Eva Faraghi
Princeton University

Social Death or Social Resurrection? Dostoevsky's The Double *through the Looking Glass*

> I beg you to read it inversely – completely inversely, that is, with deliberately friendly intent, giving the inverse sense to all my letter's words (*ПСС* 1; 204).[1]

So says the bureaucrat Yakov Golyadkin, protagonist of Fyodor Dostoevsky's *The Double* (1846), to his less than welcome alter ego. According to Golyadkin, the vitriolic letter in question, in which he expressed the intention of killing this double in a duel, was in fact a mere expression of comradery, even affection. I propose that this perplexing paradox reflects not the hesitancy or volubility of Dostoevsky's protagonist, but a far more psychologically sophisticated portrait, in which two incompatible, even inverse intentions that exist side by side evoke the irreparably fragmented state of consciousness symptomatic of a loss of identity.[2] In other words, I aim for a reading of *The Double* which takes Golyadkin by his word, and interprets all of his actions and statements, particularly the most categorical and decisive, as expressing only one half of a continually doubled consciousness. I will show how Golyadkin's psychological unravelling, his countless public humiliations, and his ultimate demise may all be understood from the inverse perspective of a new, emerging identity, and thus as the very opposite of what is shown to the reader: personal transformation, redemption, and resurrection.

For both Dostoevsky's contemporaries, steeped in the fantastic tales of E.T.A. Hoffmann, and for modern readers, who may be inclined to associate the double with the Freudian *id* or the Jungian shadow, the very title of the novella tends to conjure up images of a "dark" repressed self, animated by malig-

1 Unless otherwise noted, all translations are taken from Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Double*, trans. Hugh Aplin (London: Penguin Books, 1988).

2 I am following in the footsteps of other scholars of Dostoevsky's paradoxes such as Gary Saul Morson, "What is it Like to be Bats? Paradoxes of *The Double*", in Vladimir Golstein and Svetlana Evdokimova (eds.), *Dostoevsky Beyond Dostoevsky: Science, Religion, Philosophy* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2016), pp. 235-248; Robin Feuer Miller, "The Gospel According to Dostoevsky: Paradox, Plot, and Parable", in Robin Feuer Miller, *Dostoevsky's Unfinished Journey* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), pp. 68-85.

nant egotism, violence, lechery, and all the fantasies forbidden by social and legal norms. One rather extreme, characteristically romantic example of a Jekyll-and-Hide double is Hoffmann's *Devil's Elixir*: the monk Merdarus uses the identity of an identical brother to commit a wide variety of crimes, including stabbing the object of his affections, poisoning his lover, and murdering his love interest's brother. Another example of this notion is Edgar Allen Poe's "William Wilson" (1839), in which the mold is inverted, but by no means disrupted: in this case, the narrator is an alcoholic, a cheat and a womanizer, while his double is consistently morally upright. Given that the dichotomy between a socially functional and a licentious self underlies the literary conception of the double figure in the 1830s and 1840s, but also recalls subsequent psychoanalytical theories, it is no surprise that readers should be tempted to assume Dostoevsky's take on the theme is centered around one good and one evil, one conscious and one unconscious, or one repressed and one dissolute self. I propose, however, a new interpretation of the story that transcends this "evil twin" theory. I argue that the dichotomy of the two Golyadkins is the conflict between a dying, failed identity and its emerging new counterpart.

It is certainly true that the protagonist largely tends to perceive the newly appeared man who shares his name and appearance as a shadow self, a moral inferior who "transgresses [...] every rule of civilized society" (*ПСС* 1; 175), and whose shameless behavior threatens to tarnish his own respectable reputation. Whether this is an accurate assessment is, however, another matter. Golyadkin's double, hereafter referred to as Golyadkin Jr., is hardly a paradigm of moral righteousness, but the misbehavior the original Golyadkin lambasts as outrageous is almost comically trivial: he eats ten pies at a restaurant, flirts with a waitress, and repeatedly mocks Golyadkin Sr. for embarrassing private confessions he made while intoxicated. More importantly still, this brazen and unapologetic Golyadkin Jr. is far from the socially dysfunctional equivalent of his already awkward and generally unpopular namesake, and, on the contrary, all other characters appear to prefer Golyadkin's double to Golyadkin himself. It is the cautious, serious, insecure original who finds himself socially marginalized, while Golyadkin Jr. is "of lively and agreeable disposition, and is equally successful in the service and in the society of persons of common sense" (*ПСС* 1; 182). If Golyadkin Jr. is the fully uninhibited, socially dysfunctional version of the respectable Golyadkin Sr. – identifiable, perhaps, with the Freudian id or the Jungian shadow – why does he commit only relatively minor offences, and why is it so unequivocally Golyadkin Jr. that wider society is more inclined to accept?

Scholarship on *The Double* can be divided into two camps in its treatment of this issue: critics who attempt a "psychological reading" which takes Golyad-

kin as a Hoffman-inspired double, and critics who turn away from the heritage of romanticism all together. Following the novel's initial publication, the former school was undoubtedly the more dominant one. Nikolay Dobrolyubov, for example, gave a voice to the more general sentiment of Belinsky's circle as he wrote that Golyadkin projects everything "mean and worldly adroit" onto a double because his own timidity prevents him from integrating them into his own identity.[3] This understanding of Golyadkin Jr. as Golyadkin Sr.'s morally objectionable shadow underlies many seminal 20th-century interpretations of the double scholars such as Charles Passage, Otto Rank and Jospeh Frank.[4]

While the parallels between Golyadkin Jr. and the Hoffmannian evil double or the Jungian shadow are worthy of note, they do not answer the question of why this character's moral flaws tend rather towards pettiness than towards any metaphysical idea of evil, why his "good" counterpart displays little behaviour worthy of admiration, or, indeed, why society at large tends to prefer the double to the original. Given this apparent incongruity between *The Double* and a German romantic vision of the world, it is no surprise that many critics have moved away from Hoffmann-inspired interpretations of the story. Some, such as Victor Terras, even read *The Double* as a parody of romanticism and Golyadkin's internal battle as "a struggle not between Heaven and Hell for a man's soul, but between two ridiculous underlings – for a snug little job" and "a travesty" of the "Hoffmanesque Doppelgängers".[5] Bakhtin's interpretation, on the other hand, very convincingly argues that the main question of *The Double* is not the unconscious at all, but self-consciousness, which he defines as a dialogue between an external self – "I for the other" – who turns

3 Николай А. Добролюбов, *Собрание Сочинений в 9 тт.*, т. 7 (Москва: Художественная литература, 1963), с. 258.

4 Charles Passage, for instance, argues that "the new Mr. Golyadkin is the latent aggressive phase of Mr. Golyadkin's character". Otto Rank calls Golyadkin Jr. "the antithesis to [Golyadkin Sr.'s] prototype in terms of character. Although the two are considered to be twins, the double is venturesome, sycophantic and ambitious. Knowing how to attain popularity with everyone, he soon eliminates his clumsy, timid and pathologically candid rival" (Otto Rank, *The Double: A Psychoanalytic Study*, ed. and transl. Harry Tucker [Chapeocel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1971], p. 30). Perhaps inspired by Rank, Roger B. Anderson also concludes that Golyadkin's double is rebellious, while the original is meek. Roger B. Anderson, "Dostoevsky's Hero in *The Double*: A Re-Examination of the Divided Self", *Symposium*, vol. 26, № 2, 1972, p. 102. Similarly, Joseph Frank writes "the double's behaviour both mirrors the supressed wishes of Mr. Golyadkin's subconscious and objectivies the guilt feelings which accompany them" – Joseph Frank, *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), p. 304.

5 Victor Terras, *The Young Dostoevsky (1846-1849): A Critical Study* (The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1969), p. 14.

against his meek and insecure internal "I for myself" double.[6] Other interpretations of *The Double* discover new, innovative ways to focus not on the psychological conflict between Golyadkin and his double, but on the historical context,[7] the significance of secondary characters,[8] the role of paradox and the semiotics of doubling.[9]

In this article, I will consider the basic question that troubled *The Double's* first readers, namely, who is Golyadkin Sr., who is Golyadkin Jr, and what is their relationship to one another? Given that *The Double* was written only very shortly after the Zenith of Dostoevsky's love for Hoffmann,[10] I aim to return to an approach which takes the German romantic model into account, while also offering an interpretation that transcends the notion of a morally opposite "ugly shadow". If we go beyond Hoffmann's fiction and turn our attention to *Naturphilosophie,* the broad intellectual and artistic movement underpinning Hoffmann's works, we may find a compelling alternative to the overtly Manichean model of doubling. I argue that the novella may instead be understood in accordance with the psychological and mystical theories of *Naturphilosophie*, as the story of an identity death – the war of an untenable identity of idealized social ascension with a "deeper" self, culminating in a social death that kills the old and untenable identity, and from which a new and better socially integrated equivalent may emerge. This reading owes a significant debt to Yuri Corrigan's book *Riddle of the Self*, which examines how Dos-

6 See Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010), pp. 212-221.

7 Jillian Porter, for example, makes a convincing argument that the anxiety about what is 'real' and what is 'counterfeit' in *The Double* can be traced back to the 1839-43 monetary reforms, "rather than fixing the Double with the stable allegorical status of counterfeit and Golyadkin with the status of original, Dostoevsky sets these categories in unstoppable motion". Jillian Porter, "The Double, the Ruble and the Real: Counterfeit Money in Dostoevsky's *Dvoinik"*, *The Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 38, № 3, 2014 (Fall), p. 389.

8 Vitaly Antonov proposes that there are two versions of Dr. Rutenspitz: the kindly doctor and his demonic double: Виталий А. Антонов, "Другой двойник в повести Ф. М. Достоевского *Двойник*", *Достоевский и мировая культура. Филологический журнал*, vol. 3, № 7, 2019, с. 142-150.

9 Kroó and Faustov explore the semantic implications of Dostoevsky's doubling, focusing particularly on repetition, copying and the individual faced with a de-individualizing bureaucratic world. Каталин Кроо, Андрей А. Фаустов, Сергей В. Савинков, *Перевоплощения смысла в творчестве Достоевского: Семиотические Заметки* (Воронеж: Изд. дом БГУ, 2022).

10 In the summer of 1838, Dostoevsky wrote that he had read the entirety of Hoffmann's work. Throughout his life, Dostoevsky frequently mentioned his youthful admiration for the German author. See Frank, pp. 102-105.

toevsky's "passionate reverence for the irreducible and inviolable nature of the personality" can coexist with his continual striving toward the "annihilation of the I".[11] Since Corrigan's discussion of *The Double* is limited to a brief analysis of how a little dog symbolizes a hidden, long-forgotten memory, this article seeks to expand and explore the question of personality in relation to *The Double* and to show how the "annihilation of the I" can lead directly to the development of a personality.

Golyadkin and the Ganglious

Although largely forgotten by modern psychologists, *Naturphilosophie* offers a theoretical approach to the human being which arises out of the same social, artistic and literary movements that also shaped the young Dostoevsky. Although the boundaries of its chronology are fluid, most critics agree that the movement began with the writings of Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling in 1798 and reached its apex between 1800 and 1830. Among its most celebrated theorists were Schelling, Ritter, geologist Franz von Baader, and lawyer-turned-philosopher Johann Jakob Wagner, to name only a few. While a new rise in empirical thought beginning in the 1840s marked the decline of the medical and physiological streams of *Naturphilosophie,* their psychological counterpart persisted into the 1870s, with Gustav Carus' *Psyche* (1846) and Eduard von Hartmann's *Philosophie des Unbewussten* (1869) among its most influential later contributions.

One of the most distinctive features of *Naturphilosophie* is its aim of merging medical science, natural sciences, poetry, literary studies, philosophy and theology into one coherent branch of knowledge. For the nature-philosophers, the workings of the human mind, the human body, the natural world and God are not distinct phenomena, but all parallel manifestations of the single, omnipresent, transcendental order of the universe. For nature-philosophers, every unique entity – whether animal, person, or even idea – is a microcosm of the whole, albeit in various degrees of perfection.[12] Thus, every being is simultaneously driven by a pursuit of its own interests and its preservation while also animated driven by a hidden, "collective spirit", towards the cosmic aims of nature

11 Yuri Corrigan, *Dostoevsky and the Riddle of the Self* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2017), p. 4.

12 See Karl E. Rotschuh, "Ursprünge und Wandlungen der Physiologischen Denkweise im 19. Jahrhundert", *Technik und Geschichte*, vol. 33, 1966, pp. 329-355; Manfred Engel, *Naturphilosophisches Wissen und romantische Literatur – am Beispiel von Traumtheorie und Traumdichtung der Romantik* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2002), S. 65-69.

itself. This is not merely an abstraction, but very much understood as the physiological basis of the human body, whose existence "is controlled by an individual center (which we like to consider the brain) and by a center located in the universe (whose point of attachment is found in our ganglious system)".[13] Precisely this tension is at the core of *Naturphilosophie,* and particularly of its psychological branch; such theorists as Gotthilf von Schubert refer to these two centers and their satellites as the nervous and the ganglious system.

Broadly speaking, the nervous system is responsible for all acts of consciousness and voluntary action; goals, aspirations, choices and our sense of self all fall under its jurisdiction. The ganglious system, on the other hand, "participates in all of the movements of the universe".[14] On the one hand, the ganglious encompasses the unconscious mechanisms of the body – heartbeat, digestion, and reproductive urges, for instance – and, on the other, the individual being's connection with the "total life", a divine unity that necessarily transcends individual consciousness.[15] According to Schubert, those who attempt to suppress and eliminate the urges of their body – even as an act of religious asceticism – in fact risk losing their connection to the life forces of the universe as a whole, to other human beings, and, consequently, to God.[16]

While similar to notions such as the *ego* and the *id*, the Apollonian and the Dionysian, the conscious and the unconscious, the psychological binary that underlies *Naturphilosophie* is best summed up as the internal struggle between an individual and a collective orientation: the nervous system drives one towards material well-being, stability, status, and self-preservation, while the ganglious aims at union with the cosmic cycles of creation and destruction, through dreams, hallucinations, intoxication, sexual indulgence, but also religious experience – a union which surpasses and may even destroy individual identity.

The extent of these theories' influence throughout Europe in the first half of the 19th century must not be underestimated. Engel goes as far as comparing it to the prominence of psychoanalysis in our own time: even those who have never read a sentence by Freud are likely to know about the *ego*, the *id*, and the

13 Albert Béguin, *L'âme romantique et le rêve: Essai sur le romantisme allemand et la poésie française* (Paris: J. Corti, 1939), p. 78.

14 Carl Gustav Carus, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Seele*, 2-nd ed. (Stuttgart: G.H. Scheitlins Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1851) quoted in Béguin, p. 140.

15 Engel, S. 72.

16 Gotthilf Heinrich von Schubert, *Die Symbolik des Traumes* (Bamberg: C.F. Kunz, 1814), S. 92.

superego, or the Oedipal complex.[17] The theories of *Naturphilosophie* are known to have exerted various degrees of influence over numerous well-known and obscure literary figures of the era, including Novalis, Jean Paul, Ludwig Tieck and Hoffmann. At the very least, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that someone of Dostoevsky's level of education would likely have been familiar with the main intellectual currents of his time, including this one. More importantly, however, he was known to have been an avid reader of Schelling and Hoffmann, and even to have cultivated a friendship in his youth with poet Ivan Shidlovsky, who aimed at a pantheistic form of mystical self-annihilation. Dostoevsky also read Gustav Carus's *Psyche* in the 1840s and expressed the wish to translate this work into Russian while in Siberia,[18] and his early works such as *The Landlady* are strong evidence of an intimate familiarity with these general ideas, especially of their literary proponents such as Hoffmann. Furthermore, Dostoevsky's conception of the world as "an ocean" in which "a touch in one place sets up movement at the other end of the earth" and which can only be reached through an "all-embracing love, in a sort of transport" (*ПСС* 9; 290) bears a great similarity to the *Naturphilosophie* vision of the ganglious system. On this basis, we may assume that Dostoevsky was not only familiar with this pre-Freudian nervous-ganglious model of the mind, but that it was very likely a significant influence on what might be termed the mystical psychology he would go on to develop.

An Identity War

I propose a reading of Dostoevsky's complex psychological character studies through the lens of *Naturphilosophie* as an underlying conceptual framework. In the case of *The Double,* we are faced with a character who is, quite literally, at war with himself. From a psychoanalytic perspective, this war takes place between Golyadkin's conscious, moral self and his aggressive, lecherous and animalistic unconscious. From the perspective of *Naturphilosphie,* however, a perspective which does not exclude or contradict the more familiar psychoanalytical model, this is a war between an identity in which the nervous system reigns supreme – a fantasy self, deliberately constructed and under full conscious control – and an alternate identity which acknowledges at least certain aspects of an embodied ganglious system it cannot suppress. These are not nec-

17 Engel, S. 77.
18 See Frank, p. 76.

essarily the emotional and aggressive vestiges of a repressed self, but a self-deprecatory admittance to gluttony and lust – in other words, recognition of the body and acceptance that no idealized self will transcend it. When the first identity publicly fails, the second triumphs.

To a certain extent, a sense of identity is always constructed as a bulwark against the anonymizing collective, the tyranny of individual emotions and desires, and the continual natural fluxes of creation and destruction to which we are necessarily vulnerable – a bulwark against all that with which the ganglious system seeks reconciliation, in other words. In this sense, an individual identity is always opposed to this ganglious system. In the case of Golyadkin, I would argue, however, that Dostoevsky depicts the psychological causes of an identity which tends to deny the existence of the ganglious system altogether, of fantasy's failure to negotiate adequately with reality. The identity this yields is so categorically divorced from the physiological reality of the body that Golyadkin Sr. comes to believe his very existence is not contingent on eating, sleeping, and breathing, but on his social status and reputability. In the crisis of identity in which we find him, the endangerment of his reputation feels like a nightmarish endangerment of life itself, and public humiliation becomes equivalent to execution.

From the opening pages of *The Double,* we learn that the original Golyadkin is very concerned with upholding the identity he has constructed for himself. He washes, shaves, puts on a new set of clothes, forces his servant to dress in a gaudy livery, and orders a carriage. In a passage later removed from the 1866 version of *The Double,* Dostoevsky elaborates on Golyadkin's tendency to fabricate a fantasy self, incongruous with his real position in society:

> The fact is that he was very fond of sometimes making romantic assumptions about himself. He loved to promote himself now and then into the hero of the most ingenious novel, to imagine himself entangled in various intrigues and difficulties, and, at last, to emerge with honor from all the unpleasantness, triumphing over all obstacles, vanquishing difficulties and magnanimously forgiving his enemies (*ПСС* 1; 335).

While any identity is, to some extent, constructed, a conception of the self by the self which strays too far from a conception of the self by others will necessarily be maintainable only through great effort, fragile, and easily subject to existential threats. Indeed, Golyadkin's identity appears to be imperiled by the slightest blemishes upon his body, as he looks into the mirror in fear that "some extraneous [посторонний] spot had made its appearance" (*ПСС* 1; 110). The word 'extraneous' implies that this pimple would not be a part of him – a com-

mon, natural and largely inevitable consequence of having skin – but an encroachment from the outside upon an infallible, idealized body.

Given that it is estranged from reality, incapable of negotiating itself with the outer world, Golyadkin Sr.'s inner, subjective sense of himself cannot be measured, validated, rejected or revised. On account of his rigidly inward identity's incapability of adapting and evolving through contact with external reality, it can only be absolutely fabricated or absolutely real, and it is no surprise that he appears to favour the latter assumption. Golyadkin Sr. consistently seems to conceive of his identity as objective, absolute, and infallible, in perfect correspondence with concrete reality, including even material, corporeal reality, which should be expected to reflect his inflexibly idealized self. In fact, his thorough examination of his own face for "external" blemishes recalls a desperate attempt to seek confirmation of the axioms upon which he bases his identity in objective and indisputable reality, and thus to reinforce his delusions, a poor substitute for active identity's active negotiation through social engagement with the wider world.

In a general sense, one may argue that the character's artificial and extremely fragile identity tends to rely on material confirmation as a substitute for the social confirmation which it cannot have. The discernment of an unblemished and idealized body serves as verification, albeit weak, that the unblemished and idealized sense of self is real. Since the idealized and isolated identity can only be totally real or totally false, any rejection of his idealized-self image by the outer world, as through derision or social exclusion, feels rather like a categorical rejection of the person in his entirety, and thus, not of his *failed* identity, but of *any possible* identity he may adopt. In parallel, since the body is understood as the objective vessel of his idealized self, suggestions that Golyadkin Sr. is delusional are experienced as a destruction of the organism itself, or, in other words, homicide. In fact, when telling his doctor about how people in his social circle are planning to ruin somebody's reputation, he asks very literally "What did they think up to murder a man? [убить человека]" (*ПСС* 1; 121), and only after the doctor's understandable confusion does he specify that he means "to murder a man morally [нравственно]" (*ibid.*). It is rather clear that this 'man' is Golyadkin himself, and the murderous rumors concern his less than respectable relationship to his former landlady, Karolina Ivanovna, whom he allegedly agreed to marry in return for free meals. This codependent relationship, in which Golyadkin's sustenance depends on a physical and psychological intimacy with another person not only falls short of the social code of conduct which this idealized self is presumably expected to uphold, but also publicly exposes his sexual and literal appetites, with which it appears absolutely incapable of

coexisting. When Dr. Rutenspitz pointedly asks him about this former living arrangement, he gives a bizarre response.

> "Where am I living now, Krestian Ivanovich?"
> "Yes... I want... previously, I think, you were living..."
> "Yes, Krestian Ivanovich, I was, I was previously too. How could I not have been living!" (*ПСС* 1; 121).

Even at the expense of common sense, Golyadkin treats the doctor's suspicion that he once lived less than respectably as a suggestion that he previously was not alive at all.

Yet, as mentioned at the beginning, Golyadkin's words and behavior constantly undermine his constructed identity as a respectable, honest and upstanding citizen. This is perhaps why others treat him with suspicion, derision and even outward hostility. Interestingly, although Golyadkin treats his identity as absolute, unthreatened by others' response to it, he is nonetheless driven to seek its affirmation by the outer word, and thus to social interaction, even as he proves incapable of modifying his identity in the slightest through it. It is largely this simultaneous wish to test his sense of self in the outer world and the refusal to recognize the outer world's rejection of it which leads to an inconsistent, vacillating state of consciousness, symptomatic of a failing identity. Shortly after he justifies himself privately for why he must stay home from work, for instance, we hear that he inexplicably got up and "flew to the office" (*ПСС* 1; 145). Later, he tells himself that any intimacy between him and his younger colleagues must be avoided, only to slap them on the shoulder and to attempt, very unsuccessfully, to make jokes with them. Even more outrageously, as he waits in a stairwell, wondering whether or not to intrude on a ball, Golyadkin eventually concludes that he must instead go home, and then, without warning, dashes "forward, as if someone had touched a spring in him" (*ПСС* 1; 132) and enters the gathering. As he hesitates during this passage, the protagonist is increasingly aware of his contradictory doubled consciousness:

> He, gentlemen, is also here, not at the ball, that is, yet all but at the ball; he, gentlemen, is all right; although he's his own man, still at this moment he stands on a road that is not entirely straight [...]. He, gentlemen, is only observing now; he, gentlemen, might go in as well, of course... so why not go in? (*ПСС* 1; 131).

The narrator can barely utter a single clause without a 'yet,' 'but,' or a 'that is' to contradict and modify his previous statements. Golyadkin is both at the ball

and not at the ball, 'sam po sebe' and thirsting for community, a disinterested spectator and the soon-to-be center of attention. And yet Golyadkin attempts to tell himself that even this ridiculous situation is the result of his own conscious wishes: "but he had not ventured to penetrate farther, he clearly had not dared to do that... not because he had not dared to do something, but simply because he himself had not wanted to, he preferred to be nice and quiet" (*ПСС* 1; 132). Although the narrator here speaks with Golyadkin's own voice, he represents these thoughts as increasingly ridiculous and untenable given his present situation.[19] Just as Golyadkin rejects the reality of his bodily imperfections and bodily appetites, he cannot conceive of his thoughts and actions as subject to any internal forces beyond his conscious volition. In a rare moment of clarity, Golyadkin then finally briefly admits to his fear of exposure and decides to go home, at which point his clarity is immediately eclipsed by the reactive need to uphold his delusional sense of self, and he finds himself walking into the ball without knowing what he is doing. Once again, his identity proves to be a fantasy which, to use the terms of *Naturphilosophie*, rejects the ganglious system categorically.

A Social Death

After Golyadkin enters the ballroom uninvited, his life transforms into a nightmare. His constructed identity now faces an existential threat, exposure is imminent, and every attempt he makes to preserve his dignity only leads to his further humiliation. He wishes to congratulate Klara, but a slight stammer – a symptom of his anxiety – paralyzes him completely:

> He sensed that if he stumbled, all would go to the devil straight away. And that was how it turned out – he stumbled and got stuck; he got stuck and blushed; he blushed and got confused; he got confused and raised his eyes; he raised his eyes and looked around; he looked around and – and froze [обмер] (*ПСС* 1; 134).

From the narrator's repetition, we get the sense that each bodily symptom of confusion – stuttering, floundering, blushing – embarrasses him anew and

19 Bakhtin writes that "the narration glitters with Golyadkin's own words: "'he is all right', 'he's on his own', etc. But these words are uttered by the narrator with ridicule, and somewhat with reproach, directed at Golyadkin himself and constructed in a form meant to touch his sore spots and provoke him" (Bakhtin, p. 218).

leads to another, more severe symptom, until his humiliation appears to reach an apex. Interestingly, the word 'обмереть' (to faint or to freeze), shares a root with the verb 'умереть' (to die). In this manner, the exposure of the rejected ganglious system, of even relatively harmless bodily functions outside of conscious control – but now uncomfortably visible to everyone – kills his consciously constructed identity.[20] Here, the narrator puts the 'голый' (naked) in Golyadkin; our protagonist may as well be naked.

Again and again, the narrator reminds us that the gaze of others "kills" Golyadkin. For example, when his superior gives him a look that "if our hero had not already been utterly, completely destroyed, he would without fail have been destroyed a second time – if that had only been possible" (*ПСС* 1; 134). Likewise, an unknown bystander looks at Golyadkin with a "murderous smile" (*ПСС* 1; 135). And as others destroy Golyadkin with their disdain, Golyadkin himself loses the ability to see. In a typical example of Golyadkin's continuous state of contradiction, the narrator says that "he saw other people too. Or no: he saw nobody, looked at nobody" (*ПСС* 1; 133). This is directly opposed to the protagonist's awakening at the beginning of the story: "he yawned, stretched and in the end opened his eyes fully" (*ПСС* 1; 109). While the opening of the eyes seems to evoke the conscious – and in this case, socially spurned, untenable – self, sudden darkness at the ball may be equated with the transient collapse of conscious thought, rationality, and individual identity – a descent back into the primal darkness of the ganglious system.

With the culmination of this embarrassing scene, Golyadkin is forced to recognize the unbridgeable gap between his sense of himself and others' sense of him. In a final moment of humiliation, he takes Klara's hand as if to dance with her, but finds himself stopped by the crowd's outrage. Desperately hanging onto the delusion that dancing with Klara is his decision, he says that he "consents" to dance with her. But the narrator tells us that "nobody seemed to have asked for Golyadkin's consent" (*ПСС* 1; 137). Other people lead him to the door, put on his coat and throw him out: "Mr. Golyadkin wanted to say something, to do something... But no, he no longer wanted anything" (*ПСС* 1; 137). Through contempt, laughter and rejection, the crowd has destroyed Golyadkin's self-conceived identity as a respectable suitor; exposed the tripping, blushing and stammering limitations of his body; and has thrust Golyadkin in-

20 Deborah Martinsen explains the influence of shame on identity: "Shame concerns identity; thus, shame exposed has the power to shake us to the core of our being. [...] Shame has as its object who we are and involves a sense of inferiority or inadequacy and a fear of exposure." Deborah Martinsen, *Surprised by Shame: Dostoevsky's Liars and Narrative Explorers* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2003), p. 20.

to a terrifying reality in which the delusion of an absolute self collapses, and in which the individual's subjection to collective scrutiny condemns an untenable identity to death.

Yet Golyadkin is surprised to discover that the execution of his reputation does not lead to his literal death: "Mr. Golyadkin was dead – fully dead, in the full sense of the word, and if he had retained at this particular moment the ability to run, it was only by some miracle, by a miracle in which he himself, finally, refused to believe" (*ПСС* 1; 138). This new life – a life that continues because it depends upon a living, breathing body, not social status – appears to be a life without identity, even without the bulwark of individuality, given that the idealized, infallible material self has been lost, and the protagonist immediately finds himself surrounded by the chthonic disorder of darkness, liquids, and disease. The narrator describes the night as "wet, misty, rainy, snowy, pregnant with gum oils, head colds, cold sores, sore throats, fevers of all possible types and kinds" (*ПСС* 1; 138). And indeed, after his public humiliation, Golyadkin seems to merge with the collective for a moment and wish for the total dissolution of his percieved self: "Mr. Golyadkin now not only wished to escape from himself, but even to be completely annihilated, not to be, to turn to dust" (*ПСС* 1; 139). When he stops and begins "to stare at the black, turbid waters of the Fontanka" (*ibid.*), he appears, for the first time, to accept his social death without the delusion that literal death must necessarily come along with it: "the deed was done, finished, the decision signed and sealed; what was it to him?" (*ibid.*). As he recognizes that his identity is fabricated, untenable in the real world, the possibility for a new and better identity emerges if only, like a snake, he is able to fully shed this old skin. It is at this precise moment that Golyadkin's flesh and blood double, Golyadkin Jr., is born.

A Social Resurrection

This brings us to the question of Golyadkin Jr.. Critics often describe him in purely negative terms: a fawning sycophant,[21] "a mixture of Antichrist and Judas",[22] the embodiment of meanness and dishonesty. And indeed, if we take Golyadkin Sr.'s words at face value, we find a whole collection of unpleasant adjectives to describe his new counterpart: he is 'mean' (подлый), 'depraved' (развращенный), 'shameless' (безбожный), and 'self-sat-

21 Dina Khapaeva, *Nightmare: From Literary Experiments to Cultural Project*, transl. Rosie Tweddle (Leiden: Brill, 2012), p. 110.

22 Anderson, p. 109.

isfied' (самодовольный). Yet it may be useful to consider Golyadkin Sr.'s statement that the listener should understand his words as conveying the "inverse sense" to what they denote, since all of the novella's other characters seem far more ready to agree with this than with the overt meaning of the aforementioned words: the junior clerks laugh at his jokes, his superiors admire his work, and friends invite him to live with them. Indeed, Golyadkin Sr.'s former friend calls Golyadkin Jr. "true in word and in friendship". One could argue, of course, that society at large is so corrupt that it rejects the virtues of Golyadkin Sr., and prefers instead the villainous machinations of his double. Yet this interpretation sounds suspiciously like a fantasy concocted by a resentful Golyadkin Sr., a character whose judgement seems less than trustworthy.

None of this means that Golyadkin Jr. should be taken as his namesake's more admirable and virtuous counterpart. There is no doubt that he fawns over his superiors and plots against those he dislikes, but, importantly, he shares this behavior with Golyadkin Sr., who, in the words of Khapaeva, "merits no other title than a scoundrel".[23] In fact, Golyadkin Jr. is, in many respects, very similar to the original. The one striking difference between them is Golyadkin Jr.'s lack of crippling shame:

> The man who was now sitting opposite Mr. Golyadkin [...] was Mr. Golyadkin himself – [...] not the one who liked to efface and bury himself in the crowd; not the one, finally, whose gait clearly pronounced: "Don't touch me, and I won't touch you" or "Don't touch me, after all, I'm not knocking into you" – no, this was an entirely different Mr. Golyadkin, a completely different one, but at the same time, completely like the first one too (*ПСС* 1; 147).

Thus, we will interpret this new Golyadkin not as an impostor, but as a new and alternate identity for Golyadkin, born after the social death he suffered at the ball. This is, as outlined earlier, a more viable and more genuine identity because it takes better account of its fallibility and of the existence of a concealed and not always respectable self beyond its idealized equivalent. Former terror at being exposed for the failure to adhere to an idealized identity is eclipsed by an unapologetic advertisement of these failures, perhaps in order to preclude their use by others to undermine the individual. By means of these "pores" in idealized identity, the new Golyadkin shows himself quite unafraid of his appetites, even revealing them to others, as he eats ten pies, openly jokes about his sexual preferences – he remarks to Golyadkin Sr. "That's really a tasty bit of skirt!"

23 Khapaeva, p. 109.

(ПСС 1; 202) – and appearing unashamed of having spent a night in Golyadkin Sr.'s room. As noted, the idea of the ganglious system which Golyadkin Jr. seems to accept as part of his identity is not limited to bodily urges but involves a far broader recognition of the individual's role in the wider collective order. In this case, we are not face to face with a character suddenly dominated by the ganglious system, which would involve an entire collapse of subjective identity, and it is therefore no surprise that Golyadkin Jr. shows no sign of the unbridled bacchanalian revelry or the experience of the transcendental that Schubert associates with indulgence of the ganglious system. Instead, the character's recognition of this system in himself and his consequent self-deprecatory admission to his own identity's limitations as a bulwark against it liberates him from the need to defend the identity from appraisal and attack by the collective; precisely through this admission, and often in palpably bodily terms, Golyadkin Jr. gains the acceptance of the collective without which identity cannot be maintained: "he squeezed himself into the group of clerks, shaking hands with one, slapping the other on the shoulder, putting his arm around another; [...] probably to his most intimate friend, he gave a resounding kiss" (*ПСС* 1; 194-195).

By integrating his bodily self into his public persona, the new Golyadkin can make connections with others that transcend the concrete structures of professionalism or conventional affability.

Now that the old Golyadkin's old identity has been publicly destroyed, the new Golyadkin can be born, and this less respectable variant of him is paradoxically by far the more respected of the two. For three days, Golyadkin's identity is effectively dead and not yet reborn – the old and the new coexist side by side amidst great anxiety and upheaval. This period of three days displays obvious biblical undertones: Jonah had to spend three days in the belly of the whale before emerging as a new man, while Jesus lay three days in the tomb before his resurrection.[24] For Dostoevsky, just as in the foundational stories of Christianity, resurrection is not an instantaneous transformation, but a long and painful process in which the old must die so the new can live. In the case of Golyadkin, the old identity, still idealized and estranged from reality, experiences a crippling shame as the new identity affirms itself in its unapologetic failure to uphold idealized standards of behavior. When Golyadkin Jr. eats ten pies, Golyadkin Sr. turns "red as a beetroot" (*ПСС* 1; 174) and begins to make embarrassed exclamations: "Felt no shame in a public place! Can they see him? Nobody seems to have noticed" (*ПСС* 1; 174). Conversely, the new Golyadkin derides the old self for a fantasy identity which nobody considers credible and goes out

24 Mat 12:40.

of his way to destroy it once and for all. He publicly teases his old self by calling him "Faublas", the devious and adroit seducer of Jean-Baptiste Louvet de Couvray's novel *Les amours du chevalier de Faublas*, and makes brazen comments about the similarity of their sexual appetites. Most intolerably for Golyadkin Sr., the new identity publicly exposes his former self for his alleged illicit conduct. Neither his junior colleagues nor his superiors are deprived of discovery that Golyadkin had less than respectable relations with his landlady. Golyadkin Jr., in other words, is less interested in uncovering the hidden sins of his counterpart than in exposing them to social scrutiny, presenting them as blatant failures in the pursuit of an infallible social identity, and, it would seem, in pushing the old Golyadkin towards a more robust identity, which is, paradoxically, a more flawed one.

A Successful Psychotherapy

Golyadkin's transformation isn't the result of his own conscious volition, and given its painful and humiliating nature, it is highly plausible that such a person would never have chosen it at all. Instead, an outside force seems to pull the protagonist along the jagged transformational path from awkward and delusional recluse to his self-aware, well-integrated counterpart. *Naturphilosophie* generally associates the acquisition of a more self-aware double with animal magnetism, in which two subjects "stand in a sympathetic relationship to one another" and "the life-form of one is conditioned by the sphere of influence of the other".[25] In *The Double,* the role of magnetizer may be associated with the physician, Dr. Rutenspitz, a familiar and utterly mundane figure whose vocation is to heal his patients from their physical and psychological ailments.

In their meeting at the beginning of the story, the morning before the disastrous party scene that throws Golyadkin Sr. into crisis and precipitates the emergence of Golyadkin Jr., the protagonist seems to conceive of Dr. Rutenspitz not only as a doctor, but also as a confessor of sorts (духовник), whose main duty is to "know his patient" (знать пациента) (*ПСС* 1; 113). The narrator establishes an implicit link between Dr. Rutenspitz and magnetism when describing his "expressive, flashing gaze" as "evidently all that was needed to drive off every illness" (*ПСС* 1; 114). Indeed, eye-contact and physical touch, another key component of animal magnetism,[26] seem to play an essential role

25 Matthew Bell, *The German Tradition of Psychology in Literature and Thought, 1700-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 177.

26 The father of animal magnetism, Franz Anton Mesmer, was known for triggering various

in Dr. Rutenspitz's communication with Golyadkin. At the beginning of the conversation, the protagonist rather stubbornly presents his constructed and untenable identity, insisting that he is honest, open, respectable, etc., but the dynamic of the conversation suddenly shifts in a "rather strange scene":

> Somewhat perplexed, Krestian Ivanovich seemed for a moment to be rooted to his armchair and, at a loss, stared wide-eyed at Mr. Golyadkin, who looked at him in the same manner. Finally, Krestian Ivanovich stood up, holding on a little to the lapel of Mr. Golyadkin's uniform coat. For several seconds they both stood like this, motionless and not taking their eyes off one another. Then, and moreover in an extraordinarily strange way, Mr. Golyadkin's second impulse was resolved too. His lips began to shake, his chin began to jerk, and our hero quite unexpectedly burst into tears (*ПСС* 1; 118).

The combination of eye-contact with physical touch brings about a sudden emotional change in Golyadkin. His constructed identity appears to rupture for a moment so that genuine emotion can pass through it. As Golyadkin's demeanor shifts, he replaces his hackneyed, repetitive and stiff phrases about his own excellent character with metaphoric language and Russian idioms. He still cannot admit that he was the one to have been involved with his landlady, but he manages to tell the doctor of his troubles by transparently pretending that the rumors concern his "close friend". It is, in this sense, the doctor's very gaze and touch which allow this second, more genuine Golyadkin Sr. to come to the surface.

Dr. Rutenspitz's words to Golyadkin foreshadow the birth of Golyadkin Jr. as he says that Golyadkin's therapy should consist of his integration into a community: "Your treatment should consist in the alteration of your habits... Well, amusements – well, I mean you should call on friends and acquaintances, and at the same time not be afraid of having a drink; consistently keep cheerful company [...] go to shows and a club" (*ПСС* 1; 115). His insistence that Golyadkin needs friends, alcohol and amusement – discreetly hinting at a sexual form of amusement, as well – suggests that the cure for his mental affliction is as simple as accepting a need for community and satisfaction of appetite, or, to use Schubert's terms once again, for acceptance of his ganglious system. The topic of sexuality is particularly relevant in this context, as it simultaneously evokes the pursuit of union with others – if not profound, then at least in-

symptoms in patients such as convulsions by the touch of his finger. For more information, see Henri F. Ellenberger, *The Discovery of the Unconscious: The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*, vol. 1 (New York: Basic Books, 1970), p. 56.

tense – through the explicit stimulation of the material body, and thus perhaps exemplifies the dual nature of the ganglious system more clearly than any other means by which it might be accessed. When the patient seems impervious to his advice, Dr. Rutenspitz changes his approach, and insists "you need to make a radical transformation of your whole life and in a certain sense to master [переломить] your own character" (*ПСС* 1; 115). The narrator stresses the significance of this pronouncement: "Krestian Ivanovich put a strong emphasis on the word 'master' [переломить] and paused for a moment with a very meaningful air" (*ibid.*). The word 'переломить', which is defined by Ushakov's *Dictionary* (*Толковый словарь Ушакова)* as 'break in two' (сломать на двое) rather explicitly foreshadows the splintering of Golyadkin's character into two pieces.

In addition to his advice that Golyadkin seek company, alcohol and amusement, Dr. Rutenspitz evokes sexuality in his association with Golyadkin's landlady, Karolina Ivanovna. In Dostoevsky's 1846 version of *The Double,* this connection is explicit: Golyadkin's former roommate writes to him that "the doctor of medicine and surgery, Krestian Ivanovich, who is known to you, will not refuse with all of his influence to contribute to the wellbeing and defense of his insulted countrywoman" (*ПСС* 1; 114).[27] In the final version, the shared patronymic and heritage establishes a clear parallel between the figurative magnetizer – the only character who we see appearing to permeate the protagonist's idealized and highly artificial identity – and the landlady who almost certainly permeated it as well, providing him not only with shelter and food but also sexual amusement. Both German characters thus seem to evoke the bodily urges that Golyadkin Sr. may take as the most objectionable aspects of the ganglious system he denies.[28]

Dr. Rutenspitz then writes Golyadkin a prescription. From the very beginning, Golyadkin seems to fear this medication; he clutches the doctor's hand and says, "No sir, it's not required at all" (*ПСС* 1; 118). Although he is never depicted going to a pharmacy or taking the medication, one event suggests that the prescription was indeed significant. Towards the end of the story, Golyadkin, dirty and exhausted from his pursuit of his double, finds in his pocket the bottle of medicine "prescribed some four days before by Krestian Ivanovich" (*ПСС* 1; 208). As if in a trance, Golyadkin looks at the "dark, repulsive, reddish

27 Translation is my own – *E. F.*

28 Natal'ja V. Konstantinova convincingly establishes the link between the two characters: Наталья В. Константинова, "Немцы и немецкое в ранних произведениях Ф. М. Достоевского (На материале повести «*Двойник*»)", *Сибирский Филологический Журнал*, т. 4, с. 132 Our points of view diverge, however, when she argues that Dr. Rutenspitz punishes Golyadkin for his affair with his landlady.

liquid", drops it to the ground and screams "So, my life is in danger!" (*ibid.*) This extreme reaction to discovering the medication seems to suggest that Golyadkin fears that this liquid will bring about his death – and perhaps his fears are not unreasonable.[29] If Golyadkin has indeed been taking it for four days, perhaps it is responsible for this "break" in his character and, by helping a new Golyadkin Jr. emerge, threatens the very existence of his dysfunctional and unstable counterpart. Alternatively, the "repulsive, reddish liquid" could also symbolize blood, a symbol of Golyadkin's bodily self, which he sees not as a link to the divine – "the life of a living body is in its blood" (Lev. 17.11) – but as something dangerous and disgusting, entirely separate from himself.

Nonetheless, the full extent of Dr. Rutenspitz's significance to Golyadkin's transformation only becomes apparent at the story's conclusion. In an echo of Golyadkin's humiliation at Klara's birthday ball, the story ends with another large social gathering at the house of Olsufy Ivanovich, her father. Golyadkin Sr., still under the delusion that she is willing to elope with him, attempts to hide behind a wood stack, but he is exposed once more: "and suddenly he completely burned up in shame. He had been fully spotted, everybody had spotted him all at once" (*ПСС* 1; 224). Just as in his previous humiliating exposure, Golyadkin Sr. seems to become the passive puppet of an overwhelming crowd: "all this clustered around Mr. Golyadkin, all this sped towards Mr. Golyadkin, all this carried Mr. Golyadkin out aloft, and he remarked very clearly that he was being dragged off in a particular direction" (*ПСС* 1; 225). This time, however, he does not resist the will of the crowd, but resigns himself fully to its power. Significantly, the narrator describes the crowd as an abyss [бездна] (*ibid.*); the crowd transforms into a sublime, awe-inspiring and ultimately destructive force of nature, ready to swallow up Golyadkin's identity.

In *The Double*, the crowd alone does not have the power to pass the final judgement. Everyone solemnly sits down in rows arranged around Golyadkin and Olsufy Ivanovich, "obviously expecting something not entirely ordinary" (*ПСС* 1; 227). They are waiting for a particular person and shout "He is coming, he is coming" [едет, едет] and "It's time!" [пора] (*ibid.*). The formality of the scene increases even further when everyone rises their feet to greet the new arrival. The expectation, the shouts of "he is coming", and Golyadkin's sense of an imminent ending all recall the Last Judgement. The arrival is not Christ,

29 For an alternate explanation of this scene, see Антонов, pp. 148-149. The loss of Krestian Ivanovich's medicine causes Golyadkin to fear for his life because, without the medication, prescribed to him by Krestian Ivanovich, it is in danger". However, since Golyadkin is horrified as soon as he sees the "repulsive, reddish liquid" and leaps away from the spilt liquid, it seems quite clear that he suddenly perceives it as poison.

however, but Dr. Rutenspitz. Golyadkin now perceives the formerly rather prosaic doctor as an angel of death "whose look alone turned Mr. Golyadkin to ice" (*ПСС* 1; 227). Starting with Golyadkin Jr., everybody in the crowd repeats over and over again that this is indeed Krestian Ivanovich Rutenspitz. Convinced by the crowd, Golyadkin says that "in that case I'm prepared… I entrust myself fully… and deliver my fate into Krestian Ivanovich's hands" (*ПСС* 1; 228). But Dr. Rutenspitz hardly seems trustworthy any longer. We learn that, as soon as Golyadkin and the doctor drive away in a carriage and reach a desolate stretch of road, Golyadkin's "heart stood still: two fiery eyes were looking at him in the darkness, and these two eyes shone with a sinister, diabolical glee" (*ПСС* 1; 229). At the beginning of the story, it is said that Dr. Rutenspitz's eyes "could drive off every illness", and now they seem to be quite literally driving off Golyadkin Sr. These two sides of Dr. Rutenspitz – the benevolent helper and the sinister demon – are by no means incompatible. If Dr. Rutenspitz is the helper of Golyadkin as a whole and initially advises him to turn outwards and pursue amusement, it is hardly surprising that he now carts off the old and untenable identity as its new counterpart watches with excitement.

From this perspective, *The Double* is not the tragic story of a little man's undoing, but a hopeful and uplifting tale of redemption. Golyadkin Jr. is overjoyed that his former mocked and derided identity has been destroyed for good: "he was rubbing his hands in delight, he was turning his head around in delight; he seemed ready to begin dancing in delight right away" (*ПСС* 1; 228). The new Golyadkin has returned to his life in a communal apartment; he is cared for again by Karolina Ivanovna, supported by his friends, appreciated by his superiors and admired by his colleagues. This is not the transformation of a petty bureaucrat into a remarkable hero or of a self-serving recluse into a Christian saint, but it is rebirth of a socially dysfunctional man as a better-integrated variant of himself. It is perhaps not a coincidence that this story of mundane, relatively pedestrian resurrection still evokes the biblical themes of the three-day limbo and the figurative damnation of the failed identity with language and images recalling the Last Judgment. The psychological binary most likely to have influenced the author is not the later ego and id model, nor is it best described as the tension between the conscious and unconscious or the rational and the irrational; instead, the *Naturphilosophie* binary of the nervous and ganglious systems may more readily be understood as the struggle between the aims of the individual and the collective, that is, between the ambitions of personal identity and the needs of the organism, the pressures of the group, and the will of the cosmos. According to this model, an identity which finds itself at odds with the reality of the body and the scrutiny of wider society is nec-

essarily an identity at odds with God as well. And although Dostoevsky makes no suggestion that Golyadkin Jr. better accesses spirituality, the biblical themes underlying the story suggest that the character's transformation in favor of a more realistic acceptance of his own imperfections may mark a movement towards a more absolute truth as well. At the very least, it is a movement beyond the petty self-interest and excessively materialistic sense of self that seem to preclude any hope for spiritual fulfillment in Golyadkin Sr. Golyadkin's first name, Yakov, a reference to the Biblical twin Jacob who steals his brother's birthright, is particularly relevant here, as Jacob goes on to become one of the founding patriarchs of Israel. In the biblical story, as perhaps in *The Double,* an unjust usurpation sets us to the path towards spiritual fulfilment.

This interpretation of *The Double*, while generally at odds with scholarship of the novella, is by no means inconsistent with the author's wider works. Despite his reputation as an author of disturbing, dark and twisted narratives, Dostoevsky spent his career striving to depict stories of resurrection. In this case, Golyadkin is and remains a petty clerk, but, through a painful and terrifying transformation – the death of his old identity, which often feels like literal death – he is elevated from awkward and delusional recluse to a well-loved member of a community.

Even after significant revisions in 1859, Dostoevsky remained unsatisfied with *The Double*. Still, he insisted multiple times that the idea behind Golyadkin was "excellent [...], the greatest type in its social importance", and, as late as 1877, called it the most serious idea which he had ever come up with in literature.[30] Much speculation has followed Dostoevsky's words. Perhaps this important idea may be understood as the painful, humiliating and tragic experience through which resurrection may be made possible. However, in *The Double,* even the most profound emotions are only one half of a doubled consciousness. If we read *The Double* from an inverted perspective, conscious of its fundamental antonymity, we find a newfound sanity in a journey to the madhouse, hope in bleakness, and a social resurrection in a social death.

30 Владимир Н. Захаров, "Гениальный «Двойник»*:* Почему критики не понимают Достоевского?", *Неизвестный Достоевский*, т. 7, № 3, 2020, с. 33.