About Freedom and Suffering. A Theological View over Dostoevsky's Female Characters

Rodica POP

L'essai que nous proposons vise la création de Dostoïevski, qui se déroule dans l'espace de la liberté parfaite que Dieu a donné à l'homme. Chez Dostoïevski, l'idée dominante lié à l'homme est donc la liberté, qu'engendre le fil de l'histoire et met les personnages dans situations extrêmes. Il s'agite de la liberté comme attribut ontologique de l'homme, de la liberté en relation avec les mécanismes complexes du monde extérieur qui constituant l'ensemble des lois de la nature. Nous avons l'intention de suivre comment se reflète concrètement la conception de la liberté et les choses qu'elle peut générer dans l'œuvre de Dostoïevski, évidemment : la problème du mal et de la souffrance- penchant sur le destin de deux personnages féminines qui nous offrent une richesse des significations du point de vue psycho-social et religieux, en la pâte littéraire donc elles sont créés : Nastasia Filippovna Baraskova du roman L'idiote et Sonia Semionovna Marmeladova du roman Crime et Châtiment.

Mots-clés: *Dostoïevski, la liberté, la théologie, la femme.*

Introduction

It said about that Fyodor Dostoevsky is an christian writer. Although this, he doesn't do theology, but literature. But he does it above the shadow of the orthodox christianity, the religion that he understands it only as a form of cultural and spiritual expresion, but as an way to live life. This explains that the only subject, interest and aim in his creation literary is *the man.* In order to understand the depths of the intention of Russian novelist we have to keep in mind of this essential element, the anthropocentrism, which forces us to make recurse to Byzantine philosophy, ie to Eastern Christian philosophy. We have here also another detail which puts us precisely in the sphere of the philosophy and Christian theologie: Dostoyevsky's anthropologie is oriented *iconic*; he sees the man as a theological being which, although he somewhat contains the world in itself, he hasn't as an aim the world but God.

For Dostoevsky, the man was created as a free, conscious and responsible being, therefore, he doesn't entirely depend on God, and he can draw his own path

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

on life; he transcends the created order, being ontologically endowed with the power to become saint. It is about the freedom as an ontological attribute of the man, about the freedom in relation to the complexe mechanisms of the outer world that form the assembly of the laws of the nature. We can know how these complex ideas are reflected in Dostoevskian creation watching how Dostoevsky sketched two female characters, bidder in terms of literary, religious and psichological: Nastasia Filipovna Baraşcova in *The Idiot*[1] and Sonia (Sofia) Simionovna Marmeladova in *Crime and punishment*[2].

1. The Place of the woman in Dostoevsky's creation

According to Nicolai Berdiaev[3], women weren't a particular and autonomous subject for Russian novelist, but they were rather elements that have contributed to the shaping, to the crystallisation of some male characters: „Dostoevkian anthropology is exclusively male. The woman interestes only as a element in the destiny of man. The human spirit is, above all, male spirit. Female principle is only a detail from the male spirit tragedy, an inner temptation of its [...]. There is nowhere a feminin face that has value of its own. She always explores the tragic destiny of the man. The woman is just a inner masculin tragedy [...]. The woman is a simple obstacle encountered on path, she doesn't matter in itself, but only as an inner phenomenon of the masculin destiny". Therefore, from Berdiaev'a words we understand that Dostoevsky's women haven't got an own destiny and that they are present only in order to highlight a particular feature of the man, in order to envelop his destiny, in order to arouse the pasion, for atmosphere; „the destiny of the man meansthe destiny of the individual, of the principle of *the human entity*, which is predominantly male for Dostoevsky" [4].

However, we believe that the things aren't even like so, and in the following lines we will try to say why.

Indeed, the women is a discreet presence in Dostoevky's novels, but its manifestations have a tremendous impact on the man. To sit her on the same level with the man it would be was a wrong step, inauthentic and mediocre. Only the mediocre daily consciousness imposes a hierachy. To say that woman is superior or inferior to man is as inadequate as to make comparison with the importance of the air or wather. In Orthodox spirituality, Saint John Chrysostom[5] is categorical: the equality generates tension, and this not means that the one is superior and the other, inferior. Each is called to fulfill different tasks in life in order to the entire works harmoniously. The way in which Dostoevsky creates two female characters talks about a knowledge of this theology. He knows that it is wrong to define the woman

[1] Dostoievski, *Idiotul*, Editura pentru literatură uniersală, Bucureşti, 1962.

[2] Dostoievski, *Crimă şi pedeapsă*, Editura de stat pentru literatură şi artă, Bucureşti, 1957.

[3] *Filosofia lui Dostoievski,* Editura Institutul European, Iaşi, 1992, p. 72-73.

[4] Paul Evdokimov, *Femeia şi mîntuirea lumii*, Editura Christiana, Bucureşti, 1995, p. 74.

[5] Sfîntul Ioan Gură de Aur*, Omilia XXVI şi Omilia XXXIV la I Corinteni* ; *Omilia XX la Efeseni*; *Omilia XXIII la Romani.*

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

comparing with the man, but, also, he knows that her image would be false if he would consider her in own right, placing her in herself. Just through this Dostoevsky is unique: „he transcends the clichés about faithful wives, pious widows, and, more generally, about women reduced to the single dimension of the *domestication*, which is only a purely historical point of reference: the patriarchy, the masculine rule"[6].

Dostoevsky knows that woman is able to acumulate the intelectual values as much as the man, that she can intellectualize all excesively, equally with the man, that she can build, side by side with man. But he knows that all these would clear out her of its essence, „because the woman is called to bring in culture the femininity as irreplaceable way"[7].

In our opinion, Nastasia is the main character in *The Idiot*, equally with Maskin, which has to remov all masks from all of them, because only an „idiot" might be able to say with naiv honesty , without resentment, everything sees and thinks about his neighbor. Everyone revolve around these two characters, either as rivals or as lovers, in some way all relate to Nastasia or to Maskin, although we tend to think that when someone has to do with Maskin, actually, by ricochet, he is interested in Nastasia interested.

In *Crime and Punishment*, we see the same thing. Although obviously the book talks us about a crime, therefore about Raskolnikov and his ideas about man's freedoms, alternatively it presents us the struggles of the one tormented and saved soul by the most humble figure, Sofia Semionovna Marmeladova. Actually, it discovers us the mistery of the humility. Skilfully, Dostoevsky confronts once again – as if Nastasia case – the constrasts, the abomination and the beauty, darkness and light, „mud and brilliants", in order to descover of each of them attributes and the logical of the relationships[8]. It isn't for the first time when he insists to notes and to describe the duplicated behavior of the souls of the people, thinking that even in the most innocent conscience can foresee starts despicable, vile: „Tell me – Raskolnikov asks Sonia – how this shame and this dirt can combine in your soul with feelings so opposed, with feelings so holy?" [9].

2. Nastasia Filippovna Baraşkova or about the „the selfishness of the suffering"

The fatality puts his stamp on Nastasia Filippovna's life since childhood, when her mother, her father and sister died one after another, leaving her alone. Nastasia is growed with manoy of a filthy rich man, ultra-refined tastes, delicate and great admirer and connoisseur of female beauty[10], Afanas Ivanovich Toţki.

---

[6] Paul Evdokimov, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[7] *Ibidem*, p. 191.

[8] B. Riurikov, Postfaţă la Romanul „*Crimă şi pedeapsă*", Editura de Stat pentru Literatură şi Artă, Bucureşti, 1957, p. 521.

[9] F. M. Dostoievski, *Crimă şi pedeapsă*, p. 294.

[10] Dostoievski, *Idiotul*, p. 73.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

So keen and tried was his eye than he saw what potential Nastasia had yet to 12 years (when she was a little charming, lively, smart girl and which "promised to be a rare beauty"[11]), moment in which he has decided to invest in her development. After four years of "multicultural education"[12], Nastia is taken by Toţki in a new home, modest but full of things that were on pleasing to the girl: books, instruments, paintings, a puppy. He provided two women. At 16 years old, Nastasia Filipppovna is perfect for her experienced seducer. In this pleasant place (the property was called Otradnoe, ie, quiet place, pleasing, agreeable[13]), Toţki spends every summer for four years, "leading a sheltered life, full of charm and happiness"[14].

The author does not tell us what Nastasia thinks about this experience in which she entered without warnnings. We know that when Toţki decides to marry - and ironically, not with her! - Nastasia Filipppovna shows him a completely unknown face to her seducer. Toţki woke with her at Petersburg, in fact, with a completely different Nastasia Filippovna, new, who put him in difficulty: "she knew and understood great many things - so many that he was wonder: from where she had been able to get so many knowledge and information, that to form precise ideas on so many things?" [15]. Now she is determined to confuse him any plan for marriage, only malice and not because she would entertain other sense than "a disgust to nausea", "even only for game, because, finally, it has one's inning me to laugh my heart's content"[16].

Such a reaction can not talk us only about the impact that the sexual abuse committed by Toţki had on the teenage soul of Nastia, who has never proposed to treat the girl otherwise than as a luxury item that could be used heart's ever so slightly in front of the female beauty. Only now, Toţki is understanding how deep and smart Nastasia is, who would deserved to be treated differently in the past.

Here's how the elegant, rich, respected, fashionable man suddenly becomes "wise because of fear"[17]. If at first he thought that a proposal would resolve the crisis, immediately he understood that "the pride of this *insulted and precipitous* woman has going up there, insomuch that she would have preferred to lose even the brightest situation just to be able to show once more the contempt by a refusal [...]. She was able to lose irreparably and in the most odious way, to grasp Siberia and the prison way, only to know that she managed to mock at will of the man which has inspired so much wild disgust" [18]. In this context Maskin appears, which falls hopelessly in love with Nastasia and which can understand more than she

[11] *Ibidem*, p. 75.
[12] *Ibidem.*
[13] The footnote of the translators Tamara and Nicolae Gane at *The Idiot*, 1957; Valeriu Cristea, *Dicţionarul personajelor lui Dostoievski,* Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 2007, p. 56.
[14] Dostoievski, *Idiotul*, p. 76.
[15] *Ibidem*, p. 77.
[16] *Ibidem.*
[17] Valeriu Cristea, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
[18] *Ibidem*, p. 81.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

understands herself. He asks her as wife, and she believes that this is a chance for salvation.

Now, don't that Dostoevsky falls into ridiculous and tells us the story of a happy marriage. No, Nastasia's story is the one about freedom. But it is the best exemple of the one freedom that is expressed irrational. We can see also the consequences that come from it.

Nastasia had in herself all data to choose the beautiful love, in order to forgive, to pray, to go on gracious freedom, to choose God, because she had a brilliant intelligence, was deep and capable of virtue. But she is the pinnacle of what Dostoyevsky called "the egoism of the suffering". Therefore, she has choosen the death.

3. Sofia Semionovna Marmeladova or about the „insatiable compassion "

An example founded at the other extreme is Sonia Marmeladova. For her, self-sacrifice through the obedience to the most humiliating and degrading endurances is the form in which she intends to express the love for her neighbor to whom, after all, she had no social or moral obligation. She perfectly embodies the prototype of Christian which knows how to suffer, for which doesn't matter the life, which is ever ready to sacrifice, "denigrating vanities"[19]. Sofia found the recipe for happiness in the faith of Christ, the one Which suffered for man, in order to redeem him. Her happiness comes from suffering, but that does not mean that we have a new case of masochism, as we have already meet at Nastasia. Sonia's suffering targets to the joy of that she loves. The suffering designs above Sonia a light that allows us to see her full humility, the inner beauty, the exemplary virtue.

Sonia is the daughter of a missed, irresponsible, cowardly and drunk clerk, remarried with Katerina Ivanovna, one widow, poor, renegade family, desperate, sick and neurotic fury, which has three young children. They live in abject poverty, and the head of the family drinks all the money, including those stolen from the house, as were ordained for food and clothing for children. Sonia, now a teenager, is a seamstress, but she gets of much injustice and indignity from the customers who do not pay. The hunger and the despair lead on Katerina Ivanovna - always irritated, frustrated, unhappy, sick - to urge Sonia to prostitute.

Like this begins the ordeal of the girl who, after her „marmelade"[20] father's description, is "quiet by nature, she never answers and has a gentle little voice..., little blonde, with skinny and pale little cheek" she „decides for that job"[21], entering among the most despised women. Without saying a word, she goes and sells herself for 30 rubles, a figure that could be a random one, but that still, if we follow the spiritual path of Sonia, we see that it is symbolic and it reminds us about the pieces of silver for which Savior was sold.

[19] Nicolae Steinhardt, *Jurnalul fericirii*, Editura Dacia, Cluj Napoca, 1992, p. 214.
[20] Vladimir Marinov.
[21] *Ibidem*.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

Unlike Nastasia Filippovna, which enjoying a spectacular, passionate and rich in detail display, she being beautiful, intelligent and magnetic, Semionovna Sonia is introduced into the story as a promiscuous element, regardless of father's words who wants to alleviate the misery of the reality. What can we expect from a such woman, after we have got used with a remarkable volcano, with a bright and deadly force, like Nastasia Filippovna is. Sonia is insignificant as a woman, silent, scared, ashamed and prostitute. Through everything she does, however, she shows us that she knows his own place, that she knows the opinion of the people about her occupation, she can say anything in her defense.

She considers herself a sinner which has to do an important work: to feed on the half brothers. We can not ignore this detail. Dostoevsky's way to tell us that for Sonia nothing is so importand than to save on those three little children from starvation and misery is very interesting. Prostitution is the only way to win, therefore Sonia believes useless to try to justify or defend. She keeps silence. But silence never said more and had a greater effect as in this pale figure. It is the perfect embodiment of the humility. Not for defending - Father Arsenie Boca says - "where defense is, there is not humility, nor confession and nor remission"[22] Nothing announces the importance of the role of Sonia Marmeladova which will appear in this novel. It pass hundred pages in which its presence is barely perceptible. Moreover, all her action has an *mysterious* effect, but permanently.

4. The duplication of man through elections and the entry into the sphere of the Evil

Nastasia Filippovna and Sonia Marmeladova seek both to sit on the road which leads them from *the eikon to the likeness*. In this account odyssey of two (souls) characters which we have chosen, because they present us two variants or, more precisely, a journey in two stages. We have the most concrete form of appeal to the irrational freedom (Nastasia) and to the gracious freedom (Sonya). It's like we would have in front of us one single person, but duplicated, and this condition recoursing from our own choices.

Both seek the peace from love, they seek the *truth* that to release them forever from what hold them captive. And we paradoxically find that without suffering, sin and evil, without fumbling freely attempts, without the experiencing of the pain, good and evil, the spiritual tranquility can not install. Just freedom (that everyone else understands diffrent) is what makes to exist in the life of the two which suffering so much. It's a vicious circle seemingly incomprehensible for "Euclidean mind" because it has as foundation an irrational mystery[23]: "For people with thought and states consciousness, the enormous discoveries of Dostoevsky about freedom are more difficult to understand. The static people ask *yes* or *no*, while

[22] Pr. Arsenie Boca, *Cărarea Împărăţiei*, Editura Episcopăiei Ortodoxe Române a Aradului, 2006, p. 63.

[23] Nikolai Berdiaev, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

such answers can not be given"[24]. The mistery of life consists of the tragic aspect of the life. Man can always chose between good or bed. Irrationally and instinctively, he goes to evil. Although he is constantly drawn to evil, the soul suffers over longing for God, feeling fresh, thirst that was planted in his being when God creates.

Therefore what gives rise to pain, suffering and tragedy of life is the location at distant from God. As the man removes from God - the good source of perfect good, of love, of beauty - his suffering increases in intensity because he eners on the sphere of the evil.

The shunning of passions makes the soul receptive to God's call. Sonia hears more clearly and not slow to respond and to use whatever gives life to ascend to God. With Nastasia[25] the things are different. She interpreted the Maskin's marriage proposal as a chance for salvation. But it is clear that she has valued so much her virginity that now she cherishes her humility as much as one side of the coin. She choses not to heal, but rather to self-destruct through a form of masochism which degenerates and is expressed by the crazy oscillation between Rogojin and Maskin. Her soul sees the light, but it is lacked by the force to rise.

Nastasia admits that she "has renounced at the world. Maybe you find funny to hear this from me, seeing me in lace and diamonds, together drunks and scoundrels. Do not take after that, I barely exist and I know that. God knows what lives in me inside my place". She doesn't talk here about the ascetic renunciation of the world.

Deep down of her soul, it isn't began to build the kingdom of God, even if she claims that God lives instead of her. No, it states that she still lives because of God's will, of the divine shreds, of the Holy Spirit that is in all of us. Otherwise, she's dead and she savors with masochism her tumultuous slipping to thanatos. She chooses Rogojin, which is fundamentally opposite of Maskin's character that she fell in love - because she sees im as a younger version of Toţki that she wants to take revenge, but that she uses once again as a tool of self-destruct.

Rogojin's gesture to slam on the table a hundred thousand rubles in order to buy Nastasia is relevant for the temper of the individual. It is a new opportunity that Dostoevsky offers to that woman to blame herself, to self-flagellation in public, giving up at the offer of Maskin in favor of Rogojin: "How could you have imagined that I would destroy the life of this innocent child?"[26]. Maskin was the expected Prince, which she had found in the end, but - fatality! - she has poulluted

---

[24] *Ibidem*, p. 56.

[25] It is amazing how Nichifor Crainic redured Nastasia Filippovna to the following characterization: "a ravishing beautiful demi-rep which not gives her for money, but the passion" (Crainic, *op. cit*., p. 87).

If Dostoevsky exhausts himself in order to create such a frivolous female character, Sonia would not have exceeded cabotine Christian image of prostitutes. Fortunately for the reader, the souls of these women offer an unimaginable world in which the contradictory traits met, and their fascination comes from the meeting, logically impossible.

[26] Dostoievski, *Idiotul*, p. 243.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

meantime: "I'm just a lost woman"[27], a slut[28], "I'm going to do the sidewalk, have you heard, there's me, and if not, I will do washerwoman"[29].

The modern psychology has highlighted a behavior of this type, in which the man which faces with a issues and leaves dominated by it, talks much about it, and talks, and talks, "he cools", but he does nothing to relieve to defeat it. This process of boiling and persistence in evil generates caress. A negative pleasure, it is true, but pleasure. It's like a drug. As in the case of the alcoholism.

Maskin[30] understood the best that her folly means wish of death, accompanied by a terrible and unnatural pleasure to make sick herself. She doesn't want to simply die, but terrible, shameful and painful, because only in this way she thought that she could to fully punish for "how slut" she felt that she is.

She suffers of an incurable wound. Rogojin is the only one that Nastasia Filippovna sees able to punish her over self-defeating expectations: first of all, he buys her with a huge amount, placing her once again in the category of the lost women ("this unfortunate woman is deeply convinced that she is the most fallen, the most depraved creature in the world", Lebedev says about her), scuffing his feelings of self blame; after that, she sees in him a great killer potential: "Maybe that's why doesn't drown, because next to me she sees an end worst than the bottom of water"[31]. There isn't only an assumption of Rogojin, Nastasia even that feels when wants to marry with him, "I get marry with you as I would throw in a whirlpool"[32]. She hated so intense and so long that she has exhausted all her affectiv resources. Before she has died, she already was living in hell, if we undestand through hell what the abbot Zosima from *The Brothers Karamazov* undestood: "the inability to love".

Falled under evil, where she met Rogojin - himself an evil force - Nastasia Filippovna gradually turns into a volcanic force of evil nature. That makes her capable of anything. She becomes irresponsible and enters into the clutches of the demons, because the demonic is defined, after Derrida, by irresponsibility or non-responsibility[33]. The collision of these two forces produced a catastrophe. The climax, predictably, is Nastasia killing. But we already understand that Nastasia Filippovna concrete death was necessary for her spiritually dead anyway, because he fell into the arms of evil, because he chose not to forgive anyone or himself.

5. The reason is defeated by heart

Raskolnikov doesn't explain himself why he feels uncontrollable desire to visit Sonia. He isn't attracted to her. Neither could not. Sonia isn't beautiful. For

[27] *Ibidem*, p. 244.
[28] *Ibidem*, p. 245.
[29] *Ibidem*, p. 250.
[30] *Ibidem*, p. 471.
[31] *Ibidem*, p. 300.
[32] *Ibidem*, p. 301.
[33] „Le demonique se definit originaiment par l'irresponsabilite ou, si l'on vent, par la non-responsabilite", J. Derrida, *Donner la mort,* Galilee, 1997, p. 17.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

Dostoevsky, the beauty, which he considers divine, has a special role of the saving of the world. On Nastasia, Dostoevky has made her by a beauty that can overturn the world (as expressed Aglaia Epancina) and Sonia imagined a trivial, tasteless at the first sight. The dark, complicated, and ill mind of Raskolnikov, that Dostoevsky plans to save him, was not receptive to the seductive image of a woman. For Dmitri Karamazov, the beauty, especially of a woman, has an impenetrable mystery, "it is a terrible scary thing". Dostoevsky felt "that in beauty there is a demonic dark foundation"[34]. Raskolnikov already was chached in too sophisticated trapped, and an obvious beauty was not the solution in order to lead on the way to salvation. However since the drunk Marmeladov spoke about the girl which prostituted, Raskolnikov felt a warmth in his heart, he understood that something incomprehensible binds by her.

For Raskolnikov seems difficult to understand how it is possible that the soul of Sonia was not attracted "of pestilential marsh"[35] of the practices that she has joined. He tries an explanation related by her faith, and he asks her if she prays a lot, opening a theme that will definitively mark, even though he seemed not ready for that. Sonia's reply - "What would I be without God?" – gives to Raskolnikov the opportunity to sharpen own weakness and the inability to believe. He was under the control of demons and even if the longing for God was not killed, the company of the evel gave him the courage to grin at Sonia, to tease her, to rake up in order to tear down the principle that makes possible a whole sacrifice.

„And what does God do for you?", he asks Sonia. It is time when the love and reason enter in conflicts. Dostoevsky has created a character with a paradoxical combination of practice and temper. So we are obliged to note that only abeing overshadowed by the grace of God can endure much suffering and having nothing (either materially or emotionally), to believe that God gives her everything. Such responses are not "on the Earth". He suspects girl of madness. Sonia's faith can not be justified as Raskolnicov would want, the intellectual. Sonia, who didn't read than a couple of books borrowed from Lebeziatnikov, she broke her hands of pain that she could not give any answer. I shed tears of helplessness, considering that her soul has a treasure so great, valuable, that nothing in rational order, not a word, would not be able to form a satisfactory speech for a questing as Raskolnikov.

Her relationship with God was holding a secret by that Raskolnikov was not worthy[36], though she wanted to say it. Because of this reason she knead and aches. It's a matter of pride and love at the same time. Pride, because her heart tells her she's on the right track, but is unable to kneel on the weapon of logic which obviously is not on her side, a sincere faith. Then Sonia loves young and wants harmony. Sonia is disturbed and offended by malicious suspicions of Raskolnikov, even though he had no way of knowing specifically what indispose, but Dostoevsky gives us clear evidences that she intuits that still means much more

[34] Nikolai Berdiaev, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
[35] Dostoievski, *op. cit.*, p. 295.
[36] Dostoievski, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

than she is able to express. Therefore, Nikolai Berdyaev said that “by the phenomenon of spirit you must get closer with the soul full of faith, not rummage him with suspicion and skepticism”[37].

Single, with his rationalist theories of megalomania, Raskolnikov realizes that no can help himself. He sees in Sonia the urge to realm of the rest of the soul. He leans on her, even if she seems without force, she is a fragile and vulnerable being: "Although defenseless - as Romano Guardini shows us - the child (Sonia) is not weak. He shall submit her , he, the one, who refused to obey to moral laws, to men and to divinity"[38].

Conclusions

Dostoevsky is a Christian writer. The statement can be considered a cliché, but the prospects that we have proposed in this study is considering this detali, aspect, issue. We have followed the theological foundations of the concept of freedom, as Russian writer wanted to evoke when he sketched two of the most interesting female characters from his novels: Nastasia Filippovna in *The Idiot* and Sonia Marmeladova from *Crime and Punishment*. The freedom means not posting to the distance to the laws of this world, at the independence of another person, at the captivity. Nastasia really is dependent by Toţki’s money, and she is affected by how men interested by her treat her. Sonia, in turn, depends on money earned by prostitution and feels captive of the environment in which her family lives. Then we talk about what kind of freedom, when, actually, we see good dependencies of various kinds?

This essay is about the paradoxes of the freedom. About that feeling that makes the human being to be free, although he is in prison, convicted for murder, as Raskolnikov's case. We managed to find out the operating mechanisms of such a state, hovering us in the metaphysical space of soul, where everything seems to stay under the sight of mystery. Here, on this creative space, Dostoevsky places his hole creative arsenal and presents us two options, that are different and nuanced, for the irrational freedom, assumed by Nastasia Filippovna, and for the gracious freedom, unsuitable by Sonia Marmeladova.

Under the impulse of one great strength suffering – we not say unbearable because the two women live differently, that the one reacts because she can not more bear it, the other lives it as a gift that she offers loved ones – the souls of Nastasia and Sonia move in the direction opposite because *this is their will*. Nastasia would can give up at the thought of the revenge, she might have to accept the love of another man, might have to carve a road leaving all past wrongs and forgive. Sonia, in turn, would have to leave the body and soul trapped in prostitution, could refuse to help his family, could have let Raskolnikov to boil in the poison of own his sins. But no, Nastasia, although she has all the qualities to make a fruitful and positive choice, she screams her pain and throws herself in the

[37] Nikolai Berdiaev, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
[38] Valeriu Cristea, *op. cit.*, p. 438.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

claws of the death with a masochistic pleasure. And Sonia sacrifices down to the cancellation of the self, from a love that breathes her whole being. The freedom choice, without which the evil would not have been possible, explains why the evil is not an mundane issue but spiritual one. The soul that shall bear mutations qualitative irrational freedom: "Evil gets life in attitudes and actions contrary to the meaning of existence created"[39].

We don't know if Russian novelist knew the idea about freedom that belong to Saint Gregory of Nyssa. But how he kneads Nastasia Filippovna, as being within the scope of Evil, is perfect. Therefore, the Cappadocian saint speaks about the person which, if she doesn't participate in good, if she isn't in communion with God, she becomes a wicked being, that hes faculties pervert and become the source of evil[40]. Nastasia refused the good and she chose the privacy of evil in the person of Rogojin, causing harm and suffering to those around.

The gracious freedom takes always into account the will of God, that the man founds it in a way of communication through less accepted intellectual species: the heart. Sonia has capacity of dialogue with God. She understands even the most incomprehensible issues, using the heart. Her soul freely chose to bear the pain of the humility, using the fulfillment of the divine commandment concerning to the love of the neighbor.

Nastasia would get rid of suffering (understood as the promise of the hell) if she choose the love and the forgiveness. Sonia would get rid of suffering (understood as the promise of the Heaven), if she stops to help his family by the only possible mean, namely, the prostitution. But Nastasia chose deepening in the evil, looking for the good falsely, wrongly. Her "selfishness of the suffering" peaked. Sonia consciously chose to expels herself from the *moral* society, to give herself to the evil, which, this time hides the secret meanings of the good, because she being able of the "insatiable compassion", therefore she saves her own soul, and another pulling up behind her .

Bibliography

Berdiaev, Nikolai, *Filosofia lui Dostoievski*, Editura Institutul European, Iaşi, 1992

Boca, Arsenie, *Cărarea Împărăţiei*, Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe Române a Aradului, 2006

Crainic, Nichifor, *Dostoievski şi creştinismul rus,* Editura Anastasia şi Arhidiecezana Cluj, Bucureşti, Cluj, 1998

Cristea, Valeriu, *Dicţionarul personajelor lui Dostoievski,* Editura Polirom, Iaşi, 2007.

Derrida, J., *Donner la mort*, Galilee, 1997

Dostoevsky, F. M. *Crimă şi pedeapsă*, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură şi Artă, Bucureşti, 1957

Dostoevsky, F. M., *Idiotul*, Editura Pentru Literatură universală, Bucureşti, 1962

[39] Vasile Răducă, *Antropologia Sfîntului Grigorie de Nyssa. Căderea în păcat şi restaurarea omului*, Editura Institutului Bilbic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, Bucureşti, 1996, p. 174.

[40] Sfîntul Grigorie de Nyssa, *Comentariu la Cîntarea Cîntărilor*, 8, 45 in PSB 29.

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)

Evdokimov, Paul, *Femeia şi mîntuirea lumii*, Christiana, Bucureşti, 1995
Grigorie de Nyssa, Sfîntul, *Comentariu la Cîntarea Cîntărilor,* Colecţia PSB, vol 29, Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, Bucureşti, 1982
Ioan Gură de Aur**,** Sfîntul**,** *Comentariu la Evanghelia de la Ioan*, traducere de Diacon Gheorghe Băbuţ, Editura Pelerinul Român, Oradea, 1997
Ioan Gură de Aur**,** Sfîntul**,** *Omilii la Epistola către Romani*, Christiana, Bucureşti, 2005
Ioan Gură de Aur**,** Sfîntul, *Comentariu sau Tîlcuire la Epistola I către Corinteni,* Editura Sophia, Bucureşti, 2005
Steinhardt, Nicolae, *Jurnalul fericirii*, Dacia, Cluj Napoca, 1992

BDD-A19556 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.58 (2026-11-16 20:51:41 UTC)