is, like very many others. Only you must not be like everybody else, that is all' (627).

It is the simple goodness that must be cherished in Alyosha's philosophy and the remembering of that goodness. It is about not letting the world and its morality-forming institutions take away the goodness in everyone. It is about remembering the world is

good “that there is nothing higher and stronger and more wholesome and good for life in the future than some good memory, especially a memory of childhood, of home” (Dostoevsky 875). It is brotherhood and fellow feeling that Alyosha envisages as they go off hand in hand after the funeral: “‘Well, now we will finish talking and go to his funeral dinner. Don't be put out at our eating pancakes— it is an ancient custom and there's something nice in that’ laughed Alyosha. 'Well, let us go! Moreover, now we go hand in hand’” (877). It is about the common Russian believing in each other's goodness and looking after each other in love and friendship. This is best seen in Alyosha as he tries to look after his brothers throughout the novel: “‘Brother,’ Alyosha called after him, 'if anything happens to you to-day, turn to me before any one!’” (860).

So, *The Brothers Karamazov* finishes with the youngest brother sermonising to the young boys he has befriended. This is the culmination of Alyosha’s experiences from the time of the death of the Elder Zosima until the end of the trial of Dmitri. After seeing his brothers drive themselves to ruin through letting a dominant feature of their personality override the other side of their characters, Alyosha realises that neither of these dominating traits can be the path towards a new morality. He understands that Dmitri’s willingness to be a sufferer and Ivan’s intellectual games cannot be used as guiding principles in this new outlook. The youngest brother Karamazov also realises that it is not the Church, or being sequestered away in a monastery that will provide the answer to becoming a new Russian type to deliver a new contemporary morality. Alyosha realises that it a belief in humankind that must drive forward this progressive understanding. He realises that it is to love each other as brother and sister,

unchallenged, and never to forget the goodness that you have witnessed. It is holding that in your heart that will lead to this new Russian religious morality.

9. Conclusion.

Thus, *The Brothers Karamazov* follows the path of Alyosha, a Russian everyman, and is a story of the zeitgeist of the period in which it was written. It portrays certain types that have been the dominating classes in creating and maintaining the morality of contemporary Russia. These are the types that will later be codified in Nietzsche's *The Genealogy of Morals*, the types which Dostoevsky uses to display the dysfunctionality this morality causes within society. Through witnessing the trials and tribulations of his brothers, guided by the understanding hand of Zosima, Alyosha is able to discern that the old morality passed down by the ruling types, so dominant in Russian society for centuries, does not coincide with a functioning society designed to bring the best out of all of its citizens. The story of *The Brothers Karamazov* is a tale of the pressure exerted on individuals by these contrived morals conceived by stratas of society with no real attachment to the majority of the people. The novel portrays, through the psychomachia of Ivan and Dmitri, how trying to adhere to the morality of a certain type developed by these ruling classes, against the understanding of your true nature, leads to ruin. It is by seeing this that the youngest Karamazov, Alyosha, understands the need for a new morality that is brought forth from the true strength of Russia - the Russian peasantry. It is in their strength in unity that a morality based on brotherly love can be established.

In a vastly troubled modern world, with schisms between left and right so pronounced, the gap between have and have not never wider, and democratic institutions seemingly held to ransom by corporate power, *The Brothers Karamazov* remains as timely as ever. If the very institutions that are supposed to defend justice and freedom, themselves perpetrate the death of children held in custody, react to mass shootings with ‘thoughts and prayers’, and stigmatize anyone easily targeted as ‘other’, is it not time to revise the moral basis on which our Western world is based?

7. Bibliography

Alfano, Mark. “An Enchanting Abundance of Types: Nietzsche's Modest Unity of Virtue Thesis.” *Philosophy and Other Thoughts, Springer Science*, 12 Oct. 2013, alfanos.org/Blog/?p=400.

Apollonio, Carol. “Dostoevsky’s Religion: Words, Images and the Seed of Charity.” *Dostoevsky Studies, New Series, XIII*, 2009, pp.23-35.

Babushkina, Dina. “Secrets, Dark and Deep in Dostoevsky.” *Homo Oeconomicus, vol. 28, no. 4*, 2011, pp. 59–86., doi:10.1007/978-0-387-72797-4_3.

Bird, Robert. “Refiguring the Russian Type: Dostoevsky and the Limits of Realism.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov"*, Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Briggs, Katherine Jane. “Dostoevsky, Women, and the Gospel: Mothers and Daughters in the Later Novels.” *Dostoevsky Studies, New Series, XIII*, 2009, pp. 109-120.

Buzina, Tatyana. “Two Fates: Zosima’s Bow and What Rakitin Said.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov"*, Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Cassedy, Steven. *Dostoevsky's Religion*. Stanford University Press, 2005.

Cassedy, Steven. “Who says Miracles Can’t Be the Basis for Faith? More Reasons Why Dostoevsky’s Religion Isn’t Christianity.” *Dostoevsky Studies, New Series, XIII*, 2009, pp. 37-45.

Cohen, Sharon. “Balaams Ass: Smerdyakov as a Paradoxical Redeemer in Dostoevsky’s The Brothers Karamazov.” *Christianity & Literature, vol. 64, no. 1*, 2014, pp. 43–64., doi:10.1177/0148333114552772.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Translated by Constance Garnett, Lowell Press, 1882.

Emerson, Caryl. “Zosima’s “Mysterious Visitor”: Again bakhtin on Dostoevsky and Dostoevsky on Heaven and Hell.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov"*, Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Flath, Carol A. “The Passion of Dmitri Karamazov.” *Slavic Review, vol. 58, no. 03*, 1999, pp. 584–599., doi:10.2307/2697569.

Fusso, Susanne. “The sexuality of the Male Virgin: Arkady in A Raw Youth and Alyosha Karamazov.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov"*, Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Futrell, Michael. “Buddhism and The Brothers Karamazov.” Synoptic Parallels, *Dostoevsky Studies*, 1981, sites.utoronto.ca/tsq/DS/02/index.shtml.

Gerigk, Horst-Jurgen. “Dostoevsky-Genius of Evocation: The Scene of Fyodor Karamazov’s murder and Its Symbolic Topography.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov"*, Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Glatzer Rosenthal, Bernice. “*Nietzsche in Russia*.” Find in a Library with WorldCat, 11 Mar. 2018, www.worldcat.org/title/nietzsche-in-russia/oclc/13668609.

Goldsmith, Marcella Tarozzi. *Nietzsche's Understanding of a Good Life: Seeking More than Happiness*. Edwin Mellen Press, 2012.

Golstein, Vladimir. “Accidental Families and Surrogate Fathers: Richard, Grigory, and Smerdyakov.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov"*, Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Harrison, Lonny. “The Numinous Experience of Ego Transcendence in Dostoevsky.” *Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 57, no. 3, 2013, pp. 388–402., doi:10.30851/57.3.003.

Holland, Kate. “The Legend of the Ladonka and the Trial of the Novel.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Jackson, Robert Louis. “Preface.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov",* Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Jackson, Robert Louis. “Alyosha’s Speech at the Stone: “The Whole Picture.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Janaway, Christopher. “On the Very Idea of ‘Justifying Suffering.’” *The Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, Penn State University Press, 10 July 2017, muse.jhu.edu/article/664345.

Johnson, Lee D. “Smerdyakov as Would-Be-Saint.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Jones, Malcolm V. *Dostoevsky and the Dynamics of Religious Experience*. [Electronic Resource]. London : Anthem Press, 2005. Anthem Russian and Slavonic studies. EBSCOhost, ezproxy.massey.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat03987a&AN=massey.b3652458&site=eds-live&scope=site.

Knapp, Lisa. Mothers and Sons in The Brothers Karamazov: Our Ladies of Skotoprigonyevsk. *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Kostalevsky, Marina. “Sensual Mind: The Pain and Pleasure of Thinking.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Lavrin, Janko. “Lavrin - A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky.” Scribd, 1969, www.scribd.com/document/293366917/Lavrin-A-Note-on-Nietzsche-and-Dostoevsky.

Lesic-Thomas, Andrea. “The Answer Job Did Not Give: Dostoevsky's Brat'ia Karamzovy and Camus's La Peste.” *The Modern Language Review, vol. 101*, 2006, pp. 774–788., doi:10.2307/3719271.

Martinsen, Deborah A. “Shame’s Rhetoric, or Ivan’s Devil, Karamazov Soul.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

McReynolds, Susan. “Introduction.” *Dostoevsky Studies, New Series, XIII*, 2009, pp. 5–22.

Miller, Robin Feuer. “The Brothers Karamazov Today.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Mills, Todd III. “The Brothers Karamazov Tomorrow.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Morson, Gary Saul. “The God of Onions: The Brothers Karamazov and the Mythic Prosaic.” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. *The Genealogy of Morals: a Polemic*. T.N. Foulis, 1913.

Orwin, Donna. “Did Dostoevsky or Tolstoy Believe in Miracles?” *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov*", Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Poljakova, Ekaterina. “*Fyodor Dostoevsky and Friedrich Nietzsche: Power/Weakness*.” Taylor & Francis,

2017, www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/21692327.2016.1249015.

Pomerants, Grigorii. "*Russian Studies in Literature*." Taylor & Francis, 9 Dec. 2104, www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.2753/RSL1061-1975340419.

Razumov, Aleksandr. "The Secret of Dmitri Karamazov's Money." *Russian Studies in Literature, vol. 51*, no. 2, 2015, pp. 54–65., doi:10.1080/10611975.2015.1024

Sabo, Gerald J. " "The Dream of a Ridiculous Man: Christian Hope for Human Society." *Dostoevsky Studies, New Series, XIII*, 2009, pp. 47-60.

Seiden, Melvin. "Nabokov and Dostoevsky." *Contemporary Literature, vol. 13, no. 4*, 1972, p. 423., doi:10.2307/1207440.

Shrayer, Maxim D. "The Jewish Question and The Brothers Karamazov." *A New Word on "The Brothers Karamazov"*, Northwestern University Press, 2004.

Smith, Macklin. "Prudentius' 'Psychomachia.'" Project MUSE, Princeton University Press, muse.jhu.edu/chapter/1479176.

White, Justin, and Browning, Dr. Gary. "The Russian Orthodox Response to Father Zosima in The Brothers Karamazov." *Journal of Undergraduate Research, 11 Sept. 2013*, jur.byu.edu/?p=5379.