

**Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue canadienne des slavistes**  
**Plotting the ending: Generic expectation and the uncanny epilogue of Crime and Punishment**  
--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Full Title:</b>	Plotting the ending: Generic expectation and the uncanny epilogue of Crime and Punishment
<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	RCSP-2019-0016R1
<b>Article Type:</b>	Special Issue Article
<b>Keywords:</b>	Fedor Dostoevskii; epilogue; genre; crime fiction; redemption narrative
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>This article examines the epilogue of Dostoevskii's novel Crime and Punishment from the perspective of genre and generic expectation. Considering two generic plots that appear in the novel, the detective plot and the redemption narrative, the author argues that the imagined reader's generic expectation is both satisfied and thwarted in each case. The author introduces the idea of "generic stasis" to refer to Raskol'nikov's situation vis-à-vis generic plot in each plot trajectory of the epilogue. In upsetting generic expectation, this state of generic stasis creates an opening that enables the novel's ending to occur. In this sense, the article argues for the utility of the epilogue's generic hybridity in resisting narrative predetermination.</p>
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Katherine Bowers, PhD
<b>Response to Reviewers:</b>	Revisions made in response to reviewers.

1  
2  
3  
4 **Special Section: On the Epilogue of Dostoevskii's *Crime and Punishment***  
5

6  
7  
8 **Plotting the ending: Generic expectation and the uncanny epilogue of *Crime***  
9 ***and Punishment***  
10

11  
12  
13 Katherine Bowers  
14

15 *Department of Central, Eastern, and Northern European Studies, University of British*  
16 *Columbia, Vancouver, Canada*  
17

18  
19 Email: [katherine.bowers@ubc.ca](mailto:katherine.bowers@ubc.ca)  
20 Twitter: @kab3d  
21 ORCID: 0000-0002-3747-5160  
22

23  
24 Biography: Katherine Bowers is Assistant Professor of Slavic Studies at the University of British  
25 Columbia. Her research interests include genre, narrative, and imagined geography. She is currently  
26 finishing a book on the way European gothic fiction shaped the development of Russian realism.  
27

28  
29 Acknowledgments: This article emerged from a paper I wrote for a panel on the epilogue to *Crime and*  
30 *Punishment* at the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies conference in November  
31 2016. The panel was the last event of a year-long celebration of the novel's sesquicentenary "*Crime and*  
32 *Punishment* at 150," which received significant financial support from the Social Sciences and  
33 Humanities Research Council of Canada. I thank my fellow panelists Kate Holland and Sarah J. Young,  
34 discussant Robin Feuer Miller and chair Deborah Martinsen, and those who attended and discussed the  
35 epilogue with us. I am also grateful to my colleagues at the University of British Columbia who discussed  
36 an earlier version of this article in April 2019 as part of our department's faculty research colloquium,  
37 organized by Ilinca Iurascu and Alice Christensen. Finally, I send warm thanks to Connor Doak, Tatiana  
38 Filimonova, Melissa Frazier, Robin Feuer Miller, Eric Naiman, and, especially, Kate Holland, who read  
39 earlier drafts of this article and gave extremely helpful suggestions toward its improvement.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Plotting the ending: Generic expectation and the uncanny epilogue of *Crime and***  
5  
6 ***Punishment***  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Abstract: This article examines the epilogue of Dostoevskii's novel *Crime and*  
12 *Punishment* from the perspective of genre and generic expectation. Considering two  
13 generic plots that appear in the novel, the detective plot and the redemption narrative, the  
14 author argues that the imagined reader's generic expectation is both satisfied and  
15 thwarted in each case. The author introduces the idea of "generic stasis" to refer to  
16 Raskol'nikov's situation vis-à-vis generic plot in each plot trajectory of the epilogue. In  
17 upsetting generic expectation, this state of generic stasis creates an opening that enables  
18 the novel's ending to occur. In this sense, the article argues for the utility of the  
19 epilogue's generic hybridity in resisting narrative predetermination.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Keywords: Fedor Dostoevskii; epilogue; genre; crime fiction; redemption narrative  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 At the end of *Crime and Punishment* (1866) the hero confesses his crime and is sent to  
31 Siberia. The two short chapters that comprise the novel's epilogue neatly wrap up the plotlines of  
32 many of the novel's characters and focus on Raskol'nikov's experiences in prison nearly a year  
33 and a half after the events of the first six parts of the novel. Raskol'nikov suffers, labours, and, in  
34 the end, repents, while the last lines send him off as protagonist of a new plot: "the story of a  
35 man's gradual renewal and gradual rebirth, of his gradual crossing from one world to another, of  
36 his acquaintance with a new, as yet unknown reality."<sup>1</sup> *Crime and Punishment* essentially  
37 summarizes its plot – both *siuzhet* and *fabula* – within its title: first, a crime, then, a punishment.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Robert L. Belknap explains *siuzhet* and *fabula* as understandings of plot:  
50

51 The *fabula* is *the relationship among the incidents in the world the characters inhabit*, a  
52 multidimensional, intricately interconnected array where events may happen  
53 simultaneously in different places, where causation plays a crucial structural role, and  
54 where sequences of events exist in the time system of the characters' lives. The *siuzhet* is  
55 *the relationship among the same incidents in the world of the text*, a one-dimensional  
56 array of words encountered one after another in the time system of the reader.<sup>2</sup>  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 In this sense, the book’s epilogue is precisely the expected ending, following on Raskol’nikov’s  
5 moral torments detailed in the 500 or so pages that separate the murder and his Siberian exile.  
6  
7

8  
9 Since the novel’s publication 150 years ago, critics have discussed the ways these two  
10 short chapters have failed or succeeded in concluding the novel. Nikolai Strakhov expressed  
11 dissatisfaction with the epilogue early on, commenting in 1867 that the resolution described in  
12 Siberia is “too general” as Raskol’nikov’s true moment of resurrection is his confession to Sonia  
13 in Part 6; he went on to argue that Fedor Dostoevskii rendered the section superfluous when he  
14 stated that Raskol’nikov’s story would continue.<sup>3</sup> Some critics have made the claim that the  
15 epilogue fails to continue the novel’s artistic vision. Edward Wasiolek, for example, argued that  
16 it “follows logically, but not artistically,” while Soviet critics found it to be “artistically weak”  
17 because of its reliance on the Christian trope of redemption.<sup>4</sup> Mikhail Bakhtin considered the  
18 epilogue a “conventionally monologic” disruption of the novel’s dialogism, a forum for its  
19 author’s ideology that undermines the novel’s artistic integrity.<sup>5</sup>  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Some critics have accepted the epilogue as necessary, or “inevitable” in David Matual’s  
37 phrasing.<sup>6</sup> Liza Knapp observes that the happy ending is expected thematically but seems to  
38 occur “miraculously” in that it is not precisely explained, while Tat’iana Kasatkina views the  
39 Gospel elements – readings and sermons – present in the epilogue as a “key” (*kliuch*) to  
40 understanding Dostoevskii’s overall message.<sup>7</sup> Boris Tikhomirov’s recent excellent commentary  
41 on the novel argues that the epilogue is not only necessary but central, as it redeems both  
42 Raskol’nikov and Sonia.<sup>8</sup> Robert L. Belknap, reading the novel and its epilogue from the  
43 perspective of plot, finds that discourse shifts “from the dialogic to the inspirational” in the  
44 epilogue, but the “plot remains consistent” and logical as it proceeds towards redemption.<sup>9</sup> This  
45 discussion of critical takes on the epilogue is by no means exhaustive, nor are any surprising  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 readings revealed. I present it to demonstrate the richness and vastness of critical literature on the  
5  
6 epilogue, which canvasses multiple theoretical approaches. A common path of inquiry here is the  
7  
8 epilogue’s narrative “fit,” that is, how well it succeeds in following the first six parts.  
9

10  
11 The present article is not about whether the epilogue fits the novel. Rather, I am  
12  
13 interested in exploring why the epilogue sparks such strong and opposed feelings among its  
14  
15 readers. One way to examine this is from the perspective of generic expectation. Genre is a  
16  
17 useful approach to the question of reader reaction to the epilogue because it implicitly builds a  
18  
19 community encompassing reader, author, and text; as Carolyn R. Miller has observed, genre is a  
20  
21 social act.<sup>10</sup> Generic expectation becomes a uniting experience. In this, genre relies on what  
22  
23 Walker Gibson has termed the “mock reader.”<sup>11</sup> The “mock reader,” in Gibson’s formulation, is  
24  
25 the imagined reader “whose mask and costume the individual takes on in order to experience the  
26  
27 language” of the literary work; this imagined reader is an artifact “controlled, simplified,  
28  
29 abstracted” by the author, and henceforth, when I refer to the reader, this imagined “mock  
30  
31 reader” is what I mean.<sup>12</sup> While genre is often described in terms of its conventions, in this  
32  
33 article I focus on a different aspect: plot, described by Peter Brooks as “the principle of  
34  
35 interconnectedness and intention which we cannot do without in moving through the discrete  
36  
37 elements—incidents, episodes, actions—of a narrative.”<sup>13</sup> Plots, in Brooks’s formulation, bind  
38  
39 together and organize disparate elements, which then generate expectation, anticipation of what  
40  
41 comes next. In this I follow Paul Cobley’s argument that places expectation and, by extension,  
42  
43 plot centrally in a consideration of genre: “Genre is not a set of textual features that can be  
44  
45 enumerated; rather, it is an expectation.”<sup>14</sup> Generic expectation becomes a central defining aspect  
46  
47 of the collective reading (and writing) process.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Dostoevskii was himself a keen reader of genre fiction.<sup>15</sup> He famously and self-  
5  
6 consciously “borrowed plots and plotting techniques from his omnivorous reading.”<sup>16</sup> In this  
7  
8 article, I will examine two entwined generic plots that are deeply embedded in the novel’s  
9  
10 narrative: those of the crime novel and the redemption narrative.<sup>17</sup> By “generic plot” I mean a  
11  
12 *siuzhet* that follows the conventions of a narrative common to a genre. Belknap describes the  
13  
14 structure of a *siuzhet* as bipartite: “incidents in the *siuzhet* consist of an expectation and its  
15  
16 fulfillment or frustration.”<sup>18</sup> A *siuzhet* can be result-focused, just as a narrative common to a  
17  
18 particular genre often has a pre-determined outcome: crime plots end in a revelation to the reader  
19  
20 while redemption plots end in the regeneration of a character. Strikingly, in *Crime and*  
21  
22 *Punishment*, the two plots function as expected, and yet, at the same time, they subvert generic  
23  
24 expectations, creating an uncanny narrative space for the reader. Although the epilogue logically  
25  
26 follows the novel’s events, I argue that the epilogue both fulfills and deviates from the generic  
27  
28 plots that inform it. As the anticipated narrative for each of the generic plots introduced and  
29  
30 traced in the novel breaks down, the uncanny – the simultaneous feeling of familiarity and  
31  
32 strangeness – emerges from the reader’s perceived dislocation from the anticipation of the plot.  
33  
34 A focal point for each plot is the narrative trajectory of the protagonist, but, as I demonstrate in  
35  
36 each, the protagonist becomes mired in generic stasis, unable to progress. This rupture of generic  
37  
38 expectation creates openness and possibility, the narrative space where the expected outcome –  
39  
40 or other outcomes – could occur.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **The crime plot and generic expectation**

54

55 In the first pages of the epilogue, Russian readers of the mid-1860s would recognize a  
56  
57 familiar sequence of events. Accounts of trials where lurid details emerge for the titillation of the  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 public, and then either a sentence (or an upset) were common in newspaper accounts of the late  
5  
6 nineteenth-century courtroom.<sup>19</sup> *Crime and Punishment* was published at a time when crime  
7  
8 dominated reading material, both in the news and in fiction.<sup>20</sup> Crime fiction is a genre predicated  
9  
10 on concealing or diverting attention from a sequence of events, but its readers expect that their  
11  
12 role in reading the novel will be to piece together what happened from clues in the text.<sup>21</sup> The  
13  
14 detective novel plot is a specific subgenre of crime fiction which features not just a crime, but an  
15  
16 investigation of that crime within the text.<sup>22</sup> Or, in Brooks's formulation, the genre entails  
17  
18 "finding the *fabula* and its instigator."<sup>23</sup>  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 An obvious generic plot model for *Crime and Punishment* is introduced in the character  
25  
26 of Porfirii Petrovich, whose role in the novel is to investigate the murder of the pawnbroker and  
27  
28 her sister. At the time Dostoevskii was writing, the detective novel was a relatively recent  
29  
30 innovation; the first was Edgar Allan Poe's 1841 story "The Murders in the Rue Morgue."<sup>24</sup> The  
31  
32 fictional works that informed Dostoevskii's crime novel included Charles Maturin's gothic novel  
33  
34 *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820), Thomas de Quincey's crime fiction from the 1830s, Honoré de  
35  
36 Balzac's *Le Père Goriot* (*Father Goriot*) (1834), Poe's "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" and  
37  
38 other C. Auguste Dupin stories of the 1840s, and Eugène Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris* (*The*  
39  
40 *Mysteries of Paris*) (1842-1843), all readily available and popular on the Russian book market of  
41  
42 the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>25</sup> These works were so influential that Michael Holquist goes so far  
43  
44 as to argue that Sue's *The Mysteries of Paris* serves as the model for the detective story that runs  
45  
46 through Parts 1-6 of *Crime and Punishment*.<sup>26</sup>  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 There is a long-standing debate about whether *Crime and Punishment* is crime fiction at  
55  
56 all, as it does not conform to other contemporaneous models of the genre.<sup>27</sup> However, with  
57  
58 Porfirii Petrovich, *Crime and Punishment* deliberately builds on the investigator type established  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 by Poe's Dupin. Even if *Crime and Punishment* takes a new approach to the crime plot,  
5  
6 Dostoevskii's novel still provokes generic expectation in the reader thanks to the strong  
7  
8 influence of popular works and the recognizable detective figure Porfirii Petrovich. *Crime and*  
9  
10 *Punishment*'s crime plot is written as a "whydunit" rather than a "whodunit,"<sup>28</sup> but the basic  
11  
12 detective plot element persists: like Dupin, Porfirii Petrovich gets his man.  
13  
14

15  
16 In his classic study of detective fiction and the English novel, D. A. Miller observes that  
17  
18 the novel and the police seem incompatible in that the aims of the one work against the aims of  
19  
20 the other: "[the investigation's] sheer intrusiveness posits a world whose normality has been  
21  
22 hitherto defined as a matter of *not needing* the police or policelike detectives. The investigation  
23  
24 repairs this normality, not only by solving the crime, but also, far more important, by  
25  
26 withdrawing from what had been, for an aberrant moment, its 'scene.'"<sup>29</sup> Reading only the crime  
27  
28 novel aspects of *Crime and Punishment* strips the narrative down to its base elements of plot,  
29  
30 some aspects of characterization, and convention, but ignores the novel's generic messiness, in  
31  
32 the fissures of which lie its deeper meaning. Raskol'nikov's confession at the end of Part 6  
33  
34 neatly ends the detective plot of the novel, but the epilogue's opening works against a  
35  
36 straightforward narrative of a deserving criminal facing punishment, creating openings for doubt  
37  
38 or even alternative generic models.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 At the beginning of the epilogue's first chapter there is a break, not only temporal and  
47  
48 spatial, but also narrational; Part 6 ends in July 1865, as Raskol'nikov confesses, and the next  
49  
50 page begins the epilogue's first chapter, eighteen months later in Siberia. At the end of Part 6, the  
51  
52 reader is still firmly lodged inside Raskol'nikov's head. The lead-up to the confession is swift,  
53  
54 and as Raskol'nikov walks to turn himself in, time subjectively slows, connecting the reader  
55  
56 even more closely with the protagonist. The first page of the first chapter of the epilogue  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 abruptly obliterates that narrative intimacy, describing Raskol'nikov's trial and referring to him,  
5  
6 for the most part, only as "the criminal" (*prestupnik*). In confessing, Raskol'nikov has lost his  
7  
8 identity. His trial, however, provides him with an alternative identity, one that works against the  
9  
10 expected persona of the criminal in the detective plot. The account of his trial brings out, in  
11  
12 addition to lurid details of the murder, stories of his kindness and heroism: his pledge to marry a  
13  
14 dying girl, and his heroic feat in saving children from a burning building. These narratives of  
15  
16 selflessness erode the generic detective plot, just as Raskol'nikov's sympathetic character does in  
17  
18 Part 1; the reader of *Crime and Punishment* cheers for Raskol'nikov throughout, not Porfirii  
19  
20 Petrovich.  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 Poe's Dupin stories and other hero-detective works are often thought to be predicated on  
27  
28 "ratiocination," a belief in rationality, causality, and order that informs the detective genre  
29  
30 throughout the nineteenth century, but Dostoevskii's work resists this determinism. Ratiocination  
31  
32 is the process in which both detective and reader engage: the organization of revealed  
33  
34 information to piece together the disordered *fabula* of the text. Melissa Frazier, however, argues  
35  
36 that ratiocination is too limiting.<sup>30</sup> Frazier observes that the power of Dostoevskii's novel lies in  
37  
38 its detective's refusal to conform to the rational, a circumstance that demonstrates the  
39  
40 indeterminacy that characterizes the broader world.<sup>31</sup>  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Indeterminacy in the novel is grounded in the narrative structure of the detective plot and  
47  
48 also has ramifications for generic expectation. Dostoevskii's radical experimentation with  
49  
50 narrative subjectivity undermines generic expectation in that it allows for the open and multi-  
51  
52 faceted expression of individual and independent voices. Crime fiction also has the capacity for  
53  
54 multiple voices, a narrative device used to "fragment" the information the reader uncovers  
55  
56 towards the solution of the mystery, as Whitehead has observed.<sup>32</sup> However, a detective novel  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 seeks to determine and privilege one objective truth – who and howdunit. In Holquist’s reading  
5  
6 of *Crime and Punishment* as a detective novel, he asserts that the detective-hero is not Porfirii  
7  
8 Petrovich, but Raskol’nikov himself, searching for a meaning for his life. He argues that, while  
9  
10 Raskol’nikov fails to “find a self in the detective story,” a new plot is granted him in the  
11  
12 epilogue.<sup>33</sup> And yet, where Holquist identifies disparate generic plots clearly demarcated by a  
13  
14 shift that appears in the epilogue, Dostoevskii’s writing does not so easily relinquish the generic  
15  
16 plots that inform it.  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Confession should end the crime plot, but its unrealized expectation persists into the  
22  
23 epilogue, where Raskol’nikov’s reported internal thoughts place him firmly in what I term  
24  
25 generic stasis. By generic stasis I mean a curious temporal space in the novel where “generic  
26  
27 refugees” – characters from other genres who appear in the realist novel, to borrow the term from  
28  
29 Gary Saul Morson – can get stuck when they cannot follow their master plots.<sup>34</sup> Raskol’nikov  
30  
31 asks himself why he did not follow through with Svidrigailov’s trajectory and commit suicide, or  
32  
33 why he turned himself in for Sonia’s sake but now still feels no repentance or remorse for his  
34  
35 crime, only for his “weak” confession. As a result of this internal struggle, he cannot progress to  
36  
37 one or the other plot line, and instead stays trapped, a prisoner of his inability to get back on the  
38  
39 generic plot track.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 Intriguingly, although ratiocination does not structure the *siuzhet*, it develops in the  
46  
47 epilogue as Raskol’nikov is punished for his crime. Here I use the term ratiocination in the sense  
48  
49 of the process of ordering the *fabula*, of getting the generic plot back to its expected trajectory.  
50  
51 At first, neither redeemed nor damned, Raskol’nikov persists in stasis: “he understood his  
52  
53 situation perfectly well, expected no sudden improvements, entertained no frivolous hopes (as  
54  
55 others in his situation are prone to do) and found almost nothing to surprise him about his new  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 surroundings.”<sup>35</sup> When this statement appears, in Chapter 1 of the epilogue, the reader anticipates  
5  
6 the end of the narrative. This summary of Raskol’nikov’s expectations and experiences,  
7  
8 however, counterbalances yet simultaneously fuels the reader’s anticipation of a sudden  
9  
10 improvement or a surprise of some kind to conclude the novel. In Chapter 2 of the epilogue, the  
11  
12 narrator seems to begin to push the protagonist towards an outcome.  
13  
14

15  
16 Ratiocination appears in the epilogue in a series of narrative interventions that aim to set  
17  
18 Raskol’nikov on the generic path to rehabilitation. In a long passage discussing Raskol’nikov’s  
19  
20 mood and internal monologue, the narrator inserts himself. “But it wasn’t his shaven head and  
21  
22 his shackles he was ashamed of, it was his pride that had been badly wounded; it was this that  
23  
24 had made him ill. Oh, if only he could have blamed himself, how happy he would have been! He  
25  
26 could have put up with anything then, even shame and disgrace. But he judged himself  
27  
28 harshly.”<sup>36</sup> This line – “Oh, if only he could have blamed himself, how happy he would have  
29  
30 been!” – intrudes, inserting a sense of what must happen to finalize Raskol’nikov’s generic  
31  
32 trajectory. This outcome refers to a pre-determined fate and undermines Raskol’nikov’s  
33  
34 unfinalizability.<sup>37</sup> These insertions continue throughout this internal monologue. Later the  
35  
36 narrator muses, “If only fate could bring him remorse – burning remorse that breaks the heart  
37  
38 into pieces, that drives away sleep; the kind of remorse whose dreadful torments yield visions of  
39  
40 the noose, the whirlpool! Oh, how glad he would have been!”<sup>38</sup> Here a fate that might have  
41  
42 resulted in happiness is specifically brought into the narrative. Fate’s invocation in the novel, and  
43  
44 not through Raskol’nikov discussing determinism but through the narrator’s voice, adds a frisson  
45  
46 of uncertainty. One of the major arguments of the novel is that determinism and fatalism are  
47  
48 problematic ways of viewing the world, yet the novel’s conclusion undermines this in  
49  
50 introducing “fate” – even conditionally – as a necessary agent in resolving the novel’s plot.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 These narrative interventions begin to push the unrepentant confessed criminal Raskol'nikov  
5  
6 onto a new generic plot trajectory: the redemption plot.  
7  
8

9 One of the striking features of the generic crime plot is narrative engagement with the  
10 reader. The detective novel forces its reader into the role of investigator, seeking within the  
11 narrative the truth about the crime, the perpetrator, the motive, and the text's central unifying  
12 mystery.<sup>39</sup> In *Crime and Punishment*, however, the central mystery of the text is neither the  
13 crime nor the chase but Raskol'nikov's subjective and existential consciousness. The crime plot,  
14 thus, concludes its narrative arc with Raskol'nikov's confession and punishment, but generic  
15 expectation remains unfulfilled, the mystery unsolved.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **The redemption plot and Raskol'nikov's generic stasis**

29  
30

31 While the crime plot is the most immediately visible first in the *siuzhet* and *fabula* of  
32 *Crime and Punishment*, a second generic plot model permeates every part: the redemption  
33 narrative. The redemption narrative's central event is Sonia's symbolic reading of the story of  
34 Lazarus, the Gospel tale of a man who is raised from the dead by Christ, but, as Tikhomirov  
35 observes, this scene is not simply a narrative "trick," but is a manifestation of the novel's deep  
36 engagement with the redemption plot.<sup>40</sup> Ksana Blank has identified the influence of two  
37 repentance narrative models from other genres on Dostoevskii's art: a penitential text, the Great  
38 Canon of Saint Andrew of Crete, and a sixteenth-century folktale, "The Legend of an Incestuous  
39 Man." In Blank's analysis, two significant ideas from these narrative models came to occupy a  
40 central place in Dostoevskii's religious philosophy: that "man's way to God may lie through sin  
41 and crime" and that "in and of itself the fall does not guarantee resurrection."<sup>41</sup> Raskol'nikov's  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 rebirth is a process, not the work of a single moment of crisis when he falls to his knees in the  
5  
6 Haymarket.  
7

8  
9 Raskol'nikov suffers in various ways directly stemming from his crimes: anxiety that he  
10 will be caught, anguish of conscience for Lizaveta's murder, fear of dishonour in the eyes of his  
11 family, and an inability to reconcile the reality of his actions with his justifying theories about  
12 creating a better world through them. Finally, at the end of Part 6, he confesses, which alleviates  
13 much of his suffering and – through punishment, both physically in the prison and  
14 metaphysically in his own consciousness – creates the circumstances for redemption.<sup>42</sup> In the  
15 epilogue Raskol'nikov's moment of repentance ushers in a better world through his transformed  
16 perspective, or, in Robert Louis Jackson's phrasing, the epilogue describes "the transformation  
17 of ends into beginnings."<sup>43</sup> Yet, when Raskol'nikov's redemption does come, it is, according to  
18 the *fabula*, sudden and unexpected, and yet, in terms of the *siuzhet*, entirely expected,  
19 conventional, and even pre-determined. The uncanny dissonance between *siuzhet* and *fabula* in  
20 the novel subverts generic expectation for the redemption plot.  
21  
22

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 *Zapiski iz podpol'ia (Notes from Underground)* (1864) provides a useful example of the  
39 way Dostoevskii subverts generic expectation in his fiction and, in particular, models a subverted  
40 redemption plot. *Notes from Underground* is a metafictional, first-person account of its main  
41 character's philosophical views and the experiences that led to their formation. The metafiction  
42 aspect of the novel's narration mocks readers' generic expectations but also betrays significant  
43 generic anxiety on the part of the protagonist-narrator. In Part 2, Underground Man, the  
44 protagonist, psychologically torments the prostitute Liza, leading her to believe he will offer her  
45 safety and rehabilitate her, following a classic narrative of the redemption of the fallen woman.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 In the end, however, he mocks her for not realizing the cliché of this trite story. Thwarting Liza's  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 expectation of the outcome of the fallen woman redemption narrative enables Underground Man  
5  
6 to gain the upper hand, to humiliate Liza and, in so doing, exact revenge for his own earlier  
7  
8 humiliation. Generic expectation projects a pre-determined narrative path for Liza and  
9  
10 Underground Man. His subversion of this narrative model not only satisfies his need for revenge,  
11  
12 but also creates an opening for a kind of freedom. As Gary Saul Morson writes, “He destroys the  
13  
14 edifice in order to avoid completing it.”<sup>44</sup> Bakhtin, analyzing Underground Man, observes that  
15  
16 “his consciousness of self lives by its unfinalizability, by its unclosedness and indeterminacy.”<sup>45</sup>  
17  
18 Tricking Liza using generic expectation and then pulling the narrative rug out from under her is  
19  
20 another way of asserting his own free will, of refusing a pre-determined ending.  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 Like Underground Man, Raskol’nikov defines himself and justifies his actions through  
27  
28 theories and ideas, and like Underground Man, Raskol’nikov sees his path as determined unless  
29  
30 he is able to “step over.” Where Underground Man’s stepping over consists of asserting his own  
31  
32 will on others, of subverting narrative models, Raskol’nikov sees Alena Ivanovna’s murder as  
33  
34 the moment to realize his own greatness, to subvert the codes of expected behaviour. However,  
35  
36 having committed the murder, Raskol’nikov finds himself in generic stasis, as I have argued  
37  
38 earlier; he neither achieves the greatness he desires nor the external punishment society requires.  
39  
40 Raskol’nikov, however, is not the only character who gets “stuck” in this way.  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Characters Raskol’nikov encounters become emblematic of different outcomes.<sup>46</sup> Sonia  
47  
48 represents the redemption narrative, the mirror image of the narrative that Underground Man  
49  
50 subverts, in which Raskol’nikov confesses, suffers, and, through suffering, is redeemed.  
51  
52 Kasatkina argues that Sonia’s character represents an icon for Raskol’nikov, a guiding force that  
53  
54 leads him to redemption.<sup>47</sup> Svidrigailov, on the other hand, models the path of a successful  
55  
56 transgressor, one who has unrepentantly stepped over and now has unlimited power. Just as  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Raskol'nikov is stuck in generic stasis in the epilogue, both Sonia and Svidrigailov are trapped in  
5  
6 their own generic stases through Parts 1-6 of the novel.  
7  
8

9         Sonia has confessed, suffers, repents, and her voice is privileged as the redemption  
10 narrative in the novel becomes the central generic plot following the reading of the story of  
11 Lazarus.<sup>48</sup> Svidrigailov transgresses without repentance, but happiness eludes him. Each is in a  
12 holding pattern of sorts, endlessly waiting for their own generically pre-determined outcome  
13 while urging Raskol'nikov to choose his fate. Raskol'nikov repeats the same pattern in an  
14 internal monologue for most of the epilogue's two chapters; this stasis is no more apparent than  
15 when, less than 10 pages before the end of the novel, the reader discovers that "the only crime he  
16 acknowledged" was "that he hadn't coped and had turned himself in."<sup>49</sup>  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28         The generic uncertainty in which Raskol'nikov spends much of the novel allows for  
29 possibility. As in *Notes from Underground*, straying from a predictable generic plot path, away  
30 from a literary model, enables a more open narrative structure and creates the space where the  
31 work of psychological transformation – from murderer to penitent – can take place. While the  
32 trajectory from the moment of murder to the final scene is an expected one, generic stasis  
33 subverts reader expectation and allows for the possibility of other outcomes.<sup>50</sup> Although these  
34 outcomes do not occur, they *could* occur, and Raskol'nikov's generic stasis, in this sense, is a  
35 necessary component of the novel; counter-intuitively, *not* following a redemption plot enables  
36 the novel's redemption plot.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49         Belknap argues that "the reader, like Raskol'nikov, will alternate between a strong drive  
50 towards his escape and a drive toward his confession."<sup>51</sup> The fact that the reader spends so much  
51 time listening to Raskol'nikov's inner monologues leads to their implication in the crime, as well  
52 as their attachment to the hero. Belknap views this attachment as the product of narrative  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 manipulation: “Dostoevsky’s siuzhet manipulates his readers into the fabula of the novel[;] [...] [  
5  
6 the siuzhet programs the reader’s experience to track the hero’s experience in the fabula.”<sup>52</sup> The  
7  
8 reader of the novel, however, is not just reading any novel; the reader of *Crime and Punishment*  
9  
10 clearly identifies the detective plot and the redemption narrative, among other generic plot  
11  
12 models, and the reader is also a reader of these genres. In this sense, the reader is both criminal  
13  
14 and investigator, both unrepentant and redeemed.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

## 21 **The end**

22  
23  
24 Generic expectation creates a sense of what ought to happen in a narrative, and when that  
25  
26 expectation is thwarted, narrative dissonance can occur. In *Crime and Punishment* redemption  
27  
28 and detection both operate outside of the way they are expected to operate, and in the ending  
29  
30 coalesce to create a new generic hybrid, one that betrays the social contract inherent in generic  
31  
32 expectation. Reading the novel from the perspective of plot and time, Ilya Kliger finds *Crime*  
33  
34 *and Punishment* “ultimately indecisive about the preferable emplotment for the protagonist.”<sup>53</sup>  
35  
36 Kliger argues that four plots exist, but two are cancelled out before the epilogue; the remaining  
37  
38 two – hagiography, represented by Sonia, and *Bildungsroman*, represented by Porfirii Petrovich  
39  
40 and Razumikhin – not only persist, but, by the end combine to project a compatible and yet  
41  
42 incompatible generic plot, “a saint’s life in *Bildung* time.”<sup>54</sup> While this article does not consider  
43  
44 the genres woven into the fabric of the novel so neatly as this, Kliger’s analysis and mine both  
45  
46 identify the curious inconsistency of the epilogue, which is not related to whether the epilogue  
47  
48 “fits,” so much as it underscores the novel’s inherent generic uncanniness. In this the effect on  
49  
50 the reader is not surprising; indeed, Holquist, writing about modernist detective fiction, observes  
51  
52 that in “[jumbling] the well-known patterns of classical detective stories” such literary works  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 constitute an “attack on the reader” in that they give disorienting “strangeness” instead of the  
5 expected and familiar generic plot.<sup>55</sup> The curious paradox of the novel’s epilogue is that it  
6  
7 simultaneously and uncannily fulfills and disrupts generic expectation.  
8  
9

10  
11         Is this generic messiness or generic hybridity?<sup>56</sup> In *Crime and Punishment* genre creates a  
12 productive space where opposing narrative potentials can function simultaneously and  
13  
14 harmoniously, leading to narrative openness and possibility. Other critics have observed this  
15  
16 open aspect of the novel’s ending. Knapp, in her study of inertia and metaphysics in Dostoevskii,  
17  
18 likens it to the “miraculous,” for example.<sup>57</sup> Tikhomirov argues that Sonia’s and Raskol’nikov’s  
19  
20 paths “converge” in the moment Sonia reads the Gospel, and both – one through crime and the  
21  
22 other through Christian sacrifice – equally experience their situation as “a state of death.”<sup>58</sup>  
23  
24 However, only this state of death enables rebirth. Greta Matzner-Gore, approaching the epilogue  
25  
26 from the perspective of probability, finds that the epilogue “balances the expected with the  
27  
28 unexpected, the literarily conventional with the anomalous and improbable.”<sup>59</sup> While these  
29  
30 responses and this critical attention could be read as the result of generic messiness, I think,  
31  
32 rather, that the ending of the novel and Dostoevskii’s plans for the novel’s outcome both attest to  
33  
34 the epilogue’s reliance on generic hybridity as a strategy that enables the redemption narrative to  
35  
36 occur within Dostoevskii’s own philosophical terms.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45         The narrative uncanniness of the epilogue is not overt in these readings, yet it is central.  
46  
47 And, perhaps, necessary. The narrative of Raskol’nikov’s shift from unrepentant to redeemed  
48  
49 obviously parallels Dostoevskii’s own conversion narrative, which “like his fictional conversion  
50  
51 narratives is fraught with mystery and paradox,” in Robin Feuer Miller’s phrasing.<sup>60</sup> Miller  
52  
53 argues that Dostoevskii’s conversion took place not in Siberia but at the moment of his mock  
54  
55 execution in December 1849.<sup>61</sup> Thus the epilogue’s depiction of Raskol’nikov’s redemption is  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 necessarily liminal in that it simultaneously describes a redemption that has happened and that  
5  
6 has not happened. Raskol'nikov is redeemed narratively to the reader in the testimonials to his  
7  
8 good character in the beginning of the epilogue, before the redemption narrative happens.  
9

10  
11 Yet Raskol'nikov's genuine rebirth is possible within the bounds of Dostoevskii's novel  
12  
13 because it is not predetermined by generic expectation; rather, it manifests as an expression of  
14  
15 free will. The novel's final lines speak to this paradoxicality:  
16  
17

18  
19 He didn't even know that his new life was not being given to him for free, that it would  
20  
21 still cost him dear, that it would have to be paid for with a great, future deed...  
22  
23 But here a new story begins: the story of a man's gradual renewal and gradual rebirth, of  
24  
25 his gradual crossing from one world to another, of his acquaintance with a new, as yet  
26  
27 unknown reality. That could be a subject for another tale – our present one has ended.<sup>62</sup>  
28

29  
30 Here the narrator simultaneously sets out a predetermined narrative path for Raskol'nikov and  
31  
32 allows for its disruption. The first line of the excerpt details the *siuzhet* of a new novel and lays  
33  
34 out what will befall its hero. The reader understands Raskol'nikov's narrative fate, but the  
35  
36 ellipsis creates a sense of narrative openness. The second line, then, in emphasizing that the  
37  
38 *siuzhet* and *fabula* are united in one “new, as yet unknown reality” (*novaia, dosele sovershenno*  
39  
40 *nevedomaia deistvitel'nost'*), reiterates the potential for the unexpected in this expected narrative  
41  
42 arc. The final line of the excerpt (and the novel), using the conditional statement “could be”  
43  
44 (*moglo by*) again opens up this new narrative, freeing it from the constraints of generic  
45  
46 predetermination.  
47

48  
49 Following a generic master plot from start to its expected ending asserts determinism in a  
50  
51 way the novel itself resists, just as it fights against Raskol'nikov's idea-fuelled fatalism. As a  
52  
53 result, when the novel ends as expected, even with opportunities for disruption woven into its  
54  
55 narrative fabric, the ending sits uneasily. One could argue that the reader's uneasiness in  
56  
57 encountering the epilogue directly reflects Dostoevskii's own uneasiness with the confines of  
58  
59 generic convention, even as he exploits the form for his own artistic aims. The epilogue of *Crime*  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 *and Punishment*, viewed through the lens of genre, becomes a generative space between reader  
5  
6 expectation and the way the novel ends.  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 Bibliography  
12

13  
14 Alewyn, Richard. "The Origin of the Detective Novel." In *The Poetics of Murder: Detective*  
15 *Fiction and Literary Theory*, edited by Glenn W. Most and William W. Stowe, 62-78.  
16 San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.  
17

18  
19 Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Translated and edited by Caryl Emerson.  
20 Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.  
21

22  
23 Belknap, Robert L. *Plots*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.  
24

25  
26 Blake, Elizabeth. "Sonya, Silent No More: A Response to the Woman Question in Dostoevsky's  
27 'Crime and Punishment.'" *The Slavic and East European Journal* 50, no. 2 (2006): 252-  
28 271.  
29

30  
31 Blank, Ksana. *Dostoevsky's Dialectics and the Problem of Sin*. Evanston: Northwestern  
32 University Press, 2010.  
33

34  
35 Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Cambridge, MA:  
36 Harvard University Press, 1984.  
37

38  
39 Cobley, Paul. "Objectivity and Immanence in Genre Theory." In *Genre Matters: Essays in*  
40 *Theory and Criticism*, edited by Garin Dowd, Jeremy Strong, and Lesley Stevenson, 41-  
41 54. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2006.  
42

43  
44 Dostoevskii, F. M. *Prestuplenie i nakazanie. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. vol. 6. Edited by V. G.  
45 Bazanov et al. Moscow: Nauka, 1973.  
46

47  
48 Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. Translated by Oliver Ready. London: Penguin  
49 Books, 2014.  
50

51  
52 Frazier, Melissa. "The Science of Sensation: Dostoevsky, Wilkie Collins, and the Detective  
53 Novel." *Dostoevsky Studies New Series*, no. 19 (2015): 7-28.  
54

55  
56 Gibson, Walker. "Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers." In *Reader-Response*  
57 *Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, edited by Jane P. Tompkins, 1-6.  
58 Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.  
59

60  
61 Grossman, Leonid. *Poetika Dostoevskogo. Istorii i teoriiia iskusstv*, issue 4. Moscow:  
62 Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, 1925.  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Gus, M. S. *Idei i obrazy F. M. Dostoevskogo*. Moscow: Gos. izdatel'stvo khudozh. literatury,  
7 1971.  
8  
9 Gustafson, Richard F. *Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger. A Study in Fiction and Theology*.  
10 Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.  
11  
12 Holquist, Michael. *Dostoevsky and the Novel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.  
13  
14  
15 Holquist, Michael. "Whodunit and Other Questions: Metaphysical Detective Stories in Postwar  
16 Fiction." In *The Poetics of Murder: Detective Fiction and Literary Theory*, edited by  
17 Glenn W. Most and William W. Stowe, 149-174. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich,  
18 1983.  
19  
20  
21 Jackson, Robert Louis. "Introduction: The Clumsy White Flower." In *Twentieth-Century*  
22 *Interpretations of Crime and Punishment: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by  
23 Robert Louis Jackson, 1-8. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.  
24  
25  
26 Kasatkina, T. A. *Kharakterologiya Dostoevskogo. Tipologiya emotsional'no-tsennostnykh*  
27 *orientatsii*. Moscow: Nasledie, 1996.  
28  
29  
30 Kasatkina, T. A. "Ob odnom svoistve epilogov piati velikikh romanov Dostoevskogo:  
31 'Prestuplenie i nakazanie,' 'Besy,' 'Idiot,' 'Brat'ia Karamazovy,' 'Podrostok.'" In  
32 *Dostoevskii v kontse XX veka*, edited by Karen A. Stepanian. Moscow: Klassika plus,  
33 1996.  
34  
35  
36 Kliger, Ilya. "Shapes of History and the Enigmatic Hero in Dostoevsky: The Case of 'Crime and  
37 Punishment.'" *Comparative Literature* 62, no. 3 (2010): 228-245.  
38  
39  
40 Klioutchkine, Konstantine. "The Rise of *Crime and Punishment* from the Air of the Media."  
41 *Slavic Review* 61, no. 1 (2002): 88-108.  
42  
43  
44 Knapp, Liza. *The Annihilation of Inertia: Dostoevsky and Metaphysics*. Evanston: Northwestern  
45 University Press, 1996.  
46  
47  
48 Matual, David. "In Defense of the Epilogue of *Crime and Punishment*." *Studies in the Novel* 24,  
49 no. 1 (1992): 26-34.  
50  
51  
52 Matzner-Gore, Greta. "The Improbable Poetics of *Crime and Punishment*." In *Dostoevsky at*  
53 *200: The Novel in Modernity*, edited by Katherine Bowers and Kate Holland. Toronto:  
54 University of Toronto Press, forthcoming 2021.  
55  
56  
57 McReynolds, Louise. *Murder Most Russian: True Crime and Punishment in Late Imperial*  
58 *Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 McReynolds, Louise. “Who Cares Who Killed Ivan Ivanovich?": The Literary Detective in  
5 Tsarist Russia.” *Russian History* 36 (2009): 391-406.  
6  
7  
8 Miller, Carolyn R. “Genre as Social Action.” In *Genre and the New Rhetoric*, edited by Aviva  
9 Freedman and Peter Medway, 20-36. London: Taylor & Francis, 2005.  
10  
11 Miller, D. A. *The Novel and the Police*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.  
12  
13  
14 Miller, Robin Feuer. *Dostoevsky's Unfinished Journey*. New Haven: Yale University Press,  
15 2008.  
16  
17  
18 Morson, Gary Saul. *The Boundaries of Genre: Dostoevsky's Diary of a Writer and the Traditions*  
19 *of Literary Utopia*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1988.  
20  
21  
22 Morson, Gary Saul. “Genre and Hero/Fathers and Sons: Intergeneric Dialogues, Generic  
23 Refugees, and the Hidden Prosaic.” In *Literature, Culture, and Society in the Modern*  
24 *Age*, edited by E. J. Brown, L. Fleishman, G. Freidin, and R. Schupbach, 336-381.  
25 Stanford Slavic Studies 4. Stanford: Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Stanford  
26 University, 1991.  
27  
28  
29 Morson, Gary Saul. *Narrative and Freedom: The Shadows of Time*. New Haven: Yale University  
30 Press, 1994.  
31  
32  
33 Reitblat, A. I. “Detektivnaia literatura i russkii chitatel' (vtoraia polovina XIX – nachalo XX  
34 v.).” In *Knizhnoe delo v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX-nachale XX veka*, issue 7, edited  
35 by V. E. Kel'ner et al., 126-140. St Petersburg: Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka,  
36 1994.  
37  
38  
39 Schur, Anna. *Wages of Evil: Dostoevsky and Punishment*. Evanston: Northwestern University  
40 Press, 2013.  
41  
42  
43 Strakhov, N. N. “Prestuplenie i nakazanie. Roman v shesti chastiakh s epilogom. F.M.  
44 Dostoevskogo. Izdanie ispravlennoe. Dva toma. Peterburg. 1867. Stat'ia vtoraia i  
45 posledniaia.” *Literaturnaia kritika*. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1984.  
46  
47  
48 Tikhomirov, B. N. “Lazar'! Griadi voi” *Roman F. M. Dostoevskogo 'Prestuplenie i nakazanie' v*  
49 *sovremennom prochtenii. Kniga-kommentarii*. St Petersburg: Serebrianni vek, 2005.  
50  
51  
52 Wasiolek, Edward. “On the Structure of *Crime and Punishment*.” *PMLA* 74, no. 1 (1959): 131-  
53 136.  
54  
55  
56 Whitehead, Claire. *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction, 1860-1917: Deciphering Stories*  
57 *of Detection*. Cambridge, UK: Legenda, 2018.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Zakharov, V. N. "Simvolika khristianskogo kalendara v proizvedeniiakh Dostoevskogo." *Novye*  
5 *aspekty v izuchenii Dostoevskogo*, edited by V. N. Zakharov: 37-49. Petrozavodsk:  
6 Izdatel'stvo Petrozavodskogo Universiteta, 1994.  
7  
8  
9

---

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Notes

17 <sup>1</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 658. The original text may be found in Dostoevskii,  
18 *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 422.

19 <sup>2</sup> Robert L. Belknap defines plots as "ways of relating incidents to one another." Belknap, *Plots*,  
20 3. Belknap, *Plots*, 16-17.

21 <sup>3</sup> Strakhov, "Stat'ia vtoraiia i posledniaia," 121.

22 <sup>4</sup> Wasiolek, "On the Structure of *Crime and Punishment*," 135-136. As an example of a Soviet  
23 critic, see Gus, *Idei i obrazy*, 325-326, 333.

24 <sup>5</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 92.

25 <sup>6</sup> Matual, "In Defense of the Epilogue of *Crime and Punishment*," 26-34.

26 <sup>7</sup> Knapp, *The Annihilation of Inertia*, 64-65; Kasatkina, "Ob odnom svoistve epilogov," 78.

27 <sup>8</sup> Tikhomirov, *Lazar'! Griadi voi*, 33-34.

28 <sup>9</sup> Belknap, *Plots*, 127.

29 <sup>10</sup> Miller, "Genre as Social Action," 20-36.

30 <sup>11</sup> Gibson, "Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers," 1-6.

31 <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

32 <sup>13</sup> Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 5.

33 <sup>14</sup> Copley, "Objectivity and Immanence in Genre Theory," 41.

34 <sup>15</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 104-105.

35 <sup>16</sup> Belknap, *Plots*, 84.

36 <sup>17</sup> These two types of plot align with Michael Holquist's study of emplotment based on the  
37 discovery of knowledge, although Holquist describes the latter as a "wisdom tale"; see Holquist,  
38 *Dostoevsky and the Novel*, 87-88. More recently, these are two of four plots identified in Ilya  
39 Kliger's article about emplotment in *Crime and Punishment*; see Kliger, "Shapes of History,"  
40 229.

41 <sup>18</sup> Belknap, *Plots*, 39.

42 <sup>19</sup> McReynolds, *Murder Most Russian*, 117-120 and *passim*.

43 <sup>20</sup> Crime fiction's popularity in late imperial Russia has been documented by Avram Reitblat.  
44 See Reitblat, "Detektivnaia literatura i russkii chitatel'," 126. For a corresponding discussion of  
45 popular topics in news, see Klioutchkine, "The Rise of *Crime and Punishment*," 97-99.

46 <sup>21</sup> Claire Whitehead considers the appeal of crime fiction for nineteenth-century Russians in  
47 terms of the genre's narrative utility. See Whitehead, *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime*  
48 *Fiction*, 3.

49 <sup>22</sup> Alewyn, "The Origin of the Detective Novel," 64.

50 <sup>23</sup> Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 25.

51 <sup>24</sup> Alewyn, "The Origin of the Detective Novel," 63.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 
- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
- <sup>25</sup> Grossman, *Poetika Dostoevskogo*, 28-43.  
<sup>26</sup> Holquist, *Dostoevsky and the Novel*, 77.  
<sup>27</sup> Whitehead, *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction*, 112.  
<sup>28</sup> McReynolds, “Who Cares Who Killed Ivan Ivanovich?,” 391-406.  
<sup>29</sup> Miller, *The Novel and the Police*, 3.  
<sup>30</sup> Frazier, “The Science of Sensation,” 23.  
<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.  
<sup>32</sup> Whitehead, *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction*, 92-93.  
<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 100.  
<sup>34</sup> On “generic refugees,” see Gary Saul Morson. “Genre and Hero/Fathers and Sons,” 336-381.  
<sup>35</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 647. The original text can be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 413.  
<sup>36</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 649; Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 416-417.  
<sup>37</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, 53-68.  
<sup>38</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 650. The original text can be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 417.  
<sup>39</sup> Whitehead, *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction*, 11.  
<sup>40</sup> Tikhomirov, *Lazar! Griadi voi*, 31.  
<sup>41</sup> Blank, *Dostoevsky’s Dialectics and the Problem of Sin*, 34.  
<sup>42</sup> On the relationship between punishment and redemption in *Crime and Punishment*, see Schur, *Wages of Evil*, 114-115.  
<sup>43</sup> Jackson, “Introduction: The Clumsy White Flowers,” 6-7.  
<sup>44</sup> Morson, *The Boundaries of Genre*, 130.  
<sup>45</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, 53.  
<sup>46</sup> Here I use the phrase “emblematic” in the sense of Richard Gustafson’s “emblematic realism,” but where he sees characters in Lev Tolstoi’s works that are portrayed fusing their social environment with religious allegory as emblematic, in Dostoevskii’s novels I would argue that characters are portrayed fusing their social environment with generic models. See Gustafson, *Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger*, 203.  
<sup>47</sup> Kasatkina, *Kharakterologiiia Dostoevskogo*, 200.  
<sup>48</sup> Blake, “Sonya, Silent No More,” 267-268.  
<sup>49</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 651. The original text can be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 417.  
<sup>50</sup> In this my analysis builds on Morson’s theory of sideshadowing. See Morson, *Narrative and Freedom*, 117-172.  
<sup>51</sup> Belknap, *Plots*, 107.  
<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 106-107.  
<sup>53</sup> Kliger, “Shapes of History,” 229.  
<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 243-244.  
<sup>55</sup> Holquist, “Whodunit and Other Questions,” 173.  
<sup>56</sup> I am indebted to Eric Naiman for suggesting this question.  
<sup>57</sup> Knapp, *Annihilation of Inertia*, 65.  
<sup>58</sup> Tikhomirov, *Lazar! Griadi voi*, 31-32.  
<sup>59</sup> Matzner-Gore, “The Improbable Poetics of *Crime and Punishment*,” forthcoming.  
<sup>60</sup> Miller, *Dostoevsky’s Unfinished Journey*, 4.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 4-8.

<sup>62</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 658. The original text can be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 422.



**Special Section: On the Epilogue of Dostoevskii's *Crime and Punishment***

**Plotting the ending: Generic expectation and the uncanny epilogue of *Crime and Punishment***

## **Plotting the ending: Generic expectation and the uncanny epilogue of *Crime and Punishment***

**Abstract:** This article examines the epilogue of Dostoevskii's novel *Crime and Punishment* from the perspective of genre and generic expectation. Considering two generic plots that appear in the novel, the detective plot and the redemption narrative, the author argues that the imagined reader's generic expectation is both satisfied and thwarted in each case. The author introduces the idea of "generic stasis" to refer to Raskol'nikov's situation vis-à-vis generic plot in each plot trajectory of the epilogue. In upsetting generic expectation, this state of generic stasis creates an opening that enables the novel's ending to occur. In this sense, the article argues for the utility of the epilogue's generic hybridity in resisting narrative predetermination.

**Keywords:** Fedor Dostoevskii; epilogue; genre; crime fiction; redemption narrative

At the end of *Crime and Punishment* (1866) the hero confesses his crime and is sent to Siberia. The two short chapters that comprise the novel's epilogue neatly wrap up the plotlines of many of the novel's characters and focus on Raskol'nikov's experiences in prison nearly a year and a half after the events of the first six parts of the novel. Raskol'nikov suffers, labours, and, in the end, repents, while the last lines send him off as protagonist of a new plot: "the story of a man's gradual renewal and gradual rebirth, of his gradual crossing from one world to another, of his acquaintance with a new, as yet unknown reality."<sup>1</sup> *Crime and Punishment* essentially summarizes its plot – both *siuzhet* and *fabula* – within its title: first, a crime, then, a punishment.

Robert L. Belknap explains *siuzhet* and *fabula* as understandings of plot:

The *fabula* is *the relationship among the incidents in the world the characters inhabit*, a multidimensional, intricately interconnected array where events may happen simultaneously in different places, where causation plays a crucial structural role, and where sequences of events exist in the time system of the characters' lives. The *siuzhet* is *the relationship among the same incidents in the world of the text*, a one-dimensional array of words encountered one after another in the time system of the reader.<sup>2</sup>

In this sense, the book's epilogue is precisely the expected ending, following on Raskol'nikov's moral torments detailed in the 500 or so pages that separate the murder and his Siberian exile.

Since the novel's publication 150 years ago, critics have discussed the ways these two short chapters have failed or succeeded in concluding the novel. Nikolai Strakhov expressed dissatisfaction with the epilogue early on, commenting in 1867 that the resolution described in Siberia is "too general" as Raskol'nikov's true moment of resurrection is his confession to Sonia in Part 6; he went on to argue that Fedor Dostoevskii rendered the section superfluous when he stated that Raskol'nikov's story would continue.<sup>3</sup> Some critics have made the claim that the epilogue fails to continue the novel's artistic vision. Edward Wasiolek, for example, argued that it "follows logically, but not artistically," while Soviet critics found it to be "artistically weak" because of its reliance on the Christian trope of redemption.<sup>4</sup> Mikhail Bakhtin considered the epilogue a "conventionally monologic" disruption of the novel's dialogism, a forum for its author's ideology that undermines the novel's artistic integrity.<sup>5</sup>

Some critics have accepted the epilogue as necessary, or "inevitable" in David Matual's phrasing.<sup>6</sup> Liza Knapp observes that the happy ending is expected thematically but seems to occur "miraculously" in that it is not precisely explained, while Tat'iana Kasatkina views the Gospel elements – readings and sermons – present in the epilogue as a "key" (*kliuch*) to understanding Dostoevskii's overall message.<sup>7</sup> Boris Tikhomirov's recent excellent commentary on the novel argues that the epilogue is not only necessary but central, as it redeems both Raskol'nikov and Sonia.<sup>8</sup> Robert L. Belknap, reading the novel and its epilogue from the perspective of plot, finds that discourse shifts "from the dialogic to the inspirational" in the epilogue, but the "plot remains consistent" and logical as it proceeds towards redemption.<sup>9</sup> This discussion of critical takes on the epilogue is by no means exhaustive, nor are any surprising

readings revealed. I present it to demonstrate the richness and vastness of critical literature on the epilogue, which canvasses multiple theoretical approaches. A common path of inquiry here is the epilogue's narrative "fit," that is, how well it succeeds in following the first six parts.

The present article is not about whether the epilogue fits the novel. Rather, I am interested in exploring why the epilogue sparks such strong and opposed feelings among its readers. One way to examine this is from the perspective of generic expectation. Genre is a useful approach to the question of reader reaction to the epilogue because it implicitly builds a community encompassing reader, author, and text; as Carolyn R. Miller has observed, genre is a social act.<sup>10</sup> Generic expectation becomes a uniting experience. In this, genre relies on what Walker Gibson has termed the "mock reader."<sup>11</sup> The "mock reader," in Gibson's formulation, is the imagined reader "whose mask and costume the individual takes on in order to experience the language" of the literary work; this imagined reader is an artifact "controlled, simplified, abstracted" by the author, and henceforth, when I refer to the reader, this imagined "mock reader" is what I mean.<sup>12</sup> While genre is often described in terms of its conventions, in this article I focus on a different aspect: plot, described by Peter Brooks as "the principle of interconnectedness and intention which we cannot do without in moving through the discrete elements—incidents, episodes, actions—of a narrative."<sup>13</sup> Plots, in Brooks's formulation, bind together and organize disparate elements, which then generate expectation, anticipation of what comes next. In this I follow Paul Cobley's argument that places expectation and, by extension, plot centrally in a consideration of genre: "Genre is not a set of textual features that can be enumerated; rather, it is an expectation."<sup>14</sup> Generic expectation becomes a central defining aspect of the collective reading (and writing) process.

Dostoevskii was himself a keen reader of genre fiction.<sup>15</sup> He famously and self-consciously “borrowed plots and plotting techniques from his omnivorous reading.”<sup>16</sup> In this article, I will examine two entwined generic plots that are deeply embedded in the novel’s narrative: those of the crime novel and the redemption narrative.<sup>17</sup> By “generic plot” I mean a *siuzhet* that follows the conventions of a narrative common to a genre. Belknap describes the structure of a *siuzhet* as bipartite: “incidents in the *siuzhet* consist of an expectation and its fulfillment or frustration.”<sup>18</sup> A *siuzhet* can be result-focused, just as a narrative common to a particular genre often has a pre-determined outcome: crime plots end in a revelation to the reader while redemption plots end in the regeneration of a character. Strikingly, in *Crime and Punishment*, the two plots function as expected, and yet, at the same time, they subvert generic expectations, creating an uncanny narrative space for the reader. Although the epilogue logically follows the novel’s events, I argue that the epilogue both fulfills and deviates from the generic plots that inform it. As the anticipated narrative for each of the generic plots introduced and traced in the novel breaks down, the uncanny – the simultaneous feeling of familiarity and strangeness – emerges from the reader’s perceived dislocation from the anticipation of the plot. A focal point for each plot is the narrative trajectory of the protagonist, but, as I demonstrate in each, the protagonist becomes mired in generic stasis, unable to progress. This rupture of generic expectation creates openness and possibility, the narrative space where the expected outcome – or other outcomes – could occur.

### **The crime plot and generic expectation**

In the first pages of the epilogue, Russian readers of the mid-1860s would recognize a familiar sequence of events. Accounts of trials where lurid details emerge for the titillation of the

public, and then either a sentence (or an upset) were common in newspaper accounts of the late nineteenth-century courtroom.<sup>19</sup> *Crime and Punishment* was published at a time when crime dominated reading material, both in the news and in fiction.<sup>20</sup> Crime fiction is a genre predicated on concealing or diverting attention from a sequence of events, but its readers expect that their role in reading the novel will be to piece together what happened from clues in the text.<sup>21</sup> The detective novel plot is a specific subgenre of crime fiction which features not just a crime, but an investigation of that crime within the text.<sup>22</sup> Or, in Brooks's formulation, the genre entails "finding the *fabula* and its instigator."<sup>23</sup>

An obvious generic plot model for *Crime and Punishment* is introduced in the character of Porfirii Petrovich, whose role in the novel is to investigate the murder of the pawnbroker and her sister. At the time Dostoevskii was writing, the detective novel was a relatively recent innovation; the first was Edgar Allan Poe's 1841 story "The Murders in the Rue Morgue."<sup>24</sup> The fictional works that informed Dostoevskii's crime novel included Charles Maturin's gothic novel *Melmoth the Wanderer* (1820), Thomas de Quincey's crime fiction from the 1830s, Honoré de Balzac's *Le Père Goriot* (*Father Goriot*) (1834), Poe's "The Murders in the Rue Morgue" and other C. Auguste Dupin stories of the 1840s, and Eugène Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris* (*The Mysteries of Paris*) (1842-1843), all readily available and popular on the Russian book market of the mid-nineteenth century.<sup>25</sup> These works were so influential that Michael Holquist goes so far as to argue that Sue's *The Mysteries of Paris* serves as the model for the detective story that runs through Parts 1-6 of *Crime and Punishment*.<sup>26</sup>

There is a long-standing debate about whether *Crime and Punishment* is crime fiction at all, as it does not conform to other contemporaneous models of the genre.<sup>27</sup> However, with Porfirii Petrovich, *Crime and Punishment* deliberately builds on the investigator type established

by Poe's Dupin. Even if *Crime and Punishment* takes a new approach to the crime plot, Dostoevskii's novel still provokes generic expectation in the reader thanks to the strong influence of popular works and the recognizable detective figure Porfirii Petrovich. *Crime and Punishment*'s crime plot is written as a "whydunit" rather than a "whodunit,"<sup>28</sup> but the basic detective plot element persists: like Dupin, Porfirii Petrovich gets his man.

In his classic study of detective fiction and the English novel, D. A. Miller observes that the novel and the police seem incompatible in that the aims of the one work against the aims of the other: "[the investigation's] sheer intrusiveness posits a world whose normality has been hitherto defined as a matter of *not needing* the police or policelike detectives. The investigation repairs this normality, not only by solving the crime, but also, far more important, by withdrawing from what had been, for an aberrant moment, its 'scene.'"<sup>29</sup> Reading only the crime novel aspects of *Crime and Punishment* strips the narrative down to its base elements of plot, some aspects of characterization, and convention, but ignores the novel's generic messiness, in the fissures of which lie its deeper meaning. Raskol'nikov's confession at the end of Part 6 neatly ends the detective plot of the novel, but the epilogue's opening works against a straightforward narrative of a deserving criminal facing punishment, creating openings for doubt or even alternative generic models.

At the beginning of the epilogue's first chapter there is a break, not only temporal and spatial, but also narrational; Part 6 ends in July 1865, as Raskol'nikov confesses, and the next page begins the epilogue's first chapter, eighteen months later in Siberia. At the end of Part 6, the reader is still firmly lodged inside Raskol'nikov's head. The lead-up to the confession is swift, and as Raskol'nikov walks to turn himself in, time subjectively slows, connecting the reader even more closely with the protagonist. The first page of the first chapter of the epilogue

abruptly obliterates that narrative intimacy, describing Raskol'nikov's trial and referring to him, for the most part, only as "the criminal" (*prestupnik*). In confessing, Raskol'nikov has lost his identity. His trial, however, provides him with an alternative identity, one that works against the expected persona of the criminal in the detective plot. The account of his trial brings out, in addition to lurid details of the murder, stories of his kindness and heroism: his pledge to marry a dying girl, and his heroic feat in saving children from a burning building. These narratives of selflessness erode the generic detective plot, just as Raskol'nikov's sympathetic character does in Part 1; the reader of *Crime and Punishment* cheers for Raskol'nikov throughout, not Porfirii Petrovich.

Poe's Dupin stories and other hero-detective works are often thought to be predicated on "ratiocination," a belief in rationality, causality, and order that informs the detective genre throughout the nineteenth century, but Dostoevskii's work resists this determinism. Ratiocination is the process in which both detective and reader engage: the organization of revealed information to piece together the disordered *fabula* of the text. Melissa Frazier, however, argues that ratiocination is too limiting.<sup>30</sup> Frazier observes that the power of Dostoevskii's novel lies in its detective's refusal to conform to the rational, a circumstance that demonstrates the indeterminacy that characterizes the broader world.<sup>31</sup>

Indeterminacy in the novel is grounded in the narrative structure of the detective plot and also has ramifications for generic expectation. Dostoevskii's radical experimentation with narrative subjectivity undermines generic expectation in that it allows for the open and multi-faceted expression of individual and independent voices. Crime fiction also has the capacity for multiple voices, a narrative device used to "fragment" the information the reader uncovers towards the solution of the mystery, as Whitehead has observed.<sup>32</sup> However, a detective novel



seeks to determine and privilege one objective truth – who and howdunit. In Holquist’s reading of *Crime and Punishment* as a detective novel, he asserts that the detective-hero is not Porfirii Petrovich, but Raskol’nikov himself, searching for a meaning for his life. He argues that, while Raskol’nikov fails to “find a self in the detective story,” a new plot is granted him in the epilogue.<sup>33</sup> And yet, where Holquist identifies disparate generic plots clearly demarcated by a shift that appears in the epilogue, Dostoevskii’s writing does not so easily relinquish the generic plots that inform it.

Confession should end the crime plot, but its unrealized expectation persists into the epilogue, where Raskol’nikov’s reported internal thoughts place him firmly in what I term generic stasis. By generic stasis I mean a curious temporal space in the novel where “generic refugees” – characters from other genres who appear in the realist novel, to borrow the term from Gary Saul Morson – can get stuck when they cannot follow their master plots.<sup>34</sup> Raskol’nikov asks himself why he did not follow through with Svidrigailov’s trajectory and commit suicide, or why he turned himself in for Sonia’s sake but now still feels no repentance or remorse for his crime, only for his “weak” confession. As a result of this internal struggle, he cannot progress to one or the other plot line, and instead stays trapped, a prisoner of his inability to get back on the generic plot track.

Intriguingly, although ratiocination does not structure the *siuzhet*, it develops in the epilogue as Raskol’nikov is punished for his crime. Here I use the term ratiocination in the sense of the process of ordering the *fabula*, of getting the generic plot back to its expected trajectory. At first, neither redeemed nor damned, Raskol’nikov persists in stasis: “he understood his situation perfectly well, expected no sudden improvements, entertained no frivolous hopes (as others in his situation are prone to do) and found almost nothing to surprise him about his new

surroundings.”<sup>35</sup> When this statement appears, in Chapter 1 of the epilogue, the reader anticipates the end of the narrative. This summary of Raskol’nikov’s expectations and experiences, however, counterbalances yet simultaneously fuels the reader’s anticipation of a sudden improvement or a surprise of some kind to conclude the novel. In Chapter 2 of the epilogue, the narrator seems to begin to push the protagonist towards an outcome.

Ratiocination appears in the epilogue in a series of narrative interventions that aim to set Raskol’nikov on the generic path to rehabilitation. In a long passage discussing Raskol’nikov’s mood and internal monologue, the narrator inserts himself. “But it wasn’t his shaven head and his shackles he was ashamed of, it was his pride that had been badly wounded; it was this that had made him ill. Oh, if only he could have blamed himself, how happy he would have been! He could have put up with anything then, even shame and disgrace. But he judged himself harshly.”<sup>36</sup> This line – “Oh, if only he could have blamed himself, how happy he would have been!” – intrudes, inserting a sense of what must happen to finalize Raskol’nikov’s generic trajectory. This outcome refers to a pre-determined fate and undermines Raskol’nikov’s unfinalizability.<sup>37</sup> These insertions continue throughout this internal monologue. Later the narrator muses, “If only fate could bring him remorse – burning remorse that breaks the heart into pieces, that drives away sleep; the kind of remorse whose dreadful torments yield visions of the noose, the whirlpool! Oh, how glad he would have been!”<sup>38</sup> Here a fate that might have resulted in happiness is specifically brought into the narrative. Fate’s invocation in the novel, and not through Raskol’nikov discussing determinism but through the narrator’s voice, adds a frisson of uncertainty. One of the major arguments of the novel is that determinism and fatalism are problematic ways of viewing the world, yet the novel’s conclusion undermines this in introducing “fate” – even conditionally – as a necessary agent in resolving the novel’s plot.

These narrative interventions begin to push the unrepentant confessed criminal Raskol'nikov onto a new generic plot trajectory: the redemption plot.

One of the striking features of the generic crime plot is narrative engagement with the reader. The detective novel forces its reader into the role of investigator, seeking within the narrative the truth about the crime, the perpetrator, the motive, and the text's central unifying mystery.<sup>39</sup> In *Crime and Punishment*, however, the central mystery of the text is neither the crime nor the chase but Raskol'nikov's subjective and existential consciousness. The crime plot, thus, concludes its narrative arc with Raskol'nikov's confession and punishment, but generic expectation remains unfulfilled, the mystery unsolved.

### **The redemption plot and Raskol'nikov's generic stasis**

While the crime plot is the most immediately visible first in the *siuzhet* and *fabula* of *Crime and Punishment*, a second generic plot model permeates every part: the redemption narrative. The redemption narrative's central event is Sonia's symbolic reading of the story of Lazarus, the Gospel tale of a man who is raised from the dead by Christ, but, as Tikhomirov observes, this scene is not simply a narrative "trick," but is a manifestation of the novel's deep engagement with the redemption plot.<sup>40</sup> Ksana Blank has identified the influence of two repentance narrative models from other genres on Dostoevskii's art: a penitential text, the Great Canon of Saint Andrew of Crete, and a sixteenth-century folktale, "The Legend of an Incestuous Man." In Blank's analysis, two significant ideas from these narrative models came to occupy a central place in Dostoevskii's religious philosophy: that "man's way to God may lie through sin and crime" and that "in and of itself the fall does not guarantee resurrection."<sup>41</sup> Raskol'nikov's

rebirth is a process, not the work of a single moment of crisis when he falls to his knees in the Haymarket.

Raskol'nikov suffers in various ways directly stemming from his crimes: anxiety that he will be caught, anguish of conscience for Lizaveta's murder, fear of dishonour in the eyes of his family, and an inability to reconcile the reality of his actions with his justifying theories about creating a better world through them. Finally, at the end of Part 6, he confesses, which alleviates much of his suffering and – through punishment, both physically in the prison and metaphysically in his own consciousness – creates the circumstances for redemption.<sup>42</sup> In the epilogue Raskol'nikov's moment of repentance ushers in a better world through his transformed perspective, or, in Robert Louis Jackson's phrasing, the epilogue describes "the transformation of ends into beginnings."<sup>43</sup> Yet, when Raskol'nikov's redemption does come, it is, according to the *fabula*, sudden and unexpected, and yet, in terms of the *siuzhet*, entirely expected, conventional, and even pre-determined. The uncanny dissonance between *siuzhet* and *fabula* in the novel subverts generic expectation for the redemption plot.

*Zapiski iz podpol'ia (Notes from Underground)* (1864) provides a useful example of the way Dostoevskii subverts generic expectation in his fiction and, in particular, models a subverted redemption plot. *Notes from Underground* is a metafictional, first-person account of its main character's philosophical views and the experiences that led to their formation. The metafictional aspect of the novel's narration mocks readers' generic expectations but also betrays significant generic anxiety on the part of the protagonist-narrator. In Part 2, Underground Man, the protagonist, psychologically torments the prostitute Liza, leading her to believe he will offer her safety and rehabilitate her, following a classic narrative of the redemption of the fallen woman. In the end, however, he mocks her for not realizing the cliché of this trite story. Thwarting Liza's

expectation of the outcome of the fallen woman redemption narrative enables Underground Man to gain the upper hand, to humiliate Liza and, in so doing, exact revenge for his own earlier humiliation. Generic expectation projects a pre-determined narrative path for Liza and Underground Man. His subversion of this narrative model not only satisfies his need for revenge, but also creates an opening for a kind of freedom. As Gary Saul Morson writes, “He destroys the edifice in order to avoid completing it.”<sup>44</sup> Bakhtin, analyzing Underground Man, observes that “his consciousness of self lives by its unfinalizability, by its unclosedness and indeterminacy.”<sup>45</sup> Tricking Liza using generic expectation and then pulling the narrative rug out from under her is another way of asserting his own free will, of refusing a pre-determined ending.

Like Underground Man, Raskol’nikov defines himself and justifies his actions through theories and ideas, and like Underground Man, Raskol’nikov sees his path as determined unless he is able to “step over.” Where Underground Man’s stepping over consists of asserting his own will on others, of subverting narrative models, Raskol’nikov sees Alena Ivanovna’s murder as the moment to realize his own greatness, to subvert the codes of expected behaviour. However, having committed the murder, Raskol’nikov finds himself in generic stasis, as I have argued earlier; he neither achieves the greatness he desires nor the external punishment society requires. Raskol’nikov, however, is not the only character who gets “stuck” in this way.

Characters Raskol’nikov encounters become emblematic of different outcomes.<sup>46</sup> Sonia represents the redemption narrative, the mirror image of the narrative that Underground Man subverts, in which Raskol’nikov confesses, suffers, and, through suffering, is redeemed. Kasatkina argues that Sonia’s character represents an icon for Raskol’nikov, a guiding force that leads him to redemption.<sup>47</sup> Svidrigailov, on the other hand, models the path of a successful transgressor, one who has unrepentantly stepped over and now has unlimited power. Just as

Raskol'nikov is stuck in generic stasis in the epilogue, both Sonia and Svidrigailov are trapped in their own generic stases through Parts 1-6 of the novel.

Sonia has confessed, suffers, repents, and her voice is privileged as the redemption narrative in the novel becomes the central generic plot following the reading of the story of Lazarus.<sup>48</sup> Svidrigailov transgresses without repentance, but happiness eludes him. Each is in a holding pattern of sorts, endlessly waiting for their own generically pre-determined outcome while urging Raskol'nikov to choose his fate. Raskol'nikov repeats the same pattern in an internal monologue for most of the epilogue's two chapters; this stasis is no more apparent than when, less than 10 pages before the end of the novel, the reader discovers that "the only crime he acknowledged" was "that he hadn't coped and had turned himself in."<sup>49</sup>

The generic uncertainty in which Raskol'nikov spends much of the novel allows for possibility. As in *Notes from Underground*, straying from a predictable generic plot path, away from a literary model, enables a more open narrative structure and creates the space where the work of psychological transformation – from murderer to penitent – can take place. While the trajectory from the moment of murder to the final scene is an expected one, generic stasis subverts reader expectation and allows for the possibility of other outcomes.<sup>50</sup> Although these outcomes do not occur, they *could* occur, and Raskol'nikov's generic stasis, in this sense, is a necessary component of the novel; counter-intuitively, *not* following a redemption plot enables the novel's redemption plot.

Belknap argues that "the reader, like Raskol'nikov, will alternate between a strong drive towards his escape and a drive toward his confession."<sup>51</sup> The fact that the reader spends so much time listening to Raskol'nikov's inner monologues leads to their implication in the crime, as well as their attachment to the hero. Belknap views this attachment as the product of narrative

manipulation: “Dostoevsky’s siuzhet manipulates his readers into the fabula of the novel[;] [...] the siuzhet programs the reader’s experience to track the hero’s experience in the fabula.”<sup>52</sup> The reader of the novel, however, is not just reading any novel; the reader of *Crime and Punishment* clearly identifies the detective plot and the redemption narrative, among other generic plot models, and the reader is also a reader of these genres. In this sense, the reader is both criminal and investigator, both unrepentant and redeemed.

### **The end**

Generic expectation creates a sense of what ought to happen in a narrative, and when that expectation is thwarted, narrative dissonance can occur. In *Crime and Punishment* redemption and detection both operate outside of the way they are expected to operate, and in the ending coalesce to create a new generic hybrid, one that betrays the social contract inherent in generic expectation. Reading the novel from the perspective of plot and time, Ilya Klinger finds *Crime and Punishment* “ultimately indecisive about the preferable emplotment for the protagonist.”<sup>53</sup> Klinger argues that four plots exist, but two are cancelled out before the epilogue; the remaining two – hagiography, represented by Sonia, and *Bildungsroman*, represented by Porfirii Petrovich and Razumikhin – not only persist, but, by the end combine to project a compatible and yet incompatible generic plot, “a saint’s life in *Bildung* time.”<sup>54</sup> While this article does not consider the genres woven into the fabric of the novel so neatly as this, Klinger’s analysis and mine both identify the curious inconsistency of the epilogue, which is not related to whether the epilogue “fits,” so much as it underscores the novel’s inherent generic uncanniness. In this the effect on the reader is not surprising; indeed, Holquist, writing about modernist detective fiction, observes that in “[jumbling] the well-known patterns of classical detective stories” such literary works

constitute an “attack on the reader” in that they give disorienting “strangeness” instead of the expected and familiar generic plot.<sup>55</sup> The curious paradox of the novel’s epilogue is that it simultaneously and uncannily fulfills and disrupts generic expectation.

Is this generic messiness or generic hybridity?<sup>56</sup> In *Crime and Punishment* genre creates a productive space where opposing narrative potentials can function simultaneously and harmoniously, leading to narrative openness and possibility. Other critics have observed this open aspect of the novel’s ending. Knapp, in her study of inertia and metaphysics in Dostoevskii, likens it to the “miraculous,” for example.<sup>57</sup> Tikhomirov argues that Sonia’s and Raskol’nikov’s paths “converge” in the moment Sonia reads the Gospel, and both – one through crime and the other through Christian sacrifice – equally experience their situation as “a state of death.”<sup>58</sup> However, only this state of death enables rebirth. Greta Matzner-Gore, approaching the epilogue from the perspective of probability, finds that the epilogue “balances the expected with the unexpected, the literarily conventional with the anomalous and improbable.”<sup>59</sup> While these responses and this critical attention could be read as the result of generic messiness, I think, rather, that the ending of the novel and Dostoevskii’s plans for the novel’s outcome both attest to the epilogue’s reliance on generic hybridity as a strategy that enables the redemption narrative to occur within Dostoevskii’s own philosophical terms.

The narrative uncanniness of the epilogue is not overt in these readings, yet it is central. And, perhaps, necessary. The narrative of Raskol’nikov’s shift from unrepentant to redeemed obviously parallels Dostoevskii’s own conversion narrative, which “like his fictional conversion narratives is fraught with mystery and paradox,” in Robin Feuer Miller’s phrasing.<sup>60</sup> Miller argues that Dostoevskii’s conversion took place not in Siberia but at the moment of his mock execution in December 1849.<sup>61</sup> Thus the epilogue’s depiction of Raskol’nikov’s redemption is



necessarily liminal in that it simultaneously describes a redemption that has happened and that has not happened. Raskol'nikov is redeemed narratively to the reader in the testimonials to his good character in the beginning of the epilogue, before the redemption narrative happens.

Yet Raskol'nikov's genuine rebirth is possible within the bounds of Dostoevskii's novel because it is not predetermined by generic expectation; rather, it manifests as an expression of free will. The novel's final lines speak to this paradoxicality:

He didn't even know that his new life was not being given to him for free, that it would still cost him dear, that it would have to be paid for with a great, future deed...  
But here a new story begins: the story of a man's gradual renewal and gradual rebirth, of his gradual crossing from one world to another, of his acquaintance with a new, as yet unknown reality. That could be a subject for another tale – our present one has ended.<sup>62</sup>

Here the narrator simultaneously sets out a predetermined narrative path for Raskol'nikov and allows for its disruption. The first line of the excerpt details the *siuzhet* of a new novel and lays out what will befall its hero. The reader understands Raskol'nikov's narrative fate, but the ellipsis creates a sense of narrative openness. The second line, then, in emphasizing that the *siuzhet* and *fabula* are united in one “new, as yet unknown reality” (*novaia, dosele sovershenno nevedomaia deistvitel'nost'*), reiterates the potential for the unexpected in this expected narrative arc. The final line of the excerpt (and the novel), using the conditional statement “could be” (*moglo by*) again opens up this new narrative, freeing it from the constraints of generic predetermination.

Following a generic master plot from start to its expected ending asserts determinism in a way the novel itself resists, just as it fights against Raskol'nikov's idea-fuelled fatalism. As a result, when the novel ends as expected, even with opportunities for disruption woven into its narrative fabric, the ending sits uneasily. One could argue that the reader's uneasiness in encountering the epilogue directly reflects Dostoevskii's own uneasiness with the confines of generic convention, even as he exploits the form for his own artistic aims. The epilogue of *Crime*

*and Punishment*, viewed through the lens of genre, becomes a generative space between reader expectation and the way the novel ends.

## Bibliography

Alewyn, Richard. "The Origin of the Detective Novel." In *The Poetics of Murder: Detective Fiction and Literary Theory*, edited by Glenn W. Most and William W. Stowe, 62-78. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Translated and edited by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Belknap, Robert L. *Plots*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.

Blake, Elizabeth. "Sonya, Silent No More: A Response to the Woman Question in Dostoevsky's 'Crime and Punishment.'" *The Slavic and East European Journal* 50, no. 2 (2006): 252-271.

Blank, Ksana. *Dostoevsky's Dialectics and the Problem of Sin*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2010.

Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Cobley, Paul. "Objectivity and Immanence in Genre Theory." In *Genre Matters: Essays in Theory and Criticism*, edited by Garin Dowd, Jeremy Strong, and Lesley Stevenson, 41-54. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2006.

Dostoevskii, F. M. *Prestuplenie i nakazanie. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. vol. 6. Edited by V. G. Bazanov et al. Moscow: Nauka, 1973.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. Translated by Oliver Ready. London: Penguin Books, 2014.

Frazier, Melissa. "The Science of Sensation: Dostoevsky, Wilkie Collins, and the Detective Novel." *Dostoevsky Studies New Series*, no. 19 (2015): 7-28.

Gibson, Walker. "Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers." In *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, edited by Jane P. Tompkins, 1-6. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

Grossman, Leonid. *Poetika Dostoevskogo. Istorii i teorii iskusstv*, issue 4. Moscow: Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, 1925.

- Gus, M. S. *Idei i obrazy F. M. Dostoevskogo*. Moscow: Gos. izdatel'stvo khudozh. literatury, 1971.
- Gustafson, Richard F. *Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger. A Study in Fiction and Theology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Holquist, Michael. *Dostoevsky and the Novel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Holquist, Michael. "Whodunit and Other Questions: Metaphysical Detective Stories in Postwar Fiction." In *The Poetics of Murder: Detective Fiction and Literary Theory*, edited by Glenn W. Most and William W. Stowe, 149-174. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.
- Jackson, Robert Louis. "Introduction: The Clumsy White Flower." In *Twentieth-Century Interpretations of Crime and Punishment: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Robert Louis Jackson, 1-8. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Kasatkina, T. A. *Kharakterologiya Dostoevskogo. Tipologiya emotsional'no-tsennostnykh orientatsii*. Moscow: Nasledie, 1996.
- Kasatkina, T. A. "Ob odnom svoistve epilogov piati velikikh romanov Dostoevskogo: 'Prestuplenie i nakazanie,' 'Besy,' 'Idiot,' 'Brat'ia Karamazovy,' 'Podrostok.'" In *Dostoevskii v kontse XX veka*, edited by Karen A. Stepanian. Moscow: Klassika plius, 1996.
- Kliger, Ilya. "Shapes of History and the Enigmatic Hero in Dostoevsky: The Case of 'Crime and Punishment.'" *Comparative Literature* 62, no. 3 (2010): 228-245.
- Klioutchkine, Konstantine. "The Rise of *Crime and Punishment* from the Air of the Media." *Slavic Review* 61, no. 1 (2002): 88-108.
- Knapp, Liza. *The Annihilation of Inertia: Dostoevsky and Metaphysics*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1996.
- Matual, David. "In Defense of the Epilogue of *Crime and Punishment*." *Studies in the Novel* 24, no. 1 (1992): 26-34.
- Matzner-Gore, Greta. "The Improbable Poetics of *Crime and Punishment*." In *Dostoevsky at 200: The Novel in Modernity*, edited by Katherine Bowers and Kate Holland. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, forthcoming 2021.
- McReynolds, Louise. *Murder Most Russian: True Crime and Punishment in Late Imperial Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.

- McReynolds, Louise. “Who Cares Who Killed Ivan Ivanovich?": The Literary Detective in Tsarist Russia.” *Russian History* 36 (2009): 391-406.
- Miller, Carolyn R. “Genre as Social Action.” In *Genre and the New Rhetoric*, edited by Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway, 20-36. London: Taylor & Francis, 2005.
- Miller, D. A. *The Novel and the Police*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Miller, Robin Feuer. *Dostoevsky's Unfinished Journey*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Morson, Gary Saul. *The Boundaries of Genre: Dostoevsky's Diary of a Writer and the Traditions of Literary Utopia*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1988.
- Morson, Gary Saul. “Genre and Hero/Fathers and Sons: Intergeneric Dialogues, Generic Refugees, and the Hidden Prosaic.” In *Literature, Culture, and Society in the Modern Age*, edited by E. J. Brown, L. Fleishman, G. Freidin, and R. Schupbach, 336-381. *Stanford Slavic Studies* 4. Stanford: Dept. of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Stanford University, 1991.
- Morson, Gary Saul. *Narrative and Freedom: The Shadows of Time*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Reitblat, A. I. “Detektivnaia literatura i russkii chitatel' (vtoraia polovina XIX – nachalo XX v.).” In *Knizhnoe delo v Rossii vo vtoroi polovine XIX-nachale XX veka*, issue 7, edited by V. E. Kel'ner et al., 126-140. St Petersburg: Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka, 1994.
- Schur, Anna. *Wages of Evil: Dostoevsky and Punishment*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2013.
- Strakhov, N. N. “Prestuplenie i nakazanie. Roman v shesti chastiakh s epilogom. F.M. Dostoevskogo. Izdanie ispravlennoe. Dva toma. Peterburg. 1867. Stat'ia vtoraia i posledniaia.” *Literaturnaia kritika*. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1984.
- Tikhomirov, B. N. “‘Lazar’! Griadi voi” Roman F. M. Dostoevskogo ‘Prestuplenie i nakazanie’ v sovremennom prochtenii. *Kniga-kommentarii*. St Petersburg: Serebrianni vek, 2005.
- Wasiolek, Edward. “On the Structure of *Crime and Punishment*.” *PMLA* 74, no. 1 (1959): 131-136.
- Whitehead, Claire. *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction, 1860-1917: Deciphering Stories of Detection*. Cambridge, UK: Legenda, 2018.

Zakharov, V. N. "Simvolika khristianskogo kalendara v proizvedeniiakh Dostoevskogo." *Novye aspekty v izuchenii Dostoevskogo*, edited by V. N. Zakharov: 37-49. Petrozavodsk: Izdatel'stvo Petrozavodskogo Universiteta, 1994.

---

Notes

<sup>1</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 658. The original text may be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 422.

<sup>2</sup> Robert L. Belknap defines plots as "ways of relating incidents to one another." Belknap, *Plots*, 3. Belknap, *Plots*, 16-17.

<sup>3</sup> Strakhov, "Stat'ia vtoraiia i posledniaia," 121.

<sup>4</sup> Wasiolek, "On the Structure of *Crime and Punishment*," 135-136. As an example of a Soviet critic, see Gus, *Idei i obrazy*, 325-326, 333.

<sup>5</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 92.

<sup>6</sup> Matual, "In Defense of the Epilogue of *Crime and Punishment*," 26-34.

<sup>7</sup> Knapp, *The Annihilation of Inertia*, 64-65; Kasatkina, "Ob odnom svoistve epilogov," 78.

<sup>8</sup> Tikhomirov, *Lazar'! Griadi voi*, 33-34.

<sup>9</sup> Belknap, *Plots*, 127.

<sup>10</sup> Miller, "Genre as Social Action," 20-36.

<sup>11</sup> Gibson, "Authors, Speakers, Readers, and Mock Readers," 1-6.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>13</sup> Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 5.

<sup>14</sup> Copley, "Objectivity and Immanence in Genre Theory," 41.

<sup>15</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 104-105.

<sup>16</sup> Belknap, *Plots*, 84.

<sup>17</sup> These two types of plot align with Michael Holquist's study of emplotment based on the discovery of knowledge, although Holquist describes the latter as a "wisdom tale"; see Holquist, *Dostoevsky and the Novel*, 87-88. More recently, these are two of four plots identified in Ilya Kliger's article about emplotment in *Crime and Punishment*; see Kliger, "Shapes of History," 229.

<sup>18</sup> Belknap, *Plots*, 39.

<sup>19</sup> McReynolds, *Murder Most Russian*, 117-120 and *passim*.

<sup>20</sup> Crime fiction's popularity in late imperial Russia has been documented by Avram Reitblat. See Reitblat, "Detektivnaia literatura i russkii chitatel'," 126. For a corresponding discussion of popular topics in news, see Klioutchkine, "The Rise of *Crime and Punishment*," 97-99.

<sup>21</sup> Claire Whitehead considers the appeal of crime fiction for nineteenth-century Russians in terms of the genre's narrative utility. See Whitehead, *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction*, 3.

<sup>22</sup> Alewyn, "The Origin of the Detective Novel," 64.

<sup>23</sup> Brooks, *Reading for the Plot*, 25.

<sup>24</sup> Alewyn, "The Origin of the Detective Novel," 63.

- 
- <sup>25</sup> Grossman, *Poetika Dostoevskogo*, 28-43.
- <sup>26</sup> Holquist, *Dostoevsky and the Novel*, 77.
- <sup>27</sup> Whitehead, *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction*, 112.
- <sup>28</sup> McReynolds, "Who Cares Who Killed Ivan Ivanovich?," 391-406.
- <sup>29</sup> Miller, *The Novel and the Police*, 3.
- <sup>30</sup> Frazier, "The Science of Sensation," 23.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.
- <sup>32</sup> Whitehead, *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction*, 92-93.
- <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 100.
- <sup>34</sup> On "generic refugees," see Gary Saul Morson. "Genre and Hero/Fathers and Sons," 336-381.
- <sup>35</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 647. The original text can be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 413.
- <sup>36</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 649; Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 416-417.
- <sup>37</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 53-68.
- <sup>38</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 650. The original text can be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 417.
- <sup>39</sup> Whitehead, *The Poetics of Early Russian Crime Fiction*, 11.
- <sup>40</sup> Tikhomirov, *Lazar! Griadi voi*, 31.
- <sup>41</sup> Blank, *Dostoevsky's Dialectics and the Problem of Sin*, 34.
- <sup>42</sup> On the relationship between punishment and redemption in *Crime and Punishment*, see Schur, *Wages of Evil*, 114-115.
- <sup>43</sup> Jackson, "Introduction: The Clumsy White Flowers," 6-7.
- <sup>44</sup> Morson, *The Boundaries of Genre*, 130.
- <sup>45</sup> Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 53.
- <sup>46</sup> Here I use the phrase "emblematic" in the sense of Richard Gustafson's "emblematic realism," but where he sees characters in Lev Tolstoi's works that are portrayed fusing their social environment with religious allegory as emblematic, in Dostoevskii's novels I would argue that characters are portrayed fusing their social environment with generic models. See Gustafson, *Leo Tolstoy: Resident and Stranger*, 203.
- <sup>47</sup> Kasatkina, *Kharakterologiiia Dostoevskogo*, 200.
- <sup>48</sup> Blake, "Sonya, Silent No More," 267-268.
- <sup>49</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 651. The original text can be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 417.
- <sup>50</sup> In this my analysis builds on Morson's theory of sideshadowing. See Morson, *Narrative and Freedom*, 117-172.
- <sup>51</sup> Belknap, *Plots*, 107.
- <sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 106-107.
- <sup>53</sup> Kliger, "Shapes of History," 229.
- <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 243-244.
- <sup>55</sup> Holquist, "Whodunit and Other Questions," 173.
- <sup>56</sup> I am indebted to Eric Naiman for suggesting this question.
- <sup>57</sup> Knapp, *Annihilation of Inertia*, 65.
- <sup>58</sup> Tikhomirov, *Lazar! Griadi voi*, 31-32.
- <sup>59</sup> Matzner-Gore, "The Improbable Poetics of *Crime and Punishment*," forthcoming.
- <sup>60</sup> Miller, *Dostoevsky's Unfinished Journey*, 4.

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 4-8.

<sup>62</sup> Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 658. The original text can be found in Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenie i nakazanie*, 422.