"REMIZOV'S SISTERS OF THE CROSS: AN EXTENSION AND CONTINUATION OF DOSTOEVSKY'S NOTES FROM THE UNDERGROUND"

BY

DONNA E. KELLER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Russian Literature

McGILL UNIVERSITY

April 1976

RESUME

Le but principal de cette étude est de montrer la similarité des philosophies de Fyodor Dostoevsky et d'Aleksey Remizov. Cette étude porte sur les ressemblances entre ces deux écrivains et la similitude des mouvements littéraires parallèles qui les ont encouragé à traiter des thèmes semblables dans leurs romans; Zapiski iz podpol'ia de Dostoevsky et Krestovyia sestry de Remizov sont les deux romans étudiés pour démontrer la ressemblance entre les écrivains. La thèse veut prouver que les thèmes du roman de Remizov sont une continuation et un développement des mêmes idées que Dostoevsky avait avancées cinquante ans plus tôt.

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this paper has been to show the similarities between Fyodor Dostoevsky and Aleksej Remizov. This paper discusses similarities in the backgrounds of these two writers and similarities in the parallel literary movements which encouraged them to broach similar themes within their novels. Zapiski iz podpol'ja by Dostoevsky, and Krestovyja sestry by Remizov, were the two novels discussed to demonstrate the likeness between the two writers, and it was proposed that the themes and topics in Remizov's novel were an expansion and a maturing of the same topics and themes which Dostoevsky had advanced fifty years earlier.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

PREFACE

The intent of this thesis is to demonstrate how the themes of Dostoevsky in Notes From the Underground in 1864 are re-created fifty years later in Remizov's novel, Sisters of the Cross. This comparison has never been made before. Various critics of Remizov have alluded to his similarity to Dostoevsky, but no in-depth study on this subject has been found.

Little trouble was encountered in conducting research on Dostoevsky's personal life and on the novel, Notes From the Underground. Remizov, however, was another matter. Very little has been written about this author, and many of the Russian journals which were the prime source, were either non-existent in the library-loan system, or very difficult to obtain. Furthermore, the articles used seldom made reference to Sisters of the Cross. Of Remizov's five main novels, this novel was not one of the more popular. Consequently, the conclusions and analogies made about the book are entirely original.

During the research, two dissertations on the works of Remizov by Sarah Burke and Sona Aronian helped to reinforce the ideas which had been gleaned from a translation of the book by the present thesis writer, and they also provided help in compiling the bibliography. Furthermore, a

biography by N. Rodrjanskaja helped tremendously in compiling information on the background of Remizov, and also, on his views on religion and fate.

A historical introduction in this preface to the two novels under discussion is unnecessary. The first chapter is devoted to this very aspect. It will suffice to say, that Dostoevsky and Remizov each belonged to two very different periods in literature and it was the intent of this paper to point out how, barring the differences in time and literary period, the literary philosophy in the novels of these two writers was very similar, thus, implying that such concepts and perceptions about life are not dependent upon time or literary movement, but are permanent throughout.

I wish to express special thanks to the librarians in inter-library loan department at Dartmouth Library who spent a great deal of time helping me find various references for this paper. I, also, wish to thank Lt. O. J. Harts who motivated me to finish this paper and to whom I am very indebted.

Chapter 1

LITERARY TRENDS AND BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES

This chapter primarily describes the different literary atmospheres surrounding the writing of Sisters of the Cross and Notes From the Underground. Also included are pertinent biographical facts in the lives of both Fyodor Dostoevsky and Aleksej Remizov - facts which had special significance for the writers' development and for their motivations in writing these two short novels. Upon completion of these descriptions, it will then be shown that sufficient similarities exist in the sphere of literary development and in the personal biographies of the writers in order to establish valid and sound comparisons of the novels themselves in the following chapters and to form a sound basis for analyzing the content of Remizov's novel as an extension and continuation of the contents of Dostoevsky's novel.

Literary Atmosphere of the 1860s

When Notes From the Underground was published in 1864, Nihilism was flourishing in Russia and one of the most famous nihilistic novels of the time, Chernyshevsky's What's to be Done?, was enjoying tremendous success.[1] Romanticism

had died out by 1855 and Realism had taken root in the Russian soil. However, these roots were not so deep and sturdy that writers during that period were able to stand on a solid and unified foundation.[2] Most writers, including Dostoevsky, were not in agreement about the constitution of the concept of realism, and consequently, most works in that period were not constrained to any basic prototype in form or style.

In the period when Dostoevsky wrote Notes From the Underground, he was caught between the waves of Romanticism and Realism. He vehemently rejected the concepts of the Nihilists, who were trying to build a "Crystal Palace" for man on the basis of reason and a scientific rationale; and yet one cannot call him a Slavophil in the strict sense of the word. On one of his trips abroad, Dostoevsky saw the Crystal Palace of the London Exposition and marvelled at its perfection. In his novel, this building became a symbol for him of the Nihilists' concept of man's ultimate and most perfect creation.[3] When Dostoevsky returned to St. Petersburg from exile in 1860, the slavophil tendencies in his literature greatly decreased and he began to accuse the Slavophils of maintaining an "ivory tower idealism"[4] in their writings. In fact, Dostoevsky was now so concerned with this overidealization of the past that he and Apollon Grigoriev (a very close friend and frequent contributor to Dostoevsky's magazine, Vremia), formed a moderate branch of slavophilism called Pochvenniki.[5] The main thrust of this movement was based on man's uprootedness from his country and homeland due

to the increasing influence from the West and from the turmoil of social change in Russia, initiated by the emancipation of the serfs.

The descent from idealistic concepts at the time of the writing of Notes From the Underground is the time which most critics consider the point of Dostoevsky's break with the past and the start of his cycle of mature works, Notes From the Underground being the basis for such works as Crime and Punishment, The Idiot, and The Brothers Karamazov. This break and the maturing of Dostoevsky's talent can best be described by the development of the main character in Notes From the Underground - the Underground Man. This man has been referred to as an evolution of the dreamer of the 1840s, or as the maturing of the superfluous man of the first half of the nineteenth century.[6] Like the author himself, this character of the 1860s certainly has ties with the past, but by no means do these ties bind and limit him. Like the romantic dreamer, the Underground Man is confronted with mysterious and unknown forces in his life which control his fate as well as the depth and credibility of his reality. But unlike the Romanticist, the Underground Man does not live in awe of this mystery, but becomes embittered and nasty, because he does not care to live in a dream world of illusion, no matter how pleasant it may initially appear.

Romanticism was at the most "intrigued" and "delightfully mystified" by the psychic and the underground of man, but deliberation over it never extended to the point upon

which Dostoevsky chose to embark in his novel. In its final stage, Romanticism was taken more seriously and satire against the immature dreamer caricature was becoming more prevalent. Yet, until Dostoevsky's Underground Man was created, further development of this type of character was not undertaken.[7] Romanticism itself was largely curtailed by 1855 when Alexander II accepted the throne and innovated a wave of social and political reforms. At this point the ideology of Romanticism began to seem superfluous and even harmful to the newer, progressive thought of reform and change.[8] This very rejection can be seen in the satirical description of Dostoevsky's Underground Man when the reader is told that he is a "bookish man", a "dreamer" divorced from the Russian soil and its people. Joseph Frank, in his article on Dostoevsky's underground, states that part two of the novel is, foremost, a rejection of Romanticism.[9] It seems not to have been Dostoevsky's intention to concentrate primarily on the denunciation of Romanticism in part two of Notes From the Underground, although his negation and departure from romantic and idealistic factors is nevertheless a primary detail to consider when analyzing the novel. The fact that love does not succeed in subduing the underground is a blow to the romantic period of literature, yet it was only a tool used by Dostoevsky to deliver blows elsewhere in the contemporary literary circles at that time - reasons which were Dostoevsky's primary concern for even writing Notes From the Underground. However, it is first necessary to provide a more literary background

to Dostoevsky's novel before undertaking a discussion of the obtrusive, antagonistic problems at which the novel was directed.

The period of Realism, flourishing between 1850-1890, was ill-defined, due to the numerous interpretations of its exact meaning. However, there are several points which characterize this period and which are also eminent in Notes From the Underground. Interest in current events and social issues was an important common point, as was a growing sympathy for the suffering and insignificant man displaced in Russian society. Due to the varied political and economic reforms taking place, the growing influence from the West, the emancipation of the serfs, and the development of a more urban society, the Russian man of the 1860s was tossed about in this turmoil and his individuality and personal importance were neglected, if not completely shoved aside. The Underground Man is an excellent representative of this state of being. He is "one of the people", yet, he is divorced and withdrawn from the real world. The external world has not accepted him as part of its living structure. The Underground Man is bookish and stuffy; he lives in the abstract, aloof from his colleagues, and he dreams. The positive heroes of the 1840s and of the romantic period were also subject to these states, but the main difference was that the Underground Man is completely conscious and aware of his actions and states of mind, while his less developed ancestors simply wallow obliviously in their mysticism in face of the superior

forces which control their lives.

Most Realists were concerned to concentrate their works on a single plane of reality, devoid of symbolism and grotesque, hyperbolic devices. Generally, the subjects were representative of contemporary man, painted with current social and political coloring. The Underground Man was not a typical character of the 1860s, yet he does portray the general development of thought in that decade. This character represents more a state of mind, struggling on a plane one step above the empirical. Not all of these generalized, basic characteristics of Realism can be applied to Notes From the Underground, and it is not essentially necessary to do so. The important point is the recognition of this movement as one of several supportive braces constituting and upholding the creation of his novel and the source of nourishment for his assertions and arguments. It now remains to be discussed against what, precisely, is this defense and support necessary.

At the time of publication of Dostoevsky's novel, Chernyshevsky's nihilistic novel, What's to be Done?, was enjoying great popularity. This book and the nihilistic movement, in general, were a culmination of the same literary movements as those which influenced Dostoevsky and a culmination of the numerous social and political changes which the country was undergoing. However, justification for these changes and innovations was quite difficult to find. The Nihilists refused to hide behind the veil of mysticism as the Romantics had done, and they did not care to fall into the

hopelessness and despair of the underground world of Dostoevsky. Consequently, the most adequate answer was found in reason and the rationale. Chernyshevsky's assertions were basically, that man is inately good and amenable to reason. If man lives and thinks according to reason, then the harmony in his life will not be disputed. With this basis of reason and with the tools of science and technology, man will be able to construct a perfect society.[10] This "new man" concept, based on rationalism, proposed that Russian society should be rebuilt independently of all previous institutions and concepts. The Nihilists themselves were not certain exactly what it was that should replace these institutions; they were only certain that it was necessary to negate all prior social order. Fundamental problems sprang from this movement; problems which Dostoevsky, also, was concerned with, and with which he argued vehemently in Notes From the Underground, attacking viciously the side of the Nihilists. According to Chernyshevsky, since man is governed by reason and rationalism, the concept of free will and choice is not applicable to mankind. The nihilistic concept of the perfect order in man's life is expressed in Vera Pavlovna's dream of paradise in the Glass House.[11] (This was the main character in Chernyshevsky's novel and whose concept of a perfect society was found in her references to her Glass House). Consequently, it is from necessity that man will desire this rational order for the sake of happiness, and he cannot wish for anything irrational for the sake of his happiness.

Dostoevsky was opposed to these basic assumptions of the Nihilists, and his novel, Notes From the Underground, is basically a reply and a rebuttal to Chernyshevsky's novel, What's to be Done?. In fact, some critics will assert that Notes From the Underground is a grandiose parody of Chernyshevsky's novel. Dostoevsky accepts the principles of the Nihilists in his novel and carries them through until they end in ridiculous dilemmas. In What's to be Done?, Vera Pavlovna's dream of paradise in the Glass House represents the nihilistic belief in the construction of a perfect society through reason and the rationale. Yet, the Underground Man sees his Crystal Palace and says that it is all very beautiful and fine, but it does not mean that man will necessarily be happy living in such an abode. Dostoevsky states that it may be that man simply is happy participating in the construction of this magnificent piece of architecture and there should be no inference that man will be content and happy while actually habitating this structure. Man may be content to build this structure and not find it necessary for the sake of happiness to live in it. Man may prefer to live in inferior surroundings, even in the presence of the Crystal Palace. Dostoevsky inferred that happiness was in the ability to choose and not in the actual cohabitation with the rules of reason and the rationale. This is in direct opposition to Chernyshevsky's society. Vera Pavlovna's prosperous sewing co-op, created and run according to reason and rationale, encounters little, if any, conflict with its participants. The New Man of the

Nihilists fits into this organization precisely in the manner called for in the basic blueprint. Dostoevsky's man of action, Zverkov, highlights this stereotyped New Man of Chernyshevsky, and the Underground Man's ridiculing of the man of action is, a condemnation of this nihilistic new man.

Dostoevsky created Zverkov as a stereotype nihilistic character. Outwardly, this character seems to be a successful social creature with the probability of a financially successful life. But internally, Dostoevsky shows us nothing but shallowness and unconsciousness of reality. Given the constant contrasts between Zverkov and the Underground Man, the former is, of course, much more esthetically appealing, yet, given a preference, Dostoevsky deems it likely that most men would prefer to lead the life of the Underground Man over the life of Zverkov. Dostoevsky, however, does not deny his repulsion for the Underground Man and his state of mind, but he soundly asserts that underground life is much more preferable than the sterile, limited life of Zverkov. Vera Pavlovna significantly refers to her early life with her parents as the "cellar".[12] In her transcendence into the new nihilistic world, she rejects all ties to the "cellar" of petty, suffering individuals - the very same "cellar" which Dostoevsky accepts as the media of expression for the defense of the irrational side of man. The Underground Man certainly does not prefer to live in his underground world, yet he has no other way to retain his freedom of consciousness. Unlike the man of action and heroes of the nihilistic movement, Dostoevsky's Underground

Man does not stand in awe before the Great Wall of Rationality and condescend to its limitations on man's life. Rather, he says, "Of course I won't be able to breach this wall with my head if I'm not strong enough. But I don't have to accept a stone wall just because it's there."[13]

Chernyshevsky and Nihilists justified the social changes occurring after the rise of Alexander II in 1855 by saying that this life style of the new nihilistic man would necessitate happiness and contentment. Dostoevsky applauded social change, but he also asserted that it would not save mankind, nor would it bring man the happiness and personal fulfillment which the Nihilists had alluded to. The Underground Man says that reason and "two plus two equals four" is very nice, but sometimes man will desire that "two plus two equals five", simply due to his freedom of choice, completely disregarding the laws of reason. For this very reason, Chernyshevsky's new man will not be a happy, liberated man, but a man bound by the chains of the rationale.

It now remains to be shown why it was Fyodor Dostoevsky and no other author who was influenced by these above mentioned external elements in such a manner. It is necessary to examine certain elements from the author's biography to establish his personal constitution and personality in respect to these external literary forces which influenced him at the time of the writing.

Significant Elements in the Biography of Fyodor Dostoevsky

Notes From the Underground is about the displacement of man from his environment, divorced from life and reality. Dostoevsky knew this theme well, because from his earliest childhood he was alienated from the society in which he lived and was forced to become accustomed to the daily torments and sufferings of adult life - things usually not thrust upon individuals at such an early age.

Dostoevsky's father was a miserable tyrant to the family, succumbing to frequent fits of wrath and sudden states of depression.[14] Fyodor's childhood was strictly regimented by his father's crude whims and fancies, and impressions of them remained with him throughout his adult life. Dostoevsky was not allowed to make the acquaintance of or associate with any of the neighborhood children. There were very few visitors to the house, and participation in social events by the family was very rare.[15] The family lived in an annex of the Hospital of the Poor in Moscow, and young Dostoevsky's only contact with the external world was his meetings on the hospital grounds with the sick and diseased segment of society. Not only did these malformed and physically decayed creatures present a dismal view of the world to the small boy, but their comments and pessimistic outlook on life surely had great influence on his own developing views.

Another significant influence on Dostoevsky was his close association with the household servants, especially the nurse, Aliona Frovlovna.[16] This enormous peasant woman told Dostoevsky many stories about the peasant class and of her

own hard life as a child, which deeply impressed the boy. From this woman and other servants he was able to learn of a life style that he had hitherto been unaware of. And these early impressions doubtlessly remained on the author's mind, so that nearly four decades later he was able to write a novel about man divorced from life. Influence from the peasantry probably enabled young Dostoevsky to form enlightened basic principles and ideas about his society. Troyat, in his biography of Dostoevsky, states that Aliona Frovlovna was the only person who was ever firm enough to protect the children from their father's rages and fits of anger.[17] This, too, doubtlessly had great influence on Dostoevsky's later perception of the inner strength of the peasant and ordinary man.

In 1831, when Fyodor was ten years old, his father purchased a country estate where the young boy's deep dependence and loyalty to the peasantry was strongly reinforced. Six years later, his mother died and his father retired to the estate to drink and waste his life away in despair. By this time Dostoevsky had been sent away to school and his father had so completely shut him out of his life that he sent Fyodor only the very barest allowance to live on. Dostoevsky still led a solitary and isolated life, he himself shutting out those who might have come close to him. Two things happened at this time which greatly stabilized Dostoevsky's gloomy and dismal outlook on life and on his own personality. In 1839, Dostoevsky's father became so intolerable that his own peasants plotted and murdered him. Dostoevsky himself

had nothing to do with the murder, but the shock of the action and his consciousness of his own personal hatred for his father merged upon him in a wave of guilt. Secondly, Dostoevsky's father's murder may have been the initiating factor for the start of Dostoevsky's epileptic fits, a disease which plagued him throughout his life. Dostoevsky never mentioned how they affected him, but these gruesome attacks certainly reinforced his hopeless and defeated outlook on life.

One of the most significant events which influenced the writing of Notes From the Underground was Dostoevsky's imprisonment in 1849 and his subsequent exile for four years. It seems probable that Dostoevsky's prison and exile experiences enabled him to determine with some finality that man cannot be saved by other men or by human powers alone - that religion is necessary for man. Although Dostoevsky was once again back in the midst of the plain and common people during his imprisonment, his intellectual upbringing created a barrier between himself and the peasants. Again, Dostoevsky lived in relative isolation, and it is probably at this time that he turned to religion for solace. By now it was firmly established in Dostoevsky that reason was not enough to satisfy the needs and desires of man.

As if proving that man can be happy by desiring that which is contrary to reason, Dostoevsky began a cycle of love affairs involving "unattainable" women, beginning with Maria Dmitrievna, the wife of a drunken schoolmaster whom he met while in exile.[18] This striving for the unattainable is very

characteristic of the Underground Man's desire to extend himself beyond the wall of reason. For Dostoevsky it was the challenge of the attaining and not of the attainment of the goal itself which was of ultimate concern. This is seen again, when Dostoevsky falls in love with Pauline Suslova and travels abroad with her as his first wife lies dying at home.

In November 1859, Dostoevsky was allowed to return to St. Petersburg after nearly ten years of imprisonment, exile, and mandatory military service. Fyodor and his brother, Mikhail, immediately began to publish a literary journal, Vremja. The brothers not only encountered financial hard times, but they were also constantly under attack for their views by the radicals and Slavophils. During the early stages of the journal's publication Dostoevsky worked unceasingly, writing articles and stories and planning serials. His health was worsening and his fits became more and more frequent. His wife was slowly and agonizingly dying of consumption. These conditions, of course, contributed to Dostoevsky's state of mind, and finally, in 1863, when Vremja was officially banned by the government, Dostoevsky threw up his work in despair, deserted his dying wife, and went abroad again. At this time he developed his infatuation for Pauline Suslova, and also developed an obsession for gambling - something which kept him in financial ruin for most of his literary career.

Upon his return to St. Petersburg, Fyodor and his brother established The Epoch to replace Vremja. Dostoevsky wrote part one of Notes From the Underground for the Jan-Feb.

1864 issue, sitting at the bedside of his dying wife. Filled with guilt and remorse, surrounded by death and the insane shriekings of his wife, and overwhelmed with debts and literary pressures, it was probably not difficult for Dostoevsky to create the dismal, hopeless tone and the gloomy pessimism for his novel.

Part two of Notes From the Underground was written under similar external influences. Maria Dmitrievna finally died in April 1864, the month in which part two was published. Dostoevsky's brother was suffering severely from an abscess in his liver and he died a few months later. Also, at this time, Apollon Grigoriev, a close friend and literary contributor to Dostoevsky's magazines, died.

Consequently, at the time of the writing of his novel, Dostoevsky had lost all former illusions and naive enchantment with life. Critics have said that his exile experiences subdued his tendency to idealize that which he had formerly considered beautiful and lofty. Only after exile did external circumstances of his personal life so demean any remaining idealistic concepts that he finally developed the bitterness and vengefulness which is depicted in the heart of the Underground Man. In Notes From the Underground, this character not only shuns the "beautiful and good", but ridicules it and challenges the Nihilists:

> . . . why, just when I was most capable of being conscious of every refinement of the 'good and beautiful' . . . were there moments when I lost my awareness of it, and did such ugly things - things that everyone does probably, but that I did precisely at

moments when I was most aware that they should not be done.[19]

Dostoevsky asks, how can it be that man strives after the irrational and unreasonable if the nihilistic principle is correct? He asks in bewilderment, why did he desert his dying wife, why is he continuously overwhelmed by irrational, wild passions? Where are the inherent set of principles which man abides by in order to establish a harmonious and well-ordered life?

Dostoevsky, like his Underground Man, is embittered, resentful, and offended. But it is not against mankind that these self-abasing feelings rise, but against the very state of man's being. Certainly, Dostoevsky ridicules those who misinterpret man's state of being, but he does not blame them for it. The Underground Man says that he despises Zverkov, who is the epitome of the perfect social being, yet this feeling is only an outward expression for the Underground Man's inner torments. And so, too, one may define Dostoevsky's bitterness towards life. Dostoevsky was able to see the fallacies of rationalism in man's life and the over-idealization of the Nihilist's new man. He was overwhelmed with the theme of the downtrodden man, but not disillusioned by the esthetic appeal of this character and he did not find enchanting or mystical the inherent superior powers which lord over mankind.

In the second part of this chapter the literary atmosphere of the 1910s and the personal biography of A. Remizov will be examined, noting especially the similar background

of Remizov to Dostoevsky, common personality traits characteristic of the philosophies found in their writings, and the paralleling influences which the varying literary climates bestowed upon them.

The Literary Atmosphere of the 1910s

Sisters of the Cross was published in 1910 at a time when the symbolist trend in prose and poetry was nearing an end and people were once again looking for a more realistically oriented form of literature. As society and the economy were somewhat calmed after the 1905 uprising, Neo-Realism was able to provide the mixture of reality and fantasy which seemed necessary to the literary atmosphere at that time. Like the period of Dostoevsky, no one specific school of thought can be identified with Remizov. When he returned from his exile in 1905 and began his literary career, Remizov was very close to the Symbolists,[20] but even five years later, when Sisters of the Cross was published, he had significantly encompassed literary devices and literary philosophies from Neo-Realism, and in specific respects, he employed concepts from both Westerners and Slavophils of the nineteenth century movements.

The symbolist movement arose in 1895 at a time conducive to the flourishing of Russian literature. Dostoevsky had died in 1887, and with him died a period of nineteenth century literature. These last years before the turn of the century were filled with turmoil, artistic alienation, and a renewed searching for that which is inherently valuable in

man. Alexander III assumed the throne upon the assassination of Alexander II, and with him came a wave of great literary suppression. A period of intense industrialization also began at this time, which significantly influenced the use of an attitude of materialism. These events alone were sufficient to discourage advents of new literary trends or any renewal of old trends. However, the appearance of Darwinism in the scientific field seemed to be the decisive factor which set the stage for the rise of symbolism.[21] The Darwinist theory was an instigating factor which propelled the insecurity of writers of that time into activity. The hustle and bustle of these scientific and industrial innovations had all but left the literary controversies and trends of the Dostoevskian period covered with their dust.

Consequently, it was not surprising that a movement should arise that stressed the importance of the individual and the need to free it from all social bonds. The Symbolists stressed that which was beautiful in its own right, and they placed great emphasis on aestheticism. Russian symbolism was not simply a literary trend, but an entire expression of philosophy during the late nineteenth century. This period has been referred to as the new romanticism of Russian literature, yet it was considerably more forceful and more mature than the older movement. The Symbolists were not merely disillusioned and bored with life - they felt that they were living in its negation and were in complete despair of life. Erotic themes were prominent in literature at that time and there

was a great emphasis on the emotional value of the "sound" of the written word. The early Symbolists, for the most part, were extremists and their official literary name was appropriately, the Decadents.

By the turn of the century certain changes and modifications were taking place in the basic symbolist philosophy, and these changes set the basis for many influential factors seen in Remizov's novel in 1910. Feelings of deep insecurity within the writers gradually developed and a tendency arose to lean towards the mystical, fantastical, and religious thresholds, in order for writers to secure their philosophy of symbolism.[22] During the late 1890s and the early twentieth century, as the political and economical situation of the country worsened, the symbolist writers' tendency to escape into fantasy and mysticism became more and more pronounced in their works.

For many writers the illusory, fantastical world of symbols and imagination was the only sanctuary for the freedom of their writings. After the failure of the 1905 revolution, writers became discouraged with the country in every respect, and the erotic, crude themes which emerged at the beginning of the symbolist movement were again prominent. Some writers began to regress into mysticism and others blatently presented their feelings in erotic themes, generally centering on sex.

All of these features are inherently important in the works of Remizov. In Sisters of the Cross, Remizov's mystical and fantastical tendencies are exhibited through frequent

dreams and hallucinations of the character, Marakulin, and through the indefinite line between reality and the world of dreams and illusion. Remizov does not dwell excessively upon the theme of sex in this novel, but his crude descriptions of the suffering of mankind definitely follow in accordance with the symbolist school. In Remizov's description of a dying cat, which had eaten a piece of glass or a nail, there are probably few symbolist writers that could match this account of such a bizarre, grotesque occurrence.[23]

The mysticism and fantasy in the works of Remizov and the symbolist writers has little in common with the earlier romantic movement which had influenced Dostoevsky to a certain degree. Man is no longer looking towards superior external forces, in order to enrich his life and exalt his consciousness. Now he sees these higher forces as a prison, or a shelter against the atrocious realities of life. Even though this shelter created a blinding and isolating effect on the perception of reality, it was nevertheless good, because it gave comfort to man in his suffering.

Symbolism itself was strongly rooted in the themes of Dostoevsky - theme which center on man's striving for individualism, his unrequited and needless suffering, and man lost and forsaken by God.[24] These themes, also, were the basic constitutions of Remizov's work in the early twentieth century, but in certain respects Remizov's writings exhibit more gloom and pessimism about man's plight than do those of Dostoevsky. The Underground Man is more sophisticated than the dreamer of

the 1840s, because he can see the illusory Russian society and knows that people will not and cannot save him, nor offer him that which is inherently valuable in man. However, in Sisters of the Cross, Remizov's underground man, Marakulin, is even more sophisticated than Dostoevsky's Underground Man. Marakulin has lived half a century longer in a society which no longer even offers superficial comfort to the stifled intellectual. When he seeks comfort in his mystical world, he is quite aware that it is on the equivalency of an ostrich who derives pleasure from hiding its head in warm sand. Dostoevsky's Underground Man is still measuring and analyzing his existence; but Remizov's character completes this step, throws up his hands in dismay, and resigns himself to asking why the order of existence must be this way. Dostoevsky's character still hopes.

Another movement whose influence was greatly predominant in Sisters of the Cross and provided another indirect link to the writings of Dostoevsky was Neo-Realism. Neo-Realism is most aptly defined as the synthesis between Symbolism and Realism.[25] After the unsuccessful revolution of 1905, Symbolism simply began to grow stagnant and people became tired of the prevalence of illusiveness and the fantastical. Literature written under the influence of this trend was basically a return to a reality enriched by Symbolism. This return to reality was not a return to the nineteenth century realism, but there were similar correlations. The pessimism and gloom of the Neo-Realists was much stronger,

and where the nineteenth century Realist had seen mud holes, the Neo-Realist now saw gullies and gorges.

Citing again the example of the ostrich with its head in the sand, the Neo-Realists were primarily concerned about the well-being of the ostrich, in general, and not about the illusive pleasure and security he found in hiding his head in the sand. Like Dostoevsky, they saw that man lived in isolation and alienation, and they strove to bring him back into literature, giving him justification for his existence. They depicted Russian provincial life, the common people, and most important, the harshness and complexness of everyday existence.[26]

These latter traits are seen quite strongly in Sisters of the Cross and bear much resemblance to those in Notes From the Underground. The characters of Remizov are common people, and although they have varied backgrounds and have all met with different degrees of financial and materialistic success, all seem to share the tremendous burdens of day to day existence. Not only do most of Remizov's characters depict the symbolist philosophy of man's helplessness before fate, but they are basically extensions and continuations of Dostoevsky's Underground Man. This man, like Marakulin, is a petty government official who has been divorced from the Russian soil. He depicts the intellectuals' alienation from his country and its people and heritage, and most of all, from himself as an individual. The Underground Man understands that his awareness of man's reason for existing in the world will

give him a heightened consciousness of himself, but according to Remizov, man needs this knowledge to survive on a day to day basis. Remizov's characters do not care to philosophize about the fate of man and his inherent value, because they realize the helplessness of his position; they only care to exist as happily and contentedly as possible under the doom of fate.

The emergence of Neo-Realism brought forth several other Dostoevskian themes seen quite clearly in Remizov's novel. In both novels the depth of man's soul is explored as it exists in a world of monotony, ugliness, and monstrosity. These concepts, together with the atmosphere of shame and humiliation and morbid attention to pain and misery, link unbreakable bonds between these two authors.

Another literary movement which had great influence on Remizov and linked him to Dostoevsky was Slavophilism. Although Dostoevsky was not a pure Slavophil at the time of the writing of Notes From the Underground, Remizov, nevertheless, associated Dostoevsky with the Russian slavophil tradition.

Remizov became acquainted with the slavophil tradition in associations during his youth and early university years. He was deeply attached to the Russian soil and old Russian tradition, and he looked back to Dostoevsky for guidance in his doctrines and ideology.[27] Remizov felt that Dostoevsky was one of the few writers who actually understood the Russian people in their struggle against suffering and pain and who

did not try to tear them from their culture and inherited traits.

Nihilism also had a profound effect on Remizov. He had almost the same attitude as Dostoevsky and his novel expresses the same rejection of Nihilism and the same argument against it as does Notes From the Underground. After Marakulin loses his job as a government copier, he moves to Burkhov's Court in a state of despair and numbness. He says that the primary consideration should be given to "not thinking" so that he can survive.[28] If man does not think, he will not remember or regret, thus, he will not suffer or feel the anguish of pain. Yet, Marakulin goes on to show that this is not humanly possible. Very similar to this is Dostoevsky's argument against rationalism. If man lives by reason, as the Nihilists propose, then man will humble himself before the wall of "two plus two equals four", and he will happily succumb to it, because it would be irrational (and therefore cause unhappiness), to do otherwise. But like the Underground Man, Marakulin later admits that he does not exist for the sake of his rationale and that there is something more to live for than the rational wall of the Nihilists. When Marakulin searches for a deeper meaning to his existence, he says that he knows he has a right to exist by the very fact that he can see and hear and feel, and if he can find nothing else to live for, then he will live for nothing, except to sense the world of life about him.[29] This is a parallel expression of the Underground Man's rejection of "two plus two

equals four", when he asserts that it may be that he will not want to accept that which is rational and ordered, and it may be that he will want to prefer that which is irrational for the simple reason that he has the right of choice - the right to prefer whatever he chooses.

As Remizov's novel develops, Marakulin discovers that he does have something to live for, other than for sensual perception of life, and that is his "unusual joy" which he used to feel when he was young.[30] This "unusual joy" of which Remizov speaks is Remizov's link to religion and to God as a saving force for man. On this point, Marakulin is perhaps more advanced than the Underground Man, because the latter never experiences this "unusual joy", but only acts in such a manner, because he "has the right to do so." Had the censors not forced Dostoevsky to eliminate a crucial chapter in part one of Notes From the Underground, Dostoevsky's novel might have had the same development. But as it is, Remizov stands alone against the Nihilists in presenting a more substantial substance in his assertions that God will or should be the saving force for man, and not reason.

There is no evidence that Remizov had direct intentions, as had Dostoevsky, to write a novel aimed as an attack against the rationalists, yet Sisters of the Cross carries the same basic argument against the Nihilists as did Dostoevsky's novel, and it is just as strong in its attacks against Nihilism. Remizov's rejection of rationalism probably had two main sources. First, from Dostoevsky's ideologies, and second,

from the economical and political upheaval during Remizov's life. The Symbolists, also, had great influence on his work in their flight from reality, preferring mechanized industrialization over the value of human beings, and the deep gloom and pessimism of realists certainly did much to create the literary setting for the development of Remizov's novel.

The literary period of the 1860s was quite different from the period of the 1910s. Yet, despite these differences and the half a century that separated the publishing of the two novels under discussion, the similarity between them is striking and it is very apparent that the author of Sisters of the Cross is a conscientious disciple of the author of Notes From the Underground. In the following pages significant aspects from the personal biography of Remizov as discussed, which not only tend to formulate certain fundamental principles and ideas in his literary works, but also, tend to coincide with remarkable similarity to the same influential aspects which were attributed to Dostoevsky.

Significant Elements in the Biography of Aleksej Remizov

Remizov was born in Moscow in 1877. His father, a widower, was a merchant of substantial means. His mother, Mar'ja Aleksandrovna, was a very educated woman who had been quite active in nihilistic circles in Moscow. She fell in love with a nihilist artist, and when he deserted her for his own family, she married Remizov's father out of spite. They had four sons in rapid succession, Aleksej being the last.[31]

When Aleksej was two years old she took her sons and left her husband, unable to live with a man whom she did not love. Her relatives were quite wealthy, but when she arrived at the family country estate with her sons, they gave her only very meager lodgings and very slim means on which to live.[32] She isolated her family as much as possible from the external world and raised her sons in an atmosphere of gloom and depression. The poverty and atmosphere of despair are, of course, quite similar to conditions of Dostoevsky's upbringing. Remizov, like Dostoevsky, felt that he had been born into the world as an outcast, and in later years often remarked about his birth, "I was the last stone of her (mother) evil fate. My appearance decided her fate."[33]

This feeling of guilt was also seen in Dostoevsky at the time of his father's murder and at the death of his first wife's husband. Remizov's father died when Remizov was six years old, leaving an impression of extreme guilt on the mind of the young boy. Proof of this is seen when, a year after the father's death, Remizov wrote a short story in which the child narrator is the murderer of his father.[34] Although Remizov's father was good to his family and was not to blame for their separation, it seems that Remizov felt the same rejection and negation for him as Dostoevsky felt for his father. It appears that Remizov did not hate his father so much as the dismal circumstances which surrounded his life, yet his father was then the foremost concrete object on which he could focus all his blame.

Both writers were raised in isolation, away from ordinary social contact. Like Dostoevsky, Remizov's first associations were with the servants and children of poor factory workers who lived near by. Through these associations Remizov developed a strong sense of compassion for the suffering and for victims of injustices. By the start of his literary career in 1905, this compassion had been developed into a definite protest against the seemingly unpreventable fate of man, and Remizov used these experiences again and again in his novels to reinforce his cry of bitterness against man's subservience to an unjust fate.

During his youth, Remizov had two means of escape from this reality - religion and fantasy. Of the latter, he says that it was the only place where he could feel truly free.[35] These tendencies towards fantasy are later expressed in Remizov's literary works and these early childhood impressions of the fate of man and the strong currents of literary disillusionment with life were equally dominant in his novels.

The second means of escape was religion. Mar'ja Aleksandrovna raised her sons in a strict religious manner and they were made to attend church on every opportune occasion. For Remizov, these religious excursions were an excellent means of escaping from reality. He was entranced by the grandiose ceremonies and the deep faith and emotional involvement of the people. The church was the only physical place where he could feel relaxed and easy and temporarily forget about the gloomy and dismal state of his family life.

Another important influence on Remizov in his youth was the influx of slavophil teachings and stories which he heard. The Remizovs lived near a monastery, in which Aleksej was educated for a time. He heard the monks' stories of old traditional Russia and their dialects, and combined with the compassion he had developed for man through his associations with the children of factory workers and the servants, Remizov became very drawn toward the old ways of Russia. In addition to this, Remizov's uncles frequently hosted literary circles at their home in which slavophil topics were discussed.[36] Remizov attended these meetings with great enthusiasm and met and heard many famous Slavophils, among them being N. A. Zverev, who is considered by some to be the last Russian Slavophil of that period, and whom Remizov later studied under at the University of Moscow.[37]

Consequently, all of these factors strongly bond Remizov to the Russian people and to the Russian soil, and even if Remizov had never heard of the name of Dostoevsky, his writings probably would have still bore the same relationship with the Russian past and its tradition.

In 1897 Remizov was arrested and sent into exile. Dostoevsky had been arrested because of his associations with the Petrashevsky literary circle, but Remizov's arrest was even more unjust and coincidental. He was in his second year at Moscow University when he attended a student demonstration. There, he was fatedly arrested as one of the activists, kicked out of the university, and exiled for six years.[38] Although

Remizov wrote little while in exile, his arrest appeared to be the final blow which set the basis for the themes in his novels - much as Dostoevsky's arrest had set the tone for his writings. From his earliest years, Remizov had seen how his mother lived in subservient obedience to her fate, unable to break away; he heard the cruel and unjust stories about man from the servants, and he saw the desperation and poverty of mankind in the children of the factory workers. As if this was not enough, fate sent Remizov his own personal crushing blow through his arrest. In his later literary career, critics have said that Remizov's feelings toward fate had mellowed and that he had accepted it as an expected part of life,[39] but at the time of writing Sisters of the Cross, Remizov did not accept fate and he cried out in protest against its unfairness.

Upon his return to the literary world in 1905, Remizov had lost the blind faith which he had embraced in his youth, yet he still believed, like Dostoevsky, in the necessity of religion to save man. By 1905, Remizov did not look to mankind to save itself, and indeed, he even said that man is only a log of wood to another man. Their relationship is not even as majestic as the fox-to-sheep relationship.[40]

Like Dostoevsky, Remizov spent his university years like he spent his childhood - isolated and alienated from society. The first time that Remizov even felt accepted by a group was probably the night of his arrest when the others arrested accepted him as a fellow provocator.[41]

Even upon his return to Moscow in 1905, Remizov was unable to find a niche for himself in literary circles. Prud was published in 1905 and was met with harsh literary criticism. A. Belyj himself called the novel unreadable[42] and it was generally too complex for the public to understand. Remizov was also in constant financial straits. Returning from exile, he secured a job with Voprosy žizni, but the journal went bankrupt within the year and he spent the remainder of his years in Russia living on the meager income from various odd jobs and on the earnings of his wife, who was a paleographer. In 1921, Remizov and his wife left Russia for reasons of his ill health, intending, initially, to return. But due to political conditions they immigrated and settled in Paris where Remizov resided until his death in 1957.

Much material for Sisters of the Cross was taken from the life of Remizov's older brother, Sergei.[43] Thematically, the novel is very autobiographical of Remizov himself. Much of his own thought is expressed through the main character, Marakulin. Marakulin's coming to consciousness and his recognition of the pitiful plight of the downtrodden man is very similar to a statement Remizov made about himself years later, saying that he (Remizov) was a good person and never intentionally hurt anyone; that he felt sorry for humanity, because he could foresee its doom.[44]

Marakulin's mother is also portrayed in the novel with striking similarities to Remizov's own mother. Remizov wrote Sisters of the Cross completely and originally as a product

of his own time, just as Dostoevsky wrote Notes From the Underground in his own time. The influence which Remizov received from Dostoevsky was only received within the limits of his own experiences and thought and it is only because each author described the "underground" and his "underground character" as being strictly pertinent to his particular historical and literary period that an analysis and comparison of the two works becomes so valuable.

CHAPTER 1

FOOTNOTES

[1]Robert G. Durgy, Notes From the Underground, (NY: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1969), p. XIII.

[2]Dmitrij Čiževskij, History of Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature, Vol. II, trans. by Richard Noel Porter, (Nashville: Vanderbilt U. Press, 1974), p. 4.

[3]Konstantin Mochulsky, Dostoevsky, His Life and Work, (Princeton: Princeton U. Press. 1967), p. 141.

[4]Robert Lord, Dostoevsky, Essays and Perspectives, (Berkeley: U. of Calif. Press, 1970), p. 55.

[5]Ibid., p. 51.

[6]Donald Fanger, Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. Press, 1965), p. 178.

[7]Čiževskij, op. cit., p. xvi-xvii.

[8]Ibid., p. xix.

[9]Durgy, op. cit., p. 153.

[10]Ibid., p. 150-151.

[11]Konstantin Mochulsky, op. cit., p. 253.

[12]N. G. Tchernychewsky, What's To Be Done?, trans. by Benj R. Tucker, (Boston: Benj R. Rucker, Publisher, 1886), p. 110.

[13]Dostoevsky, Notes From the Underground, trans. by Andrew R. MacAndrew, (NY: New American Library, 1961), p. 99.

[14]Henry Troyat, Firebrand, The Life of Dostoevsky, (NY: Roy Publishers, 1946), p. 15.

[15]Ibid., p. 22.

[16]Ibid., p. 18.

[17]Ibid., p. 19.

[18]Ibid., p. 183.

[19]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 94.

[20]Marc Slonim, Modern Russian Literature, (NY: Oxford U. Press, 1953), p. 230.

[21]Oleg A. Maslenikov, The Frenzied Poets: Andrey Biely and the Russian Symbolists, (Berkeley: U. of Calif. Press, 1952), p.4.

[22]Slonim, op. cit., p. 83.

[23]Aleksej Remizov, The Sisters of the Cross, (Hertfordshire: Bradda Books LTD, 1969), p. 12.

[24]D. S. Mirsky, A History of Russian Literature, (NY: Alfred A. Knope, 1949), p. 432.

[25]A. M. Shane, "Remizov's Prud: From Symbolism to Neo-Realism," California Slavic Studies, Vol. VI, 1971, p. 71-82.

[26]Slonim, op. cit., p. 228.

[27]Ibid., p. 46.

[28]Remizov, op. cit., p. 12.

[29]Ibid., p. 18-19.

[30]Ibid., p. 61.

[31]Sona Aronian, "The Dream as a Literary Device in the Novels and Short Stories of Aleksej Remizov," unpubl. Diss., Yale U., 1971, p. 7.

[32]Ibid., p. 8.

[33]N. Kodrjanskaja, Aleksej Remizov, (Paris: 1950), p. 77.

[34]Aronian, op. cit., p. 9.

[35]Ibid., p. 12.

[36]Sarah Burke, "Salient Features in the Writings of A. M. Remizov," unpubl. Diss., Univ. of Texas, 1966, p. 43.

[37]Ibid., p. 43-44.

[38]Kodrjanskaja, op. cit., p. 79.

[39]Burke, op. cit., p. 22.

[40]N. Kodrjanskaja, "Remizov o samom sebe," Novyj žurnal, No. 71, 1964, p. 58-74.

[41]Kodrjanskaja, Aleksej Remizov, op. cit., p. 78.

[42]Aronian, op. cit., p. 19.

[43]Kodrjanskaja, Aleksej Remizov, op. cit., p. 76.

[44]Kodrjanskaja, Novyj žurnal, op. cit., p. 64.

Chapter 2

SUFFERING AND THE HEIGHTENED CONSCIOUSNESS

Both Notes From the Underground and Sisters of the Cross have been written about and influenced by the concept of man, alienated in his own society by forces in his own intellect and motivated by external forces resulting from economical and political factors. The vividness and reality of this alienation is conveyed by both authors by creating characters who possess this feeling of alienation and who are very much aware of their unique state of being. This awareness, in fact, is the very core of the matter, because man's straited plight of alienation can be of no internal significance to him if he is not aware of it. This specific awareness will be referred to in this paper as heightened consciousness. In Konstantin Molchulsky's study of Dostoevsky, Mochulsky sometimes refers to this awareness as a morbid consciousness, which, he says, is actually the human tragedy of Dostoevsky's works.[1]

In Notes From the Underground, the Underground Man possesses this consciousness and this possession is the cause of the tragedy of the novel. The character himself even states that his state of consciousness if ". . . a sickness, a veritable and complete sickness."[2]

This consciousness is identically found in Remizov's novel. Chapter one of Sisters of the Cross is primarily concerned with the main character's obtaining this consciousness. It is vividly expressed in the symbolic scene in which the main character, Marakulin, watches the grotesque death of a cat who had eaten a sliver of glass or a sharp metal object and lay writhing and howling on the ground. At this point, for the first time recognizing the misfortunes of all of mankind, he ponders that this cat, symbolically, had always been howling, not just here in Burkhov's court, but all over Russia, and not just today, but in the past; he had simply never heard it before, and now he could not get away from its howling.[3]

Both novels focus upon these main characters under the influence of their consciousness. The primary events and actions which take place in both novels are related to the characters' struggles to come to terms with this consciousness.

The state of consciousness will be discussed in great detail for its literary significance in the two novels under discussion. By such a comparison it will be shown how closely the writers themselves resemble one another within the basic themes of their works.

This heightened consciousness, of course, does not occur without cause or pattern. In both Marakulin and the Underground Man the cause for their coming to consciousness and the actual procedures in doing so are remarkably similar. This procedure of coming to consciousness entails ten basic steps or stages of development of the characters in question.

These steps will be briefly stated, then followed by a more concise treatment of each, constituting the main body of this chapter.

In both novels of Dostoevsky and Remizov, suffering is the pivot point for all human awareness. The Underground Man says, "Suffering - why . . . that is the sole cause of consciousness."[4]

For the Underground Man suffering is the only means by which man will rise above himself and above his day to day existence.[5] Remizov states similar views through the character, Marakulin, when he says that man must open up his soul in order to become aware of reality. For one person this is necessary through treachery, for another it is necessary to commit murder, and for himself it was necessary that he lose his job and suffer before finding this awareness.[6] Marakulin says that to obtain this consciousness of life, man must suffer.[7]

Suffering prompts the consciousness of man to awaken from its sleep of illusion and from its sheltered perceptions of life. This first stage of suffering is what this paper will refer to as superficial suffering. This state is simply the initial distress felt about an incident which disrupts the order in one's life. When superficial suffering causes the character to consider those basic and ultimate values in his life and causes him to become aware of himself in relation to those values, then he is said to have come into heightened consciousness. At this point genuine suffering occurs, due to the ambiquities and the disharmonies which the character

finds in these "laws of nature". In this state, the feeling of total alienation and withdrawal is felt until the desire to assert one's individuality collides with this suffering. Yet, when this effort of assertion fails, the feeling of impotence and helplessness transcends until the character feels cowed and humiliated by these things which are beyond his comprehension, and he finally sinks into inertia, determined that to do absolutely nothing is the best possible state in which to be. However, this state only lasts until boredom and fantisizing set in, and the character no sooner commits an act or dreams of a situation to occupy his time, than he becomes angered and resentful for this pathetic state of his being. With this state arrives the desire for malice and revenge, knowing at the same time that these feelings have only arisen from tedium; and thus, the character becomes conscious of what it is he is doing and soon falls into suffering again over his condition, and the cycle begins once more.

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to an examination of these steps which constitute the framework of the thoughts and actions of both main characters in Notes From the Underground and Sisters of the Cross and display the close literary associations between the works of Dostoevsky and Remizov.

Superficial Suffering

Part one of Sisters of the Cross is primarily devoted to the story of how Marakulin, the main character, falls victim

to chance, loses his job, and through his hardships, comes to awareness of the tragic life around him and the unjust suffering of others.

Petre Alekseevič Marakulin, a clerk-copiest, is a child-like figure with a great deal of naïvety towards life. Remizov says that Marakulin approaches people as he would enter the cage of a mad animal - extending his hand and not batting an eye, never for a minute thinking that the animal might rear and bite.[8] All his life Marakulin has been content with his uninvolved, simple life, and his menial work, oblivious to pain or injustices that exist around him. He experiences a child-like "unusual joy" in his simple day to day existence. However, all of this changes when, due to a surprise examination just before the Easter holidays, Marakulin's records are found to contain an error, and he is immediately fired. Unable to accept his first hardship in life, Marakulin pretends that it is all a joke and writes a letter of explanation to the director, all to no avail.

At this point, Marakulin, for the first time, sees that all that has happened, has happened by chance and coincidence - that he should have ever made an error, that they would have a surprise examination, and that from all of the records of different clerks his was chosen at random for the intensive scrutinization. Marakulin becomes aware that the heavy hand of fate has clamped around his neck and he cries out that he is not guilty and does not deserve this punishment.

The director, Marakulin's boss, becomes a symbol of

man's indifference to the suffering of other men and does not even sympathize with Marakulin's plight. Marakulin decries that man is "merely a block of wood to other men."[9]

However, Marakulin has not totally lost faith in mankind. He continues to cry that he is not guilty and asks who or what is it that is knocking him down and for what reason is it all necessary.[10] But there is no one to answer his questions.

Marakulin eventually concludes that fate is uncontrollable and it is all the same to man if man tries to push it aside or if he lets himself be subjected to it passively. It simply appears to be man's lot to suffer and endure.[11]

In his initial suffering, Marakulin devises a formula for living with this burden. He concludes that man must suffer, forget, and not think. If one can forget about the pitiless, worthless people in the world and uncontrollable fate, and if one cannot think about misfortune and hope, then pain and anguish will not be felt.

Thus far, Marakulin has not entered into a state of heightened consciousness. He has simply become conscious of his own personal subjection to pain and does not see it as a universal tragedy.

The Underground Man is less easily seen in this stage of pre-heightened consciousness, because Dostoevsky only develops this character after he has come into this awareness, and no initiating force for this heightened consciousness of the character is shown. Even as a child, the Underground Man does

not have the innocence of the thirty year-old Marakulin. From his earliest years, the Underground Man has had this consciousness. About his early years in boarding school, he says, ". . . I couldn't take them (schoolmates), in my stride as they took one another. I hated them from the first and withdrew into my timid, wounded, cumbersome pride."[12]

Konstantin Molchulsky asserts in his criticism of Dostoevsky's novel, that the source of consciousness for Dostoevsky in Notes From the Underground was suffering.[13] Throughout the novel, it appears that it is always this superficial suffering or an unexpected or harmful action that triggers the Underground Man to enter into this cycle of consciousness. His clash with the police officer, the friction between himself and his servant, Apollon, and his conflict with Zverkov, are all initiated as incidents which prompt him to renew his feelings of hopelessness against the forces which control his life.

The Coming to Consciousness

Two incidents occur which prompt Marakulin's coming to consciousness. Due to his straited circumstances upon losing his job, Marakulin is forced to move from his fashionable Petersburg apartment into a back apartment in the dingy area of Burkhov's Court on the lower side of the city. On the last day in his modern apartment, he witnesses a gross event. A cat, having choked on a sliver of glass or a nail, falls from a window on the fifth floor and lay writhing and howling in

agony on the pavement. As he stood watching this horrendous display, an old man enters his room to ask a favor. The old man proceeds to tell Marakulin of his ill-fated life - how he was kicked by a horse in the chest and can no longer work and simply wanders from place to place. Marakulin is struck by the fact that this old man has such a strong desire to live and how he states over and over that he would do anything at all to survive.[14] When he asks the old man why he wants to survive, the old man suddenly disappears from the room.

Up to this point Marakulin is still adhering to the principle that one can survive by suffering, forgetting, and finally, not thinking. Yet, when hearing about the tragic, unjust life of this old man, he asks himself, why even bother to survive at all? Suddenly, his thoughts are distracted by the howling of Murka, the cat, and he understands that this unjust suffering and cruel fate is universal to all of mankind and not just oriented towards him alone. Remizov says that this cat had been howling long before Marakulin was aware of it and that it howled all over the country and there was no place for man to hide from its howling.[15]

This new awareness is emphasized by the dostoevskian device of illness. Upon this realization, Marakulin falls feverishly ill for two weeks. Upon his recovery, he realizes that there is more to life than simply blotting out and hiding from reality. He says that now he exists simply to see and hear and feel.[16] He knows he had been wrong to glorify the importance of his job, his relations with people, and his

personal state of mind, because these things were all pending on fate. Now he believes that it is necessary to live only to experience these phenomona as sensual perceptions and treat fate with indifference.

After his illness, Marakulin says that his personal hardships have finally "opened his heart, and his soul is now living", that his awareness of life has given him a new type of "unusual joy".

Upon moving into his lodgings in Burkhov's Court, Marakulin faces an unbearable life of doom. Remizov's introduction of various characters into Marakulin's life adds and adds to the character's consciousness of suffering in the world. Marakulin meets Gorbachev, the landlord, who locks his daughter in the pantry with rats and who sends his prostitute-lodgers out to steal from the graves; he meets Akumovna, whom fate dealt an unmerciful series of blows; and Verochka and Verushka, girls forced to turn to prostitution in order to survive; and Anna Stepovna, who loses her money and teaching position, because she has faith in people and they take advantage of her. The biographies of all these lodgers press Marakulin deeply as he subconsciously tells himself that it is enough to simply see and hear and feel. Each of the lodgers whom he meets, seem to have a different technique or crutch to help them survive, but Marakulin can see that these so called techniques are actually regressions from reality and he begins to feel that simply sensing life is also a regression. He finally reaches a point at which he is not able to accept all of this.

Marakulin already knows that there is no one to blame for all this misery, yet his knowledge does not calm him in the slightest and he becomes so intent with this idea of retribution for this injustice that this awareness drives him to despair in endless inner torment.

Konstantin Mochulsky states that in Notes From The Underground,

> Consciousness is only born from conflict with reality, from a rupture with the world. Consciousness must pass through separation and solitude, . . . yet there is no such thing as a solitary consciousness; consciousness is always linked with all humanity . . . ."[17]

This statement is quite similar when Marakulin says that, "to some it is necessary to commit murder or treachery or make an error in one's job in order to open up one's soul."[18] Marakulin cries out in anguish, "who is to blame for all this?", knowing full well that there is no one or nothing that can be held responsible for the misery in man's life, and therefore, these torments in man's life must arise in his own consciousness. Consciousness causes its own conflicts.

In part one, the Underground Man says,

> . . . the most important point is that there's a set of fundamental laws to which heightened consciousness is subject so that there's no changing oneself or, for that matter doing anything about it."[19]

When man must by subservient to these laws, he also cannot be guilty of the consequences of his actions, since he is but a tool of fate. But it is not enough to merely hear and see and feel things which happen in the world. The Underground Man says that he is still guilty without guilt, he

still feels outrage at events that could not have happened otherwise, and he still has the desire to become a participant in a world that gives no value or importance to man. The tragedy is in the Underground Man's awareness that whenever he attempts an act in complete sincerity, he simultaneously realizes the impossibility of it, because of his subservience to fate. Consequently, whatever acts he attempts are necessarily superficial and illusory. He reaffirms this by stating,

> . . . the real snag, the most repulsive aspect of my nastiness, was that, even when I was at my liverish worst, I was constantly aware that I was not really wicked nor even embittered, that I was simply chasing pigeons . . . ."[20]

This internal conflict is quite apparent in the Underground Man during his first encounter with the prostitute, Liza. At the start of their conversation, he says, "I was involved in what I was saying. In fact, I was getting excited."

Yet, later, when the Underground Man becomes conscious of the uselessness of his emotions, he begins to play games, and says, "And what appealed to me most was the challenge which it presented."

Later, concluding his dramatic speech on morality, the Underground Man finds the entire incident a fruitless waste and he thinks, "But now, having attained the effect I sought, I suddenly found I had no stomach for it."

In all contacts with humanity the Underground Man faces the same dilemma. He wants to belong to humanity, yet all of his actions are superficial. And realizing that he is but a mere pawn for fate, his actions and interactions become

defensive and contradictory and meaningless.

Internal Suffering

At each stage in his mental development, Marakulin experiences an elated feeling which he calls his "unusual joy". However, this "joy" is used in reference to three very different states of mind. The "unusual joy" which Marakulin felt about his life before coming to consciousness is quite different from the feeling of elation which he had upon moving to Burkhov's Court and discovering that all of mankind was subjected to the same cruel and unjust fate as he had been. Now that he has come into this awareness, Marakulin experiences the most advanced type of "unusual joy" and this comes from his acceptance of suffering.

When Marakulin accepts suffering he no longer suffers for himself, alone, but for all of mankind. One person who greatly enhances his vulnerability to suffering is Vera Verhovna, a young orphan girl, who is fully convinced that she will become a great actress given the right opportunity. She lives in Burhov's Court, having been cast aside by a lecherous old factory owner, and she haughtily tells everyone of her great talents. Marakulin, at first, does not care for her presumptuous manner, but soon pities her when he realizes that fate had already cast its shadow on her, although she would not admit it. The miserable lives of all of the inhabitants of the court act as a cohesive force, tearing down any contentions Marakulin ever had to simply see and hear and feel.

The plight of Vera, however, strikes Marakulin the hardest. One night, when the old factory owner has promised to return for Vera, Marakulin suffers for her silently in his room. When the old man does not show up, Marakulin hears dull thudding sounds in Verochka's room - as she rythmically bangs her head against the wall in anguish and loneliness. At this point, Marakulin physically cries out and feels his "unusual joy". This joy of suffering does not originate from Marakulin's happiness of the actual suffering of others, but from his consciousness of its existence.

Marakulin, like the Underground Man, prefers this state of suffering to his former state of blindness. Several times he prays to return to that innocent stage which existed before his hardship, yet this only occurs in moments of delirious despair when his suffering becomes unbearable. Generally, Marakulin not only thrives on his suffering, but he encourages it.

When Marakulin begins to realize that seeing and hearing and feeling are not reason enough to survive, he becomes very intrigued about a newspaper article about a doctor who poisoned people to put them out of their misery. Marakulin begins to believe that, maybe, the doctor is actually a benefactor to mankind.[21] Soon, he makes it a point to pick out as many tragedies and bizarre catastrophies as he can find in the newspapers. Murders, fires, floods, diseases, - all these events acknowledge the presence of this cruel and unjust fate. It appears that Marakulin almost expects his suffering to reach

such limits that at some point an explanation or an escape will be offered to him.

The Underground Man, in his state of heightened consciousness, suffers precisely in the same manner and for the same reasons for which Marakulin suffers. He also feels an "unusual joy" in his consciousness of this doom for mankind. He says,

> And I inwardly gnawed at myself for it, tore at myself and ate myself away, until the bitterness turned into some shameful, accursed sweetishness and, finally, into a great, unquestionable pleasure . . . . I derived pleasure precisely from the blinding realization of my degradation, because I felt I was already up against the wall . . . .[22]

The Underground Man further states that, "it is better to suffer than to live in an unconscious state." His dearest mousehole is certainly not better than a crystal palace, but if one cannot have heightened consciousness in this crystal palace, then it is not a palace and the mousehole is much more preferable.

Whereas Marakulin enjoys reading about tragedies in the newspapers, the Underground Man feels . . . a secret, unhealthy, base little pleasure in creeping back into my hole after some disgusting night in Petersburg."[23]

Just as Marakulin suffers for the plight of Vera, the Underground Man suffers for the plight of the young prostitute, Liza. His suffering is apparent at the end of part two when he chases Liza from his house, after humiliating her and shoving a five ruble note at her. After she is gone, he thinks,

> That was what I was musing about sitting at home that

> evening, hardly able to bear my sadness and despair. Never before had I gone through such anguish and remorse.[24]

The Underground Man feels decadent and repulsive for treating Liza in such a despicable manner, yet, at the same time he believes that through these torments inflicted upon her she will begin to acquire the consciousness which he himself has about his own fate and the fate of all mankind.

This suffering causes a dilemma in the minds of the characters of both books. The Underground Man says that,

> I felt I was already up against the wall; that it was horrible but couldn't be otherwise; that there was no way out and it was no longer possible to make myself into a different person . . . .[25]

Similarly, Remizov says that Marakulin wandered about Petersburg from end to end, from gate to gate, like a mouse in a mousetrap.[26] When Akumovna, the court fortune teller, is reading his cards, Remizov says that fate taunts and jeers at Marakulin.[27]

Caught in Remizov's mousetrap or up against Dostoevsky's wall, both main characters of the two novels feel the same torments. If fate is so powerful that it is beyond all control of mankind, then man has no freedom at all. In this case, man cannot be blamed for his actions, but he is still treated as though he were in control of his actions. Hence, the dilemma. The Underground Man cries out, "I was guilty without guilt, by virtue of the laws of nature."[28]

Akumovna, the palmist, cries out to the court residents, "There is no one to blame!"[29]

Unless man has a definite or primary cause, he simply cannot act from a sound basis. Yet, as the Underground Man asks, "Where will I find the primary reason for action, the justification for it?"[30]

If fate or the laws of nature are incomprehensible to man, then man cannot even choose to act in accordance or not in accordance with them. His realm of comprehension is restricted and there seems to be no way out of this mousetrap or over this wall. Thus, the dilemma and the suffering.

Assertion of Man's Individuality

In his critique of Notes From the Underground, Jackson states that ". . . in suffering, at least, the Underground Man finds a guarantee of his own individuality."[31]

In Molchulsky's analysis, Molchulsky says, ". . . it is possible to forget about what is reflected and to lose oneself in how it is reflected."[32]

Similarly, the critic, Chukovsky, has accused Remizov of creating a character who thrives on pain and suffering.[33] Yet, neither character is nurtured from the actual pain and suffering of others, but from the fact that this awareness of suffering is present in them in the first place. This awareness or heightened consciousness becomes especially evident when Marakulin and the Underground Man are contrasted to those characters who do not possess it, and hence, have a limited and superficial understanding of fate.

It appears that unless man does, indeed, have this

heightened consciousness, acquired through suffering, he is not a free creature at all, but merely an unimposing cog in a wheel, is not even aware of his pitiful predicament.

In Sisters of the Cross, the character which acts as a contrast to Marakulin, is Xolmogorovna, the wife of a former general, now widowed and living in relative luxury in one of the front apartments of Burkhov's Court. Remizov says that according to the protocol of society, Xolmogorovna is an ideal citizen. She does not murder or steal and she never will. She simply exists by eating and drinking; she walks daily along the boulevard for exercise with her folding chair, goes to the steam baths on Tuesdays to temper herself, and goes to church on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. Marakulin and the other residents refer to her as the Louse, not because they are jealous of her wealth and easy life, but because they abhor her ignorance towards life.

Her ignorance is very similar to Marakulin's state before his hardships begin. At first, he despises and hates the Louse, because he needs some direct object on which to focus his attentions and on which to place the blame for his misery. After all of his rantings and hateful thoughts of her superficial and worthless existence, he thinks that if he killed her he could justify his actions by saying that "it wasn't he who killed her, but the cruel burkhovsky night."[34]

However, Marakulin soon changes his mind and decides that she actually does have a right to live, just from the fact that she is a Louse. Her total unconsciousness to misery and

suffering may even give her more than a normal right to exist, she may have a czarist right to exist.[35]

Marakulin reasons that if other residents of the court had a chance to live in this sheltered New Zion of unconsciousness as the Louse does, they would probably not pass up the opportunity, even though this state is artificial and illusory. Marakulin now realizes that it is not enough to live sadless, sinless, and deathless, as he had previously done, and as the Louse does now, but at times when his torments become unbearable, he prays to God to give him just one minute of the Louse's life and of his past life to momentarily ward off his pain.

Marakulin finds it impossible to assert his individuality knowing that he, like the Underground Man, cannot become anything, because he can find no basis, no primary cause to act upon. Yet, if he was created to live under the iron hand of fate, like a log of wood, why, also, was he not given an unawareness of this imprisoned state of existence? Is one expected to exert his individuality in respect to the degree of pain and torment one generates in this dilemma?

The character, Zverkov, is the man of unconsciousness in Dostoevsky's novel. Dostoevsky calls this man, the man of action, or the man of society, but Jackson uses the phrase, "normal man."[37] Like Xolmogorovna, Zverkov is totally oblivious to heightened consciousness and to the sufferings and torments of man, and who is content to live in harmony within the limitations of his society. Just as Marakulin uses the Louse as an object of blame for the actions of fate, the Underground

Man vents his pent-up emotions on Zverkov. Zverkov, now a successful, debonair army officer, was a former schoolmate of the Underground Man. The latter says of him,

> In elementary grades he was just a pretty, playful boy whom everyone liked - although I, of course, hated him then, precisely because he was so pretty and cheerful."[38]

The man of action possesses characteristics of self-confidence, self-assurance, and lives in harmony with his environment - things which evoke envy and respect from the Underground Man. But, at the same time, the Underground Man realizes that the man of action is really a very limited being. As Jackson quotes,

> he (Underground Man), . . . realizes his inability to become anything with the 'useless consolation that an intelligent man cannot become anything serious, and it is only the fool (Man of Action), who becomes anything.'"[39]

The Underground Man and Marakulin have already concluded that it is impossible to change oneself or one's course of action, and the Underground Man asserts that the stupidity of the Man of Action lies precisely in this area. He says,

> Although . . . these people may roar like furious bulls and this may add immensely to their prestige, they capitulate at once before the impossible, that is, a stone wall. What stone wall? Why, the laws of nature, of course; the conclusions of the natural sciences . . . .[40]

The Underground Man is outraged that man should be so degraded. Men like Zverkov humble themselves before these higher laws and nobly ascribe to them, but the Underground Man feels crushed and doomed and is outraged that the Man of Action cannot feel even the faintest twinges of his torments.

Like Marakulin, the Underground Man is not proposing that his suffering is better than the oblivious life of Xolmogorovna or Zverkov, but he is saying that there must be something beyond his suffering - beyond, what Marakulin says, the seeing and hearing and feeling. At least, through suffering, man can maintain his individuality and need not bow down and subject himself to the restrictive laws of nature.

In reaction to a man of action, Marakulin is more mature in his development than the Underground Man. Marakulin eventually reasons that the Louse, above anyone else, has a right to live, hoping that she, too, will experience his "unusual joy" in suffering. The Underground Man, however, does not seem to advance his feelings beyond his initial hate and disdain of Zverkov. The Underground Man continues to boil and surge over the characters of unconsciousness as though they themselves were to blame for their unconscious state.

Humiliation, Offense, and Impotence

Marakulin knows that while he may blame the conditions of his existence on fate, he himself is responsible for his attitude towards these superior forces. Consequently, during his feelings of despair and frustration, there is no one or nothing to materially blame. The position of the Underground Man is identical to Marakulin's, and the former only compensates for his feelings by striking out at man himself. Jackson, in his critique of Notes From the Underground, says of

the Underground Man,

> But in his rebellion he bears the mark of what he is negating; he is defaced and left nameless; tormented, he seeks torment; humiliated, he seeks the humiliation of others.[41]

Humiliated, Marakulin, also, seeks the humiliation of others, and he says that he must invent the Louse, Xolmogorovna, in order to have someone to blame.[42] In the novel there is no indication that Marakulin has ever even talked to her, yet, in his moments of despair and contempt, he focuses all his feelings of bitterness upon her. When Marakulin despairs over the wasted life of Verochka, he concludes his statement with the cynical comment, "And the Louse sleeps" (while all of these events are happening).

Offended and humiliated, Marakulin buries himself in his underground. He cannot obtain another job, because he refuses to lie about his dismissal and insists in telling everyone about his error. The fact that he refuses to result in lies and deception in order to obtain a job suggests that Marakulin's freedom of choice is essential to him, and his ability to choose to do whatever he prefers, rational or irrational, is essential to his existence.

Marakulin's impotence, his inability to change or even cope with nature, are typified by the pitiful hope which rises from the incident with his old friend, Pavel Plotnikov, an old schoolmate of Marakulin, who helped him on several occasions by finding him a job and saving him from a beating. Since Plotnikov comes from a very rich family, Marakulin now thinks

that he will borrow a thousand rubles from him and take Vera and several other misfortunate members of the court to Paris in order to begin a new life: V. Nicholaevna, who wants to become a teacher, will pass her exams; Vera, who is now a prostitute, will become a great actress; and Marakulin will find his lost joy.[43] Yet, time passes and hope dies. Plotnikov eventually sends twenty-five rubles and Marakulin repeats his philosophy that no one can be blamed for the state of his existence and that man is just a log of wood when it comes to helping other men.

Nature offends man and humiliates him, but, worse, it gives him the awareness to see all of this quite clearly. Remizov's contrast between the scene early in the novel in which a cat dies in anguish from eating glass, and the scene near the end of the novel in which an old man with a harmonica and a one-legged beggar girl sing for money in the court is symbolic of man's humiliation and impotence before fate. Remizov says of the latter scene that the people from the court gazed at the girl just like they had stood and watched the cat rolling on the stones in pain.[44] Later, he makes another comparison when he says that the girl gazed upwards to the windows just as the cat had done when it lie dying on the stones.[45] This first example demonstrates Remizov's feelings of the helplessness of man to others; the second example uses the expression "gazing upwards" as symbolic of man's search for an answer to his fate, an imploration of these higher forces.

Both main characters wallow in their humiliation and derive pleasure from their consciousness of their actions. Dostoevsky says of the Underground Man, "

> we find that this test-tube man is so subdued by his anti-thesis that he views himself . . . as a mouse rather than a man . . . . And, what's more, he regards himself as a mouse; no one asks him to do so. This is a very important point.[46]

Marakulin, too, is responsible for his feelings of being caught in a mousetrap. However, the Underground Man has more of a tendency to project his personal feelings onto other characters, finding it necessary to relate his feelings to a materialistic object. Marakulin, on the contrary, continues to maintain his feelings on a higher level, only projecting his frustration and confusion to the reader. This difference is seen in each character's relation to their prostitute girl-friend. When fate "laughs" at Marakulin, and Plotnikov does not send the money for the trip to Paris, thus extinguishing all hope, Marakulin does not react by striking out against Vera as a release for his torment. Even in his state of heightened consciousness, when he is most aware of the fruit-lessness of all his actions and thoughts, he does not reject his feeling of compassion and endearment towards Vera. The Underground Man, however, cannot fall into the dilemma which nature imposes upon him without entangling this dilemma with his relationship with Liza, the prostitute. He is so obsessed with his own dilemma of consciousness and suffering that he cannot view man as a creature with similar feelings to his own. Whereas Marakulin's despair before fate is more universal

and directed toward others, the despair of the Underground Man is only despair for himself, despite all of his broad philosophizing in part one of the novel.

On the eve of their first meeting, the Underground Man begins his talk with Liza as though it were a game, a means of passing the time; yet, as he becomes more and more involved with Liza's pitiful story, he periodically checks himself, so as not to become carried away or actually involved in her problems, as though Liza herself represented that which was superior to the Underground Man, and therefore, to be avoided.

In this respect, Marakulin is more mature than the Underground Man. Although Vera offers the former only contempt when he goes to visit her, he is still able to feel a special compassion for her which, he states, might be the source of his lost joy, namely love. Yet, he fully realizes that Vera is only a human who is also subject to the same fate as he, and consequently, he expects nothing extraordinary from her. The Underground Man is actually offered love by Liza and rejects it, because it threatens his safeguard against fate. The Underground Man is so set in his cycle of heightened consciousness that he cannot accept Liza's love as an escape from his underground world. The Underground Man has less hope than Marakulin, because Marakulin, at least, maintains that life may be better if they can all move to Paris. The Underground Man justifies his own degradation of Liza, his refusal of her love, by saying that it will be more pleasurable in the

end for her to suffer nobly than to obtain cheap happiness. He still does not explain why he rejects this escape from fate, since the latter statement implies that his act was done for Liza's benefit, which would be an action uncharacteristic for the Underground Man.

Both characters, however, do pass through these stages of feelings of humiliation and impotence and helplessness and both eventually conclude that it is actually better to do nothing at all - that the state of complete inertia is the least harmful position for man in which to exist.

Inertia

The state of inertia for both Marakulin and the Underground Man is only temporary and cannot be long maintained. Marakulin initially accepts his suffering by saying that he will live for nothing, only to see and hear and feel. Yet, this passive state of inertia is incongruous with man's nature. In his initial state of inertia, Marakulin meets several secondary characters of the novel whose stories compile to break down the walls of his passive state of existence. Akumovna, the fortune teller, relates how her mother dies, how her money is stolen by an uncle, and how she is eventually forced to become mistress to a baron and is eventually kicked aside. Vera Nickolaevna tells how her mother and she lived in a bath house when their house burned down, how her father died, and how a convict, who was her teacher, died fatefully under the sign of death.

Marakulin, of course, has seen all this suffering and misfortune before, but this is the first time that he realizes that this state of inertia, as a shelter against suffering, is not enough for which to survive, and he proceeds to examine how and why other characters of the novel, who are aware of their plight, cope with this problem.

Two brothers, who work as a ballet dancer and a trapeze artist, tell Marakulin that man must shake himself off from others and isolate himself from the world.[47] Others say that man must live for the next world, or live to help and benefit mankind in this world. Hearing all of this, Marakulin becomes outraged by man's fate and finds it impossible to live in this state of inertia. Yet all of the reasons for living, which he has been told, are only crutches, devices to help man deceive himself about the almighty power of an unjust fate controlling his life.

The Underground Man also experiences this same state of inertia which cannot remain a constant for him. Jackson states the

> Underground Man lives in 'conscious inertia', divorced from the 'living life', in constant fear of reality; yet at the same time his hungry ego craves contact with reality. When he can no longer stand solitude he rushes out into the Petersburg streets to find means of restoring his lost sense of being.[48]

The Underground Man himself says, "And what would the natural, logical fruit of heightened consciousness be if not inertia, by which I mean consciously sitting with folded arms'."[49]

Both main characters face the same dilemma. Through

their suffering they try to find a reason for their existence, a clue to their individuality; yet this search always ends in a feeling of helplessness and despair. But, to sit in inertia is maddening, because inertia in itself accomplishes nothing, and it is precisely because of this dilemma that Marakulin and the Underground Man despise the men of action. These people are not even conscious of the limitations of their freedom, and they never feel suffocated by the state of inertia in which the men of heightened consciousness find themselves. The Underground Man can find no reason for maintaining this state other than that it temporarily precludes his suffering. Yet, the very minute when the Underground Man rushes out into the Petersburg night to find contact with humanity, he is also aware that this act is meaningless. It is only part of his cycle of consciousness. Marakulin displays similar traits in his attitude towards the prostitute, Vera. After she has moved from Burkhov's court Marakulin goes to visit her, hoping somehow to get from her his "lost joy". He, too, wishes to come back into contact with humanity, although fully realizing that Vera cannot really help him, just as he cannot help her.

The only difference between the Underground Man's acceptance of it, is that the Underground Man seethes and froths in his hole in the underground, striking out irrationally, while Marakulin wanders dreamily about in utter despair and hopelessness. When Marakulin realizes that he is going to die, he begins to roam the streets with the prostitutes, looking for Vera. Remizov writes that "he wanted to say

good-bye to her." Like the Underground Man he is still striving to come into contact with humanity, knowing that this contact will not help him escape his fate.

The Underground Man says that if he could accept the state of inertia, "I'd loathe myself for deliberately sinking into self-deception."[50]

Marakulin feels the yoke of fate so heavily about his neck that he does not have the strength to loathe himself, because he knows that he has been made the guilty victim without ever having been guilty.

Boredom and Fantasy

Both characters try to accept and live with the state of inertia, because it is the least painful state for them. Both admit that it is impossible to become anything because of the dominance of fate, and if one tries to be good or evil, it is quickly realized that all of these traits are merely efforts of self-deception and man cannot become anything or change himself in any way.

Man cannot bear to exist long in this state of inertia. Yet, his attempts to react constitute a self-deception which he is very aware of. The only alternative is to lapse into a state of boredom of fantasizing. The Underground Man exclaims about this state, "Of course, what won't one invent out of boredom."[51]

The Underground Man simply exists in a preoccupation of mental activity. He says,

> I made up whole stories about myself and put myself through all sorts of adventures to satisfy, at any price, my need to live . . . . Once, or rather twice, I tried to make myself fall in love. And, believe me, ladies and gentlemen, I certainly suffered! Deep down, of course, I couldn't quite believe in my suffering and felt like laughing.[52]

This game with external reality occurs at the same time when the Underground Man most desires contact with humanity. When the prostitute, Liza, comes to visit him, the Underground Man is caught between wanting to accept her love and thinking that the entire affair has merely been a game. Likewise, at Zverkov's dinner party, the Underground Man, one moment becomes enraged over a remark which he believes has humiliated and offended him, and the next minute he is imploring the supposed offender to forgive him for his outburst of rudeness. At the dinner party, the Underground Man, offended, paces the floor in front of the company for three hours because of his obstinancy and pride. Yet when the gentlemen all prepare to go to a public house, the Underground Man cries out, "Zverkov, I want to ask you to forgive me. You too, Ferfichkin. And the others also - all whom I've offended."[53]

It is not really other characters who act as offenders or forgivers of the Underground Man, yet it is through other characters that the Underground Man channels his reactions. The feelings of offense and humiliation are generated within the Underground Man himself.

Marakulin is different than the Underground Man. The only time that Marakulin strikes out against another character

is in his initial stage of heightened consciousness when he blames the Louse for the torments and misfortunes of others. Yet, he realizes that this blame is unfounded, and after continued advancement of his awareness, he admits that perhaps Xolmogorovna has a right to live simply because she has not yet become aware of all this unjust misery in the world.

The Underground Man never diverts from his cycle, and in this stage of inertia the Underground Man plays games with people, ends them in frustration when he senses their uselessness, and sinks back into his decrepit underground into inertia. Marakulin does not fall into the same boredom as the Underground Man, but lapses into periods of fantasizing, characterized by his dreams. Just as the Underground Man strives to find a primary cause for his existence through contact with other characters, Marakulin attempts to find just cause for his existence in the realm of mysticism. Whenever Marakulin attempts to come into contact with man and fails, he fantasizes through dreaming, using this outlet for his frustrations.

Marakulin's first dream occurs when he cannot make the director understand how he made an error in his records. Again, when Vera rejects his friendship, and again, when he returns from his dismal trip from visiting Plotnikov. Finally, when Marakulin searches for Vera among the streetwalkers, Marakulin hallucinates about his own death. All of these fantasizings and hallucinations serve the same purpose for Marakulin as the idle musings and mental games serve for the Underground Man. In all of these dreams Marakulin laments

about his isolation from humanity and the overpowering presence of death as an alternative to his miserable life. This dreaming constitutes the successive stage after inertia in Marakulin's developing cycle of consciousness.

Jackson says of this stage in the Underground Man (and it applies to Marakulin), that "consciousness opposes itself to the world" . . . that the Underground Man "hides in his hole while his fantasy protects him from loathsome reality."[54]

The world of fantasy not only protects the characters from fate and the unpredictable laws of nature, but reflects to them their own self-created world, and the character can become an entertained spectator and a critical judge of his own fantasy world, minus the influence of fate. Yet, precisely because this heightened consciousness is present, the character soon realizes the purposelessness of all this and again sinks into his mousehole.

The last stage following boredom and fantasy is the stage of last effort, of striking out wildly before becoming enveloped in misery and suffering, and relapsing into the beginning of the entire cycle.

Striking Out

In this last phase Marakulin and the Underground Man both assume different roads to a similar end. For the Underground Man this stage is characterized by maliciousness, spite, and revenge. For Marakulin this stage is dominated by overwhelming feelings of hopelessness and near apathy towards this

world and a concentration of actions appealing to higher forces - God and religion - to save him from this state of existence.

Jackson, in his critique of the Underground Man, says that "malice is no more than a last despairing effort of the individual to reject the consequences of his tragic position."[55]

Fed up with his state of inertia, the Underground Man becomes bored and restless, and when he tries to shake these feelings from himself, he simultaneously realizes that his actions are all to no avail. Not being able to become anything at all, the Underground Man strikes out in frustration and says that he will try anyway, simply because he has that privilege. The Underground Man says,

> But then, one might do anything out of boredom. Golden pins (referring to the fact that Cleopatra enjoyed sticking pins in the breasts of servant girls through sheer boredom), are stuck into people out of boredom. But that's nothing. What's really bad . . . is that the golden pins will be welcomed by them.[56]

Malicious acts which are originated by the Underground Man do not indicate an evilness on his part, but are merely indicators of his confusion and despair. Whereas Marakulin falls victim to illusion and dreams, the Underground Man falls victim to acts of maliciousness. These malicious acts are directly aimed at offending the initiator of the act. In the end, however, the Underground Man is always the one who is the most offended for the simple reason that malice itself is impotent and leads to inertia. The Underground Man cannot even admit that he has a right to be malicious, since he has

no primary or substantially just cause for this feeling and soon realizes that this is only part of his game playing, just as all his other actions have been.

When the Underground Man initially meets Liza, he maliciously upbraids her way of life, because he finds pleasure in watching her torments and anguish. It is all a game for him and he is playing a role; yet, when Liza comes to visit him a few days later and threatens to unmask his games by means of her love, he humiliates her and rejects her, wishing to feel disgust with his own self, rather than to hurt her feelings. Likewise, when he persists to remain at Zverkov's dinner party, forgotten and ignored by the other members of the party, he realizes that he is only tormenting himself, because, he says, "They really paid no attention to me."[57]

Yet, he persists in remaining and works his emotions up to the point of delirium.

The Underground Man is actually striking back at his own self-abasement and dilemmic existence under the hand of fate. His maliciousness is frequently focused on a man of action, just as Marakulin's is, yet, neither character really hates the man of action. Both characters know that man cannot save man, that he is like a log of wood to man. Nevertheless, the Underground Man still cries out in despair for help from fellow man. By insulting and offending, the Underground Man hopes that this will shock the man of action into his own heightened consciousness. Yet, as soon as the Underground Man thinks that there may be hope or at least sympathy found in

other men, he realizes that these feelings have all been created out of his own state of boredom and he again sinks into his mousehole.

Marakulin matures in his cycle of heightened consciousness. Upon his arrival at Burhov's Court, Marakulin takes out all his frustration on the general's wife, Xolmogorovna. He says that he needed to invent someone whom he could blame for all of the suffering around him. Also, for a time, he found malicious pleasure in reading about disasters and bizarre events in the newspaper. But all of this soon passes, because this self-abased pleasure is not enough on which to survive, and like the Underground Man, Marakulin realizes its fruitlessness.

When Marakulin was obsessed with malice towards the Louse, he was not striking out at her, per se, but symbolically, against all that was beyond his limitations. This is implied when Marakulin sees how Xolmogorovna is shot one night quite accidentally as she is strolling along the street with her folding chair. She herself, becoming a mere victim of chance, just as Marakulin had, certainly was never an opposing force to Marakulin, but she suffers similar consequences as he, with or without his heightened consciousness. It is shown that Marakulin strikes out against that which offers him nothing substantial to strike at, but which is closest to him - other people.

The malice of both characters is only a last fruitless effort to strike at the laws of nature and to awaken in

other human beings their own state of consciousness. Just as the Underground Man believes that Liza will benefit from her humiliation over the incident at his house, Marakulin, also, says that he would love to boil and scald the Louse, not because he hates her, but because that he believes that suffering will give her that intensive awareness which he himself possesses. However, the Underground Man and Marakulin do not succeed in this stage and they both succumb again to suffering and despair.

Suffering Again

Once this cycle of consciousness is completed it is repeated over and over again in both characters. Dostoevsky allows his main character to live his entire life in this cycle without any further maturing or insight. Each cycle is only a repetition of a previous one. Marakulin possesses this cycle of heightened consciousness over a period of two years - from the time of dismissal from his job until his coincidental death in Burhov's Court; however, in Remizov's character one can see a maturing of his feelings towards this newly discovered reality. Marakulin does not simply mesh himself into the cycle, but becomes more and more uninvolved and apathetic towards it, until he seems to be a mere figure of the abstract and mystical by the end of the novel. In Marakulin the dominance of fate is felt more strongly. This same dominance is also found in the Underground Man, but is not quite as overwhelming. Indeed, some critics have been misled to assume that

the Underground Man is malicious because he is truly evil, that he strikes out against his fellow man because he hates him, and that he is a degenerated, corrupt figure, when he is actually one of the most compassionate.

One last example will demonstrate the magnitude of Marakulin's oppression by fate. Akumovna, a resident of the court and also, a victim of many misfortunes, tells the fortunes of the residents every evening. She interprets their dreams and gives them religious advice. All of the residents place their respect in her and call her the "Divine Akumovna." Near the end of the novel, Marakulin dreams that he will finally die. Not wanting to believe this, he runs to Akumovna for confirmation, but she only shakes her head, admitting that she, like all others, really knows nothing at all about the fate of man.

CHAPTER 2

FOOTNOTES

[1]Robert G. Durgy, Notes From the Underground, (NY; Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1969), p. 136.

[2]Ibid., p. 136.

[3]Aleksej Remizov, The Sisters of the Cross, (Hertfordshire: Bradda Books LTD, 1949), p. 16.

[4]Robert Louis Jackson, Dostoevsky's Underground Man in Russian Literature, (The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1958), p. 38.

[5]Henry Troyat, Firebrand, The Life of Dostoevsky, (NY: Roy Publishers, 1946), p. 251.

[6]Remizov, op. cit., p. 18.

[7]Ibid., p. 10

[8]Ibid., p. 6

[9]Ibid., p. 8

[10]Ibid., p. 9

[11]Ibid., p. 10.

[12]Fyodor Dostoevsky, Notes From the Underground. Trans. by Andrew R. MacAndrew. (NY: New American Library, 1961), p. 14.

[13]Konstantin Mochulsky, Dostoevsky, His Life and Work, (Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1967), p. 249.

[14]Remizov, op. cit., p. 15.

[15]Ibid., p. 16.

[16]Ibid., p. 18.

[17]Durgy, op. cit., p. 131.

[18]Remizov, op. cit., p. 18.

[19]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 94-95.

[20]Ibid., p. 91.

[21]Remizov, op. cit., p. 48.

[22]Dostoevsky, op cit., p. 94.

[23]Ibid., p. 94.

[24]Ibid., p. 202.

[25]Ibid., p. 94

[26]Ibid., p. 120.

[27]Ibid., p. 85.

[28]Ibid., p. 95.

[29]Remizov, op. cit., p. 32.

[30]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 103.

[31]Jackson, op. cit., p. 40.

[32]Mochulsky, op. cit., p. 249.

[33]S. Adrianov, "Kriticeski nabroski," Vestnik Evropy, No. 2, 1911, pp. 353-365.

[34]Remizov, op. cit., p. 48.

[35]Ibid., p. 50.

[36]Ibid., p. 52.

[37]Jackson, op. cit., p. 38.

[38]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 140.

[39]Jackson, op. cit., p. 38.

[40]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 98.

[41]Jackson, op. cit., p. 33.

[42]Remizov, op. cit., p. 119.

[43]Ibid., p. 114.

[44]Ibid., p. 122.

[45]Ibid., p. 123.

[46]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 96-97.

[47]Remizov, op. cit., p. 28.

[48]Jackson, op. cit., p. 36.

[49]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 102.

[50]Ibid., p. 103.

[51]Jackson, op. cit., p. 45.

[52]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 102.

[53]Ibid., p. 157

[54]Durgy, op. cit., p. 135.

[55]Jackson, op. cit., p. 34.

[56]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 109.

[57]Ibid., p. 156.

Chapter 3

THE CRYSTAL PALACE

This chapter acts as a pivot point for the thesis; providing more material and information to show the continued similar development of the main characters of Dostoevsky and Remizov.

The Role of Reason and Rationalism

Many readers of Notes From the Underground have thought that the Underground Man denies reason and the rationale in preference for the illogical and irrational, yet, this is just the opposite of what Dostoevsky attempted to do. He does not reject reason, but only rejects the superiority and the all-powerfulness which the men of action attribute to it. In part one, section seven of Notes From the Underground, Dostoevsky begins his argument against the fact that reason encompasses an all-powerfulness over man. In order to argue against the superiority of reason and the basic assumptions of the Nihilists, who were the main supporters of reason, Dostoevsky does not initially deny their assumptions, but rather, he accepts them, begins to argue from them, and when the argument is reduced to dilemmas and absurdities, Dostoevsky, then, points to the assumptions and says that they are now necessarily at fault and therefore, not acceptable. Dostoevsky certainly is not trying

to deny the importance or necessity of reason, but he is saying that there are times when it is just as beneficial to be unreasonable and illogical. He says, "But reason is only reason, and it only satisfies man's rational requirements."[1]

There are other requirements of man, not ruled by reason, that must be fulfilled, and the Underground Man knows this, and he says, because,

> . . . a man, always and everywhere, prefers to act in the way he feels like acting and not in the way his reason and interest tell him, for it is very possible for a man to feel like acting against his interests.[2]

Consequently, when man does not always act in accordance with reason, then this leaves room for the concept of human freedom and morality and simply, responsibility for one's actions.

Dostoevsky goes on to argue that man is not simply a doorstop or a piano key whose entire existence can be set up and analyzed like a logarithmic table, and even, if every moment of his life was predicted, then he says, "In that case man would go insane on purpose, just to be immune from reason."[3]

Chernyshevsky and the Nihilists, of course, denied that any aspect of man's life should be constructed outside the boundaries of reason and they considered man to be in harmony with life and possess consciousness when he knew enough to bow down to the wall of reason and to shun anything that was not structurally rational and logical and in harmony with his restricted existence.

Heightened consciousness has no place in the doctrine

of the Nihilists. Of this state, the Underground Man says, "Consciousness, for instance, is of a much higher order than twice two."[4]

He admits that although consciousness gives way to the various emotions and states of being, which always end in frustration and torment, this state, at least, is far superior to the blind stage of merely living within the boundaries of reason and logic.

Remizov indicates a similar intent concerning the role of reason for Marakulin. However, because of the difference in basic writing style and actual literary techniques, Remizov does not directly expound upon his views, but indicates them discretely and indirectly through the actions and comments of his characters.

Like the Underground Man, Marakulin, also, is not denying the importance of reason, but simply asserts that there has to be more in man's life than the dominance of this force. Just as the Underground Man's heightened consciousness does not fall within the boundaries of reason, Marakulin's "unusual joy" does not fall within this category. Marakulin does not exist merely to be a log of wood, just as he does not exist to be a doorstop or a piano key. Although there seems to be no other preferable alternative to this restricted, freedomless existence, except suffering and inner torment, this latter case is generally more preferable, because it allows for man's freedom while the other does not. In instances of extreme despair Marakulin prays to God to give him the unconscious life of the

Louse so that he can return to his child-like state of innocence and naivety towards life. However, he, like the Underground Man, finds a certain pleasure in his suffering, and through this determines that suffering is better, in the long run, than complete ignorance of man's plight in the world.

At first, Marakulin tries to act within the realm of reason and logic, determined to become a puppet before the wall which fate has put up. He tries to be a mere receptacle through which sensations of the external world flow in and out. But, as time progresses and he is confronted with more and more acts of injustices, he proves to himself that there must exist something beyond man's calm acceptance of this wall, and he finds out that his consciousness and suffering do not belong to the rational and logical aspect of man; that only part of his life is governed by the rational. Marakulin is already fully aware of his helplessness and uselessness to the other people in this world, yet, even with this knowledge Marakulin does not prevent himself from becoming involved with Vera, the prostitute. Even when Vera herself rejects his offering of help, Marakulin persists, not because he cannot see the uselessness of his actions, but because his mind will no longer allow him to accept passively all of these injustices, and he reacts aggressively, persisting because he chooses to react, however irrelevantly or irrationally, to these injustices.

The Underground Man says that he values his freedom of choice, simply because his freedom of choice is dearer to him than any lifelong logarithmic table. This is identical to

Marakulin's philosophy. Marakulin extends himself and avails himself to beneficial actions for others, yet, realizing all of the time that his actions are useless and powerless when confronted with the overwhelming power of fate.

Marakulin also views the role of reason in another light which is not acknowledged by the Underground Man. He is initially repulsed by the General's wife and by the externally perfect life which she leads. Yet, Marakulin is mature enough to soon realize that man's subservience to the laws of nature need not prove man's stupidity or his rejection of a broader knowledge of life, but may simply be used as a device, a crutch to "make it" through life. Marakulin has not found an escape or an answer to the overpowering force of fate, and all he knows of that consciousness, despite its pain and torment, is that it is better than obliviousness to reality. Marakulin realizes that he has no right to condemn those who need props and crutches, and he concludes that confining herself to the world of the rational may be the crutch which Xolmogoravna uses.

The Underground Man does not allow reason such a respectable role. He despises the man of action, who, like Xolmogorovna, confines himself to the laws of nature and does not allow him to use these laws as a device to "make it" through life. The Underground Man readily admits that he himself has various petty intrigues which amuse him in his suffering, yet, he does not allow the same weakness or props in other characters. Concerned with his own self-indulgence, the role of reason seemingly exists only to restrict and prohibit, and rather than

vent his frustration in a universal cry of helplessness as Marakulin finally does, the Underground Man vents his wrath on those who are the victims most subjected to unawareness and unconsciousness of reality.

The Man of Action

The characters of both novels who act as men of action, Zverkov and Kolmogorovna, are very similar in their characteristics and they portray the same philosophy found in both novels. In the attempt to reject reason and rationalism as the primary factor in man's life, these men of action are used as focal points in the argumentation. Zverkov and Kolmogorovna represent the ideal man as portrayed by Chernyshevsky's philosophy. Both lead orderly, harmonized lives in accordance and within the acceptable boundaries of society. Both live sinlessly and happily within these boundaries, oblivious to any shortcomings or inconsistencies in their lives, thinking that all is well, because their lives are so well-ordered and externally, error free.

However, as the Underground Man bitterly comments, "The plain men of action simply do not understand that scientific determinism does not allow them to be morally decisive about anything, . . ."[5]

The man of action humbles himself and submits to the stone wall or the barrier of reason and rationalism readily accepting these barriers as natural limitations in his life and willing to live contentedly and happily within them. The Under-

ground Man, however, cannot accept these limitations and says that when man does accept this stone wall, then he has no right to think that he has freedom or any form of independent choice. The conflict lies not in the question of whether or not this stone wall actually exists, because the characters of both novels readily assert that they do. The conflict occurs when the man of action says that this is the normal state of affairs and easily submits to it, and when the men of heightened consciousness rebel at these limitations, asking how these principles can exist if man's life is predetermined by fate. Without freedom of choice, man cannot be guilty of any of his actions and when this happens, his entire existence can be layed out and deciphered like a function on a logarithmic table.

The character, Zverkov, is the epitome of all that stands against the philosophy of the Underground Man. Zverkov does not live in the dilemmic world of the underground, because he does not feel imprisoned by the stone wall of fate. He does not feel the contradiction between freedom of choice and morality and between a predetermined, logical, rational life. He believes that just because one's life may be plotted like a function on a logarithmic table, it does not necessarily mean that man has no choice; it simply denotes that man has a well-ordered and determined life, which, if followed according to logic and reason, is the fullest and best possible life man can have.

Kolmogorovna is identical to the character, Zverkov. In this character, Remizov flawlessly depicts Dostoevsky's man

of action. Like Zverkov, Xolmogorovna belongs to the well-to-do upper class and does not face the burdensome financial problems which have much influential effect on the characters of heightened consciousness. This widow is not a sinner or a criminal and she occupies her day to day existence by eating, sleeping, and strolling along the boulevard with her folding chair, never harming anyone. Like Zverkov, she considers her life well adjusted and fulfilled, because it fits compatibly into the realms of her society. Like Zverkov's life, Xolmogorovna's could be predicted on a logarithmic table in the world of the Underground Man, and yet, this predetermined, well-ordered existence does not cause any feeling of limitedness or restriction. Just as Zverkov could never understand the Underground Man's loathsomeness for the stone wall, Xolmogorovna will never understand Marakulin's revulsion for her well-ordered and logical life.

In both men of action there is an absence of any sign of heightened consciousness. This very obliviousness in man is the very thing which stirs the emotions of the characters of heightened consciousness. Both the Underground Man and Marakulin hate the men of action for their vulnerability and humility before the stone wall, yet, in time of despair, both characters begin to envy this nonchalance and ignorance of reality. Marakulin prays to God to give him a brief moment of the Louse's life so that he can return to that state of ignorant bliss. The Underground Man frequently asks, is it really better for man to have this consciousness, if it only brings

torment and misery and offers no solace to his suffering? But, precisely because men are men and not logs of wood, both men of consciousness prefer this torment to any pleasurable illusion about their existence. Both characters, also, openly discredit the illusory life of the man of action. The Underground Man accomplishes this in his own argument, fighting for his own self-recognition, and thus, denying the life style of Zverkov. Remizov, however, accomplishes this task in an even more dramatic manner. Not only does Marakulin himself reject Xolmogorovna's life style, but fate herself openly and actively deals a blow to this oblivious creature. Walking along the boulevard with her folding chair one evening, Xolmogorovna is suddenly caught in a fight between a police officer and a patron of a nearby tavern, and is fatally shot. The coincidence and the total unfairness of this act demonstrates the superficiality of her life and emphasizes the tragic aspect of reality with which the character of heightened consciousness has been struggling.

The next section will deal with the parallel differences of the men of action and of the men of heightened consciousness in regards to the primary goals in their lives and the basic motivative factors which determine their concepts of life.

<u>The Crystal Palace</u>

The Crystal Palace is a very significant concept insofar as it represents a portion of the similar concepts found

in both novels and greatly clarifies them. In Chernyshevsky's What's To Be Done?, Vera Pavlovna, a Nihilist, dreams of a 'glass house' where she might one day live in total peace and happiness; this 'glass house' representing the nihilistic concept of a perfect society and environment in which everything is pre-planned and ordered, not leaving room for alternative actions or events, and in actuality, doing away with all freedom of choice and ascribing to man a completely organized life by which to live. Dostoevsky argues against this 'glass house', but refers to is as man's Crystal Palace - man's perfectly ordered society. Ridiculing the Nihilists, he cynically begins his argument against this idealistic concept by stating with tongue in cheek, "Then the utopian palace of crystal will be erected; then . . . well, then those will be the days of bliss."[6]

Before probing deeper into this concept of the Crystal Palace it is necessary to note the ambiguity of the use of this term. As Joseph Frank points out in part one of the novel, Dostoevsky actually uses Crystal Palace to refer to two very different concepts - the first, in reference to the nihilistic ideal of a predetermined existence based on the rationale, and the second, when he speaks in reference to the ideal society envisioned by the man of heightened consciousness.

At the beginning of chapter X, the Underground Man says,

> So you believe in an indestructible Crystal Palace in which you won't be able to stick out your tongue or blow raspberries even if you cover your mouth with your hand. But I'm afraid of such a palace precisely because it's indestructible and because I won't even be allowed to stick my tongue out at it.[7]

In this passage, the Underground Man is referring to that concept of the Nihilists, yet, in the following passage, pointed out by Joseph Frank, there is no doubt that the Underground Man is referring to an idealistic concept of his own preference when he refers to the Crystal Palace. He says,

> The Crystal Palace may be just an idle dream, it may be against all the laws of nature, I may have invented it because of my own stupidity, because of certain old and irrational habits of my generation. But what do I care whether it is against the laws of nature? What does it matter so long as it exists in my desires, or rather exists while my desires exist?[8]

As Frank goes on to comment, it is obvious that the above two references to 'Crystal Palace' are not only dissimilar, but very opposite of one another. In the second passage, mention is made of the Crystal Palace being constructed according to man's whim and fancy, even against and in contradiction to the laws of nature. Consequently, in order to analyze the concept of the Crystal Palace accurately, it is necessary to keep this distinction in mind and not alienate particular statements in the book from the context in which they were written.

In chapter seven, Dostoevsky begins his discussion of the Crystal Palace concept as part of his discourse on free will and its necessity for man's happiness. The Underground Man, attempting to prove the ludicrousness of a predetermined life, says that given the fact that man will be able to predict every aspect of his life,

> Then . . . new economic relations will arise, relations ready-made and calculated in advance with mathematical precision, so that all possible questions instan-

> taneously disappear because they receive all the possible answers. Then the utopian palace of crystal will be erected; then . . . well, then, those will be the days of bliss.[9]

The Underground Man then goes on to say that in this perfect utopia it may become very boring to the extent that man will desire to stick golden pins into people out of sheer boredom, and that these people, also bored by their existence, will actually welcome the pain. He continues by stating that

> a man . . . prefers to act in the way he feels like acting and not in the way his reason and interest tell him, for it is very possible for a man to feel like acting against his interests and, in some instances, I say, that he positively wants to act that way.[10]

Finally, he concludes,

> . . . where did these sages pick up the notion that man must have something that they feel is a normal and virtuous set of wishes; what makes them think that man's will must be reasonable and in accordance with his own interests?[11]

In chapters eight and nine, Dostoevsky uses this philosophy of the Crystal Palace to substantiate his defense for the necessity of the irrational and illogical. In chapter ten, he uses the Crystal Palace to present another argument against the dominance of reason in the world of the Nihilists which serve as the final blows to the nihilistic concepts. The Underground Man says that, given this life of predetermined and pre-ordered existence, man could not even stick his tongue out at this Crystal Palace, even if he wanted to. It is not that he actually wants to stick his tongue out at the Nihilists' Crystal Palace, but, "On the contrary, I'd be willing to have my tongue cut out in sheer gratitude if it could be arranged that I would

never again feel like sticking it out."[12]

He continues, "I said that not because I love sticking out my tongue, but because I have yet to see a building of yours at which one could refrain from sticking out one's tongue."[13]

The point that the Underground Man is trying to make is that he is not concerned with specific actions which he is or is not allowed to conduct, but the fact that he will always have a preference or a choice for doing them or not doing them. He does not try to reject Nihilism for its attempt to establish a utopian society, for he himself realizes the waste and hopelessness of his own existence. Yet, he is not willing to accept a substitute or a superficial utopia as he feels the Nihilists have done. The Underground Man argues against the superiority of reason by saying that if it were raining and he crawled into a chicken coop for shelter, he would be very grateful, but he would not be so grateful or disillusioned that he would mistake the chicken coop for a palace. He says that the chicken coop would be a palace, "if the only purpose of life was keeping from getting wet."[14]

However, man has higher goals in life than just keeping out of the rain, and he also has higher expectations than living a predetermined life. In essence, the Underground Man says that the Crystal Palace of the Nihilists is superficial and deceptive, and he is not deceived by it and will not accept it as a true Crystal Palace - as a true means of existence for man which does not restrict his freedom or individuality. Since "suffering is the only cause of consciousness . . . ,"[15] and the source of

man's heightened consciousness, the Crystal Palace of the Nihilists would necessarily rule out suffering. The Underground Man rejects the Crystal Palace of the Nihilists entirely, preferring his real, tormented life to the false, pleasurable one of the Nihilists.

Remizov also describes a Crystal Palace very similar to the one rejected by the Underground Man. Remizov, however, calls this Crystal Palace the New Zion and only directly refers to it as such on several occasions throughout his novel. In chapter three of Sisters of the Cross, in which Marakulin, reflects how each of the novel's characters live and justify their lives. He also, reflects how each of the characters find contentment and bliss in an artificial zion, or artificial Crystal Palace in which their happiness exists as long as they can shut out those very truths which give heightened consciousness to man and make him realize his morbid and hopeless position. Remizov does not argue directly against the idea of this artificial New Zion, but displays the same repulsion and final negation in his direct line of arguing as Dostoevsky had done. As Remizov describes Xolmogorovna's New Zion - her sinless, crimeless, indifferent life, he subtly ridicules and even loathes her contentment with such a life. Xolmogorovna, of course, like Sverkov, does not realize the artificialness of her Crystal Palace and, in fact, never does.

Marakulin's various references to his past "unusual joy" allude to the same attitude which Dostoevsky's Underground Man expresses about the Crystal Palace. When Marakulin prays to

God in moments of desperation to give him back his "unusual joy" and the bliss which he had felt before coming into consciousness, he wants to accept the true Crystal Palace, but disdains those which are artificial, preferring to suffer rather than live in conscious disillusionment. Marakulin would love to live in a New Zion, yet, like the Underground Man, the only ones available to him are false and deceptive and he refuses to trade his consciousness and suffering for this superficial and temporary happiness.

Remizov's philosophy concerning the role of reason and logic are clearly implied and tend to harmonize completely with those beliefs of Dostoevsky. The very fact that Marakulin does come into consciousness reaffirms the fact that Marakulin's previous rationalistic life had not fulfilled his needs as an individual and free human being. When he becomes conscious of suffering and injustices in the world, he not only realizes that the rational and logical cannot solve these injustices, but in truth, are superceded in importance by them. Later, realizing that it is simply not enough to see and hear and feel or to be programmed on a logarithmic table , he concludes that the true Crystal Palace for which he is searching, goes far beyond one built on the basis of mere reason and rationale.

The Palatial Chickencoop

The man of action accepts an artificial Crystal Palace, and instead of having a true palace, he has only been disillusioned by a chicken coop. Both Remizov and Dostoevsky con-

demn man's acceptance of chicken coops for the true ideal, yet, they pose another question which makes this matter more complex. Dostoevsky says of the man of heightened consciousness,

> And perhaps if he feels like straying now and then, it is just because he is doomed to build this road; even the man of action, however stupid he may be, must realize from time to time that his road always goes somewhere and that the main thing is not where it goes, but keeping the well-meaning babe at his chores, thus saving him from the deadly snares of idleness . . .[16]

And further on,

> The worthy ants began with their anthill and will most likely end with it, which is greatly to the credit of their single-mindedness and perserverance. But man is frivolous and unaccountable and perhaps, like a chess player, he enjoys the achieving rather than the goal itself.[17]

Similarly, when Remizov is renumerating the various methods and ploys which the characters use to busy themselves to prevent boredom and despair, he, too, does not speak of final goals, but only of the actual striving to achieve.

The goal of the ants is to build the anthill as quickly and as grandly as possible for the sake of survival, yet, man does not build for this reason; he builds for the activity itself or simply from his ability to determine to build or not to build. Consequently, if the Crystal Palace, as a final product, is not the ultimate goal of man, then it is certainly a chicken coop, satisfying temporary desires, and not a true Crystal Palace.

The despair of both Marakulin and the Underground Man occurs when they recognize these glorified chicken coops of others. Both characters are willing to accept these chicken

coops for what they actually are, but are frustrated and dismayed on two other accounts: first, that the men of action cannot distinguish them from a true palace, and second, that they themselves cannot find a true palace, knowing that one necessarily must exist.

Marakulin does not deny the man of action the crutches and day-to-day chicken coops which ease the suffering of man, but he is not so overwhelmed in despair by the absence of the true Crystal Palace that he will turn to a lesser concept as a substitute, knowing well that by using a substitute he will necessarily begin to put limitations and restrictions upon himself, until he does indeed, become a block of wood or a doorstop. The Underground Man suspiciously surveys Zverkov, unable to believe that this character, blind to consciousness, does not see how easily he has so easily replaced the true values of his life with superficial substitutes and unworthy replacements. Marakulin often reminisces about the period of his life before his coming to consciousness, but although he himself existed in this blind state for many years, he still finds it extremely difficult to sympathize with characters such as the General's widow, who still exists as he had. Dostoevsky does not state if the Underground Man himself had ever existed in a state not dominated by his heightened consciousness, but it still appears that his basic human traits are not different than those of the man of action, and he does not offer any sympathy or give any indication of any understanding to the characters who do not possess his heightened

consciousness.

Both Remizov and Dostoevsky dissect the characters of heightened consciousness, throw them into a prison-like world, tortured and humiliated, and offer them no means whatsoever of escape, providing only the brief, artificial shelter of substitute Crystal Palaces. These characters are so helpless that they do not even have the noble privilege of choosing between a superfluous life and a true life. They are only able to choose whether or not they will lower themselves to the realm of superficiality or face its insurmountability in torture and agony.

However, there is an escape from this hell. Both Remizov and Dostoevsky allow for this escape for their characters and both ascribe to this method of freedom the exact same importance in their philosophies. This escape - the realm of religion - is the final point of comparison which will be expressed in respect to the two writers and perhaps, the most significant point in the novels of both writers.

The fourth chapter will be devoted to a discussion of this theme in relation to both novels and will provide a final and decisive bond between these two great writers.

CHAPTER 3

FOOTNOTES

[1]Fyodor Dostoevsky, Notes From The Underground, Trans. by Andrew R. MacAndrew, (NY: New American Library, 1961), p. 112.

[2]Ibid., p. 110.

[3]Ibid., p. 115.

[4]Ibid., p. 118.

[5]Robert G. Durgy, Notes From the Underground, (NY: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1969), p. 159.

[6]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 109.

[7]Ibid., p. 118.

[8]Durgy, op. cit., p. 169.

[9]Dostoevsky, op. cit., p. 109.

[10]Ibid., p. 110.

[11]Ibid., p. 118.

[12]Ibid., p. 120.

[13]Ibid., p. 119-120.

[14]Ibid., p. 119.

[15]Ibid., p. 118.

[16]Ibid., p. 116.

[17]Ibid., p. 117.

Chapter 4

RELIGION: THE LOOPHOLE FOR MAN'S IMPRISONMENT TO FATE

In this chapter, it will be shown how philosophies of Remizov and Dostoevsky, at first sight, dismal and tragic, do, indeed, have a bright side, or, a "loophole" for man - a chance for a man of consciousness to unburden himself and free himself from his imprisonment to fate and the laws of nature.

This loophole is religion. The treatment of this subject and its relationship to the philosophy of heightened consciousness of both writers will appear to be very similar and in close harmony in both novels. Furthermore, it will be shown how the problems and controversies previously discussed, will all be related and linked to the question of religion, and the paradox of heightened consciousness of man will be analyzed from this aspect, bringing the philosophies of Remizov and Dostoevsky even closer in comparison.

Fyodor Dostoevsky acquired the basis of his religious beliefs while in prison and in exile. In his book on this subject, Rene Fueloep-Miller reaffirms this observation:

> The 'longing for belief' was to be resolved by the conversion which began for Dostoevsky with his experience in the Katorga (prison). There for the first time he looked into the real depths of human nature and saw all its frightfulness. It was in this context

> that he perceived the cardinal meaning of the problem of morality. His 'merciless examinations of his own self' showed him the hidden contradictions and dangers within the average human soul, the conflict between reason and instinct, and the regenerative force of suffering. He came to believe that man is an irrational element in Creation, and that by his nature and destiny are determined by powers which cannot be comprehended by reason, let alone guided by it.[1]

This paragraph sums up Dostoevsky's philosophy on religion, which is not only found throughout his most mature works, but originated and appeared quite explicitly in Notes From the Underground. When Dostoevsky wrote Notes From the Underground, chapter ten of part one contained Dostoevsky's main argument for the need of faith and religion. However, due to the strict censorship of his work, much of chapter ten was deleted, leaving only a brief argument against the unacceptability of the Crystal Palace of the Nihilists. This chapter was intended to present faith in God as the true Crystal Palace of man, but all reference to this subject was extracted and the chapter, most crucial to Dostoevsky's religious doctrine, does not even mention that actual subject. Consequently, it remains for his critics to analyze his religious doctrine in relation to what is implied and inferred in his attitude of related doctrines.

To some, Notes From the Underground may appear to be an anti-religious description of man. The Underground Man lives in a murky, distorted world of chaos and despair without value or any type of ethical doctrine, but he does not live in this state by preference; he simply cannot find a true state of content and happiness and refuses to accept a

substitute. The Underground Man says that he would prefer to stay in his painful, suffering state, until he finds the true Crystal Palace rather than be deceived into thinking an inferior Crystal Palace is all that man can hope for.

Almost all critics of Dostoevsky are generally agreed on the necessity and the reliance on faith and belief in God in Dostoevsky's works, and as Fueloep-Miller states about Dostoevsky's philosophy, ". . . man cannot live without belief in God."[2]

Another critic of Dostoevsky, Vyacheslav Ivanov, says that without God, man will, ". . . either go mad or resort, in half-madness, to suicide, which they come to regard as the only action worthy of them."[3]

Ivanov, later, goes on to say that there are two types of men: those who acknowledge God, and those who refuse him.[4] The Underground Man, in his world of suffering and torments, has certainly not rejected God, but has simply not found him, nor determined the road to belief and faith. Fueloep-Miller similarly states that, ". . . existence free from God is the freedom on nonexistence."[5]

The Underground Man says that he values his freedom above all else, yet this freedom is not freedom from God, but freedom from those man-made chicken coops. Because man is part of the whole of the universe, he does not desire freedom from God, because, without God, he ceases to contain that which constitutes the essence of man. The men of action, in their readiness to build substitute palaces not only reject

God, but they must create man-God images in order to lend credibility to their improvised, superfluous worlds. Miriam Šajkovič, a critic of Dostoevsky, says that the destiny of the Underground Man is either to find his way back to God, since he now exists in a fallen, alienated state, or he himself must assume the place of God.[6] The Underground Man has no desire to elevate his own self-importance to assume a God-like image. He merely wants to define and clarify this force of fate, so that he need not grope blindly through life to fulfill his goals and desires. The Underground Man feels that he is merely estranged from God and that he will hover in his nasty little corner until his relationship to this devine force is no longer muddled or unclear to him. The Underground Man cannot accept the fact that man's maximum efforts and activities are all indiscriminately subjected to the whims and fancies of fate and that man's will becomes superfluous. The Underground Man believes that superior forces do control him, but do so in accordance with his free will and his ethical decisiveness.

Dostoevsky's religious philosophy blends in well with his philosophy of heightened consciousness and his rejection of the principles of Nihilism. For Dostoevsky, religion and faith are as essential to man's irrational side as is the logarithmic table to his rational, calculating side.

Since the actual religious argument was censored from Notes From the Underground, whatever inferences are made about

Dostoevsky's views at that time are either inferences made from the relationship of the novel to other works, or they are inferences quoted from reputable critics on this subject.

Due to the scarcity of articles and publications written about the works of A. Remizov, and especially about Sisters of the Cross, the majority of the following discussion will be based on a personal examination by the writer of this theses.

In 1908, a critic of Remizov, M. O. Geršenzon, commenting on a novel of Remizov's published two years prior to Sisters of the Cross, stated that contrary to popular opinion, Remizov's characters were not totally deformed creatures, they were merely searching for God.[7] This can also be said for the characters in Sisters of the Cross.

Remizov, throughout his life, asserted that he was religious, and that he believed in God. His beliefs are very close to the religious beliefs of Dostoevsky and can be substantiated by statements he had made to a very close friend, Natalia Kodrjanskaja, who later wrote the only existing biographical sketches about Remizov. In one of their many correspondences discussing religion, Remizov stated that non-belief in God resulted only in emptiness for man. Although man desires freedom, it is not a freedom independent from God, because freedom without God is only external.[8] True freedom exists simultaneously with faith and religion, and man lives in disillusionment when he believes that he can live without either one.

This is identical to the beliefs of Dostoevsky. Both writers belief that Faith implies necessity of irrationality in man and this belief draws their philosophies even closer together against nihilistic doctrine. Both religious outlooks are focused on the irrational side of man and this makes an analysis and examination of this type much easier than if the religious foundation of both differed greatly.

Like Dostoevsky, Remizov does not discuss faith and religion directly and openly in his novel, but alludes to it. Most explicit expressions about faith are found in five dreams - four by Marakulin and one by the palmist, Akumovna - and one flashback about the story of Marakulin's mother. These dreams cannot be directly interpretted for their religious significance in respect to the content of Notes From the Underground, however, like trends and distinct similarities can easily be pointed out in these two novels.

Dream One: The Despair Towards Humanity

The first dream encountered in Sisters of the Cross is the first of five dreams of the novel showing a progression and evolution of the religious doctrine of Remizov, and also, showing the complete cycle of man's growth: his fall from the devine world, his earthly searching for a man-God image, and finally, his restoration of God.

Having fallen into disharmony with the world, Marakulin's first dream shows his fruitless search for a man-God image to restore tranquility to his life. During the first

night in his new dwelling in Burkhov's Court, Marakulin dreams that he is surrounded by unfamiliar, evil-looking people. He imagines that they are whispering about him and thinking evil thoughts about him. They begin to close in around him in a circle and he suddenly realizes that they intend to kill him, and he flees. Filled with fear and terror, Marakulin cries out that if there was only one man, one, who would save him, all would be well. Suddenly, he trips and falls into a ditch. A kite springs down on his back, clutching his back with claws, and pecking at him. But Marakulin is so heavy with grief and sorrow that he cannot even rise up.[9]

In her dissertation, Sona Aronian states that the main theme of Remizov's novel is Marakulin's fall from grace,[10] depicted on a metaphysical level for the first time in this dream. Marakulin's despair and pleading to humanity for help, instead of to a higher source, shows his complete defection from the divine and his miserable disillusionment in his search for a man-God to replace his true God. He cries out, "if there were only one man . . ." who could save him, yet he knows that man does not have this divine power and that man can only comfort or torment one another.

The Underground Man resides in this same stage of alienation from God as does Marakulin. The critic, Miriam T. Šajkovič, states that for the Underground Man, the general state of man is a fallen state, alienated from God.[11] When Marakulin dreams that people are whispering about him and are plotting to kill him, the Underground Man hallucinates daily,

thinking that his servant, Apollon, and his friends and co-workers all vindicate themselves against him. The Underground Man is constantly on the defensive against the humanity. But because the Underground Man is estranged from God and does not look to him for help, his only alternative is to search for divine guidance within the realm of humanity. This despairing search is similar to Marakulin's plea for at least one man to save him. The divine guidance which is lost to the Underground Man, appears throughout the novel when he tenderly reaches out to humanity for help. He implores Zverkov for help on the night of the going away party.

> I turned sharply toward Zverkov. I was so exhausted, so broken, that I'd have cut my own throat just to put and end to it. I was feverish - my wet hair was stuck to my forehead and temples. 'Zverkov,' I said, with determination, in a shrill voice, 'I want to ask you to forgive me . . .'[12]

Again, the Underground Man reaches out when he is comforted by the love of the prostitute, Liza.

> I ran a couple of hundred yards or so and stopped. 'Where is she going? Why am I running after her?' I thought. 'Why? To go down on my knees before her, to sob with remorse, to kiss her feet, to beg her to forgive me . . .' I was longing to do it, my breast was bursting.[13]

These appeals to mankind, however, do not last long, because, by virtue of both characters' heightened consciousness, both immediately realize that mankind alone cannot offer the guidance for which they are seeking.

Man's Desecration of Religion

In the second dream, man's desecration and violation

of true divinity is expressed. Remizov explores the fallen state of man in respect to its physical decadence and spiritual decay. Akumovna, the palmist, relates her dream, symbolizing this desecration. She says that she walked through a mansion whose floor was covered with filth and debris, with rotten fish, human skulls, and corpses - all rotting together. She sees all of this and when she reads a prayer, her companions do not respond. She asks to receive the Eucharist and she is led to the top of a mountain. But instead of finding the holy vessel, all she finds is a slop basin. She tries to cross herself, but a heaviness overcomes her and she cannot. Next, her companions take her to a lake, but a herd of pigeons ascends onto the water and they dirty the water. She goes into this water on her knees, crying for the angels to protect her.

In this dream Remizov depicts man fallen from the grace of God and unable to return to this sanctuary because of his sins. Shocked by the filth and debris in the world, Akumovna desires the Eucharist to instill strength and faith in herself from a divine source. Yet, her every attempt to capture the holy communication and blessing is fruitless. The holy vessel is only a slop basin, she chokes on the Host, and the lake is filled with filth and will not cleanse her. Even the pigeons, which she had recognized as a sign of holiness, now descend in a swarm and defecate in the lake. Possessing a state of heightened consciousness, she is now able to see the superficiality of many things which she had earlier accepted.

Sacred rituals now turn into rites of decadence and shame and she is overwhelmed and lost by this new experience. Akumovna wants a union with God, but does not know how to obtain it. Holy ceremonies and services no longer suffice, since she can see through their shallowness.

The Underground Man, also, experiences this hopeless searching for God. Like Akumovna, he sees the filth and decadence in the world and wants to replace it with that which is clean and holy, yet he can find no replacement. Karl Pfleger comments that, ". . . there is no single modern writer of his (Dostoevsky), rank who has clung to Christ with such burning of heart and mind alike as Dostoevsky."[14]

Dostoevsky's Underground Man wants to cling to Christ, but cannot find him and refuses to create a substitute. Like Akumovna, he sees the filth in the world and is not willing to accept it. She rushes to receive the Eucharist, thinking that this ceremony will give her the strength which she needs. The Underground Man simply cries out in anguish, knowing that his strength must come from a superior source, but not knowing where to turn to receive it. Through himself, the most that the Underground Man may gain is strength through his own suffering.

The Dream of Death

In the third dream, Remizov advances his religious thoughts one step further and shows that once man has fallen from God and strives unsuccessfully to reacquire his position,

the only two recourses are the humiliating acceptance of this state of frustration, or death - the consequence of giving up and falling into total hopelessness and despair. This dream is prefaced by an hallucination by Marakulin, which occurs on the day of the dream.

Having gone to visit Vera, who has moved from the court, Marakulin leaves her feeling very upset and depressed. Out on the street he suddenly sees a giant fireman with a huge brass helmet. The fireman is real, but inhumanly large, and his helmet is higher than the fence gate. Marakulin rushes home and for the first time since his old nurse had left him, he feels like crying and his throat is choked. Later that evening he has his first dream about death. He dreams that in the court yard the bodies of all the court's inhabitants are piled together in a huge mound. They are piled together like dead bodies or rubbish or garbage, but they are actually living bodies. Rich or poor, sinless or virtuous, Marakulin sees that everyone whom he knows is on this mound, and he says that these people are really "all of Petersburg." Suddenly, Gorbachev, the landlord, says that the cup of sin has been fulfilled and punishment is close. The fireman appears and approaches Marakulin, and Marakulin feels that he is the bearer of death. Marakulin asks him if death will be good, and the fireman, hesitatingly, finally answers that it will be good, thus, ending the dream.

This dream has progressions beyond that of Akumovna's dream, because it indicates Marakulin's complete rejection of

humanity as a saving device, plus his state of almost total despair of falling from the grace of God. Whereas Akumovna had seen skeletons of human bodies lying about the floor, Marakulin sees a heap of living human bodies sprawled before him in the court yard, thus, decreasing from the mysticism of religion and considering it at a much baser, more human level. Akumovna requests the Eucharist to enhance and strengthen her life on earth, but Marakulin has given this up and is concerned with death itself as an outlet for his earthly torments. Marakulin asks the fireman if death will be good - if, in that state, he will be able to be freed from his torments and be able to form a common bond with God again. Since he cannot fulfill his needs by submitting himself to a limited life as the man of action does, death seems to be the only solution left which offers him any possibility for an uplifting of his fallen state.

Had chapter ten of part one not been deleted from Notes From the Underground, similar thoughts by Dostoevsky would have probably been presented. But, because of the censorship, these similar thoughts are seen only in indirect inferences in the novel.

The Underground Man speaks, thinks, and acts in a chain of contradictions and paradoxes. At one point he holds out his hand to mankind, begging for help, but immediately withdraws it when he remembers that mankind cannot save him. He really has no other alternative but to turn to religion. But, not understanding this superior force, nor seeing justi-

fication, nor understanding it for its actions, which humiliate man, the Underground Man rebels against it.

In Notes From the Underground there is no mention of death, as in Sisters of the Cross, yet much of the same philosophy is expressed by other means. Whereas Marakulin must hallucinate to see the figure of death, the Underground Man has this figure before his eyes at all times. The Underground Man never permanently chooses to live the life of the man of action, but then again, Dostoevsky does not provide an alternative to death. At this point the main characters of these two novels differ somewhat. Marakulin reacts in a more sophisticated manner than does the Underground Man.

The Underground Man never frees himself from his paradoxical cycle of torments. He repeats over and over again the cycle of suffering. Marakulin, however, does not stay chained to this dilemmic cycle. He cannot tolerate the repetition and therefore, turns to death as an alternative to his misery. This looking towards death, of course, is not a simple desire for annihilation, but a means of expressing his desire to be at unity with God once more. The Underground Man does not express this desire, directly. There are strong overall implications that only faith will save the Underground Man, but he never expresses this feeling in reference to death.

The Suicide Dream

The fourth dream is a dream which overtakes Marakulin as he is journeying to see his old friend, Plotnikov, in Moscow.

It is an extension and a continued deepening of Marakulin's thoughts on death, and in this dream the idea of death as a path to God and faith becomes a more serious possibility for Marakulin than when it was initiated in the previous dream.

Marakulin dreams that Plotnikov tries to convince him to cut his head off. Plotnikov says that it would be a very rational and psychologically sound thing to do. Marakulin objects that it would be painful and feel strange, and that he would not know what to do without his head. But Plotnikov convinces him, and so Marakulin lets Plotnikov cut off his head for him. It rolls to the floor and a fountain of blood spurts out from his throat. The blood meanders over the floor until the flowing stops. Marakulin then goes to a mirror and sees himself without a head and only a red throat, and he wonders how it is that he can consciously exist in this state.

This dream greatly strengthens Marakulin's idea of death as a path to unity with God. The thought of suicide, however, is horrible to Marakulin, who seeks a reunion with his faith, and not destruction of himself. For this reason, Sona Aronian, in her dissertation, says that in the dream Marakulin allows Plotnikov to cut his (Marakulin), head off, since suicide is so horrible to him.[15] Marakulin himself does not wish to face self destruction, because he does not really want to die; he merely wants to live in peace with his faith.

Unity with God is uppermost in Marakulin's thoughts. In the dream, when the flood of blood is curtailed, Marakulin peers at himself in a mirror to examine the results, thus

symbolizing his thoughts concerning the outcome of his death. He is not certain that death will offer him the understanding and tranquility which he hopes it will achieve. If Marakulin had only been concerned to annihilate himself, he would have had no curiosity of the result of the beheading. Metaphysically, he is looking to see if this act has, indeed, solved the problem of his dilemmic life.

In Notes From the Underground, Dostoevsky does not show this evolution, and only similar generalizations can be made with Remizov's novel on this particular point. Although both main characters "cling" to religion and live tormented and demented lives when they have fallen from the grace of God, the Underground Man does not explicitly consider death as an answer to the dilemma. This concept of death and suicide was employed by Dostoevsky in other works of his, however, his Underground Man does not stray from his cycle of paradoxical existence.

The last dream in Sisters of the Cross not only expresses Remizov's overall concept of faith and God in relation to death, but also, adds a common bond to Dostoevsky's Underground Man who is also desperately seeking salvation and forgiveness from his present life and from his immoral actions.

The Dream of Salvation and the Image of Christ

The main thrust of Remizov's religious doctrine occurs before the suicide of Marakulin. Marakulin's mother plays an important role in this dream and before discussing the dream,

it is necessary to examine the role which this figure has in the novel.

On his way to Moscow to see Plotnikov, Marakulin relates the story of his mother. Evrenja Aleksandrovna, he says, was a good, sweet young girl whom no one would even dare gossip about. She was wise and always was prepared to help and console all whom she met. Her compassion for humanity was equal only to that of Christ. She had fallen in love with a student coach from her brother's school and looked upon him "as only she would look upon God." Once, she went to the factory with her father and met a worker for whom she agreed to do paper work. One night when they were alone, he raped her. However, because of her deep compassion for mankind and her willingness to forgive, she told no one of the incident. After the young worker left the factory a succession of other men followed in his path, violating her; and each time she forgave them and told no one about these attacks. For three years she remained silent, until her father noticed how sullen and remorseful she had grown. He sent her to live in the country, and it was here that her resurrection with God took place. She went into the forest and prayed for three days and nights in order to rid herself of all the shame and torments which lingered in her soul. And on the fourth day, a religious holiday, she appeared in church, totally naked, except for a razor in her hand. She stood before the shroud of Christ and began to cut herself. She cut crosses on her forehead, arms, and breasts.

A year later she was released from the hospital, her wounds healed, the scars barely visible. After that episode, she spoke of her degradation only once. Marakulin's father met her and fell in love. She confessed to him all that had happened and he wept with compassion for her. They married and she spent the remainder of her life devoted to their children.

It is doubtless that Remizov meant to portray Marakulin's mother as a Christ figure. Her compassion and total forgiveness to man for his sins, and the taking of these sins upon her own conscience, is identical to Christ's activities before the resurrection. Prior to the desecration of her body in the church, Remizov stresses that she is looking for the punishment due her for these sins. The cutting of crosses into her body is very similar to Christ's execution upon the cross as the punishment for the sins of others.

In Marakulin's final dream this mother-Christ figure appears to reaffirm the fact that what Marakulin wants most is a return to God and not annihilation of himself.

In this dream, Marakulin finds himself surrounded by unfamiliar people in a crowded room. An old woman, naked, tells him that on Saturday he should not forget to give Akumovna, the palmist, a pound, and that his mother will be in white. Marakulin cannot make sense of her words and she simply laughs at him when he questions her. The courtyard is then filled with its residents coming out of their apartments and gazing upward to the window just as Murka, the cat,

had gazed when she had rolled on the stones in pain, and just as the one-legged girl, who sang songs with her father and beat with the tamborine, had done. All of these people ask Marakulin what the old woman said. He tells them that "one of us will die!" In answer, they all begin to whisper and murmur in deadly grief, "It won't be me?"

Marakulin goes into the kitchen and sees a woman all in white - his mother with a cross on her forehead. She says that she is already here and begins to cry, and Marakulin kneels and bows his head to her, "as though under an ax." The dream is then concluded.

Two distinct points about Remizov's religious doctrine are made in this dream. Marakulin, like the Underground Man, is still controlled by higher forces, no matter what his thoughts or actions. The sentence of death is handed down regardless of personal wishes and desires. These forces have been the instigating reason for despair since the time of coming to consciousness, yet, in both characters if these forces were not so dilemmic and paradoxical and did not restrict their freedom, then they would gladly welcome these forces and dedicate their lives to them. Death, for Marakulin, and most certainly, for the Underground Man, is simply another chance deed of fate. From another aspect, death is also an opportunity for man to fall back into unity with God and into the grace of divineness and virtue.

In the dream, it appears that the people are afraid of death because they huddle together and whisper their thoughts,

who will be the one to die? Also, when the divine figure of Marakulin's mother arrives at the court, symbolizing the nearness of Marakulin's death, she, too, is sorrowful and begins to cry. This apprehension to death, stresses man's animal-like submissiveness to his fate, and it appears that death is the only chance for man to be released from his earthly torments. The Underground Man explored every avenue of death, only to plummet again into his dilemmic cycle of suffering. But then, too, the appearance of Marakulin's mother as symbolic of Christ and resurrector adds hope and deeper dimension to the concept of Marakulin's death. Because she had been a human being and now comes back to earth as a spirit, it is implied that man does have a value and significance which is not displayed until his death. Because Marakulin's mother depicts Christ, Remizov does give man hope to acquire the freedom and content for which his heart yearns. Like Dostoevsky, Remizov does not restrict man to an imprisoned life dominated by fate, but through this Christ image infers that man's wishes will be fulfilled and that he will eventually be reunited with God.

However, neither in Notes From the Underground nor in Sisters of the Cross do we see further proof of this hope in religion. The Underground Man never escapes from his tormented cycle of consciousness and Marakulin's death is hardly encouraging.

On Saturday, the day of his predicted death, the fear of destruction closes in around Marakulin. But when midnight

strikes and Sunday dawns, Marakulin rejoices that he has escaped fate. He falls asleep on the window sill feeling the return of his "unusual joy". Suddenly he hallucinates, unable to contain himself, flies from the sill and falls to the stones below, crushing his skull. During his fall Marakulin hears a voice from the bottom of a well saying that the time has ripened, the cup of sin has been fulfilled, and punishment is near.[16] Remizov does not tell us if Marakulin's hope has been in vain or not, because nothing is known of his life after death. However, the fact that the last conscious feeling which Marakulin experiences is his lost "unusual joy," there appears to be an attempt by Remizov to imply the character's coming into harmony with God again. It is while Marakulin is in this peaceful state of mind that he dies, thus indicating an end to his torments.

V. I. Ivanov, a critic, quoting Dostoevsky's philosophy, said that man cannot exist as man without God, and that without this divine faith, man will either go mad or commit suicide.[17] This statement is not directly stated in Notes From the Underground, but taken on a metaphysical level, it appears that this statement must apply to the Underground Man. If he does not place his strength in faith in God, then he has nothing but a mechanical, wooden existence. Although Ivanov's statement was made about Dostoevsky's religious philosophy, it is entirely applicable to Remizov's thought.

In both novels the necessity of religion and faith is evident, although it is stated so differently in each work.

The fact that Dostoevsky and Remizov are remarkably similar on this final point of religion not only adds to the list of likenesses and similarities discussed throughout this entire paper, but, acts as an ultimate rallying point around which all other matters under discussion seem to fluctuate and grow and finally culminate in an overall view of the authors' main intent in the writing of their novels - namely, to dispel the estrangement of man from God and bring him into a oneness with his realm of existence.

CHAPTER 4

FOOTNOTES

[1]Rene Fueloep-Miller, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Insight, Faith, and Prophecy. Trans. by Richard and Clara Winston, (NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), p. 47.

[2]Ibid., p. 48.

[3]V. I. Ivanov, Freedom and the Tragic Life, (NY: Noonday Press, 1968), p. 31-32.

[4]Fueloep-Miller, op. cit., p. 112.

[5]Ibid., p. 52-53.

[6]Miriam T. Šajkovic, F. M. Dostoevsky, His Image of Man, (Philadelphia: U. of Penn. Press, 1962), p. 147.

[7]M. O. Geršenzon, "Aleksej Remizov, Časy, Petersburg, 1908," Vestnik Evropy, IV, No. 8, 1908, pp. 769-771.

[8]N. Kodrjanskaja, Aleksej Remizov, (Paris: 1950), p. 35.

[9]Aleksej Remizov, The Sisters of the Cross, (Hertfordshire: Bradda Books LTD, 1949), p. 16-17.

[10]Sona Aronian, "The Dream as a Literary Device in the Novels and Short Stories of Aleksej Remizov," unpubl. Diss., Yale U., 1971, p. 95.

[11]Šajkovic, op. cit., p. 147.

[12]Fyodor Dostoevsky, Notes From the Underground. Trans. by Andrew R. ManAndrew, (NY: New American Library, 1961), p. 157.

[13]Ibid., p. 201.

[14]Karl Pfleger, Wrestlers With Christ, (NY: Sheed and Ward, 1938), p. 209.

[15]Aronian, op. cit., p. 107.

[16]Remizov, op. cit., p. 139.

[17]Ivanov, op. cit., p. 31-32.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Books

Annenkov, Jurij, Dnevnik moix vstreč, New York: Inter-Language Library Associates, 1966.

Aronian, Sona, "The Dream as a Literary Device in the Novels and Short Stories of Aleksej Remizov," unpubl. Diss., Yale University, 1971.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Trans. by R. W. Rotsel, Ardis, 1973.

Burke, Sarah, "Salient Features in the Writings of A. M. Remizov," Unpubl. Diss., Univ. of Texas, 1966.

Čiževskij, Dmitrij, History of Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature, Vol., I, II. Trans. by Richard Noel Porter. Nashville: Vanderbuilt U. Press, 1974.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor, Notes From the Underground. Trans. by Andrew R. MacAndrew. NY: New American Library, 1961.

Durgy, Robert G., Notes From the Underground, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1969.

Fanger, Donald, Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. Press, 1965.

Freeborn, Richard, The Rise of the Russian Novel, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U. Press, 1973.

Fueloep-Miller, René, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Insight, Faith, and Prophecy. Trans. by Richard and Clara Winston. NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.

Gifford, Henry, The Hero of His Time, London: Edward Arnold and Co., 1950.

Ivanov, V. I., Freedom and the Tragic Life, NY: Noonday Press, 1968.

Jackson, Robert Louis, Dostoevsky's Underground Man in Russian Literature, The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1958.

Kodrjanskaja, N., Aleksej Remizov, Paris, 1950.

Lord, Robert, Dostoevsky, Essays and Perspectives, Berkeley: U. of Calif. Press, 1970.

Maslenikov, Oleg A., The Frenzied Poets: Andrey Biely and the Russian Symbolists, Berkeley: U. of Calif. Press, 1952.

Mirsky, D. S., A History of Russian Literature, NY: Alfred A. Knope, 1949.

Mochulsky, Konstantin, Dostoevsky, His Life and Work, Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1967.

Moser, Charles A., Antinihilism in the Russian Novel of the 1860's, London: Mouton and Co., 1964.

Olgin, Moissaye J., A Guide to Russian Literature, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920.

Pfleger, Karl, Wrestlers With Christ, NY: Sheed and Ward, 1938.

Randall, Francis B., N. G. Chernyshevskii, NY: Twayne Ribs Inc., 1967.

Remizov, Aleksej, The Fifth Pestilence, Hertfordshire: Bradda Books LTD, 1970.

Remizov, Aleksej, The Fifth Pestilence, The History of the Cymbol and the Sounding Brass, Ivan Semyonovitch Stratilatov, NY: Payson and Clarke LTD, 1928.

Remizov, A. M., The Fire of Things, Paris: Opleshnik, 1954.

Remizov, Aleksej, The Sisters of the Cross, Hertfordshire: Bradda Books LTD, 1969.

Remizov, Aleksej, On a Field Azure, London: Lindsay Drummond Limited, 1946.

Roberts, Spencer E., Essays in Russian Literature, Athens, Ohio: Ohio U. Press, 1968.

Sajkovic, Miriam T., F. M. Dostoevsky, His Image of Man, Philadelphia: U. of Penn. Press, 1963.

Slonim, Marc, Modern Russian Literature, NY: Oxford U. Press, 1953.

Struve, Gleb, Soviet Russian Literature 1917-50, Norman, Oklahoma: U. of Oklahoma Press, 1951.

Tchernychewsky, N. G., What's To Be Done? Trans. by Benj R. Tucker. Boston: Benj R. Tucker, Publisher, 1886.

Troyat, Henry, Firebrand, The Life of Dostoevsky, NY: Roy Publishers, 1946.

2. Journals

Adrianov, S., "Kritičeskie nabroski," Vestnik Evropy, No. 2 (1911), pp. 353-365.

Adrianov, S., "Kritičeskie nabroski," Vestnik Evropy, No. 4 (1915), pp. 328-338.

Ajxenval'd, Ju., "Literaturnye nabroski," Reč, No. 7 (8 January 1912), p. 3.

"Alexei Remizov," Times Literary Supplement (21 February 1924), p. 108.

Annibal, L., "A. Remizov: Prud, Roman," Vesy No. 9-10 (1905), pp. 85-86.

Beardsley, Monroe C., "Dostoevsky's Metaphor of the 'Underground,'" Journal of the History of Ideas, III (June 1942), pp. 265-290.

Bicilli, P., "A. Remizov. Tourguéniev, poète do rêve. Paris, 1933." Sovremenny zapiski, LIV (1934), p. 461.

Brown, Alec, Preface to The Fifth Pestilence by A. Remizov (London, 1927), pp. vii-xxv.

Burnakin, A. "Novaja special'nost'," Novoe Vremja, No. 12440 (29 October 1910), p. 4.

Čudovskij, Valerian, "'Čertyxanec' Alekseja Remizova," Apollon, No. 8 (1911), pp. 64-65.

Dobužinskij, M. B., "Vstreči s pisateljami i poetami," Novyj zurnal, XI (1945), pp. 282-296.

Erenburg, I., "Ljudi, gody, žizn'," Novyj mir, No. 9 (1961), pp. 88-152.

Fagin, N. B., "Dostoevsky's Underground Man Takes Over," The Antioch Review, III, No. 1 (1953), pp. 23-32.

Frank, Joseph, "Nihilism and Notes From Underground," The Sewanee Review, LXIX, (Winter 1961), pp. 1-33.

Geršenzon, M. O., "Aleksej Remizov, Časy, Petersburg, 1908," Vestnik Evropy, IV, No. 8 (1908), pp. 769-771.

Gul', Roman, "Solženicyn, sorealizm i škola Remizova," Novyj žurnal, No. 71 (1964), pp. 58-74.

Knjaznin, V., "A. Remizov, Podorožie, Petersburg, 1913," Sovremennik, No. 11 (1913), pp. 297-299.

Kodrjanskaja, N., "Remizov o samom sebe," Novyj žurnal, LII (1958), pp. 63-70.

Kollontaj, A. M., "A. Remizov, Časy, Petersburg, 1908," Sovremennyj mir, No. 7 (1908), Section 2, pp. 125-127.

Krajnij, Anton, "A. Remizov: Nikoliny pritči," Sovremennye zapiski, XXII (1924), pp. 447-448.

Kuzmin, M., "Aleksej Remizov. Sočinenija. T.VI. VII," Apollon, No. 3-4 (1912), p. 105.

Kuzmin, M., "Sočinenija A. Remizova, IV, Roman: Prud," Apollon, No. 9 (1911), p. 74.

Kuzmin, M., "Zametki o russkoj belletristike," Apollon, No. 8 (1910), pp. 55-59.

Kuzmin, M., "Zametki o russkoj belletristike," Apollon, No. 1 (1912), pp. 67-69.

Lovckij, G. L., "Aleksej Remizov. Iga. Volšebnye rasskazy. Izd. 'Plamja'. Praga. 1925. Str. 279," Sovremennye zapiski, XXIV (1925), pp. 438-439.

Lur'e, Ja., "A.M. Remizov i drevnerusskij 'Stefanit i Ixnelat'," Russkaja literatura, No. 4 (1966), pp. 176-179.

Močul'skij, K., "Aleksej Remizov. Obraz Nikolaja Cudotvorca Alatyrkamen' russkoj very." Sovremennye zapiski, XLVIII (1932), pp. 479-481.

Močul'skij, K., "Aleksej Remizov. Olja. Izd. Vol. Paris, 1927," Sovremennye zapiski, XXXIV (1928), pp. 500-501

Osorgin, M., "Aleksej Remizov: Vzvixrennaja Rus'. Izd. 'Tair'. Paris, 1927," Sovremennye zapiski, XXXI (1927), pp. 453-456.

Phillips, William, "Dostoevsky's Underground Man," Partisan Review, No. 5, Nov-Dec (1946), pp. 551-561.

Reavey, George, "A Note on the Author," in On a Field Azure by A. Remizov, London, 1946, pp. 1-6.

Reznikova, N., "Iz Vospominanija o A. M. Remizova," Mosti, No. 13-14, (1968), pp. 364-74.

Shane, A. M., "Remizov's Prud: From Symbolism to Neo-Realism," California Slavic Studies, Vol. VI, (1971), pp. 71-82.

Shane, A. M., "A prisoner of Fate: Remizov's Short Fiction," Russian Literature Triquarterly, No. 4 (1972), pp. 303-318.