I

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF "SCHILLERISM" IN DOSTOEVSKIJ'S EARLIER FICTION

Schiller's importance to Dostoevskij can be viewed in two distinct ways: on the one hand, as the reflection of a general orientation towards German intellectual culture in the Russia of his time, on the other, as the result of a spiritual affinity between two literary men who were also philosophers. Though literary contacts were fairly continuous between Russia and Germany throughout the eighteenth century, after the Petrine period France became the principal source of foreign influence in Russian literature.[1] To mark the point at which the balance of influence tipped in favor of Germany, 14 December 1825, associated ever after with the Decembrist Uprising, may serve as a convenient date. It is true, as O. P. Peterson has pointed out, that in the case of Schiller the influence began already at the turn of the century,[2] the first climax of his Russian popularity being signalized in 1804 by the presentation of a diamond ring from Alexander I and Elizabeth.[3] However, this early wave of Schiller enthusiasm was much narrower in scope than that which came in the wake of the Decembrist revolt, being largely based on his *Sturm und Drang* dramas and his lyrical poetry. As the proponent of a philosophy and an aesthetic, Schiller became important only at the point where a powerful new wave of German influence, that of literary and philosophical romanticism, made its impact upon Russian culture. Yet, in his capacity as poet-thinker Schiller transcended this wave, achieving a popularity in Russia unequaled both by pure philosophers, like Fichte and Schelling, and by other poets.

The combination, in Schiller's work, of philosophical and aesthetic speculation with revolutionary drama and romantic poetry is, no doubt,

[1] Harald Raab, "Deutsch-russische Literaturbeziehungen von der Aufklärung bis zur Romantik," *Neue deutsche Literatur* 5, 1 (1957), 93.
[2] *Schiller in Russland, 1785-1805* (New York, 1934), 234.
[3] *Ibid.*, 98.

the chief reason why he held a unique place in the affections of Russian writers and intellectuals. This is also the reason why there is no unified conception of Schiller in Russian literature. A Soviet critic has noted that, from the very inception of Schiller's Russian influence, there were two schools of interpretation, one "progressive," the other "reactionary." The progressives, first represented by the Decembrists, saw Schiller as a revolutionary humanist, while the reactionaries saw him as an aesthetic idealist.[4] Dostoevskij, according to this critic, belonged to the reactionary camp. After the Decembrist debacle it was Schiller the aesthetic idealist who came to the fore; only in the late 'thirties and early 'forties, with the stabilization of Belinskij's philosophy of revolutionary radicalism, did the "progressive" interpretation of Schiller become a force in literary and critical activity. A counterforce emerged in the early 'sixties, when Dostoevskij and his brother started their own journal, *Vremja*. The publication, by Gerbel', of Schiller's works in Russian translation (1856-1861) provided an occasion for controversy.[5] With the growth of the revolutionary movement, Schiller once more emerged as a potent force in Russian cultural and literary life; Gor'kij, among others, shows traces of Schiller's influence.[6] Of later Soviet writers, Aleksej Tolstoj and Konstantin Fedin reflect the "progressive" Schiller's popularity after the Revolution.[7] It is not surprising that, in Soviet criticism, Schiller the aesthetic idealist should have become submerged by Schiller the revolutionary humanist. One element, however, has supervened upon the revolutionary, namely, nationalism. Accordingly, *William Tell* exceeds anything else that Schiller wrote both in popular appeal and in critical acclaim.[8]

The general vicissitudes of Schiller's reputation in Russia have their counterpart in the individual writer's and critic's attitudes. Again, though the response may vary from admiration to scorn, the interest is usually permanent. An excellent example is provided by the intellectual biography of Vissarion Belinskij. Initially an enthusiastic admirer of Schiller, Belinskij in the middle 'thirties became first an exponent of

[4] Roman M. Samarin, "Schiller im Urteil der russischen Kritik," trans. E. M. Arndt, *Weimarer Beiträge* 2 (1956), 20.

[5] *Ibid.*, 21.

[6] Rudolph Fischer, "Schillers Widerhall in der russischen Literatur," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig* 103, 5 (1958), 21.

[7] *Ibid.*, 22.

[8] Samarin, 29. –Though Samarin's view is limited by the schematic dichotomy of "reactionary" and "progressive" characteristic of Soviet criticism, it correctly emphasizes the wide range of critical interpretation of Schiller's work.

Schellingianism, later of Hegelianism. When, around 1840, he rejected the Hegelian "harmony," Schiller — who in the meantime had been downgraded for his abstract idealism[9] — returned to prime place in his affections. In a letter to V. P. Botkin of 4 October 1840, he writes: "I curse my base striving to reconcile myself with base reality! Hail the great Schiller, the noble advocate of humanity, the bright star of salvation, the emancipator of society from the bloody prejudices of tradition."[10] The same return to Schiller characterizes the thought of other Russian radicals, such as Bakunin and Gercen. In all these instances Schiller displays a staying power exceeding that of other influential German philosophers and poets.

The same pattern of permanence in change also marks Dostoevskij's relations with Schiller; there is scarcely a time when the German philosopher-poet is totally absent from his thought. When he leaves no mark on the creative work, he appears in the letters, and vice versa. The change in Dostoevskij's critical response has a remarkable similarity to that which occurred in the case of Belinskij. A youthful phase of extravagant enthusiasm for Schiller is followed by one of critical reevaluation, leading, in turn, to a period of renewed Schillerian impact on his creative work.

The phase of enthusiasm began exceptionally early, namely, when Dostoevskij, at the age of ten, saw the great actor Močalov in a performance of *The Robbers* in Moscow. In a letter to N. L. Ozmidov written in August 1880, about half a year before his death, Dostoevskij says that "the powerful impression which I carried away [from the performance] had a very fruitful effect on my spiritual life."[11] The first recorded expression of his enthusiasm for Schiller appears in a letter to his brother Mixail of January 1840, in which he relates an experience of the preceding year. At that time he had become close friends with the Schiller-disciple Šidlovskij, as well as with another young man whom he came to love very dearly, but whose identity has not been established with certainty.[12] Dostoevskij writes:

Last winter I was in a sort of exalted state. The acquaintance with Šidlovskij bestowed upon me so many hours of a better life; this, however,

[9] See letter to N. V. Stankevič of 1939 October 2, *Polnoe sobranie sočinenij* XI (Moscow, 1956), 385-386.

[10] *Ibid.*, 556.

[11] F. M. Dostoevskij, *Pis'ma,* ed. A. S. Dolinin, IV (Moscow, 1959), 196.

[12] Dolinin suggests that this friend could possibly have been Ivan Ignat'evič Berežeckij, one of Dostoevskij's fellow students from the Military Engineers School. Berežeckij left the school as ensign in 1841 and died after reaching the rank of sub-lieutenant. –*Pis'ma* I (Moscow, 1928), 471.

was not the cause of my state. I had then by my side a friend, a being whom I loved so much! You wrote to me, brother, that I have never read Schiller. You are mistaken, brother! I learnt him by heart, I spoke his language, and I dreamt in his images. I believe that fate never did anything more to the purpose in my life than to allow me to get to know this great poet at such a period of my life; never would I have been able to get to know him better than just then. While I read Schiller *with him,* I tested *on him* the noble and fiery Don Carlos, Marquis Posa, and Mortimer. This friendship brought me so much of both grief and delight! Now I shall forever remain silent about it. The very name Schiller became to me an intimate and sort of magic sound, which evokes in me so many memories and dreams. These memories are bitter, brother; that is why I never talked to you about Schiller, about the impressions he left on me. Just to hear Schiller's name gives me pain.[13]

The atmosphere of passionate friendship in which Dostoevskij acquired a deeper knowledge of Schiller's work no doubt contributed to the intensity and permanence of the poet's impact on his thought. So great was his enthusiasm that it even affected his practical judgment: he believed that the publication of his brother's translation of Schiller's works in three volumes, with a foreword by himself, would once and for all remedy their financial problems.[14]

Through Dostoevskij's acquaintance with Belinskij, his image of Schiller may have become colored by the complex of ideas associated with Utopian Socialism.[15] By this time, 1845, Belinskij had been a confirmed Schillerian for several years. His utopian interpretation of Schiller appears clearly in the following passage from a letter to Bakunin of 1841. Belinskij announces that the time of Goethe and Hegel are past, that

now again have risen before me in the full splendor of radiant greatness the gigantic figures of Fichte and Schiller, these prophets of mankind (humanity), these heralds of the kingdom of God on earth, these priests of eternal love and eternal truth, not merely in a bookish sense and by way of Brahmin contemplation, but in the living and rational deed [*Tat*].[16]

It is highly dubious that the youthful Dostoevskij had interpreted Schiller in such a revolutionary spirit; symptomatic of his vague, almost

[13] Dostoevskij, *Pis'ma* I, 57.

[14] Letter to Mixail Dostoevskij of 30 September 1844, *ibid.* I, 71-72.

[15] Martin E. Malia's statement that Dostoevskij began with a "radical and 'socialist' enthusiasm for Schiller" fails to take into account the earliest period of admiration, in which Schiller was intimately associated with personal friendship, fidelity, and love rather than with devotion to a cause. –See "Schiller and the Early Russian Left," *Harvard Slavic Studies* 4 (1957), 178.

[16] Belinskij, *op. cit.* XII (Moscow, 1956), 38.

indiscriminate response is the simultaneous mention, in the previously cited letter to his brother, of Don Carlos, Marquis Posa, and Mortimer. The only quality which these characters share is idealistic fervor; the tenor of the ideal is different in each case. What Dostoevskij responded to in Schiller at that time seems to have been, above all, the emotional afflatus; he could hardly have been deeply engaged by the ideological content if he was equally attracted by a vacillating princeling crossed in love, a Maltese knight preaching the gospel of a new freedom and peace, and an apostate Protestant prepared to sacrifice all for illicit passion. Yet, this may not be entirely fair; the "preaching" of a Marquis Posa, after all, was not in vain. Moreover, the result of his act of self-sacrifice was to cure Don Carlos of his erotic brooding, make him embrace the cause of freedom and, concurrently, the highest concerns of mankind. Perhaps the ideological content of Dostoevskij's first enthusiasm for Schiller can be said to have been a sort of abstract humanism, embodied in characters who show a need for self-sacrifice, human brotherhood, and idealistic love. Interestingly, this happens to be almost a replica of Belinskij's initial view of Schiller.[17] At that stage, however, influence can safely be ruled out, since Dostoevskij's Schiller-worship far antedates his meeting with Belinskij.

That, on the other hand, Belinskij had something to do with Dostoevskij's changing view of Schiller, seems unquestionable. In the section "Old People" in *Diary of a Writer*, the author says that Belinskij set out to "convert me to his faith."[18] Apparently he was successful. Commenting on the fact that they never met during the last year of Belinskij's life, because the critic no longer liked his work, Dostoevskij confesses that at the time of their friendship he had "passionately embraced his [Belinskij's] teaching."[19] Though this must refer primarily to Belinskij's brand of Utopian Socialism, it is impossible to dissociate that doctrine entirely from his conception of Schiller. At any rate, as time went on Dostoevskij came to associate Schiller more and more with the ideas and attitudes of personalism — the key to Belinskij's new understanding of the German writer — while the equation of Schillerism with abstract humanism still persisted at the back of his mind. Belinskij's new view of Schiller is stated succinctly in a letter to Botkin of 4 October 1840. After hailing the "great Schiller" as the

[17] *Ibid.* XI, 385-386.
[18] F. M. Dostoevskij, *Polnoe sobranie xudožestvennyx proizvedenij* XI, ed. B. Tomaševskij and K. Xalabaev (M.-L., 1926-1930), 8.
[19] *Ibid.* XI, 10.

"noble advocate of humanity," the critic continues: "For me now *human personality* stands higher than history, higher than society, higher than mankind."[20] As I shall show later, this individualistic interpretation of Schiller played an important role in Dostoevskij's literary coming of age.

Curiously, the first larger work in which Schillerian elements appear, *The Insulted and the Injured* (1861), both positively embodies and emphatically rejects these elements. The pattern of attraction and repulsion in regard to Schiller is clearly evident from the fact that, while in its general situation, dramatis personae, and social pathos the novel is reminiscent of Schiller's domestic tragedy *Cabal and Love*, the Schillerian ideal which underlies Dostoevskij's treatment of his material is mercilessly undercut by the only character who seems to possess the breath of life, Prince Valkovskij.[21] This rejection of Schillerism, which began shortly after Dostoevskij's return from Siberia,[22] was directed against Schiller the sentimental romantic and abstract humanist who had been the idol of Dostoevskij's early youth. Speaking of *The Insulted and The Injured,* Meier-Graefe says: "Schiller is the real hero concerned — the Schiller who had possessed the young Dostoevskij."[23] This view acquires considerable credibility when it is recalled that at this period, in which Dostoevskij made a strenuous effort to recollect his childhood, he steeped himself in Schiller a second time.[24] The effects of the new "possession," Meier-Graefe suggests, were "salutary": by carrying his cult to the utmost limit and, consequently, exceeding even Schiller in sentimentality, Dostoevskij reduced his youthful idol to the absurd and rid himself forever of Schiller's "weaknesses."[25] However, this was not, according to Meier-Graefe, his conscious intention; the actual result came about unconsciously. As evidence of Dostoevskij's unconscious intention he mentions the author's rush to complete the

[20] *Belinskij*, XI, 556.

[21] One may note a comment by K. Močul'skij to the effect that Prince Valkovskij is the real hero of the novel. –*Dostoevskij: Žizn' i tvorčestvo* (Paris, 1947), 172.

[22] Leonid Grossman, one of many critics who have commented on this matter, directly attributes it – along with Dostoevskij's turning against all idealists, romantics, and utopians – to his prison experience. – *Put' Dostoevskogo* (Leningrad, 1924), 114.

[23] Meier-Graefe, 127.

[24] *Ibid.*, 128. –Specific evidence in indirect support of this contention is offered by Čiževskij, who says that Dostoevskij reread Schiller when Gerbel' published his edition of Schiller's works (1856-1861). See "Šiller v Rossii," *Novyi žurnal* 45 (1956), 122.

[25] Meier-Graefe, 128.

work, his involuntary self-caricature in the young narrator, and the banality of the characters.[26]

It is, however, the presence of Prince Valkovskij which offers the best evidence of Dostoevskij's unconscious intention. For despite his villainous character, the Prince is portrayed with a great deal of understanding, even sympathy; only through passionate involvement could an author produce a figure of such vehement destructiveness. The fanaticism of Prince Valkovskij's hatred of "Schillerism" is undoubtedly rooted in Dostoevskij's one-time "possession." After reading the anti-Schillerian tirades, one is left with a curiously sad feeling, because one realizes how painful it must have been to destroy something that was once so precious. At the same time, perhaps, the author may have derived a certain measure of masochistic pleasure from the demolition of his idol.

As mentioned above, the phrase "abstract humanism" comes closest to summing up what Schiller and Schillerism signify in the novel. With the principal characters this "humanism" is not a mere attitude, but a veritable cult. In the absence of a ritual, the members of the cult abandon themselves to the transports of eternal brotherhood and mutual self-sacrifice. All the younger characters adopt this stance: Nataša, Aleša, Katja, and Vanja, the narrator; even Prince Valkovskij, the evil prime mover of the action, confesses that at one time he "wanted to be a benefactor of humanity, to found a philanthropic society."[27] The young people, inspired by an "ardent love for all humanity" (III, 199), have an informal counterpart of such a society. Katja typifies their rhetoric by her talk of "duty, of our mission, of how we all ought to serve humanity" (III, 197). They are easy targets, and the Prince revels in puncturing their pretty dreams — his son's, for example. With his talk of "universal love" and his enthusiasm for the "sublime and the beautiful," Aleša, he notes, is yet capable of committing "crimes against love" by neglecting a woman who, he says, "must be dearer to you than the whole world!" (III, 204).

Since *The Insulted and the Injured* is a love story — several in one, in fact — it is largely through the treatment of love that Schillerism is defined and exposed. One quality characterizes all the passionate involvements: an unusual readiness to merge eros in agape, to give up one's beloved for another's benefit. The young people assume extrav-

[26] *Ibid.*, 129.

[27] F. M. Dostoevskij, *Sobranie sočinenij* III (Moscow, 1948-1959), 272. Henceforth references to this work will be made in the text.

agant stances of self-denial and of mutual devotion. Most extreme is the attitude of Vanja; though he loves Nataša, he is — in the Prince's words — prepared, "like some Schiller, to lay down . . . [his] life for them," and he calls his behavior a "sickening show of generous feelings" (III, 266). The strictures of the Prince apply all too justly to the manner in which the love "rectangle" manage their affairs. Thus, at a point where everyone knows that he will marry Katja, not Nataša, Aleša goes into raptures over Katja's suggestion that he and Nataša stay together another few days. "He was at once completely comforted; his face was radiant with joy, he embraced Nataša, kissed Katja's hand, and embraced me" (III, 324-325). Katja, being the least experienced, is the most theoretical and consequently the most ludicrous of the foursome. When the rivals meet — in a scene which echoes *Cabal and Love* — she is quite prepared to discuss their situation, including the question which of them "should make Aleša happy and which ought to give him up" (III, 323). Then, holding Nataša "in her embrace" and kissing her hands, " 'If you only knew how I love you!' she said, weeping. 'Let us be sisters, let us always write to one another . . . and I will always love you . . . I'll love you so, love you so' " (III, 323). This ideal love is associated with Schiller not only by Prince Valkovskij, but also by Masloboev, who mentions that Mr. Smith's daughter had an "ideal lover, one of the Schiller fraternity, a poet, and at the same time a merchant, a young dreamer . . ." (III, 236).[28]

The epithets used by the Prince to deride the attitudes of the young people betray the nature and the possible source of the underlying ideal of perfection. He says he is "sick of all these naivetés, all these pastorals of Aleša, all this Schillerism, all the loftiness of this damned affair with this Nataša . . ." (III, 268-269). These epithets bring to mind Schiller's treatment of the idyl in his essay "On Naive and Reflective Poetry" (1795). Central to the concept of the idyl in its "reflective" [*sentimentale*] variety is the absence of conflict "in the individual as well as in society, a free accord of inclination with the law. . . ." In brief, Schiller writes, this concept is "nothing but the ideal of beauty

[28] The definition of Schillerism through love is a natural consequence of the widespread allegiance to Schiller's concept of love among Russian intellectuals of the 1830's and '40's; Belinskij, for example, traces idealistic love to Schiller (Malia, 188). This fact raises the question whether Dostoevskij may not have had nearer targets of satire in mind. Malia notes the Schillerian cult of love and friendship in the Stankevič circle (ibid., 187-188), and Močul'skij claims that the group around Aleša is reminiscent of the Petraševskij circle (*op. cit.*, 174). But such topical satire notwithstanding, the book's anti-Schillerian animus loses none of its force.

applied to real life. Accordingly, its character consists in the fact that *all opposition between reality and the ideal* . . . is completely abolished. . . ."[29] This principle is manifest in *The Insulted and the Injured* through the characters' attempt to live out their poetic dreams and ideal aspirations in their everyday existence. Thus, while *Cabal and Love* provided the general situation of Dostoevskij's novel, its intellectual horizon bears a striking resemblance to Schillerian aesthetic thought, with which Dostoevskij was familiar from his early youth.[30]

The Schillerians, refusing to distinguish between dream and reality, are completely incapable of coping with their problems. Masloboev, a reliable witness, comments on the inferiority of Ixmenev and Mr. Smith's daughter in their dealings with the Prince. These "exalted souls" confine themselves to a "noble and lofty contempt instead of applying the law to the case. . . . Brüderschaft [Miss Smith's "ideal lover"], too, encouraged her. . . . They read Schiller" (III, 238). Here Schillerism is specifically connected with inability to cope with actuality. The Prince puts it more simply: these lofty souls are plain fools; since, however, they constitute the majority of men, he has decided that the only thing one can do is "to encourage them; it pays" (III, 277).

It appears that the Prince has anticipated Raskol'nikov's distinction between ordinary and superior men, with the difference that, because the inferior ones — the Schillerian dreamers — are in the majority, the Prince believes the superior individual had better externally accept their values. The Schillerians, being too tender-minded to bear seeing reality stripped of the veil of pleasant illusions, paradoxically wield such a great power over the tough-minded that the latter must conform; if they are not emotionally swayed to do so, they conform out of "enlightened self-interest." For, as Valkovskij confides to Vanja, "if it were possible for everyone of us to describe all his cherished secrets, . . . what he is even at times afraid to confess to himself, there would rise such a stench on the earth that we would all be suffocated. That is why . . . our social conventions and proprieties are so good. They have a profound purpose, I won't say a moral one, but simply for self-preservation and comfort . . ." (III, 272).

[29] Friedrich Schiller, *Sämtliche Werke* V, ed. Jost Perfahl, with an Introduction by Benno von Wiese (München, 1968), 488. Henceforth references to this work will be made in the text.

[30] See Dostoevskij, *Pis'ma* I, 72. –According to Čiževskij, Dostoevskij read Schiller's philosophical works for the first time in the edition of Gerbel'. He adds, however, that the author must have been familiar with the contents of some at second hand ("Šiller v Rossii," 122). As a matter of fact, Dostoevskij shows ac-

As we have seen, the complex of ideas inherent in the Prince's concept of Schillerism is varied indeed: from abstract humanism, with brotherly love and self-sacrifice as corollaries, it has come to connote a high-strung idealism and romanticism;[31] beyond this, it also comprehends social proprieties and conventions that serve to protect this idealism so as to avoid confronting human nature in the raw. Fundamentally, according to Prince Valkovskij, Schillerism is false, a mask, even with those who are its convinced adherents.

And this is the most telling and cynical point made by the Prince: one cannot really distinguish between the genuine and the fake Schillerian. The anecdote he relates about "an outstanding beauty" with whom he was intimate at one time, helps to illustrate his point. Despite her "majestic and unapproachable" manner and her "formidable" virtue, "no profligate was more lewd than that woman.... My lady was sensual to such a degree that even Marquis de Sade could have taken lessons from her" (III, 275). The Prince sees little difference between such a deliberately assumed "Schillerism" for the purpose of enhancing sensual pleasure and genuine Schillerism, of which Miss Smith, the Prince's former victim, is a good example. Prefacing his story of their affair by announcing that "at the root of every human virtue lies the most profound egoism" and that "the more virtuous anything is, the more egoism there is in it" (III, 277), Valkovskij justifies his cruel treatment of Miss Smith by asserting that he would only have made her unhappy by returning the money he had taken from her.

---

quaintance with at least two of Schiller's prose works as early as 1844, when in a letter of 30 September to his brother Mixail he recommends the inclusion of Schiller's letters on *Don Carlos* and the essay on the "naive" in his prospective translation. The conservatism of Čiževskij's estimate of Dostoevskij's familiarity with Schiller's prose works is further shown by a notation of Leonid Grossman to the effect that in a letter to his brother from the Fortress, in 1849, Fedor asked Mixail to send him a copy of Schiller's *History of the Thirty Years War (Žizn' i trudy F. M. Dostoevskogo* [Moscow, 1935], 60). A writer of fiction would not be likely to read Schiller's historical works before his aesthetic and critical writings. It may be added that, despite the skepticism of critics, there are indications that Dostoevskij possessed considerable command of German, great enough, most likely, to enable him to understand Schiller in the original. On receiving his brother's translation of *Don Carlos*, he praises it as generally competent, but points out five to six poor lines (*Pis'ma* I, 72). Moreover, Dostoevskij's wife records that Fedor spoke German fluently, at least on their travels in Germany in 1867 (*The Diary of Dostoevsky's Wife*, ed. René Fülöp-Miller and Fr. Eckstein, trans. Madge Pemberton [New York, 1928], 290).

[31] One may recall here Belinskij's one-time rejection of Schiller because of his "prekrasnodušie" [Schönseligkeit], which had become a jargon term for one-sided idealism (Malia, 184).

I should have deprived her of the pleasure of being unhappy entirely *owing to me* and of cursing me for it all her life. Believe me, my friend, there is even a sort of lofty spite in unhappiness of that kind, in feeling oneself magnanimous and completely in the right and in having every right to call one's offender a scoundrel. This "ecstasy of spite" is often met with in Schilleresque people, of course; afterwards, perhaps, she had nothing to eat, but I am convinced that she was happy.... Thus, my maxim is fully justified — that the greater and more conspicuous a person's magnanimity, the greater and the more revolting is the egoism underlying it (III, 279–280).

The notion of an "ecstasy of spite" will play an important role in Dostoevskij's later fiction.

Despite its absolute cynicism, the Prince's self-revelation does not lack a certain engaging quality. Compared to the self-delusions of the virtuous Schillerians, who refuse to recognize man's limitations or veil them in lofty verbiage, the Prince's anecdote about the "crazy official in Paris" who had the compulsion to exhibit himself stark naked "in all the ... purity of his heart" to anyone he would meet, "men, women and children," introduces a welcome note of candor. In a figurative sense, the Prince is "exhibiting" himself to Vanja as he reveals his innermost thoughts to him. He claims that to some degree "the same pleasure may be had by suddenly flabbergasting some Schiller and sticking out one's tongue at him when he least expects it" (III, 273). Valkovskij, naturally, is not "exhibiting" himself in the "purity of his heart"; his motive in removing his mask to Vanja is practical: he wants the young man to use his influence with Aleša and Nataša, so that there will be "no pastorals, no Schillerism," to further hamper his plans for his son's marriage (III, 280). Nevertheless, after being exposed for a long stretch of story to the sentimental complications of a "rectangular" intrigue, one welcomes the Prince's confidences because they introduce a badly needed realistic perspective. Indeed, his parody of the clichés of Schillerism is quite enjoyable.

The Prince's assumed "Schillerian" naiveté is so well acted that it seems quite genuine. He says to Vanja: "You simply have to keep me company today. I feel wonderful, and since I am soft-hearted to the point of sentimentality, I cannot be happy alone. Who knows, we may yet come to drinking *Brüderschaft*" (III, 264-265). The cynical outbursts of the Prince alternate with the clichés of eternal friendship and brotherhood. "You see how much sweet simplicity there is in me, what candor, what *bonhomie!* I confess everything to you, even my childish caprices. Yes, *mon cher*, yes, a little more *bonhomie* on your side, too, and we should come to an agreement and get on excellently, and in

the end we would understand one another perfectly" (III, 268). Sprinkling his talk with *mon cher* and *mon ami*, he produces a convincing semblance of beer-hall conviviality, *Gemütlichkeit*, appropriately transposed into a more elegant language: "*Buvons, mon ami*, allow me to fill your glass" (III, 274). Very cleverly, Dostoevskij manages the conversation in such a way that gradually the lofty idea of human brotherhood becomes debased to the mere social gesture of drinking *Brüderschaft*. Just before the end of the dialogue, Valkovskij says: "I hope we are parting as friends. Shouldn't we drink *Brüderschaft* together?" (III, 282).[32]

The upshot of *The Insulted and the Injured* in terms of ideas is the crystallization of two diametrical attitudes, the first organized around the concept of Schillerism, the second finding its most forceful statement in an utterance of Valkovskij's which echoes the solipsistic philosophy of Max Stirner. The only thing that is not nonsense, the Prince says, is "personality — myself. All is for me, the whole world is created for me" (III, 276).[33] The Schillerians are weaklings; furthermore, morally they seem but little superior to the avowed egoists. The latter, according to the Prince, are indestructible: "Everything in the world may perish, but we shall never perish" (III, 278). Variants of these attitudes will provide the basic dialectic of Dostoevskij's later novels. But Schillerism as it appears in *The Insulted and the Injured* will play a gradually decreasing role, whereas a more fully assimilated brand of the same "ism," crystallized around the quest for freedom, will unite with the insurgent individualism typified in this early novel by Prince Valkovskij. The pathos of abstract humanism will be replaced by the pathos of individual freedom. This change, however, does not become perceptible until Dostoevskij has projected a more radical and complete critique of Schillerian sentimentalism than is contained in *The Insulted and the Injured*. The trend of rejection is continued in *An Unpleasant Predicament* [*Skvernyj anekdot* (1862)] and achieves a climax in *Notes from Underground* (1864).

Meier-Graefe calls *An Unpleasant Predicament* a travesty on *The*

[32] For a passage which specifically links drinking *Brüderschaft* mockingly with Schillerism, one may turn to *The Eternal Husband*. After Vel'čaninov has been told that the young man who is in love with Trusockij's child-bride has been reconsiled with his aging rival, he exclaims: "So in the end they finished up with *Brüderschaft*! Ha-ha! They embraced and wept! Oh, you Schilleresque poets!" (IV, 570).

[33] For a note on Max Stirner's influence on Dostoevskij's thought, see Fülöp-Miller's preface to *The Diary of Dostoevsky's Wife*, 13.

Insulted and the Injured, a statement which requires some qualification. The fact that Valkovskij provides a concise parody, within the novel itself, of the complex of Schillerian attitudes presented, makes a travesty of the entire work pretty much an artistic impossibility. Not even the specific theme is parodied, since *An Unpleasant Predicament* has no love interest. Travesty applies only to the more general theme, the relationship between one social class and another, originally derived from Schiller's *Cabal and Love*. Schiller had shaped a tragedy around this theme, while Dostoevskij's treatment varies from pathos with a streak of comedy (*The Insulted and the Injured*) to pure farce (*An Unpleasant Predicament*). The latter story is a veritable burlesque on abstract humanism, "gumannost'," which is the catchword of the well-intentioned high official, Pralinskij, who endeavors to cross the class barrier. Pralinskij is nearly a diametrical opposite to Prince Valkovskij; with his genuine naiveté he is eager to experience a sense of brotherhood with those beneath him on the social scale. The ludicrous situations in which he gets involved as a result of his "Schillerian" humanism are a measure of Dostoevskij's advance in realism. Whatever comedy of situation exists in *The Insulted and the Injured* is there accidentally, not by design; and in the great scene of parody between Ivan Petrovič (Vanja) and Valkovskij, there is only dialogue. In *An Unpleasant Predicament* the entire story is bathed in the light of ridicule; a satirical intent informs character portrayal, incident, and dialogue alike. One notes, for example, that the portrait of the good man, the idealistic humanist, is drawn according to Prince Valkovskij's unflattering analysis of the Schillerian: though the latter will profess high idealism, he acts, without realizing it, upon purely practical, even base motives. However the official may glow at the prospect of exhibiting "gumannost'," he becomes even more fervent on the subject of his enhanced future reputation and popularity. Subsequently, the memory of his embarrassment at the wedding of his humble employee destroys his dream of "gumannost' " and turns him into a more severe — and more classconscious — official. Meier-Graefe calls the story "a big step towards the conquest of Schiller's banal superficialities." The "extravagant sentimentality" of *The Insulted and the Injured* is followed by a style of "terseness and concision never yet achieved."[34]

[34] Meier-Graefe, 132.