# 3 The Greasy-Haired Pawnbroker and the Capitalist *Raskrasavitsa*: Dostoevsky's Businesswomen

VADIM SHNEYDER

## Dostoevsky's Businesswomen

Women's unusually strong property rights in Imperial Russia had important consequences both for Russian society and for Russian literature. Russian women retained the right to own and acquire separate property in marriage.[1] As the nineteenth-century feminist writer and critic Mariya Tsebrikova explained, "The pecuniary independence of the Russian woman – for she is mistress of her own fortune, as I have already stated – has led to her obtaining the few other privileges which she enjoys. As she owns property, she pays taxes, and therefore participates in the choice of the members of the municipal council (*gorodskaia ouprava*) [*sic*] which expends her money."[2] Nineteenth-century Russian literature offers numerous examples of economically independent women, from the landowners Korobochka in Nikolai Gogol's *Dead Souls* [Mertvye dushi, 1842] and Arina Petrovna Golovlyova in Mikhail Saltykov-Shchedrin's *The Golovlyovs* [Gospoda golovlevy, 1880] to owners of enterprises like Vera Pavlovna in Nikolai Chernyshevsky's *What Is to Be Done?* [Chto delat'?, 1863] and a number of characters in stories by Anton Chekhov. In this respect, Dostoevsky may be unusual only in terms of the relative frequency with which wealthy women appear in his works.

Scholars examining Dostoevsky's representation of women have come to different conclusions regarding his treatment of women's property. Sally Livingston argues that nineteenth-century Russian women writers could posit alternatives to the marriage plot for their female protagonists, while Dostoevsky and other male writers responded by portraying "propertied heroines as dangerous and controlling."[3] Ultimately, argues Livingston, Dostoevsky "neutralizes the women of property, subjugating their wealth to spiritual redemption," so that they come to function as "vehicles through which Dostoevsky conveys his larger message about the

evils of money."[4] On the other hand, Nina Pelikan Straus emphasizes the ways that money allows some of Dostoevsky's female characters to resist their own commodification. Writing about *Brothers Karamazov* [Brat'ia Karamazovy, 1880], Straus argues that "Katerina and Grushenka differ from these women [i.e., women who are forced by poverty to acquiesce to purchase by men] in a major respect […] Each has money and therefore more choice; neither Grushenka nor Katerina can be 'bought' like Nastasya Filippovna or the poverty-stricken gentle creature."[5] Furthermore, "each woman actively participates in culturally symbolic transactions involving money that allow her to remain independent of men's evaluations of her to some extent."[6]

Perhaps Livingston and Straus are both right: women of property in Dostoevsky often lose their property in order to embark upon their own redemption or to become vehicles for the redemption of others. At the same time, women who control property exert power over men. Indeed, propertied women in Dostoevsky's fictions are frequently both economically active subjects and objects of desire, coercion, and violence. The aim of the following pages is to examine this subject/object duality in the broader context of Dostoevsky's economic plots and to deepen our understanding of the ways that money, gender, and power interact in Dostoevsky's fictions. In the process, this chapter focuses, to a large extent, on apparent *melochi* – insignificant details. Two case studies – one drawn from *Crime and Punishment* [Prestuplenie i nakazanie], the other from *Brothers Karamazov* – will aim to show how details pertaining to the description of two exemplary businesswomen link them to their characteristic forms of money. At the same time, these details – the greasy hair of the pawnbroker Alyona Ivanovna and the curiously abstract "curve" expressed in the body of the (part-time) moneylender Grushenka – also illustrate the other crucial dimension of each Dostoevskian businesswoman: her status as an object of male observation and violence. Each of these telling details is isomorphic with a type of money and, more broadly, a character type within Dostoevsky's taxonomy of economic elites.

In Dostoevsky's fictions, most rich characters resemble their money.[7] This applies to the two major categories of these characters, who can be distinguished as merchants and capitalists (a distinction that does not necessarily hold in the works of other nineteenth-century Russian writers or in Russian history). Alyona Ivanovna and Grushenka generally correspond to merchants and capitalists, and their characteristic details point to their function within two quite different novelistic economies. Whereas Alyona Ivanovna is linked, like Dostoevsky's merchant characters, to immobile, unexchangeable money, Grushenka is connected to the model of Dostoevsky's capitalists, who are linked to abstract, fungible

capital. At the same time, in their imperfect correspondence to these models of economic activity, with their related narrative forms, the cases of Alyona Ivanovna and Grushenka also reveal how Dostoevsky's economic imaginary is gendered.

**Capitalists and Merchants in Dostoevsky's Economic Imaginary**

Dostoevsky's character system accommodates a considerable number of pawnbrokers, landlords, lawyers, merchants, and businesspeople loosely labelled "*delovye liudi*." Within this range of characters largely defined by their relationship to money, there are, broadly, two types, whom I have categorized elsewhere as capitalists and merchants.[8] It is in *The Idiot* [Idiot, 1869] that Dostoevsky offers the clearest differentiation of these types. Among the St Petersburg super-rich in that novel there is a somewhat indistinct man named Afanasy Ivanovich Totsky, known for being "a landowner and arch-capitalist [raskapitalistom], a member of companies and societies."[9] What is an arch-capitalist? This distinctive locution enters the novel through the speech of the verbally excessive civil servant Lebedev. It appears to be Dostoevsky's neologism, alongside other nouns augmented with the intensifying prefix *-raz*: *razarestant* (arch-prisoner), *razgenii* (arch-genius), *razmillioner* (arch-millionaire).[10] It is, moreover, one that appears only once in all of Dostoevsky's oeuvre.[11] Despite its unique application to him, this word tells us rather little about Totsky. We learn almost nothing about his biography, except that, many years earlier, he became the guardian of the adolescent Nastasya Filippovna and used his position to rape her. He fears exposure of this single biographical fact and tries to bribe an ambitious and acquisitive young suitor, Gavrila Ardalionovich, into marrying Nastasya Filippovna with a dowry of 75,000 rubles. When a scandal ensues at her name-day party, he makes a quiet exit from the novel, but reappears in the narrator's recollections at the very end, at which point we learn that he, unlike the novel's protagonists – Myshkin, Rogozhin, and Nastasya Filippovna – is, by all indications, doing fine at the novel's conclusion. When his money is no longer significant to the plot, Totsky vanishes, but unlike the characters in this novel who make their exits by dying, going mad, or being sentenced to hard labour, Totsky leaves the novel unharmed. This ability to slip away is a telling feature of Dostoevsky's capitalists.

The very lack of description that makes Totsky so illegible within the novel and so easily dismissed form its plot associates him with the endlessly mobile, amorphous wealth that he derives from his activities as an arch-capitalist. This money is generated somewhere on the fringes of the novel's diegesis and flows from these undescribed "companies

and societies" into unspecified repositories where it remains available, if Totsky needed to deploy it at a narratively pivotal moment. He does not need to bring his 75,000 rubles to Nastasya Filippovna's apartment; everyone believes that he has the money, and that is enough. Diametrically opposed to capitalists like Totsky are the Dostoevskian merchants, of whom Rogozhin is the most fully elaborated example. In general, the merchants tend to be suspicious and conservative. They build their insular lives around their wealth, which has a tendency to assume the form of cash, and they hoard this cash in their massive, solid houses. The merchants are merchants somehow ontologically – immobile, isolated, and, at extreme points, tending to fuse with their possessions, like Kuzma Kuzmich Samsonov in *Brothers Karamazov*, who has become immobile and sits permanently inside his house. These merchants owe much to traditional miser types in European literature, although Dostoevsky imbues his most prominent merchants, like Rogozhin, with tempestuous interior depths: he is a "usurer … with poetry," as a draft to *The Idiot* puts it (9:142).[12]

Dostoevskian capitalists are less like the traditional misers of European literature. They are always busy, constantly accumulating new capital through ceaseless activity that usually involves manipulating the institutions of modern society. General Yepanchin, another prominent capitalist in *The Idiot*, is a self-made man, a soldier's son who rose from such disreputable activities as tax farming to owning expensive rental properties in St Petersburg and a factory on its outskirts, as well as participating in a joint-stock company. His wealth is abstract like Totsky's, consisting of assets that stretch across the novel's imaginary topography. Likewise, Luzhin in *Crime and Punishment* is a modern type of capitalist. He is a lawyer, benefiting from the newfound relevance of his profession in the wake of the 1864 legal reform. Like his counterparts in other works of Russian fiction of the time, Luzhin seeks to turn his legal expertise into a remunerative business.[13] While the merchants hoard, the capitalists invest. The economic immobility of Dostoevskian merchants tends to fix them narratively as well. The capitalists, on the other hand, range far and wide in their novels, and their narrative future tends to remain open at the end.

Dostoevsky's businesswomen broadly fit into these two categories of economic elites. Although Alyona Ivanovna does not belong to the merchant estate, she shares their key features, such as the physicality of their wealth and their harmony with their interior spaces. Grushenka, on the other hand, shares important traits of the capitalists.[14] Although her description by the narrator of *Brothers Karamazov* is considerably more detailed than that of most of the capitalists who inhabit Dostoevsky's

novels, her physicality bears traces of the capitalists' distinctive abstractness. These similarities notwithstanding, Dostoevskian businesswomen differ from their male counterparts in several significant ways. They tend to have a narrower range of occupations. Both Alyona Ivanovna and Grushenka collect debts (although Grushenka does not loan money).[15] Other, more marginal, characters, like Zarnitsyna, Raskolnikov's landlady, own real estate. More significantly, unlike businessmen in Dostoevsky's novels, the businesswomen are never just businesswomen. Whereas wealthy men are largely defined by and congruent with their wealth, there seems always to be a descriptive excess associated with the businesswoman. In each case examined here, in the course of introducing the character, the narrator will come to a telling detail, which will complicate the connection between the woman and her moneymaking by defining her in part as an object of a (male) character's actions or desires. In their constantly oscillating status as, alternately, agents and objects of economic transactions, Dostoevskian businesswomen do not fit their milieus quite as snugly as do their male counterparts.

**Interior Description and Essence**

We can see a clear example of the differing degrees of correspondence between character and milieu by comparing the relationship of two characters and their homes. Once again, *The Idiot* furnishes the best material for comparison. In Part 2 of that novel, Prince Myshkin pays a visit to the house where Rogozhin lives with his elderly mother. Myshkin explains to Rogozhin that he was able to identify the building from the street on account of a mysterious similitude between its appearance and the essence of its owners:

> Your house has the physiognomy of your whole family and your whole Rogozhin life. But ask me why I came to this conclusion, and I won't be able to explain it at all. It's nonsense, of course. It even frightens me that this concerns me so much. Before, I would not have even thought that you live in such a house, but once I saw it, it immediately occurred to me: "Yes, why he has to have a house exactly like this!" (8:172)

Myshkin finds that the house's details are legible, and what he reads in them is the nature of the Rogozhin family: the dark recesses, the thick, almost windowless walls, and the money-changing booths run by *skoptsy* on the lower floors all say something about the Rogozhins and about Parfyon Semyonovich in particular.[16] William Comer summarizes the metonymic links joining the house and its occupants as follows: "secretive

gloom – the house – the 'Castrates' – Rogozhin."[17] The Rogozhin family essence, objectified in the house, also suggests Rogozhin's destiny. The encounter with Nastasya Filippovna sets Rogozhin on a path of public confrontation and wanton expenditure, but even his passionate desire for her ultimately assumes the form of greed. As Michael Holquist puts it, "he is a miser who takes very seriously the grim joke of Nastasya Filippovna's sale of herself to the highest bidder in the auction that concludes the first book of the novel. Having bought her, he seeks to hoard her – because she possesses him."[18] In the end, Rogozhin's essence reasserts itself and pulls him back into the world of his family home – which is where his story ends in a deranged embrace with Myshkin beside Nastasya Filippovna's body.

At first glance, every detail of Alyona Ivanovna's appearance seems to indicate that she fits her apartment just as well as Rogozhin corresponded to his house. Although she is a minor character, we learn a gread deal about her details. Near the beginning of *Crime and Punishment*, Raskolnikov pays a visit to the apartment from which Alyona Ivanovna conducts her business. He has prepared for this meeting – this trial run for the murder – by deliberately dwelling on the danger posed by insignificant details (*melochi*) to his carefully reasoned plan. Walking through Haymarket Square, he is singled out by some passerby on account of his grotesque hat. "Some stupid little thing, some banal little detail could ruin the whole idea!" Raskolnikov reflects (6:9). The word *meloch'* occurs four times on this page as Raskolnikov reflects: "It's precisely these little details that always bring ruin to everything." This is, in a certain sense, precisely what will happen later. Raskolnikov forgets to close the door after he kills Alyona Ivanovna, and this *meloch'* means that Lizaveta enters silently when he is in the other room. As far as he is concerned, she – and, possibly, her unborn child as well, since Raskolnikov overhears that Lizaveta is "constantly pregnant" (6:54) – are likewise *melochi* – and to such an extent that he famously forgets about them.[19] But for now, he meticulously registers every detail of the building in which the pawnbroker lives.

When Alyona Ivanovna responds to his knock by opening the door to her apartment, he looks inside, and this motivates the first of the novel's interior descriptions.[20] The pawnbroker's apartment, filled with suffocating air and furnishings all tinged with yellow, is itself a metonym of the febrile city suffering under a July heatwave. In addition to the intensification of the urban atmosphere, as focalized through Raskolnikov's tormented subjectivity, this glimpse of the apartment also incorporates Alyona Ivanovna into the novel's system of social classification.[21] Like Rogozhin's house, this apartment gives material expression to a

particular social category: in this case, the apartments of "cruel and old widows" (6:9). Observing the old and oddly shaped objects in the apartment (including a "round table of an oval shape"), Raskolnikov notices that, despite the obvious age of the furnishings and the signs of poverty and decay, "everything was very clean: both the furniture and the floors were polished to a shine; everything gleamed" (6:9). The pawnbroker's tyrannical will has evidently imposed itself upon all the objects in this apartment (and upon Alyona Ivanovna's half-sister Lizaveta, who tends to them and keeps everything shiny and free of dust). Later, after the murder, when Raskolnikov rummages through the pledges in the pawnbroker's lockbox, he will find that the apparent disorder in which they are scattered among items of clothing in fact gives way to a systematic organization of carefully wrapped and hidden objects. It turns out that everything in this small and poor interior has its place. Even a cracked saucer has found purpose as a soap holder, which Raskolnikov finds while he is trying to scrub the blood from the handle of his ax. Everything in this space is rigorously controlled, and the space itself is totally sequestered from the outside by numerous locks and bolts.

In most respects, Alyona Ivanovna is like the space she inhabits. Her clothing, faded and yellowed, seems in harmony with the apartment's yellow wallpaper. The flannel and fur that she wears intensifies the sensation of heat that pervades these rooms. The adjectives that the narrator attaches to Alyona Ivanovna's physical description likewise suggest that she belongs in this hot and desiccated environment: she is "a dry little old lady, about sixty, with sharp and cruel eyes and a sharp little nose" (6:8). A dried-up, suspicious old woman, living out her life inside a tiny, hermetically sealed apartment with her accumulated wealth: Alyona Ivanova is a familiar type. She clearly descends from the misers of European literary tradition, which, as Jillian Porter has shown, adapted to the formal and thematic demands of Russian realism even as other traditional types tended to obsolesce.[22] Like Rogozhin, she dwells and hoards in secret.

The particular similitude that obtains between Alyona Ivanovna and her interior stems from several sources. One of these is likely Balzac. In his novel *Eugénie Grandet* (1834), whose Russian translation was Dostoevsky's first published work, the protagonist, a miser's daughter, ends up succumbing to the rigorous discipline of monetary accumulation: "money was destined to impart its cold glitter to her angelic life and to inspire a mistrust of feeling in a woman who was all feeling."[23] At the end of the novel, the narrator informs us that Eugénie, now the widowed Madame de Bonfons, lives in solitude in the house where she grew up. "The house at Saumur, sunless, devoid of warmth, gloomy,

and always in the shade, reflects her life."[24] Notably, both the passages about the cold glitter of money and the description of the gloomy house in Saumur were absent from the published text of Dostoevsky's translation as it appeared in the journal *Repertoire and Pantheon*, although it is unclear if this absence reflects Dostoevsky's choice or the editor's.[25] Regardless, Dostoevsky undoubtedly read these descriptions as he carefully worked his way through Balzac's text. While he opted to emphasize Eugénie's "suffering self-denial" and her sentimental relationship with her servant Nanon, rather than her relationship to money, the image of a woman shaped and transformed by money comes back forcefully twenty years later in the figure of Alyona Ivanovna.[26] In his translation, Dostoevsky does make one suggestive lexical change: whereas Balzac attributes to the aging Eugénie "the rigidity [raideur] of the old maid," Dostoevsky translates *raideur* as *sukhost'* (dryness), which anticipates the miserly dryness of the pawnbroker in *Crime and Punishment*.[27]

Furthermore, certain textual details suggest that Alyona Ivanovna is related to another character type intimately linked to interior spaces in realist novels: the landlady. Elisa Frost has observed that within the intricate system of doubles in *Crime and Punishment*, several plot details – stairs, debts, apartments, the alternation of Raskolnikov's thoughts – link Alyona Ivanovna to his landlady Zarnitsyna, and, by extension, to what Frost calls the "landlady topos" in Russian fiction.[28] Insofar as Alyona Ivanovna functions as a quasi-landlady in the character system of *Crime and Punishment*, she brings to mind another character from Balzac: Madame Vauquer, the quintessential landlady from *Father Goriot* [Le Père Goriot, 1835]. The deep connections between this novel and *Crime and Punishment* have been examined extensively.[29] As for Madame Vauquer, Erich Auerbach provided the classic analysis of the essential connection, the "harmony," that obtained between the landlady and her boarding house.[30] What asserts the connection between the landlady and her property is, as Hayden White suggests, the perspective of the implied author, with his interest in social taxonomy.[31] An observer's consciousness establishes the link between the woman and the interior space she inhabits, identifying her as a type linked to a particular environment. In the case of *Crime and Punishment*, Raskolnikov, who seeks both to scrutinize and to kill, focalizes the narrative perspective that establishes a similar kind of harmony between Alyona Ivanovna and her interior. It is also because of the prominent place of Raskolnikov's subjectivity in this scene that the accummulated details of Alyona Ivanovna's description will eventually disrupt the Balzacian harmony between her and her environment.

**Alyona Ivanovna's Hair**

Among the things that Raskolnikov notices as he glances over the apartment is Alyona Ivanovna's hair: "Her blond hair, with just a bit of gray, was thickly covered in grease" (6:8). The greasiness of her hair is sufficiently noteworthy to merit a second mention when Raskolnikov returns to the apartment to murder her (6:63). This time, nothing else about Alyona Ivanovna or her home attracts the narrator's attention, here again focalized through Raskolnikov's subjectivity: only her hair, which Raskolnikov presumably notices moments before striking her head with the ax. This little bit of obdurate detail drives a tiny wedge between Alyona Ivanovna and her apartment. While all the objects are spotlessly clean, her hair is greasy. In this novel, and in particular in these scenes where Raskolnikov's preoccupation with *melochi* causes everything to overflow in semiotic excess, the pawnbroker's greasy hair is unlikely to be merely an inert bit of nineteenth-century realia.

I think that we can gain insight into the meaning of this greasy hair by way of a distant source: twentieth-century existential phenomenology. Near the end of *Being and Nothingness*, Jean-Paul Sartre examines the tactile quality of *viscosité*, which can be translated as sliminess or stickiness.[32] What makes this material property so notable for Sartre is its capacity to simultaneously define and threaten the boundaries of the embodied self and the world it inhabits:

> There is something like a tactile fascination in the slimy. I am no longer the master in *arresting* the process of appropriation. It continues. In one sense it is like the supreme docility of the possessed, the fidelity of a dog who *gives himself* even when one does not want him any longer, and in another sense there is underneath this docility a surreptitious appropriation of the possessor by the possessed.[33]

Although one may choose the moment when one touches a slimy or sticky substance, one does not have the same degree of choice in disengaging from it. Its traces remain on one's fingers for a long time, a reminder that one has been changed by this contact, which cannot be undone. The same property of lingering contact, which resists the body's attempts to extricate itself, also obtains in the case of the greasy, and this, I think, is where the deeper significance of Alyona Ivanovna's hair becomes apparent. Grease spreads to surfaces it contacts, and it is not soluble in water, a substance with no shortage of symbolic resonances in *Crime and Punishment*.[34] Once Raskolnikov commits murder, traces of this act, and of his victim, will cling to him like the blood that contaminates

the fringes of his clothing. But this persistence of Alyona Ivanovna has meaning only for Raskolnikov: she continues to exist, in a sense, but only as his nightmares and torments. In other words, Alyona Ivanovna's greasy hair, which severs the link between her and her milieu, simultaneously makes her an object for Raskolnikov to observe, to murder, and to think about later as he takes his slow path from error to redemption.

Sticky and greasy substances will continue to adhere to Raskolnikov throughout the novel.[35] The one other appearance of a person explicitly described as greasy takes place between Raskolnikov's two visits to Alyona Ivanovna's, when he steps into the bar where he meets Marmeladov. In that case, the bar's proprietor has a face "as if smeared in grease, just like an iron lock" (6:10). This greasy proprietor is congruent with his bar, where the tables are sticky and the food smells rotten. Moments later, in this environment where everything sticks and becomes contaminated, Raskolnikov will encounter Marmeladov, the ex–civil servant whose sugary name is also redolent of stickiness, and the two men will become morally and narratively entangled. The sticky, beer-encrusted table on which Raskolnikov rests his sleeves just before his conversation with Marmeladov seems likewise to contain the implication that Raskolnikov has not fully removed himself from the intersubjective density of his social surroundings. Later, Raskolnikov will help carry the dying Marmeladov to his family's apartment. Afterward, Nikodim Fomich, the police officer, notes that Raskolnikov is covered in blood:

> "You are all soaked in blood," noted Nikodim Fomich, observing several fresh stains on Raskolnikov's vest in the light of a street lamp. "Yes, I got soaked … I am all covered in blood!," said Raskolnikov with some special look, then he smiled, nodded his head, and went down the stairs. (6:145)

This "special look" refers, of course, to Raskolnikov's awareness that he has been covered in blood before. But this sticky blood also reifies the persistent stickiness of social connections in this novel.

Like the sticky tabletop in the bar, which itself adumbrates Marmeladov's sticky blood, Alyona Ivanovna's greasy hair turns out to be more than a mere *meloch'*. It is what Naomi Schor has called a "diegetic detail," that is, one belonging to "that class of details which is situated on the evenmential[36] plane of the text, and which involves those prosaic objects whose exchange and communication constitute the classical realist narrative."[37] Unlike those apparently non-signifying details exposed by Roland Barthes that duly proclaim "we are the real,"[38] the diegetic detail establishes a link between background and foreground, object and subject. This particular detail, the greasy hair, pulls Alyona Ivanovna out of

the "semantic matrix" of her room and into the accreted associations in Raskolnikov's mind.[39] That grease becomes one of the many substances in this novel that leave traces on Raskolnikov, whether materially or mentally. That is to say, the notable greasiness of Alyona Ivanovna's hair becomes a sign of her own transformation into an object for Raskolnikov's hypertrophied consciousness.

This is the kind of objectification that Dostoevsky's characters often seek to avoid by means of accumulating money. In an 1880 note, Dostoevsky wrote: "Wealth (Hard to save oneself [or to be saved – spastis']). Wealth is the augmentation of the individual [or subjectivity – lichnosti], a mechanical and spiritual satisfaction, thus, separation of the individual from the whole" (27:49). In the novels, Dostoevsky's money-loving characters often desire money because of the hypertrophied individual power that it can grant them. This is, for example, the dream of Arkady Dolgoruky in *The Adolescent* [Podrostok, 1875].[40] But if Alyona Ivanovna, as a Dostoevskian miser, had sought isolation in her rigorously separated and compartmentalized apartment, that ceased to be a possibility when she became the object of Raskolnikov's contemplation and, eventually, his murder victim. Her money could not shield her from this process, a sort of dissolution, whereby she became the vehicle for Raskolnikov's redemption.[41] This transformation of her into an object of another's will makes it impossible for her to remain solely a miser in harmony with her hoard. This does not happen to Dostoevsky's businessmen.

### From *Raskapitalist* to *Raskrasavitsa*

Alyona Ivanovna broadly corresponds to Dostoevsky's secretive, avaricious merchants. While she is evidently not of merchant origin, she shares a common literary ancestor with characters like Rogozhin in the traditional misers of European literature. There is also at least one Dostoevskian businesswoman who similarly corresponds to the capitalists. This is not the woman actually called a capitalist by other characters: in *Demons* [Besy, 1872], the estate-owning Varvara Petrovna earns this unflattering label for attempting to found a literary journal and allegedly "exploiting" workers' labour in the process (10:22).[42] Likewise, it is not the woman who has the most to say about capitalism: the landowner Madame Khokhlakova, who discourses about the problems besetting the Russian financial system while Mitya desperately seeks three thousand rubles. Both of these wealthy landowners reside in the old world of Russia's pre-capitalist economy, which survives in the provinces even as Dostoevsky's Petersburg hurtles into a future ruled by non-noble wealth. Their association with capitalism is faintly ridiculous. It is Grushenka,

an impoverished young woman who grew up under the tutelage of a merchant, who most clearly exhibits the the abstraction characteristic of a Dostoevskian capitalist. In the chapter titled "The Little Onion," in Book Seven of *Brothers Karamazov*, we learn about Grushenka's current living arrangements and business activities in the provincial town of Skotoprigonevsk. After she was abandoned by her fiancé, the seventeen-year-old Grushenka found a patron in the local merchant Samsonov. She now rents a room belonging to a relative of his, an old spinster. Grushenka lives under the watchful eye of this woman, but it turns out that the surveillance is unnecessary because she exhibits some of Samsonov's own habits. She is shrewd, calculating, minimizes contact with other people, and devotes herself to making money. The narrator informs us that, in the course of four years, Grushenka has grown quite wealthy through her business. We learn that she grew up into a woman "having good sense in money, acquisitive, miserly, and cautious, who had already managed, by fair or unfair means, as people said about her, to knock together a little fortune of her own" (14:311). Her financial skill has earned her a reputation as a "Jewess" [zhidovka], and she has teamed up with Fyodor Pavlovich Karamazov to buy up discounted promissory notes and collect the debts at a considerable profit.

"Acquisitive" Grushenka is thus a successful businesswoman who has proven herself capable of accumulating a considerable capital by earning large profits. Although the narrator does not call her a capitalist, she belongs to the capitalist type within Dostoevsky's taxonomy of rich people, even if she does not rise to the heights of a millionaire like Totsky. In mid-nineteenth-century Russian usage, a capitalist was someone who was, in Vladimir Dal's definition, "a rich person, one who has a great deal of money, a large amount of capital [velik istinnik]."[43] In Dostoevsky's works, this word refers either to markedly modern entrepreneurs, or, with discernible irony, to those who obviously are not, such as Varvara Petrovna in *Demons* or Samsonov himself, whom Mitya tries to flatter in hopes of borrowing three thousand rubles: "If only you would lend me these three thousand … since who is a capitalist [kapitalist] compared to you in this little town?" (14:335). Samsonov is shrewd and calculating, but he exhibits the characteristic ponderousness of Dostoevsky's merchants – in his case, this is manifested physically in his inability to walk. Grushenka, on the other hand, is dynamic and adaptable and has grown rich with minimal financial support from Samsonov. She has evidently even managed to outwit the old merchant by making herself indispensable to him ("Grushenka stunned him, so that he could not live without her") (14:311). It is this ability of Grushenka to profit from her own status as a desired commodity that distinguishes her from the male capitalists.

Although Grushenka belongs to a lower rank of capitalists than the *raskapitalist* Totsky, the narrator assigns her comparable status in an altogether different category. A few lines before we read the details of her financial activities, the narrator makes use of the same prefix, favoured by Dostoevsky, to relate that Grushenka has grown into a "*raskrasavitsa*," a superlative beauty.[44] In the difference between a *raskapitalist* and a *raskrasavitsa*, the shifting meaning of the businesswoman in Dostoevsky's fiction emerges. In the course of describing Grushenka's business activities, the narrator notes how unusual it is for her to reward any man with positive attention. The narrator observes that there are many in the town who sought the "acquisition" [priobretenie] of this acquisitive woman's good graces (14:311). This repetition carries the strong suggestion that Grushenka is both the subject and object of the same transactional logic. While she exercises considerable economic power, she also belongs to the category of "beautiful female commodities whom men attempt to buy as though they were prostitutes."[45]

Grushenka's status as both a businesswoman and a commodity becomes apparent in her interactions with Mitya. In the story of their meeting, she emerges as the unlikely successor to Alyona Ivanovna. When Mitya first tells Alyosha about her, he relates how she "she likes to earn money, earns it by lending at evil rates, she is a swindler, a rouge, merciless [den'gu nazhit' liubit, nazhivaet, na zlye protsenty daet, proidokha, shel'ma, bez zhalosti]" (14:109). Mitya's first meaningful encounter with Grushenka takes places when he goes to her house with the intention of beating her, because his father had transferred to her a promissory note in Mitya's name. Mitya intends to harm Grushenka out of anger that she now possesses his debt, not for some thought experiment like Raskolnikov. Nevertheless, the parallels between these two plot situations are considerable. The crucial difference is what happens occurs when Mitya arrives at Grushenka's house. As we learn from Mitya's account to Alyosha, Grushenka, like Alyona Ivanovna, has a distinctive physical attribute: a certain curve [izgib] of her body. Once he sees this curve, Mitya falls in love with Grushenka. Instead of beating her in accordance with his plan, he goes carousing with her and spends three thousand rubles entrusted to him by Katerina Ivanovna. We hear no more of the promissory note, and the financial relationship, in which Mitya had become Grushenka's debtor, has given way to a relationship of desire, so Mitya will now go to extreme lengths to acquire three thousand rubles not to pay his debt to Grushenka, but to acquire her. Since Fyodor Pavlovich has already fallen in love with Grushenka in the course of their joint enterprise, the debt collector becomes the object of competition between father and son, and each seeks to entice her with the promise of money, even though, as

a contemporary reviewer complained, three thousand rubles would not have meant much to the rich businesswoman.[46]

In the course of this competition, Grushenka takes her place among the diverse objects in the novel – including a lawyer's fees and a café-restaurant in Moscow – whose postulated price happens to be three thousand rubles.[47] This price, in turn, takes its place in a register of commodified women in Dostoevsky's fiction, including Nastasya Filippovna in *The Idiot*, as well as both Sonya Marmeladova and Avdotia Raskolnikova in *Crime and Punishment*, Varenka in *Poor Folk* [Bednye liudi, 1846], and many others. Grushenka's designation as a *raskrasavitsa* posits her as a supremely desirable object, but her apparent price is the same as several utterly disparate objects. The extraordinary fungibility of the three thousand rubles in *Brothers Karamazov* merits more detailed examination than is possible here.[48] What matters for the present argument is Grushenka's connection to this kind of amorphous, endlessly motile money. Much of the drama in the trial scene at the end of the novel rests on Mitya's inability to prove that the money he had been carrying around his neck did not come from the bundle of money stolen from Fyodor Pavlovich's room. Money from any source could have served as the projected payment for Grushenka according to the economic logic that predominates in this novel.

Grushenka's resemblance to this untraceable money is apparent in the distinctive nature of her physical form. Despite Mitya's quite concrete attraction to her, the particular object of his obsession is curiously abstract – a curve that is reproduced fractally on every level of her body: "I'm telling you: a curve. Grushenka, that rogue, has this curve in her body, it's reflected on her foot and even in her left pinky toe" (14:109). This structure, endlessly reduplicating itself, and, furthermore, somehow linked to her penchant for trickery, seems to describe Grushenka's essence as much as her body. Indeed, she will prove, in the course of the novel, to be an elusive, amorphous person. By the end, she apparently gives up her business, but what remains is the resemblance between her form – each curve like every other – and the flow of endlessly self-similar money that at times falls under her control and at other times absorbs her.

Whereas the money in *Brothers Karamazov* is difficult to authenticate, its origins disappearing in the course of its circulation, the money that initiates the causal chain of events in *Crime and Punishment* remains inextricable from its physical context. Like the blood that contaminates all of Raskolnikov's rags, the money and valuables that he takes from the dead pawnbroker's apartment prove to be tainted by their origin and incapable of being spent or exchanged. Having justified his crime as a means to acquire start-up capital, Raskolnikov ends up being unable to do

anything with the money he has stolen except to hide it: the rationalized robbery becomes, in desperation, a burial. Separated from her money, Alyona Ivanovna lingers on as the ineradicable trace of crime. She meets a bad end like the Dostoevskian merchants generally do, but her fate is not to die on her moneybags. It is, rather, to become pure object, a faint trace of greasiness. Grushenka's fate, like that of the capitalists, remains open at the end of her novel. In her commitment to follow Mitya into Siberian exile, she appears to shake off all traces of her capitalist activity.[49] In this respect, Grushenka, as a female character, appears to be less locked in to the circulation of capital than are her male counterparts.

Although having money means that Alyona Ivanovna and Grushenka exercise considerably more power than the numerous poor women in Dostoevsky's novels, neither of them remains sequestered from the relentless expansion of commodification, which spreads though the language of Dostoevsky's works, even capturing the most seemingly unpecuniary concepts in its orbit.[50] Whereas the male capitalists, like Totsky and Yepanchin, pass through the plot of *The Idiot* ultimately unaffected by what has taken place around them, both of the businesswomen examined here remain, despite their money, linked to a world of people and objects. In the case of the (male) merchants and capitalists, money functions as an extension of the man and resembles him accordingly. On the other hand, Alyona Ivanovna and Grushenka both lose contact with their money by the end of their respective stories. In the process, however, they come to resemble money in another of its Dostoevskian guises: a kind of substantivized metaphor, capable of taking on the resemblance of seemingly disparate things. The desiccated pawnbroker metamorphoses into an unremovable stickiness. The *raskrasavitsa* becomes a *raskapitalistka*, and vice versa.

## NOTES

1 For an overview of the situation of Russian noblewomen, see Michelle Lamarche Marrese, *A Woman's Kingdom: Noblewomen and the Control of Property in Russia, 1700–1861* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), 1–9. Marrese focuses on the period before 1861. For an examination of women's economic activity over the course of the whole nineteenth century, see Galina Ulianova, *Female Entrepreneurs in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (London: Routledge, 2009).

2 Marie Zebrikoff, "Chapter XIV: Russia," in *The Woman Question in Europe: A Series of Original Essays*, ed. Theodore Stanton (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1884), 400. This essay is also cited in Sally

A. Livingston, *Marriage, Property, and Women's Narratives* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 121.

3 Livingston, *Marriage, Property, and Women's Narratives*, 133.

4 Ibid., 136.

5 Nina Pelikan Straus, *Dostoevsky and the Woman Question: Rereadings at the End of a Century* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1994), 124–5.

6 Ibid., 124–5.

7 It is notable, but beyond the scope of this chapter, that so much wealth in Dostoevsky's fictions is contained in money rather than landed property. Much of that money also belongs to characters who are not nobles. For more on this issue, see Vadim Shneyder, *Russia's Capitalist Realism: Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Chekhov* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2020), chapters 3 and 4.

8 For a detailed examination of capitalists and merchants in *The Idiot*, and the relationship between their distinctive forms of money and the development of the novel's narrative form, see Vadim Shneyder, "Myshkin's Million: Merchants, Capitalists, and the Economic Imaginary in *The Idiot*," *The Russian Review* 77, no. 2 (March 2018): 241–58.

9 F.M. Dostoevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh*, ed. G.M. Fridlender et al. (Leningrad: "Nauka," 1972–90), vol. 8, 11. Subsequent volume and page number references to this edition will be indicated in the text in parentheses: (vol.:page). All translations in this chapter are mine unless specified otherwise.

10 I.V. Ruzhitskii, "Atopony Dostoevskogo: K proektu slovaria," *Voprosy leksikografii* 1, no. 5 (2014): 64.

11 According to the *Statisticheskii slovar' iazyka Dostoevskogo*, ed. A.Ia. Shaikevich et al. (Moscow: Iazyki slovianskoi kul'tury, 2003), 342, *raskapitalist* appears only once in his entire oeuvre. See also the article on *kapital* in Dostoevsky's writings: *Slovar' iazyka Dostoevskogo: Leksicheskii stroi idiolekta*, issue 1, ed. Iu.N. Karaulov et al. (Moscow: "Azbukovnik," 2001), 186–9. On the productivity of the prefix *-raz* in the Russian literary language of the 1830s and '40s, including in Dostoevsky's early works, see L.I. Shotskaia, "Leksiko-semanticheskie gruppy s narodno-razgovornymi slvoobrazovatel'nymi priznakami v proze 30–40-kh godov XIX veka," in *Voprosy stilistiki russkogo iazyka*, ed. L.I. Shotskaia et al. (Irkutsk: Irkutskii Gosudarstvennyi Pedagogicheskii Institut, 1973), 10–17. Shotaskaia notes that nouns of this type tend to be "situational, stylistically motivated" and "unreproducible in literary language" (16).

12 Of course, Rogozhin is more than a miser. His willingness to spend extravagantly in order to impress Nastasya Filippovna leads to conflict with his father. It also makes his money, as a tactile object, central to the plot of *The Idiot*.

13 A particularly striking, albeit neglected, example is P.D. Boborykin's *Del' tsy* (1870–1), which features a larger-than-life lawyer-capitalist named Salamatov, who makes tens of thousands of rubles a day writing up commercial documents that exploit various loopholes in the law.

14 To be clear, "merchants" and "capitalists" are convenient names for two literary types, rather than sociological categories. That Alyona Ivanovna does not come from a merchant family is arguably less important than her typological similarity (although, as we will see, not perfect identity) with merchant characters from other novels by Dostoevsky.

15 Nathan Rosen has catalogued the major moneylenders and usurers in Dostoevsky's novels; aside from the two women, these include Ptitsyn in *The Idiot*, Liamshyn in *Demons*, and Perkhotin and Fyodor Pavlovich Karamazov in *Brothers Karamazov*. See Nathan Rosen, review of *Dostoevsky and the Jews*, by David I. Goldstein, *Dostoevsky Studies* Old Series, no. 3 (1982): 200–2.

16 For an analysis of the ways in which Dostoevsky foregrounds the gothic in his discussion of the Rogozhin house and how this spatial description informs the novel's narrative structure, see Katherine Bowers's chapter in this volume.

17 William J. Comer, "Rogozhin and the 'Castrates': Russian Religious Traditions in Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*," *Slavic and East European Journal* 40, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 90.

18 Michael Holquist, "Gaps in Christology: *The Idiot*," in *Dostoevsky: New Perspectives*, ed. Robert Louis Jackson (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984), 142. For a different reading of Rogozhin, one according to which he departs from the trajectory of the miser, see Gary Rosenshield, *Challenging the Bard: Dostoevsky and Pushkin, a Study of Literary Relationship* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2013), 221–2.

19 Several scholars have examined Raskolnikov's telling forgetfulness. See Richard Peace, *Dostoyevsky: An Examination of the Major Novels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), 39–40; Deborah A. Martinsen, "Shame and Punishment," *Dostoevsky Studies* New Series, no. 5 (2001): 60; and Olga Meerson, *Dostoevsky's Taboos* (Dresden: Dresden University Press, 1998), 56–7. On the significance of *melochi* – including Lizaveta, see Robin Feuer Miller, *Dostoevsky's Unfinished Journey* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 64–7.

20 Sarah J. Young examines the importance of interior spaces in *Crime and Punishment* as locations where characters become embodied – often through the mediating effect of a concealed eavesdropper. See her chapter in this volume.

21 Donald Fanger, *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism: A Study of Dostoevsky in Relation to Balzac, Dickens, and Gogol* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1998), 197.

22 Jillian Porter, *Economies of Feeling: Russian Literature under Nicholas I* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2017), 113–14.

23 Comparisons of Dostoevsky's translation to Balzac's original were long marred by inattention to the edition that Dostoevsky used – the 1834 edition, which differs in significant ways from the edition of 1843, which has become canonical. See Vera Nechaeva's discussion of the various editions of *Eugénie Grandet* and her convincing conclusion that Dostoevsky used the edition of 1834 in V.S. Nechaeva, *Rannii Dostoevskii 1821–1849* (Moscow: Nauka, 1979), 106–7. When quoting from Balzac, I have checked the modern English translation against this edition: M. de Balzac, *Eugénie Grandet*, in *Études de mœurs au XIXe siècle. Scènes de la vie de province*, tome 5, vol. 1 (Madame Charles-Béchet, 1834), 381. English translation from Honoré de Balzac, *Eugénie Grandet*, trans. Sylvia Raphael (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 192.

24 Balzac, *Eugénie Grandet*, 380; *Eugénie Grandet*, trans. Raphael, 191–2.

25 By Nechaeva's count, the cuts imposed by the editors amounted to 10–15 pages out of 150 pages of text. The final pages of the novel contain some of the most significant paraphrases and omissions, some evidently made out of consideration of the censor. See Nechaeva, *Rannii Dostoevskii*, 110–12.

26 The quotation comes from Dostoevsky's translation of *Eugénie Grandet* in the new edition of the *Complete Collected Works*: F.M. Dostoevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v tridtsati piati tomakh*, 2-e izdanie, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe, ed. V.E. Bagno et al. (St Petersburg: Nauka, 2013) vol. 1, 466. While taking issue with claims that Dostoevsky's translation was loose and unfaithful to the original, Nechaeva notes that he emphasizes Eugénie's moral elevation above her social surroundings and reduces her complexity somewhat. The overall result, Nechaeva concludes, is that Dostoevsky "departed from Balzac's naturalistic depictions of the everyday and went in the direction of deepening the characters psychologically, while giving sentimentalism its due with a heightened emotional, occasionally melodramatic tone in the representation of his heroes' experiences" (*Rannii Dostoevskii*, 126).

27 Balzac, *Eugénie Grandet*, 380. Dostoevskii, *PSS* 2nd ed., vol. 1, 465.

28 Elisa S. Frost, "The Hut on Chicken Legs: Encounters with Landladies in Russian Literature" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin Madison, 2002), 239–43.

29 See Priscilla Meyer, *How the Russians Read the French: Lermontov, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy* (Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 2008), 119–23, and Leonid Grossman, *Bal'zak i Dostoevskii*, in *Poetika Dostoevskogo* (Moscow: 39-aia tip. Internatsional'naia "Mospoligraf," 1925), 92–107.

30 Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 470–3.

31 Hayden White, "Auerbach's Literary History," in *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 92–3.

32 Jean-Paul Sartre, *Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology*, trans. Hazel E. Barnes (New York: Washington Square Press, 1966), 765–80. I have chosen to follow Barnes in rendering *visqueux* as "slimy."

33 Ibid., 776. Italics in original. Sartre's discussion of sliminess is accompanied by explicit associations of the slimy with the feminine – associations that have been examined in detail by feminist critics. See Margery L. Collins and Christine Pierce, "Holes and Slime: Sexism in Sartre's Psychoanalysis," *Philosophical Forum* 5, nos. 1–2 (Fall–Winter 1973–4): 112–27.

34 See, for instance, George Gibian, "Traditional Symbolism in *Crime and Punishment*" *PMLA* 70, no. 5 (December 1955): 982–5.

35 The meaning and function of sticky and greasy substances in the symbolic matrix of Dostoevsky's works deserve more detailed examination. Particularly notable among the multifarious meanings of stickiness is the image of the "sticky little leaves," which, as Robin Feuer Miller has pointed out, can serve as a "tag phrase identifying Ivan Karamazov," which indicates that he, too, is still sticky – still "susceptible to experience." Miller, *Dostoevsky's Unfinished Journey*, 179, 182.

36 That is, the plane of events.

37 Naomi Schor, *Reading in Detail: Aesthetics and the Feminine* (New York: Methuen, 1987), 142.

38 Roland Barthes, "The Reality Effect," in *The Rustle of Language*, trans. Richard Howard (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 141–8. This is the sort of realist detail from which Schor distinguishes the diegetic detail.

39 I borrow this term from Faith Wilson Stein, "Wallpapering the Novel: Economics, Aesthetics, and the Realist Home" (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2013), 150.

40 See Yuri Corrigan, *Dostoevsky and the Riddle of the Self* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2017), 108.

41 Straus reads Raskolnikov's relationship to women in *Crime and Punishment* with a different emphasis. "Bakhtinian feminism re-engages the question of Raskolnikov's motives by suggesting that his 'self' is not a self-sufficient entity, but is constituted by the variously assimilated voices of others: his mother's and Dunia's voice, the intellectual's voice associated with 'Napoleon,' and Sonya's voice, to name just a few." Nina Pelikan Strauss, "'Why Did I Say 'Women'?' Raskolnikov Reimagined," *Diacritics* 23, no. 1 (1993): 55.

42 Another time, Pyotr Stepanovich Verkhovensky explains the transactional nature of the relationship between Varvara Petrovna and his father, Stepan Trofimovich: "I proved to her, like two times two, that you lived to mutual advantage [na vzaimnykh vygodakh]: she as a capitalist and you as her sentimental fool" (10:239).

43 V.I. Dal', *Tolkovyi slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo iazyka* (Moscow: Tipografiia lazaretskogo instituta vostochnykh iazykov, 1865), vol. 2, 704.

44 In all its forms, *raskrasavitsa* appears eleven times in Dostoevsky's fictional works. See *Slovar' iazyka Dostoevskogo*, ed. Iu.N. Karaulov (Moscow: "Azbukovnik," 2012), 294. The word is applied by various speakers to Katerina Ivanovna and Grushenka in *Brothers Karamazov*, Avdotia Romanovna in *Crime and Punishment*, and Nastasya Filippovna and an undetermined beauty whom Totsky would like to marry in *The Idiot*. Outside of Dostoevsky's works, *raskrasavitsa* was a relatively common word in nineteenth-century Russian literature. It occurs, for example, in Nikolai Leskov's *The Enchanted Wanderer* [Ocharovannyi strannik, 1873], which features another *raskrasavitsa* named Grushenka, and in Andrei Melnikov-Pechersky's *On the Hills* [Na gorakh, 1875–81], as a component of folksy, colloquial formulas: "Well, he is a nice young fellow, and you are a maidenly beauty [raskrasavitsa-devitsa]," said Patap Maksimych. "Now, by the testament of your grandfathers and great-grandfathers, we ought to kiss for love, counsel, and a long and happy life. Be so kind as to conclude the Lord's blessing by your kiss." P.I. Mel'nikov-Pecherskii, *Na gorakh*, Part 4, in *Sobranie sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda," 1976), vol. 7, 96–7.

45 Straus, *Dostoevsky and the Woman Question*, 127.

46 Oniks [V. Petersen], "Vstuplenie k romanu angela," *Literaturnaia gazeta* 6 (1881), quoted in V. Zelinskii, *Kriticheskii komentarii k sochineniiam F.M. Dostoevskogo. Sbornik kriticheskikh statei. Chast' chetvertaia: "Brat'ia Karamazovy,"* 3rd ed. (Moscow: Tipo-lit V. Rikhter, 1906), 504.

47 See Jacques Catteau, *Dostoyevsky and the Process of Literary Creation*, trans. Audrey Littlewood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 164–5.

48 For more on the adventures of the three thousand and their broader meaning for *Brothers Karamazov*, see Jonathan Paine, *Selling the Story: Transaction and Narrative Value in Balzac, Dostoevsky, and Zola* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2019), 156–82, and Shneyder, *Russia's Capitalist Realism*, chapter 4.

49 In following Mitya into Siberian exile, Grushenka enters into a different kind of Dostoevskian narrative paradigm: the open-ended and ambiguous romantic relationships that Anna Berman examines in chapter 2 of the present volume. There is nothing that precludes capitalists from having families in Dostoevsky's novels: General Yepanchin in *The Idiot* has a happy family life with a wife and three daughters. But the danger and uncertainty of life with Mitya – possibly in America – distinguishes her future path from that of the male capitalists, who carry on their steady accumulation.

50 See Susan McReynolds, "'You Can Buy the Whole World': The Problem of Redemption in *The Brothers Karamazov*," *Slavic and East European Journal* 52, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 87–111.