III

SCHILLER AND *THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV:* PERVASIVE THEMES AND MOTIFS

The scholar who has written most extensively on the subject of this and the following chapter, Dmitrij Čiževskij, claims that in *The Brothers Karamazov* Dostoevskij frequently has "arguments" [*Auseinandersetzungen*] with Schiller; that is, he endeavors "to overcome the 'Schillerism' which Dostoevskij himself had gone through at one time and which, as he thought, had deeply affected part of the Russian society of the day."[1] I have in the preceding chapters discussed both Dostoevskij's battle with Schillerism and his creation of a new universe of thought. By the time he wrote his last novel, Schiller's thought must have been so closely assimilated to his own that no such "arguments" as Čiževskij postulates could have taken place. Kurt Wais is probably closer to the truth when he stresses the absence of any polemical intent in the novel, as well as Dostoevskij's endeavor to carry further certain lines of religious thought to which Schiller had failed to do full justice.[2] It may even seem as if the one-time Schiller enthusiast has come full circle in his attitude to the German author, since among over thirty allusions to or quotations from Schiller, none is in a mocking tone. Yet, the image of the circle is misleading, since it suggests a reversion to the point of departure. Nothing could be more false. Whereas the early admiration as well as the later rejection were somewhat strained and partly, therefore, failed to find embodiment in artistically pleasing or impressive forms — except in brief passages like Ippolit's "Explanation" in *The Idiot* — the Schillerian elements in *The Brothers Karamazov* are fitted into an intricate and harmonious artistic design.

One is struck by the wide range of the Schillerian materials embodied in the work; they represent Schiller the dramatist, the philosophical essayist, the poet. *The Robbers* gave Dostoevskij suggestions for situation, character and theme, and *Don Carlos* influenced a crucial chapter

[1] "Schiller und die 'Brüder Karamazov'," 15.
[2] Wais, 476.

of the novel, "The Grand Inquisitor." Schiller's treatise *On the Aesthetic Education of Man* provided the intellectual framework for the three psychological types represented by the Karamazov brothers, as well as the important motif of the "higher man," also present in *The Robbers*. Finally, Dmitrij and Ivan introduce, through their quotations from Schiller's poetry, significant ideas which become essential parts of the novel's ideological structure.

The range of attitudes and ideas associated with these elements from Schiller is equally broad. The two polarities of Schiller's thought as reflected in Dostoevskij's earlier work, the cult of humanity and of the great individual, are both present in *The Brothers Karamazov*. The former, repeatedly a focus of mockery, has found an attractive embodiment in Aleša Karamazov, who at the outset is called "an early lover of humanity" (IX, 26). The attitude of proud individualism, formerly incorporated in such figures as Ippolit and Kirillov and traceable as far back as the underground man, is represented by Ivan. Mitja, the "hero" of the novel as it exists, seems to be an entirely new type, though clearly akin to Rogožin. Čiževskij correctly calls Mitja a wholly Russian type, but this does not, as he suggests, make Schiller's contribution superfluous.[3]

As a matter of fact, Mitja is associated with several concepts developed from Schillerian ideas in earlier novels, such as expiatory suicide and the "broadness" of human nature. Moreover, the Schillerian poetry that Mitja recites is not merely a convenient means of portraying an ecstatic personality; it also enables Dostoevskij to prefigure the dynamics of his hero's future development. For Mitja is the only character in the novel who undergoes significant growth. Aleša at the end differs little from what he was at the beginning, and Ivan, though vastly changed, can hardly be said to have "grown." When one considers how important spiritual development was to Schiller, the author of tragedies of expiation and of an aesthetic treatise based on the possibility of evolving a harmonious man, Dmitrij Karamazov comes to seem the most Schillerian of all the three brothers. In his way, he is initially a great egoist, like Ivan, but through his suffering he moves gradually closer to Aleša and begins to speak his language. Thus, within the movement from intellectual and spiritual anarchy to order which constitutes the overall rhythm of the novel, Schiller in one way or another is present at virtually every point.

The following analysis will proceed from the whole to the parts,

[3] "Schiller und die 'Brüder Karamazov'," 26.

starting with central themes and pervasive motifs; a subsequent chapter will take up motifs associated with the individual characters. Unlike Čiževskij, I shall not be concerned with defining what he calls the "Schiller motif," which hardly exits — except, perhaps, in a trivial sense. For Schiller is not a subject of debate in the novel. Čiževskij apparently believes he is, a conviction that may be rooted in a mistaken distinction, impossible to maintain, between Dostoevskij the artist and Dostoevskij the thinker. This distinction comes to the surface in his puzzled query concerning the significance of Aleša's Schillerian association of art and play in a conversation with Kolja Krasotkin. Čiževskij asks: "Did Dostoevskij put this thought into Aleša's mouth because he shared it, or did it belong to the 'orchestration' of the novel that Aleša, too, was a 'Schillerian' in one respect — this, to be sure, is difficult to decide."[4] The distinction here made between ideological and purely aesthetic qualities does not seem justified. No attempt is made in *The Brothers Karamazov* to develop an anti- or pro-Schillerian theme; the Schillerian elements are fully and unobtrusively embodied in the characters and in the aesthetic structure of the novel. If one argues that the Schiller motif is constituted precisely by Dostoevskij's association of all the members of the Karamazov family with Schiller, it must be noted that this usage of the word "motif" trivializes its meaning. The association in question is far from being a motif in the sense, for example, of the suffering of children or moral responsibility for others, just to mention two of those articulated by Čiževskij. Thus, though there are numerous Schillerian motifs in the novel, there is no Schiller motif worth discussing.

[4] *Ibid.*, 12. –Perhaps this question is not as difficult to answer as Čiževskij intimates. Presumably, Dostoevskij would put into the words of his most positive character views with which he himself agreed. Besides, if all he wanted to show was that Aleša, too, had read Schiller, it would have been sufficient to let him repeat a line or so from a Schiller poem, something like Ivan's "Den Dank, Dame, begehr' ich nicht." On the other hand, the relative triviality of an allusion like Ivan's does not justify the inference that the author is not involved with his problems. But, again, to ask the question whether Dostoevskij *agrees* with the Schillerian ideas and interpretations of Ivan is, within the context of the novel, meaningless. The wide dramatic and poetic production of Schiller contains many ideas which Schiller himself did not share. The very fact that Dostoevskij uses such a great variety of Schillerian material in *The Brothers Karamazov* shows that there is no Schiller motif in the book. The possibility of such a motif would require a well-defined concept of Schillerism, and such a concept is no longer present. The time was long past when Dostoevskij was either advocating or battling with the *Weltanschauung* of the German poet.

1. *THE ROBBERS:* PARRICIDE, THEODICY AND RELATED MOTIFS

The relationship of *The Brothers Karamazov* to Schiller's first play, *The Robbers*, is indicated in the very text of the novel. The subject of Schiller's play is the feud between a father and his two sons, the oldest of which, Karl Moor, becomes an outlaw and organizes a band of robbers, while the younger, Franz, does his evil best to kill his father and to seduce his brother's fiancée, Amalia. Despite the rather hysterical rhetoric and the lack of structural logic in the play,[5] it seems to have been one of Dostoevskij's favorites from the very moment when he first saw it performed in 1831. His deep involvement with the play becomes strikingly evident from an incident reported by his daughter Ljubov', who as a child was entertained to a reading of it by her father. Perhaps, Ljubov' writes, her father was in such a hurry to sow good ideas by reading aloud from great authors because he knew his illness was fatal. The first literary evening, she recalls, took place when she was seven years old and her brother six (1874); *The Robbers* was the work chosen to introduce this series of educational readings. Her father, she says, read with "passion, [and] often paused to explain a too difficult expression to us." Apparently, even at that age Dostoevskij was gripped by the play, because to the little girl he seemed very strange during the reading. Though she did not understand the work, she fully understood that "this enigmatic drama interested . . . [her] father very much." When, however, he noticed that, instead of entertaining them, the play served as a soporific, Dostoevskij realized how foolish had been the hope of sharing with his children the philosophical and moral reflections of his own mature mind. Ljubov' exclaims: "Poor father! He had hoped to experience once more with us the emotion which Schiller's dramas had once conveyed to him...."[6] According to Leonid Grossman, Dostoevskij read *The Robbers* to his children again in the summer of 1880, the very year when *The Brothers Karamazov* was published.[7]

This enduring fascination with *The Robbers* notwithstanding, it has been suggested that Dostoevskij's treatment of parricide was inspired by *The Covetous Knight* of Puškin.[8] Alfred Bem claims that Dostoevskij

[5] Benno von Wiese says that "the characters are falsely drawn, the plot is fantastic, the dramatic complication remote from reality" (*op. cit.*, 13).

[6] Aimée Dostojewski, *Dostojewski: Geschildert von seiner Tochter* (Zürich, 1920), 215-216.

[7] *Žizn' i trudy F. M. Dostoevskogo*, 305.

[8] That this was one of Dostoevskij favorite poems is evident from a comment made by the "raw youth," whose literary taste may safely be taken to mirror the

was the first to grasp the full depth of the collision between father and son in that poem. "He presents his interpretation of this collision in the story of the clash between Dmitrij Karamazov and his father. . . . It is even more remarkable that in Albert, the 'fool and spendthrift,' the 'parricide in thought,' he perceived the moral originator of the sort of crime he later relates in *The Brothers Karamazov*."[9] Puškin's "little tragedy" does contain one suggestive idea which is absent from *The Robbers*, namely, that of a "parricide in thought"; yet, since Dostoevskij chose to make allusion to Schiller rather than to Puškin, it must be assumed that *The Robbers* had a broader relevance to his theme. His recurrent reading of and meditation on this work was, indeed, unusually productive.

On the surface, the implementation of the theme of parricide differs greatly in the two works. In Schiller's play, the "murder" is coldbloodedly planned by Franz, the younger son, for no apparent motive except greed and envy; he manipulates the existing misunderstanding between his father and Karl to serve his own nefarious ends. There is no jealousy between Franz and his father; on the other hand, Franz does feel jealous on account of Amalia's love for his brother. Though it need not be assumed that Dostoevskij had to seek his themes in literary works, one might mention that two other Schiller plays, *Don Carlos* and *The Bride of Messina*, do contain the motif of jealousy between father and son so crucial to the plot of *The Brothers Karamazov*. In *Don Carlos*, which has left traces of a different order on the novel, most of the action springs from Carlos' love for his stepmother and his consequent jealousy of King Philip. Before her marriage to the King, Elizabeth had been Don Carlos' affianced bride.[10] In *The Bride of Messina*, the plot of which turns on the love of two brothers for the same woman, the rivalry between father and son is resolved by the victorious son reaping the curses of his father for himself and his descendants (Act II, sc. 1). The necessity of having recourse to additional works by Schiller to complete the list of cardinal plot motifs in Dostoevskij's novel, shows the complexity of the latter as compared to *The*

young Dostoevskij's: "Already as a child I learned by heart the monologue of Puškin's Covetous Knight. Puškin never produced anything with a loftier conception than that! I have the same ideas now" (VIII, 100).

[9] Alfred Bem, "Dostojevskij, der geniale Leser," *Slavische Rundschau* 3 (July, 1931), 473.

[10] In the audience which Don Carlos has with the King in Act II, the latter even suggests that his son may have ideas of murder in his mind. On Carlos' request that he entrust him with Flanders, the King retorts: ". . . My best field-army to your lust for power? / The knife to my murderer?" (Act II, sc. 2).

Robbers. Scrutinizing the situation in the play more closely, one realizes that its psychological complexity is only apparent: Franz's gratuitous evil is the unique source of the plot and ultimately entraps him as well as most of the other characters. That close similarities in the area of plot and its psychological basis are absent should not be surprising, since action and motivation, perhaps more than any other element in a work of art, are dependent upon the particular condition of the author's society and the literary conventions of the age.

The *reductio ad absurdum* of the attempt to find close approximations between *The Robbers* and *The Brothers Karamazov* on the level of plot and motivation occurs in an article by Marcel Weinreich. Though Weinreich mentions works by George Sand and Balzac as additional sources of inspiration for *The Brothers Karamazov*, he seems to imply that in the treatment of parricide Dostoevskij follows Schiller's blueprint to the last detail. For instance, he says that in *The Robbers*, too, the father is an "old tyrant," whereas in actuality old Graf von Moor is much like King Lear, an old man abused.[11] Weinreich presses the similarities by saying that in both works "moral and emotional torture proves to be deadly. It is the venom of words, not of poison, with which the jealous son kills the despotic Karamazov *père*, the same subtle and insidious means by which Franz breaks the life of his father, the old tyrant Moor." The "jealous son" must be Mitja, who, however, cannot be said to kill his father in any way. Subsequently, while intending to stress similarities, the critic mainly brings out differences between the two works: "Dostoyevski's hero covets the same gain as Schiller's: access to the inheritance and to his relative's bride-to-be by eliminating the competitor thru paternal curse and ostracism."[12] This makes little sense whether the "hero" is taken to be Ivan or Mitja: the former, as V. Ermilov has stated, was not covetous,[13] and he did not have great cause to fight Mitja on the score of Katerina Ivanovna, since his brother had become quite indifferent to her. If the statement applies to Mitja, it makes even less sense. The most significant affinities between the two works do not exist on the level of plot and motivation; these affinities are ideological, relating to religious and moral conceptions.

[11] *King Lear* clearly influenced Schiller in the conception of his play. Notable is the close similarity of the relationships between old Gloucester and his two sons, Edgar and Edmund, and those between Graf von Moor and his two sons.

[12] Marcel Weinreich, "Ideological Antecedents of the *Brothers Karamazov*," *Modern Language Notes*" 64 (June, 1949), 401.

[13] V. Yermilov, *Fyodor Dostoyevsky*, trans. J. Katzer (Moscow, n. d.), 285.

Benno von Wiese's definition of the nature of Schiller's dramaturgy in *The Robbers* will point the way to these affinities. According to von Wiese, Schiller aspired to implement the "tragic dialectic of man, the world, and the deity." Only such a conception can make sense of the "monumental simplicity" of the play's structure, its apocalyptic pathos, and the presence of the deity as a main actor in the tragedy. Von Wiese sees Schiller's dramatic conception in relation to Greek and Christian baroque tragedy. Like Aeschylus, young Schiller also endeavored to "articulate the world of tragic drama and the theological world of belief as an inner unity; he, too, was playwright and theologian at the same time."[14]

Of Dostoevskij it can be said with even greater justification that he was a literary artist and a theologian at the same time. The external action, or plot, of *The Brothers Karamazov* is an embodiment of religious-ideological attitudes, and the underlying conflict is between such attitudes. One may note, for example, how important the questions of God and immortality are to the two works. In *The Robbers* nearly the entire first scene of Act V — in which Franz converses, first, with the pious old servant Daniel, later with Pastor Moser — is devoted to these questions; the same questions are lengthily discussed by the members of the Karamazov family in Book III, Chapter 8: "Over the Brandy."[15] In both works the characters adopt polar attitudes of rejection and affirmation. In Schiller's play, the negative moral consequences of the radical skepticism and rationalism of Franz Moor are best exemplified by the actions which follow from his cold-blooded "critique" of paternity. The counterpart to this in Dostoevskij's novel is Ivan's slogan that "everything is lawful," which indirectly causes his father's murder. Dostoevskij considered Franz's rebellious questions and reflections important enough to put the gist of them into the mouth of the counsel for the defense at Mitja's trial. I shall present the crucial parts of these passages to show how closely Dostoevskij here echoes Schiller.

First, Franz implicitly distinguishes between two notions of paternity: "Not flesh and blood, but the heart makes us fathers and sons," he says to his father. Alone, Franz reflects on the "droll" incongruities between what he calls "blood-love" and "harmony of spirit." A father

[14] *Op. cit.*, 15.

[15] This title looks like a reminiscence of a phrase used in a comparable context in *The Robbers*, where Franz Moor remarks to Pastor Moser: "I've often toasted you with a sneer *over the burgundy:* there is no God" (Act V, sc. 1; my italics).

gives one life — "you are his flesh, his blood — therefore he is sacred to you!" But "*why*," he asks, "did he make me? Surely not out of love of me, who first would have to become an I? Did he know me before he made me? Or did he think about me as he was making me? . . . Can I recognize a love which is not based on esteem for my *self*?" (Act I, sc. 1). Later, physical fatherhood is further stripped of its meaning and dignity. The father, perhaps stimulated by too much wine, gets an "itch," and "out of that comes a man"; but that was hardly the reason for his "Herculean labor," Franz mocks (Act IV, sc. 2).

Fetjukovič, who like Ivan adheres to Euclidic reason, brings into the open the contrast between a mystical and a rational conception of paternity which is implicit in Franz's reflections. Like Franz, he rejects the mystical conception, which should be "kept outside the sphere of actual life" (X, 301). The legitimate questions asked by young people concerning an "unworthy father" cannot, says Fetjukovič, be answered in the conventional manner:

> "He begot you, and you are his flesh and blood, and therefore you ought to love him." The youth involuntarily starts pondering: "But did he love me when he begot me?" he asks, wondering more and more. "Was it for my sake he begot me? He did not know me, not even my sex, at that moment, at the moment of passion, perhaps flushed with wine, and he has, perhaps, only passed on to me a tendency to drunkenness . . ." (X, 301–302).

The most extreme example of Fetjukovič's way of thinking is Smerdjakov's double crime of murder and suicide. Both acts are covered by Franz Moor's analogy between the "itch" which leads to the conception of a child and the "itch" to murder; in each case there is nothing but bestiality. If a man's life originates in a "bestial impulse," who, Franz asks, would have any qualms about the "denial of his birth?" (Act IV, sc. 2). Smerdjakov's rejection of his own birth is confessed to Marja Kondrat'evna, the neighbor's daughter. "Grigorij Vasil'evič," he says, "blames me for rebelling against my birth, . . . but I would have authorized their killing me while still in the womb so as not to come into the world at all" (IX, 281). In his case, as with Franz, "denial of his birth" leads first to murder, then to suicide.

Both in *The Robbers* and *The Brothers Karamazov* the surface theme of parricide, as approved by Euclidic reason, is related to the religious theme: rebellion against the physical father is paralleled by rebellion against God, the heavenly father. Franz's corrosive analysis of the concept of paternity is accompanied by an equally destructive criticism of religious belief. Ivan, though too civilized to defend parricide out-

right, comes close to doing so indirectly when he expresses a kind of regret at having helped his father during the latter's stormy encounter with Mitja. When Aleša reacts with a horrified "God forbid!" to the idea of murder, " 'Why should he forbid?' Ivan went on in the same whisper, with a malicious grimace. 'One reptile will devour the other. And serve them both right, too!' " (IX, 179). Ivan's wish that father and brother destroy one another parallels Franz's double exposure of the irrational basis of brotherhood and fatherhood alike, as well as his assaults on both relatives (Act I, sc. 1).

Nevertheless, Franz's rebellion against God is too gratuitous to offer many fruitful suggestions to a realistic novelist. Accordingly, it is Karl Moor, the passionate idealist, who is of greatest significance to Dostoevskij's development of the theme of rebellion in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Though Karl's revolt against society is directly caused by the presumed mistreatment he has suffered from his father, he universalizes his condition, identifying it with that of all sufferers, and relates his father's injustice to the idea of a bungling Providence. Typical of his attitude is the epithet he applies to Kosinsky — "accuser of the deity" — during the latter's recital of his wrongs (Act III, sc. 2). Here is an indication of the intent of theodicy which informs Schiller's drama,[16] as well as a meaningful counterpart to Ivan's rebellion against God's world.

Certain differences between the two characters' attitudes, and their consequences, may be noted. Ivan's rebellion is passive and theoretical; Karl Moor actively tries to rectify the shortcomings of the providential order. When he sends his men to catch his brother, for example, he speaks of the revenge in religious terms. Their "handiwork," he says, is "ennobled" by an "invisible power," and he calls them "the terrible angels of his [God's] dark judgment" (Act IV, sc. 5). Toward the end, however, Karl's and Ivan's destinies seem to merge, though imperfectly. The rebellion against the divine order — whether in the form of destructive criticism and unconscious conniving with evil as in Ivan's case, or of attempts at improving this order as in Karl's — in both cases this rebellion entails fatal consequences. After his father's and Amalia's deaths, for which he considers himself partly or wholly guilty, Karl realizes that his strategy of "beautifying the world through

[16] For treatments of the problem of theodicy in Schiller's work, see Josef Kremer, *Das Problem der Theodicee in der Philosophie und Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Kant und Schiller* (Berlin, 1909) and Hans Lindau, *Die Theodicee im 18. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1911).

outrage and maintaining the laws through lawlessness" has tragically failed. The endeavor to improve on Providence turns out to have been not only childish folly, but the most pernicious immoralism: "*two people like myself*," he says, "*would destroy the entire structure of the moral world.*" At this point there is only one way by which he can reconcile the "wronged laws . . . and again heal the abused order." When his associates fear that he will commit suicide, he asks: "Do you believe that the harmony of the world will gain through this godless discord?" And he goes to turn himself in (Act V, sc. 2). The religious rebellion of both characters ends in capitulation, as they submit themselves to trial for crimes committed through mistaken idealistic rationalism. But Dostoevskij had in mind to restore Ivan, whereas for Moor no such prospects are held out. "Where for Schiller there was an end, a downfall, there is, for Dostoevskij, the beginning of rebirth, the beginning of 'a new novel,' which unfortunately was never written."[17]

The chief motif related to theodicy in *The Brothers Karamazov*, that of children's suffering, represents only one of the many unexplained evils in the world which theodicy purports to rationalize. The attempt to rationalize evil, particularly suffering, goes back as far as history itself, informing many Greek plays as well as Biblical stories. Indeed, it permeates the entire Old Testament, particularly the Prophets, whose vision of the divine purpose made the afflictions of the Jews more bearable. Perhaps the most dramatic Biblical formulation of the problem of evil and suffering is the Book of Job, alluded to both in *The Robbers* (Act II, sc. 2) and in *The Brothers Karamazov* (IX, 365). Generally, in the Bible suffering is justified by a condition of future harmony, a paradise on earth that will come in due time. It is in these terms that the theodicy appears also in *The Brothers Karamazov*.

The prominence of theodicy in the Bible might seem to put in question the validity of any search for a different provenience of the associated motifs. However, Ivan's presentation of his counter-theodicy differs from most earlier versions by the central position in it of children's suffering. True, the humanitarian nineteenth century abounded with fictional treatments of the suffering of children, but neither Dickens, nor the earlier Dostoevskij — when, as in *The Insulted and the Injured*, he portrays children's suffering — had exploited this motif in a philosophical spirit. In *The Robbers*, on the other hand, it is the heartless murder of a child by one of the men which first disillusions Karl Moor about the idea of improving on the order of Providence

[17] Čiževskij, "Schiller und die 'Brüder Karamazov'," 39.

(Act II, sc. 3). Though the gratuitous death of the child spoils the harmony which Karl Moor is trying to establish rather than that of God's world, the fundamental function of the child — to symbolize the ethical imperfections of the order within which man exists — is the same in *The Robbers* as in Ivan's "Rebellion."

The motif of children's suffering, essential to the Dostoevskian theodicy, goes through a number of permutations in the course of the novel. In Ivan's "Rebellion," constituting the fourth chapter of Book V, it is the chief argument for rejection of God and of ethical responsibility. Subsequently, through the story of the crucified child related by Ivan to Lise Xoxlakova (X, 95-96), it becomes associated with attitudes of sado-masochism, which, seemingly, Dostoevskij meant to present as the emotional counterpart to atheism. On the other hand, through Father Zosima and particularly Mitja, children become the focus of a religion of enraptured acceptance and of the idea of responsibility for all. In Mitja's case, the dream of the suffering child initiates a process of spiritual growth. While no murderer, he accepts the guilt for his own life and is ready to suffer to expiate it. "It's for that babe I am going to Siberia now; I did not kill, but I must go to Siberia!" (X, 77). Through Mitja, Dostoevskij also expands the motif of children's suffering to include the suffering of all men. To Aleša Mitja says: "It's for the babe I'm going. Because everyone is guilty for everyone else. For all the 'babes,' for there are little children and big children. All are 'babes.' I go for all, because someone must go for all" (X, 105). Here the theodicy is complete, taking in all the suffering in the world; and the solution is not rejection of God's creation for the sake of love of humanity as in Ivan's case, but the free acceptance of guilt for all, and for all suffering. The only way suffering can be countered and overcome is by humbly, and actively, accepting it.

2. THE HYMN MOTIF AND ITS PERMUTATIONS

V. Ermilov, the Soviet critic, has expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which Dostoevskij answers Ivan's rebellion. "Instead," he says, "of discussing the essence of Ivan's words regarding the cynicism of any attempt to justify the tormenting of little children, Dostoevskij prefers to discredit Ivan himself."[18] Ivan certainly is discredited, but this is not the entire answer to his revolt. True, there is no attempt at

[18] *Op. cit.*, 278.

a reasoned rebuttal; in this respect Ermilov is right. The most dramatic counterpoise to Ivan's rejection of God's world is Mitja's absurd enraptured insistence on singing his hymn, even from the bowels of the salt mines — this despite the fact that he is himself one of those abused children whose sufferings, to Ivan's thinking, negate the moral order. It is through Schiller's poem *To Joy* [*An die Freude*], which Mitja calls a "hymn to joy" (IX, 136), that Dostoevskij develops this counter-motif to rebellion.[19]

That it is meant to be such a motif becomes clear from Ivan's association of "eternal harmony" with a song of praise to God (IX, 307).[20] Close to the end of the novel, in Ivan's exchange with the devil, the latter twice refers to the same idea, though in a different tone. First, the devil tells an anecdote of the atheist who, indignant at finding his principles contradicted by the continuance of life after death, was sentenced to walk "a quadrillion kilometers in the dark" and after the penance had been performed was allowed to enter Paradise (X, 171). After "two seconds" he was so overwhelmed by the new experience that he started singing " 'hosanna' and overdid it so that some persons there of a noble cast of thought wouldn't even shake hands with him at first — he had changed too rapidly into a conservative, they said" (X, 173). The devil amplifies the anecdote by relating a similar experience of his own, which occurred when Christ ascended into Heaven with the penitent thief upon his "bosom." Though he refused to give in to his longing to "join the chorus and shout 'hosanna' with them all" (X, 177), his reasons were not those for which Ivan rejects the "eternal harmony."[21] Anyway, the devil admits that ultimately he will be reconciled (X, 177). The point of the difference between the devil's and

[19] Though the part of *To Joy* used by Dostoevskij fails to show the importance of theodicy in the poem, a casual inspection will make one realize its central position in the poem as a whole. Except for stanza four, which is one of those recited by Mitja, all of the eight stanzas imply the existence of a God who rewards and judges and of ultimate universal harmony.

[20] Documentary evidence from Dostoevskij's notes for *The Brothers Karamazov* confirms the association of Schiller's *To Joy* with the counter-motif to rebellion. In one passage the Inquisitor says: "Why does it make us feel sorry? We are more humane than you. We love the earth. Schiller celebrates joy . . ., but with what is this joy purchased: with what torrents of blood, torments, baseness and bestial savagery, impossible to endure" (F. M. Dostojewski, *Die Urgestalt der Brüder Karamasoff*, ed. W. Komarowitsch [München, 1938], 545).

[21] At this point Dostoevskij's devil approaches the Goethean, Mephistopheles. If he had joined the choir, the devil says, "everything on earth would have been extinguished at once and no events could have occurred" (X, 177). The underlying conception is that of a being which serves as an irritant to human activity and

Ivan's attitude toward the hosanna is most likely to show that, unconsciously, Ivan is changing, while consciously he remains much the same. Mitja tells Aleša that "Ivan understands about the hymn, too; he understands, only he doesn't answer — he doesn't speak. He doesn't believe in the hymn" (X, 110). Through the new perspective on the "eternal harmony" projected by the devil, Dostoevskij shows that, subconsciously, Ivan is turning towards faith.

It is through Mitja that the hymn motif achieves its fullest statement. After reciting three stanzas from Schiller's *The Eleusinian Festival* centered on the ritual initiation of civilization and the taming of the wild, cannibalistic "troglodyte," Mitja identifies himself with this savage and, next, having recited two stanzas from *To Joy*, with the insects to whom is given "sensual lust." At this point I shall deal only with what is immediately relevant to the motif of the hymn.

There is a neat consistency in the images associated with the hymn. The opening of Mitja's recital runs: "Wild and fearful in his cavern / Hid the naked troglodyte" (IX, 136). Mitja thinks of himself as belonging in that cavern: "I think about that man because I am that man myself," he tells Aleša (IX, 137). Next, the cavern motif, which in *The Eleusinian Festival* appears in a context of Greek religion, assumes Christian form as the pit of hell, a permutation of images in accord with the relative position of the two poems by Schiller that are the vehicle of Mitja's "confession." For *The Eleusinian Festival* is pagan in inspiration, *To Joy* fundamentally Christian. Similarly, within the total action of the novel Mitja's development proceeds from Dionysian ecstasy to Christian adoration. However, it is not simply a question of one being superseded by the other; there is permanence as well as change. As is the case in *To Joy*, the two religious and cultural outlooks — Greek and Christian — are intimately fused. On the level of symbolism, the primitive cavern inheres in the new image. And in this cavern, in the pit, Mitja will "begin a hymn. Let me be accursed, let me be mean and base, only let me kiss the hem of the vestment in which my God is clothed. Though I may be following the devil, at the same time I am still your son, my Lord, and I love you, and I feel the joy

---

accomplishment. In the Prologue in Heaven, the Lord speaks in these words to Mephistopheles:

> Man's activity can all too easily slacken off,
> Soon he will love to have absolute rest;
> Therefore I am glad to give him a companion,
> Who acts and provokes and must as devil create.

(Johann Wolfgang Goethe, *Goethes Werke* III: *Faust* [Basel, 1944], 12.)

without which the world cannot stand or exist" (IX, 137).

At the end of the second stanza of *To Joy* recited by Mitja — characteristically in reverse order — appear the two lines which have already been mentioned: "To insects — sensual lust, / And the angel stands before God" (IX, 138). Though Mitja identifies with the insect, the lowest creature in the hierarchy of creation, he will, like the angels who see God — and like Aleša, consistently called "angel" or "cherub" — render thanks to God, despite the "terrible amount of suffering for man on earth" (IX, 137). Mitja's hymn, of course, is quite different from the one referred to by Ivan and the Devil. Mitja, ready to intone a hymn in hell, the perennial symbol of absence of eternal harmony, requires no faith in a future harmony to justify his acceptance of life. Much less would he reject creation on the ground that even such an eventual harmony could not justify the suffering of the innocent. Here is total, unquestioning, and ecstatic affirmation, a Dostoevskian *amor fati*.

The chief permutation of the cavern is the mine, which Mitja envisages as his place of expiation. The hymn returns, now associated with several other motifs, but principally that of the individual's responsibility for all. As one of the innocent "big children," Mitja takes upon himself freely the suffering for which Ivan holds God guilty. To Aleša he says:

> There are many of them there, hundreds of them underground, with hammers in their hands. Oh, yes, we'll be in chains and there won't be any freedom, but then, in our great sorrow, we shall rise again to joy, without which man cannot live nor God exist, for God gives joy: it's his privilege, a great one.... If they banish God from the earth, we'll shelter him underground. It's impossible for a convict to be without God, even more impossible than for a non-convict. And then we men underground will sing from the bowels of the earth a tragic hymn to God, with whom is joy. Hail to God and his joy! I love him (IX, 105).

Once more the cavern motif from *The Eleusinian Festival* and the hymn and joy motifs from its companion poem are intimately connected.[22] Uniting Greek and Christian elements, the joy of life here celebrated is the chief "argument" against Ivan's denial — joy shared in the consciousness of mutual responsibility.

Not that Mitja's mind is unclouded by doubts. Katja, reporting what she has heard from Mitja himself, associates the hymn with "some cross he has to bear, some duty" (X, 317); and after he is sentenced, Mitja

[22] As a curiosity it may be mentioned that Mme Xoxlakova's "gold mines" constitute a comic permutation of the cavern motif.

questions his readiness to carry the cross: "I have been lying here all night, passing judgment on myself. I'm not ready! I'm not able to resign myself. I wanted to sing a 'hymn,' but if a guard acts familiar with me I cannot bear it" (X, 321). These doubts, however, do not affect the basic pattern: the joy of existence, wrested from suffering and reverberated whether from the cavern, the pit of hell, or the salt mine, remains the chief alternative to atheistic denial in the book. And it is by exploiting and expanding images and ideas from two of Schiller's poems that Dostoevskij has made this counterthrust to unbelief.

However, the function of *To Joy* within the structure of *The Brothers Karamazov* is broader than this; in fact, it provides images that cut across the various philosophical attitudes presented in the novel. This is clearly evident from the manner in which Dostoevskij develops a verbal motif which occurs only in the Russian translation of the poem. The two stanzas recited by Mitja have, in the translation by Tjutčev used by Dostoevskij, a metaphorical structure consisting largely of images of drinking.[23] One phrase, *kubok žizni* [the "cup of life"], reverberates with a variety of meanings throughout the novel. Tjutčev

[23] I shall give the two stanzas in Russian translation and indicate Tjutčev's major changes:

Dušu bož'ego tvoren'ja
Radost' večnaja poit,
Tajnoj siloju brožen'ja
Kubok žizni plamenit;
Travku vymanila k svetu,
V solncy xaos razvila
I v prostranstvax, zvezdočetu
Nepodvlastnyx, razlila.

U grudi blagoj prirody
Vse, čto dyšit, radost' p'et;
Vse sozdan'ja, vse narody
Za soboj ona vlečet;
Nam druzej dala v nesčast'e,
Grozdij sok, venki xarit,
Nasekomym—sladotrast'e . . .
Angel—bogu predstoit.

(Dostoevskij, *Sobranie sočinenij* IX, 138).

Tjutčev's main changes appear in the initial four lines of the first stanza, where mechanical images – joy is called a "strong spring" [*Feder*] which "drives the wheels / In the great world clock" – have been consistently replaced by images of fermentation, drinking and fire, a change which is poetically justified by the imagery of Schiller's initial stanza:

Joy, lovely divine spark,
. . .
We enter, drunk with fire,

may have had the first stanza of Schiller's poem in mind when he made this translation. There, joy is called a "divine spark" [*Götterfunken*], and the worshipers are "drunk with fire" [*feuertrunken*]. Ivan Karamazov, not a particularly Dionysian character, is the one who expresses his attitude towards the world most consistently by means of the "cup of life" metaphor. As he uses the phrase, it is associated with alternate shame and longing rather than with joy, and it is tinged with irony. Whatever disillusionments he may meet with, he tells Aleša, "I'd want to live and, once having tasted of the cup, I wouldn't turn away from it till I'd emptied it! At thirty, though, I'll most likely renounce the cup, even if I've not emptied it, and turn away — I don't know where" (IX, 288). Because Ivan has no faith, joy does not fire "the cup of life with flame." And, therefore, at thirty he will "dash "the cup of life with flame."[24] And, therefore, at thirty he will "dash suicide; it could also mean sinking "into debauchery" and stifling one's soul "with corruption" (IX, 331). These contexts of the phrase suggest that the "cup of life" represents not simply the appetite for life, but also higher values. This is clearly apparent from what Ivan says about his father, who stands "on his sensuality as though on a rock — though after thirty, it is true, there may be nothing else to stand on" (IX, 290). There is an implication in all this that without higher values, and joy, life is not worth living; without these the "cup of life" will lose its savor. Feeling he possesses neither, Ivan can only envisage following his as yet healthy youthful instincts until such time as corruption sets in.

Interestingly, apart from the recital of the poem, Mitja never once uses the phrase being discussed: Mitja *drinks*, enjoying life in its most obvious physical aspect, the sensual. Yet, his attitude cannot be said to violate the spirit of Schiller's poem,[25] where drinking is ritual in char-

Into your celestial shrine.
(III, 115.)

Moreover, Tjutčev's rendering informs the poem as a whole with a religious sentiment that is more specifically Christian in character than that produced by Schiller's poem in the original.

[24] The lines in which this phrase occurs are accurately as well as forcefully rendered in Mrs. Garnett's translation of Dostoevskij's novel. See *The Brothers Karamazov* (New York, 1950), 126.

[25] Mitja is not simply a drunkard, though critics have applied both this and worse epithets to him. It is not inappropriate that he should be in an "exhilarated condition" (IX, 133) when he recites *To Joy*, which is so Dionysian despite its Christian ideas. We should believe Mitja, however, when he tells Aleša: "Don't think I'm jabbering away in drunkenness. I'm not drunk at all. Brandy is brandy, but I need two bottles to get me drunk .... But I haven't even drunk a quarter of a bottle ..." (IX, 136).

acter. While Mitja's toasts contain no promises or oaths — "Let's drink to life, dear brother," he says to his friend Petr Il'ič Perxotin. "What can be more precious than life? Nothing!" (IX, 505) — he has the true gift of joy, which requires no wine or brandy. As he tells his friend, "I'm drunk in spirit, Petr Il'ič, drunk in spirit!" (IX, 500). Like the worshippers in *To Joy* he is "drunk with fire," though he visits no "shrine" [*Heiligtum*]. It is through the hymn motif, as we have seen, that Mitja's religious yearnings are articulated and developed.

A masterly permutation of the "cup of life" motif is associated with Aleša and Father Zosima. It occurs in the strange chapter entitled "Cana of Galilee." The miracle at the center of this chapter, the turning of the water into wine, is crucial to the theme that "life is paradise." In context, the miracle is most important as a symbol of transfiguration [*preobraženie*]. " 'We are rejoicing,' the... little old man [Father Zosima] went on. We are drinking the new wine, the wine of a new great joy; do you see how many guests? Here are the bridegroom and the bride, here is the wise governor of the feast, he is tasting the new wine" (IX, 451). Viewed in the light of Schiller's *To Joy*, the Biblical story has become a vehicle of significant ritual; for they are drinking the *new* wine, the wine of the "*new*, great joy" (my italics). While it may seem that, with this permutation of the "cup of life" motif, Dostoevskij has passed beyond the sphere of thought and feeling associated with Schiller's poem, the central scene within Aleša's dream can be viewed as an enactment of the final line of *To Joy* quoted in Mitja's "confession": "And the angel stands before God" (IX, 138). As previously noted, the epithet "angel" is more than once applied to Aleša

I have shown how fertile the quoted stanzas of *To Joy* were as a source of symbolic motifs and how consistently Dostoevskij worked the latter into the larger structure of his novel. The last instance discussed, the "cup of life" motif, is used to epitomize three fundamental attitudes. Ivan fears he will lose his zest for life and that, ultimately, he will sink into a life of debauchery from lack of faith. Mitja has a true Dionysian inspiration, along with a kind of animal faith, but his purpose is as yet inchoate. Only Aleša among the brothers has a faith capable of informing life with meaning and with a "new, great joy." The motif can be interpreted in terms of theodicy as well: Ivan's idea of dashing the cup to the ground parallels his handing back the "entrance ticket" and his refusal to participate in the hymn; Mitja's ecstasies, whether purely Bacchic or Dionysian, are in harmony with the hymn, which is his deepest response to the problem of theodicy; and

the new wine of Father Zosima and Aleša is a religious symbol of the transformation of life, here and now, into paradise. This is Dostoevskij's ultimate answer to Ivan: transfiguration of life through love will do away with the evils on which Ivan bases his rejection;[26] indeed, these evils can vanish at any moment.

The spirit of ecstatic acceptance and universal brotherhood animating Schiller's poem, as well as *The Brothers Karamazov*, finds its ultimate expression in the idea of the resurrection of the dead; this idea can be seen as the answer to the surface theme of the novel, parricide, with which this discussion began. According to S. Frank, "Dostoevskij's notes show that, to him, parricide signified the greatest crime, man's deepest temptation, the epitome of sinfulness in general, as it were." Ultimately, parricide means falling away from the divine harmony of being, a view hinging upon Fedorov's concept of paternity. To Fedorov, " 'paternity,' the unity of the sons with the father, is the general foundation of human existence, the only possible basis of an all-embracing brotherhood of man. . . ."[27] This unity of the sons with the father demands as its utmost consequence and symbol the universal resurrection of the dead. Whether such a dénouement to history could satisfy an Ivan Karamazov is another matter.

[26] Though Ivan does not quote the context of Schiller's poem *Resignation* from which his formula of rejection is taken, it is noteworthy that the phrase "earthly paradise" appears in the Russian translation of the stanza where the phrase occurs. Here are the lines from Danilevskij's translation, which was printed in Gerbel' 's edition of Schiller's works, owned, according to Leonid Grossman, by Dostoevskij:

I gramotu na vxod' k zemnomu raju
Tebe neraspečatav vozvraščaju—
Blaženstvo bylo čuždo mne.

(Čiževskij, "Schiller und die 'Brüder Karamazov'," 11). Though Ivan speaks of "eternal harmony," the phrase "earthly paradise" used in the stanza from which he makes his paraphrase suggests that he would also reject the collective paradise of the Grand Inquisitor. The meaning of the term "earthly paradise" embodied in Father Zosima's autobiography is not applicable to *Resignation*.

It is well known that the "earthly paradise" or "golden age" is a widespread motif in Dostoevskij's work; it is particularly important in *A Raw Youth* and *The Dream of a Ridiculous Man*. Močul'skij claims that the idea of the golden age and world harmony, the "most sacred and most 'holy' of his ideas," stood in the center of Dostoevskij's *Weltanschauung* and creation (*op. cit.*, 96. See also V. Komarovič, "Mirovaja garmonija Dostoevskogo," *Atenej* 1-2 [1924], 141). Very possibly, Schiller's concept of the idyllic affected Dostoevskij's thought on this subject. For treatments of the motif, see L. Pogoževa, "Mečta Dostoevskogo o 'zolotom veke'," *Krasnaja nov'*, Feb. 1941, 173-181, and V. Setschkareff, "Dostojevskij und das Goldene Zeitalter," *Festschrift für Dmytro Čiževskyj zum 60 Geburts-Tag* (Berlin, 1954), 271-274.

[27] S. Frank, "Aus Dostojevskijs geistiger Werkstatt," *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 7 (1930), 138-140.

3. ELEMENTS OF MYSTICISM COMMON TO DOSTOEVSKIJ AND SCHILLER

As is well known, certain ideas of Dostoevskij's have an aura which is difficult to define and for which the term "mystical" and "mysticism" have often been used. Some of these ideas are fairly traditional, or they are such as Dostoevskij could easily have arrived at by himself on a Christian basis. For example, no superhuman genius would be required to transform the Biblical saying "the kingdom of God is within you" to Father Zosima's "life is paradise." Nevertheless, Dostoevskij was clearly influenced by certain native interpreters of Christianity with whose works he was familiar, especially Tixon Zadonskij and Nikolaj Fedorov.[28] However, several of the thoughts supposedly derived from Fedorov — to choose the figure whose influence is presumed to have been the strongest — were widely current and cannot definitely be traced to Fedorov; secondly, these, as well as associated ideas to which there is nothing comparable in Fedorov, have close counterparts in various works of Schiller.[29] Three such thoughts are the mystical unity of all life, the ecstatic embrace of nature, and planetary-spiritual parallelism.

There is a profound similarity between the mystical philosophy of nature expressed in *The Brothers Karamazov* and Schiller's philosophy as expressed in *Theosophy of Julius* and several poems. The basic metaphysical conception in the *Theology of Julius* is that of a mystical unity through which nature and man become absorbed in the divine. The ruling force within this unity is love, which rewards its votaries with the most intense joy. Though these ideas are nothing extraordinary and could be found in any number of sources, detailed similarities between Schiller's and Dostoevskij's imagery give a special status to *Theosophy of Julius.*

To illustrate the organic relationship of the individual and humanity, for example, Schiller uses the image of flow, suggesting the most intimate fusion of elements. The context of the passage is the infinite ramifications of one's actions, the awareness of which confuses the borderline between the ego and mankind: mankind is a "body in which *his* [the individual's] life, forgotten and dispensable, swims like a drop of blood."[30] In *The Brothers Karamazov* the image of the sea which is

[28] *Ibid.*, 137-141.
[29] Čiževskij, "Šiller v Rossii," 133.
[30] In *The Idiot,* as I have shown, Ippolit's "Explanation" draws upon *Theosophy of Julius* for a similar conception.

potential in "swims" comes to the surface in Father Zosima's deathbed talk, except that the organic concept here implied embraces nature as well as man. Recollecting the attitude of his brother before he died, Father Zosima develops a panpsychistic philosophy in oceanic terms: "for all is like an ocean, all is flowing and blending; if you touch one place, it reverberates at the other end of the earth." In this universal interfusion of living forms, the relationship between man and nature is characterized by an "all-embracing love" and "rapture" (IX, 400). Interestingly, *Theosophy of Julius* also contains a passage in which the relationship of man and nature is compared to that of lover and beloved. Schiller speaks of certain moments in which we are "disposed to press every flower and every remote star, every worm and every imagined higher spirit to our bosom — an embrace of all nature as our beloved." Through this embrace man approaches the divine: "The entire creation dissolves in his personality" (V, 121). After Aleša's dream of the wedding in Cana, this conception becomes a living experience. In this passage Dostoevskij reveals himself as a genuine lyrical poet. The stillness, the "shining stars," the slumbering flowers — all is permeated with mystery: "the mystery of earth was one with that of the stars." Aleša's response is to throw himself down, embracing the earth and kissing it (IX, 452).

Of particular interest is the star-spirit parallelism in both authors' work. Schiller uses such parallelism in several poems, namely, *Fantasy: To Laura, The Friendship* — a truncated version of which appears in *Theosophy of Julius* — and *To Joy*. The first of these, belonging to a group of poems with which Dostoevskij shows intimate familiarity in his article against Dobroljubov and the utilitarian conception of art,[31] works out the parallel between the material and the spiritual, and the union of the two realms through love. Here are a few lines: "Love guides the spheres within one another, / World systems endure only through it," and, "Without love no spring returns, / Without love no being praises God!" (III, 34). In *The Friendship*, after stating that the same "turn of the wheel" drives both "the world of spirits and the tumult of the material world," Schiller elaborates the parallel. While the "spheres" move in their "labyrinthine orbits" around the "heart of the great cosmos,"

> *Spirits* in embracing systems
> Stream toward the great sun of the spirits [*Geistersonne*]
> As brooks rush to the sea. (III, 73.)

[31] F. F. Doestoevskij," –Bov i vopros ob iskusstve," *Polnoe sobranie xudožest-*

In *To Joy* the realms of the stars and of the spirit are variously juxtaposed, with joy rather than love as the all-penetrating, uniting element.

In *The Brothers Karamazov* this mystical analogy appears most explicitly in the chapter entitled "Cana of Galilee." Of the objects that are part of Aleša's experience of rapture, only one, the "shining stars," is repeated. "Oh! in his rapture he was weeping even over those stars, which were shining to him from the abyss, and 'he was not ashamed of that ecstasy.' Threads from all those innumerable worlds of God seemed to come together in his soul, and it was trembling all over 'in contact with other worlds' " (IX, 452). The fusion of star and soul also manifests itself in metaphor. After Aleša has returned to the monastery, "fragments of thoughts flashed through his soul, burned like stars and went out again at once, to be succeeded by others; and yet there reigned in his soul a sense of the wholeness of things . . ." (IX, 448-449). Star and spirit come together even more intimately in a question which Father Zosima directs to Aleša at the dream-wedding: "Do you see our sun, do you see him?" (IX, 451). This question, in which the sun symbolizes Christ, sounds like an echo of the last lines quoted above from Schiller's poem *The Friendship.*

4. THE "HIGHER MAN" MOTIF

The Schillerian materials so far discussed serve as vehicles of religious and philosophical ideas. Because the moral-ethical concepts for which Dostoevskij is partially indebted to Schiller have received close attention from other scholars, the following discussion will be brief. Reference has been made to the "higher man" and to universal responsibility. As a mediating concept between these contrary notions, Dostoevskij holds the idea that every man, regardless of whether he be a "higher" man or not, participates in the lowest human attributes. In *The Brothers Karamazov*, as also in *A Raw Youth*, its chief manifestation is the "broadness" of human nature. In the former, it is introduced by Mitja, who after reciting *To Joy* tells Aleša: "Yes, man is broad, too broad, indeed; I'd have him narrower" (IX, 138). The symbol for this attribute of participation in the lowest is the ubiquitous insect to which is given "sensual lust." Even the saintliest man has his part in *nasekomost'*, the insect nature. To Aleša, Mitja says: "All we Karamazovs are such insects and that insect lives in you too, angel, and will stir up a tempest

vennyx proizvedenij XIII, 87-88.

in your blood" (IX, 138). While Dostoevskij's use of insects and reptiles in *The Brothers Karamazov* is consistent with his previous practice, in no other work do references to lower animals constitute a strand of imagery of comparable force.

All men participate in the lowest animal attributes of human nature, yet they often fail to draw the moral consequences from this fact. The Karamazov brothers, Ivan included, recognize their insect nature, but Ivan differs from the others by morbidly indulging it in a sado-masochistic spirit. Čiževskij says that "Ivan's tales of the tortured children are saturated with a cruel lust. . . ."[32] Yet, Ivan is quite self-righteous and, unlike Aleša and Mitja, puts himself up as a judge over his father and his older brother. "One reptile will devour the other. And serve them right, too," he tells Aleša (IX, 179). These words imply that he has passed judgment on them both. Curiously, Ivan's hate for those closest to him is not irreconcilable with an abstract love of man; he rejects the "eternal harmony" precisely "from love of humanity" (IX, 307). Only a violent emotional upheaval can resolve such a paradoxical moral situation.

The moral position of Ivan is not dissimilar to that of Karl Moor in *The Robbers*. Karl seemingly holds himself to be a "higher man" and from his great height judges mankind — that is, the common run of men.[33] But gradually he realizes that he is intimately involved with the atrocities of the band of robbers that he leads, especially with the evils of those closest to him, such as Spiegelberg, who can be considered as his double.[34] Ivan Karamazov, with his pseudo-idealistic rejection of world harmony on account of the suffering of children and his preference for merely loving one's neighbors in the abstract, can only be made aware of his moral responsibility by learning how inescapably he shares in the moral nature of the lowest "reptile" of the book, Smerdjakov. Through his recognition of sharing guilt for parricide with Smerdjakov, Ivan is finally emerging from his moral self-sufficiency.

Besides the distinction between "higher" and ordinary which runs through *The Robbers* and several works of Dostoevskij, both authors employ the notion of a three-level hierarchy of human types. Schiller's dramatization of the idea of the "higher man" inevitably assumes the pattern of tragedy. However, his treatise on "aesthetic education" sets

[32] "Schiller und die 'Brüder Karamazov'," 21.
[33] *Ibid.*, 29.
[34] *Ibid.*, 32. –Besides Karl Moor and Spiegelberg, Čiževskij mentions Fiesko and the Moor as examples of the same moral phenomenon.

up a scheme whereby man can transcend this pattern and move toward perfection. The aesthetic type, embodying an equilibrium between the one-sided drives of the two lower — the sensual and the rational types — represents the highest perfection attainable by man.

The differences between the rational "higher man," such as Karl Moor, and the aesthetic type — "ideal" man — are crucial; yet Schiller displays a certain ambiguity in regard to their relative status. Interestingly, in Dostoevskij's novel a similar feeling is expressed. Mitja, who is used to focus the reader's attention upon the two rival images of man, seems unable to choose between them; that is, he cannot tell which of his two brothers, Ivan or Aleša, is the better man. To the latter he says: "You are everything to me. Though I say that Ivan is superior to us, you are my angel. Only your decision will decide it. Perhaps it's you that is superior and not Ivan" (X, 109-110). Mitja's puzzlement has a counterpart in Schiller's intellectual vacillation in his treatise. Though the general scheme assumes that the aesthetic man is the highest, often the order of the hierarchy is altered, so that the "man of reason" appears to be the highest. In these contexts, the aesthetic state seems purely transitional, as the only means through which sensual man may become rational (V, 380-385). Nevertheless, despite the tragic stature of rebels of reason like Karl Moor and Ivan Karamazov, the sympathies of the authors are never fundamentally in doubt.

Critics disagree about the philosophical basis of Dostoevskij's concept of the ideal man. While Čiževskij, for example, admits that the formal characteristics of Schiller's and Dostoevskij's ideal image of man are similar, even identical, he asserts that the bases of their conceptions lie in quite different spheres. Indeed, he says, "Dostoevskij attacks Schiller's conception of the 'higher' [ideal] man as one who is higher in beauty, as 'aesthetic' man. . . . Dostoevskij does not believe that beauty can create a stable equilibrium between two contending powers in the human soul."[35] Instead, Čiževskij concludes the author intended to present the *homo religiosus* as the highest type of man, and religion as the only means of salvation. Kurt Wais, on the contrary, discerns no intent in *The Brothers Karamazov* of refuting Schillerian aestheticism.[36]

Zen'kovskij's view provides a reconciling *tertium quid*. Despite his profound awareness of evil in man, Zen'kovskij asserts, Dostoevskij never gave up his early "Christian naturalism." This conception is a

[35] "Schiller und die 'Brüder Karamazov'," 23.
[36] "Schillers Wirkungsgeschichte im Ausland," 498.

"specific combination of *Rousseauism* and *Schillerism*, refracted through the prism of Christianity, a faith in 'nature' and an acknowledgement of the natural nobility — even though it may be concealed under outer crusts — and hidden 'sanctity' of the human soul; or, as Dostoyevsky expressed it in an article on George Sand, a recognition of the '*perfection* of the human soul'."[37] Elsewhere, Zen'kovskij says that the foundation of Dostoevskij's *Weltanschauung* consisted in "the aesthetic conception of the problem of life and of Christianity."[38] In view of this alleged aesthetic bias, it is interesting that the two divine events which were at the focus of Dostoevskij's religious thought, the Incarnation and the Transfiguration,[39] are also those which present the closest symbolic analogues to the process and purpose of literary creation.

[37] V. Zenkovsky, *A History of Russian Philosophy* I, 413.
[38] *Aus der Geschichte der ästhetischen Ideen in Russland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Musagetes* VII, ed. D. Čiževskij ('s-Gravenhage, 1958), 25.
[39] Zenkovsky, *A History of Russian Philosophy* I, 424.