

Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations

The Graduate School

Money as a Powerful Function in Fyodor Dostoevsky's Works

Kristina I. McCall

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

MONEY AS A POWERFUL FUNCTION IN
FYODOR DOSTOEVSKY'S WORKS

By

KRISTINA. I. MCCALL

A Thesis submitted to the
Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

2021

Kristina I. McCall defended this thesis on March 30, 2021.

The members of the supervisory committee were:

Nina Efimov

Professor Directing Thesis

Lisa Ryoko Wakamiya

Committee Member

Michael Leeser

Committee Member

The Graduate School has verified and approved the above-named committee members, and certifies that the thesis has been approved in accordance with university requirements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
UNCOVERING CHARACTERS THROUGH THE MONEY THEME	10
MONEY IN LOVE RELATIONSHIPS	29
MONEY AS A RIVAL IN LOVE TRIANGLES.....	42
MONEY AS A CHANGING POWER.....	46
CONCLUSION	49
References	51
Biographical Sketch.....	52

ABSTRACT

In my paper, I investigate how money is depicted and the way it plays a primary function and catalyst in its interactions with the other protagonists, how attitudes toward money manifest in the characters' actions and reveal their characteristics, and how it contributes to the plot developments in three of Dostoevsky's novels: *Crime and Punishment* (1866), *The Idiot* (1868), and *The Brothers Karamazov* (1879). I will provide close readings of three novels and provide information about the social and biographical conditions in which they were written.

Money plays an important role in the subplot of *Crime and Punishment*. It is a socio-psychological and philosophical novel where Dostoevsky provides his vision of Russian people in post-reform Russia. Significant social changes in all spheres of society followed abolition of serfdom of 1861 and created a number of social evils, such as alcoholism, poverty, immorality, socialism, nihilism, atheism and materialism, which the writer openly condemns. He blames the social trends and situation on contemporary intelligentsia, particularly socialism and moral degradation of society. In the novel he portrays the environment of capitalism where money crosses the boundaries of economic and financial spheres, becomes entangled in socio-psychological aspects of human existence and aggravates these problems.

In *The Idiot* Dostoevsky shows how socialist ideology caused future social issues by dramatically shifting people's social and ideological beliefs and foundations. The writer introduces the world of huge money where millioners, capitalists, usurers, merchants and dealers play major roles. They exist in the environment of usury and deal in money, valuables and debts making up their fortunes from capitals completely detached from production and without any signs of labor origin. According to Dostoevsky's ideological, social and political conception,

socio-economical crisis is the result of people's departure from Christian values. People in post-reform Russia were seeking new ideals and found them in money. In the novel Dostoevsky portrays the destructive influence of money over human souls and lives.

In *The Brothers Karamazov* Dostoevsky continues the portrayal of social problems in Russia in the second part of the nineteenth century along with the ever growing fatal power of the "golden sack". He describes the socio-psychological phenomenon of contemporary everyday life '*karamazovshina*', the description of the uttermost degree of people's moral degradation, which is caused by capitalist ideology and the socio-economic conditions of the time. Further, in the novel the writer depicts the power of money to infiltrate the sphere of love and intimate human relations subjecting them to the abusive power of uncontrolled passions and constant vacillations from moral falls to the sublimest virtuous deeds.

INTRODUCTION

One of the major aspects of human engagement, and a main reason for human relationships, is money. It is a powerful drive behind human thoughts, behaviors and actions. Dostoevsky's characters acutely understand what money means and how deeply it affects people's relationships and souls. The writer always had a deficit of money and struggled financially throughout his life; he was happy when he managed to sell his works for a profit and experienced emotional distress when he had trouble providing for his loved ones. Having money comforted him, as it gave him a sense of accomplishment and affirmation. Dostoevsky meticulously accounted for every ruble that his works brought him. For example, in 1877, he wrote in one of his notes:

Crime and Punishment was sold for — 487 r. 12 к. Bound copies of 'A Writer's Diary' of 1876 — 497 r. 80 к. 'Demons', 'The Idiot,' 'The House of the Dead' — 561 r. 63 к. from 1876 — + 295 r. 40 к. Total — 1841 r. 95 к." (Fokin, 1). In 1878, he had "Demons", "The Idiot" и "The House of the Dead" — 1199 r. 50 к., "Crime and Punishment" — 548 r. 98 к. Bound copies for 1877 — 346 r. 50 к. Bound copies for 1876 — 281 r. 68 к. Total — 2376 r. 66 к. (1).

Dostoevsky kept updating this ledger every year.

In the second half of the nineteenth century 100 rubles was worth just about one year of a modest subsistence. Students and workmen in Petersburg of Dostoevsky's times were considered to belong to the lower class with a minimal monthly salary of more or less than 8 rubles. In comparison with modern earnings of the western world, 100 rubles in the later nineteenth century would be equal to the minimal wage of today's pay. For government officials with prominent connections the income was far larger. In Leo Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* (1873) her brother, Stiva, earned 6000 rubles in one of Petersburg' ministries, the post that he received with

the help of his brother-in-law. Dostoevsky was not born into a landed gentry and did not live an overly extravagant life style, thus, the income that he earned from his works was rather considerable in terms of that it would be enough to live off of for 2 or more years at a time.

Literature was Dostoevsky's sole source of legitimate income. Despite his exile, mock execution, epileptic seizure and extremely shy personality, he was a successful writer almost from the beginning of his professional career. But more often than not, he had to either rush to complete works by the deadline or missed the deadlines altogether, thus he never had an assurance that his creations would bring him any money. One of the major dramatic events in the professional occupation that ever happened to Dostoevsky was his acquaintance with Fyodor Stellofski, a profiteer publisher who wanted to capitalize on Fyodor Mikhailovitch's financial predicament. In 1865, in a desperate need for an advance he entered into a contract with the unscrupulous publisher offering the strictest agreement stipulations. Stellofsky required that if Dostoevsky didn't submit his novel *The Gambler* by the deadline he would relinquish all of the royalties coming from any of his works for the following 9 years. 26 days till the deadline that Dostoevsky had no novel to submit. Were it not for Anna Snitkina, a stenographer and Fyodor Mikhailovitch's future wife who saved him from bankruptcy, Dostoevsky would not have been able to finish his novel on time and would not have seen a single ruble from his future creations. The whole *Gambler* (1866) was finished in record 26 days.

At times, to accommodate his needs and those of his family, the writer had to take money from publishers in advance, and thus, was always in debt and under financial obligations. This is partially related to the fact that Dostoevsky was not a good manager nor did he have any restraint when it came to handling his finances. To make matters worse, Dostoevsky was a compulsive

gambler often being overcome with uncontrolled passion and excitement for gambling to that end that he pawned his wedding ring and Anna's earring to play roulette. Gambling became an objective in itself which consumed his entire nature and made it impossible to control. *The Gambler* is based on Fyodor Mikhailovitch autobiography and includes a detailed, deep and thorough psychological analysis of a gambler's mind as he goes through the process of gambling addiction development. He examines his own state of being and conditions of those playing roulette and identifies with the protagonist, however notices: "yet let me say also this: that from the first I have been consistent in having an intense aversion to any trial of my acts and thoughts by a moral standard. Another standard altogether has directed my life...." (Dostoevsky, 1). Accompanying compelling ideas of knowing the secret of the game or being the chosen one who will inevitably break the bank are reflected in the thought that: "I should require but to put a check upon my nature for one hour, and my fortunes would be changed entirely" (5). He blindly believed that a controlled, calm and collected mindset was the key to winning which never agreed with his passionate and irritable nature, and as a result he lost more often than he won.

In 1864, when Fyodor Mikhailovitch had already overcome his gambling addiction and paid majority of his financial obligations, his beloved brother, Mikhail Mikhailovitch died and left his family with over 20,000 rubles in debts. Out of love and respect for Mikhail Mikhailovitch and his family, Dostoevsky decided to take on all of his brother's accounts and save his family from financial ruin. For this purpose, he borrowed money from his aunt for the long term debts and from his literary fund to pay off immediate short term obligations. Because there was no way to prove or verify who Mikhail Mikhailovitch borrowed from, there appeared many exploitative claimants speculating on Dostoevsky's good nature. Fyodor Mikhailovitch

issued many promissory notes asking the pretenders not to request the payments until he had the money. The swindlers accepted the notes, agreed to wait for payments and never did, asking for the compensation immediately. Dostoevsky was yet again in financial bondage and under the stress related to his never ending economic hardships.

Because of his experience, Dostoevsky understands the value and the influence of money and how deeply and profoundly it affects and controls peoples' lives. This strong power of money eventually manifests itself in the writer's works in different ways. Dostoevsky's works are either written out of experience or from deep and profound observations and understanding of human nature. Although, he never categorized himself to be a psychologist, he is an expert of human souls and a keen observer of human lives. Fyodor Mikhailovitch is an ardent advocate of Christianity as it is practiced in the Russian Orthodox Church. Christian values, motives and teachings are reflected in his major works on different levels: problematical, ideological, figurative. Dostoevsky is a religious philosopher whose creations are filled with Christian ideology and whose characters are full of Christian spirituality, and the art form of his creations is reminiscent of biblical motives, stories and traditions.

The Bible says that money is the root of all evil. Dostoevsky sees that money is not only the source of material prosperity and comforts, it is not solely the means to satisfy people's gratification of their utilitarian and pragmatic every day needs and wants. When elevated to a status of a value, it transcends the boundaries of those limits and gains more power in motivating human attitudes and guiding their actions. When the money becomes an end in itself, it imperceptibly integrates with the social-psychological and spiritual-moral aspects of human existence and enslaves human conscience.

On an individual scale, Dostoevsky is a master of exploring and uncovering dynamics of complex personalities emphasizing the presence of pathological states of mind which lead to dysfunctional behaviors. The influence of money that the writer so skillfully subjects his protagonists' intricate psychologies to, creates diverse range of conflicts that Dostoevsky views in light of Christian values and ideology. On a social scale, he knows that monetary values, when put at the forefront, cause egotism, aggression, selfishness, and immorality in people that, in turn, results in society as a whole becoming pervasively depraved and corrupt. In his "A Writer's Diary" he writes:

There appeared some twisted and unheard of distortion of ideas in people with occupying worshipping of materialism. In this case, I call materialism people's worshipping of the money idol, the worshipping the power of the golden sack. It's as if a notion has invaded the people that the sack is now everything, that it contains all the power, and that everything that they were told, that everything that their fathers taught them, is all nonsense (Stahl, 174).

Fyodor Mikhailovitch was a keen observer of, and took a genuine interest in, the social trends of his time. During the second part of the nineteenth century when appreciation of Christianity and the true experience and exercise of the Orthodox faith substantially subsided, capitalism became a prevalent trend to which collective social and individual conscience was oriented to and consumed with. Second part of the nineteenth century saw an acute intensification of religious crisis and a deep degeneration of Christian faith in Russia and its people. Among many reasons of why society turned away from God and why the Church lost its prestige and status was the abolition of serfdom and a number of demographic and social changes taking place in Russia that the Church was not ready, or refused entirely, to deal with. In 1861 Alexander II ended serfdom and implemented social reforms that set the stage for

development of the new and unprecedented modernized processes contradicting the dogma of the Russian Orthodox Church and its outlook on the institution of family and society as a whole.

Although they believed in God, peasants did not favor the social institution of Church due to the fact that it supported serfdom and it even aspired to own serfs (the right reserved strictly for the landed gentry class). Many of them were pagans practicing worship of their own gods. Thus, when they got freedom they quickly started widely demonstrating, propagandizing and supporting anti-religious ideas, which coupled with their general illiteracy and the lack of education, spread cancerously throughout Russia. Internal processes unbecoming to a Church accompanying the clergy's inadequate instruction in theology and their poor faith in God contributed to deterioration of the national spirit and degradation of the Christian value system. Further, official Church found itself unable to respond to the fast changing demands of the fledgeling new society. Its dogma was inflexible to react to the appearing issues of emancipation, registration of marriages during religious holidays, divorces and suicides (the Church refused to perform burial services for people who took their own life thus infuriating unfortunate relatives, especially when it came to teenagers). Such rigid and principal attitude toward its parish stirred feelings of contempt and anger in people.

Besides the processes and trends happening on the periphery of Russia's cultural and political centers, many underground and overt societies oriented to developing religious-philosophical doctrines and religious-socialistic ideologies and disseminating their propaganda were created in big cities. Majority of their members and the most active participants, who were also ardent advocates for their agendas, were representatives of intelligentsia. The contingent of members belonging to the ideological societies included not only members of gentry but also

'raznotchinets' (nineteenth century intellectuals of not a gentry origin). Dostoevsky belonged to one of these societies and engaged passionately in dissemination of socialist ideology norms and principles. In 1849 he was arrested, convicted and exiled to one of Siberian prison camps where he spent 4 years with cross-grained everywhere convicts about whom Dostoevsky would say after that he had discovered "deep, strong, beautiful characters, gold under under the coarse hard surface" (Frank, 190).

Petrashevsky's circle was a society devoted to advocating utopian ideas of socialism. The purpose of the circle was the reorganization of Russia's autocratic social structure based on the theories of materialism and the western economic thought (using primarily the works of Charles Fourier and Ludwig Feuerbach). The insiders of Petrashevsky's circle took a hostile attitudes toward religion and private property and considered emancipation of serfs to be the first step toward the radical change of the social order. Dostoevsky believed in their purpose as he was deeply touched by the inequalities and injustices that were prevalent under the nineteenth century Russia social construct. But as opposed to the other members of the circle, he was against a forceful and violent revolution and rather favored peaceful implementation of the phased social reforms that would gradually bring the society to its ideal state.

In the process of finding ways of reforming the society, eliminating slavery (serfdom) and establishing social equality, along with the search for a foundation that would support the socialist utopian ideology, Petrashevsky's circle declared the Christ to be the first moral revolutionary of all times. He is the one to preach socialist ideas and ideals based on the principles of love and freedom and to combine religion with socialism, the notion appealing to laymen but diametrically opposite to the Orthodox Church's doctrine. Socialistic slogan

“freedom, equality, brotherhood!” was promoted on every corner in the second part nineteenth century Russia. However, Dostoevsky did not share the sentiment of Jesus Christ being a revolutionary and refused to accept moral-religious foundations of socialists ideology because “Christ for him would always remain not only the traditional Savior from the bonds of sin and death but also the sacred pledge of the possibility of moral freedom” (Frank, 132).

Then, the theory of rational egoism appeared in the intelligentsia environment and consumed hearts and minds of unsophisticated masses. Nikolay Chernyshevsky was the pioneer and the avid proponent of the theory which he postulated in his “Anthropological Principle in Philosophy” (1860) and artistically manifested in the novel “What to Be Done?” (1863). He proposed that a man’s actions is the product of his strive for his own profit, personal satisfaction and his personal wellbeing, the result of his purely egoistical and self-serving feelings and that morality is just a product of physiology. He further developed the idea to conclude that the rational egoist’s satisfaction is the act of good doing because it benefits his neighbor in the long run. Fyodor Mikhailovitch notices: “dark moral aspects of the former regime—egoism, cynicism, slavery, separation, corruption—have not only disappeared with the abolition of serfdom but rather intensified, developed and multiplied” (Stahl, 64). Many had comfortably accepted this theory to be the guiding principle of human actions and decisions as it provided a good justification for people’s selfish, dishonest, corrupted and unscrupulous behaviors.

All of the later nineteenth century trends, social and ideological movements, civil and demographic changes, have resulted in the destruction of the centuries built foundations of Russian society. People were eager to start a new life in the free society willfully subjecting themselves to the loss of their cultural traditions, norms and conventions. The society desperately

needed the new values that would make it possible for them to convert stones into bread, find economic solutions to the social and moral issues, establish paradise on earth and to secure the coveted equality. Dostoevsky was convinced that Christianity and socialism are organically incompatible because “socialism in Russia had been atheistic and ant-Christian from the start, and it was impossible to maintain any connection between it and Christian morality” (Frank,124). Atheism, capitalism, nihilism, rejection of the absolute moral values and refusal of a free will was the result of the utopian socialist ideology and the theory of rational egoism.

It is only during his exile (1850-1854), during the time of severe deprivations, pain, fear, suffering and violence that Dostoevsky realized that socialist ideology was flawed at its core. It is unable to perfect society placing it in direct dependence on its economic structure because the economic power will never be binding. Instead, it is only human free will and their spiritual potential, based on solid and unwavering belief in God and Christian values, that is capable of changing individuals, communities and societies and establishing truly peaceful human coexistence based on mutual values of Christian love, compassion and personal sacrifice. While Dostoevsky depicts his social, political and ideological conceptions challenging socialist ideology and principles in his five major novels, condemning capitalism and the loss of faith in God in Russian people, he portrays money as a powerful function influencing and destroying people and the foundation of Russian society.

UNCOVERING CHARACTERS THROUGH THE MONEY THEME

Crime and Punishment is Dostoevsky's first work out of the series of his five major novels. It has many social implications as it was written as a reaction to the socialist ideology of Chernyshevsky and his ideas of rational egoism. Dostoevsky builds the plot of the novel around the main event - an impoverished student Raskolnikov's murder of the old lady pawn broker. He is the representative of the new class of "students-raznotchinets" (the ones coming from not so well to do families) flooding Petersburg after receiving access to the education system in the aftermath of the education reforms of 1863 which opened up public institutions of higher learning for all social classes. Students-raznotchinets played an important role in Russian social life as they introduced many new ideas and developed new moral norms.

The author places Raskolnikov at the center of the social crises of post-reform Russia and explores his story as a personal tragedy. The student develops a social theory dividing people to the categories of ordinary, the masses, and the extraordinary ones who are capable of, and justified in, breaking the law and attributing himself to the latter class, the great men. The central answer to the validation of his theory lies in the question of "whether I am a trembling creature or whether I have the right?" (Dostoevsky, 588). By exploring Raskolnikov's character and his psychological state as it evolves following the murder, Dostoevsky exposes the social conflict of Russia of 1860s characterized by the powerful influence of materialism, the impact of new social ideologies, people's loss of faith in God and rejection of, or deviation from, Christian values.

The hallmark of the novel is the struggle of opposing ideas and ideologies and the conflict nature of situations in which Dostoevsky places his characters. The writer uses money as a powerful function influencing human interactions and their relations to the world and to one

another. He develops the plot story around money and reveals the inner worlds of the novel's characters. In *Crime and Punishment*, money is the main suspect in Raskolnikov's crime at the beginning of the story. Initially, Dostoevsky presents it as if Raskolnikov kills for material reasons because of simple arithmetic "for one life thousands would be saved from corruption and decay. One death, and a hundred lives in exchange" (Dostoevsky, 100). But surprisingly, after the pawnbroker's murder, Raskolnikov engages in self-questioning and searches for his true motivations for committing the crime.

Joseph Frank notices: "the two antithetical parts of Raskolnikov's personality, held together earlier by the razor-sharp dialectic of his casuistry, had persuaded him that it was possible to reconcile murder and morality" (492) to underline the destructive power of rationalism in Raskolnikov's life. Because he breaks the spiritual law of "thou shall not kill" by relying solely on the power of his rational facility logically deducting the justification for the murder he commits, he is not able to overcome the psychological tortures that Dostoevsky subjects him to, going back and forth to the question whether he was justified in his actions or not. This is the way that the writer shows that how dangerous it is to reduce human nature to logic and to be guided by the rational thinking alone. Depicting Raskolnikov's individual torments in the wake of the crime along with the social consequences of the prevalent socialist ideology (Rodion belongs to poor intelligentsia who hadn't escaped the influence of the ideas of equal distribution of wealth), Dostoevsky challenges his ideological opponents and points out the obvious flaws and unavoidable outcomes of the socialist utopia doctrine. Later in the novel, when Raskolnikov learns that his motives were neither altruistic nor humanitarian but rather selfish because he wanted to prove to himself that he was not a "trembling creature", money, or

in this case a lack thereof, plays a role of partner in crime, or more precisely, an accessory to exploring and testing Raskolnikov's whole values system.

Dostoevsky exposes the social (environmental influence), ideological (collectivistic socialist ideas), and psychological aspects of Raskolnikov's crime but ultimately determines the failure of free will and unsustained rational thinking based on farfetched premises to be the true motives for Raskolnikov's actions. He is the product of his environment and the social conditions in which he found himself in; all that surrounds him in Petersburg is poverty, crimes, prostitutions, injustices, inequality and crushing humiliation. At the same time he is a smart and ambitious young man with a mind of a philosopher and kindness and compassion in his heart who suffered deeply from seeing the injustices and violence that surround him. However, money is the ultimate trigger and the underlying reason for all the Raskolnikov's actions and their justifications.

In *Crime and Punishment*, Petersburg, the city where Rodion lives, is a place where everything depends on money and everyone is engulfed with money fever. Capitalism was responsible for the way the city came to be and the pressing social conditions in which overwhelming majority of its people lived. Dostoevsky saw the city as the embodiment of capitalism, its result and symbol. Petersburg was filled with former peasants and people that had migrated into it from the country creating a special type of an environment conducive of crimes, immorality, poverty, illiteracy and violence. As Svidrigailov refers it as: "a town of crazy people where there are few places where there are so many gloomy, strong and queer influences on the soul of man" (Dostoevsky, 653). Dostoevsky chooses Hay Market to be the location for the action development because it was the place of dwelling for the most antisocial and criminal

elements in the city. The depiction of post-reform Petersburg brings the social connotations of the novel to the forefront once again.

A person lacking money finds himself unable to live there with dignity and is doomed to humiliation, disease, hunger, and death. Rodion, a law student, lives on the money that his mother and his sister mail to him, rents a small apartment reminiscent of a coffin, and deprives himself of all of life's necessities. Raskolnikov, the resident of post-reform of Petersburg, is introduced as poverty-stricken: "he was crushed by poverty (Dostoevsky, 7)... low ceilings and tiny rooms cramp the soul and the mind (585)," leaving the reader feeling compassionate toward Raskolnikov's situation. According to the contemporary views of the nineteenth century of the devastating influence of the environment on a person ("среда заела", an expression meaning that a person was a prey to his environment, is a theory that liberals used to explain that surrounding circumstance greatly affected people's actions and even were responsible for the city's widespread criminal activity). One might deduct that Raskolnikov's circumstances caused a him to embark on a path of a crime.

But poverty, according to Dostoevsky, is not good justification for criminal actions and behaviors. The theory, according to Dostoevsky, rejects human free will and relieves him from any responsibility for his actions, thus corrupting the already morally decomposing society. Through his positive character Dmitry Razumihin, Dostoevsky provides a clear picture of his position on the environmental influence on human decisions:

Everything with them (socialists) is 'the influence of environment,' and nothing else. Their favorite phrase! From which it follows that, if society is normally organized, all crime will cease at once, since there will be nothing to protest against and all men will become righteous in one instant. Human nature is not taken into account, it is excluded, it's not supposed to exist! ...The living soul demands life, the soul won't obey the rules

of mechanics, the soul is an object of suspicion, the soul is retrograde!... You can't skip over nature by logic. Logic presupposes three possibilities, but there are millions! (Dostoevsky, 363).

Thus, Dostoevsky stresses that human freewill is the root of all actions and the driver of all behaviors.

Dostoevsky introduces the conversation in the tavern between an officer and a student in support of Raskolnikov's wretched ideas of humanitarian assassination and articulates how widespread the socialist ideology was in 1860s Russia. Military, intelligentsia, students and laymen were preoccupied with the idea of sharing wealth. He overhears the student saying: "a hundred thousand good deeds could be done and helped, on that old woman's money which will be buried in a monastery!" (Dostoevsky, 99) referring to Alyona Ivanovna, the pawn broker who Raskolnikov's subsequently murders.

Such hazardous ideas of sharing wealth and money by violence and murder distorted Raskolnikov's understanding of the Christian teaching of helping your neighbor and reinforced his delusional thought patterns of "extraordinary" people having the right to kill, the idea that ultimately materialized in his real crime. Further, Dostoevsky portrays Raskolnikov's inner struggle between his resolve to commit the crime and the moral principles against the taking of human life to stress that Raskolnikov must choose between being an "extraordinary man" and a boy who breaks away from his father and kisses the dying horse on its bloodshot eyes. To convey his social controversial feelings and attitudes Dostoevsky introduces Raskolnikov's dream where he becomes a witness of a mob's cruel and merciless beating and murder of a horse. Raskolnikov has good intentions and qualities, but ultimately his ego and his egotism get the best of him, spurs his moral convictions, and pushes him towards murder. Svidrigailov accurately diagnoses

Raskolnikov's motive in the wake of the murder: "above all, vanity, pride and vanity, though goodness knows he may have good qualities too" (Dostoevsky, 687).

Although, money is not the true reason for Raskolnikov's crime, Dostoevsky reveals his perception of society and people through Raskolnikov's plot which is a direct response to Chernyshevsky's rational egoism theory. The writer points out that the theory cannot withstand the trials of life for people. Even if rational crimes are committed in the spirit of the noblest purposes, spiritual laws and human consciousness cannot be confined in the rigid and inflexible framework of the logical reasoning. Punishing Raskolnikov with the severe psychological tortures for breaking moral and spiritual laws, Dostoevsky shows that material interests when they prevail in people's lives cause chaos, result in crimes and corruption of society and its members.

To expose the absorbing spirit of capitalism in Russian society Dostoevsky states: "there is something in the air, something full of materialism of skepticism; there appeared an adoration of free gains, pleasure without work; any deception, any evil deed is done in cold blood; they kill merely to pull out one ruble from the pocket" (Stahl, 176). Further, as society found itself preoccupied with material values, overcome with the fever of capital and monetary gains, the writer underlines the side effects of breaking away from and replacement of the moral and spiritual values. He continues: "people are not protected by any enlightened ideas, by any sermon of any opposing ideas, people can oppose nothing to the golden sack as they don't have anything but their wants and their rags" (Stahl, 178). This is precisely what happens to Raskolnikov. Unable to conquer the abusive and dark thoughts and to combat the murderous ideals with any opposing virtuous ones, he ultimately becomes the victim of his ideology and commits the

double murder.

Money, before his crime, is Raskolnikov's frame of reference and the justification for his vision and actions as the one whose "aim is ultimately the improvement of mankind's lot, and they are thus in the long run benefactors rather than destroyers" (Frank, 489). Raskolnikov's conscience wrestling with itself, his painful vacillations, and his gradual psychological breakdown began before he committed the crime, when he published his article, "On Crime" approximately two months before. By categorizing himself among the "extraordinary" people, as the Napoleons of the world who have the moral right to kill and violate God's Commandments for a greater social benefit, Raskolnikov uses monetary motives to justify his vision of himself and his actions. He does not see that his self-esteem that is the most important and valued thing to him. To expose moral consequences of breaking the God's commandment, with all his artistic eloquence, Dostoevsky reveals the devastating fallout of such reasoning on Raskolnikov's conscience and juxtaposes his twisted rationality borne by a corrupt mind with a genuine compassionate sacrifice of a perfect person who lives up to the Christian values and spiritual laws (Sonia).

In *Crime and Punishment*, she is the embodiment of meekness, Raskolnikov's direct opposite, and the novel's most ideal and positive character. Although she must overcome poverty with profligacy, "not one drop of real depravity had penetrated to her heart" (Dostoevsky, 458). She has no material motivations or incentives and money for her is the sole means for survival based on sacrifice and altruism as she sells her body for money to feed her step mother's children. Her selfless self-denial is practical and grounded in her love for humanity that stems from Christian ideals as opposed to the rational altruism of Raskolnikov's theory which is the

product of his gigantic hubris and inflated ego.

Raskolnikov is so far from understanding her and her situation that he considers her to be a *yurodivaya*, a holy fool. Having sacrificed everything for her family and having become a prostitute, Sonia considers herself to be the greatest sinner, because Bible condemns prostitution, but lives in hope and has faith in God. The writer thinks that society and people can only effectively function and be happy through belief in God, and this allows him to bring the money theme and religious motives to the forefront and tie them together in a mutual interconnectedness. Dostoevsky shows that attitudes toward money can bring out the positive in people even in the most seemingly condemnable circumstances. Poverty, alcoholism, depravity and amoral and corrupted environment, in which she lives, have not affected Sonia and she manages to remain a virtuous person. Prostitution was her only way to save her family from starvation. Dostoevsky values suffering and compassion in mankind and makes Sonia a Christ figure. Moreover, Sonia blames Raskolnikov only for his lost faith in God and not for committing the double murder: She whispers to Raskolnikov: “you turned away from God and God has smitten you, has given you over to the devil! (Dostoevsky, 586). Sonia is capable of seeing a person even in a criminal, a murderer, and her boundless love and her pure sole experiences compassion and empathy towards all people.

Thus, Dostoevsky portrays how money contributes to Raskolnikov’s crime due to his weak will and absence of faith in God. By contrast, money, along with Sonia’s solid and steady belief and hope in God, has only solidified her faith and hope in Him. On the surface, money alone is unbiased; people’s attitude toward money that gives it value and significance. Money is material, a physical item that is exchanged for goods and services to satisfy people’s needs. It’s

not significant in terms that it is a mere tool to support one's existence. When it becomes the source of gratification of human vices and passions such as power, fame, domination, surfeit and the like, when it enters the metaphysical sphere of human existence and when the need for money originates from greed, vanity and pride, then it gains significance and abusively influences human thoughts and actions. Almost every character in Dostoevsky's works sees and uses money to either achieve a personal goal or satisfy psychological needs. It is through this attitude toward money that Dostoevsky exposes his protagonists' inner worlds.

Thus, Dostoevsky compares the two outcasts, Raskolnikov and Sonia, who both break God's commandments and shows how their attitude toward a seemingly unbiased thing— money —brings outcomes that correspond to their actions. For Sonia, money, or more precisely what she must do for money due to her solid and unwavering belief and hope in God is an involuntary undertaking to become purified in the eyes of both God and Raskolnikov in the filthy and desperate environment in which they both (Sonia and Raskolnikov) live. On the one hand, money paves the way for her to solidify her faith in God and save others in the process, both spiritually and financially. On the other hand, because of his gigantic vanity and pride that pushes him to willfully commit a double murder, money for Raskolnikov results in unleashing unbearable psychological and spiritual torture in the aftermath of his crime.

Luzhin is another protagonist who is incontrovertibly revealed through money. He is an embodiment of hypocrisy and bourgeois pragmatism that stems from an insatiable thirst for material gain and monetary profit. He is one of the most repulsive characters in *Crime and Punishment*. Contrary to Raskolnikov and Sonia, Luzhin is a predator who lacks any philosophical, religious, moral, or ethical values or principles. As opposed to Svidrigailov's

cynicism and sensual lechery, money for Luzhin is the means to achieve his entirely pragmatic, low, and corrupt self-interest in whatever form it may come, crushing peoples' lives in the process. Luzhin understands that he is "buying" his wife and is getting ready to morally dominate and humiliate Dounia because he realizes his material supremacy over her. The epitome of his practical egoism and rottenness is in his low attempt to frame Sonia for stealing 100 rubles. In order to pit Raskolnikov against his mother and sister and to reduce his influence on them, which Luzhin thought came from Sonia, he commits to the openly vile deed; he gives her the money, secretly puts it in her pocket and demands that she returns the stolen note in the presence of witnesses.

In *Crime and Punishment*, Luzhin is a representative of capitalism that Dostoevsky blamed for the majority of the social problems in Russia. Dostoevsky reveals time and again how money fever makes Luzhin a coldblooded, inhumane, and immoral person who does not hesitate to humiliate and frame an innocent fellow human being. Luzhin has one passion-the worshipping of the money idol. He belongs to the newly created capitalist segment of society in post-reform Russia who "loved and valued above all was the money he had amassed by his labour, and by all sorts of devices: that money made him the equal of all who had been his superiors" (Dostoevsky, 434). Once again Dostoevsky challenges Chernyshevsky's theory by portraying Pyotr Petrovitch Luzhin as the product of his theory of rational egoism making him a person lacking any mercy, compassions and fairness to other people.

Dostoevsky depicts Luzhin's inner character as stingy, tight-fisted, and money hungry, incapable of compassion, and driven entirely by his inflated self-egotism. Luzhin's theory about the whole coats and that the pursuit of selfish, egotistical interests is the foundation of good for

all, is the opposite of Raskolnikov's altruistic utilitarianism (good for all) and Razumihin's legitimate approach to business. He is convinced that if a man, willing to love his neighbor, gives that neighbor half of his clothes then he causes them both to be naked. The theory of rational egoism prioritizes the necessity to love only oneself if one wants to still have his clothes. Thus, according to Luzhin: "the more whole coats in the society, so to say, - the firmer are its foundations, and the better is the common welfare organized too" (Dostoevsky, 216). Further, Dostoevsky underscores Luzhin's corrupt and crooked nature introducing his flawed logical reasonings stemming from such a conviction: "in acquiring wealth solely and exclusively for myself, I am acquiring, so to speak, for all, and helping to bring to pass my neighbor's getting a little more than a torn coat" (216). Here, Dostoevsky vividly depicts how money imperceptibly migrated into the sphere of morality and psychology. Money for Luzhin is no longer the means for survival and satisfaction of necessities of life, it has become a purpose in itself, an end, and the cunning justification for his selfish desire to achieve prestigious social status, domination and power.

To portray the influence of money on others, Dostoevsky introduces a whole system of poverty-stricken secondary characters and opposes them to Raskolnikov. He shows how they relate to money; how greatly they depend on it in their actions, behaviors, and choices; and how money reveals their different characters. For example, Raskolnikov's poverty is more fortunate than that of Marmeladov. The latter is a former soldier who became a hopeless alcoholic incapable of holding a government job for long due to his malady. Utterly desperate and weak to overcome his addiction, he drinks away every kopek that he makes. With his three youngsters, a sick wife and an underaged teenage Sonia, Marmeladov's family has no one to turn to for help.

Unlike Raskolnikov, who has his mother, sister, Razumihin, and the ability to earn money performing tutoring services, they live in hopeless penury which promises no escape. However, the attitude toward money and the reactions of their family members to their situation differ dramatically.

Marmeladov, the head of the family, who “sold her (Katerina’s) very stockings for drink” (Dostoevsky, 25) escapes to alcoholism. He even enjoys his misery in the way that he desires humiliation and suffering: “I drink so that I may suffer twice as much... such is my fate and I am a beast by nature!” (25). He tolerates, welcomes, and is grateful for his wife’s beatings and constantly gives her the respect that she deserves: “I am a pig, but she is a lady! I have the semblance of a beast, but Katerina Ivanovna, my spouse, is a person of education and an officer’s daughter. Granted, granted, I am a scoundrel, but she is a woman of a noble heart, full of sentiments, refined by education” (24). Marmeladov is a humble man who has no concept of superior or inferior men, and as opposed to Raskolnikov prefers to humiliate and downgrade himself rather than categorize himself to belong to the Napoleons of this world. Even though he endlessly loves family but unable to resist his alcoholism, he admits that he is the reason for his loved ones’ misery, acknowledges his fault and accepts the consequences of his actions: “and then I will go of myself to be crucified, for it’s not merrymaking I seek but tears and tribulation!” (36). Unlike Raskolnikov who divides people into two categories of the “ant-heap creatures, the material” and the “extraordinary ones” having the moral rights to commit crimes and assigns himself to the latter.

Katerina Ivanovna, is similar to Raskolnikov in that she is “a lady of spirit, proud and determined” (Dostoevsky, 26). She does not resolve to commit murder or create any rationalizing

theories to compensate for her injured self-esteem, even though like Raskolnikov, “she was proud, too, excessively proud” (27). Her crime is rather different than that of his. Out of desperate misery, financial destitute and impending starvation for her three kids, she made Sonia take a yellow ticket (engage in prostitution). At the same time, she is “seeking righteousness” (450) as Sonia speaks about her with Raskolnikov. When Sonia comes home after her first shift at the new job and puts 30 rubles on the table, Katerina Ivanovna “in the same silence go up to Sonia’s little bed; she was on her knees all the evening kissing Sonia’s feet, and would not get up” (30). Further, she tenderly cares for Marmeladov when he is dying even though in the novel she beats him up and blames the unfortunate circumstances of their family on him. Her actions show that there is deeply rooted love in her heart, active love based on suffering and compassion towards others.

She is a proud pauper and her reaction to the lack of money manifests itself differently. How she expresses her destitution is rather desperate, eccentric, and controversial what Dostoevsky calls “a poor man’s pride” (531). She beats her husband, argues with her landlord, and forces her three kids to dance and sing in a despairing attempt to ask for alms on the street. Katerina’s need for self-assertion is reflected in her continuously expressing her noble origin or her belonging to a higher social status. She hosts a funeral for Marmeladov that is beyond her means, tells stories of her youth, often times over-exaggerating them to show her peculiar pride. Dostoevsky describes her eccentric nature as follows: “even the poorest and most broken-spirited people are sometimes liable to these paroxysms of pride and vanity which take the form of an irresistible nervous craving. And Katerina Ivanovna was not broken-spirited” (531). But this bragging is radically different from that of Raskolnikov’s. Her stories are nostalgic for times long

gone and a helpless acceptance of her present situation and frustration over it. Raskolnikov's thoughts and actions, on the other hand, are the manifestation of his hubris and his unwillingness to accept his circumstances, an absence of meekness that stems from the overwhelming influence of capitalism. Joseph Franks says: "For Dostoevsky, psychology and ideology were now inseparable, and each precipitous shift of behaviors correlated with some reference to radical doctrine" (488).

In *Crime and Punishment* Dostoevsky introduces a number of characters belonging to different social classes in the capitalistic environment of post-reform nineteenth century Russia. As it became the supreme value for the majority of the people, he uses money to try his every character and shows how their attitude toward it reveals the protagonists' inner essence, spirits, souls, and inner worlds and contributes to the novels' plot developments. In contrast to Raskolnikov, Marmeladov and Luzhin, Arkady Ivanovitch Svidrigailov belongs to the upper social class, has money and enjoys the comforts and entertainment that life can offer, however, his sins and transgressions are far more numerous and abhorrent than those of the poor. Svidrigailov is an ultimate creation of capitalism who has lost sense of what was right and wrong; he is a double-faced and base individual and a practical nihilist without any morals. He "was the most worthless scoundrel on the face of the earth" (Dostoevsky, 660) who has allegedly committed murders. He cynically and utterly devotes himself to depravity and pervasiveness labeling his indecencies a disease "like everything that exceeds moderation" (658). Svidrigailov uses money to feed his material, carnal, and sensual desires to satisfy his earthly immediate wants and wishes, only seldom using it to ease his tortured conscience for the offenses he committed. He is an example of the product, an end state per say, of money that has been

acquired and enjoyed without any labor or effort. While Luzhin is becoming someone like Svidrigailov, the latter is the final product of capitalism who is rotten, depraved, and corrupt to his core. It is unsurprising that although Raskolnikov far exceeds Luzhin and Svidrigailov in terms of his morals and principles, he is nevertheless similar to both of them in some ways.

Svidrigailov is Raskolnikov's spiritual double in terms of outlook, opinions, and actions. Both characters justify committing evil deeds for the sake of a good end, and both are murderers. Svidrigailov is reportedly responsible for the deaths of at least three people (a teenage girl, a peasant, and his wife), and Raskolnikov kills Alyona Ivanovna and Lisaveta, her sister. It is true, however, that Svidrigailov pursued his merely selfish interests while Raskolnikov focused on the greater good and other people's benefits in their crimes. But their theories and approaches are very similar. Svidrigailov's belief that "a single misdeed is permissible if the principal aim is right, a solitary wrongdoing and hundreds of good deeds!" (Dostoevsky, 687) resonates perfectly with the utilitarian ideas expressed by the officer and the student which resemble Raskolnikov's belief that "extraordinary" people can and must commit crimes if it would benefit greater masses. It takes one to know one, and Svidrigailov understands this: "wasn't I right in saying that we were birds of a feather?" (409). Dostoevsky uncovers the corrupt power of money and how harmful this type of reasoning is by using Svidrigailov's past. Because of money's pervasive and abusive influence, his character is carnal, immoral, selfish, corrupt, depraved, and lecherous. Raskolnikov feels disgusted when he realizes that he is similar to Svidrigailov. But as opposed to the latter, Raskolnikov is not a hopeless person while all of the characters in the novel regard Svidrigailov as the worst scoundrel.

Raskolnikov's similarity to Luzhin is ideological. Although, his demands are less

ambitious in terms of that he doesn't associate himself with Napoleon, Lycurgus, Solon, Mahomet (the extraordinary people that Raskolnikov refers to in his article), Pyotr Petrovitch's enormous vanity and pride are similar to that of Raskolnikov. They both strive to rise above the "material" as Raskolnikov refers to the ordinary people, "the material that serves only to reproduce its kind" (Dostoevsky, 369). Raskolnikov wants to belong to the "extraordinary" people while Luzhin is eager to occupy a high position in society. They both are mutually disgusted at each other without understanding how similar they are. Luzhin's theory of whole coats and his view that "everything in the world rests on self-interest" (216) invokes Raskolnikov's response; "why, carry out logically the theory you were advocating just now, and it follows that people may be killed" (220). In essence, his crime is of the same nature as Luzhin's because they both developed their own theories and believed in their merits, value and significance.

One can see progressive levels of corruption as it is reflected in Raskolnikov, Luzin and Svidrigailov's characters, respectively, by comparing the degrees to which money has affected them. Luzhin is an ideological murderer while Raskolnikov is an example of someone who has carried out his actions based on the principle of superiority and domination fueled by individual egotism and vanity. While both are guided by their self-conceit and self-importance, Luzhin is more corrupted than Raskolnikov. His motivation stems from the uttermost selfishness based on personal gains and profits, and adherence to his theory of whole coats makes him a rigid and calculating person unresponsive to the suffering of the ones around him and deprives him of feelings of mercy, compassion, love and the basic respect for others. Raskolnikov's actions, on the other hand, are driven by the humanitarian issues even though he doesn't fully understand his

motives before the crime happens. Luzhin conceals, masks or hides his corrupted nature and his low deeds but Raskolnikov having “overstepped the line” (Dostoevsky, 425) is doubtful of the righteousness of his actions, experiences remorse which provides for moral and spiritual hope for resurrection and purification.

Arkady Ivanovitch Svidrigailov also having “crossed the line” remains beyond; he is a conscious transgressor; he is aware of his crimes and infringements. He is the product of capitalist mindset and ideology and an example of the terminal degree of money’s corrupting power. He is not as stingy and calculating as Luzhin either because he has sufficient money or because he acquired it in questionable ways without performing any labor to earn it. But besides being vile and base, similar to Luzhin, the profound level of destruction of money on him is seen in his salacity, perversion, permissiveness and depravity. He lives up to the formula that “where there is money, there is debauchery”. Additionally, he used to be a card sharper, an occupation associated with deceit, easy profits, free gains and lies. By living only for himself and insatiably satisfying the gratification of his earthly wants and needs mercilessly oppressing any spiritual laws and moral norms, Svidrigailov finds himself useless and needless, and realizes that he has no meaningful purpose in life. Without having any spiritual values, any enlightened ideas providing support, hope and strength to a person in times of distress, Svidrigailov becomes the first person to kill himself in the series of Dostoevsky’s future novels.

Dostoevsky once again shows money’s presence in his characters’ lives, albeit indirectly. It is as if no person can live or function without money, or as if money must be the major factor that the writer needs to describe or develop his characters. Money fulfills one of the main functions in Dostoevsky’s works and more often than not, as seen on Svidrigailov’s example, the

writer moralizes on the idea that dirty money (acquired by questionable or effortless means) provides no happiness and destroys human lives. One can see that Dostoevsky develops his characters only in terms of how they treat money. It is possible that he would not have created such deep psychological profiles and the system of images in his masterpieces if he took money out of the equation.

The writer describes his favorite characters in the light of money. Razumihin is one of the positive characters in *Crime and Punishment* and is in direct opposition to Luzhin, Raskolnikov and Svidrigailov. Dostoevsky describes Razumihin as “a warm, open, simple-hearted, honest giant” (Dostoevsky, 292). His character is “competent, hardworking” (597) and “honest and capable of real love” (597). Razumihin is working on a plan to establish a legitimate book printing and trading business but does it without any avarice, greed, or cunning. His reasoned rationalism, based on a legitimate and honest approach to business and his true love for Dounia, are fundamentally different from the others’ egotistical rationalism, calculating love for themselves and their pursuit of easy gains.

Dounia is another positive character in *Crime and Punishment*. She is a practical and rational sacrificer as she makes the decision to forgo her happiness for the sake of her mother and brother, Raskolnikov. She is a woman of dignity and honor who claimed that she would never marry a person she didn’t love, however, the family financial circumstances were so desperate that she resolved to accept Luzhin’s courting. To underline similarities in character with her brother, Dostoevsky depicts Dounia and Raskolnikov as both physically and spiritually looking alike: “the very portrait of him, and not so much in face as in soul... both haughty and both generous...” (Dostoevsky, 342). Her pride is based on the feeling of personal dignity and

strength of spirit which makes her seek an honorable way out of poverty. On the contrary, Raskolnikov's pride leads him to a different path, distorts his thoughts, clouds his judgement and pushes him toward the way of a crime.

Donia lives in poverty and must earn her living working as a governess in rich families' houses. She and Sonia are very similar in a couple of ways. First, they sacrifice themselves and their happiness for the sake of the loved ones and are prepared to withstand many deprivations if circumstances require so. Dounia's sacrifice, however, is more rational than Sonia's, whose self-sacrifice is that of boundless compassion that stems from her Christian faith. Second, both women live in poverty but they remain faith, strength of spirit and honor in the trying conditions that surround them (although Sonia does sink to the social bottom, she nevertheless, remains a person of dignity). Money and destitute circumstances hasn't affected their characters because they are guided by Christian values of sacrifice, love and compassion and remain true to themselves and God.

Dostoevsky's characters' approach to money reveals their true qualities and inner worlds. He shows how an attitude towards money profoundly affects people's ideologies and actions in the context of the social-psychological trends of nineteenth-century Russia (capitalism). The writer is even more astute to reveal his protagonists' inner worlds and natures through their treatment of money. Money's influence on the characters of *Crime and Punishment* and their attitude towards it measures their decency and dignity. Indeed, money is the root of all evil, and Dostoevsky employs varying situations and scenarios to put money at the center of all conflicts that any attentive reader would spot immediately without effort.

MONEY IN LOVE RELATIONSHIPS

Dostoevsky writes about usury in *The Idiot*. The phenomenon was gaining popularity and was spreading throughout Russia with full speed since 1850. By the time Fyodor Mikhailovitch finished his novel there appeared a number of first small commercial banks and usurers became to be called as bankers. In *Crime and Punishment* Alyona Ivanovna is a petty local usurer, speculating on small items that her clients pawn for interest. In *The Idiot* Dostoevsky represents usury on a greater scale with monetary amounts far exceeding those transactions that Alyona Ivanovna engaged in. Ivan Petrovitch Ptitsin, one of the most well-marked types of an usurer in the novel is "well known, was engaged in the business of lending out money on good security, and at a good rate of interest" (Dostoevsky, 133). The amounts of the transactions he is capable to carry out are sizable. When Rogojin asks Ptitsin to supply by the same day evening the needed 40,000 rubles that he had promised Nastasia Philipovna in exchange for her love he exclaims: "Ptitsin! Find it for me. A good share shall stick to your fingers!" (167). He also calls him "a gay usurer" which in the original is "процентная душа" literary meaning an interest-bearing soul. Rogojin offers to pay Ptitsin an enormous interest for the urgent credit and later that night appears at Nastasia Philipovna's apartment with a dirty pack of the promised money.

In *The Idiot* monetary amounts that the writer uses to create and intensify conflicts are larger. Raskolnikov takes 317 rubles and 60 kopeks from the old lady pawnbroker's apartment after he murders her, the money that she meticulously collected and kept in a locked box under her bed. In contrast, Nastasia Philipovna throws 100,000 thousand rubles in the fireplace, and Totsky offers Gania 70,000 rubles to marry her. Even wealthy Svidrigailov doesn't operate with such large amounts; he offers Raskolnikov 10,000 ruble for Dounia not to marry Luzhin, he

gives 3,000 to Sonia to follow Raskolnikov to his excite and he leaves 15,000 for his young fiancée.

All the characters in *The Idiot* are engulfed with the money fever; they are all immersed in the money world by either thinking about it, making it, dreaming about it or squandering it. Continuing the theme of the money power and its corrupting nature in the novel, Doestoevsky depicts that it was no ordinary thing that people and their dignity had become objects for buying and selling. He shows that in the post-reform Russia new norms were being created with the worship of “the golden calf” becoming the standard which disintegrated the foundations of social life and corrupted its members. According to Bakhtin: “the major emotional thrust of all Dostoevsky’s work, in its form as well as its content, is the struggle against a reification of man, of human relations, of all human values under the conditions of capitalism... with great insight Dostoevsky was able to see how this reifying devaluation of man had permeated into all the pores of contemporary life, and even into the very foundations of human thinking” (Bakhtin, 62).

In *The Idiot* Dostoevsky depicts how money fuels, develops and intensifies human passions. Money gains major importance and plays a distinctive role in love relationships because it is intertwined with human emotions and influences people to make illogical and, at times, absurd decisions. This is especially evident in the unconditional passionate love relationships of Parfen Rogojin, Fyodor Pavlovitch, and Dmitry Karamazov. All of the protagonists resort to money as the instrument to achieve what they want, and all are similar in they are driven by blind passion in their actions and their decisions. Dostoevsky uses money as the catalyst in the processes in the protagonists’ souls that invariably manifest themselves in their actions. Elaborating on the role and importance of an idea in Dostoevsky’s heroes, Bakhtin says:

“Such a person enters into special relations with the idea: he is defenseless before it and its power, for he is not rooted in objective reality and is deprived of any cultural tradition. He becomes a "person of the idea," a person possessed by an idea. An idea becomes for him an idea-force, omnipotently defining and distorting his consciousness and his life” (Bakhtin, 22). Parfen Rogojin, Fyodor Pavlovitch, and Dmitry Karamazov are all obsessed with an idea of possessing the woman they desire, and money for them is the only means to get what they want because they feel worthless, useless and unvalued without money. Their passions for owning Nastasia Philipovna and Grushenka are blind and irrational, they affect their thinking, cloud their judgements and disturbs their emotional stability. Indeed, “money, in Dostoevsky’s works, plays a distinctive lyrical character, a negative image, almost a materialized one, which rules over the souls of other characters” (Makhmudova, 43). Money fuels, develops and reinforces their emotional fevers by promising to realize their desires making the protagonists commit illogical actions and behave erratically.

Rogojin is a true Russian soul, similar to Dmitry Karamazov, in that their uncontrolled passions, which are in great part the product of their backgrounds, influence them. He is a merchant who comes from a family of merchants and has inherited his father’s worst instincts, inclinations, and vices. Rogojin’s chronic limitations and constant deprivations that his father imposed on him and that had been subduing his will for so long and were fueled with fear, found a desperate escape when the latter died and left Rogojin a millionaire of 2.5 million rubles. Unfortunately for both Nastasia Philipovna Barashkoff and Rogojin, the former becomes an unintentional trigger that sets all his blind and uncontrollable passions free; money is what he needs to nurture his passion.

As a merchant with a keen sense of monetary value and business acumen, Rogojin trades Nastasia Philipovna as if she were a commodity for which he could bargain a better deal, starting with 18,000 rubles, progressing to 40,000 rubles and ending with 100,000 rubles. Similar to Fyodor Pavlovitch, who trades Grushenka, Rogojin wraps his money in a rough and tough dirty paper, puts a hessian rope around it, and gives it to Nastasia Philipovna. The manner in which they both use money and its outward appearance speaks volumes about the characters' natures and personalities. Coarse and sloven appearance of Rogojin's batch is indicative of the lack of respect for Nastasia Philipovna as a person along with his rough, primitive, frivolous, and savage temperament. The gesture resembles a crude barter transaction with Nastasia Philipovna being an object of a certain value to be acquired. Fyodor Pavlovitch's batch, which is smaller and less untidy than that of Rogojin, also reveals his mercenary nature and the spirit of disregard for Grushenka and her dignity. Both Rogojin and Fyodor Pavlovitch are earthly and material persons, and money for both of them is a mere tool to get or buy what they want. Both are driven by either the strive to satisfy his carnal and sensual desires (Fyodor Pavlovitch) or to satisfy his ego and desire for possessing what he so desperately wants (Rogojin). Both selfishly pursue the satisfaction of their wishes and are unaware that this buying the women is offensive to them. It is interesting to note that Rogojin is aware that when Nastasia does leave with him, she does so for money but Rogojin doesn't mind it; it doesn't offend him.

Money empowers his masculinity and reinforces his sexuality. All Rogojin wants is Nastasia Philipovna. With the magnanimous gesture reflected in the sum of the money that he progressively offers her, he shows her that he will sacrifice everything to demonstrate how much she means to him. Because of his passion, Rogojin does not see how he is offending her as he

essentially trades her as a prostitute. One can suppose that money for Rogojin is a direct reflection of how he values others; money empowers and means supremacy for him. It gives him the dominance, authority, and ambitions to get what he desires—Nastasia Philipovna.

He is so blind with passion for Nastasia Philipovna that he does not see that trading her is insulting. When he sees Nastasia Philipovna for the first time, he says, “I swear I was all of a blaze at once” (Dostoevsky, 13). Describing his impression of Rogojin, Prince Myshkin gives the state of his well-being: “it certainly did seem to me that the man was full of passion, and not, perhaps, quite healthy passion. He seemed to be still far from well” (45). When Gania asks if Rogojin would marry Nastasia Philipovna, Prince Myshkin replies “why not? Certainly he would, I should think. He would marry her tomorrow!—marry her tomorrow and murder her in a week!” (52). With the words of different characters, Dostoevsky conveys Rogojin’s painful passion and its abusive influence on the soul of the character. General Epanchin is the first to anticipate the consequences of Rogojin’s fervor. During their first conversation in his study with Prince Myshkin and Gania, he describes Parfen as: “the fellow really has a million of roubles, and he is passionately in love. The whole story smells of passion, and we all know what this class of gentry is capable of when infatuated. I am much afraid of some disagreeable scandal, I am indeed!” (44).

Sardonic Fyodor Pavlovitch, does not mind if women like him or not, he is not offended—after all, he plans to buy sex from women. He is hopelessly carnal and earthly, depraved and pervasive, lustful and indulgent. He meticulously collects money to ensure the satisfaction and gratification of all of his depravities until his death. He understands that no one will want to be with him unless he has money and is not ashamed to talk about it when he tells Alysha: “I intend

living as long as possible so I need every farthing, and the longer I live, the more I shall need it...The wenches won't come to me of their own accord, so I shall want my money. So I am saving up more and more, simply for myself” (Dostoevsky, 204). He is so cynical that considers money solely as a tool for the gratification of his basic desires. Dostoevsky expresses Fyodor Pavlovitch’s moral and ethical ugliness through his outward appearance: “the Adam’s apple hung below his sharp chin like a great, fleshy goiter, which gave him a peculiar, repulsive, sensual appearance; add to that a long rapacious mouth with full lips, between which could be seen little stumps of black decayed teeth” (21). Money for him is the ultimate goal, an end in itself, a purpose and means to fulfill his ignoble bodily cravings.

At the same time, Nastasia Philipovna would prefer to run away with Rogojin even though Prince Myshkin has money, declares his pure intentions for her, and offers her his hand in marriage. She seems to prefer a life of debauchery over virtuousness and rejects the Prince. Her decision is justified by an unwillingness “to emulate Totsky as a violator of ‘innocence,’ and a ‘cradle-snatcher,’ even though Myshkin is the miraculous realization of her hopeless adolescent dreams” (Frank, 581). But her disturbed personality prevails over virtue. She feels desecrated and dishonored because she fell prey to Totsky’s seduction when she was 17. She feels unworthy to marry an honorable Prince and leaves him for Rogojin. Moreover, she is a woman that no-one has truly loved. Totsky used her for his lust and lechery, Parfen’s love is a blind passion and Prince’s love is nothing more than a pity. Combined with her intractable maximalist nature, strong and prideful personality, Trotsky’s injustices over her have resulted in development of distinct masochistic inclinations that she sees running away with Rogojin as one of the options to end her life.

Having “suffered too much already in the consciousness of her own undeserved shame” (Dostoevsky, 639) and having experienced too much pain, she doesn’t care for herself or anything in life. She uses money in the intense scene where she throws the packet that Rogojin gives her in the fireplace to compensate for humiliation and gain self-respect and self-assertion for what Totski inflicted on her. Joseph Frank notes, “Nastasya Philipovna as a character is irremediably doomed, and she will function to bring down ‘her savior,’ the Prince, in her own tragic end” (581). He elaborates that while she achieves some satisfaction and triumph over her oppressor with this defying gesture, she plunges into a tragic destiny. Aglaya seems to expose Nastasia Philipovna’s true essence and true motives when she exclaims in the confrontation scene with her: “If you had cared to be an honest woman, you would have gone out as a laundress” (Dostoevsky, 843). Even though Nastasia Philipovna has unfortunate past and is quite unhappy, she is not a virtuous woman. She is a person of passion similar to Rogojin; she enjoys suffering her self-inflicted pain and her misery. Money is inseparably intertwined with her passion and she would be only able to entertain it with Parfen as she is not able to live a quiet life with Prince.

Dostoevsky once again exposes the inner characteristics of his characters in love relationships and uses money to bring them to the forefront. Like Sonia, who considers herself to be the greatest sinner, Prince says about Nastasia Philipovna that “this unhappy woman is persuaded that she is the most hopeless, fallen creature in the world” (Dostoevsky, 639). However, as opposed to Sonia’s sacrificial, compassionate, and altruistic actions, Nastasia Philipovna “did not go out to honest work, but went away with a rich man, Rogojin, in order to pose as a fallen angel” (842) and “could not love him (the Prince) because you (Nastasia

Philipovna) are too proud...too vain...too self-loving; you are self-loving” (839). Nastasia Philipovna labels herself Rogojinskaya (belonging to Rogojin), underlining her inclinations to choose money and Rogojin instead of the Prince and a virtuous life.

In *The Brothers Karamazov* Dostoevsky writes about “*karamazovshina*”, a term that became an allegory to describe the contemporary conditions in Russia and the state of its people in Dostoevsky’s times. The writer captures the specifics of psycho-social aspects of people’s lives in terms of their loss of spiritual values by the end of the nineteenth century. The influence of capitalism was obvious; materialism and the worship of the “golden sack” permeated all spheres of human existences and material values forced out spiritual ones. Dostoevsky points out: “never before in Russia was the “golden sack” accepted to be the highest and the sublimest thing on earth, never before was it elevated to such a position and with such a meaning than in our time, when the idol of money, its worship and gain absorbs everything around, and when the most authority is given to traders, lawyers and the other “best people” (Tarasov, 10).

Karamazovshina, reached to the farthest corners of the country and replaced of the Christian values with vices in whatever form they may come; greed, lust, hunger for profits, hate, hypocrisy, mendacity and all sorts of immorality. It’s no longer just fever of money, *karamazovshina* has infiltrated human nature and became the air they breath distorting souls and minds of the people. It is the uttermost degree of money’s corrupting power. Fyodor Pavlovitch knew that there was nothing more dissolute than *karamazovshina* for his contemporary generation and was afraid for the fate of the country.

Dostoevsky bring salacity, as one of the most prominent features of *karamazovshina* to the forefront. One of the novel’s major protagonists, Fyodor Pavlovitch, is the most obvious

sensualist in which he writes embodies his view of the destructive forces of capitalism. He is the head of the Karamazov's household whose sole purpose of existence is money and entertainment that are made possible only by the presence of money on hand; his tool and his reference point. Deprived of any moral compass and having the power, i. e. capital, Fyodor Pavlovitch frees up all his animalistic and carnal instincts. Dostoevsky shows that this kind of love for money completely eliminates the love for one's children. In his sons, Fyodor Pavlovitch sees only threat and destruction of his capital. His son, Dmitry Karamazov, inherits *karamazovshina* from his father, particularly his lustful and passionate nature.

There are similarities to Rogojin in Dmitry Karamazov's actions and feelings, and Dostoevsky uncovers their passionate characters through their attitude toward money. Like Rogojin, Dmitry is too wide of a man, in that his nature combines the two maximally opposing poles of good and evil that manifest themselves in turns in his actions. He is a very dissipated person who also unreasonably throws money around just to impress Grushenka. Dmitry experiences the same emotions as Rogojin when he first encounters Grushenka: "I went to beat her, and I stayed. The storm broke—it struck me down like the plague. I'm plague-stricken still, and I know that everything is over, that there will never be anything more for me" (Dostoevsky, 136). His passion for Grushenka is manifested in his use of money. He is too blind with passion towards her in a way identical to Rogojin's emotional fever. He takes the money that Katerina Ivanovna gives him, takes Grushenka to Mokroe, squanders money on gypsies, and gives peasants champagne to impress her. He sacrifices his conscience and prefers humiliation when he commits to conceal 300 rubles that Katerina Ivanovna entrusts him with to mail to her sister. Dmitry squanders half of her money and keeps his last 1,500 rubles to marry Grushenka. Rogojin

also knowingly spent his father's government loan bonds, which his father entrusted him to sell, on diamond earrings for Nastasia Philipovna in order to impress her and win her heart, aware of the grave consequences that would follow (his father brutally beat him up). Dostoevsky depicts how money impacts both Parfen and Dmitry's actions to the point of controlling them by fueling up powerful destructive feelings and emotions thus becoming the main reason for the characters' troubles and misfortunes.

Dostoevsky's spares no characters in his novels of money fever, and there is no personality trait that he does not uncover through the money theme. Dmitry uses money to avenge his wounded pride when he invites Katrina Ivanovna to his apartment and then refuses her while still giving her money to save her father. Later, when she gets her inheritance, she uses money to dominate and manipulate Dmitry, curing the psychological injuries that he caused her. Dmitry sees money as means to win Grushenka's heart while she used to be a money dealer (usurer) to compensate for love betrayal when the Polish officer left her. Heart broken and destitute, she became a mistress of an old and rich merchant Samsonov, who taught her the craft of usury, and then "after four years the sensitive, injured and pathetic little orphan had become a plump, rosy beauty of the Russian type, a woman of bold and determined character, proud and insolent. She had a good head for business, was acquisitive, saving and careful, and by fair means or foul had succeeded, it was said, in amassing a little fortune" (Dostoevsky, 408).

Katerina Ivanovna is similar to Nastasia Philipovna in her self-egotism. She sees money as a means of manipulation which, in turn, masks the selfish desire for moral domination over Dmitry. Joseph Frank says, "his (Dmitry's) refusal to take advantage of her when she complied was an even deadlier blow to her pride and gave him the psychological advantage in

their relations. Katerina's only weapon in this struggle of wills was a magnanimity that, in constantly reminding Dmitry of his moral inferiority, would allow her to maintain the upper hand" (862). Her feigned love for Dmitry and her desire to become his savior as "a means for his happiness... an instrument, a machine for his happiness" (Dostoevsky, 224) underlines her love-hate attitude toward him based on her psychological need for control and superiority. According to Dmitry: "she loves her own virtue, not me" (135), like Nastasia Philipovna who loves her shame. Alyosha adds: "you're torturing Ivan, simply because you love him—and torturing him, because you love Dmitry through 'self-laceration'-with an unreal love—because you've persuaded yourself" (227). Nastasia Philipovna does not want to dominate anyone but her egotism and self-love that money brings to the forefront is what the action develops around of and contributes to the plot development of Dostoevsky's works.

As cynical as he is, Fyodor Pavlovitch falls in love with Grushenka but he neither knows how to respect and treat women nor does he need it. He sees women only as means to fulfill his selfish immediate needs and wants. His first marriage was financially motivated. This "worthless puny weakling" (Dostoevsky,3) man managed to marry up, then appropriated all his wife's money and later tried to take away her estate. His second marriage was founded on his carnal and lustful basis which later: "he gathered loose women into his house, and carried on orgies of debauchery in his wife's presence" (11). He sees money as means to buy Grushenka's similar to Rogojin trading Nastasia Philipovna. For this purpose, he wraps 3,000 rubles in a paper packet and writes on it "to my angel Grushenka, if she will come," to which he added three days later, "for my little chicken" (321). Fyodor Pavlovitch knows the value of money as he undergoes a *prizhevalshik* (the one who lives at someone's expense typically out of mercy, a sponge) phase

and builds his landowner business from the ground after he “began with next to nothing” (3). Although he is “wicked... depraved profligate, a despicable clown... (81)... senseless... he was one of those senseless persons who are very well capable of looking after their worldly affairs” (3). But being a calculating landowner is not his major trait. Depravity and lecherousness are the hallmarks of his character. His two passions, lewdness and money-grubbing, become the center of gravity of the events that develop when Dmitry comes to Skotoprignyevsk and “was in open quarrel with his father and even planning to bring an action against him” (15) to settle his financial conflicts with his father.

Dmitry inherits his father’s lecherousness and is interested in only acquiring money for his own purposes. The money dispute and the love rivalry between father and son become the main point around which the plot of *The Brothers Karamazov* revolves. Dostoevsky portrays Dmitry to be a broad character “capable of combining the most incongruous contradictions, and capable of the greatest heights and of the greatest depths” (858). Joseph Frank notes that “Dmitry is seen as a symbol of Russia itself” (906) in that he is a believer who has a deep faith in God, but his morals do not forestall his actions and typically manifest themselves post-factum as remorse. But as opposed to his father, money for Dmitry is not an end in itself but a mere means of achieving his immediate wants.

Similar to Rogojin, money reveals Dmitry’s unruly and uncontrollable nature, rowdiness, and passions: “with me money is an accessory, the overflow of my heart, the framework” (Dostoevsky, 125). Although too extravagant, Dmitry is an honest and conscious man who loves God: “Hail to God and His joy! I love Him!” (725). He is a man in whose heart “God and the devil are fighting” (124) and the deeply-rooted good in his heart is what prevents

him from committing murder, although Dmitry was overcome with blind jealousy and impecuniousness. His attempt to break free from the shackles of the *karamazovshina* phenomenon is his genuine struggle to “wrench himself free from the temptations of Sodom and commit himself to the Mother of God” (Frank, 906). Once more, Dostoevsky simultaneously employs two main themes, money and religion, to show the degree of his characters’ wretchedness and show the destructive and the saving power of each.

MONEY AS A RIVAL IN LOVE TRIANGLES

Money itself creates love triangles in the novels where it functions as a rival. In *The Brothers Karamazov*, money functions as a competitor in a love triangle in Fyodor Pavlovitch and Dmitry Karamazov's money relationships. It is worth noting that the reason for meeting for Dmitry and his father was to settle financial disputes, which is the beginning of the major conflict of the novel. Further, Dostoevsky introduces another factor in the father and son quarrel—rivalry for a woman—as if to intensify the hatred and animosity in the father and son relationship. Ultimately, money becomes a rival to Dmitry, creating a major stumbling block in the father-son bond that ultimately leads to Fyodor Pavlovitch's tragedy.

For Dmitry and Fyodor Pavlovitch, the relationship with Grushenka, and Grushenka herself, is measured in monetary terms. For example, Dmitry thinks he is worthless to her without money and resorts to desperate measures to get the necessary money. He worries: "if she were to say to him: I'm yours; take me away, how could he take her away? Where had he the means, the money to do it?" (Dostoevsky, 437). Realizing that he is at a financial disadvantage over his father, he sacrifices his dignity and integrity to keep Katerina Ivanovna's 1,500 rubles to marry Grushenka. Additionally, he supposes that they can start a new life only if they have money, as if money is the source of happiness. This is one way that the writer shows how material values force out spiritual ones and how people see each other—and even themselves—not as valued human beings but rather objects to buy and sell with corresponding monetary values.

Similarly, Fyodor Pavlovitch leaves his wrapped 3,000 rubles for Grushenka thinking that this is the appropriate sum to buy her love. He feels his material superiority over Dmitry and is

relatively confident that she would choose him over his son. He expresses both of their approaches with a statement: “and I’ll marry Grushenka in a minute if I want to. For if you’ve money, Alexey Fyodorovitch, you have only to want a thing and you can have it” (Dostoevsky, 205). It is worth noting that money for Grushenka is not the last thing she considers when making her choice. Dostoevsky says: “But Grushenka favors neither of them, she’s still playing with them, and teasing them both, considering which she can get most out of. For though she could filch a lot of money from the papa he wouldn’t marry her, and maybe he’ll turn stingy in the end, and keep his purse shut. That’s where Mitya’s value comes in; he has no money, but he’s ready to marry her” (90). Before she is reborn, Grushenka is no different than her suitors. She is a stingy, wicked, mean, calculating usurer and a mischievous coquette planning to seduce Alyosha, a righteous man. As Stahl observes, “In this woman the author reflected the pernicious influence of the social environment, in which the money has the power, and where the moral code has lost its authority” (Stahl, 79). But through the acts of mercy to Alyosha and Dmitry that revive feelings of love and compassion in her heart, she opens up herself to spiritual rebirth and resurrection.

Another example where money creates a love triangle is the Gania-money-Nastasia Philipovna plot. Dostoevsky describes Gania’s nature as: “gloomy and greedy, impatient and selfish...” (Dostoevsky, 70), vain and ambitious almost to morbidity... (154), ... his self-respect is greater than his thirst for money” (154). For him, money is an end in itself, the object of passion and the ultimate goal. Gania wants to acquire capital by any means possible and for this purpose, he agrees to marry Nastasia Philipovna for 70,000 rubles. Although he knows that he would be miserable if he marries her, he lays his conscience at the altar of the money idol because it promises him further wealth and riches. Money for Gania is the equivalent to freedom,

an end in itself, a reason to achieve a prestigious social status, domination, and power; as Dostoevsky calls it, the status of “the best people.” He does not love Nastasia Philipovna; rather, he hates her and is afraid that she will marry Rogojin or Prince Myshkin if they offer her more money when it is revealed that he has a substantial inheritance.

Money is a destructive and powerful character but at the same time very subjective; a person can fight it if he has the will and desire to do so or treats it differently. Although money is a rival in the Gania-money-Nastasia Philipovna love triangle, Gania later refuses money and undergoes a profound change after declining to jump into the fireplace for the burning money. One can only imagine the intensity of the psychological processes that he had undergone before his fainting spell and woke up a different person. When out of loathing for Gania’s vanity and greed Nastasia Philipovna tests his prideful nature and throws the money she received from Rogojin into the burning fireplace, she offers all of it to Gania if he takes it out with his bare hands. While the packet containing 100,000 rubles starts gradually burning on its edges, Gania loses consciousness from the tension and temptation that overcome his soul at the decisive moment, but does’t jump for the money. Nastasia Philipovna takes out the money herself and gifts it to Gania afterwards. In this way, money is a means of positive change to put Gania in the spotlight, test his value system, and require him to choose between truth, integrity, and self-respect and self-egotism and shame. Dostoevsky portrays money equally capable of crushing a person’s spirituality and pushing him to a path of a crime, or purifying and saving him altogether.

Money has a destructive power over the protagonists’ lives; however, it is not always an antagonist in Dostoevsky’s novels. In Fyodor Pavlovitch - Dmitry Karamazov’s - money triangle money wins because Fyodor Pavlovitch is unable to fight his passion for money. But in Gania-

money-Nastasia Philipovna it loses as Gania makes a choice toward integrity, dignity and self-respect. In Dostoevsky's works, money functions as a litmus test in a laboratory of human souls that reveals his protagonists' true essence. Furthermore, money reaches deeply into the protagonists' psyches to uncover deep-seated emotions and underlying issues. Similar to money as a positive force for change in his novels, Dostoevsky also uses money to reveal his protagonists' positive characteristics when comparing his characters with one another.

MONEY AS A CHANGING POWER

As the primary function and catalyst in Dostoevsky's novels, money undergoes some changes in its character that correspond to the internal changes that Dostoevsky's human protagonists experience. Money loses its social power for Raskolnikov. It is without money, and without the slightest sign of its power in his exile in the environment of deprivation and suffering that Raskolnikov finally repents and turns to the eternal values capable of curing a human's soul. For Svidrigailov, money becomes a tool for coming to terms with those he wronged and alleviating his transgressions. Facing impending death he displays generosity and kindness in the form of noble deeds. He pays for Katrina Ivanovna's funeral and allocates money to put her kids in the good orphan asylum and even "will settle fifteen hundred rubles to be paid to each on coming of age" (Dostoevsky, 610) so that Sonia does't worry about them when she goes to Siberia with Raskolnikov. Money loses its importance for Dounia as she marries Razumihin for love. She has experienced Svidrigailov's unsolicited and offensive advances and endured a humiliating role being Luzhin's fiancée. Being happily married to Razumihin, they decide to leave Petersburg for Siberia to be with brother and "all together begin a new life" (751). Grushenka is also purified and changed once she sees Dmitry as he is and falls in love with his true nature. Just like for Raskolnikov, money loses its social power for her, and both characters are saved with the love that they discover within themselves.

Sonia gives up her body and reputation but, at the same time, manages to maintain her humility and faith in God. While according to Prince Myshkin, Nastasia Philipovna "has passed through hell and emerged pure" (Dostoevsky, 237), she leaves back to hell in terms of she runs away with Rogojin inflicting more pain and suffering on herself and ultimately causes her

own death, Prince's insanity and Rogojin's exile. Sonia is pure and innocent until the end. She convinces Raskolnikov to confess, follows him to his exile, supports him, and her love saves them both. Her self-sacrificing love, meekness, kindness and compassion cause radical transformation of Raskolnikov's value system and bring him back to life. When he comes to the realization that he loves her he feels that "how it happened he did not know. But all at once something seemed to seize him and fling him at her feet. He wept and threw his arms around her knees" (765). Nastasia Philipovna, on the other hand, destroys everything—herself, Prince Myshkin, and Rogojin.

Dostoevsky uses money to further develop and show the depth of Prince Myshkin's and Alyosha's pure characters. Unlike Rogojin, who squanders his inheritance to pursue his selfish goals, Prince Myshkin wastes his money on good deeds and acquiring friends. Unlike Dmitry, who makes enemies and drama because of money, Alyosha offers the money that he has to help Ilusha and, similar to Prince Myshkin, to make friends.

Even Smerdyakov is changed in the final moments of *The Brothers Karamazov*, although his ending is tragic. From an early age, he observes his master (who is more likely his father) and sees that whoever has money has power. He refuses to accept God and religion, as he senses that the real power of capital, the power of "colored papers," is a product of his environment and he becomes his father's murderer. Like Raskolnikov, he kills to rob (the ideological and monetary motives are also intertwined in Smerdyakov's actions) and, at the end, he refuses to keep the money (3,000 rubles) and gives it to Ivan. While Raskolnikov repents and surrenders, Smerdyakov chooses to punish himself by suicide. Although Dostoevsky does not specify what goes on in Smerdyakov's head after Fyodor Pavlovitch's murder, self-destruction is a definite

indication that his value system was compromised and questioned. Dostoevsky's conception that it is the individual who is solely responsible for his actions, irregardless of his social class or his level of education, is reflected in Smerdyakov's suicide. The writer places the full weight of moral responsibility on Smerdyakov's shoulders. His suicide note is indicative of regret and disappointment with his actions: "I destroy myself of my own will and inclination so as to throw no blame on anyone" (Dostoevsky, 872). Unlike Raskolnikov, Smerdyakov is an ardent and irreparable atheist who does not have any spiritual foundation capable of tearing a human being from his misery and saving him from destructive feelings of hopelessness and helplessness. Ivan naively thinks, "And now, I suppose, you believe in God, since you are giving back the money? No, I don't believe" (775). Suicide is the logical ending of Smerdyakov's life.

CONCLUSION

By entangling money with his protagonists' complex personalities, Dostoevsky shows how it fuels and reinforces vices in each character. The money theme in Dostoevsky's works is related to the Christian Orthodox teaching that love for money is the source of all evil that enslaves peoples' consciousness. In his 1980 essay, "Vlast' Stikhii," Brodsky eloquently underlines this metaphysic axiology of monetary consciousness: "together with earth, water, air and fire, - money is the fifth element which a person most often has to reckon with. It is in this fact one of the many reasons lays, probably the most important one, that today, after a hundred years since Dostoevsky's decease, his creations retain their urgency" (2). In his works Dostoevsky always stresses that it is the individual who can change the world and reverse its destructive trends. The fever of money can either manifest itself in poverty or in prosperity, but an environment is not the determining factor for crimes and sins. It begins with an individual and his soul, values, and faith.

Dostoevsky's attitude toward money is reflected in his novels where money exposes and brings to the forefront the inner worlds of the writer's protagonists. When it stops being mere means for ensuring satisfaction of peoples' essential needs and becomes an end in itself, money functions as a litmus test for human nature revealing people's true essences. Actions of the characters are closely connected to money so that it becomes a compass for determining people's true motives and intentions. By using money as the dominant principle in human relationships, Dostoevsky artistically paints his varying characters to show that money is capable of crushing peoples' lives by enslaving their consciousness, overturning their value systems, and corrupting their lives. Through the depiction of money, the writer draws the reader's attention to the kind of

consequences that the newly selected value and the frame of reference, money, has, and he calls on to the society and individual people to revise their attitude towards money. Attributing such tremendous power to money and its importance in his characters' lives, Dostoevsky portrays money as a separate function, rightfully deserving the status of being the most important feature in all of Dostoevsky's works.

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, Michael. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. Theory and History of Literature. Volume 8.* University of Minnesota Press. 1984.
- Brodsky, I. "Vlast' Stikhii". 1980. Live Journal, 2017. philologist.livejournal.com/9067654.html. Accessed 22 December 2020.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. Planet eBook, 2020, www.planetebook.com/crime-and-punishment/. Accessed 22 December 2020.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Global Grey eBooks, 2012–2020. www.globalgreybooks.com/brothers-karamazov-ebook.html. Accessed 22 December 2020.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Idiot*. Planet eBook, 2020, www.planetebook.com/crime-and-punishment/. Accessed 22 December 2020.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Gambler*. The Project Gutenberg Ebook of the Gambler. 2000. www.gutenberg.org/files/2197/2197-h/2197-h.htm. Accessed 31 March 2021.
- Fokin, P. E. Достоевский без глянца. Долги и доходы. Retrieved from <https://biography.wikireading.ru/156167>. Accessed 31 March 2021.
- Frank, Joseph. *Dostoevsky a Writer in His Time*. Princeton UP, 2010.
- Makhmudova S. M. "А мне надо деньги". "The Myth 'Money' in the Works of F. M. Dostoevsky." 2018, vol. 5, no 4, pp. 42–48.
- Stahl, J. "The Role of Money in Dostoevsky's Philosophy: 'The Gambler' and 'The Brothers Karamazov.'" University of Waterloo. 2003. Retrieved from http://www.hefter-verlag.de/verd/Dengi_0.pdf
- Tarasov, V. N. Метафизика Денег в Творчестве Бальзака и Достоевского. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/metafizika-deneg-v-tvorchestve-balzaka-i-dostoevskogo/viewer>

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Principal Investigator Name

Florida State University, Department of Modern Languages and linguistics

Florida State University
625 University Way
PO Box 3061540
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-1540

Professional Preparation

Undergrad Institution:	Panama City, FL	Business Administration	BA, 2012
Graduate Institution:	Kileen, TX	Business Administration	MBA, 2018

Appointments

Teaching Assistant, 2019-2020

Synergistic Activities:

Fyodor Mikhailovitch Dostoevsky raises the questions of the utmost urgency and importance in all of his works. These questions are not likely to ever lose their significance. The writer acutely feels money's corrupting power on individuals and on society as a whole. He tirelessly conveys the consequences of the worshiping of the money idol and its devastating impacts on peoples' lives. This is especially important nowadays as the XXI century is marked by materialism where people have been gradually forgetting and putting any other values and ideas but material ones in the backyard of their conscience. Dostoevsky's philosophy and his stance on the money is a wake up call for people to reevaluate their values or face the consequences if they bow down to the mammon of this world.