

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

A Nietzschean Reading of Dostoyevsky's *the Brothers Karamazov*

Hassan Taheri

M.A. Student, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Guilan, Iran

Abstract:

*This paper primarily aims to lay the foundations of Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* through the use of Nietzsche's death of God and superman concept, alongside with loneliness as the source of creation. Description of character's mentality is delineated so as to give us a light into Dostoyevsky's motifs. The chaotic world of Dostoyevsky's fiction is yet investigated through the results of any search and finding of aforementioned ideas by the use of Nietzsche's concept and death of God concept plays a key role as well. The amalgamation provided the researcher with nothing but the inevitability of necessity of evil in the world and the mental consequences followed by it. Role of Ivan as the all-time questioner of the predefined ideologies is the key that makes Dostoyevsky's project of chaos; beyond good and evil.*

Keywords: *Atheism and Agnosticism, Death of God, Dostoyevsky, Loneliness and Creation, Superman, The Brothers Karamazov.*

1. Introduction

Born in Tsarian era, and confined for the act of treason, Dostoyevsky in his solitude found out the misery and the upcoming in fortunes of the coming century. Dostoyevsky was not only a novelist of his time, but a psychologist and sociologist and philosopher of even today. Canonically he is considered a moralist, but by reading between the lines of his entire oeuvre one can baldly enough claim that he was moral challenger.

2. What is Atheism and Agnosticism?

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, atheism was defined, among other things, as the absence or refusal of any belief in any divinity, or as a social or political attitude, or a doctrine denying the existence of any god or Divinity whatsoever. The term is therefore opposed to theism and is to be distinguished from agnosticism. The conception of atheism has not always been so, it changes according to authors and epochs.

2.1. Definition

The authors have difficulty in defining in the best possible way atheism and in classifying its variants, since it can at the same time mean a mere absence of beliefs and a real and conscious rejection of religions. Several categories have been proposed to try to distinguish these different forms of atheism, most defining it as 'absence of beliefs in one or more divinities' thus covering the variety of this non-theism.

Moreover, the diversity of the possible definitions of divinity creates ambiguities in the field of the notion of atheism; a belief will be compatible or not with atheism depending on whether its object will be considered as a divinity. Like religion, atheism varies with the type of civilization of which it is one of the facets. Just as there is no universal and immutable religion, there is no universal and immutable atheism.

2.1.1. Atheism in Modern Thought

Western philosophical reflection tends in general to naturalize the divine, to bring it back into the world, as in Spinoza's *God or Nature*, for which God is a synonym of Nature. There is a debate between pantheism and atheism. For some, pantheism is in reality a disguised atheism when the God identified with nature has neither project nor intentionality. This pantheism thus paved the way for a philosophical atheism (Sade, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche). It also finds its origin in the pre-Socratics, in particular the atomists, and relies moreover on various arguments relating to relativism, rationalism, nihilism, and even morality. Atheism refuses to postulate the existence of entities whose existence is neither proven nor observable, and also emphasizes the possible immorality of this existence. There are no valid rational arguments to support belief in the existence of any god, whether it is man-made (anthropomorphic) or a metaphysical abstraction.

Philosophical atheism can range from a radical critique of religion to an attitude of constructive inquiry or inquiry into the existence of God, which is part of legitimate philosophical speculation.

2.2. Agnosticism

Agnosticism or thought of interrogation is an attitude of thought considering the truth of certain propositions concerning in particular the existence of God or of the gods as inaccessible to human intelligence. Agnosticism is not necessarily incompatible with atheism or theism even if certain agnostics refuse to decide. If the degree of skepticism varies according to the individual, the agnostics agree that there is no definitive proof in favor of the existence or non-existence of the divine, and affirm the impossibility of pronouncing in which concerns knowledge and also, sometimes, with regard to belief or non-belief.

If the agnostics refuse to pronounce on the existence of superior intelligence, they do not, on the contrary, grant, or at least tend to grant, no transcendence and no sacred value to religions (prophet, Messiah, sacred texts, etc.) and their institutions (clergy, rituals and various prescriptions). They see religions as purely social and cultural constructions whose main function is to ensure cohesion and order in traditional human societies through, for example, the threat of hell, the promise of paradise or the notion of sin or the mechanism of the scapegoat. In other words, religions, in the eyes of an agnostic, are far too 'human' in their modes of functioning and by the anthropological dynamics on which they are based – psychological support in the face of death, a very anthropocentric analogy of a god builder of the universe – so that they have any direct link with any form of superior intelligence, while also not excluding for some, the fact that it is nevertheless possible. Hence this constant interrogation proper to the agnostic.

2.2.1. Etymology

The term 'agnosticism' comes from the Greek agnostikismós, itself taken from agnosta (ignorant), the gnosis being knowledge; it denotes the deprivation of knowledge or the impossibility of knowing what goes beyond experience. It is therefore a rather epistemological position that questions the legitimacy of metaphysics, revelation, divination, and so on. Agnosticism is not to be confused with a systematic and specific opposition to Gnosticism, which is a doctrine connected with the beginnings of Christianity, but it has a much more general meaning. Prior to Christianity, the word 'agnostic' meant a person who had not been initiated into 'gnosis', that is, a mystical belief in 'perfect and absolute knowledge'.

The word 'agnostic' was coined in 1869 by Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1895). Huxley in his essay, *Agnosticism*, which is published in Appleton's *Christianity and Agnosticism: a Controversy*, declared that: "So I took thought, and invented what I conceived to be the appropriate title of "agnostic." It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the "gnostic" of Church history, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant. To my great satisfaction the term took" (Appleton, 1889: 21).

Further on, he adds: "This principle may be stated in various ways, but they all amount to this: that it is wrong for a man to say that he is certain of the objective truth of any proposition unless he can produce evidence which logically justifies that certainty. This is what agnosticism asserts; and, in my opinion, it is all that is essential to agnosticism" (ibid.: 21).

He wanted the term to make it clear that metaphysics is 'empty of meaning'; as the empiricist philosopher David Hume, who at the end of his *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, had already thought of throwing to the flames books of theology or of metaphysics.

3. Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoyevsky (1821-1881)

3.1. Biography

If there is a novelist in whom the terms suffering and redemption have a meaning, it is certainly Dostoyevsky. With him, the themes of good and evil are pushed to the extreme, hence the strong impression that seizes every time of his readers. No one leaves his work unharmed, regardless of the age at which he is approached. Throughout our lives, his tortured characters will continue to populate our imagination and our consciousness.

Take for example the hero of *The Adolescent*; Arkady Dolgoruky wants to become rich like James Rothschild. Behind this will, which is very simple and a little naive, hides a much more complex truth. Thus it is not wealth as such that interests us, but the power it provides. Yet it must be understood that this power does not intend to make use of it. All he wants is to own it and know that he could use it if necessary. In other words, behind the wealth, it is the freedom of the individual that is his leitmotiv. We thus pass from a character anchored in the real – a young man who wants to find his place in society – to the description of the inner world of consciousness. For what is freedom, in the end? Where does it begin and where does it end? This is the problem posed by Dostoyevsky. On the one hand the individual feels that the destiny which nature has assigned to him is to do everything possible to become himself; for example, someone who has gifts and who does not exploit them would fish against nature. But on the other hand to impose oneself as much as possible and to develop to the maximum his personality, is to run the risk of harming others.

And that's the dilemma. Do we have the right to do everything that we feel is right for ourselves if our actions do harm around us? Should we limit our freedom in the name of morality? If the answer is yes, we are acting against our nature by restricting our power. If the answer is no, we are likely to commit evil. And there are all possible cases of consciousness. What would push me to do good? God, no doubt. But we should be sure that it exists. In Dostoyevsky, however, doubt always seems to hover. The writer certainly has a mystical approach and the questions of metaphysics are of great interest to him. God may well not exist. Or if it exists, why does it impose this insurmountable dilemma between the need to affirm myself and the respect I owe to my fellow men? After all, God created the world as it is. It is therefore he who asks me to believe and to love my neighbor. In *the Brothers Karamazov*, Dostoyevsky thorough the mouth of Kolya, declared:

Oh, I've nothing against God. Of course, God is only a hypothesis, but ... I admit that he is indeed ... for the order of the universe and all that ... and that if there were no God he would have to be invented [...] It's possible for one who doesn't believe in God to love mankind, don't you think so? (Dostoyevsky 2005: 513)

How to get out? By the notion of freedom. I am free to do what I want, but I can also decide for myself to put a brake on this freedom in order to respect other men. This restriction is at the heart of the Dostoevskian problem. Later in the novel, Lise once says: “[...] I don’t talk about holy things. I don’t want to be holy. What will they do to one in the next world for the greatest sin?” (ibid.: 539-540); this feeling of ambivalence is quite dominant.

But let us return to the hero of *The Adolescent* and listen to him speak. As a first step, this is how he expresses himself: “Yes, I am a gloomy person; I’m always shutting myself up. I often love to walk out of a room full of people. I may perhaps do people a kindness, but often I cannot see the slightest reason for doing them a kindness. People are not such splendid creatures that they are worth taking much trouble about.” (Dostoyevsky 2007: 82).

Egoist in essence, He decides to become rich to be superior to others:

That is the point of my idea, that is the force of it, that money is the one means by which the humblest nonentity may rise to the foremost place. I may not be a nonentity, but I know from the looking-glass that my exterior does not do me justice, for ray face is commonplace. But if I were as rich as Rothschild, who would find fault with ray face? And wouldn’t thousands of women be ready to fly to me with all their charms if I whistled to them? I am sure that they would honestly consider me good-looking. (ibid.: 84)

The hero warns the reader that he will not use the power that money gives him to avenge his low social condition: “What I want isn’t money, or rather money is not necessary to me, nor power either. I only want what is obtained by power, and cannot be obtained without it; that is, the calm and solitary consciousness of strength! That is the fullest definition of liberty for which the whole world is struggling! Liberty!” (ibid.: 84).

And the teenager to explain that he will not look for worldly successes. On the contrary, it will prefer to remain unknown and it does not matter if it is believed poor. At the bottom of him, in his intimate being, he will know that he is not, and that he possesses the power of money and the freedom to enjoy it. Everything is interior, then. Only the image he takes of himself is counted. He even went so far as to dress up an old coat for the pleasure of seeing others mistaken about his social condition. This pleasure would then arise from the discrepancy between the gaze of others and the consciousness that the individual has of himself.

We are therefore at the very center of the problematic developed by Dostoyevsky in all his novels in general and in this one in particular. What counts is the personality, the self-consciousness and self-worth. Even if the latter does not express itself by acts, even if the others, who judge you only by your actions, have an erroneous opinion of you, it does not matter as long as you know yourself who you are. There remains the problem of morality which has already been mentioned above. *The Adolescent* responds in this way: “I don’t want to oppress or torment anyone and I won’t, but I know that if I did want to ruin some man, some enemy of mine, no one could prevent me, and every one would serve me, and that would be enough again. I would not revenge myself on anyone” (ibid.: 85).

It is enough for him to know that he can do evil, that he has the possibility and the means to do so, in order to feel himself in accord with himself. He no longer even felt the necessity of taking action. His knowledge of his power allows him to remain in the realm of possibilities, without realizing anything. He thus avoids the evil and the bad conscience that is corollary to him. He even pushes the game so far that he imagines that once he has become rich, when he has enjoyed the possibilities that have become his – but possibilities that will have remained unfulfilled by his own decision – he will be able to distribute his wealth and becoming a beggar. Only the memory of having been rich and thus of having been important at a certain moment will suffice, as well as the memory of having renounced these riches by a voluntary act. The individual is therefore all powerful on his destiny and on the way in which he manages his life. There are its true richness and true value. This way of transcending the evil by making the free choice to renounce it is certainly a behavioral peak to reach.

Another approach that characterizes the hero of *The Adolescent*, alongside his desire for wealth, is his desire for nobility. To understand such an attitude, one has to get back to the context of Russian society of the nineteenth century. For Pushkin, for example, who was descended from a noble family himself, the aristocracy was the memory of the nation, as well as the only social class capable of maintaining a certain independence from the power of the Tsar. It is not surprising, then, that our teenager also dreams of this nobility that is denied him. In fact he is of popular origin by his mother, but he happens to be the son of a wealthy noble owner. Unfortunately this paternity cannot be claimed before society because it is not official. Concretely, his father had an illegitimate relationship with one of his peasant women, who was already married. This is our teenager, a prey to a case of conscience. On the one hand he wishes to claim his noble origin, but to do so he should admit that his father is a woman runner who abuses his servants – and here we find the theme of evil so dear to Dostoyevsky. On the other hand he must assume his modest condition and remain in his own eyes an insignificant being.

The situation is cogent when we know that, by chance, the name he bears – that of the legitimate husband of his mother – is precisely that of one of the largest families in Russia. In other words, in the college or elsewhere, whenever his name is asked and he calls himself Dolgorouki, he is asked whether he is Prince Dolgorouki. Bitterly, he must reply that his name is Dolgorouki. With the years, his answer will become even more scathing:

[...] nothing could be more foolish than to be called Dolgorouky without being a prince. I have to bear the burden of that foolishness through no fault of my own. Later on, when I began to get very cross about it, I always answered the question “Are you a prince?” by saying “No, I’m the son of a servant, formerly a serf.” At last, when I was roused to the utmost pitch of fury, I resolutely answered: “No, simply Dolgorouky, the illegitimate son of my former owner.” (ibid.: 4)

Thus, when he is believed to be noble by his name, he must confess to being a commoner, but when he claims his true origin, he must not only cite a name without apparent prestige – Versilov – but also admit the ignominy of this noble father – and therefore the shame of his own birth. He immediately loses the benefit of the patronymic and plunges into a moral ostracism. So the solution he finds is that of reaching the nobility of the soul and not that of the name. His approach thus becomes metaphysical. We have already addressed

this religious aspect when we have spoken of the free will to renounce the evil that one might commit towards others. But here we must go further. In his existential approach, in his quest for purity, there is clearly in *The Adolescent* a desire to find God. This does not prevent him from showing himself cruel and unjust towards his mother, an attitude which plunges him into evil in spite of all his fine speeches and his best intentions.

3.2. Characters

The characters of Dostoyevsky are valued by their inner world. They are not simple caricatures that have emerged from the novelist's imagination. They are well anchored in real life; they love, suffer, are envious, have debts, and so on. On this side, they seem very concrete and play a part in a well-conducted intrigue. It is all the art of the writer to know how to keep us in a state of mind by obliging us to be interested in paper characters. But behind these stories told, it is of course all the complexity of the different protagonists that will captivate us. The situation is both simple and multiple; simple because each character represents an idea – an idea that evokes in itself a stage of Western thought. Thus we find the atheist, the revolutionary, the player, the mystic, and so on. Multiple because each character cannot be summed up in the main idea he embodies. Plunged into his own contradictions, tortured by his doubts, he becomes, in our eyes, profoundly human by this very fact. This does not prevent everyone from defending his main idea before others. Thus, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, Mitya is impulsive, vicious and enamored of the beauty of the flesh. Ivan is reserved and educated. Addressing Alyosha he declares: "Is there in the whole world a being who would have the right to forgive and could forgive? I don't want harmony. From love for humanity I don't want it. I would rather be left with the unavenged suffering. I would rather remain with my unavenged suffering and unsatisfied indignation, even if I were wrong. Besides, too high a price is asked for harmony; it's beyond our means to pay so much to enter on it. And so I hasten to give back my entrance ticket, and if I am an honest man I am bound to give it back as soon as possible. And that I am doing. It's not God that I don't accept, Alyosha, only I most respectfully return him the ticket." (Dostoyevsky 2005: 222)

Skeptical, he denies the love of God and neighbor. Alyosha has rather a simple mind and a pure heart. Finally, Smerdyakov, epileptic, cynical, libertine and embodies evil. Conflicts of interest and complex relationships between the brothers will constitute the intrigue. Once their father is assassinated, the reader wonders who among the brothers could have killed him. Alyosha received their confessions. There follows a whole series of philosophical discussions which constitute the heart of the narrative, but which do not bother the reader in spite of the complexity of the subjects tackled. Here good and evil confront each other without ceasing, and despair is opposed to the deepest faith. Ivan opposes to Alyosha the suffering of man to deny the existence of God. God cannot exist and his love even less because innocent children suffer every day as well as the worst villains. Alyosha responds by invoking the character of Christ, who descended into the abyss of our suffering and our misery. By giving his blood for all, Christ would justify the suffering of the world permitted by God. The symbol of the cross would thus compensate for the martyrdom of the innocent child. But this explanation does not satisfy Ivan. Dialogue is impossible between profound faith and extreme impiety. We thus touch on the genius of Dostoyevsky who manages to ask the most fundamental questions and to make us think without really deciding in one direction or another.

If he himself, by conviction – or by existential necessity – is closer to the faith of Alyosha, it is certain that in his life he often experienced the tortures of Ivan. Finally, everything is a matter of faith and not of reasoning. Only simple and pure hearts can understand the evangelical message.

In other words the life and evil it implies have no meaning without God. It must therefore be invented. But then, nothing proves that it really exists. In this hypothesis, it is only the fruit of our imagination, a necessity created by man to help him survive and suffer less. The man who reasoning realizes this imposture. It is better, therefore, to reflect less and believe in the depths of his heart. That is why Dostoyevsky loves simple beings. Even if they commit errors and horrible actions – through weakness – their repentance brings them closer to the personage of Christ. He finally prefers these people to logicians who decide to triumph in the affirmation of their personality. The spirit involves the negation of God and helps to affirm man – 'God is dead' Nietzsche said. But without God, the life of man has no meaning. So it is better to stay simpler and accept God. Dostoyevsky is not far from believing in the necessity of evil as a means of repentance. It is only after having plunged into the abyss of sin and being ashamed that the individual becomes aware of his soul and can seek forgiveness in the divinity. Evil would therefore be a (paradoxical) means of joining God. As a result, the greatest sinners would be closer to God than the integral logicians.

And what is valid for the individual is also valid for a whole people. Thus the Russian people, more mystical than others, would have the mission of reminding humanity of the Christian message. Dostoyevsky's distrust of foreigners in general and of European ideas of progress in particular can be better understood. It is also in this way that his hatred is explained both for the Roman Church and for atheistic socialism. Thus, in his short account *The Crocodile* (1865), otherwise little known, he imagines that a functionary was eaten by the first crocodile that a German charlatan had come to show the public of St. Petersburg. The 'monster' represents the incursion of foreign capitalism into Russian soil. It is about making money with anything, while presenting ideas and objects – here an animal – hitherto unknown. Everyone opposes the possibility of opening the crocodile to recover the official who like the biblical Jonah in his whale, is not dead but continues to dialogue with passers-by. The owner of the animal wants to keep his livelihood – he even increases the price of the visit since his reptile became famous – some citizens would find it regrettable to discourage foreign investment, the civil servant's wife enjoys his freedom regained, and the victim herself takes advantage of her adventure to explore the interior of the crocodile. She hopes to become famous by the scientific conferences she will be able to give. In short, this immoral and asocial fable is a critique of foreign incursion into Russian soil. Any mystic, Holy Russia should turn away from Western progress and return to the messianic role that is its.

Obviously, the contemporary readers that we are, tired by the rise of globalization and neo-capitalism, will see in this tale a critique of capitalism. In Dostoyevsky, this is indeed the case. In his great novels, too. Heroes often live in tragic situations, confronted as they are with the dominant classes of Tsarist Russia. Thus misery and despair often lead them to crime or to suicide. This view of things explains why the communist regime, after 1955, agreed to spread the works of our novelist. But this Marxist reading is poor. It is true that they see Dostoyevsky as the critic of capitalism there, but they neglect the solution brought by the author. For the latter, far from advocating the revolution, proposes a Christian solution by the acceptance of suffering and the outcome in redemption. Ultimately, the poorer and abused the people, the more it will be a sign of God and the closer the people will be to their conversion. The least that can be said is that such ideas are particularly retrograde. Personal correspondence, as quoted in *Dostoyevsky: His Life and Work* (1971) by Konstantin Mochulsky: "To study the meaning of man and of life – I am making significant progress here. I have faith in myself. Man is a mystery: if you spend your entire life trying to puzzle it out, then do not say that you have wasted your time. I occupy myself with this mystery, because I want to be a man" (Mochulsky 2001: 17).

Dostoyevsky, a man of all anxieties, is not, therefore, in a paradox. He who had made four years of penalties for contentious ideas, at the end of his life became the bard of eternal Russia, that of the popes and the people of God. Thirsty for truth, he has no clear solution to make. The world remains a valley of tears and the individual, conscious of its singularity, wonders what role it must take to justify its existence. It is this descent into the depths of consciousness that enchants the modern reader. If Dostoyevsky does not give answers, he has the gift to constantly question himself and to go through all the contradictions. It is this permanent questioning that makes him an exceptional author. Far from ready-made truths – socialism or Christianity – he desperately seeks a God while doubting his existence. Doubtless this is the only way of not falling into the faith of the charcoal-burner but on the contrary of assuming doubt and obscurity. It is beyond dispute that Dostoyevsky is not a total man of order when commenting in *The Idiot*:

[...] Roman Catholicism is, in my opinion, worse than Atheism itself. Yes— that is my opinion. Atheism only preaches a negation, but Romanism goes further; it preaches a disfigured, distorted Christ—it preaches Anti-Christ—I assure you, I swear it! This is my own personal conviction, and it has long distressed me. The Roman Catholic believes that the Church on earth cannot stand without universal temporal Power. He cries 'non possumus!' In my opinion the Roman Catholic religion is not a faith at all, but simply a continuation of the Roman Empire, and everything is subordinated to this idea—beginning with faith. The Pope has seized territories and an earthly throne, and has held them with the sword. And so the thing has gone on, only that to the sword they have added lying, intrigue, deceit, fanaticism, superstition, swindling;—they have played fast and loose with the most sacred and sincere feelings of men;—they have exchanged everything—everything for money, for base earthly POWER! And is this not the teaching of Anti-Christ? How could the upshot of all this be other than Atheism? Atheism is the child of Roman Catholicism—it proceeded from these Romans themselves, though perhaps they would not believe it. It grew and fattened on hatred of its parents; it is the progeny of their lies and spiritual feebleness. Atheism! In our country it is only among the upper classes that you find unbelievers; men who have lost the root or spirit of their faith; but abroad whole masses of the people are beginning to profess unbelief—at first because of the darkness and lies by which they were surrounded; but now out of fanaticism, out of loathing for the Church and Christianity!' (Dostoyevsky 1955: 801-802)

3.3. Summary of the Brothers Karamazov

It is a spiritual drama, segmented into parts, books and chapters. The writer there dissects in its smallest details the story of a parricide using the plot of a detective novel. We find this theme already discussed in *Crime and Punishment* and *The idiot*. As a means of introspection, Dostoyevsky uses an external narrator, a true active shadow of himself. This approach helps to make a book, of rare clarity, pegged in four parts.

The first is the setting up of the decor and the presentation of the characters. Towards the middle of the nineteenth century a Russian family of small nobility, uprooted and skeptical, is left to its passions. Father, Fyodor Pavlovich Karamazov is a violent, cunning, hungry, money and sex ghost.

His eldest son, Mitya (Dmitri) is the child of a first mother. Ignored by his father, he is brought up by an old servant Grigory. Adult, he also becomes violent, obsessed with women and money. He nevertheless possesses a sensitive soul padlocked deep within himself and open to purification through suffering.

The second son, Ivan is the most educated. As a child of a second mother, he was also raised by Grigory. Solitary, he is an idealist who does not admit the world. He vows to his father a hatred never clearly expressed.

As for the cadet Alyosha (Alexey) – the same mother as Ivan – he is paradoxically a pure heart. Engaged in the way of the Church, he follows the religious precepts of his director of conscience the holy starets Zosima who prepares him to purify the world. We shall not forget Smerdyakov, the redoubtable natural son, epileptic bastard.

The second part contains the ideological theme: advocacy for atheism. Faced with the condition of the Russian people bending under labor and grief; what are the possible solutions? Should we be secular or religious? Would not religion offer the possibility of dominating oneself and thus tending towards freedom? Which way to choose? And if the ideal was ultimately a 'State-Church' combination.

Like this, the amorous rivalries become clearer. Catherine, abandoned betrothed of Dmitri, likes to suffer not to be loved. In the sacrificial position, she relies on an illusion of happiness to live 'refused'. Thus she accepts that Dmitri will go and convince her of her new love, Grushenka; a young woman of good pleasure. But this is complicated because Fyodor Karamazov, the father, likes Grushenka to madness. Then Dmitri the son and Fyodor the father, besides questions of money, will not be slow to fight. One would almost forget that Ivan, the austere idealist, loves Catherine, but is not loved by her.

Then we have, in reading, a confusion of emotions and feelings. Passionate errors succeed one another. I love you, you love me, I no longer love you, but if I still love you. What confused promises! What immature characters dominated by their affective hyper-fragilities! And what a compensatory and masochistic pleasure to repeat them. We can ask ourselves basically, to what extent this so-called 'Church-State' could provide for all these puerile deficiencies. And to complicate the situation, the saint stares Zosima, referent of a certain stability of thought, dies and releases a 'deleterious' odor. Around his remains the monks are left alone. How does God permit this cadaveric stench! Was the starets an authentic saint? Alyosha, his disciple, charged with going to bear the good word throughout the world, comes to doubt his late director of conscience. His perception of an idealized world is wavering. The world is above all earthly and the prayers are of little effect.

The third part is that of the crime. Dmitri, accused, proves incapable of defending himself. There, Dostoyevsky pushes the cork and records almost all the psychological components of the human soul. It precedes Freud in the unconscious desire for the death of the father with the original horde of brothers and the natural son, the formidable Smerdyakov. We are witnessing a long descent into the depths of man. We are all guilty. One cannot help but have a thought for Letter to the father of Kafka. "[...] who doesn't desire his father's death?" exclaimed Dmitri (Dostoyevsky 2005: 637). And the family taint of which no one is exempt appears in the open, it is sensuality. In addition, except for Alyosha, the thirst for money.

The police framework is well constructed and the fourth part finally solves the question: 'who killed?' Smerdyakov actually turns out to be the culprit. He is the one who carries at the highest level the defect contained in the father. Ivan, meanwhile, is a potential assassin undermined by desire. But it is Dmitri who is condemned.

There are other ways of approaching this work of inexhaustible riches. It is in itself an intimate tragedy where the writer has put much of himself. But it remains a strong angle, the image of the father, who probably haunted Dostoyevsky all his life. His father, Mikhail Andreyevich, who retired to the country, drank and tyrannized his serfs. He was found dead in his field, probably murdered.

So this man, what mystery? What nature is made of this evil which sticks to it and devours it? Why is there in him the appetite for domination, this need to make others and himself suffer? Where do these self-destructive drives come from? Would not his soul be the field where the devil with God are fighting? And what is the value of the society in which he lives? By dint of questioning, the writer operates a true psycho-societal analysis, for what perspectives to consider in this nonsense?

Beginning in 1880, exhausted by incessant attacks of epilepsy, Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoyevsky ended his work at the end of his forces. *The Brothers Karamazov* influenced a large number of writers and thinkers. Sigmund Freud has described this work as 'the most imposing novel ever written'.

Numerous influences seem to be at the origin of the novel. First of all, that of the Russian philosopher Nikolai Fyodorov advocates a Christianity in which redemption and resurrection would pass through the redemption by sons of the sins of their fathers, in order to promote the unity of human beings within a universal family. Now, the tragedy of parricide in this novel represents exactly the opposite of this idea, where, far from redeeming their father's faults, the sons Karamazov become actors, if not accomplices, in his murder. Dostoyevsky sees it as the personification of the disunity of mankind.

Although religion and philosophy, deeply influenced Dostoyevsky in his life, taking an important place in *The Brothers Karamazov*, a much more intimate tragedy changed the course of his work: the death of his son. Prison as well had a profound impact on him while writing in his *The House of the Dead* (1862): "The degree of civilization in a society can be judged by entering its prisons" (Dostoyevsky 2011: 210).

Dostoyevsky delivers himself entirely in this novel. He expresses the doubts and contradictions of his mind. He does not hide anything of what is going on in his deep being. The destiny of his heroes is his own destiny, their doubts, their criminal attempts are the hidden crimes of his mind. The originality of his genius is such that he has been able, by analyzing his own destiny to the end, to express at the same time the universal destiny of man, perpetually torn between good and evil.

It does not cut the roots that attach it to the native soil. But it is a Russian wandering in the world of the spirit. He has no land, no dwelling. It is not linked to any stable form of existence: everything in its nature is dynamism, anxiety, spirit of revolution. Above all, it incarnates the fate of the nomad and the revolt. He is the partisan of Europe, the bard of St. Petersburg. He conceives nothing outside literature.

4. Nietzsche, the Death of God and the Birth of Man

On page 216 of *The Brothers Karamazov*, Ivan says: "I think if the devil doesn't exist, but man has created him, he has created him in his own image and likeness" (Dostoyevsky 2005: 216). It is often by this phrase that Nietzsche's philosophy is summarized. Let us try a little to see its origin and its consequences. The challenge of Nietzsche's philosophy is to reverse the table of values, to think of man from himself, and not from God.

This quotation is taken from the work *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, which presents itself as an Antichrist, that is a Bible in reverse. The book tells the epic of Zarathustra, which has the mission to announce to men the coming of the superman and to release them from the divine precepts, false and illusory.

When I came for the first time among men, I made the folly of the loner, the great madness: I set myself on the public square. And as I spoke to all, I did not speak to anyone. But the evening of the rope dancers and the corpses were my companions; and I was almost a corpse myself. But with the new morning a new truth came to me: then I learned to say, "What do I care about the public square and the populace, the noise of the populace, and the long ears of the populace? Learn from me this: in the public square no one believes in the superior man. And if you want to talk in the public square, at your leisure! But the populace winks: "We are all equal." "Higher men, so winks the populace, - there are no superior men, we are all equal, a man is worth one Man, before God-we are all equal!" Before God! -But now this God is dead. Before the populace, however, we do not want to be equal.

Higher men, go away from the public square! [...] Superior men! Now only the mountain of the human future will be born. God is dead: now we want the superhuman to live. (Nietzsche 2010: 222-223)

Much like Nietzsche's Zarathustra who had been cut off from the reality due to the failure of communication he felt, Dostoyevsky, to a large extent, feels himself un-attachment from the mass he is a part of; as he writes in his *Dream of a Ridiculous Man*:

I am a ridiculous person. Now they call me a madman. That would be a promotion if it were not that I remain as ridiculous in their eyes as before. But now I do not resent it, they are all dear to me now, even when they laugh at me – and, indeed, it is just then that they are particularly dear to me. I could join in their laughter – not exactly at myself, but through affection for them, if I did not feel so sad as I look at them. Sad because they do not know the truth and I do know it. Oh, how hard it is to be the only one who knows the truth! But they won't understand that. No, they won't understand it. (Dostoyevsky 1992: 1)

4.1. Why does Nietzsche Kill God?

According to Nietzsche, God is incompatible with the dignity of man, with the affirmation of life. God, and his son Christ, are synonymous with suffering and death – the Dionysian pole. Now man is the affirmation of life – the Apollonian pole. Man can only arise by opposing God. The death of God is the condition for the liberation of man; “Well! Take heart! you higher men! Now only travails the mountain of the human future. God has died: now do we desire - the overman to live” (Nietzsche 2010: 223)

Rightly enough Dostoyevsky's staretz Zosima states:

Fear nothing and never be afraid: and don't fret. If only your penitence fail not, God will forgive all. There is no sin, and there can be no sin on all the earth, which the Lord will not forgive to the truly repentant! Man cannot commit a sin so great as to exhaust the infinite love of God. Can there be a sin which could exceed the love of God? (Dostoyevsky 2005: 43)

The striking point here is whether there is a superior Being, if there is should it be discussed beyond good and evil or is it only a punitive part of the whole life mechanism?

4.2. God is Dead, What Becomes of Man?

The death of God is not an end, but the beginning of human transformation. Man is a bridge, a rope between the subman and the superhuman. This construction is carried out in three stages, three phases during which man gradually divests himself of his old beliefs and errors to invent new ones:

- the camel: phase of accumulation of knowledge, without reflection.
- the lion: phase of destruction of the whole of knowledge, of what was considered as true.
- the child: rebirth ex nihilo, from nothing. Phase of pure creation of new knowledge and a new morality.”¹

Ivan, the atheist astutely states:

To my thinking, Christ like love for man is a miracle impossible on earth. He was God. But we are not gods. Suppose I, for instance, suffer intensely. Another can never know how much I suffer, because he is another and not I. and what's more, a man is rarely ready to admit another's suffering (as though it were a distinction). (Dostoyevsky 2005: 214)

The metamorphosis, what Nietzsche's triad scheme is all about demands a lot of takings which Dostoyevsky through staretz Zosima puts as follow:

It's just the same story as a doctor once told me, observed the elder. He was a man getting on in years, and undoubtedly clever. He spoke as frankly as you, though in jest, in bitter jest. 'I love humanity,' he said, 'but I wonder at myself. The more I love humanity in general, the less I love man in particular. In my dreams,' he said, 'I have often come to making enthusiastic schemes for the service of humanity, and perhaps I might actually have faced crucifixion if it had been suddenly necessary; and yet I am incapable of living in the same room with any one for two days together, as I know by experience. As soon as any one is near me, his personality disturbs my self-complacency and restricts my freedom. In twenty-four hours I begin to hate the best of men: one because he's too long over his dinner; another because he has a cold and keeps on blowing his nose. I become hostile to people the moment they come close to me. But it has always happened that the more I detest men individually the more ardent becomes my love for humanity.' (ibid.: 47-48)

Man, without God, receives no more instruction. He posits for real what he believes to be real. He no longer receives ready-made morals to be applied, he has constructed it entirely; is good what I desire.

Monster of will and domination, being who knows how to laugh, being wicked, the Nietzschean man confronts the populace to assert himself as a superior being, who does not hesitate to fight for domination. Alone and without reference, man becomes superman.

Dostoyevsky's mental turmoil gave birth to a manifold of dualistic ideas. One of which expressed by Zosima: “Above all, avoid falsehood, every kind of falsehood, especially falseness to yourself. Watch over your own deceitfulness and look into it every hour, every minute” (ibid.: 48).

It should be taken into account what Dostoyevsky attempts to illuminate. Quite by mistake post-Nietzschean readings directed their main focus on the literary meaning of death of God. What could be extracted from this polemical statement on the other hand is, it is human who is responsible for making a leap forward in the ocean of unknown, not the pre-given so-called doctrines landed from heaven. This catechism, which concerned Dostoyevsky the most posterior to Nietzsche thought is of great significance. The striking point here is the conflict between the atheist, Ivan, and the man of order, Alyosha. It is fallacy or mere stupidity to believe which Nietzsche astutely indicates as the most pernicious venom for human thought.

¹ . <http://www.the-philosophy.com/nietzsche-god-dead-explanation>

Ivan further adds: “If you were to destroy in mankind the belief in immortality, not only love but every living force maintaining the life of the world would at once be dried up. Moreover, nothing then would be immoral, everything would be lawful, even cannibalism” (ibid.: 59).

The educated and the man of science, Ivan, holds paradoxical views on the existence of God. Science has prized us with new but complicated ideas on the existence of God and the place human stands. Richard Dawkins, for example, claims a scientific atheism, that is to say, based on science, in his book *The God Delusion*. He recognizes that the formal proof of the non-existence of God is impossible. But according to him “the existence of God is a scientific hypothesis like any other” (Dawkins 2006: 50). and as such can be examined by science. If it is not absolutely certain, it can estimate its probability. Let us point out that the God of whom he speaks is a supernatural God. The hypothesis ‘God does not exist’ is by far the most likely. His central argument is that far from designating a designer, the illusion of design in the living world is explained with much more economy and irresistible elegance by Darwin's natural selection. Thus the existence of God is an unnecessary and unlikely hypothesis. Moreover, as Bertrand Russell in his article *Is There a God?* (1952) puts it:

Many orthodox people speak as though it were the business of sceptics to disprove received dogmas rather than of dogmatists to prove them. This is, of course, a mistake. If I were to suggest that between the Earth and Mars there is a china teapot revolving about the sun in an elliptical orbit, nobody would be able to disprove my assertion provided I were careful to add that the teapot is too small to be revealed even by our most powerful telescopes. But if I were to go on to say that, since my assertion cannot be disproved, it is intolerable presumption on the part of human reason to doubt it, I should rightly be thought to be talking nonsense. (Russell 1952: 547-548)

Believes that it is up to them to prove their dogmas, and not the other way round. The hypothesis of the existence of God is therefore illegitimate, since the existence of God is very improbable. In 1958, Russell further adds:

I ought to call myself an agnostic; but, for all practical purposes, I am an atheist. I do not think the existence of the Christian God any more probable than the existence of the Gods of Olympus or Valhalla. [...] I think the Christian God just as unlikely. (Brian 2010: 12)

The conclusion he draws is exactly the opposite of that of Blaise Pascal in his famous *Bet*.

Still on the other extreme pole of the catechism mentioned above Zosima, states:

Brothers, have no fear of men's sin. Love a man even in his sin, for that is the semblance of divine love and is the highest love on earth. Love all God's creation, the whole of it and every grain of sand in it. Love every leaf, every ray of God's light. Love the animals, love the plants, love everything. If you love everything, you will perceive the divine mystery in things. Once you have perceived it, you will begin to comprehend it better every day. And you will come at last to love the world with an all-embracing love. Love the animals: God has given them the rudiments of thought and joy untroubled. Do not trouble it, don't harass them, don't deprive them of their happiness, don't work against God's intent. Man, do not pride yourself on superiority to the animals; they are without sin, and you, with your greatness, defile the earth by your appearance on it, and leave the traces of your foulness after you — alas, it is true of almost every one of us! Love children especially, for they too are sinless like the angels; they live to soften and purify our hearts and, as it were, to guide us. Woe to him who offends a child! [...] My brother asked the birds to forgive him; that sounds senseless, but it is right; for all is like an ocean, all is flowing and blending; a touch in one place sets up movement at the other end of the earth. It may be senseless to beg forgiveness of the birds, but birds would be happier at your side – a little happier, anyway – and children and all animals, if you yourself were nobler than you are now. It's like an ocean, I tell you. Then you would pray to the birds too, consumed by an all-embracing love, in a sort of transport, and pray that they too will forgive you your sin. Treasure this ecstasy, however senseless it may seem to men. (Dostoyevsky 2005: 291-292)

Dostoyevsky puts the words in Ivan's mouth by stating: “The awful thing is that beauty is mysterious as well as terrible. God and the devil are fighting there and the battlefield is the heart of man” (ibid.: 94). This simply implies the un-decidability of the author himself by creating a sense of suspense for both the reader and himself by not being sure of the aforementioned catechism. This turmoil is further intensified by Albert Camus' *The Rebel* by commenting:

Ivan Karamazov ... does not absolutely deny the existence of God. He refutes Him in the name of a moral value. ... God, in His turn, is put on trial. If evil is essential to divine creation, then creation is unacceptable. Ivan will no longer have recourse to this mysterious God, but to a higher principle – namely, justice. He launches the essential undertaking of rebellion, which is that of replacing the reign of grace by the reign of justice. (Camus 1956: 55-56)

4.3. What are Nietzsche's Ideas on God?

4.3.1. Introduction

The term creation is one of the concepts that its history is, if not older, at least as ancient as that of men themselves. It is rich in meanings, deep and almost inexhaustible. It is a perpetual opening to make be the senses; an opening also where living beings cease to manifest. For they themselves perpetuate themselves through space and time by procreating. Creation is what makes the darkness burst so that living beings are and with them history. Creation then is like the day that is freed from the night insofar as it makes manifest all that conceals the night as varied riches, as potentialities, that is, as lives in becoming.

In his *Confessions*, St. Augustine affirms that God created matter from nothing. From a sort of non-being, God produces phenomena by making them emerge from deep darkness at the origin or before time; it makes be the light. The account of creation (Genesis 1:3) shows us God creating the worlds and all that they contain; It reveals especially to us the Creator extracting the Light from the breast

of darkness: "God says: 'Let there be light', and the light was" (ibid.). The imperfection of the created beings, and even of the whole of creation, apart from the angels. Do they not result, according to St. Augustine, from the fact that God created them from his own substance, not from nothing? Therefore, the concept of creation is first and foremost applicable to God as the essential source of it, which makes Being, gives life and existence, and creates from nothingness; he draws light, which is also the symbol of the manifestation of creation, the image of creation and especially life.

Man is in his way a demiurge, to borrow this term from Plato. He is also a creator. He can create, if not from nothing, as God himself, at least from the material from which he himself came. He builds his habitat. It never ceases to be created in the production of its culture. The architect designs plans to build buildings. The legislator institutes laws which the history of those who adopt them bases. The sculptor gives some pictorial form to the raw material on which he works. The painter, like the poet, creates works based on the observation of nature or a prodigious imagination. Does not the philosopher have a similar approach? Is not it meditation on Life or its observation on nature that it creates? Did not Nietzsche, as a philosopher and poet, give the concept of creation a rich and profound meaning?

The real foundation of creation, according to Nietzsche, is essentially suffering as the pain of the living and of the being itself as an essential will; this is understood, of course, beyond the various senses to which it gives an opening. Like Schopenhauer, Nietzsche thinks that suffering is the very foundation of all nature, the very essence of being. Schopenhauer will write that "Nature shows that with the growth of intelligence comes increased capacity for pain, and it is only with the highest degree of intelligence that suffering reaches its supreme point" (Schopenhauer 2004: 19).

However, suffering, far from leading the creator towards a lethargic state, leads him on the contrary towards virtues, as Nietzsche asserts, 'transfigurantes'. The creator transforms his personal suffering and with it, that of Life. There is in him a will, first of all, of consent to suffering, and then of overcoming it to a contrary state which is health, Life, through the production of works, fruits of this transfiguration, the object of which is to dress, to veil, and consequently to make bearable, to appease that depth of being which is suffering, deep pain. Does not Nietzsche himself affirm that he owes everything to suffering and, above all, to his own pain in the permanent suffering of his life? "I owe him also my philosophy", he says in the *Fragments Posthumes*, Volume XIV. Thus, in this movement of transfiguration, which refers to the particular virtues of strong souls, of one's own life as suffering, Nietzsche declared in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*: "to create is the great deliverance from pain, and relief. But for the creator to be, it takes a lot of suffering and metamorphosis" (Nietzsche 2010: 71). In this capacity, the artist in general, by plunging his gaze into the depths to try to reach the ultimate depths of things, discovers "that pain is linked to the essence of being". Art must therefore be, in a way, the mirror that allows us to see this depth and make pain painful and enriching.

Dostoyevsky, the skeptic puts the words in Ivan's mouth as follows:

The second reason why I won't speak of grown-up people is that, besides being disgusting and unworthy of love, they have a compensation – they've eaten the apple and know good and evil, and they have become 'like gods'. They go on eating it still. But the children haven't eaten anything, and are so far innocent. Are you fond of children, Alyosha? I know you are, and you will understand why I prefer to speak of them. If they, too, suffer horribly on earth, they must suffer for their father's sins, they must be punished for their fathers, who have eaten the apple. [...] the innocent must not suffer for another's sins, and especially such innocents! (Dostoyevsky 2005: 215)

Further Dimitri talking to Alyosha mentions: "A new man has risen up in me. He was hidden in me, but would never have come to the surface, if it hadn't been for this blow from heaven" (ibid.: 549).

Further on Ivan mentions right to the point that:

With my pitiful, earthly, Euclidian understanding, all I know is that there is suffering and there are none guilty; that cause follows effect, simply and directly; that everything flows and finds its level – but that's only Euclidian nonsense, I know that, and I can't consent to live by it! [...] Surely I haven't suffered simply that I, my crimes and my sufferings, may manure the soil of the future harmony for somebody else. [...] if all must suffer to pay for the eternal harmony, what have children to do with it, tell me, please? It's beyond all comprehension why they should suffer, and why they should pay for the harmony. (ibid.: 220-221)

The creation and destruction of a higher being is the key to the novel where for example, Mitya says to Rakitin: "What will become of men then [...] without God and immortal life? All things are lawful then, they can do what they like? [...] a clever man can do what he likes" (ibid.: 547).

The dilemma is further delineated while Mitya imprisoned and visited by Rakitin:

[...] we shall be in chains and there will be no freedom, but then, in our great sorrow, we shall rise again to joy, without which man cannot live nor God exist, for God gives joy: it's his privilege – a grand one. [...] One cannot exist in prison without God; it's even more impossible than out of prison. [...] I think I could stand anything, any suffering, only to be able to say and to repeat to myself every moment, 'I exist.' In thousands of agonies – I exist. I'm tormented on the rack – but I exist! Though I sit alone on a pillar – I exist! (ibid.: 549-550)

Creation also has the meaning of self-occurring. One is to oneself (or one must be) one's own creator. Is it not in this sense that Albert Camus also understands it when in *Ephemeral Creation*, he writes: "To create is likewise to give a shape to one's fate"? Nietzsche in *The Gay Science* will say, "You shall become the person you are" (Nietzsche 1974: 219). Becoming what we are is, as potentiality, possibility, realization according to its very nature. It is to want oneself as one is. It is, in other words, created by creating. In order to do this, creation, as a determination of its nature, originally, original creation of itself, is like a scale: steps towards height are a journey towards the superman as realization, Man; the steps downward, bring the individual into the depths of his being, towards his soul. In other words, only the one who projects before him the image of what he must become by necessarily accomplishing it in the

course of his journey, only then the cosmopolitan man, in the words of Hegel, Who deciphers the future and reveals it to humanity fully realizes in him the type of the superman. The true creator, according to Nietzsche, unites to the clearest lucidity the impulse of an inspiration that captures the forces unleashed within the infra-cosmic abysses. The true creator finally penetrates deep into his consciousness, discovers there the origins of a world whose genesis he can follow in him. For the subject and the object finally coincide at their source. From then on, creating is not only communicating with the essence of things, but also communicating oneself in a movement of real and profound exchange with others. Creation is the art of communication in all its fullness.

4.4. Loneliness as a Source of Creation

While Alyosha met Mitya in prison, there, Mitya declared his recently and newly outlook towards life, which he himself believes, it's due to the prison life. "I am sorry to lose God" mentioned Mitya (Dostoyevsky 2005: 546).

Nietzsche writes in the *Fragments Posthumes*, volume XIV: "I am a solitude made man". This affirmation is essential insofar as, beyond Nietzsche itself, it concerns every living being and especially the living being as an individual of the human species. It concerns the life of the creator at the highest point that the emergence of creation, whenever it takes place throughout its life, brings into a universe of deep solitude. Indeed, every living being, in particular, the individual, comes to the world alone, lives alone and dies alone. Birth is what we make contact with the world. This contact is realized individually. It is the solitary and profound presence of the original singularity in this all that is the world, and in a multiplicity composed of singularities, namely the society in which one is born. Birth is the first characteristic of individual solitude, of existential and specifically human solitude. The individual, in his destiny, in every circumstance and for every event, finds himself alone in his existence, facing life, even death. As such, Henri Birault in *Heidegger and the Experience of Thought*, writes:

Existentially or ontologically speaking, no one can take my place, no one can live or die for me. Existence is thus to be always alone with its existence, as numerous, as similar, as close as the others may be. Loneliness is not a state of affairs, a way of life, a feeling or an affection of the heart. It is a destiny, the destiny of Dasein as such. (Birault 2005: 540)

However, accepting it, transcending it by transforming it, doesn't it make this existential solitude of Dasein, a source at the same time a means of creation? Is not every creator more profoundly solitary? Is not all creation fundamentally the daughter of solitude? Mitya says to Alyosha: "It's God that's worrying me. That's the only thing that's worrying me. What if he doesn't exist? What if Rakitin's right – that it's an idea made by men? Then if he doesn't exist, man is the chief of the earth, of the universe. (Dostoyevsky 2005: 550) Against and against all, the creator is the one whose life takes place in the depths, in the underground of the world, of life. He is the man of great solitudes. The man forgotten by men, even often ignored, who, like a grain in the bosom of the earth, seeks to germinate to become a plant; a plant that bears many good fruits and whose existence is no longer secret to anyone. Thus Nietzsche is not himself the Zarathustra who, when he was thirty years old, left his country, and went into the mountain to enjoy his spirit and his solitude.

Nietzsche was personally more philosophical than his philosophy. His talk about power, harshness, and superb immorality was the hobby of a harmless young scholar and constitutional invalid. He did not crave in the least either wealth or empire. What he loved was solitude, nature, music, books. But his imagination, like his judgment, was captious; it could not dwell on reality, but reacted furiously against it. (Santayana 2006: 127)

It is in this long solitude and deep silence of the mountain that the maturation of things will begin. There is, in the creator's enterprise, a voluntary renunciation of the world for a possible happiness that resides in creation. To renounce what is to bring about that which is not, that is to say, to discover, is the happiness of the creator. Later on Lise talks to Alyosha while on the point of semi-madness about destruction and not creation of any sort as:

[...] I don't want to be good, I want to do evil, and it has nothing to do with illness. [...] so that everything might be destroyed. Ah, how nice it would be if everything were destroyed! You know, Alyosha, I sometimes think of doing a fearful lot of harm and everything bad, and I should do it for a long while on the sly and suddenly everyone would find it out. Everyone will stand round and point their finger at me and I would look at them all. That would be awfully nice." (Dostoyevsky 2005: 540)

It is even cited by the chronic atheist and non-believer, Ivan that: "I don't want harmony. From love for humanity I don't want it. I would rather be left with the unavenged suffering. I would rather remain with my unavenged suffering and unsatisfied indignation, even if I were wrong" (ibid.: 222).

Reported in *Hoyt's New Cyclopedia of Practical Quotations*, Alphonso X, the Wise (1221–1284) said: "Had I been present at the creation, I would have given some useful hints for the better ordering of the universe" (Roberts 2009: 147-148).

John Bowker in his groundbreaking book *Problems of Suffering in Religions of the World* declared:

Some foolish men declare that creator made the world. The doctrine that the world was created is ill advised and should be rejected. If God created the world, where was he before the creation? If you say he was transcendent then and needed no support, where is he now? How could God have made this world without any raw material? If you say that he made this first, and then the world, you are faced with an endless regression. If you declare that this raw material arose naturally you fall into another fallacy, for the whole universe might thus have been its own creator, and have arisen quite naturally. If God created the world by an act of his own will, without any raw material, then it is just his will and nothing else — and who will believe this silly nonsense? If he is ever perfect and complete, how could the will to create have arisen in him? If, on the other hand, he is not perfect, he could no more create the universe than a potter could. If he is form-less, action-less and all-embracing, how could he have created the world? Such a soul, devoid of all morality, would have no desire to create anything. If he is perfect, he does not strive for the three aims of man, so what advantage would he gain by creating the universe? If you say that he created to no purpose because it was his nature to do so, then God is pointless. If he created in some kind of sport, it was the

sport of a foolish child, leading to trouble. If he created because of the karma of embodied beings acquired in a previous creation, he is not the Almighty Lord, but subordinate to something else. If out of love for living beings and need of them he made the world, why did he not take creation wholly blissful free from misfortune? If he were transcendent he would not create, for he would be free: Nor if involved in transmigration, for then he would not be almighty. Thus the doctrine that the world was created by God makes no sense at all, And God commits great sin in slaying the children whom he himself created. If you say that he slays only to destroy evil beings, why did he create such beings in the first place? Good men should combat the believer in divine creation, maddened by an evil doctrine. Know that the world is uncreated, as time itself is, without beginning or end, and is based on the principles, life and rest. Uncreated and indestructible, it endures under the compulsion of its own nature. (John Bowker 1971: 283)

5. Conclusion

This paper made an exhaustive attempt to illustrate the chaotic world of Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*, given the light of Nietzschean thoughts. Most importantly his concepts of the death of God, which Ivan as the so-called anti-protagonist, calls into question, by being an eternal skeptic. Loneliness as the source of creation here, the focus is on Mitya's confinement after being condemned of killing his father, is noteworthy. The interactions of the characters, mainly the triad of three brothers, one as the man of God, the other as the skeptic and the last one scapegoat, plays a very important role. It is beyond dispute that Freud himself had an extensive reading on *The Brothers Karamazov* to pinpoint exactly the same issue.

6. References

- i. Dostoyevsky, Fyodor. 1880 [2005]. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Moscow: The Russian Messenger.
- ii. Dostoyevsky, F. M. 1945. *The Dream of a Ridiculous Man*. Library of Alexandria.
- iii. Dostoyevsky, F. M. 1955. *The Idiot* (D. Magarshack, Trans.). Penguin Books.
- iv. Dostoyevsky, F., Pevear, R., & Volokhonsky, L. 2007. *The Adolescent*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- v. Dostoyevsky, F. M. 1986. *The House of the Dead* (C. Garnett, Trans.). US: Penguin Group.
- vi. Evans, Dylan. 2006 [1996]. *An Introductory of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London/New York: Routledge.
- vii. Undefined, U. U. 1997. *Dostoevsky and Parricide*. In S. Freud & N. Hertz (Authors), *Writings on Art and Literature*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- viii. Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. 2003 [1883]. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*. Translated by Thomas Wayne. New York: Algora Publishing.
- ix. Nietzsche, F. W., Caro, A. D., & Pippin, R. B. 2010. *Nietzsche: thus spoke Zarathustra*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- x. (n.d.). Retrieved July 6, 2017, from <http://www.the-philosophy.com/nietzsche-god-dead-explanation>