

**An Analogous Study of Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky with their  
Perceptions of Reality: Revisiting Tolstoy and Dostoevsky**

**Arsheel Iqbal**

**Student ID: 14103060**

**Department of English and Humanities**

**April 2015**



**BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh**

**An Analogous Study of Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky with their  
Perceptions of Reality: Revisiting Tolstoy and Dostoevsky**

**A Thesis**

**Submitted to the Department of English and Humanities**

**Of**

**BRAC University**

**By**

**Arsheel Iqbal**

**Student ID: 14103060**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements**

**For the Degree of**

**Bachelors of Arts in English**

**April 2015**

*For a child no one is more precious than its parents; hence, I would like to dedicate this work to  
my beloved mom and dad*

*Sharmin Islam*

*And*

*Justice Md. Ashfaquul Islam*

*It is your immense love and blessings that have made me capable of exploring this world and  
achieving the best through virtuous deeds*

*Thank you for being the greatest parents on earth*

## **Acknowledgement**

Let me thank the Almighty first for enlightening my soul with knowledge and creativity through which I have been able to accomplish a project like this. Then, a heartfelt gratitude goes to my respected supervisor Rukhsana Rahim Chowdhury, who not only just corrected my every little mistake with patience and care throughout the journey, but also cheered me up, inspired me whenever I stumbled or felt completely lost. Honestly, you are one of the best mentors I have ever had in my student life so far.

I would also like to thank some of my most admired Professors, Dr. FirdousAzim, Afsan Chowdhury, S. NishaAlam and Roohi Huda, whom I have disturbed every now and then regarding my work and they always responded with their scholarly suggestions to guide me.

Last but not theleast, I am grateful to my mother and my cousin Navil Noor, for pushing me and encouraging me to work hard.

## Contents

<b>Abstract .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Chapter One.....</b> Tolstoy and His Influences	<b>10</b>
<b>Chapter Two .....</b> Tolstoy's Portrayal of Suffering in <i>Anna Karenina</i>	<b>24</b>
<b>Chapter Three.....</b> Dostoevsky and Existentialism	<b>40</b>
<b>Chapter Four.....</b> The Human Psyche and The Concept of Freedom in Dostoevsky's <i>Crime and Punishment</i>	<b>60</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>Works Cited .....</b>	<b>74</b>

## Abstract

This paper explores Leo Tolstoy's life before analyzing *Anna Karenina* (1877). Tolstoy was a renowned author of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and was famous for his realistic works. This paper will highlight how Tolstoy portrays the conflict of classes, starting from the working class to the aristocratic class, through the novel *Anna Karenina*. Hence, the theory of Marxism will be used. Tolstoy upholds the working class and gives emphasis to the fact, that how it is necessary to sacrifice or compromise for those sinking in poverty. He signifies that, in order to be content, one should lead a humble life without having all the luxuries and that is only when one can truly appreciate life. This aspect of reality will be reflected in the paper. Furthermore, this paper will also analyze how Fyodor Dostoevsky's perspective works. Dostoevsky deals more with psychological aspects or how the human psychology works. The exploration of human psychology will be studied through his novel, *Crime and Punishment* (1866). This paper will also draw attention to the theory of Existentialism, which is one of the major aspects of this novel.

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

This paper explores Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* and Fyodor Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* respectively.

Tolstoy was considered to be a prodigy of realistic works, particularly relating to his novels and short stories near the time of 20th century. Tolstoy usually wrote about the aristocratic class but in most of his novels he has also emphasized the life of peasants and the working class, who suffered in Russia. During that time he brought in reality and in most of his works, his own life was reflected.

Hence, I would like to introduce the theory of Marxism and draw a parallel to Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*. In order to draw an equivalent view in Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina*, I would firstly define what the theory of marxism derives. Marxism falls under social or communal analysis that focuses on class and societal conflict that brings in the materialist interpretation of historical development and a dialectical view of social transformation. To be more precise, Marxism concentrates on the very idea that social life concerns conflicts of interest. The most fundamental and profound conflict or clash is that between the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat. The Bourgeoisie class is the one which controls the means of production in a society and the Proletariat class is the one which sells its labor power in the market of Capitalism. Thus it's a political theory that is concerned with revealing the political and economic paradoxes or conflicts which is intrinsic or innate in Capitalism.

Karl Heinrich Marx was a German philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist and a revolutionary socialist who was known for his theories about society, politics and economics.

One of his major works comprises of *The Communist Manifesto* (1848). The Communist Manifesto endeavors to clarify the objectives of Communism and the fundamental theory that comes along with this movement. Hence it claims that the class struggles, or the manipulation or the corruption of one class by another are the force that is driven behind all the chronological progresses. The affiliations of class are well-defined by an epoch's means of production. Ultimately these affiliations tend to be attuned the emerging forces of production. As a result, a revolution takes place and the contemporary class arises as the reigning one. Karl Marx viewed Capitalism as being highly unacceptable and as a result he wanted to purge Capitalism which led to the establishment of a Communist society. Marx believed that the formation of the productive system is one of the most important elements of a society; its social institutions, system of law, of ethics and morality and education. He was said to be a materialist and he strongly believed that dominant ideas are the consequence of material and economic conditions and therefore was antagonistic towards reformers who thought that a sheer change in ideas could bring about a change in society. So he disagreed with Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel who was also a German philosopher, whose idealist justification of reality reformed European philosophy and was a major pioneer of continental philosophy and Marxism. . According to Hegel, the route through which an individual unshackles himself from his natural existence is a process of spiritualization; through philosophical insight into his objective situation, the individual realizes that what appeared to be external restraints upon his will are instead necessary conditions of his existence as a rational being with a will of its own and with this very insight comes reconciliation with the objective reality.

Marx stressed on primitive communism, where people were involved in attaining food. Each and every one would contribute or in other words, divide among themselves from the food that was



hunted or gathered somehow. There was no concept of possession; everything was shared by the whole community and then the slave society, where the means of production was controlled by the dominating class or the elite. In the Feudal society, it was the Kings who had the divine right and hence they managed the land. The Kings made use of it as they desired. Also, in this society everyone owed adherence or fidelity to the King or their immediate supervisor. The kings granted lands to the Nobles and the Knights in exchange for their military services. The Nobles and the Knights granted their lands to freemen. The peasants or the serfs used to work for the land and they could not leave without permission. It can be said that, they belonged to the lands.

Marx claimed that, at the beginning Capitalism liberated prodigious reformist developments, particularly the big upturns in the production and in the substantial fortune of people in broader sense. With time, the forces of production and the communal associations of production arose more and more into conflict and so inconsistencies were raised. Therefore the social relations of production initiated to impede or hinder the complete claim of expertise and prolific prospective to social needs. As a result, these inner paradoxes will thrive to exist in stern harshness over time and will lead to the abolition of the Capitalist system. Marx believed that the capitalists exploited the workforce.

Karl Marx mostly focuses on labor and class struggle. Friedrich Engels was also known for the theory of Marxism along with Karl Marx. He was a German social scientist, author, political theorist and philosopher. Vladimir Lenin was a Russian revolutionary communist, politician, and political theorist. His theories were known as Leninism. He said that after Karl Marx, Engels was the finest scholar and teacher. Engels is quite known for showing the distinctive features of the modern world and he also motivated Marx to see the importance of Capitalism to construct a new modern society. Engels gives a vibrant description of the new industrial working class to be

in a wretched state. He also heralded Marx in adapting communism when Marx was still not much familiar with the ideas of communism. Engel arises as one of the first social theorists who made an effort to comprehend the structure of modern societies, to delimit their necessary clashes and to envisage their ultimate end.

Moreover, there are Marxists who used the concept of Hegemony. According to Althusser, there are two ways in which the dominant or the presiding class can amalgamate its hegemony over other classes, such as by force that involves police or army and through socialization which would involve media, social workers and teachers; it could also be called ideology. In order to comprehend the way things appear, one must understand how social life is created through a combination of economic, political and ideological conflicts.

Therefore the paper would explore the application of Marxist theory in this novel. Tolstoy was genuinely dedicated to social justice and moving peasants of Russia forward in the process of advancement. Tolstoy was highly influenced by the teachings of Immanuel Kant. He was also influenced by the French anarchist, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and his epitome of the free peasant life. While he was visiting Europe, Tolstoy made a detour to meet him in Brussels where they talked about education, which reminded Tolstoy of his childhood hero, Rousseau. Tolstoy's youth corresponded with the economic and political changes ascending from the end of serfdom and the development of Capitalism in Russia which jeopardized the lifestyle of the wealthy nobility, who were reliant on employed labor in competition with the industry. However, through his renowned novel, *Anna Karenina*, he puts political opinions in his characters and also adds his moral views. Also, his thoughts on education are expressed by one of his characters in the novel. Moreover, in my research I would like to bring it in the context, that, in Tolstoy's life, he could not live up to many of his ideas and ideals as he expressed in some of his non fictional writings

and quite surprisingly, he gave a vivid description of his failing through his fictional characters in most of his novels. Tolstoy was rational and quite pragmatic as a writer since he could uphold the realistic aspects of his life.

What made Tolstoy a remarkable writer of the 19th century was, that he thought of the peasants who were ignored and thus sinking in poverty. To be more precise, he believed in the fact that as long as the peasants were sinking in poverty or being ignored, one's social being or one's personal well-being is absolutely out of the question- that is impossible. This is what made Tolstoy special since he thought that every single being is of as much significance. In 1859, Tolstoy even opened a school for the peasant children, which is rather noteworthy and indeed phenomenal. Therefore, I would also like to involve his ideals of humanistic education, for which he is considered to be an incredible and prominent writer and even today people denote that, Leo Tolstoy was one of the greatest writers of literature.

Moving on, I would analyze one of his most famous novels, *Anna Karenina* and decipher certain aspects of life emerging from themes of family, marriage, society, and the amount of agony or torment and despair an individual goes through and more importantly, each and every character is as important as any other. The heartache, the anguish and the desolation that is concerned with this novel, makes it more enthralling. Tolstoy upheld all kinds of struggle and bitterness through this novel and he also portrayed the lives of peasants that were jeopardy in that era. All in all, I would explain as to why this novel has touched my soul.

After shedding light on Tolstoy, I would bring in Fyodor Dostoevsky into perspective. I would also start with Dostoevsky's biography and his background and how he was as a human being. Dostoevsky also gathered tremendous success and fame through his writing. People used to call

him a psychological writer and they still do, even today. He was renowned for his psychoanalysis through his major works, particularly in his novels. Dostoevsky's life was quite a difficult one and the way he endured every stage, was indeed fascinating. He believed in himself and according to his perspective, he always had this faith of inner self. Dostoevsky goes deep into the individual human psyche and he also shows the paramount importance of one's very existence and what one is capable of. Dostoevsky's ideas and views influenced the theory of Existentialism. His novel *Crime and Punishment* (1866) explores the inner consciousness of the mind of the protagonist revealing the angst and alienation and also superior intellect which represents what was later identified as existentialism.

Existentialism is a philosophical movement during the 20<sup>th</sup> century that focuses upon the exploration of the existence and of the way humans find themselves prevailing in this world. The concept derives that humans exist first and then individuals spend their generation altering their spirit or nature. This theory is concerned with finding oneself and the meaning of life through freedom of will and individual accountability. Existentialists rather believe that a person should have the freedom to choose, i.e. man has free will therefore he should be ready to face the consequences of his own actions as they are of his own choosing. When it concerns existentialism, society is unnatural and its traditional religious and secular rules are rather capricious and decisions are not taken without stress and penalties. The worldly cravings are vain. Existentialistic ideas emerged in the society during the time of World War II. Existentialists could either be religious moralist, agnostic relativist or an unscrupulous atheist. Soren Kierkegaard, who was a religious philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche who was an anti-Christian, Jean Paul Sartre who was atheist and Albert Camus who was also an atheist were known for their belief in the idea of Existentialism. Sartre believed that existence comes before essence. For Sartre 'essence,' of something is

fundamentally its intrinsic purpose, for what it is prepared. According to Sartre, if a man as the existentialist sees him not definable, because at the beginning a man is nothing and will continue to be nothing till a point and there will be a point where he will be what he makes of himself. Such as for Plato the important part of human beings is to think and gain knowledge and for Kant it is to live as individuals and according to the prescriptions of their own reason in the society. From Sartre's point of view, human beings are not encoded like objects or animals since they always live within a space and he also points out that even when a man is dying, with minimum options left in his hand, he still has decisions to take. To be more accurate, Sartre believes in the fact that human beings exist in an absolutely different manner within certain conditions, defining themselves and their lives which separates them from all the other beings. Sartre makes it evident that when someone is raised in a conventional culture without ever raising questions about the doctrines of its morality, laws, religion, aesthetics or reigning common sense, at that very time the person has deceived his or her freedom by conducting oneself like an object or what Sartre calls cultivating 'bad faith.' What's more is, the terms that falls under existentialism: absurd, facticity, authenticity, the other and the look, angst and despair.

According to Dostoevsky, freedom meant much more to him than happiness. So he believed that one would lose consciousness, if he or she gives up on suffering. Sartre pointed out that a decision made in the past does not necessarily have an effect on that of today. Some existentialists believe in religion, such as Soren Kierkegaard believed that it is essential to have faith in religion. He said that celestial understanding is of paramount importance and the love for God is conveyed in the inclination to set apart ethical conducts and answer to the divine command. Furthermore, Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis and psychotherapy comes along. The importance of anxiety in existentialism is a general focus in psychotherapy. Psychoanalysts often

provide existentialist philosophy as a clarification for anxiety. Through Dostoevsky's renowned novel, *Crime and Punishment*, I would like to analyze the various shades of emotions that the protagonist experiences from the beginning of the story till the end. The novel portrays the vexing hostility between the protagonist's psychological beliefs which leads him to commit a crime to prove his dominance or superiority and his intrinsic morality that denounces his actions. It is a story set in the stained, begrimed residences of the pre-revolutionary at St. Petersburg. This novel centers around psychological interpretations and analyses. Dostoevsky is famous for the thought he provokes in a reader's mind. Hence, I would like to highlight Dostoevsky's view of writing. Dostoevsky is less precise and more ambiguous when it comes to being a writer. His works are filled with more anxiety and frustrations and then again, there is a desperate need for redemption. In case of Dostoevsky, his character's very nature is put into extreme situations. This is particularly why, Dostoevsky is considered to be an astounding writer, mainly because of his depth that he portrays in merely all his novels. He had faith in religion but he lost his faith when he was involved with Russian Utopian Socialists which was influenced by Belinsky; a recognized literary critic.

Dostoevsky knew that as a socialist, he had to break off ties with Christianity. Later, he was sent to prison for the circulation of a private letter which was full of insolent expressions against the Orthodox Church. In prison, he regained his spiritual belief which was quite evident through his novels; *The Idiot*, *Crime and Punishment*, and *The Brothers Karamazov*. His ideal was that of Utopia and he believed that democracy represented the poor. He believed Russian orthodoxy was the ideal form of Christianity. Through this novel, I would analyze the exceptional versus the ordinary man. My focus would be on Freud's psychoanalytic theory. From Dostoevsky's perspective, each and every individual is unique and when he goes deeper into the core of a

character, he makes us think of our very own character and this is how most people can relate to Dostoevsky. Thus, I would show how the analytical view makes a difference in reality.

## Chapter 2

### Tolstoy and His Influences

Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy also recognized as Leo Tolstoy is broadly known as one of the paramount and supreme European novelists of all time. He was also known to be a short story writer, philosopher and playwright who predominantly wrote mostly novels and short stories. Tolstoy was recognized to be a chief principal of realistic fiction who brought in realism in his writing and to which people could relate their own lives with. He was known to be the God of literature who knew about the reality of this world. Leo Tolstoy was also renowned for his straitlaced and austere or abstinent views that he implemented after the spiritual awakening which took place in the 1870s and soon after which, he turned out to be an ethical thinker, a social reformer and a Georgist. The concept of Georgist criterion can be defined as the model of political economy that proposes to give clarifications to social and ecological complications depending on the doctrines of land rights and public finance which endeavors to incorporate economic proficiency with social justice. The concept was broadly propagated by the economist and social reformer, Henry George (1839-1897) and the term Gergism came in later. Tolstoy's congenital birth took place at his family's estate on the 9<sup>th</sup> of September, 1828 at Yasnaya Polyana, which was situated in the region of Tula in Central European Russia. Including Tolstoy, they were four brothers and he was the youngest amongst them. He was born into a family of hoary Russian nobility. Soon after, in 1830, when his mother, Nee Princess Volkonskaya passed away, Tolstoy's father's cousin took the responsibility for the children. Seven years later, after his father, Count Nikolay Tolstoy died, who was a veteran of the Patriotic War of 1812, Tolstoy's aunt was agreed to be their lawful care taker or guardian. Once the aunt perished or withered away, Tolstoy and his rest of the brothers settled down with a second aunt, who lived in



Kazan, which was also in Russia. From a very early age, he had the knowledge of debacle; he was familiar with the failures of his life. Subsequently in the future, he venerated his childhood memories through his writing. He received his principal education from the French and German tutors. In 1843, he registered in an Oriental language program at the University of Kazan but he unsuccessful to outshine as a student. Due to his lower grades, it was mandatory for him to take up law program. He could not survive here as well since none of the classes could inspire him and at the same time his teachers also categorized him to be rather reluctant to learn and as a result he dropped out before finishing his courses from the University of Kazan. Tolstoy rather reimbursed to his family estate and initiated spending a substantial amount of time in Moscow and St. Petersburg, where he tried to become a farmer and endeavored to lead the serfs or farmhands in their work but he was mostly inattentive on his social visits to Moscow. Thus he failed in the role of a farmer. He divided his time between books, music and reveries of joining the army. In the meantime, he correspondingly got involved with the high society, spending nights in ballrooms and at gambling tables.

In 1851, after winding up in colossal gambling debts that would take him years to repay, Tolstoy went along with his elder brother to the Caucasus, where his brother convinced him to join the army and spent nearly three years in a Cossack village. Tolstoy joined the army as a Junker, south in the Caucasus Mountains, where his brother himself was posted. Ensuing his time as a Junker, Tolstoy was transferred to Sevastopol in Ukraine in November 1854, where he fought in the Crimean War through August 1855. His depiction of the revulsions of war in the Sevastopol Sketches gained him additional admiration. During the time when he was working as a Junker for the army, he was functioning on an autobiographical story which was known as, *Childhood* (1852) and in this autobiography, he reflected his warmest childhood memories. He

yielded the draft to *The Contemporary*, the most recognized journal of that time. The story was keenly acknowledged and became one of his very first finest published works. Right after his implementation of *Childhood*, Tolstoy began writing about his daily life at the Army outpost in the Caucasus. Before 1862 he did not finish his work, which was titled, *The Cossacks*, when he already left the army. Astoundingly, Leo Tolstoy succeeded to continue writing during the Crimean War. At that time, he came up with *Boyhood* (1854) which was a sequel to *Childhood*. In the middle of the War, Tolstoy even articulated views on the salient incongruities of war through a three-part series, *Sevastopol Tales*. In the second book, he conducted an experiment with a moderate writing technique and part of the story was presented in the form of a warrior's stream of consciousness. As soon as the Crimean War ended, Tolstoy left the army and returned to Russia. He found himself to be in high demand in St. Petersburg. He repudiated from associating himself with any specific school of thought. In 1857, he flew off to Paris, affirming to the fact that he was an anarchist. He also succeeded in publishing *Youth* (1856) which was the third part of his autobiographical trilogy. At the same time, when he left the army in 1857 and travelled to Europe, Tolstoy became highly fascinated with the European education. After he came back, he founded a school for the peasant children in Yasnaya Polyana, where he was the teacher himself. Again, in 1860 he returned to Europe, visiting more schools in France, Italy, Germany and Britain and even published magazines and textbooks on the subject.

In 1861, in Russia he saw the eradication of serfdom. Tolstoy took the post of arbitrator in Yasnaya Polyana but in the process he maddened the local nobility by being on the peasant's side, who were in the controversy and hence he was fired. After a year, in 1862, he married a Moscow doctor's daughter, Sophia Bers, who was sixteen years younger than him. She gave him thirteen children and also became his devoted secretary. The next twenty years they remained in

Yasnaya Polyana and only paid frequent visits to Moscow. He had the inspiration to write even more settling down on his beloved estate that had a tranquil countryside. Their children were named, Sergey (1863), Tatiana (1864), Ilya (1866), Leo (1869), Marya 'Masha' (1871-1906), Petva (1872-1873), Nicholas (1874-1875), unnamed daughter who passed away after her birth in 1875, Andrey (1877), Alexis (1881-1886), Alexandra 'Sasha' (1884) and Ivan (1888-1895).

Before Tolstoy married Sonya, he gave his diaries to her so that she has a better understanding of how he was a person. Though she agreed to marry him, it took her time to get over the initial shock; which was losing her daughter. Moreover the tension and jealousy that was ignited between them never really debauched. The brighter side of this marriage was that, the Countess was accommodating and cooperative and indeed supportive as a wife. She organized his rough notes, copied out drafts, and assisted with his correspondence and business affairs of the estate. Therefore Tolstoy embarked into his writing; He started writing *War and Peace* in 1862, which was one of his finest works and six volumes were published between 1863 and 1869. It gained ample amount of success. Tolstoy travelled to Samara in the steppes where he bought the land and built an estate for staying in summer. Critics and public were talking about the novel's historical accounts of the Napoleonic Wars, pooled with its selfless, self-sacrificing development of genuine hitherto fictional characters. The novel also distinctively assimilated three long essays lampooning the laws of history.

Tailed by the success of *War and Peace*(1873), he began working on his second best renowned and legendary novel, which was known as, *Anna Karenina* (1877). *Anna Karenina* was based partially based on contemporary events while Russia was at war with Turkey. This novel also dramatized some natural events from Tolstoy's life. In *Anna Karenina* the romance that has been showed between the characters, Levin and Kitty, resembles Tolstoy's courtship with his own

wife. Tolstoy's famous opening line in *Anna Karenina* is said to be, "Happy families are all alike; every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way." This very line became part of his own story, as the author and his wife drifted apart. His masterpiece *Anna Karenina* speaks of the preordained affair between a high society woman entombed in a dispassionate, frigid matrimony and a flamboyant officer. The story is set in contradiction to an opulent picture of the 19<sup>th</sup> century Russia; the riveting anecdote is an expedition for love and adoration, family contentment and the connotation of life. *Anna Karenina* was published in sections from 1873 to 1877, to critical and public acclaim. The royalties that Tolstoy made from his successful and prosperous novel subsidized to his promptly emergent wealth.

After he was done with *Anna Karenina*, Tolstoy was met with an extreme catastrophe. During the 1880s he began looking at himself more as a learned and honorable leader than a significant author. He quiet agitatedly questioned faith, science, art, justice and marriage. His quest for spirituality directed him to give up patent of his previous works. Tolstoy came to believe that he did not deserve his inherited wealth and instigated functioning with the peasants, plowing and making boots. Besides his theory of pacifist opposition as to what he saw as the world's injustices gathered a hefty following around the orb. Since he was hostile and pugnacious, he wanted to discover the true meaning of life and so he went to the Russian Orthodox Church but hardly found any answers he was looking for. Hence he came to believe that Christian Churches were fraudulent and corrupt. As a result, Tolstoy developed his own beliefs. Thus these notions and philosophies highly influenced leaders of twentieth century, such as Mahatma Gandhi of India and Martin Luther King, Jr. in the United States of America. Tolstoy's criticism of Christian beliefs and state institutions aggravated the fury of the clergy and authorities. He

decided to express his beliefs by founding a new publication called the Mediator in 1883. By adopting his eccentric and progressing, and consequently controversial spiritual beliefs Tolstoy was exiled by the Russian Orthodox Church. He was kept under close inspection by the secret police. When his new beliefs urged his yearning to give away his money, his wife opposed sturdily. This disparity put the couple's marriage under stress; what may one also call anxiety. In order to save his marriage, Tolstoy was reluctant at first but agreed to compromise and approved to grant his wife the copyrights and seemingly the sovereigns to all of his writing antedating 1881. Tolstoy persistently kept on writing fiction all the way through 1880s and 1890s. His later works involved more of virtuous tales and realistic fiction. One of his popular novella which was written in 1886, was *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* (1886). In this novella the protagonist struggles to come to control with his impending death; the heading character Ivan comes to the jolting realization that he has been wasting his life on trifling matters but by the time he realizes, it's too late. Soon after in 1898, Tolstoy composed *Father Sergius* (1898), a non-fiction where he criticizes the beliefs that he developed during his spiritual conversion. The following year Tolstoy came up with his third novel, *Resurrection* (1899). This novel acknowledged some admiration but not as much commendation as his previously accomplished novels. His future works included essays on art, then a satirical play termed as *The Living Corpse*, which was written in 1890 and also a novella known as *Hadji-Murad* (1904) which was revealed and published after he passed away. In his coming years, Tolstoy gained recognition for his international approbation. On the contrary, he still had to struggle to resolve his spiritual beliefs with the tensions that created in his personal life. What is more is that his wife not only disagreed with his teaching but she disapproved of his adherents, those of whom used to visit his home estate on a regular basis. Their distressed marriage seemed to be infamy in the press. Since

Tolstoy was fretful and restless, so in order to distance himself from his wife's building resentment, in October 1910, he and his daughter, Aleksandra embarked on an excursion. His youngest daughter, Aleksandra was to oblige as a doctor during their trip. Unluckily, the voyage they took turned out to be rather laborious and strenuous for the aging novelist, Leo Tolstoy. In November 1910, the station master of a train depot in Astapovo, situated in Russia offered his home to Tolstoy letting the old, sickly, indisposed author to take rest. Tolstoy died on the 20<sup>th</sup> of November, 1910 suffering from pneumonia. He was buried at the family estate in Yasnaya Polyana, in Tula Province where he lost his loved ones but nonetheless accomplished in building such loving and eternal memories of his childhood. His wife bore him thirteen children but only ten amongst them survived past infancy.

Vladimir Chertkov (1854-1910), a wealthy army officer was a leading supporter of Tolstoy. Tolstoy's wife could often be found in an unpleasant combat with Chertkov for her husband's private diaries. Since Tolstoy embraced the pacifist doctrine of non-resistance, as what the wisdoms of Jesus were delineated in the gospels, he gave up meat, tobacco, alcohol and preached chastity. Tolstoy wrote *The Kingdom of God is within you* (1893), which was titled after Luke's Gospel in the New Testament. When Mahatma Gandhi came across it, he was intensely enthused by what he read and hence wrote to Tolstoy regarding the Passive Resistance movement. They started a correspondence and as a result, became friends. In 1908, Tolstoy transcribed, "A Letter to a Hindu." Appreciating their epitomes of leading a simple life of hard work, living off the land and following the teachings of Jesus, Tolstoy offered his friendship and that of moral and financial support to the Doukhobors (a religious group of Russian Origin); a Christian sect that was victimized and oppressed in Russia and so many Tolstoyans aided them in their mass

emigration to Canada in 1899. Leo Tolstoy was associated with many other causes including being engaged to the Tsar in order to avoid the civil war at all costs.

Moving on, I will concentrate on Leo Tolstoy's most famous recognized novel *Anna Karenina* and I will relate it with the theory of Marxism. Tolstoy's personal life can also be related with the theory of Marxism. Marxism falls under social or communal analysis that focuses on class and societal conflict that bring in the materialist interpretation of historical development and a dialectical view of social transformation. It concentrates on the idea that social life concerns conflicts of interest. The fundamental clash is between the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariat. The Bourgeoisie class is the one which controls the means of production in a society and the Proletariat class is the one which sells its labor power in the market place of Capitalism. Hence it's a political theory that is concerned with revealing the political and economic paradoxes or conflicts which is intrinsic or innate in Capitalism.

According to Tolstoy, there always had been a discrimination against various classes. He brings it into notion through his novels. He highly appreciates the working class and at the same time, he talks about the various class conflicts; the disagreement that takes place between the upper and the lower classes. For instance, he signified that fact that if one can survive without having the various luxuries just like people who live in poverty or whose standard of living are way below the upper class, then the level of anxiety in one's life is reduced. This indicates that Tolstoy highly appreciated the proletariats for they knew how to survive and smile at the same time even if the situation or the circumstances were highly unlikely. Thus, it can be said that, Tolstoy supported the Marxist view of the proletariats coming forward. The Marxist view is essential, since I would be analyzing *Anna Karenina* and I would also specify how Tolstoy gives

details about the class conflicts through Marxist point of view. Karl Heinrich Marx was a German philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist and a revolutionary socialist who was known for his theories about society, politics and economics. One of his major works comprises of *The Communist Manifesto* (1848). The Communist Manifesto endeavors to clarify the objectives of Communism and the fundamental theory that comes along with this movement. Hence it claims that the class struggles, or the manipulation or the corruption of one class by another are the force that is driven behind all the chronological progresses. The affiliations of class are well-defined by an epoch's means of production. Ultimately these affiliations tend to be attuned the emerging forces of production. As a result, a revolution takes place and the contemporary class arises as the reigning one.

Hence, it is important to know what the Communist Manifesto has deals with. The first part comprises of the relationship between the Proletarians and The Bourgeoisie class. The second part deals with the Communists and The Proletariats. The third section is about the socialist and Communist literature and the fourth part deals with the level of importance that the Communists have in relation with the several prevailing conflicting parties. Karl Marx viewed Capitalism as being highly unacceptable and as a consequence he wanted to purge capitalism, which led to the establishment of a Communist society. He believed that the formation of the productive system is one of the most important elements of a society; its social institutions, system of law and of ethics, morality and education. Marx was said to be a materialist and strongly believed that dominant ideas are the consequence of material and economic conditions and thus was antagonistic towards reformers who thought that a sheer change in ideas could bring about a change in society. Therefore he disapproved of the ideas Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel had, who was also a notable German philosopher and whose idealist justification of reality reformed



European philosophy and was a major pioneer of continental philosophy and Marxism. Steven B. Smith, in his article, *Hegel's Critique of Liberalism*, stated that, "Hegel's position, I want to argue, provides us with a via media between the two alternatives outlined above. Like modern communitarians, he is critical of the individualistic and historical concepts of rights underlying the liberal polity, but like many liberals in both his day and ours, he rejects any attempt to return to some form of democratic participatory *Gemeinschaft* based upon immediate face-to-face relations. Instead of rejecting liberalism out of hand, Hegel accepts many of the institutions of the modern world, especially its distinction between civil and political life, as uniquely capable of ensuring the citizen's rational devotion and informed consent. It is this distinction, I want to suggest, and that provides Hegel's most lasting and defensible contribution to political philosophy."<sup>1</sup>

Marx was first familiar with Hegel's dialectical philosophy throughout his student life in Berlin, adopting in the first place a republican interpretation of Hegel's philosophy of history which was presented by Eduard Gans. According to Hegel, the route through which an individual unshackles himself from his natural existence is a process of spiritualization; through philosophical insight into his objective situation, the individual realizes that what appeared to be external restraints upon his will are instead necessary conditions of his existence as a rational being with a will of its own and with this very insight comes reconciliation with the objective reality. Hegel and conservative Hegelians held that such insight, reconciliation and liberation could only be flawlessly achieved by philosophically learned state officials, while the young Hegelians, simplifying this idea acknowledged the process of spiritualization with that of the individual's maturation to citizenship. Nevertheless in both interpretations the individual is left

---

<sup>1</sup>Cited from the article, *Hegel's Critique of Liberalism* by Steven B. Smith

with a certain double identity; on one hand he is a natural individual finding oneself to be the focus of the external and coercive forces and on the other hand, he is a spiritual being influenced by the knowledge, that outwardly rejects him his freedom and is in fact his freedom and reality itself. Liberation or emancipation is a compromise or reconciliation. However for Marx, liberation is only probable when this replication of human identity into human being and citizen, into natural individual and spiritualized being, is no longer obligatory, has been flabbergasted; when human beings no longer have to actualize their own social constraints in 'an alien essence standing over and above them' - the state ( later also capital). Regardless of all his criticisms of Hegel, Marx keeps the Hegelian conviction that humanity makes progress in the course of history and he also adopts Hegel's Eurocentrism and his own Eurocentrism which is at its most obvious in his writings on India and China. Karl Marx mainly focused on labor and class struggle.

Friedrich Engels was known to be the father of Marxist theory, along with Karl Marx. He was a German social scientist, author, political theorist and philosopher. Vladimir Lenin was a Russian revolutionary communist, politician, and political theorist. His theories were known as Leninism. In 1848, he co-authored, *The Communist Manifesto* with Karl Marx, though he has also authored and co-authored with Marx in several other works and afterwards supported Marx financially to do research and write *Das Kapital*(1867). Lenin said that after Karl Marx, Engels was the finest scholar and teacher. Engels is quite known for showing the distinctive features of the modern world and he also motivated Marx to see the importance of Capitalism to construct a new modern society. Engels gives a vibrant description of the new industrial working class to be in a wretched state. He also heralded Marx in adapting communism when Marx was still not much familiar with the ideas of communism. Engels arises as one of first social theorists who made an

effort to comprehend the structure of modern societies, to delimit their necessary clashes and to envisage their ultimate end. Moreover, there are Marxists who used the concept of Hegemony. According to Althusser, there are two ways in which the dominant or the presiding class can amalgamate its hegemony over other classes, such as by force that involves police or army and through socialization which would involve media, social workers and teachers; it could also be called ideology. In order to comprehend the way things appear, one must understand how social life is created through a combination of economic, political and ideological conflicts.

It can be said, without a doubt, that Tolstoy supported the Marxist view. Tolstoy was genuinely dedicated to social justice and moving the peasants of Russia forward in the process of advancement. Tolstoy was highly influenced by the teachings of Immanuel Kant. Immanuel Kant was a German philosopher who was recognized for Modern Philosophy. He claimed that the fundamental notions associate human experience. He believed that reason is the foundation of morality. His beliefs had the foremost impact in contemporary thought particularly in the areas of Metaphysics, Epistemology, Ethics, Political Philosophy and Aesthetics. Steven B. Smith pointed out in the article, Hegel's Critique of Liberalism, "Kant believes that if we abstract from all the diverse ends and purposes for which we strive, we will find underlying them all the capacity for willing and choosing, the capacity to be self-directing or self-determining. Kant refers to this capacity as the power of "pure practical reason," which alone is sufficient to distinguish us from the laws of physical causation. We alone possess a form of "moral causality," or the capacity for "spontaneity," which escapes nature. Thus our unique status as moral beings derives from the fact that we have the capacity not merely to live in various ways, but to make the laws by which we choose to live. It is this power of initiation, rather than any determinate

end we might pursue, that testifies to the inherent "dignity and sublimity" of man and forms the only ground of right."<sup>2</sup>

Tolstoy was also influenced by the French anarchist, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and his epitome of the free peasant life. While he was visiting Europe, Tolstoy made a detour to meet him in Brussels where they talked about education, which reminded Tolstoy of his childhood hero, Rousseau. Rousseau was a widely known as Gene van philosopher and a writer of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. He was also a famous music composer at that time. Rousseau's Political Philosophy vastly prejudiced the French Revolution and also other expansion of modern political, sociological and educational beliefs. Margaret M. Bullit stated in her article that, "Rousseau is renowned, of course, for his intention to tell the whole truth about himself, to surpass even Montaigne in the analysis of his heart and in the complete and candid display of every-thing he finds therein. The truth of the human soul is unitary, says Rousseau; he chooses him-self as the object of study. Still, from the beginning a second, less objective and probably more powerful motivation animates his work: the urge to defend and to justify himself, the hope that at last he will be rendered "justice." This second impulse obviously circumscribes the first."<sup>3</sup> She also mentioned that, "Rousseau was certainly aware of at least some of the difficulties involved in a truthful and concrete presentation of oneself. One of his remarks in the unpublished Neuchâtel Preface to the Confessions is almost startling in its sophistication. In writing about his life, says Rousseau, a man "la déguise; sous le nom de sa vie, il fait son apologie; il se montre comme il veut être vu, mais point du tout comme il est." Still, the comment turns out to be directed not at Rousseau at all, but at his predecessors, and Rousseau thereupon asserts his own ability to transcend such insincerities." She also initiated that, "Rousseau concludes that the

---

<sup>2</sup> Cited from Hegel's Critique of Liberalism by Steven B. Smith

<sup>3</sup> Cited from the article, Rousseau and Tolstoy : Childhood and Confession by Margaret M. Bullit

Confessions will demonstrate at once both his absolute sincerity and his absolute innocence. Indeed, the former somehow guarantees the latter. Obviously, from the very beginning, the book is as much a weapon as it is an instrument of self-discovery, two functions which at bottom are fundamentally incompatible.” Besides this she signified that, “Tolstoy's approach to confession is likewise complex, though for different reasons. Interestingly enough, although Tolstoy deeply admired Rousseau's honesty, he applied Rousseau's goal of complete sincerity about himself only to his most private writing, his diaries, in which the only observing eyes would be those of himself, his wife, his daughter, and God. It is true, of course, that the confessional impulse runs throughout Tolstoy's public work, but his understanding of personal confession seems to be in at least two respects quite different from that of Rousseau. First, because his impulse to confession does not seem to have been animated by or mingled with the urge to justify himself to others, to be vindicated by others, Tolstoy required only a very small audience for his confessions; in fact, he found the public announcement of sins to be both personally and socially dangerous. Secondly, because his impulse to confession was not accompanied by an interest in justifying himself to himself, Tolstoy was willing, even eager, to accept full, perhaps even excessive, moral responsibility for his failures.”

Tolstoy's youth corresponded with the economic and political changes ascending from the end of serfdom and the development of Capitalism in Russia which threatened to change the ways of life for the affluent nobility who were rather reliant on appointed labor in competition with the industry.

## Chapter 2

### Tolstoy's Portrayal of Suffering in *Anna Karenina*

What made Tolstoy a remarkable writer of the 19th century was, that he thought of the peasants who were ignored and thus sinking in poverty. In 1859, Tolstoy even opened a school for the peasant children, which is rather noteworthy and indeed phenomenal; which has been mentioned earlier. Thus, I would analyze one of his most famous novels, *Anna Karenina*, and attempt to decipher certain aspects of life emerging from themes of family, marriage, society, and explore the amount of agony or torment and despair an individual goes through and more importantly, each and every character is as important as any other. The heartache, the anguish and the desolation that is concerned with this novel, makes it more enthralling. Tolstoy upheld all kinds of struggle and bitterness through this novel and he also portrayed the lives of peasants that were jeopardy in that era.

In the novel, *Anna Karenina*, Leo Tolstoy introduces three families: the Oblonskys, the Karenins and the Levins. Tolstoy introduces the theme of love, marriage and particularly family life. Surprisingly, Tolstoy gave his own voice through Levin since Levin shares some of Tolstoy's biographical details. The novel starts with Oblonsky having an affair with a French governess that puts his wife, Dolly in distress; the spasm of anguish that she tolerates knowing fully well the desolation of her state could have been far worse. Tolstoy portrays Dolly to be the stronger woman in the sense how she withstands the situation and sacrifices her life for the children. As the novel moves forward, Tolstoy shows the classes of these three families and also the conflicts that take place comprising from various situations. For instance, Tolstoy showed

Dolly to come from a middle class family; her family was not even from the working class nor did they belong to the aristocratic class. It was mentioned in the novel, that they were not that affluent financially. Moreover, Dolly seemed to have suffer from a long time; she had to struggle for the upbringing of her kids and then for her husband as well. Tolstoy showed her to be the struggling heroine of the novel. She literally binds all her hope and happiness with her children since she knows she has nothing to look forward to. On the other hand, he illustrated Anna to come from a reigning class. She belonged to the aristocratic class. Anna was the central character of the play, who attracted more attention. Tolstoy portrayed Anna Karenina to have something unfathomable; she had something so profound that no one could resist her beauty. She walked everywhere with pride and elegance. From the very beginning of the novel, Tolstoy shows Anna Karenina to be the one who tries to reconcile things between her brother and her sister in law and makes it bearable for them to live under one roof. On the contrary, this is where the irony lies; it was Anna who is known to be the legendary character that she portrayed in this novel. The emotional climax is the legendary Anna's suicidal death, which was indeed a tragedy; a heart wrenching pain. It was rather unfortunate when Anna Karenina meets the eyes of the renowned Knight, Vronsky. The tale begins with a romantic gesture but ends in a harsh and cruel manner. It's quite fortunate and unfortunate at the same time what Tolstoy portrayed in his novel; Anna was inwardly happy to have found the love of her life for she never felt the joy which she did, when Vronsky laid his eyes on her. It was a blissful moment and one of the greatest happiness of her life. Both of them were equally attracted to each other and this attraction or the magnetism and the desirability was divine. She grapples with her actions and her guilt, asking herself, "What am I? Myself or someone else?" (Edmonds 116). This indicates that Anna's attraction to Vronsky is part of her desire to live. As the novel proceeds, they get more deeply involved with each

other. Soon Anna is rejected from the society when she openly leaves her husband for Vronsky. It turns out that she was never happy with her husband as he was always content with his own life. Then again, when Vronsky was still accepted in the society, it becomes harder for Anna to accept that part of reality. This also indicates the societal class conflict. From here onwards, Anna begins to lose her dignity. By giving Vronsky a chance, her aristocratic fame slowly fades away.

Tolstoy also highlighted religious themes throughout the novel, mostly through Anna's husband, Karenin. He was an influential man of the society; he had a name in the society. Karenin was quite concerned with religion particularly in the case of Anna's infidelity and the possibility of divorce. Anna starts to have moral conflicts when her affair begins with Vronsky; she tried avoiding those conflicts most of the time. Karenin's religious beliefs and generosity makes her feel worse than ever. Furthermore as the story proceeds, Tolstoy shows Karenin to be rather liberal. Karenin not only forgives Anna but also treats her illegitimate daughter as his own. At the same time, Tolstoy shows that, Anna's son Seriozha suffered to the vilest extent without his mother. Thus, the whole family starts falling apart. He was in a miserable state when his mother died. This shows that a mother's place is irreplaceable.

Furthermore, Tolstoy shows sympathy for the peasants through the demonstration of Levin. Levin speaks for the accomplished landowners, the pillar of Russian aristocracy in Tolstoy's terms, who preserve the traditional domestic values. This is where the theory of Marxism comes in; the relationship between the bourgeoisie class and the proletariats as mentioned above. Tolstoy signifies the fact that if Russia has to determine her modern purpose in a progressively westernized world, she must depend on personalities like Levin to sustain a core of national identity. Relying on the foundation of inner forte, the processes of transformation and



development will result in a cultural enrichment as Russia brings herself resolutely through the unrest of history. On an individual level, Levin epitomizes the individual's pursuit for the meaning of life. Leading each instant with a greater passion, he finds farming, manual work and his relationship with the peasants a source of satisfaction. Fundamentally he is a humanist but not a mystic and his sense of distinctiveness originates from a corporeal, tactual communication with the world. Hence his sentiment of peace can be seen after a day's mowing and his unrest during political meetings. Although his penetrating nature pursues for meaning in love, his epitome of family happiness signifies not only immortality but his expedition for heritages and sustainability. Conforming to his insightful appetite for reality, death is his utmost intimidation. He finds death to be unpleasant. Levin concludes that death is just a part of life and so if one lives for one's soul, rather than for deceptive pleasure, the finale of life is no longer a hard reality but an additional exposé of life's meticulousness. Levin had faith in God, since God is the basis of goodness ingrained in everyone's nature. Hence he channels his selfish demands for love into a generalized love of being, a love of God. The intemperance of life which spawns his profundity and compassion gives way to ethical inebriation and the novel ends on this note of salvation.

Besides, when it comes to the portrayal of Kitty, she seems to be the ideal female according to Tolstoy. Tolstoy depicted her to have elegant beauty, which is the most prevailing theme of attraction for a woman. She is shown to be rather mortified through Vronsky's rejection of her when Anna was introduced in the novel, as said by Jeanna Marie Whiting in her article, 'Tolstoy and the woman question.' Hence the humility brings in depth in Kitty's character, as pointed out by Jeanne, 'to her once shallow façade and introduces her to the ways of the world.'<sup>4</sup> Her love for Levin gets sturdier through his ability to exonerate her rejection of his initial offer of marriage and this indeed fortifies Kitty's willpower to play the role of best spouse and also the

---

<sup>4</sup>Cited from the article, Tolstoy and The Woman Question, by Jeanna Marie

role of a mother to fulfill the longings of her only husband. Tolstoy exposed her to have a mind of her own that was allowed to embellish with thoughts and ideas when she removed herself from society and mirrored from within on her situation as a woman with no imminent future. Anna's actions are extensively forbidden by society, and it seems that Tolstoy uses her character to display the discrepancies, the duplicities in her society. Anna is excluded but nonetheless she has remained factual to herself and has repudiated to be a fabricator and leather her love affair with Vronsky. Hence Jeanne points out the question which becomes, what is Tolstoy's view of her actions and other life? It is quite difficult to distinguish for definite what views Tolstoy had concerning Anna and her engagements. He undoubtedly created a compassionate character, but her actions have also earned her discontent and disgruntlement; hence she remunerated for her wrong actions. Anna was dependent profoundly on the indulgence of the epithelium to ever reach a place of serenity and a thoughtful of life's '*istina*,' as pointed out by Jeanne. This indicates her demise. Nevertheless, Tolstoy builds Anna as a sympathetic character because he exposes her desire to find *istina*. She does not settle for Vronsky's love by hiding her affair, instead she comes clean about it. This uprightness is what saves her, in the eyes of the reader, and what abolishes her resulting from the gravities of society.

In *Anna Karenina*, Leo Tolstoy not only narrates a significant portrait of Russian society in the second half of the 19th century, but also reflects his own personal conversions during this time. Tolstoy expresses his beliefs and actions through his character Levin, the landowning aristocrat who hunts for a greater meaning in life. While Levin establishes his answers in love, family life, and nature, Tolstoy pursued for a deeper meaning in his later years, estranging from luxury, property, and pleasures for, in his mind, a more blessed and just existence. Nathaniel Goodman states in his article that, 'Levin's history, interwoven throughout the book as a

contrast, is a more orthodox one of socially sanctioned marriage and legitimate children. Levin finds himself as he realizes his purpose in life is his newly created family- the caring and the rearing of his children. Tolstoy beautifully describes Levin's awareness that his care and rearing of one's children, this giving to them of an orientation to life, is that which makes possible their security and happiness.<sup>5</sup>

On the contrary, as Anna's and Vronsky's love affair gets more solemn by the time, it seems to affect everything around them. Unknowingly, they seem to hurt the people around them. They also had their own life at stake. The demise was not only due to Anna's pregnancy but because of what Vronsky wanted. Both of them definitely wanted to have each other. During that time in the Russian society, divorce was unlikely. To be more precise, divorce was given under more serious circumstances like adultery or abuse. The state of being divorced could only be attained by the one who was innocent and on the other hand, the one who would be guilty would be deprived of having custody of any children and hence would also lose the right of being married again. Therefore, when it comes to Anna, it would kill her to be that miserable. Firstly, in order to be divorced, she would lose her reputation in the society; she would certainly lose her pride that she used to carry with herself when walked amongst everyone around her. Most importantly, she would not be able to forgive herself from being separated from her beloved son, Seizroha. For instance, when Vronsky approaches her with the idea of eloping after he heard that she was carrying his child. Anna instantly disapproved since she would not be able to stand to unbridle the forces of municipal, political and religious society which would befall upon her and her son. Being with Vronsky would mean having to let go of the aristocratic class. Moreover, the society will look down on her. Gary R. Jahn claimed that, 'The character of Anna is the novel's clearest

---

<sup>5</sup> Cited from the article, Anna Karenina Revisited by Nathaniel Goodman

model of the human personality as a divided entity which yearns for the adventure and feeling of self-worth that comes with the gratification of the individual and yet cannot exist without the security and sense of belonging that come with acknowledgement of and submission to the internal and external pressures of the social. Her highly attractive naturalness and spontaneity, the genuineness of her passion, and her desire for freedom and dignity are associated with her nature as an individual. In order to manifest these qualities in her life she forsakes the restraint, suppression, and reasonableness which are required by the social dimension of her personality and which are characteristic features of her initial portrait in the novel. The perfunctory concealment and hypocrisy which enable those involved in illicit love affairs to maintain their status as social beings are abhorrent and unacceptable to Anna. She requires more than the gratification of the flesh with which such characters as Betsy and Stiva are content. She desires also a gratification of the spirit, a sense of openly declared individual dignity which she is able to achieve only at the cost of divorce between herself and society. Unable to harmonize the two antagonistic components of her nature, she responds by choosing the individual and rejecting the social. As she learns, however, it is one thing to reject the social and quite another to live without it.<sup>6</sup>

As the story progresses, Alexei Alexandrovich Karenin comes to know about Anna and Vronsky. When she was confronted by her husband, she could do nothing but show remorse towards him. It was also obvious in the society that Anna had her heart at stake for Vronsky. To be more specific, it was clear that they were in love. While Anna was sinking and was in the state of being consumed by her love for Vronsky, Levin was flourishing. His sufferings were almost coming to an end. This was where Anna and Levin ramified. Anna being with Vronsky,

---

<sup>6</sup> Cited from the article, The Unity of Anna Karenina by Gary R. Jahn

could not completely be with him. There was this feeling of desolation or barrenness. Levin was successful in finding peace and happiness through Kitty, near the end of the novel. Tolstoy previously initiated that, if one can live happily without all the luxuries and desires of life that is only when one does not suffer from anguish or anxiety. Tolstoy clarified that staying content and at the same time being satisfied with life is of profound significance. At one point it was the demise of Anna Karenina and when it came to Levin, it was blissfulness. Gary R Jahn once again signifies that,

“The linkage between Anna and Levin, then, is a test of the hypothesis that the theme adumbrated here is central to the wholeness of the novel. Also that, at the beginning of the novel Levin is represented as one at odds with his society. His social clumsiness, the uncompromising strength of his ideals as an individual, and his preference for a life of isolated rustication are all indicative of this. Yet, he never puts himself beyond the pale of society. Although isolated, his country estate is nonetheless a social framework and one that is a genuine subdivision of the society inhabited by the other leading characters. Levin's desire to marry and found a family is at first more a matter of the gratification of his personal ideals than of attraction to Kitty as an individual. He soon discovers, however, that marriage represents an increased acknowledgement of the social dimension of his being and entails an increased acceptance of external social pressures. Despite his disinclination, he endures the confessional, the marriage ceremony with its bustle and attention to fashion, and the obligatory calls which must be made following the honeymoon.” (Jahn p. 152-153)<sup>7</sup>

While giving birth to her daughter, Anna was in a terrible condition; she was almost dying. Anna spends days suffering and squirming in pain. Observing Anna in such a miserable

---

<sup>7</sup> Cited from the article The Unity of Anna Karenina

state, Alexei Alexandrovich Karenin forgives both her and Vronsky. Then again, he did not stop for one second when it came to insulting Vronsky for the shame he brought on their family. This distressed Vronsky and he could not bear the thought of leaving Anna. In that state, for him it was better to give up his own life and hence he committed the act of killing himself. However, he was not successful in doing so. After Anna recovered and gave birth to her daughter Annie, they went separate ways. She departed from her husband and went to Italy with Vronsky, without giving him a divorce. Her husband almost forced her that she could not see her son or even take him with her. That put her in misery. Thus even being with Vronsky she was not happy or content with her life. The fact that she was far away from her son and being dead to him suffocated her and this was also one of the reasons why she could not love her daughter with the same desire when it came to loving her son. Every part of her soul longed to see her son. Gradually, she could feel it that her life was falling apart. While Vronsky was shining in the political world, Anna was tumbling downwards. She was not being able to look forward to anything. Moreover, she was resentful of Vronsky's career; she could not even be happy for him. Probably she could see that, she was also falling from her own grace. There was nothing to look forward to. Catherine Brown in her article suggested that, 'One of the causes and effects of Anna's scapegoating by her society is its refusal to recognize her as tragic. Yet certain features of the narrative, too, undermine Anna's possible tragic status. They include those which imply that her suffering is justified, and those which lower her dignity. Wholly justified suffering is not tragic: the deterioration of Anna's character, her abandonment of her son, and lack of interest in her daughter, function in part to make her suffering seem appropriate. Tragic protagonists also have a degree of stature, but Anna's dignity is eventually lost: her attendance of the St Petersburg theatre is desperate rather than defiant, and during her last journey she is presented as

psychologically disturbed. All of these features can be seen to limit the degree to which Anna is a scapegoat of her text, by presenting her as deserving of a degree of non-tragic suffering. Yet their effect is ambivalent, since in relation to the overall inconsistency in the presentation of Anna's character, they can be seen as involved in her scapegoating by the text.<sup>8</sup>

When Anna comes to see her son on his birthday, they reunite but for a very short period of time. She comes to know of the devastating state that her son had been suffering from and she knew it very well, that his father was not warm with him. It traumatized Anna to see her condition in that state. She never thought that she would have to ever abandon him; her son meant everything to her. This was evident because when she was away from him, she lost the meaning of her life. She could not be exultant anymore, even though she was with the love of her life. While Levin and Kitty were blooming in love, Anna and Vronsky were starting to suffocate each other. Their love for each other was turning into hate, since they could not find peace and contentment and sacrifice to make each other happy. As Anna was obsessing over Vronsky, he needed an incentive to look forward to something; he needed some space to stay sane. So, Vronsky fiddles with painting. At that point, painting could provide him with some space in his life. The passage where Anna and Vronsky failed to notice Mikhailov's painting in order to appreciate a sketch of two handsome boys and then move to a painting of Pilate convicting Jesus to the cross. This indicates that like them, people who denounce Jesus are not aware of the ethical influence of their actions that befall on innocents. Tolstoy was always a firm believer of religion. Alexei Alexandrovich Karenin asked for a divorce but Anna kept on denying it. It was merely the guilt that was building up inside her as she could not see her son and maybe that was the reason why she wanted to hold on to her marriage. Anna kept on taking birth control pills since she could not withstand another pregnancy; she made it evident to Dolly who came to visit

---

<sup>8</sup>Cited from the article, Scapegoating, Double-plotting and the Justice of *Anna Karenina* by Catherine Brown

her on Vronsky's estate, that she could not go through that again because this time it would kill her. She hardly looked after her daughter. Dolly was amazed to find out that Anna and Vronsky associated with lower class and that Vronsky was involved in local politics. This can be related to the theory of Marxism. It can be said that the Proletariats are emerging. The second chapter of the communist manifesto suggests that, the main purpose of the Communists is to let the Proletariats overtake the political power and rather overthrow the bourgeoisie class. The article, *The Conflict of Classes: Liberal and Marxist Theories*, where Ralph Racio said that Blanqui, who was a French socialist and Political Activist asserts that, "So, in one country, the fruit of labor is taken from the workman by taxes, under pretense of the welfare of the state; in another, by privileges, declaring labor a royal concession, and making one pay dearly for the right to devote himself to it. The same abuse is reproduced under forms more indirect, but not less oppressive, when, by means of custom-duties, the state shares with the privileged industries the benefits of the taxes imposed on non-privileged classes. (Blanqui 1837: x-xi)

Vronsky was building hospitals for peasants which was undoubtedly an admirable thing to do. Meanwhile, being in a quagmire of frustration Anna used to take morphine in order to get some sleep. Morphine was revealed to be taken by her more than seven times in the novel. Ann Marie Basom illustrates in her article, 'Dolly is shocked not only by Anna's confession concerning birth control, but also by Anna's seeming deficiency of feeling for her daughter. While Anna's lack of interest in her daughter may be a throw back to certain social norms of early nineteenth-century Russia, it also reflects Anna's obsession with Vronsky, to the exclusion of all else, even her son and daughter. On the other hand, Anna's inability to perform the practical, daily duties of a mother may be another manifestation of her opium addiction. Dolly is shocked that Anna seems a stranger to her own daughter's nursery, and that Anna cannot recall the number of Annie's



teeth. Regular opium use affects the memory, causing one to forget not only that which one wants to forget: "Memory is the intellectual faculty most affected at the later stage of addiction. For immediate daily concerns, the memory may become nearly useless." Interestingly, Anna does not run the household on Vronsky's estate, Vronsky does. Of course, this could be attributed to the awkwardness of her position, but still it is strange that she takes no interest in any of the details of managing the house, not even in the daily routine of her own daughter.<sup>9</sup>

Anna realizes that she is clingier to Vronsky and that he longs for freedom. Particularly her current state deprived her from giving him the space he wanted. She could not help it because she left behind everything to be with him and he supposed to make it worthwhile. She thought it would be a magical journey but it turned out to be rather devastating for her. The fact that she was isolated made her hate herself even more. Here Anna was in the state of losing her sanity and on the other hand, Kitty was with child. Though Levin used to get smitten by intense and passionate women, he did not love Kitty any less. Since he felt strongly towards Kitty, it was easy for him to get rid of those influences. They were only phases when Levin had to face hardship. He was able to resist to Anna's charm because he knew being unfaithful to Kitty would be in a way deceiving God; he knew better. Anna's desperate act of feeling good about herself by trying to charm Levin back fired. She was going insane since she was being rejected by the society, by her current lover. She could not tolerate feeling so torn and dejected by the entire world. Anna Karenina was a lady who was looked upon with pride. She was a desirable woman of the Russian society. Consumed by the paranoia for Vronsky's love, she had no control over herself. She was harming herself by losing her conscience. Anna could see her failure right in front of her eyes and she was looking for one last opportunity to be loved again as Anna Karenina. Near the end

---

<sup>9</sup>Cited from the article Anna Karenina and Opiate Addiction by Ann Marie Basom

of the novel, she dreams of the peasant on the railroad tracks; an intuition that her death was approaching.

Unlike Anna and Vronsky, Levin and Kitty used to have a proper conversation about their problems as a couple rather than aggravating each other. When Levin has a son, his faith in God becomes even stronger. He evolves as a person with strong morals and has faith in his relationship with Kitty more than ever. Tolstoy indicates that, since he had faith in God, his relationship with Kitty ultimately remained successful. On the other hand, Anna's and Vronsky's relationship failed miserably; they could not be even content with each other. Near the end of the novel, Anna was on the verge of losing her consciousness. She was entirely perturbed from reality. It was rather sardonic and at the same time very wretched what Anna and Vronsky ended up with. They literally turned the whole world upside down, yet they ended up giving each other nothing but unfathomable agony. At the last stage, Anna and Vronsky used to have terrible conflicts which led Vronsky to sort of detest Anna. In other words, she was driving him away. There were reasons for her to be insecure as well because she left behind everything for Vronsky; she just wanted to be loved again. Besides Vronsky's mother was also trying to fix his marriage with the Princess Sorokin. That aggravated Anna and sort of demented her and this is what led to a terrible fight. Thus when she was on her way to the train station, she was in a petrifying state. Anna felt alienated from the rest of the world. Being flabbergasted, she gets off the train and meets Vronsky's coachmen, who give her a rather harsh note from Vronsky. Frenzied with melancholy, she strolls alongside the platform. Quiet unexpectedly, she thinks of the concierge who passed away the first day she met Vronsky. Anna ceases the moment. She inclines against the tracks and waits for the train. The malice or the hostility of her relationship and her behavior towards everything literally crushes her soul. Anna felt as if she was part of a

dreadful world and the only way she could get rid of this obscenity and anguish was by killing herself. Nadezhda Gorodetzky, in the article, 'The Slavonic and The East European says that, "The railway becomes their true background. With incomparable skill, imperceptibly, casually, as if by a mere accident of the narrative, Tolstoy makes them meet for the first time at a railway station, where, deprived of the shelter of her home, Anna is taken unawares. The pleasure of seeing her brother and the acquaintance with Vronsky are overshadowed by the ill omen of an accident; a railway man is crushed by the train. On Anna's way homeward Vronsky follows her in the same train. Then come months of travelling abroad. The railway station symbolizes their homeless love; it determines Anna's end. Vronsky too appears for the last time at a station, a volunteer to Serbia seeking death. He is worried- by toothache (that toothache, an audacity of the author, saves Vronsky from becoming a conventional suffering hero), and his eyes fall on the wheel of the tender, his toothache gives way to a sudden agony of mind as the two Anna's blend in his inward vision : the one with the blood-stained body exposed to the sight of all, a revengeful expression on her face, and the one first met at the Moscow station, poetic, young, sparkling with life and joy."

As Gorodetzky points out that, "Anna's disappointing home life was not sufficient to illustrate the idea of the Family. It takes Levin, Kitty and all her clan to make this point. They are more than a background, or a mere pretext for autobiographical digressions. The patriarchal, conservative and stable mode of life, dear to Tolstoy of this period, is there to nurture, to support, to heal and save Kitty and Levin. Family ties and childbirth, loving relatives, faithful retainers, peasants who had known one's ancestors-all these formed the sacred entity of the Family which stood, in Tolstoy's eyes, for the law of nature and the law of God. And even when, towards the end of the story, Levin, the happy family man, begins to look round for a beam from which to

hang himself, he escapes through contact with the sound and simple righteousness of the peasants.”<sup>10</sup> There were times when Levin had trouble with religious matters and while seeking spiritualism, he used to have his own religious doubts. This indicates there were times when he felt like giving up his life since he had doubts regarding his religion and could not find right answers. In a way, he also was in a miserable state, wanting to give up on life, just like Anna did. Though both of them had completely different reasons but both of them were frustrated regarding something. The only way Levin could distract himself was contributing time to his family and managing the farm. There was a scene, roughly near the end of the novel when Levin his belief in God recommences and truly starts believing in God more than ever. It was after he found out, that even in the middle of the thunderstorm when Kitty took their son in the woods; his child was not hurt by any possible means. Besides, when he discovers his child showing signs of recognizing people around him, Levin realizes that there is a scintilla of hope to look forward to. He believed that, the fact he has hope and faith in God would make his life worthwhile. All in all, he also apprehended that, having faith in God was also of profound significance for the inner peace of mind. Tolstoy makes it evident that, Anna did not have hope which is why she chose death. This is where Anna and Levin differed from each other.

Gorodetzky also mentioned that, “The intellectual and spiritual pilgrimage of Levin would require a treatment of its own; here one can only point out its autobiographical accuracy. Like Levin, Tolstoy lost his mother as an infant, and later idealized motherhood. After his brother's death he turned from the instinctive natural life to reflection and introspection. It is not for nothing that the only chapter of the novel which bears a title is that on Death. Levin's quest for the purpose of life is throughout that of Tolstoy himself. Both read philosophers, particularly

---

<sup>10</sup>Cited from the article, Anna Karenina : The Slavonic and East European Review by Nadezhda Gorodetzky

Spinoza, Kant and Schopenhauer; both study treatises on land; then follows belief in the family, and at last, metaphysical despair. A ray of hope comes from contact with the traditional faith of the peasants. The vague assertion that man ought to live "for the sake of God and the soul" gives Levin such a relief that he is ready to accept the peasants' Christianity in bulk with all its dogmas, rites and superstitions. He deliberately closes his eyes to all that is unacceptable to his mind. New convictions do not change him at once into a perfect being. He makes no more than tentative attempts to apply them to life, to the right to property, to patriotism and the war, and he has a foreboding that one day he will have to reconsider this primitive system of beliefs."

Therefore, to sum it all up, Tolstoy believed that one has to struggle in order to lead a better life. He highly supported the peasants since they were the ones who would struggle day and night and still looked forward to what life has to offer. Tolstoy made it evident through his famous works that one must know how to be content, even without having the most desirable things in life. He affirmed the fact that, there is beauty in leading a humble way of life. He signified that being content with one's life and believing in one's religion is of paramount significance. Tolstoy avowed that, having and believing in God, gives people ray of hope.

## Chapter 3

### Dostoevsky and Existentialism

Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky was known for being a Russian novelist, short story writer, essayist, journalist and philosopher. He was renowned for his legendary works that involve the psyche of human mind during the distressed atmosphere of Russia, around the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Dostoevsky was famous for writing those novels that had a greater understanding of the psychology of human mind; particularly the psychology of those people, who would lose their reason and end up becoming rather insane, which would lead them to committing a murder.

Fyodor Dostoevsky's hereditary birth took place in Moscow, on the 30<sup>th</sup> of October, 1821. His family involved Russian orthodox Christians, Roman Catholics and Eastern Catholics. The maternal side of his family mostly involved merchants and his paternal side had more priests. His father, Mikhail Dostoevsky was supposed to be in the clergy but he left home and completely parted ways from his family. In 1809 Mikhail Dostoevsky signed up for the Imperial Medical Surgical Academy in Moscow. From the Medical Academy he was consigned to a hospital in Moscow, where he played the role of a military doctor and near the time of 1818, he was appointed as a senior physician. The year after, which was in 1819, he got married to Maria Nechayeva. Soon after that he obtained a position at the Mariinsky hospital particularly for the beneficiary of the poor. Dostoevsky's father, believed that he was supremely one of God's chosen one and also that all of his assessments conceded exceptional connotation. Hence his sufferings were not only physical but spiritual as well. When his first two sons were born, Mikhail and Fyodor Dostoevsky, he was recommended to be a cloistered appraiser; this indicates that he obtained a position that raised his legal status, which means that his status was upgraded to be that of an aristocratic class. As a result, this certain position gave him the authority to get

hold of a small estate in Darovoye; a small town about 150km (100 miles) from Moscow. This is where the family frequently spent their summer. Fyodor Dostoevsky had six more siblings, Varvara (1822-92), Andrei (1825-97), Lyubov (who was born in 1829 and died exactly at that date), Vera (1829-96), Nikolai (1831-83) and Aleksandra (1835-89).

Dostoevsky's father was not only dominating and demanding when it came to being a husband but a dominating father as well. He was the kind of father who wanted to set higher standards for his children and thus would get rather agitated if the set of principles were not met. His dictatorship was so extreme that it prejudiced even the most prosaic family customs. On the other hand, Fyodor Dostoevsky's mother was more temperate and affectionate. His mother was Maria was not moved by the trials of her religion. She was enthused by the munificence and the jubilation of Christ. Dostoevsky was influenced by his mother's religious spirit. It was Maria who trained her son to interpret by means of the stories of the old and the new testaments. Besides, Dostoevsky's parents' relationship was quite complicated. They were a respectable couple during that time in Russia. Indeed it was quite difficult for Dr. Mikhail Dostoevsky to part ways from his wife and even when he was gone he used to write letters to his wife. Although there were complications and that was when Mikhail Dostoevsky had the dormant desire to take control and when he became possessive. For instance his jealousy knew no bounds that he ended up challenging the paternity of one of his children, which devastated his wife. Dostoevsky used to love the countryside. He used to spend most of his time wandering around the forest. Moreover, when Dostoevsky was lost in the majestic beauty of the nature, he discovered the simple decorum of the peasants who occupied the countryside. He was captivated by the way the peasants made a living. Dostoevsky glorified or euphemized their effortless scarcity and highly appreciated the supreme faith they had. He started to build an unfathomable compassion for all

their destitution. In 1833, there was a fire that shattered both of his father's villages which completely burned the landscape and left the serfs dispossessed. This event had a huge effect on Dostoevsky and it made him idealize the peasants more than ever. His mother also shared his sympathy that he had for the peasants but Dostoevsky's Father's views were completely different when it came to the peasants. While his mother, Maria repudiated to treat the serfs in harsh manner, his father was instead adamant on the fact that she should rather beat them up so that they do not forget their position as serfs. Dr. Mikhail Dostoevsky believed in rebuking his children if they did not complete their lessons but his wife would never mistreat her children. His devoted wife was tired of his persistent need of controlling her. The last years in Moscow were pretty hard for Dostoevsky since his mother was ill. In her last stages her illness grew belligerent and desolating her till she lost consciousness. She died at the age of 35 in 1837, after she regained consciousness and Dostoevsky was only of 15 years. It was a distressing time for the family. After his mother's death, his father went into isolation with his younger children staying at Darovoe. Mikhail and Fyodor Dostoevsky were sent to boarding school. Dostoevsky's father became even more malicious and vindictive after going into isolation. Dr. Dostoevsky would take out his frustration out on the serfs, by beating them on a caprice. This viciousness would prove to be lethal. In June 1838, Dr. Dostoevsky left Darovoe and left for his other property, Cheremoshna. He never came back. Dostoevsky's father was seen to be murdered on the road between the two villages and that too by being choked by a cushion from the carriage. There was no trial for this murder. Most people believed that he was murdered for his cruelty. It was unfortunate that at the age of sixteen Dostoevsky became an orphan; his family life came to an end.



Dostoevsky began reading literature from a very early age. From the age of three, he read heroic sagas, fairy tales and legends by his nanny, Alena Frolovna. She was quite a prominent figure in his childhood. At the age of four, his mother started making him read bible particularly to read and write. His parents made sure that he knew a wide range of literature, including profoundly Russian authors, Karamzin, Pushkin, and Derzhavin. He also read Gothic fiction, for instance, Ann Radcliffe and romantic works by Schiller and Goethe. He even read Heroic tales by Cervantes and Walter Scott and Homer's epics. Dostoevsky hardly enjoyed his education that was being offered at the Military Engineering Institute. He felt cynical since he could not discuss literature and philosophy with his fellow classmates. The eternal things which profoundly interested him bored the others. Since the education was utterly dull for him, he used to get mediocre grades. In 1843, he graduated from military school and established a small position executing desk work in St. Petersburg. His average grades stopped him from getting a more prestigious job. Dostoevsky lived in poverty because he used to waste money; not because he did not have money. It was mostly due to his addiction for gambling. As soon as he would get his salary, he would lose it all either at billiards or at dominoes. He was openhanded with his money and at the same time, he was quite reckless with it to; he would waste it on parties. Regardless of the parties, he still found time for writing essays and stories and even made sketches for his own pleasure. In 1844, Dostoevsky was asked to work at a distant post which would take him away from his daily enjoyments and his writings for months. Hence he resigned from his job and from here onwards he had to make a living from his writing. His first work was a translation of Balzac's Eugenie Grandet. Dostoevsky was rather elated to see his work in print. Significantly, the translation gave him the chance to get to know the art of the novel. While he was going through Balzac's sentences and the structure of the story, he started planning stories of his own. Soon

after, in 1844, Dostoevsky had a vision on the Neva, which is a river in northwestern Russia. There he came up with the subject for his first novel, which was about a lowly civil servant and the woman who loves him. The name of the novel was supposed to be *Poor folk*(1846), which was tragedy of kind hearted people trampled by their poverty. The theme of his book like many of his other works involved the extenuating supremacy of altruistic love in the human race of dismal realities.

After finishing the novel, Dostoevsky gave it to his friend, Nikolay Alexeyevich Nekrasov. Nikolay Alexeyevich Nekrasov was a Russian poet, writer, critic and publisher. He was widely known for his compassionate poetry about the peasants of Russia and that is what molded Dostoevsky's heart. Nekrasov instantly showed Dostoevsky's novel to the prominent influential critic, Belinsky. Vissarion Grigoryevich Belinsky was Russian literary critic of Westernizing tendency. Belinsky shared the fundamental value of Westernizer Intelligentsia, which signified the concept of one that makes people human and provides them with dignity and rights. Belinsky loved Dostoevsky's work. Dostoevsky was delighted by the way Belinsky appreciated his work. At first he was quite reluctant to meet Belinsky but eventually he ended up meeting her and that meeting proved out to be a significant one. In that meeting, Dostoevsky was introduced to the inner circles of Russian literary culture. Along with the literary circle, he got in touch with the political circles as well. Both Belinsky and Dostoevsky were socialists, although there was stark difference between both of them. When it came to socialism, Belinsky required having revolution against the Tsar and his institutions. Dostoevsky put emphasis on brotherhood. Belinsky was an atheist and Dostoevsky believed in Christianity. Sooner after they had a disagreement and Dostoevsky's spiritual nature was not appreciated by everyone in the circle. Therefore he parted ways from the literary circle.

Dostoevsky was approached by Mikhail Petrashevsky and Petrashevsky was interested on what Dostoevsky would be focusing upon next. Mikhail Petrashevsky was a broadly recognized prominent figure and he had a circle of youthful supporters who met at his place to have a discussion regarding the overthrowing of the current social order in Russia during that time. He belligerently disapproved of the reign of Nicholas I, summoning for the eradication of serfdom, the rectification of the courts and the autonomy of the press. His views were considered to be excessive. He was a follower of Charles Fourier, who was a French Utopian Philosopher and an anti-capitalist. Fourier's philosophy was the concept of the phalanx, which signifies a combined rustic or pastoral society for neighborhood life where concerts, musical events, dances will take place. Fourier wanted to claim that this would teach people how to live in harmony; a stable sense of community would bring everyone together. His idea was rather inspiring and besides, this type of revolution intrigued Dostoevsky.

Dostoevsky wanted to make up a circle of his own, where there would be more emphasis on art rather than politics. Hence he went up to his friend, Nikolai Speshnev to help him make the new circle. Speshnev was a member of Petrashevsky's circle. Both Dostoevsky and Speshnev believed strongly in the supremacy of language. Dostoevsky wanted to use this supreme power to inspire Utopia, whereas, Speshnev wanted to broaden the idea of socialism, atheism and terrorism. Although he disagreed with Speshnev's way of using the language but at the same time he agreed that freedom in language was fundamental when it came to thinking about Russia's future. As a result, he decided to ascertain an underground press with Speshnev. Later, Dostoevsky found himself to be rather trapped with Speshnev's politics. Near the end of 1848 and quite at the beginning of 1849, Dostoevsky became so agitated that he paid a visit to his doctor to look for some crude source for his current state of depression. His doctor told him that

there was nothing wrong with him. Instead Dostoevsky ended up telling doctor that, he had previously borrowed a sum of money from Speshnev and probably that got to his conscience. Hence he found himself to be rather, adversary. He was not able to repay his debt. Joseph Frank, who was an elderly professor of Slavic languages and literatures at Stanford, was widely recognized for his noteworthy Dostoevsky biography series and his enduring dedication for teaching. He affirmed that Dostoevsky got caught up in Speshnev's scheme against the Tsar and hence did not know how to disentangle himself out of it. During that time Dostoevsky had a slight argument with his brother Mikhail, who was stringent on following Fourier's notion and thus believed that new social order should be accomplished by going on the peaceful path. In that argument, Dostoevsky made it evident to his brother that he should do some research on Louis Blanc, who was a French historian and favored social reforms. He summoned for the formation of cooperatives so that he can provide assurance for employment for the urban poor. His books justified exerting force in order to implement social change. However, from that argument, Frank indicated that Dostoevsky did not support Fourier's views and was rather going with Speshnev's ploy against the Tsar. Frank also assumed that Dostoevsky's agitation over Speshnev's matter shows that he was hesitant and he was not that eager to move forward. Subsequently, they were political uprisings in France, which put Tsar Nicholas in jeopardy. He assembled hordes and on the other hand, he was putting scholarly and activists under surveillance. Nicholas kept tabs on the Petrashevsky circle for fourteen months. In April 1849, he summoned for the all the member of Petrashevsky to be arrested. Dostoevsky was one of them. Dostoevsky was taken to the Peter and Paul Fortress where he was held captive in the anticipation of trial. He was arrested for several reasons. Firstly, since he was a former army officer, he listened to a story where the army was being criticized. He even read a letter to the circle that disparaged the church and the

government. Besides he was said to have an illegal printing press. The most fundamental part for being arrested was that he was involved in the scheme for murdering the Tsar. The circumstances at the fortress were said to be rigorous, where one would feel completely alone. Although Dostoevsky said that, he was completely bored and he hardly felt despondent. Initially, he was paranoid about the fact that his life was over but as time went by, he became calmer. While he was in prison, he used to spend his time reading, writing letters and making notes for his upcoming books. What was amazing was, he read rapaciously. He asked for the Bible in several translations. Dostoevsky felt glorified with the collection of Shakespeare and he cherished reading Jane Eyre. Also he concentrated on writing a proper defense. In his defense, he elucidated that though he believed in freedom of speech and in the abolition of serfdom, he was not looking for upheaval. Dostoevsky avowed that Fourier was not an activist. Fourier affirmed that it was art that can bring about a universal harmony to the mankind. Dostoevsky believed in communism. However, the Judges sentenced the entire Petrashevsky to death by the firing squad. On the 22<sup>nd</sup> of December, Dostoevsky was called to be executed with the rest of his members. Surprisingly, Tsar Nicholas ordered the prisoners to be sent to prison in Siberia. Some felt overjoyed while some went mad. For instance, Petrashevsky mutilated himself. However, for Dostoevsky it was resurrection; as he was almost facing death. He was ready to accept death happily.

When Dostoevsky arrived at the Omsk Fortress in Siberia, it was atrocious. All their heads were shaved off. The prison's most hostile and menacing parasite was Major Kristov who believed in breaking the prisoner's spirits. He petrified the prisoners. Dostoevsky became fanatic of the fear of being castigated. He would loiter around the prisoners who went through the gruesome sight of being flogged up and would ask them to express the agonizing pain. Dostoevsky was often

found in the prison hospital suffering from epilepsy. What made it worse for Dostoevsky was the class antagonism which took place between prisoners. For instance the serf prisoners loathed him and other gentlemen in prison for they were hungry for revenge because of what they had to go through before they were prisoners. Generally, the peasants were treated with malice and that is one of the reasons why they took advantage of the situation. In prison they acted like savage beasts looking for every opportunity to cut the aristocrats alive. Previously, Dostoevsky used to believe that the peasant were superior compared to the aristocratic and he even believed in extenuating communal authority of repentance. After he observed the way prisoners were being abused by the guards and also prisoners being raped by each other, he felt that he never understood human nature. At one point, he could not even bear to look at himself anymore. In the middle of all these corruption and abuse, Dostoevsky was noticing that he was going through some changes. It was during a holiday, Pascha, which was quite significant to Orthodox Christianity; he found that he and his fellow inmates had Russian Orthodoxy in common. Dostoevsky particularly wrote about this moment when he came out of Exile in, *Notes from the House of the Dead*(1864). This indicates that as he started seeing the peasants as his brothers in Christ, he started believing in the fact once more, that convicts too, were spiritual beings and capable of salvation.

In February, 1854, Dostoevsky was released from prison. Although his second part of his sentence was still left to be fulfilled. He was asked to serve in military exile near the end of Siberia. It was quite difficult for him. He was once again with the peasant class. In February 1855, Tsar Nicholas passed away and that gave Dostoevsky hope. Dostoevsky associated with the local public prosecutor, Alexander Wrangel. Paradoxically, when Wrangel was young, he saw the situation where Dostoevsky was supposed to be executed. At the same time he was also

a fan of one of Dostoevsky's works, *Poor Folk*. It baffled him when he saw to it that Dostoevsky was sent to exile. Consequently, he called Dostoevsky's brother and made sure that Dostoevsky receives letters and books. Both Dostoevsky and Wrangel became great friends. They also moved into Dacha<sup>11</sup> with a garden and horses. Precisely, at that time Dostoevsky met a married woman, Maria Dmitrievna Isaev and fell in love with her. Maria was not happy with her husband since he was an obnoxious alcoholic, which made her and her son's life miserable. They were living in poverty. Though it was disturbing for her, she was still enjoying her life. The amalgamation of both excruciating pain and joy brought her close to Dostoevsky. Dostoevsky was almost frenzied by the anguish of his first love. Maria felt empathy for Dostoevsky but she was not in love with him. Instead when her husband found employment, Maria agreed to go with him. That distressed Dostoevsky. Still then, he did not give up on Maria. Both of them had a besieged communication. In 1855, Maria's husband died and she was at a financial loss. Although Dostoevsky himself was not in a good place, he managed to love after Maria and her son. There was no change of heart for Maria. She could not love Dostoevsky the way he felt for her. In fact, she was attracted to a younger teacher. Dostoevsky was so captivated in her love, that he was losing his sanity. He feared that he might lose her if she gets married before his exile ended. Therefore he tried to make her jealous by telling her about parties that he used to go to and telling her about all the women he ever danced with and this ploy sort of worked. Dostoevsky was finally able to persuade Maria to get married to him, promising her a bright future. Even though, in the middle he was worried about the fact that, his rival might end up murdering Maria and his happiness would come to an end. However, in February 1857, after tormenting each other for so many years, they finally got married. Dostoevsky could not stay

---

<sup>11</sup>Dacha – a seasonal or year-round second home often located in exurbs of Russian and other post- soviet cities

happy for a long time. Maria proved out to be an impulsive wife; she was fickle minded. Nonetheless, Dostoevsky spent the rest of his life in exile with the intention of regenerating himself. He contrived to focus on his writing career that he could not complete since he was arrested. He was persistent on contemplating, thinking about God and mankind. Dostoevsky believed that finding and living spiritually could make him go back Petersburg and eventually begin his life as an author. It's been said that the spiritual questions is what brought him epilepsy; the type of epilepsy that would make him lose his consciousness. During the rest of his life which was spent in exile, he finally began to have faith in the power of Russia and even eulogized the belief of Russian people. He had the earnest desire of coming back to Petersburg as a true Russian. Furthermore, he realized that penitence was the key to his regeneration. Dostoevsky even showed honor towards the wife, who was an ex-empress at that time, for the loss of her late husband, Nicholas.

In 1859, Dostoevsky returned to Petersburg, when the reign of Alexander II just begun. At that time the emancipation of the serfs were forthcoming. When Dostoevsky returned from exile, his brother, Mikhail Dostoevsky started the magazine *Vremya*, where Dostoevsky was made the chief contributor. This magazine was made to go forward for the Pochva movement. This movement was about the optimistic idea of Russian peasant and it recommended that Russia could be conserved or salvaged by turning back to her ancestry. The cohorts of this movement alleged that class hostility did not exist in Russia and that all the groups could come together in order to run the nation. Dostoevsky was up for this movement since it upheld the moral supremacy of the Russian people. In the magazine, *Vremva*, Dostoevsky published *Notes from the House of the Dead*(1862), which is mentioned above. Here he stated his prison years,



portraying portraits of his prisoners worthy of reclamation and spiritual rejuvenation. This theme would prevail in many of his works, particularly in, *Brothers Karamazov* (1880). In 1862, a revolutionary document came to Dostoevsky regarding the social and democratic government and mainly for the destruction of the tsar and his family. There was a notion of fire all around Petersburg and the magazine was investigated. Alexander II secretly kept the magazine under investigation. In 1863, there was a rebellious act that took place in Poland. After three months, the magazine, *Vremva* published an article, *The Fateful Question*, which was regarding the spiritual solution. Although it was highly controversial since it raised questions towards whether Poland or Russia was more superior. However, in 1863 the journal was closed. That same year, Dostoevsky and his brother endeavored to open a second magazine *Epokha*. The magazine first issued Dostoevsky's *Notes from the Underground*. Here Dostoevsky came up with a cynical, self-loathing Russian man who is far more superior than he was. He could not attain to what he aspired for since the world was tainted and did not leave him any chance for integrity.

Unfortunately, the magazine failed after a few months his work was published. At the same time, his wife Maria was in a terrible condition. It was April when she had brain hemorrhage. She died on the 15<sup>th</sup> of April, 1864. Soon after Maria died, Mikhail fell ill as well. His liver was failing and in a few months his condition became worse. Mikhail died on the 10<sup>th</sup> of July, 1864. After Mikhail passed away, Dostoevsky felt accountable for his brother's children and also for the hefty publishing debts that his brother had accumulated. The death of his brother traumatized him. Hence he began travelling. Almost immediately, he started working on a novel, *Crime and Punishment*. The novel was about murder. It was based on the murder's causes and consequences. Dostoevsky invents this intelligent protagonist who commits a perfect crime and

yet suffers from his conscious self which he, himself was not aware of; he did not know that he that conscience at the back of his head. It slowly starts tormenting him.

In October 1866, Dostoevsky was after a contract to create a novel. He was only left with a few weeks to finish his novel. One of his friends recommended him to appoint a stenographer so that he could get some help with his writing. After two days, Anna Grigoryevna Snitkina emerged. By taking Anna's help, both of them came up with the novel, *The Gambler* (1866) before the deadline. Within a few days they were deeply in love with each other and Dostoevsky asked her to marry before the novel was even properly dictated. In February 1867, they got married. At their wedding reception, after having a bit too much of the champagne, Dostoevsky had a minor epileptic seizure. As time went by and Dostoevsky's health was getting worse, it was Anna who stood for him and found a way to pay for the trip abroad. She sacrificed her dowry and everything she could at her expense to get them both out of Russia. In April 1867, they left for Europe with the intention of visiting for a few months. Ultimately, they ended up staying there for four years.

When he went to Europe, he started working on his next novel, *The Idiot* (1869). Dostoevsky was obsessed with gambling, particularly with roulette. Eventually he was losing in bulk amounts, which made him take his wife's jewelry instead. Dostoevsky did not like Europe and there were several reasons for it. He got into an argument with the great author and also his friend, Turgenev, who turned his back on Russia and called himself a German. Dostoevsky also parted ways from Belinsky since she did not believe in immortality and considered that Christ had no emphasis in the modern world. As a result, Dostoevsky wanted to go back to Russia immediately for he believed that the prospect of his writing depended on it. Fortunately, during the summer of 1867, his wife Anna became pregnant. On the 5<sup>th</sup> of March, 1868 he was blessed

with his daughter, Sonya. He was the happiest man alive. Soon after, Sonya caught a cold and it kept on getting worse. Sonya died when she was only of three months. Dostoevsky could not bear watching his daughter die. He did not feel this worse, not even when he was in prison. This incident entirely changed everything for him. Quite unexpectedly, Europe became a dark place for Dostoevsky and there was nothing that could make it better. He could not return to Russia since they were facing a huge financial crisis. Hence for that period of time, they stayed in Italy, shortly after they stayed in Switzerland and then in Germany. Although, Dostoevsky was feeling barren, he finished his novel, *The Idiot*. On the 14<sup>th</sup> of September, 1869, in Germany he was blessed with another daughter, Lyubov. Almost Immediately, Anna became pregnant with their third child. They had son and named him, Fyodor. After their son was born, he decided to go back home and begin his life as a qualified Russian author. In December 1869, when he was in Europe, planning to go ahead with his work, *The Great Sinner*, he read about the murder of Ivanov that took place in Moscow. He was a student of the Agricultural Academy and was also a member of an underground group, the society of the Axe. This group involved followers of the terrorist Mikhail Bakunin, who was the Geneva leader of the Russian Revolution. The main follower of Bakunin and the head of the Moscow branch was Sergei Nechaev with whom Ivanov had clairvoyant differences. They opposed each other at meetings. Ivanov even formed a group of his own. For such a rebellious act, Nechaev conspired to murder Ivanov. Dostoevsky instantly sought ideas for a novel regarding philosophical murder; a murder not provoked by passion or money but by ideas. Dostoevsky went to St. Petersburg in 1871 and attended the trial. For Dostoevsky, when it came to Nechaev's trial, he could relate to this personal experience; relating to his own revolutionary past and of existing radical philosophies. Hence he would cast his judgment in his novel *Demons*(1872), where he ridicules and then wretchedly lampoon the

revolutionary ideas of his time. Then in *Brothers Karamazov*, he endorses these ideas and all of Russian connotation for spiritual verdict.

In 1870, Dostoevsky became a renowned author. He was loved by many and even compared to Shakespeare by critics. His reputation as a revolutionary hero completely subsided. Dostoevsky became famous for his weekly column in *Grazdanin* (the citizen), known as, *A Writer's Diary*. It became so widely known that Dostoevsky would publish essays almost every month. The publication represented letters all over Russia, asking for Dostoevsky's views regarding matters that concerned Russia. He was widely recognized for he spoke about all of Russia's official and revolutionary matters. As a result of consequence, he became quite influential and also gathered fame. At the same time, he was leading an ideal life. He was a compassionate husband and then again a wonderful father, who would read to his children, take them to theatres, dance with them. All in all, enjoy with them in every possible manner. Besides, his second wife, Anna proved out to be his spiritual rescuer as well as his financial redeemer. She worked day and night, to set him free from all his debts and she did that by releasing his sequential novels by dividing the volumes, a year before Dostoevsky passed away. In his last stages he suffered more from epilepsy. He had to go through one more tragic incident before he died. Dostoevsky had to witness the death of his three year old son, Alyosha.

In January 1881, while having a discussion with his sister about the inheritance of some property displeased him and quite unfortunately he started to have hemorrhage from his throat. Somehow he improved and luckily he was able to read to his children. He was in a good state just for two days. On the 28<sup>th</sup> of January, Anna found him wide awake. It was almost morning. Dostoevsky knew it from before that he was going to die that day and so he assured that to his wife.

Astonishingly, he asked his wife to read him the Bible, which he had in prison. She read to him

the fable of the prodigal son. Dostoevsky called for his children and bid them farewell. Lastly, he expressed gratitude towards his wife. Unfortunately, that very evening he had a hemorrhage again and he lost his consciousness immediately. It was 11:38 pm, when Dostoevsky departed from his life. Dostoevsky's death turned out to be harrowing for Russia. Shortly afterwards, in 1881, Tsar Alexander was killed. In 1917, what Dostoevsky always feared would happen to Russia finally took place. The spiritual deliverance that Dostoevsky dreamed for his nation was never recognized.

Dostoevsky's life was quite a difficult one and the way he endured every stage, was indeed fascinating. He believed in himself and according to his perspective, he always had this faith of inner self. Dostoevsky goes deep into the individual human psyche and he also shows the paramount importance of one's very existence and what one is capable of. Here, I would bring in the theory of Existentialism.

Existentialism is a philosophical movement during the 20<sup>th</sup> century that focuses upon the exploration of the existence and of the way humans find themselves prevailing in this world. The concept derives that humans exist first and then individuals spend their generation altering their spirit or nature. This theory is concerned with finding oneself and the meaning of life through freedom of will and individual accountability. Existentialists rather believe that a person should have the freedom to choose, i.e. man has free will therefore he should be ready to face the consequences of his own actions as they are of his own choosing. When it concerns existentialism, society is unnatural and its traditional religious and secular rules are rather capricious and decisions are not taken without stress and penalties. The worldly cravings are vain. Existentialistic ideas emerged in the society during the time of World War II. Existentialists could either be religious moralist, agnostic relativist or an unscrupulous atheist. Existentialism

brings in the concept of the absurd, facticity, authenticity, the other and the look, angst and dread and despair. The concept of the Absurd signifies that there is no meaning in the world other than the meaning that has been given to it. To be more precise, anything can happen to anyone at any point of time. Albert Camus who was an atheist was known for the idea of his belief in Existentialism. Camus indicates that life is not worth living and as a result it is an option which entails life is intrinsically overpowering. So the most reasonable alternative solution is recognition and that is to acknowledge the absurdity of a man's nature. According to Albert Camus, an individual's freedom and a solemn chance to provide life with a rationale lies in the recognition of absurdity. Camus makes it significant in *The Myth of Sisyphus* (1942).

Furthermore, Facticity notifies how someone is formed within firm laws which provide both freedom and restriction to his/her existence. To be more acute, it further explains the fact that the person is responsible for himself since the values of the individual is his/her own desire. Freedom and responsibility are both mutually dependent. Thus by elucidating one's freedom, that person will certainly know for which he or she is responsible. Authenticity would mean that an individual has to create oneself and as of consequence live in harmony with this self. It indicates that a person has to the right thing; it has more to do with morality. The Other would signify, that when an individual get to know someone else and this other individual experiences the world, the same world that a person does; it means that the person gets to know the other person as experiencing the same things. Thus it's identical for both. Look stands for gaze; when someone looks at someone in a given situation, sometimes that person is noticed and sometimes that person may not be noticed. It can work both ways. The concept of Angst and Dread comes from anxiety or anguish or certain insecurity, which is made by one's own choice of freedom. Despair could be defined as someone losing hope. It mostly derives from someone's breakdown

of identity or in confidence; when someone suffers from some kind of loss. John Killinger stated, in his article that, "Man's nature is not "fixed" as a stone's or a tree's is; he is a creature with the ability to choose, and decides what he shall become. Another way of putting it is the existentialists' favorite maxim that, for man, "existence precedes es-sence." Because man can choose, with-in the limits of his finitude, how he shall live, his existence occurs before his essence is determined. That is, you must exist as a person before it can be said of you that you are such and such a type of person.”<sup>12</sup>

Soren Kierkegaard and Friedrich Nietzsche were considered to be the first philosophers who were the fundamental believers of existentialism. Friedrich Nietzsche was anti-christian. They put emphasis on subjective human experience rather than the objective legitimacy of mathematics and science. They were more interested in people's struggle with perceptible vanity of life and to make use of distraction to run from tediousness. Jano Lavrin said, in his article that, What mattered, and vitally so, to Nietzsche and Dostoevsky, was the ultimate significance of man in the world and the universe. Larvin also affirmed that, Nietzsche, who had to fight all the time for his own health, came to regard strife and struggle as essential for the growth of life in general. Dostoevsky, too, demanded a continuous striving effort, but in the direction of that religious affirmation of life in which alone he saw a future worthy of human beings. Not long before his death he noted in his private diary that the moment would come when the God-man would meet the man-God. Dostoevsky called that encounter the most critical moment in mankind's history. What he meant was really the difference be-tween humanity as an organism on the one hand, and humanity as a mere totalitarian organization (whether from the left or from

---

<sup>12</sup> Cited from the article Existentialism and Human freedom by John Killinger

the right) on the other. The whole of mankind's future may depend on which of these two possibilities will prevail.<sup>13</sup>

Jean Paul Charles Aymard Sartre was a French philosopher, playwright, novelist, political activist, biographer and literary critic. He was an influential figure when it came to the philosophy of Existentialism. He was a firm believer of Existentialism. Sartre believed that existence comes before essence. For Sartre 'essence,' of something is fundamentally its intrinsic purpose, for what it is prepared. According to Sartre, from the Existentialist's point of view, if a man is not definable or ascertainable, it is strictly because at the beginning a man is nothing and will continue to be nothing till a point and there will be a point where he will be what he makes of himself. Such as for Plato the important part of human beings is to think and gain knowledge and for Kant it is to live as individuals and according to the prescriptions of their own reason in the society. From Sartre's point of view, human beings are not encoded like objects or animals since they always live within a space and he also points out that even when a man is dying, with minimum options left in his hand, he still has decisions to take. To be more accurate, Sartre believes in the fact that human beings exist in an absolutely different manner within certain conditions, defining themselves and their lives which separates them from all the other beings. Sartre makes it evident that when someone is raised in a conventional culture without ever raising questions about the doctrines of its morality, laws, religion, aesthetics or reigning common sense, at that very time the person has deceived his or her freedom by conducting oneself like an object or what Sartre calls cultivating 'bad faith.' What's more is, the terms that falls under existentialism: absurd, facticity, authenticity, the other and the look, angst and despair. Sartre mentioned in his book, Being and Nothingness, that there are two types of

---

<sup>13</sup> Cited from the article, A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky by Janko Larvin



consciousness, the for-itself and the in-itself. Sartre notifies that consciousness of human mind is the for-itself and the non-conscious being is for the in-itself. He says that consciousness is alienated by its past and its future by the nothingness of its being. Sartre specifies that the for-itself can define itself at any given moment since it has the freedom to do so. Thus it has the power to break free from the past and hence redefine the future. According to Dostoevsky, freedom meant much more to him than happiness. So he believed that one would lose consciousness, if he or she gives up on suffering. Sartre pointed out that a decision made in the past does not necessarily have an effect on that of today. Some existentialists believe in religion, such as Soren Kierkegaard believed that it is essential to have faith in religion. He said that celestial understanding is of paramount importance and the love for God is conveyed in the inclination to set apart ethical conducts and answer to the divine command. Furthermore, Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis comes along. The importance of anxiety in existentialism is a general focus in psychotherapy.

## Chapter 4

### The Human Psyche and the Concept of Freedom in Dostoevsky's

#### *Crime and Punishment*

However, through Dostoevsky's renowned novel, *Crime and Punishment* (1866), I would like to analyze the various shades of emotions that the protagonist experiences from the beginning of the story till the end. The novel portrays the vexing hostility between the protagonist's psychological beliefs which leads him to commit a crime to prove his dominance or superiority and his intrinsic morality that denounces his actions. It is a story set in the stained, begrimed residences of the pre-revolutionary at St. Petersburg. This novel centers on psychological interpretations and analyses. Dostoevsky is famous for the thought he provokes in a reader's mind. Hence, I would like to highlight Dostoevsky's view of writing. Dostoevsky is less precise and more ambiguous when it comes to being a writer. His works are filled with more anxiety and frustrations and then again, there is a desperate need for redemption. In case of Dostoevsky, his character's very nature is put into extreme situations. This is particularly why, Dostoevsky is considered to be an astounding writer, mainly because of his depth that he portrays in merely all his novels.

In the novel, *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevsky portrayed the protagonist, Rodion Romanovich Raskolnikov to be desperate man. Throughout the whole novel, Raskolnikov appeared to be frantic. He thought of himself to be extraordinary. It somehow made him think he could do as he pleases. It seemed as if, in his subconscious mind, he thought highly of himself. Raskolnikov

was pretty insecure and he used to repress his thoughts. For instance, he felt rather shameful when he saw the amount of sacrifices that his mother and his sister have been making for him. His subconscious mind used to torment him. As a result, his repressions made him plan a perfect crime. His conscious self was not aware of what he was going for. Raskolnikov made a rash decision and just went for it. Harvey Mindess noted in his article, that, Raskolnikov (if that is who Freud means) is certainly no "common criminal," embodying as he does more than one weighty philosophical dilemma. No careful reader can fail to see that he represents certain fundamental attitudes to life that his author wrestled with and judged per-verse. Thus, to conclude that he is just a violent type does him little justice.<sup>14</sup> He did not stop to think for once, that the crime he was going to commit could demolish his entire life. In order to prove it to himself that he was indeed exceptional, he decides to murder an abhorrent old lady, who had money. Peter Lowe mentioned that, the murder of the old woman, once only an abstract part of Raskolnikov's subconscious, has now assumed the nature of something that will render any normal life impossible until it is carried out. Murdering her will free Raskolnikov from his current existence, and enable him to resume "normal" life.<sup>15</sup> His plan was to accomplish money since he did not want to take money from his mother and his sister. Disastrously, he ends up committing two murders. Raskolnikov kills that old man he intended to and also ends up killing her little, kind-hearted sister who drops in abruptly. That absolutely petrifies him. "Terror overwhelmed him more and more...room" (Dostoevsky 98). In his subconscious mind various questions were being raised. At one point, he was proud of himself at his act of bravery and then again, his guilt was killing me every moment. Dostoevsky also brings the notion of the theory of

---

<sup>14</sup> Cited from the article Freud on Dostoevsky by Harvey Mindess

<sup>15</sup> Cited from the article Prufock in St. Petersburg : The Presence of Dostoevsky's Crime and Punishment in T.S. by Peter Lowe

Existentialism, particularly through Raskolnikov. Raskolnikov believed in man's free will and also that every living individual is entitled to certain rights. He was not aware of the fact that he had conscience. "Scraps and fragments of thoughts...all his efforts" (104).

The author has also shown that, Raskolnikov is humble; he feels sorry for people. He has a bigger heart and he would make sacrifices for people if he needs to. The author showed him to be a sympathetic character as well. For instance, when Raskolnikov brings Marmeladov home, who was fully drunk, he noticed how miserable they all were. It showed what poverty could bring to people's lives. Hence, he left the money on their windowsill for the family for the poor state they were in. This indicates that he was indeed kind hearted and felt empathy for people around him, particularly the ones who were in jeopardy. However, one of the many reasons which drove him to commit the murder was his family. When he received the letter from his mother, he was baffled to find out in what a terrible condition both his mother and his sister had to go through. Particularly, when he heard the news of his sister, Dunya's marriage being fixed with the civil servant, Luzhin, he was anxious. The news completely vexed him. That was one of the foremost reasons, why he went on with the plan of committing that murder. Raskolnikov grew quite fretful when he heard about Svidrigailov's several ventures of seducing Dunya. Moreover, what makes him explode was when his mother speaks of this marriage being a success for Raskolnikov's future. She reveals in the letter, that although Luzhin may have some unpleasant qualities, he is a successful man and that this marriage will prove out to be to a profitable one. His mother also adds, that Dunya was such an angel that she would willingly sacrifice for his brother's future any given time. Raskolnikov's mother conveys that she would be able to send him thirty roubles quite happily, for the current situation seems to be positive. This makes him think of Sonia's earning as a prostitute and he feels as if Dunya was selling

herself for the family. That thought distraught him. Raskolnikov was relating this with Marmeladov's family. He was placing himself in Marmeladov's position and he was drawing a conclusion that he was unworthy of someone else's sacrifice and self-denial. In his subconscious mind, Dunya was selling herself for having luxury whereas Sonia was doing it for her family's survival.

Susan Brooke stated in her article that, Raskolnikov commits his crime to prove his idea that all people are divided into two groups—the weak masses and the leaders, who are strong men of ideas capable of following their own rules without submission to common laws. The greater surprise and disappointment for Raskolnikov is that his crime had a serious effect on him, meaning he is not that “chosen one” but an ordinary and weak man<sup>16</sup>. After executing the murder, Raskolnikov is alienated from the rest of the world. Rigor and trepidation ravages him. Quite impulsively he starts to observe his clothes for blood stains. Dostoevsky shows the protagonist to be rather hysterical. He was slowly losing his sanity. This is where, Freud's psychoanalytic theory comes along. In his subconscious mind, he was losing his mind. It was making him think of unimaginable things. Since Raskolnikov could not make sense of anything, he was alarmed by what just happened. Hence, he fell asleep. As soon as he woke up, the first thing that came to his mind was, what if he had been seen. He was summoned by the police but it was not at all related to the murder. At that point, he could not think of anything else but the murder. He was driven by anxiety and thus before going to the station, he said to himself, “I'll go in fall on my knees and confess” (111). He was in an internal mystification. When he learned from the clerk that he was being sued for his debts, he was comforted. Raskolnikov was confident once again and his haughtiness came back. He spoke rather confidently. Instead he

---

<sup>16</sup> Cited from the article Romantic Love Theories Explored in Fyodor Dostoevsky's Crime and Punishment by Susan Brooke

enlightened the officers with his poignant story and all his debts that were uncovered.

Raskolnikov was disappointed to see that none of them were interested in his story and when he heard the officers talk about the dramatic murder that took place that petrified him. As a result he fainted before leaving.

Raskolnikov breaks down both in the corporeal and in the emotional way. By falling ill, he became chiefly dependent on one of his oldest friends, Razumikhin. Raskolnikov turned to Razumikhin after the terrible crime that he committed but he did not really talk to him about it. Razumikhin took responsibility for taking care of Raskolnikov and the rest of his family.

Raskolnikov could see several people around him after he improved. He was always wondering about the fact that if he blurted something out while he was unconscious, which could make his position risky. He yearned to be alone, relentlessly. Razumikhin gives a house warming party where he invites the police clerk Zametov and the magistrate, Porfiry Petrovich. The conversation leads to the murder case which unsettles Raskolnikov. One of the things that bothered Razumikhin was that the investigators pay less attention to the psychological state but pays more heed to any physical evidence. This makes things easier for Raskolnikov.

Peter Petrovich Luzhin, Dunya's finance has an encounter with Raskolnikov. The one person Raskolnikov despised. Luzhin was arrogant and condescending. Luzhin even booked cheap hotel rooms for Dunya and her mother, which makes it obvious the kind of person Raskolnikov envisioned him to be was true. Besides, it has been shown that Luzhin endeavors to grovel himself with younger ones by upholding views they wish to hear. In fact, those views that he expresses are way of leading his own life. His ideals indicate that one should love oneself at first and what is good for an individual will automatically help the others. However, Razumikhin unknowingly torments his friend. He states that the murderer was an inexperienced one who got

saved by chance. Also, he left fifteen thousand roubles behind after executing the murder and Razumikhin even indicates that the convict must have lost his mind. That is what actually happened with Raskolnikov. Luzhin puts forward a question that why is there so much crime. Luzhin and Raskolnikov almost have a debate. Raskolnikov states that the fact that Luzhin prefers a poor wife, who would have to be grateful to him, is also criminal. Luzhin criticizes his mother and Raskolnikov threatens to batter him. Luzhin leaves and Raskolnikov makes it evident that he would rather be alone. Both the doctor and Razumikhin were enthralled by the way Raskolnikov reacted and his stern interest in assault. His repression is what made him got him so agitated.

After Raskolnikov's state improves, he was desperate to undertake the opposing thoughts that beleaguered him. He did not want to go on like this for the rest of his life. He did not know how to bring about that change in his life. The prostitutes, beggars depressed him. As a result, the only thing he could think of was, people want to live even in the most appalling circumstances; for everyone the only thing that matters is survival. Raskolnikov has an encounter with the police clerk Zametov. Raskolnikov shows an interest in the murder case. He even reminds Zametov that when the officers were having a discussion regarding the murder, he fainted. Both of them have an intense conversation regarding the murder. Raskolnikov even expresses it to Zametov what he would have done. He precisely tells him that he would have buried the money. Astoundingly, he even asks Zametov that what if it was him, who committed the murder. This perplexed Zametov. On the other hand, Raskolnikov behaves in a harsh manner with his friend. His friend was truly concerned about him. Raskolnikov wanted to show him, that he had improved and was responsible enough to take care of himself. After that incident, Raskolnikov feels weak and felt like he would faint again. On his way, he found a woman who was about to commit suicide. The

policeman saves the woman from drowning. This incident had a huge impact on Raskolnikov. There were several questions raised in his head, whether he should give up or if he should confess his crime. This depicts that he could not still recover from the murder. The murder was now a part of his subconscious and conscious mind. He begins to act in a more bizarre way. For instance, he ridicules the crowd by raising questions of their suspicions of him. This indicates that he was gradually losing his sense of judgment.

Raskolnikov finds a man lying on the street and it was none other than Marmeladov. He makes an arrangement for him to be carried home. Unfortunately, Marmeladov dies. It was devastating for Raskolnikov. Surprisingly, Katerina Ivanovna still showed remorse for her late husband. She had no sympathy. That completely shocked Raskolnikov. Even though, Raskolnikov committed a crime, he was a great man. He offered Katerina money for the funeral. He left the remaining roubles that his mother sent for him. Raskolnikov feels rejuvenated after he helped Marmeladov's family. He felt alive after a long time. Surprisingly, Sonia's ten year old step sister, Polenka starts adoring Raskolnikov. Raskolnikov was touched by Polenka. He had a huge life altering transformation and his illness was also gone. He felt normal again. Raskolnikov was simply overwhelmed by Polenka's kiss. It touched his soul. This left a huge impact on him since he felt loved. Part of him stayed repressed because he never felt loved and it also indicates that he longed to be loved.

The presence of Raskolnikov's family bewildered him. He shows his anger towards Dunya and instantly tells her not marry Luzhin. He was adamant about the fact that he would not let Dunya sacrifice for him. He disregards that she have had any other motive to marry Luzhin.

Raskolnikov's family was rather distressed by his behavior. Moreover, Dostoevsky portrayed Dunya to be more like her brother, both physically and emotionally. On the contrary,



Razumikhin fulfills every responsibility even better Raskolnikov. Razumikhin also takes care of Raskolnikov. The doctor advised not to upset Raskolnikov, since he was mentally disturbed and had some indication monomania, as noted by the doctor. Razumkhin conveys the recent mental state of Raskolnikov to Dunya and her mother. He states that Raskolnikov seems to have double personalities. At one point he gets depressed, hypochondriac, egotistical and self-indulgent. Then again, he is warm and generous. Dunya affirms that all he needed was a women's love which could fix him. Raskolnikov comes clean to his mother about the money that he gave for the funeral. He makes her understand that he feels empathy for those people who suffer at a great length. Raskolnikov makes it more evident by conveying that he was attracted to his late finance because she was ill and probably he would have been in love with her if she had some other disability. This assures the fact that he embraced people with open arms who had baggages. He again insists his sister to make a choice between him and her former fiancé. Dunya was also as stubborn as he was. She would not listen to him either and she made it clear that she wanted her brother to be present at the interview with Luzhin.

Sonia Marmeladova pays a visit to Raskolnikov in order to invite him for the funeral. Her motive was to pay for the debt her family owed to Raskolikov. She seemed poor and timid. Her humbleness and modesty filled Raskolnikov's heart with pity. Thus, he invited her in and introduced her with his mother and his sister. Both his mother and his sister were touched by Sonia's gratitude. For the first time, Raskolnikov was content and appeared to be in high spirits. Raskolnikov also decides to see Porfiry Petrovich, who was the investigator in charge of the murder.

Raskolnikov was disappointed when saw that Zametov was also there with Porfiry Petrovich. That disturbed him because they might have discussing about the murder, particularly about the

conversation that Raskolnikov and Zametov had one evening in the tavern. Raskolnikov kept up with the conversation as long as he could but he knew that, Petrovich knew a lot more.

Petrovich indicates that environment has more to do with crime and Razumikhin depicted that the hypothesis that does not reflect on human nature as a cause of crime is baloney. Petrovich reveals that he read an article that was written by Raskolnikov. Raskolnikov was amazed that Petrovich knew about it. Petrovich asked him directly, that the article claimed where some men have the right to commit crimes. Raskolnikov rather insisted that he expressed his view in a different manner, without entirely dismissing him. Raskolnikov states that a man has the right within himself to disregard the law, only if his ideas entail it. This signifies, that he believes in the freedom of humanity and that everyone has rights. He also conveys that these ideas might help humanity and he uses some name of the renowned scientists, Newton and Kepler. He also brings in the concept of men who make new laws are always convicts or felons. He insists in order to make a new one, old one must be broken. Raskolnikov uses Napoleon and Mahomet as an example. Also, he says that there are two types of people, ordinary and extraordinary. The extraordinary ones usually disregard the law, putting emphasis on the greatness of the idea they wish to develop. At the same time, he also specifies that not every extraordinary people get away with their actions. Raskolnikov ends by saying that he believes men have equal rights. Petrovich asks him, if he believes in Lazarus; which means the resurrection and jumps to another question, which was, mocking him, that how would he know if someone is extraordinary. Raskolnikov gives him a straight answer, that whether extraordinary or not, he is not considered a threat. Petrovich tortures him further by asking him, that what would happen if someone did commit a crime. Raskolnikov was stern and replied that the nation has its own ways like exile and prison to captivate convicts. Hence, if one gets trapped, then it was bound to happen and serves him justly.

Then Petrovich asks him about the criminal conscience and Raskolnikov states that, a man is bound to suffer if he believes that he had been wrong and at the same time, if one feels pity for the victim, he suffers then too. He also indicates that great men experience immense amount of grief for the result of their own actions. This portrays that Raskolnikov had been suffering for a while by repressing all his thoughts and especially the guilt was burning him alive. Raskolnikov was also asked if he thinks of himself to be an extraordinary man and he said that it was quite likely. In order to torment Raskolnikov even more, Petrovich asked him if he ever had the urge to commit a crime and Raskolnikov wisely answered that, he would not obviously say a word if he did. Raskolnikov was wise when it to having a conversation; he could not be easily defeated. Raskolnikov was not sure of the fact that he was a suspect. Hence, he tried to go with self-criticism; he committed this crime so that his mother does not have to sacrifice for him. He was on the state of accusing himself, as to why did he even commit such a crime. Raskolnikov keeps on blaming the old woman, for whom he is going through so much pain but he felt pity for Lizaveta, for he did not plan on killing her. She reminded of Sonia.

Svidrigailov seeks to see Dunya again since his wife was dead. The more Svidrigailov and Raskolnikov have a discussion, the more similarities they find about each other. Svidrigailov insists on meeting Dunya and he even offers to provide her ten thousand rouble so that she does not have to go through this marriage. Raskolnikov was troubled and perplexed at the same time. Dunya notices Luzhin's typical behavior when he makes her mother angry. She finds about the three thousand roubles that Marfa Petrovna left behind for her. Dunya's mother accuses Luzhin for lying to her about the money being sent for the Marmeladov's funeral. Dunya gets furious and asks him to leave. Luzhin's anger was fixated at Raskolnikov.

Raskolnikov leaves after handling his family's responsibility to his friend, Razumikhin. He tells him repeatedly to take care of his mother. His friend asks him no further questions, for he understood that his guilt was eating him alive. Raskolnikov went to Sonia. His compassion for Sonia distracted him from his own misery. He tried to make her face reality. Even though Sonia's step mother was harsh, it was her duty to support them for there was no other way. Sonia found cruelty in his honesty. She felt as if he was being completely unfair as Sonia had been suffering from a long time now. He clarified that he respected her because of the way she suffered all her life. It gets unbearable for Sonia as time passes by. At times she could not sense of what he used to say. He would ask her to read the raising of Lazarus. Raskolnikov would also tell her that he deserted his family and she was all that he was left with. He tried to make her understand that they were lost souls and hence they should suffer together.

Raskolnikov goes out of his head to know if he was a suspect but Petrovich torments him each and every time. Raskolnikov finally plans on telling Sonia. It was love that drove him to confess his crime to her. He was amazed to see how genuine she was; he was moved by the way she loved him. That comforted him. She assured him that she would be there beside him. That is what changed things for Raskolnikov. Finally he affirmed that he murdered because he wanted to be a Napoleon. He clarifies that it was his only chance because he did not want to take any more help from his poor mother. He admits that he was vindictive, vile and this is one of the reasons why he came to her, for she was the only one who provided him with comfort. Raskolnikov has been isolated throughout his whole life. Svidrigailov's suicide stops Raskolnikov from giving up his own life. Hugh Mercer Cutler conveyed that, Svidrigailov's suicide, began to shatter Raskolnikov's rationalizations by confronting him with the brutal fact that evil is inherently destructive. Indeed, the total effect of Raskolnikov's several meetings with Svidrigailov was to

reveal to Raskolnikov a side of himself he found odious: his resemblance to the hated man himself as one dominated by calculation and passion.<sup>17</sup> He comes to realization that suicide is an offensive way of finishing one's life. It was because of Sonia, that Raskolnikov had a change of heart. The reason behind his final confession was due to Sonia. She is a fundamental character of the novel. His sister Dunya was right about the fact that Raskolnikov needed a women's love to keep him sane. Susan Brooke also brings up that, Sonya follows Raskolnikov to Siberia, where he realizes, after almost a year in prison, his love for her as she has always loved him. This realization allows him to rejoin the rest of humanity. Although he has seven more years of suffering ahead, it will be a small price to pay for the rebirth, for the transference into the new world of faith that he is to share with Sonya.<sup>18</sup>

To conclude with, Dostoevsky believed in freedom of choice. He believed that every human being had equal rights and hence, they were responsible for their own actions. He considered that sacrificing for others around us is the ethical purpose of life and that being selfish rather takes us further away from happiness. He concentrated more on the psychological aspects of human life and he believed that the human psyche is of profound importance when it comes to knowing someone. Lastly, he believed in the path of redeeming oneself; no matter how worse the situation can be. Dostoevsky believed that, seeking for salvation is the only way of looking for hope.

---

<sup>17</sup>Cited from the article The Artistic Failure of Crime and Punishment by Hugh Mercer Cutler

<sup>18</sup> Cited from Romantic Love Theories Explored in Fyodor Dostoevsky's Crime and Punishment by Susan Brooke

## Conclusion

Both Leo Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky were dynamic Russian authors. Tolstoy was a firm believer of realistic works. Most of his novels were based on reality. Particularly, through his novel, *Anna Karenina*, he portrayed his own life through one of the characters. He felt deeply for the peasants and the working class of Russia, for he himself suffered at a certain point of his life. To be more precise, Tolstoy came from an aristocratic class. He used to be the kind of man who was engaged in gambling, pursuing girls particularly around his 20s. The following years later on, brought a big change in him. As mentioned above, he literally felt for the working class. Hence, he even started living life like the peasants at one point and on the process he even learned about the peasant trade. Tolstoy started believing in religion when he saw how the peasant struggled everyday and they were still hopeful in life. The most remarkable thing is, that he even lived in the slums of Moscow, just to know what the peasant class go through. He signified in his novel how the most attractive and alluring heroine of the novel ends up in a tragic state. Furthermore, he shows the conflicts that emerge in various classes, beginning from the working class to that of the upper class. For instance, in the novel *Anna Karenina*, when Anna leaves with Vronsky she loses her dignity and her reputation. She no longer belonged to an aristocratic class; here Tolstoy shows the societal class conflict and how one loses their identity of class in a society. Also the anguish and the amount of pain one has to go through not only because of struggling or keeping up with other class but also because of personal clashes. Tolstoy also portrays that it is not quite necessary that since the aristocratic class has all the luxuries, the members of the class are actually happy with their lives. He showed that the

opposite can happen as well. Even though they have all the riches in the world, not everyone is happy or leading a blissful family life. Instead things can get worse with the aristocratic class since they are most materialistic and not at all content with what they have. To be more precise, they do not hold the same values that the peasants do. They lack contentment. The upper class hardly appreciates life the way the working class does. The proletariats appreciate every minute of their life and look for a scintilla of hope since they always engage themselves with their own religion and their faith in God.

On the contrary, Fyodor Dostoevsky is more vague and uncertain about life but definitely intriguing. His works are more about mental anxiety and frustration. He portrayed to have a desperate need for redemption, which is quite evident in his novel *Crime and Punishment*. Dostoevsky himself has suffered massively. His novels deal more with psychological minds of human beings. For instance when Dostoevsky was sent to exile, he suffered both physically and psychologically. He was tormented psychologically on a profound level, which even led him to have epilepsy more often. Dostoevsky usually portrays his characters to feel empathy for the ones who suffer. He believed in spirituality and freedom. Dostoevsky considered that everyone is entitled to have their own rights. Hence he did not believe in domination, which is obvious through most of his novels. From his perception every individual is unique and therefore he has the freedom to go for anything he wants to but at the same time, he also mentioned that everyone is responsible for their own actions. Dostoevsky's mother influenced him towards religion. He was not always a firm believer of religion but his mother used to read him the bible in his childhood. Moreover, while he was in prison he was moved by the working class and that is when he gathered faith in God.

## Works Cited

### Primary Sources:

Tolstoy, Lev Nikolayevich. *Anna Karenin*. Trans. Rosemary Edmonds. Richard Clay and Co, 1954. 864. Print.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. Trans. Julius Katzer. Raduga, 1985. 575. Print.

### Secondary Sources:

Bullitt, Margaret M. "Rousseau and Tolstoy: Childhood and Confession." *Comparative Literature Studies* Vol: 16.No. 1, Highlights of the Northeast Student Conference (Mar., 1979): 12-20. Print.

Brown, Catherine. "Scapegoating, Double-Plotting, and the Justice of Anna Karenina." *The Modern Language Review* Vol: 106.No. 1 (January 2011): 179-94. Print

Basom, Ann Marie. "Anna Karenina and Opiate Addiction." *Pharmacy in History* Vol: 36.No. 3 (1994),: 132-40. Print.

Brooke, Susan. "Romantic Love Theories Explored in Fyodor Dostoevsky's Crime and Punishment." *Senior Thesis Projects 2003-2006*: 1-28. Print

Curtler, Hugh Mercer. "The Artistic Failure of Crime and Punishment." *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, Vol: 38.No. 1 (Spring, 2004): 1-11. Print.

Goodman, Nathaniel. "Anna Karenina Revisited." *Social Work* Vol. 3.,No. 1 (JANUARY 1958): 26-28. Print.

Gorodetzky, Nadezhda. "Anna Karenina." *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol: 24.No. 63 (Jan., 1946): 121-26. Print



- Jahn, Gary R. "The Unity of Anna Karenina." *Russian Review* Vol: 41.No. 2 (Apr., 1982): 144-58. Print.
- Killinger, John. "Existentialism and Human Freedom." *The English Journal* Vol: 50.No. 5 (May, 1961),: 303-13. Print
- Lavrin, Janko. "A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky." *Russian Review* Vol: 28.No. 2 (Apr., 1969),: 160-70. Print.
- Lowe, Peter. "Prufrock in St. Petersburg: The Presence of Dostoyevsky's Crime and Punishment in T. S. Eliot's 'The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock'" *Journal of Modern Literature* Vol: 28.No. 3 (Spring, 2005): 1-24. Print
- Mindess, Harvey. "Freud on Dostoevsky." *The American Scholar* Vol: 36.No. 3 (Summer, 1967),: 456-52. Print.
- Raico, Ralph. "The Conflict of Classes: Liberal and Marxist Theories." 1-40. Print.
- Smith, Steven B. "Hegel's Critique of Liberalism." *The American Political Science Review*Vol: 80.No. 1 (March 1986): 121-39. Print
- Whiting, Jeanna Marie. "Tolstoy and the Woman Question." *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. Print.