

Boris Tikhomirov: *“Lazar’! Griadi von”*: Roman F.M. Dostoevskogo ‘*Prestuplenie i nakazanie*’ v sovremennom prochtenii. Sankt-Peterburg: Serebrianyi vek 2005. 468 pp.

This unique volume combines an insightful introductory essay, “Crime, punishment and – the resurrection of Rodion Raskol’nikov,” with invaluable commentary on the novel. Tikhomirov traces the novel’s development through its first drafts as a first-person story providing a psychological account of an already-committed crime, through its second phase incorporating the story of “The Drunkards” featuring the Marmeladov family and introducing the metaphysical element that dominated Dostoevsky’s major works thereafter, to the final third-person novel that features Raskol’nikov and Sonya as embodiments of two systems of ethics at odds in both 1860s Russia and Raskol’nikov’s soul: relative and absolute. Tikhomirov holds that Raskol’nikov’s and Sonya’s natural compassion places them in equally tragic positions which Raskol’nikov articulates to Dunya after his crime: “...you get to a certain limit, and if you don’t cross it – you’ll be unhappy, and if you do cross it – you will perhaps be even more unhappy” (III,2). Whereas Raskol’nikov justifies his limit crossing by developing a relativistic theory that replaces his religious-moral values with a utilitarian calculus, Sonya views herself as a sinner even as she sacrifices herself for her family. Tikhomirov observes that although Dostoevsky seems to have created divergent paths for Raskol’nikov and Sonya, he nonetheless regards both as sinners dead to themselves and in need of resurrection.

After murdering the pawnbroker and her sister, Raskolnikov must contend with the consequences of his action on three levels: criminal, moral, and existential. The turning point comes when he confesses to Sonya that he has killed himself (V,4), as he realizes that committing murder is a form of suicide. Tikhomirov astutely points out that the novel cannot end in Book 6 with Raskol’nikov’s confession, as the hero does not accept his suffering and repent until the very last pages of the Epilogue. His dream during Easter week, the first in a series of titanic dreams in Dostoevsky’s work in which the dreamer takes on the sins of the entire world, contradicts his theory and prepares the ground for his repentance. Yet his self-aggrandizing dream contains an equal and competing self-cleansing impulse, which wins at novel’s end. Dostoevsky thus concludes his novel with Raskol’nikov “on the threshold” of a new beginning, which he and Sonya realize through love.

The following four hundred pages of commentary represent a unique and invaluable contribution to our study of the novel. While Tikhomirov acknowledges all previous research and commentaries, his volume is not a mere conglomeration but an original commentary that adds greatly to our understanding of the novel's artistic structure, its rich historical cultural context, its religious references, and its symbolic topography. The commentary is keyed to the page numbers of the *Akademiya Nauk Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (1972-90) and is structured so that a reader can read straight through, follow themes through the notes, or focus on any episode, detail or word. The volume also includes three maps that trace Raskol'nikov's and Svidrigailov's routes: 1) Raskol'nikov's route to Petrovskii and Krestovskii islands from the mainland side; 2) Raskol'nikov's route to the pawnbroker's – both for his trial run and for the commission of the crime; and 3) Raskol'nikov's route to the islands from Vasilievskii Island and Svidrigailov's last wanderings from Vasilievskii to the Petersburg district.

Tikhomirov's most original contribution lies in his exposition of the novel's symbolic topography, which, on his reading, combines the mimetic, thematic, metaliterary and metaphysical. For example, as the novel opens, Raskol'nikov leaves his room on S- lane (*Stolyarnyi pereulok*) and heads towards K- bridge (*Kokushkin most*) – a destination with a rich literary history. By having his hero move towards the place where Poprishchin, hero of Gogol's story "Notes of a Madman," steals the correspondence of two dogs whom he claims to hear speaking, and where Lugin, hero of Lermontov's "Shtoss," lives, Dostoevsky informs his readers that the novel will take place in the literary space characteristic of Petersburg texts. Yet Dostoevsky adds his own symbolic dimension to the city's duality by having several buildings in the novel – such as the Crystal Palace, Razumikhin's building, and the district police station – have two potential locations, each with their own symbolic possibilities. The Crystal Palace's locations, for instance, offer the possibility of different bridge crossings: either over the Bankovskii (Bank) or Vosnesensky (Ascension) Bridge. Dostoevsky thus inscribes Raskol'nikov's inner division into the cityscape. By making Raskol'nikov's route inexact, Dostoevsky keeps his hero's possibilities open – allowing readers to wonder whether he will choose the material or spiritual path.

Tikhomirov also identifies the symbolic functions of many other locations. Raskol'nikov avoids the shortest route to the pawnbroker's, for instance, as that passes in front of Vosnesenskii Church. Instead he takes

the same route past the Yusupov Garden that Dostoevsky himself took when he went to visit his unscrupulous publisher Stellovskii. He thus avoids salvation as he courts damnation. Since the Field of Mars had originally been part of the Summer Garden, Raskol'nikov's vision of a beautiful cityscape represents nostalgia for an unfragmented past. The Crystal Palace (sometimes ironically located in the Spasskii/Saviour district) is associated with the future – Apocalypse, the New Jerusalem, Raskol'nikov's theory, his prison dreams. Svidrigailov, the persecutor of Dunya whom he compares to a Christian martyr, stays at the hotel Adrianopolis, named after the Emperor Hadrian – a persecutor of Christians. The actual hotel was named the Aleksandriya, yet another ancient capitol named after a warrior-monarch associated with early Christianity as well as with Kleopatra and Pushkin's *Egipetskie nochi*. As these examples demonstrate, Tikhomirov takes the geographical givens of Dostoevsky's day and mines them for their thematic and metaliterary associations.

He also provides numerous examples of Dostoevsky's intertexts – from the Russian literary tradition, from world literature, and especially from the Bible. Thus, while many readers catch Dostoevsky's association of Raskol'nikov's room with Lazarus's coffin, Tikhomirov points out its association with the dwelling place of the man possessed (Luke 8:27, Mark 5:3,5). He also notes the quotation from Mark 9:25, as Raskol'nikov stands on Nikolaevsky Bridge looking at the Petersburg side and feels that a “*dukh nemoi i glukhoi*” haunts the city. Tikhomirov finds the Gogolian echoes of *Revizor* in Porfiry Petrovich's three interviews with Raskol'nikov; anthill imagery from Voltaire's *Micromegas*, Nodier's *Jean Sbogar*, Turgenev's “Prizraki” (published by the Dostoevsky brothers) and Grisha Ot'repev's dream from Pushkin's *Boris Godunov*, as well as prophetic imagery from Pushkin's “Podrazhaniya Koranu” in Raskol'nikov's rants. He provides valuable commentary on Dostoevsky's polemics as well as invaluable information about the period. In addition to identifying a prototype for the murdered pawnbroker, for instance, he notes that she charges higher interest rates than those allowed by the law. In short, Tikhomirov's commentary on *Prestuplenie i nakazanie* is an invaluable resource that will enhance classroom teaching as well as serious research.

Deborah A. Martinsen

Columbia University