

OLGA STUCHEBRUKHOV

University of California
Davis

Hesychastic Ideas and the Concept of Integral Knowledge in *Crime and Punishment*

In his work *Christian Teaching about Knowledge*,¹ Vassily Zenkovsky notes that the first systematic approach to the topic of gnoseology in Russia was started by I.V. Kireevsky and A.S. Khomyakov. And although, as Zenkovsky remarks, Kireevsky and Khomyakov did not manage to create a well-established gnoseological system, their idea of integral knowledge (целостный разум) can be viewed as a fully developed and highly original philosophical concept.

Founded on the works of such famous Orthodox figures as St. Symeon the New Theologian, St. Gregory Palamas, St. Isaac the Syrian, St. Mark the Ascetic, St. John of the Ladder, and others, the concept of integral knowledge has roots in the Orthodox mystical tradition of hesychasm. According to hesychast teaching, man's primary goal is an experiential knowledge of God, which is achieved by "bringing one's mind to one's heart" ("сведение ума в сердце") or by aligning one's mind with the Divine Energies. Guided by hesychast teaching, Kireevsky and Khomyakov criticize the Western penchant "to deify" the human mind, reason, and logic. Instead, they see the mind as part of a broader cognitive totality that includes intuition, feeling, and man's overall capacity to apprehend the world.

In their recent works, Italian scholar Simonetta Salvestroni and Russian critic Olga Bogdanova talk at length about Dostoevsky's

¹ В. В. Зеньковский, *Основы христианской философии*, том первый (Москва: Свято-Владимирское братство, 1992).

knowledge of hesychasm.² Bogdanova, in fact, asserts that not only Dostoevsky's contact with the elders of Optina Pustyn and his deep awareness and appreciation of the spiritual life of the people but also his good knowledge of the works of the older generation of Russian Slavophiles—Kireevsky and Khomyakov included—could have introduced Dostoevsky to hesychasm.³ Nina Budanova's recent article, "Books Given to Dostoevsky as a Gift in Optina Pustyn,"⁴ emphasizes that Dostoevsky's interest in spiritual literature emerged in the 1850s, much earlier than had been previously believed. Therefore, it is safe to suggest that at the time of writing *Crime and Punishment* (1866) Dostoevsky was well aware of hesychasm and its philosophical offspring, the concept of integral knowledge. This fact sheds new light on the novel's obsessive preoccupation with the issues of intelligence and madness (ум и безумие), rationality and wisdom (рассудок и разум), head and heart (голова/рассудок и сердце), mind and nature (рассудок и природа). In order to grasp the significance of these intricately juxtaposed concepts and their importance for our understanding of the novel's characters, this article examines the ideological background of *Crime and Punishment* through the prism of hesychasm and the concept of integral knowledge, as articulated by Kireevsky and Khomyakov.

It is commonly known that *Crime and Punishment* reflects the ideas and the sentiments of the 1860s, the years of Alexander II's Great Reforms. A renowned Eastern Orthodox theologian and historian, Fr. Georges Florovsky calls these years a certain historical reversal to the authority figures of the Enlightenment, with their unshakeable belief in the power of human reason. Florovsky depicts this epoch in *anti-hesychastic* terms. One of the main elements of hesychasm is "sober attention and prayer" ("трезвение и молитва").⁵ Sobriety is associated

² О. А. Богданова, *Под созвездием Достоевского*, глава "Исихазм и хилиазм: антропологическая концепция и тип апокалипсического сознания в творчестве Ф.М. Достоевского и в литературе Серебряного века" (Москва: Издательство Кулагиной INTRADA, 2008); Симонетта Сальвестрони, *Библейские и святоотеческие источники романов Достоевского* (Санкт-Петербург: Академический проект, 2001) (перевод с итальянского).

³ Богданова, стр. 68-69.

⁴ Н. Буданова, «Книги, подаренные Ф.М. Достоевскому в Оптиной Пустыни» в журнале *Литература и церковь* №1 за 2005 г.

<http://sophia.orthodoxy.ru/magazine/20051/knigi.htm>.

⁵ According to St Symeon the New Theologian, "Sober attention and prayer are connected like body and soul: one is impossible without the other." ("Трезвение и молитва связаны, как душа с телом: одно не существует без другого.") Симеон Новый Богослов, «Метод священной молитвы и внимания Симеона Нового Богослова», перевод с древне-

with mental asceticism, with protecting one's mind from agitated thoughts and passions. Florovsky calls the 60s "inebriated" ("не-трезвыми"): "It was the least 'sober' time. It was indeed an inebriated time, the time of convulsive and obsessive passions. Behind the 'critical' evaluation of external actions were hiding not so critically evaluated reasons, the moralizing dogmatism of the Enlightenment" ("Всего менее то была "трезвая" эпоха. То было именно не-трезвое время, время увлечений, время припадочное и одержимое. И за 'критическим' образом внешних действий скрывались свои некритические предпосылки,—резонирующий догматизм Просвещения").⁶ In *Crime and Punishment* Dostoevsky is, in fact, trying to reveal this lack of "sobriety" of the 60s ("нетрезвость шестидесятых"). It is not without reason that the novel was initially called *The Little Drunkards* (*Пьяненькие*): This title could certainly imply not only the drinking epidemic of the post-reform years, but also the indulgence of the intelligentsia in abstract theories and projects, their state of mental agitation and excessive rationality.

Such "inebriation" is closely linked by Dostoevsky to madness that lies at the core of the seemingly logical theories of ordinary and extraordinary men and of "rational egoism" that guide the behavior of such characters as Raskolnikov, Luzhin, and Lebezyatnikov. The famous Raskolnikov's dream about the trichinae epidemic in the epilogue of the novel eloquently describes the insanity of the 60s. The infected people "immediately became possessed and mad. But never, never had people considered themselves so intelligent and unshakeable in the truth as did the infected ones" ("становились точас же бесноватыми и сумасшедшими. Но никогда, никогда люди не считали себя так умными и непоколебимыми в истине, как считали зараженные").⁷ Throughout the novel, Dostoevsky emphasizes the distinction between intelligence and wisdom, pointing out that intelligence without wisdom ceases to be intelligent. Ironically, this idea is well expressed in Raskolnikov's own statement about Luzhin: "He is an intelligent man, but it takes something

греческого и примечания А.Г. Дунаева, <http://st-jhouse.narod.ru/biblio/symeon1.htm>. All translations from Russian into English, with the exception of *Crime and Punishment*, are mine.

⁶ Георгий Флоровский, *Пути русского богословия*, изд. второе (Париж: YMCA-PRESS, 1981), стр. 286.

⁷ *Полное собрание сочинений Ф.М. Достоевского в 30-ти томах*, (Ленинград: Наука, 1972-1990), т.6, стр.419. *Crime and Punishment*, trans. by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (New York: Vintage Classics, 1993), p. 547 (hereafter the volume and the page and the page of the translation will be given).

more than intelligence to act intelligently” (“Человек он умный, но чтобы умно поступать—одного ума мало”).⁸ It explains Razumikhin’s paradoxical statement about Raskolnikov: “...I admit you’re a smart fellow, but you’re a fool!” (“...я сознаюсь, ты малый умный, но ты дурак!”).⁹ These statements go hand in hand with the following definition of intellect from *Philokalia*, a collection of texts by masters of the Eastern Orthodox hesychast tradition:

People are usually called intelligent based on the wrong definition of this word. The intelligent ones are not the ones who have studied the sayings and writings of the ancient wise men, but those who have an intelligent soul, who can distinguish good from evil, who run away from evil and instead wisely embrace the good, thanking God for that. Only such people should be called intelligent. (Люди обычно именовются умными, по неправильному употреблению сего слова. Не те умны, которые изучили изречения и писания древних мудрецов, но те, у которых душа—умна, которые могут рассудить, что добро и что зло; и злого и душевредного убегают, а о добром и душеполезном разумно радуют и делают то с великим к Богу благодарением. Эти одни по истине должны именоваться умными людьми).¹⁰

The “madness” of the 60s is epitomized in Raskolnikov’s crime and depicted in hesychastic terms as a struggle between his mind and his heart, his reason and his nature, throughout the novel. St. Maximus the Confessor distinguishes between man’s nature and man’s person, between the natural and the personal aspects of human will. The natural will is innate to any God-created being. The personal will is what distinguishes man from other men and includes his reason and free will, which may or may not be in alignment with his God-given nature.¹¹ Raskolnikov’s nature outsmarts his reason, not allowing him to commit a “perfect crime,” for as Porfiry Petrovich points out to him, man can lie, but his nature cannot: “Human nature is a mirror, sir, the clearest mirror” (“Зеркало натура, зеркало-с, самое прозрачное-с”).¹² Raskolnikov’s reason leads him to commit a crime; his nature punishes him for it. Being pulled in two opposite directions by his natural and personal wills, he feels “like a man condemned to death” before the murder that, as his reason tells him, is supposed to solve all his problems. To overcome this

⁸ 6: 180; 235.

⁹ 6: 130; 167.

¹⁰ <http://hesychasm.ru/library/dobro/txt03.htm>.

¹¹ G. C. Berthold, *Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings*, (New York: Paulist Press, 1985).

¹² 6: 264; 342.

madness, Raskolnikov needs to align his person with his nature, “to bring his mind to his heart.”

Florovsky speaks about the imperturbable feeling of infallibility that describes the infected people of Raskolnikov’s dream, asserting that despite denying traditional morality, “the men of the 60s were completely entangled in primitive moralizing and remained truly pedantic and doctrinaire in their hedonism and utilitarianism” (“шестидесятники” “оставались вполне в плену самого прописного морализма, оставались подлинными педантами и “законниками” в своем гедонизме и утилитаризме”).¹³ It is not without reason that Pyotr Petrovich Luzhin is worried whether *these people* will “expose him if he undertook this or that, or would they not expose him? And if they would expose him, then what for, and what exactly was it that one got exposed for nowadays?” (“обличат его, если он вот то-то предпримет, или не обличат? А если обличат, то за что именно, и за что собственно теперь обличают?”).¹⁴

Ironically, while struggling with the religion, mysticism, and idealism of the previous generations, the generation of the 1860s created its own religion based on materialism and rationalism. Nikolai Strakhov writes, “Raskolnikov has reached the very end of the road that his flawed reason put him on. This trait of character..., his extreme earnestness, as if religiosity..., is the reason of our many woes” (“Раскольник дошел до конца, до края той дороги, на которую завел его заблудший ум. Эта черта... чрезвычайной серьезности, как бы религиозности..., есть причина многих наших бед”).¹⁵ Raskolnikov’s last name points to his potential readiness to die for his ideals, as did the Russian schismatics (раскольники) throughout history. However, Raskolnikov’s ideals have been born from his mind rather than his heart, making them essentially flawed, in Dostoevsky’s eyes. Porfiry Petrovich tells Raskolnikov: “I regard you as one of those men who could have their guts cut out, and would stand and look at his torturers with a smile—*provided* he’s found faith, or God” (“Я вас почитаю за одного из таких, которым хоть кишки вырезай, а он будет стоять да с улыбкой смотреть на мучителей, – если только веру иль бога найдет”).¹⁶

To better understand the subtle nature of Raskolnikov’s rationalism, it is necessary to compare it with the bourgeois pragmatism of Luzhin or

¹³ Флоровский, *Пути русского православия*, стр. 287.

¹⁴ 6:279; 364.

¹⁵ 7:353.

¹⁶ 6: 351; 460 (emphasis added).

with the primitive logic of Lebezyatnikov: It is precisely the “religiousness” of his character that distinguishes Raskolnikov from these adherents of the new theories. If Raskolnikov’s theory is built upon the principle of service to humanity, then Luzhin interprets the theory of “rational egoism” not in the spirit of the generation of the 60s with their religious adherence to serving the society, but as profit-oriented, a genuine invention of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois rational egotism demands personal enrichment as the basis of universal wealth, an idea that attracts Luzhin in this theory.

It is peculiar that both in Raskolnikov’s and in Luzhin’s theory there is a reinterpretation of such biblical laws as “do not kill” and “love your neighbor as yourself.” They are reduced from the moral absolute to the rational schemes: “An isolated evildoing is permissible if the main purpose is good,” (“единичное злодейство позволительно, если главная цель хороша”)¹⁷ and “love your neighbor, provided you have a surplus of wealth.” Regardless of their twisted theories, Raskolnikov and Luzhin represent two different types of rationality, abstractly speculative and socially conditioned, so that they “in their own interest have so distorted everything they’ve touched that they have decidedly befouled the whole cause” (“до того исказили они все, к чему ни прикоснулись, в свой интерес, что решительно все дело испакостили”),¹⁸ as Razumikhin points out.

Another representative of excessive rationality in the novel, Lebezyatnikov, belongs to the “powerful, all-knowing, all-despising, and all-exposing circles” (“мощным, всезнающим, всех презирающим и всех обличающим кружкам”).¹⁹ Unlike Raskolnikov, Lebezyatnikov is not a “monomaniac” but rather a “fellow-traveler.” Lebezyatnikov’s character lacks profundity; thus, he turns into a parody of the generation of the 60s.

Both Khomyakov and Kireevsky connect the propensity towards excessive rationality with the West. In his article, “About the Character of European Enlightenment and Its Relation to the Enlightenment in Russia” (“О характере просвещения Европы и о его отношении к просвещению в России”) (1852), Kireevsky defines rather broadly the difference between the historically Russian way of thinking with the Western one: On the one hand, we deal with the integrity and wisdom (разумность) of the “ancient Russian type of enlightenment” (“древне-Русской образованности”), on the other hand, with the split

¹⁷ 6: 378, 490.

¹⁸ 6:116, 149.

¹⁹ 6:278, 363.

consciousness and excessive rationality of Western European thought. In his turn, Khomyakov defines Western European consciousness as “solitary” and “anti-communal” (“одинокое,” “анти-соборное”) because knowledge for him is not primarily an individual phenomenon, nor is it reducible to logic. Kireevsky links the decline of the Russian type of enlightenment to the schism in the Russian Orthodox Church that led to the gradual substitution of the spirit of the Orthodox teaching with “the respect for external formalities” (“уважение к наружным формам”) and “the aspiration towards foreign forms and sensibilities” (“стремление к формам чужим и к чужому духу”).²⁰ One may say, then, that the whole purpose of Raskolnikov’s odyssey is to return to the roots of the spiritual wisdom inherent in the Russian national type of enlightenment, to recover his integral knowledge, his capacity to harmonize his mind with his heart.

Kireevsky’s and Khomyakov’s description of abstract “solitary” mind is quite useful for understanding Raskolnikov’s precarious predicament. When isolated from all other sides of human nature, the mind turns into an “abstract syllogism that accepts nothing but its own deductive reasoning” (“отвлеченный силлогизм, не признающий ничего, кроме себя и личного опыта”),²¹ thereby enclosing it in an “abstract dialectic circle” (“круг отвлеченного диалектического процесса”), says Kireevsky.²² According to Khomyakov, excessive rationality leads to the “deadening of spirit” (“омертвление духа”), which can be clearly seen in Raskolnikov: “Everything was blank and dead, like the stones he was walking on, dead for him, for him alone...” (“Все было глухо и мертво, как камни, по котрым он ступал, для него мертво, для него одного...”).²³ Resurrection, thus, should be understood as the victory over excessive rationality, which the epilogue to *Crime and Punishment* describes as leaving the circle of abstracted dialectics for the spheres lying above rational thinking. Dostoevsky writes of Raskolnikov: “Instead of dialectics, there was life, and something completely different had to work itself out in his consciousness” (“Вместо диалектики наступила жизнь, и в сознании должно было выработаться что-то совершенно другое”).²⁴ The fog that “suddenly fell around him and confined him in a hopeless and heavy solitude” (“упал вдруг перед ним и заключил его в

²⁰ И.В. Киреевский, *Полное собрание сочинений*, том 2 (Москва: Типография П. Бахметева, 1861), стр.278-279.

²¹ Kireevsky, 232.

²² Kireevsky, 234.

²³ 6: 135; 174.

²⁴ 6:422; 550.

безвыходное и тяжелое уединение”)²⁵ in the beginning of the novel lifts. Using hesychast notions, one could say that Raskolnikov finally “brings his mind to his heart” or, in Kireyevsky’s terms, “subdues [his] abstract mind” (“покоряет себе внешний разум”).

A different fate awaits Svidrigailov, another “martyr” of rationalism. Unlike Raskolnikov, who suffers only from overindulgence of the mind, Svidrigailov²⁶ suffers from sensual intemperance as well. According to Kireyevsky, excessive emphasis on human intellect and senses is embodied in two schools of gnoseology, rationalism and empiricism. Such emphasis signals disharmony. In hesychasm, body or flesh is not viewed dualistically, as the opposite of spirit. Rather, it is seen as an integral part of man’s overall being that, along with mind and soul, participates in his journey towards deification. Explaining hesychast anthropology, S. Khoruzhiy says:

As an empirical being, man is usually far from being whole and unified. When he is immersed in it [empirical experience] without resisting its forces, it affects his integrity first of all: his mind wonders, distracted by various thoughts; his soul is torn by contradictory passions; his body indulges in perversions and excesses. Such a man must, first of all, overcome this chaos, this inner contradictions and dissipation, must gather himself from scattered multiplicity into unity. [В своем эмпирическом бытии человек обыкновенно далек от того, чтобы быть цельностью и единством. Когда он погружается в это бытие, не сопротивляясь его стихиям, именно цельность и утрачивается им прежде всего: его разум блуждает, отвлекаясь всевозможными помыслами, душа колеблется противоречивыми страстями, тело предается извращениям и излишествами. И человеку, в первую очередь, нужно выйти из этого хаоса, из внутренней разрозненности и разбросанности, нужно собрать себя из рассеяния, из дурной множественности—в единство.]²⁷

The “thick milky fog” that surrounds Svidrigailov on the morning of his suicide represents the chaos of his contradictory passions and impulses. Unable to overcome this chaos, he perishes.

St. Symeon the New Theologian remarks that “if one desires to be reborn spiritually, one must begin this journey towards light with the assuagement of one’s passions, or with the protection of one’s heart, for it is impossible to assuage the passions without it” (“началом ...продвижения к свету для желающего духовно возродиться является

²⁵ 6:335; 439.

²⁶ His last name originates from the name of a Lithuanian duke who betrayed Orthodoxy by converting to Catholicism, which points to his vacillating nature.

²⁷ *Московский психологический журнал*. №8 “Сердце и ум”, С.Хоружий.
<http://magazine.mospsy.ru/nomer8/s02.shtml>.

умаление страстей, или хранение сердца, ибо иначе невозможно страстям умалиться”).²⁸ He compares purifying the mind from the passions with building a house, pointing out that spiritual rebirth presumes painstaking labor. Svidrigailov, however, sees himself as incapable of such labor. He represents what, in Kireevsky’s words, is a “committed striving towards intentional disintegration of inner consciousness” (“одушевленное стремление к умышленному раздвоению внутреннего самосознания”), which “splits the very core of one’s spirit” (“расщепляет самый корень душевных сил”).²⁹ Well aware of the destructive nature of his passions, Svidrigailov is not willing to give them up. He follows the path of “intentional disintegration” of his inner being to its logical end, physical self-destruction. Raskolnikov, on the other hand, is granted the opportunity to overcome the implacable logic of split consciousness.

Raskolnikov’s mysterious attraction to both Svidrigailov and Sonya as his potential “saviors” exemplifies a lost soul’s dilemma, to follow one’s head or to follow one’s heart: “And yet here he was hurrying to Svidrigailov; could it be that he expected something *new* from him—directions, a way out?... Could it be fate, or some instinct, bringing them together? ... Perhaps it was not Svidrigailov but someone else he needed... Sonya?” (“А между тем он все-таки спешил к Свидригайлову; уж не ожидал ли он чего-нибудь от него нового, указаний, выхода?... Не судьба ль, не инстинкт ли какой сводит их вместе?... Может быть, надо было не Свидригайлова, а кого-то другого... Соня?”)³⁰ By ultimately choosing Sonya, Raskolnikov chooses to listen to his nature rather than his flawed logic.

As St. Isaak Sirin points out, “the heart...reaches its purity through suffering, sorrow...and self-renunciation” (“сердце...достигает чистоты многими скорбями, лишениями...и умерщвлением себя” для всего мирского),³¹ a principle that helps us understand the hesychastic essence of Sonya’s character. Her faith, as Raskolnikov supposes, might have been born and grown stronger not only during her life trials as a prostitute, but also much earlier, in her adolescence, “when she was still in the family, with her unfortunate father and her grief-maddened

²⁸ Симеон Новый Богослов, «Метод священной молитвы и внимания Симеона Нового Богослова», <http://st-jhouse.narod.ru/biblio/symeon1.htm>.

²⁹ “О характере просвещения Европы,” р. 273.

³⁰ 6:354; 463.

³¹ Преподобный Исаак Сирин, «Слова подвижнические», <http://www.hesychasm.ru/library/isaaksr/txt03.htm>.

stepmother” (“еще в семье, подле несчастного отца и сумасшедшей от горя мачехи”).³² Her name *Sophia* stems from the Greek word Σοφία, which means “skill,” “knowledge,” “wisdom.” In Judaism and Christianity, *Sophia* represents personified wisdom, which in hesychasm is connected with the intelligence of the heart.

Following biblical traditions, Kireevsky notes that “once the mind and heart have been already touched by God’s truth, the degree of formal education becomes irrelevant” (“где ум и сердце уже однажды проникнуты Божественною истиной, там степень учености делается вещью посторонней”).³³ According to Kireevsky, what is important is not “one’s formal education” (“наружная ученость”), but “a higher spiritual discernment” (“высшее духовное зрение”).³⁴ Marmeladov lets us know in Part One that Sonya’s formal education is rather meager. Nevertheless, well-educated Raskolnikov feels her superiority and tries to understand what sustains her, keeps her from losing her mind or “ending it all at once” in the unbearable conditions in which she lives. Raskolnikov intuitively grasps that Sonya’s salvation is in her “pure heart” because “all this shame obviously touched her only mechanically; no true depravity, not even a drop of it, had yet penetrated her heart” (“Весь этот позор, очевидно, коснулся ее только механически; настоящий разврат еще не проник ни одною каплей в ее сердце”).³⁵ Thus, in the hesychastic terms, the root of her being, her heart, had not been touched by sin, allowing her to remain strong in spirit despite external circumstances.

Speaking in the words of one of Dostoevsky’s favorite elders, Tikhon Zadonsky, Sonya represents the type of wisdom that is different in every respect from Raskolnikov’s wisdom. Tikhon Zadonsky says:

Spiritual wisdom is different from worldly wisdom in every respect. The worldly wisdom is proud; the spiritual one is humble. The worldly wisdom is self-loving; the spiritual one is God-loving. The worldly wisdom is impatient and angry; the spiritual one is patient and meek.... For the worldly wisdom, humility, deprecation, suffering, and the Cross of Christ are madness; for the spiritual wisdom they are a great learning. (Духовная мудрость во всем разнится от плотской, или мирской. Плотская мудрость горда, духовная— смиренна. Плотская мудрость само-любива, духовная—боголюбива. Плотская мудрость нетерпелива, злобна, духовная—терпелива, кротка...

³² 6:250; 326.

³³ Киреевский, *Полное собрание сочинений*, т.2, стр.299.

³⁴ Kireevsky, 311.

³⁵ 6:247; 323.

Для плотской мудрости смирение, поношение, страдание и Крест Христов есть безумие, для духовной—великая премудрость.³⁶

Embodying these polar opposite qualities, Sonya and Raskolnikov exemplify the wisdom of the heart and the mind. Raskolnikov's resurrection exemplifies his conversion to the wisdom of the heart.

Gregory Palama begins “Svyatogorsk tomos” (“Святогорский томос”) with the following epigraph: “In defense of those who adhere to holy silence and against those who, having no experience and disbelieving the saints, reject the indescribable and mysterious actions (of the energy) of the Spirit that acts in those who live in the Spirit and becomes known through example, not through reasoning” (“В защиту священо безмолвствующих, против тех, кто, не имея опыта, не веря святым, отвергает неопишваемые таинственные действия (энергии) Духа, которые действуют в живущих по Духу и обнаруживают себя деятельно, а не доказываются рассуждениями”).³⁷ Holy silence is one of the most important traditions of hesychasm, one that, as no other practice, helps bring the mind into the heart. Sonya represents this practice as well in her skill at keeping silence in response to Raskolnikov's mind games. In this respect, Sonya's silence but simultaneous active conduct in Siberia is of special interest. Fearing her religious moralizing at the beginning of his penal servitude, Raskolnikov is surprised to notice that “she never once spoke of it, never once even offered him the Gospels. He had asked her for it himself not long before his illness, and she had silently brought him the book” (“что она ни разу не заговорила об этом, ни разу даже не предложила ему Евангелия. Он сам попросил его у ней незадолго до своей болезни, и она молча принесла ему книгу”).³⁸ Sonya's silence can be explained by her understanding that Raskolnikov's resurrection cannot happen at will; it depends on God's grace. As Gregory Palama says, any act of virtue is achieved through aligning one's being with God's energies, and this “mysterious alignment takes place through grace” (“само же неизреченное единение совершается благо-дателью”).³⁹

³⁶ Тихон Задонский, *Творения иже во святых отца нашего Тихона Задонского*, том 2 (С.-Петербург: Книгоиздательство П.П. Сойкина, 1912), стр.23.

³⁷ Свт. Григорий Палама, «Святогорский томос», <http://www.hesychasm.ru/library/palamas/tomos.htm>.

³⁸ 6:422; 550.

³⁹ Свт. Григорий Палама, «Святогорский томос», <http://www.hesychasm.ru/library/palamas/tomos.htm>.

Raskolnikov's miraculous awakening rewards Sonya's patient silence: "And what were they, all, all those torments of the past! Everything, even his crime, even his sentence and exile, seemed to him now, in the first impulse, to be some strange, external fact, as if it had not even happened to him" ("Да и что такое эти все, *все* муки прошлого! Все, даже преступление его, даже приговор и ссылка, казались ему теперь, в первом порыве, каким-то внешним, странным, как бы даже и не с ним случившимся фактом").⁴⁰ For the first time, he sees the path to the consciousness beyond intellect, which, in Kireevsky's words, is given as "the highest ideal towards which the faith-based mind can strive, the very limit of an elevated thought, the guiding star that shines in the sky and, being reflected in the heart, leads the mind's way towards the truth" ("высший идеал, к которому только может стремиться верующий разум, конечный край высшей мысли, руководительная звезда, которая горит на высоте неба и, отражаясь в сердце, освещает разуму его путь к истине").⁴¹ Raskolnikov's eventual awakening signals his recovery exemplified by the shift towards holistic, integral knowledge.

And finally Razumikhin, whose very name suggests wisdom, is very interesting precisely from the point of view of integral knowledge. Razumikhin as a character reveals the narrow-mindedness of rationality, not only practically, by his conduct, which as such is evidence of his pure heart, but also intellectually, in heated arguments with the morally corrupt ideas of his generation. Such a combination of action and argumentation is not an accident because neither the Orthodox tradition, nor the Slavophiles reject rationality as such. For example, Kireevsky, while criticizing the decline of interest in philosophy in the West, notes that it is closely connected with the desperate desire to save faith through sweeping rejection of reason. He writes that faith cannot be saved by the rejection of reason and that faith and reason should not be viewed as antagonistic notions, for "religion that cannot tolerate the light of science and reason is worthless, much the same way as the faith that is antithetical to reason is worthless" ("Ибо что это была бы за религия, которая не могла бы вынести света науки и сознания? Что за вера, которая несовместна с разумом?").⁴² Similarly, in hesychasm, intellect is not dismissed or denigrated but is redeemed through the guidance of higher wisdom. Dostoevsky often emphasized the idea of unity between intellect

⁴⁰ 6:422; 550.

⁴¹ "О необходимости и возможности новых начал в философии," 308-309.

⁴² Киреевский, *Полное собрание сочинений*, т.2, стр.283.

and faith in his journalistic articles while discussing the possible reunification of the intelligentsia with the people. With all his reverence for the Russian peasant's capacity for faith, Dostoevsky does not diminish the benefits of knowledge and education, which are embodied in the intelligentsia.⁴³

In *Crime and Punishment*, Razumikhin represents the unity of intellect, common sense, and spirit. On the one hand, Dostoevsky entrusts him with the open criticism of the intellectual excesses of his generation, such as the criticism of the theory of "rational egoism," Raskolnikov's theory of ordinary and extraordinary people, and less directly, the extremes of the women's question.⁴⁴ On the other hand, Razumikhin not only speaks about his convictions, he also lives according to them, and, as a result, turns into one of the most important characters in the novel. As Dostoevsky writes about him in his drafts of the novel, he becomes indispensable to the rest of the characters; he often plays the role of a mediator and "saves everything" ("все спасает"). In the drafts of the novel, Dostoevsky also describes Razumikhin as "a very strong personality" ("очень сильная натура"). As a strong character he contrasts with the weak and divided against himself Raskolnikov. He personifies that integrity, that fusion of intellect and moral intuition, which the overly rational Raskolnikov is lacking so desperately.

One of Razumikhin's major characteristics frequently emphasized in the novel is *dobrota*, which has a double meaning of kindness and integrity or virtue. In hesychasm, *dobrota* and intellect (ум) are intricately integrated into one faculty, for "There is no need to study sciences if one's soul does not live a virtuous and God-pleasing life" ("Никакой нет пользы изучать науки, если душа не будет иметь доброй и богоугодной жизни").⁴⁵ It is significant that Raskolnikov seems to be aware of the special, hesychastic, quality of Razumikhin's mind, confusing kindness and intellect, when he says to him during their first meeting: "Well, listen: I came to you because aside from you I don't know anyone who would help... to start... because you're *kinder* than the

⁴³ For instance, in *A Writer's Diary* for February 1876 he writes: "Одним словом, мы должны склониться, как блудные дети, двести лет не бывшие дома, но воротившиеся, однако же, все-таки русскими, в чем, впрочем, великая наша заслуга. Но, с другой стороны, преклониться мы должны под одним лишь условием, и это sine qua non: чтоб народ и от нас принял многое из того, что мы принесли с собой..." PSS 22:45.

⁴⁴ See Part II, chapter 2, in which Razumikhin discusses the German text for translation, "Is Woman a Human Being?"

⁴⁵ *Добролюбие*, том первый, <http://hesychasm.ru/library/dobro/txt03.htm>.

rest of them—*smarter*, that is...” (“Ну, слушай: я к тебе пришел, потому что ты всех их *добрее*, то есть *умнее*...”).⁴⁶

With his diligence, kindness, and common sense, Razumikhin represents the wise alternative to the feverishly obsessive rationality of his generation. We read of him for the first time at the very beginning of the novel, when Raskolnikov almost goes to him for help. Symbolically, this failed attempt represents Raskolnikov’s last chance not to lose his reason and not to commit the crime. After his first visit to Razumikhin in the second part of the novel, Raskolnikov again is given a chance to recover his reason, to come to his senses (“образумиться”). On the way from Razumikhin, Raskolnikov stops to look at the domes of a familiar cathedral, which, as he remembers, has always evoked nothing but “inexplicable chill” (“необъяснимый холод”) in him. A dome is an Orthodox symbol of wisdom, but for Raskolnikov the majestic panorama of the domes is filled with “a mute and deaf spirit” (“духом немым и глухим”).⁴⁷ In such scenes, Razumikhin’s presence in the background is a silent reminder of the wisdom of the heart that is muted in overly rational Raskolnikov.

As Razumikhin explains, his real last name is Vrazumikhin. The key to understanding the meaning of this variant of his name can be found in Kireevsky’s discussion of reason and wisdom. Kireevsky writes, “The development of natural reason is but a stepping stone for higher wisdom. Being superior to natural reason, higher wisdom warns it [*vrazumlyat*] that it has digressed from its inborn integrity. In so doing, it returns reason to its lofty state” (“Для нее [высшей разумности] развитие разума естественного служит только ступенями, и, превышая обыкновенное состояние ума, она тем самым *vrazumlyat* его, что он отклонился от своей первоестественной цельности, и этим *vrazumleniem* побуждает к возвращению на степень высшей деятельности”).⁴⁸ In Kireevsky’s interpretation, the verb *vrazumlyat*’ comes close to the hesychast notion of “bringing one’s mind to one’s heart,” which makes Vrazumikhin the measure of wisdom in the novel.

St. Isaac the Syrian explains three states of the soul in *Ascetic Advice* (*Слова подвижнические*): a natural, an unnatural, and a supernatural state. “The natural state of the soul is the knowledge of God’s creatures, both through the senses and mental. The supernatural state of the soul is the excitement towards the acceptance of God’s essence. The unnatural

⁴⁶ 6:88; 111-12 (emphasis added).

⁴⁷ 6:90; 114.

⁴⁸ Киреевский, *Полное собрание сочинений*, т.2, стр.311, (emphasis added).

state of the soul is the movement of the soul in those who are tormented by worldly passions” (“Естественное состояние души есть ведение Божиих тварей, чувственных и мысленных. Сверхъестественное состояние есть возбуждение к содержанию пресущественного Божества. Противоестественное же состояние есть движение души в мятущихся страстями”).⁴⁹ Both Raskolnikov and, at times, Sonya are notable for their excited state, presence of passion, which is alien to a more grounded Razumikhin. As such, Sonya, Raskolnikov, and Razumikhin represent Isaac the Syrian’s different states of the soul. Sonya and Raskolnikov represent the opposite poles of the supernatural and unnatural states of the soul. It is not without reason that the concept of madness is so prominent in the major scenes of meetings between Raskolnikov and Sonya, “the murderer and the harlot” (“убийцы и блудницы”).⁵⁰ It is not always easy to determine which of the two characters is mad in these scenes. Sonya’s fervor is essentially different from Raskolnikov’s restless excitement by virtue of its Godly origin because, according to Isaak the Syrian, “any passion that serves virtue comes from God” (“всякая страсть, служащая к пользе, дарована от Бога”). On the other hand, Razumikhin represents the type of wisdom (разумность) that is called common sense. The *sobornost’* of Razumikhin’s and Sonya’s consciousness is obvious, however. It is expressed in their limitless capacity for empathy, “some sort of *insatiable* compassion” (“какое-то *ненасыти-мое* сострадание”), in Sonya’s case.⁵¹ Thus, they represent hesychastic knowledge of the heart and stand in sharp contrast to the overly rational generation of the “men of the 60s,” who lacked sobriety of mind and integrity of spirit. “Bringing their mind to their heart,” purification from worldly passions, and finding inner integrity are presented by Dostoevsky as the key steps for their recovery.

⁴⁹ Преподобный Исаак Сирин, «Слова подвижнические», <http://www.hesychasm.ru/library/isaaksr/txt03.htm>.

⁵⁰ 6: 251-52; 328.

⁵¹ 6: 243; 318 (Dostoevsky’s emphasis).