

The Space Between Silence and Speech: Trauma as a Narrative in Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground* and *Crime and Punishment*



Fatema Aftab Miah

211013016

Department of English and Humanities

Spring 2025

The Space Between Silence and Speech: Trauma as a Narrative in Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground* and *Crime and Punishment*

A Thesis Submitted to
The Department of English and Humanities
University of Liberal Arts, Bangladesh

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree of
BA in English

Fatema Aftab Miah
211013016
Thesis Supervisor: Anika Tahsin

Spring 2025

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

I hereby declare that this thesis is the student's own work and effort. All sources of information incorporated here have been duly acknowledged. This thesis has been submitted with my approval.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "A. Tahsin", with a long horizontal stroke underneath.

Anika Tahsin

Lecturer

Department of English and Humanities

DECLARATION

This thesis is a presentation of my original research work. Wherever contributions of others are involved, every effort is made to indicate this clearly, with due reference to the literature, and acknowledgement of collaborative research and discussions.



Fatema Aftab Miah

211013016

Department of English and Humanities

Acknowledgements

Despite being a student of English, I always find myself at a loss for words when it comes to expressing my gratitude to the people that have shaped me throughout my life, but I owe it to them to try.

To my late mother — everything I have ever done has always been for you. Thank you for continuing to teach me that love will always outlast life. To my father — I would like you to know that my love for words only comes from my love for you. To my sister — I will always be indebted to you for teaching me that the world can always use a little laughter.

This thesis would not have been possible without the invaluable support of the mentors and friends that I've had the privilege of knowing at ULAB. Your encouragement has carried me through uncertainty and your presence is proof that kindness will never cease to exist.

Last but not the least, I am deeply grateful to my supervisor and life coach, Anika Tahsin, for her unwavering support and for always reminding me of my capabilities even when I fail to see them.

Table of Contents

Abstract	7
Introduction	8
Methodology.....	12
Literature Review	14
Chapter 1: Dostoevsky's Trauma and its Appearance in His Characters	21
Chapter 2: Viewing Dostoevsky Through Caruth's Eyes	27
Chapter 3: Unspeakability Versus the Testimony of Trauma	33
Conclusion	39
Works Cited	41

Abstract

This thesis reinterprets Fyodor Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground* (1864) and *Crime and Punishment* (1866) as pioneering case studies of trauma's narratability, situating it as an unconventional literary device while also demonstrating the limitations of contemporary models of trauma. The reevaluation of his employment of fractured identities, obsessive-compulsive introspection and temporal ruptures demonstrate how Dostoevsky's fiction predates modern trauma theories presiding in literature. While Cathy Caruth's paradigm contributes to understanding the impact trauma has on its survivors, it also depicts traumatic experiences as a phenomenon that is inherently unrepresentable, thus limiting its window for expression. By fusing Dominick LaCapra's concept of working-through and empathic unsettlement – which places great emphasis on testimony, memory and articulation – this study calls for a multi-perspective approach when it comes to dissecting the nuances of trauma. Additionally, the synthesis of the two theories underscores how psychological suffering can be transformed into a deliberate literary strategy. A key premise of this argument is the symbiotic relationship between Dostoevsky's personal struggles and its translation in the literary canon. Through close readings of the selected texts, the psychological landscape of Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man determines that they are reflective of their creator, which suggests that, to Dostoevsky, writing was a means of mitigating his trauma. Through this, the study proves that trauma can not only be transformed into a literary tool, but is also testament to its documentation. As such, this research contributes to trauma studies by expanding the critical discourse on trauma narratives while also reexamining Dostoevsky beyond the perspective of a tormented writer, but as a harbinger of the cathartic relationship between fiction and trauma.

Keywords: Trauma, Unspeakability, Empathic Unsettlement, Testimony, Fragmentation, Identity

Introduction

As a concept, trauma has captured the interest of scholars for its capability of not only disrupting but also reconstructing narrative, memory and identity. In literature, trauma acts as a formidable device that allows writers to maneuver the complexities of human cognition, the vulnerability that comes with morality and mortality, and the fickle nature of identity with particular focus on how suffering impacts these human experiences. Fyodor Dostoevsky is one such author that has expanded the horizons of trauma studies in literature with his meticulous and vivid depictions of the nuances of psychological turmoil. His novels are known to often gravitate towards the deep dwellings of the human mind, unveiling the chaos of emotions that are embedded into these experiences. Although he was not the first to attempt documenting trauma, in the hands of Dostoevsky, trauma ceases to become a negative experience and mutates into a literary device – a scalpel wielded with the highest degree of precision to slice through the epidermis of pain, guilt and the relentless human need to search for meaning.

This thesis shall analyze how Dostoevsky responded to his personal experiences – ranging from his turbulent childhood, struggle with epilepsy, mock execution and insecurities due to his social class – and examine how he translated his afflictions into writing, particularly in the novels *Notes from Underground* (1864) and *Crime and Punishment* (1866). As these texts are repositories of psychological realism, they provide a clear depiction of how trauma influences memory, moral consciousness, temporality and identity. Dostoevsky's background allows us to understand how he was able to create an identity of his own through the expression of trauma in the form of his

tortured protagonists that inherit his agony. With the creation of Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man, Dostoevsky denotes how trauma has the potential to question fundamental assumptions about existence, disrupt the self and lead to isolation. Simultaneously, these novels act as evidence to the fact that while it is often strenuous to articulate, trauma is definitely not beyond the possibility of representation. Despite what the pre-existing literary models of trauma suggest, this thesis shall dissect how trauma can in fact be narrated and even transformed through expression using both Dostoevsky and his works as examples.

Central to this study is an engagement with contemporary theories and paradigms of trauma, particularly the approach that Cathy Caruth establishes in her seminal works *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History* (1991) and *Violence and Time: Traumatic Survivals* (1993). To summarize the claims made in these articles, Caruth goes down the tangent of how it is within the nature of trauma to displace their victims and trap them in a cycle that prevents them from healing by consistently forcing them to relive their initial point of trauma. She also addresses the tendency of survivors to disassociate from the traumatic event and explains how this results in temporal fractures as the trauma has not been, or rather refuses to be, integrated into the victim's consciousness. However, Caruth also announces that due to the state of stagnation that trauma obligates its survivors to endure, it has the tendency to resist language and coherent narration. Caruth's findings has undeniably been groundbreaking in literary studies and allows researchers to perceive the multidimensional temperament of trauma, but it has also roused criticism for its claim that victims are silenced by their calamitous encounters. Dostoevsky and his protagonists both align with and debunk Caruth's notion and shall be explored in further detail in the upcoming discussions of this thesis.

To refute Caruth's theory on the 'unspeakability' of trauma, this study shall borrow the findings of Dominick LaCapra's concepts uncovered in *Trauma, History, Memory, Identity: What Remains?* (2016). In his article, LaCapra coined the term 'empathic unsettlement' which is essentially a method that allows the representation of trauma without reducing it to silence or incomprehensibility. He also establishes the importance of the declaration of trauma and how memory, whether it is factual or not, plays an imperative role in deciphering the core of trauma. This directly contradicts Caruth's understanding of documentation and corresponds with Dostoevsky's narrative strategy which employs suffering on an emotional and intellectual level. In *Crime and Punishment*, Raskolnikoff is haunted by the psychological decline that follows him after he murders the elderly pawnbroker and his culpability resurfaces in the form of hallucinations, obsessive-compulsive patterns of thinking as well as fevers. However, he has the ability to rationalize his crime and navigate through his guilt which demonstrates the intellectual prowess that trauma victims do not get enough credit for. Similarly, in *Notes from Underground*, the Underground Man's obscure and antithetical narrations reflect the perplexity that surrounds the articulation of trauma, but his stubborn self-examinations indicate his self-awareness and the yearning to make sense of his suffering. As these characters are reflective of Dostoevsky's own trauma, it puts into perspective the compelling need survivors have to control their story through any means possible, solidifying the argument of how trauma can be recorded. Merging the two theories creates a bridge of understanding and brings forth the need to recognize trauma and the necessity of its narration.

While much discussion has surrounded Dostoevsky's existential themes and psychological

realism, a sizable gap resides in exploring his texts through the theoretical lens of contemporary trauma theories. Existing trauma scholarship either borrows from Caruth's notions or overlooks the interplay between Dostoevsky's relationship with suffering and the representation of trauma in his fiction. This thesis addresses this gap by analyzing how *Notes from Underground* and *Crime and Punishment* operate in a literary model that both aligns with and refutes the dominant paradigms of trauma. Hence, through the unification of these theories, this study contributes to trauma studies by reevaluating what is processed while also acknowledging the repressed in trauma narratives. As such, this research shall attempt to answer the questions: How does Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* and *Notes from Underground* challenge Cathy Caruth's trauma theory? How do these novels highlight the need for a multi-perspective theoretical approach in regards to trauma studies?

Furthermore, through the dissection of the aforementioned theories and by surveying Dostoevsky's use of trauma as a psychological and narrative force, this thesis shall prove that while the nature of trauma commands it to be elusive and often fragmented, it is not fundamentally beyond the hope of representation; Dostoevsky and his works function as evidence of this phenomenon. Both the author and his protagonists can be perceived as examples of how trauma can fracture the self and also permeate the fabric of meaning – indicating that although trauma has the potential to disrupt healing, it also possesses the ability to reconstruct meaning through literary expression. *Crime and Punishment* and *Notes from Underground* allows this study to explore the facets of trauma and its representability, proving that in literature, even the most harrowing experiences have the chance to transform into something graceful.

Methodology

This study implements an interdisciplinary methodological framework to analyze the representation of trauma in Fyodor Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground* and *Crime and Punishment*, while also acknowledging the theoretical tensions in the approach to traumatic narrations between Cathy Caruth and Dominick LaCapra. A major component of this argument relies on the dissection of the narrative techniques employed by Dostoevsky and how his literary-stylistic choices allow the documentation of traumatic experiences. Dostoevsky's literary strategies are analyzed in this research as deliberate attempts to prove that psychological distress is representable, thereby questioning Caruth's belief about trauma resisting coherent narration. The study also participates in a critical dialogue with contemporary models of trauma, collocating Caruth's theory of unspeakability with LaCapra's framework on the representability of traumatic testimony. The methodology of applying the two theories with reference to the selected texts reveals how Dostoevsky's fiction imposes the challenges that exist in contemporary theoretical paradigms – it underscores the limitations of Caruth's passivity while upholding LaCapra's fixation on narration as a reliable means of articulation.

To anchor this discussion, this thesis integrates biographical context by tracing Dostoevsky's personal traumas – poverty, mock-death, epilepsy, isolation – and evaluating how each of these attributes have taken shape in the literary realm, thus creating a new identity. This contextual layer shall add dimensions to the intersection between lived experience and creative identity and shall demonstrate how Dostoevsky translated suffering into a narrative device. As such, the methodology operates dialectically: biographical insights provide a relevant background of Dostoevsky's connection to trauma, close readings identify its literary manifestations while the

anatomization of the theoretical analysis provides interpretation to these findings. Through the bridging of these methods, this thesis not only emphasizes Dostoevsky's contribution to trauma studies, but also calls for a hermeneutic approach when it comes to perceiving psychological fiction more broadly. Although the focus of this study is limited to two novels, the scope prioritizes depth over breadth to ensure a meticulous investigation and recognizes – but brackets – clinical psychological means to concentrate on literary and theoretical discussions.

Literature Review

The subject of how psychological ruptures appear in literature and whether it can be properly expressed through narrative has always been a controversial grey area in trauma studies. Cathy Caruth's framework posits that trauma often returns in fragmented and belated ways, disrupting the chronological order of time and defying traditional structured storytelling, and has altered the course of how these experiences have been perceived in the literary domain. While this study recognizes Caruth's valuable contribution to trauma's disorderly nature, it also challenges her claim that it is inherently unspeakable, particularly with reference to Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* and *Notes from the Underground* as the protagonists from both texts practice the opposite of suffering in silence and instead compulsively narrate their suffering in order to operate through it. Their means of processing grief opposes the idea that trauma resists articulation and instead implies that its discussion functions as an imperative mechanism for survival. To support this argument, this literature review shall combine Dominick LaCapra's framework which directly refutes Caruth's unspeakability by demonstrating the many ways one can make sense of their suffering. Thus, this literature review shall examine the tensions between these theories, and examine how Dostoevsky's texts both align and contradict Caruth's notion of trauma, while also being analyzed through LaCapra's understanding of agency through narrative reconstruction.

To acquire an understanding of Dostoevsky's ideals, the biography titled *Dostoevsky: His Life and Work* by Konstantin Mochulsky provides relevant information on the author's background which is imperative as Dostoevsky's first-hand encounters with suffering mirrors the theoretical framework and aim of this study, and also provides critical insight to the psychological depth explored in the selected texts. Mochulsky evaluates Dostoevsky's personal struggles which allows

for a critical inspection of Dostoevsky's lived experience and how they influenced his writing. Mochulsky's examination of Dostoevsky and his texts assists in investigating the influence of trauma in Dostoevsky's literary expressions. Using Mochulsky's findings allows this thesis to observe the presence of Dostoevsky's own characteristics in his protagonists and storylines which further illustrates the interplay between lived trauma and narrative construction. The incorporation of Mochulsky's work strengthens the argument regarding the narratability of trauma that follows in the analytical chapters.

Following the examination of Dostoevsky's personal context, the article titled "The Epileptic Genius: The Use of Dostoevsky as Example in the Medical Debate Over the Pathology of Genius" by Tobias Dahlkvist explores the dynamics between Dostoevsky's epilepsy and its impact on his literary production, reinforcing the study's idea of trauma being an additional literary device in Dostoevsky's work. Dahlkvist analyzes Dostoevsky and his works through close readings of renowned criminology and psychiatry figures of the 19th century – Cesare Lombroso and Alexandre Lacassagne – to discuss how Dostoevsky's intimate relationship with epilepsy influenced the psyche of his characters. The integration of Dahlkvist's paper acts as a scaffolding by portraying that Dostoevsky's trauma was a transformative force in his creative process. As such, Dahlkvist's article enriches the discussion on the narratability of trauma, showcasing how Dostoevsky's afflictions shaped and enhanced his literary imagination.

René Fueleop-Miller extends this discourse in his article titled "The Posthumous Life of Dostoevsky" where he investigates the enduring legacy and influence of Dostoevsky's works long after his death. Fueleop-Miller examines Dostoevsky's unique take on realism in which he merges

the conscious with the unconscious and upholds this research by looking into how Dostoevsky's own suffering had shaped his literary themes and characters. Fueloep-Miller's findings display an overlap between Dostoevsky's neurosis and the characteristics of Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man, which supports the proposition that Dostoevsky's neurosis found an outlet through literature. Fueloep-Miller's contribution to this study fortifies the hypothesis that instead of being reduced to silence, Dostoevsky's trauma – and by extension, that of his characters – was transformed into a driving force that assisted in creating identities in both the real and fictional world.

Additionally, Patrick Lyall Bourgeois' article titled "Dostoevsky and Existentialism: An Experiment in Hermeneutics" surveys the connection between existentialism and Dostoevsky, focusing on whether Dostoevsky was an antecedent of the existentialist movement. This article's observations add weight to the argument that writing was Dostoevsky's means of processing trauma. Bourgeois evaluates how Dostoevsky incorporated themes of his interpretation of the human experience and contends that suffering was integral to Dostoevsky's narrative structure, acting as both a literary and philosophical device. Bourgeois' paper validates the notion that trauma did not hinder Dostoevsky's literary prowess, but instead enabled him to bring introspective and psychologically complex characters and themes into existence.

This research dedicates an entire chapter analyzing Cathy Caruth's Trauma Theory in relation to the selected Dostoevsky texts. It begins by taking Caruth's article titled "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History" where she dissects the paradoxical nature of trauma and surmises how it cannot be fully understood at the moment of its occurrence, and thus

resurfaces in delayed and unconscious ways. By deducing that history is not always intelligibly referential, Caruth posits that trauma resists articulation. While Caruth claims that trauma defies the laws of narration, Dostoevsky and his protagonists confront their afflictions through obsessive monologues and existential contemplation, which both aligns with and goes against Caruth's understanding of trauma. The relationship between the nature of trauma and its expression creates a conversation between Caruth's theory and Dostoevsky's response to trauma, revealing its cohesion and resistance to the traditional trauma theory.

Supporting Caruth's interpretation of trauma, Debra Kaminer and Gillian Eagle's chapter titled "Trauma As a Crisis of Meaning" from their book *Traumatic Stress in South Africa* helps us understand how trauma shakes the foundation of an individual's belief and meaning systems which often results in an existential crisis. Their analysis of trauma as a destabilizing force aligns with Raskolnikoff's psychological unraveling and allows us to comprehend how his inner turmoil manifests as a physical and mental shackle, trapping him in a cycle of endless suffering which reflects Caruth's idea of latent trauma and how it resurfaces. By incorporating their insights, this study strengthens the bond between Dostoevsky's depiction of trauma and Caruth's theory, demonstrating how trauma compels victims toward a crisis of morality and self.

To better understand the Underground Man's plight, J.A. Jackson's "Freedom and Otherness: The Religious Dimension of Dostoevsky's Notes from Underground" allows us to engage with the Underground Man's suffering. Jackson's findings help us realize that the Underground Man's inclination towards self-destructive actions is nothing but a means of

surviving the horrors of his life in the present. This offers a commentary on the struggle of the human condition and aligns with how trauma often scars an individual after their experience.

Building on the universal human experience, the chapter titled “Dostoevsky’s Concept of Reality and Its Representation in Art” by Robert Louis Jackson from his book *Close Encounters: Essays on Russian Literature* analyzes how Dostoevsky shrouds his protagonists with struggles that exist in the everyday world which in turn, bridges the gap between fiction and reality. Jackson looks into how Dostoevsky endows his characters with moral dilemmas and existential crises, which transforms their individual experience to one that resonates within the collective human conscience. This validates the argument that Dostoevsky allowed his trauma to transform into a narrative tool that gave him catharsis while also elevating his fiction.

This thesis also investigates another article by Cathy Caruth titled “Violence and Time: Traumatic Survivals” where she delves into how victims engage with their survival post-trauma. Caruth focuses on the paradox that surrounds survival where victims are not only haunted by the traumatic event, but also by their survival of it. She hypothesizes that the past bleeds into the present and creates a continuous chain of suffering which in turn presents us with a new outlook on the meaning of survival for both Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man. This article also allows for a smooth segue for the upcoming contradictory theory that follows in the next chapter.

This study also takes a step back from Caruth’s understanding of trauma and momentarily focuses on an alternate approach presented by Dominick LaCapra in his article “Trauma, History, Memory, Identity: What Remains?” where he refutes Caruth’s notion that trauma is unspeakable

by highlighting the role that fixation, memory and testimony play when it comes to documenting trauma. LaCapra investigates post-traumatic events as described by Caruth and posits that although it may not follow a cohesive structure, the testament of trauma should not be discredited as it is still a valid source. Additionally, LaCapra's studies also support the argument of Dostoevsky altering the nature of trauma – thereby transforming it into a narrative tool – from a singular experience, to one that can be shared amongst society by acknowledging the transgenerational legacy that trauma imposes on its victims. This observation may be considered as the research gap of this thesis.

Providing further support to LaCapra's argument, Michelle Balaev's article "Trends in Literary Trauma Theory" directly critiques Caruth's unspeakability by stating that it oversimplifies struggle and emphasizes how even silence can be used as a determiner of trauma. Balaev states that silence itself can be interpreted as a representation of trauma or its effects, which only amplifies the ways that trauma can be documented. Balaev's contributions reinforces the idea that not only is trauma narratable, but its interpretation is dependent on the reader's engagement of the texts.

Finally, the last article used in this study is Joshua Pederson's "Speak, Trauma: Towards a Revised Understanding of Literary Trauma Theory" where he closely refers to Richard McNally's psychological research which directly opposes Caruth's paradigm of trauma by stating that traumatic amnesia is nothing but a myth and that victims are able to not only remember, but elaborate on their experiences. In his paper, Pederson proposes a revised model of literary trauma theory which prioritises the need of paying attention to temporal ruptures, augmented narrative

detail and any kind of distortions that exist within the text which only supports the points made by LaCapra.

The scholarship reviewed in this thesis has investigated the competing frameworks that orbit around the narratability of trauma and highlights the limitations of its contemporary paradigms. By drawing on a range of psychological, biographical and literary resources that have situated Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* and *Notes from Underground* within this theoretical discourse, it has established that trauma in Dostoevsky's fiction is not silenced or repressed, but thoroughly documented. The evaluated literature emphasizes on how narration morphs into a mechanism for both survival and meaning-making, thereby challenging the notion that trauma defies representability. This premise shall form the basis of Dostoevsky's protagonists as individuals that embody psychological distress through expression rather than silence.

Chapter 1:

Dostoevsky's Trauma and its Appearance in His Characters

In order to understand how trauma is represented in Dostoevsky's texts, it is fundamental to evaluate the author's own intimate relationship with it first as his experiences not only permeate his storytelling, but serve as the basis for his introspective and tortured characters that populate his fiction. Born in Moscow on October 30, 1821, Fyodor Dostoevsky's early life foreshadowed the psychological intricacies of his later works. His father, Mikhail Andreyevich, was described as "a fusion of cruelty and sensibility, piety and avarice" (Mochulsky, 3) while his mother, Maria Fyodorovna, came from a working class family and was prone to sickness. According to Konstantin Mochulsky in *Dostoevsky: His Life and Work*, Dostoevsky liked to recall his childhood as serene, when in reality, it was far from it: "The children used to tremble before their father, fearing his angry outbursts" (Mochulsky 4). Their family doctor, Stepan Yanovsky, confirmed that "It was in fact during his childhood that Fyodor Mikhailovich underwent some gloomy and depressing experience... which imprints the subject with a temperament which is prone to nervous ailments and consequently, even epilepsy" (Mochulsky 7), thus proving that Dostoevsky's afflictions had plagued him since he was a child. However, it was his near experience with death that catalyzed the decline of his mental health.

On April 23, 1849, Dostoevsky was arrested for his association with the Petrashevsky Circle, a group of intellectuals that materialized on the account of their shared interest in socialist concepts. Their discussions on freedom of speech and liberal reform went directly against the

Tsar's despotic rule, branding them as a threat to his authority. Due to his involvement with the circle, Dostoevsky was sentenced to death by firing squad. As he prepared for death, the Tsar issued him a last-minute reprieve and altered his sentence to physical labor and exiled the members of the group to a prison camp in Siberia. There, Dostoevsky suffered rough treatment, poor conditions as well as extreme isolation, all of which had left him deeply traumatized. In 1854, he was released from the camp and was made to serve in a Siberian military battalion in Kazakhstan. In 1859, authorities had him released from service and allowed his return to St. Petersburg under close surveillance. The mock execution, his exile and years in Siberia took a huge psychological toll on Dostoevsky, changing how he viewed faith, suffering and redemption which became integral themes in his novels post-exile.

Due to his experiences, trauma tailed Dostoevsky in nearly all facets of his life, going so far as to alter his brain chemistry. Whether he was aware of it or not, Dostoevsky's epilepsy bled through the consciousness of his narration and characters, cloaking his literature in an extremely particular veil of authenticity. The recognizable blend of mania and intellectualism in his writing technique had him marked as a person of interest in the medical debate on the correlation between mental disorder and genius: "Dostoevsky's special talent was his ability to depict mental illness... This special ability is clearly the result of his first-hand experience of the pathological states that he depicts." (Dahlkvist 5). It can be argued that unbeknownst to him, Dostoevsky wielded his trauma as a literary tool which can be observed in the case of both Raskolnikoff from *Crime and Punishment* and the Underground Man from *Notes from Underground*. Dahlkvist writes "the genius exhibits the other typical symptoms of epilepsy; but instead of the seizure, they have moments of inspiration" (10). If both texts are to be examined as evidence of Dostoevsky's psyche,

the argument Dahlkvist makes appears to be true in both characters. After Raskolnikoff murders Alena Ivanovna, the corrupt pawnbroker, he constantly oscillates between periods of sanity, followed by complete disarray. His guilt manifests in the form of fevers and hallucinations that relentlessly distort his perception of reality, however, he also rationalises his guilt the way an intellect would and even manages to temporarily keep his sanity at bay through his justifications. For instance, Raskolnikoff goes so far as to compare himself to historical figures – such as Napoleon – in order to uphold reason; he says “Men are divided into ordinary and extraordinary men. The former must live in a state of obedience, and have no right to break the law, inasmuch as they are nothing more than ordinary men; the latter have a right to commit every kind of crime, and to break every law, from the very fact that they are extraordinary men” (Dostoevsky 206). This acts as a testament to Raskolnikoff’s logic; he is able to manipulate his consciousness at will, thereby altering the narrative of the story from moments of mayhem to stages of clarity.

Another example that showcases Raskolnikoff’s psychological range is when he visits the police station due to his landlady’s complaint regarding his unpaid rent. He comes across the character Mikolka – alternatively known as Nikolai, the painter – who falsely confesses to the murder of Alena. Bearing in mind that Raskolnikoff was already weakened physically and mentally due to his fevers and guilt, the false confession triggers an overlap of emotions: he trembles with fear – an action that does not go unnoticed by the police magistrate, Porphyrius Petrovich. Raskolnikoff breaks his silence by saying “You don’t seem to have expected this!” (Dostoevsky 292) in an attempt to regain his composure and avoid the already existent suspicion on him. The deliberate choice in sentence structure can be interpreted as a psychological maneuver intended to derail Porphyrius. In multiple instances, Raskolnikoff compares his interactions with

Porphyrius to an intricate game of cards where both players await for the other to reveal their hand. This wordplay reflects Raskolnikoff's illusion of control; he has a need to outwit Porphyrius and provoke him with the fact that he is the smarter man of the two. However, as soon as he reaches his quarters, Raskolnikoff is wracked with anxiety and his confident facade crumbles; he wonders how much time he has as a free man which initiates a cascade of anxious thoughts, signifying the duality of man. Through Raskolnikoff, Dostoevsky underscores the notion that the currency of action is responsibility. "Dostoevsky tells us that we embrace good and evil, that freedom is actualized in that context... and that there is a marked contrast between the world of degeneration and the world of regeneration" (Bourgeois 35). Raskolnikoff's crime causes him to spiral into moral ruin, however, his suffering also becomes a space where regeneration becomes a possibility if one were to confront their limitations, thus displaying that it is degeneration that brings us toward redemption. By understanding Raskolnikoff, we understand Dostoevsky and his beliefs toward himself and the human condition. While Dostoevsky's epileptic episodes would leave him physically and emotionally drained – a reflection of Raskolnikoff's fragmented narration – it would also cause surges of heightened consciousness that would inspire him and grant him access to these universal truths.

In *Notes from Underground*, the Underground Man's personality mirrors Dostoevsky's alienation and obsessive self-criticism that he had inherited from his time being cut-off from society at the Siberian prison camp. The writing style of the book being confessional in nature, paired with the knowledge of the trauma that Dostoevsky gained during his exile, enables readers to assume that the Underground Man's ruminations were modified projections of Dostoevsky's personal contemplations. Thus, when the Underground Man says "I want now to tell you,

gentlemen, whether you care to hear it or not, why I could not even become an insect. I tell you solemnly, that I have many times tried to become an insect. But I was not equal even to that. I swear, gentlemen, that to be too conscious is an illness—a real thorough-going illness.” (Dostoevsky 8), one can assume that Dostoevsky is not only talking about himself, but also addressing the loneliness that his trauma situated him in. Their dialogues and identities merge into one, displaying the psychological landscape of a unified individual. Additionally, the Underground Man claims “I invented adventures for myself and made up a life, so as at least to live in some way.” (Dostoevsky 25). These ‘adventures’ that the Underground Man refers to was possibly a coping mechanism developed by Dostoevsky in order to survive during his years in exile and as such, his writing should be considered an extension of it. Unburdening himself through the character of the Underground Man was perhaps Dostoevsky’s attempt at healing: “Speaking trauma pulls it from the realm of painful obscurity and hastens the process of rehabilitation.” (Pederson 338), which goes back to Dostoevsky’s perspective of the moral scale and how it relies on accountability. In the literary world, this ideology translates to traumas narratability. Furthermore, the Narrator’s bursts of rage and thinking patterns exhibit a mind fractured by neurological distress which again, is similar to that of Dostoevsky’s epileptic episodes. This, then, tells us Dostoevsky’s literature was not only articulately artistic, but also a means of processing trauma which only verifies Pederson’s claim and allows us to understand that Dostoevsky’s protagonists were simply conduits for him to exorcise himself.

The protagonists of both texts present traits that they have inherited from their creator such as clear psychological torment leading to temporal ruptures, compulsive self-scrutiny and alienation. All of the aforementioned elements only reinforce the hypothesis that Dostoevsky’s

entanglement with struggle shaped his literary themes, so much so, that they were used as narrative tools; his writing style echoed compulsive confessions, much like his characters – suggesting an overlap between him and his creations. “Reviewing the universal literary conquest by Dostoevsky, it is rather awe-inspiring that this posthumous victory was accomplished by a man who, after having completed more than twenty novels and tales, wrote: “I have not said the twentieth part of what I have to say.” (Fueloep-Miller 265). This upholds the argument that writing about trauma, to Dostoevsky, was a means of writing his way out of his neurosis. Additionally, this particular trademark of Dostoevsky is proof of how trauma can be utilized as a narrative device. “The structural level has allowed us to go beyond the contingencies of the historical situation to the objective themes about human existence uncovered in Dostoevsky” (Bourgeois 9). Bourgeois’ opinions on Dostoevsky are testament to the fact that the author’s intimate relationship with suffering transcends his autobiography and is a significant element in the structure of his fiction, allowing him to channel existential dread that has continued to reverberate across time and space.

Through his protagonists, Dostoevsky transforms his own afflictions into a universal language of suffering, proving that trauma can be wielded as a literary device. As such, this chapter has proven how the narration of trauma not only enriches literature, but also defies the laws of Caruth’s aforementioned unspeakability. By blurring the lines between the factual and fictional, Dostoevsky’s writing not only proves that trauma can in fact be documented but it also lays the groundwork for a more nuanced discourse on trauma’s narratability which shall be explored in detail in the following chapters.

Chapter 2:

Viewing Dostoevsky Through Cathy Caruth's Eyes

Cathy Caruth's *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History* provides a paradigm for perceiving trauma as a disruptive force that shatters memory, chronology, and historical narrative. According to Caruth, trauma is not fully experienced at the time of occurrence but rather returns later, influencing both individual and societal perceptions of the past: "Trauma describes an overwhelming experience of sudden, or catastrophic events, in which the response to the event occurs in the often delayed, and uncontrolled repetitive occurrence of hallucinations and other intrusive phenomena" (181). Caruth developed her conceptual framework by expanding on Freud's vision of repressed memory and stated that trauma is not merely a hidden memory, but a living wound that disrupts healing and linearity. Caruth also elaborates on how trauma is a cycle that entraps sufferers; they have no other choice but to revisit or re-enact their initial moment of crisis. Additionally, one of the arguments that Caruth mentions in her theory is the 'unspeakability' of trauma which suggests that as it tampers with our understanding of time and healing, trauma resists narrative structure and does not essentially fit into traditional storytelling. However, this particular aspect shall be bookended for the following chapter while the current one shall focus on how the aforementioned characteristics of Caruth's theory works cohesively with individual existential trauma, specifically in the selected texts of Dostoevsky. This chapter shall emphasize on examining trauma through Caruth's approach and shall attempt to provide a different perspective of analyzing the psychological turmoil of Dostoevsky's characters, particularly how they grapple with alienation, guilt and suffering. It shall also investigate how Dostoevsky's use of

non-linear storytelling such as the implementations of hallucinations and feverish monologues were essentially his attempt at discussing his trauma.

Caruth writes “Trauma consists not only in having confronted death, but in having survived, precisely, without knowing it. What one returns to, in the flashback, is not the incomprehensibility of the event of one's near death, but the very incomprehensibility of one's own survival” (25). This logic extends beyond the characters of the texts and surrounds Dostoevsky as well. Considering Dostoevsky's close proximity to death, it is an irrefutable fact that his concept of life was irreversibly changed; grappling with the flimsy nature of mortality had traumatised him and reevaluated his perception of existence, which only solidifies Caruth's argument about how trauma has little to do with a precise event but rather revolves around the survivor's inability to process their continuance despite the event in question. This ‘latency’ compels victims into a cyclical pattern of re-experiencing trauma in uncontrolled and fragmented ways and helps us understand the overlap between Dostoevsky and his characters. Both Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man exhibit the inability to process trauma as their suffering is expressed through erratic behaviour, compulsive rationalization and ultimately psychological alienation.

In the case of Raskolnikoff, his trauma seems a little more complex seeing as it is deeply embedded with homicide. His conscience cannot grasp the psychological weight of his transgression, and so he becomes suspended in the space between perpetrator and victim. While his theory of the “extraordinary man” temporarily rationalizes murder in his mind, his response to trauma manifests through fevers, dreams and hallucinations: “He felt fearfully oppressed... although he was almost always alone, in reality he could never feel so. Strange to say, the more

solitary the place, the more Raskolnikoff felt haunted by an invisible presence” (Dostoevsky 371). The psychological turmoil that follows Raskolnikoff post-murder does not solely revolve around the act itself, but rather his inability to grasp the reality of taking someone’s life and evading justice in the process. In another example, Raskolnikoff says to himself “I believe that, if she came to life again, I should kill her as I did before” (Dostoevsky 223). This tells us that his trauma post-murder does not only revolve around the act, but also around the dissolution of his empathy and identity. This disorientation results from both the collapse of his Napoleon Complex, and his denial of it: “The shattering of assumptions of personal competence and control, and of one’s basic trust in the inherent justness, order, and benevolence of the universe, creates enormous distress, vulnerability and uncertainty for many trauma survivors” (Eagle and Kaminer 61). By extension, this distorts Raskolnikoff’s concept of time as his trauma does not fade but rather merges with the present through these fevered visions and hallucinations, thereby creating a sense of non-linearity in his life. Furthermore, the disjointed time frame directly feeds into the very cycle that prevents healing and ensures that the sufferer is trapped between past and present – or rather, fiction and reality – reinforcing the crux of Caruth’s model of trauma being an unfinished experience. However, this fragmented narrative structure does not only tell us about the impact of the crime on Raskolnikoff’s conscience, but also displays how Dostoevsky cleverly employs trauma as a literary device in storytelling.

Similarly, the Underground Man’s trademark tendency of reliving past humiliations is a signifier of him being unable to move past them. He has a compulsive obsession with recalling past grievances, bringing them to life through exaggerated monologues and self-beration. However, while he immerses himself in hatred, he also exhibits delusions of grandeur. In the

following quote: “My jests, gentlemen, are of course in bad taste, jerky, involved, lacking self-confidence. But of course that is because I do not respect myself. Can a man of perception respect himself at all?” (Dostoevsky 23), it can be deduced that while he possesses contempt for himself, he also considers himself to be “a man of perception” which makes him a victim of both the inferiority and superiority complex; he despises himself and his predicament but he also believes that he is better than his peers which is yet another self-destructive quality as it sabotages the potential for forming meaningful relationships. While these attributes are testament to the repetitive nature of trauma, it also displays the defense mechanisms that develop in order to cope with traumatic experiences and tells us that the Underground Man’s fixation on his past is merely a means of survival for the present: “In Dostoevsky's world, one finds something natural in the underground man's desire to suffer, to confess and humiliate himself. This vulnerability, however, often simply masks an egoism, a desire to remain impenetrable—which is why he constantly reminds us that he lies, so that he protects himself from divulging too much... he desires relationships and yet also desires to tyrannize in those relationships” (Jackson 181). As he cannot perceive himself or others with respect and has an inclination to vandalizing meaningful relationships, Dostoevsky’s Underground Man is yet another victim of the cyclic pattern that ensnares victims – a fact that Caruth mentions in her analysis of trauma. Yet again, we bear witness to how Dostoevsky – and his characters – keenly navigate through trauma and observe how it translates in the real world. Dostoevsky equips the Underground Man with existential despair which recasts him into a character from a fictional world to one that exists in society. Through the use of trauma, Dostoevsky plants a hypocritical yet insecure man into his storyline which turns the Underground Man into a relatable person that suffers from his inadequacies and its consequences – a universal feeling that plagues the human experience. This approach to trauma is essentially a conversion of

personal misery into a collective experience. Dostoevsky borrowed extensively from real-life traumas and used it as a literary tool, which allowed him to capture society as a whole: “It is the cognitive function of realism that Dostoevsky values: in its most immediate action true realism captures social reality in movement” (Louis Jackson 249).

Caruth asks: “The problem of survival, in trauma, thus emerges specifically as the question: what does it mean for consciousness to survive?” (24). In relevance to Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man, survival in the aftermath of trauma is about punishment and can only be tolerated with complete absolution procured through extreme penance. Through seeking retribution, Dostoevsky endows his protagonists with a chance of spiritual rebirth which is how and why both characters have the pressing need to discuss their woes. Either amongst themselves or to another person, confession plays a critical function in how Dostoevsky views trauma, which highlights the last argument of Caruth’s theory: trauma is inherently unspeakable. She writes “For if the return of the traumatizing event appears in many respects like a waking memory, it can nonetheless only occur in the mode of a symptom or a dream” (24), which essentially claims that as trauma is not initially processed and is non-linear in nature, it resists language and lives beyond the traditional narrative structure since it cannot be recalled coherently. However, this thesis aims to refute this reasoning in order to bridge the gap in understanding trauma by using Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man as evidence of the fact that trauma is not wholly unspeakable. Considering how their suffering emerges through indirect references, psychological haunting and an obsession with talking about their anguish, it becomes increasingly evident that their trauma does not resist narration, it resists silence. As such, this aspect of Caruth’s theory shall be investigated thoroughly with reference to Dominick LaCapra’s divergent approach to trauma.

Chapter 3

Unspeakability Versus the Testimony of Trauma

As established, while Caruth's seminal work helps us discern the nature of trauma and the effect it has on its victims, it also tells us that trauma exists beyond the bounds of coherent representation and resists traditional narrative. "It is only in recognizing traumatic experience as a paradoxical relation between destructiveness and survival that we can also recognize the legacy of incomprehensibility at the heart of catastrophic experience" (Caruth 24). According to Caruth, the grief that orbits victims after a traumatic event is not just the event itself, but also the inability to comprehend their survival post-event; it is this precise incomprehensibility that fragments the speech of victims, rendering them fundamentally unspeakable. Characters such as Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man battle their afflictions through conflicting and often disjointed retellings, making them prime examples of this perspective. The portrayal of their inner conflict solidifies Caruth's assertion that trauma transports their victims into the chasms of language, where they struggle with communicating their trauma in a linear fashion. This chapter, however, aims to refute Caruth's claims by engaging with Dominick LaCapra's views on trauma from his article *Trauma, History, Memory, Identity: What Remains?*

In his article, LaCapra delivers a nuanced angle on trauma, one that particularly disputes Caruth's notions on unspeakability by introducing newer concepts such as empathic unsettlement – a method of approaching trauma that strikes a balance between emotional connection and critical distance. Through this strategy, the depiction of trauma does not need to be reduced to incomprehensibility or silence because silence itself becomes open interpretation in literature:

“The narrative strategy of silence may create a 'gap' in time or feeling that allows the reader to imagine what might or could have happened to the protagonist, thereby broadening the meaning and effects of the experience” (Balaev 159). This school of thought only further dismantles Caruth’s approach of unspeakability. More importantly, LaCapra argues that even if it fails to be completely resolved, trauma can be ‘worked through’ via testimony and memory which catalyses the healing process of an individual. The concept of working through trauma, as per LaCapra, is a crucial foundation for recognising how trauma can be understood and thus depicted despite its inherent challenges. In contrast to Caruth’s theory, LaCapra contends that trauma could potentially be dealt with through empathic settlement and memory work: “The ability to make an effective, nondeceptive distinction [between past and present] depends on working through traumatic and post-traumatic experience in a way that requires *inter alia* memory work that situates the trauma in a past related to—even in a sense still bound up with live issues in, but not repeatedly re-lived or conflated with—the present” (377). This emphasizes LaCapra’s belief that working through trauma entails situating it in the past while acknowledging its effects in the present; speaking about it could possibly offer closure.

For the Underground Man, his sense of alienation and self-loathing is the crux of his suffering. While his characteristics portray the difficulty of expressing psychological torment, his erratic and obsessive narration displays that trauma is not beyond expression, despite what Caruth suggests. On the contrary, LaCapra disputes Caruth’s theory by claiming that trauma seeks to leak through the barricades of silence: “Traumatic memories, then, are not elusive or absent; they are potentially more detailed and more powerful than normal ones. This fact should leave literary critics open to the possibility that authors may record trauma with excessive detail

and vibrant intensity. Indeed, we may need more words—not fewer—to accurately represent its effects in text.” (Pederson 339). Although the Underground Man’s monologues are repetitive and often incoherent, they reveal the extent of his struggle to find meaning in his existence. LaCapra’s empathic unsettlement is particularly emphasized here as it permits pain to be depicted without minimizing it to incomprehensibility. Reading *Notes from Underground* with LaCapra’s perspective brings forth a novel interpretation of the protagonist; although the Underground Man’s means of processing trauma are self-destructive, it is an attempt of him working through his trauma: “Unworked-through trauma, especially when it is foundational or structural, can become invidious and self-centered, lending itself to some very dubious uses and abuses.” (394). However, the consequences of the Underground Man’s self-sabotaging tendencies – such as profound isolation – are also an example of LaCapra’s warnings of how failure of working-through trauma can result in regression.

Another element LaCapra discusses in his article is that trauma can be recorded through testimony (re: oral history) even if it is fragmented or contradictory. He stresses on the significance of listening to the voices of survivors and interacting with them in a way that respects their emotional burden and complexity: “Testimony also raises in acute form the role of memory, for it is typically memory that allows witnesses to access their experience of events, and it is significant that testimony has a distinctive dimension with respect to experience with its important but problematic relation to events” (381). Furthermore, LaCapra writes “Even memory’s 'tricks' and the reasons for their occurrence are themselves valid and valuable objects of historical and critical scrutiny” (382) which implies that the traumatic memory of an event does not sully documentation, but rather sheds light on the ways in which trauma alters and reshapes people's perceptions of their

experiences. He criticizes the proclivity of disregarding memory as an unreliable source of information, positing that even the adjustments made upon recollection are imperative features of critical and historical scrutiny. A good example of memory work would be Raskolnikoff's disjointed narrative as he battles with the psychological ramifications of the murder that he commits. While his inability to process his guilt illustrates the struggles of healing from trauma as Caruth suggests, it is also proof of how trauma can be depicted, no matter how inaccurately. For instance, Raskolnikoff's dream of a horse being beaten to death can be interpreted as the manifestation of his guilt and also how the magnitude of his crime shadows his mind even when he is at rest. Although the dream is fragmented, it directly tells us how the character responds to his actions even in an unconscious state; the moral and emotional dimensions of his suffering is evident in a way that is narratable. This tells us that every fraction of trauma is relevant in its analysis, and that discontinuity should not discredit. The statement "Trauma doesn't efface memory, but it may warp it, and textual depictions of such distortion may be helpful clues in identifying its effects in literature" (Pederson 340) reinforces the idea that trauma victims are also victims of altered versions of reality – such as Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man – and also have a compulsion to over-narrate their memories, rather than struggle with the inability to articulate them.

It is vital for readers to remember that the sufferings of the Underground Man and Raskolnikoff are not unique; they mirror larger historical and cultural traumas residing in 19th-century Russia that were sponsored by poverty and social inequality. This knowledge offers a connection with LaCapra's other perspective regarding trauma being a collective experience that is passed down the line rather than a stationary individual inheritance. As a result, overcoming

trauma requires acknowledging its generational effects and accepting moral responsibility for its legacy, both of which Dostoevsky undertakes in his writings. LaCapra writes “Descendants of victims and of perpetrators may possibly share something significant, for they inherit a burden for which they are not, but may feel, guilty and for which they are within limits answerable and may assume responsibility”(380). If these protagonists were to be regarded as literary embodiments of Dostoevsky’s psyche – as they have been established to be the product of his own creation – we must respect the notion that they are inheritors of his trauma. This, then, returns us to the foundational claim of how Dostoevsky imbues his characters with his own suffering, thus employing it as a literary tool. Dostoevsky reconfigures trauma from an individual experience, rendering it accessible and poignant amongst readers, which is what secured his legacy in the literary canon. Pederson also writes, “A new generation of trauma theorists should emphasize both the accessibility of traumatic memories and the possibility that victims may construct reliable narrative accounts of it. Accordingly, these theorists should shift their attention away from gaps and toward actual text. This new approach will open up broad new expanses of material for interpretation” (338). This adds credibility to LaCapra’s approach as he shifts his focus from the gaps in narrative trauma by moving away from Caruth’s unspeakability and instead relocating it to the information that has been given. This perspective expands the borders of trauma studies, urging it to be more inclusive of actual testimony and lived experience, rather than theory alone.

LaCapra’s concept of trauma offers a strong foundation for comprehending how trauma can be documented despite its inherent challenges. He contradicts Caruth’s notion that trauma is unspeakable by focusing on the vital role of memory, testimony and ethical duty which proves that trauma is not beyond language. *Crime and Punishment* and *Notes from Underground* exemplify

this approach as they examine the affective, psychological and moral dimensions of trauma through fragmented storytelling. Through Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man, Dostoevsky verifies LaCapra's theory and demonstrates that despite its nonconformity, trauma can be expressed. Caruth's understanding of the nature of trauma, paired with LaCapra's method of engaging with trauma, brings forth a new way of understanding victims and how they interact with their struggles. This combined perspective illustrates how Dostoevsky corresponded with trauma in his personal life, underscoring literature's role in capturing the various modalities through which trauma can be documented.

Conclusion

Dostoevsky's fiction is a testament that trauma is far from being a paralyzing force and can be utilized as a source of narrative strategy – one that goes beyond linear temporality, fractured identity and silence. As proved, trauma has the potential to reconstruct meaning through disruption and language, or lack thereof. Through the examination of *Notes from Underground* and *Crime and Punishment*, this thesis has revealed how the Underground Man and Raskolnikoff mirror their creators psychological landscape and brings forth the discussion that trauma is not a static wound, but a dynamic process – a catalyst for deep moral reckoning, unavoidable self-interrogation and finally, agency.

The core of this study has been the critical dialogue between Cathy Caruth's and Dominick LaCapra's theories of trauma. Although Caruth's framework significantly contributes to trauma studies, her stance on traumatic events defying representation is a constrictive lens that imposes limitations on their analysis, as proved by LaCapra's theory and strengthened by Dostoevsky's fiction. While Raskolnikoff and the Underground Man exemplify Caruth's notion of trauma's fragmentation, their relentless introspective monologues and attempts of articulating their struggle goes against Caruth's belief of 'unspeakability'. By contrast, LaCapra's theory of working-through and empathic unsettlement brings forth a more nuanced perspective by acknowledging the destabilizing effects of trauma while upholding the possibility of its articulation through the gaps in memory, testimony and ethical engagement. While Dostoevsky's protagonists remain chained to Caruth's paradigm of cyclical suffering, through confession, rationalization and self-exposure,

they visibly actively narrate their struggles, thus proving the assertion that trauma *can* be documented.

By dissecting the two novels with relevance to the aforementioned theories, this thesis has proved that Dostoevsky's trauma hailing from his epilepsy, alienation and mock execution are more than mere biographical footnotes and can be recognised as a generative force that shaped and enhanced his literary methods. The use of temporal ruptures via fragmentation, obsessive-compulsive self-analysis, introspective monologues and psychological realism is reflective of Dostoevsky's personal engagement with trauma as both a subject, and a device. Through the incorporation of trauma, Dostoevsky translates it into a stylistic weapon where his narratives replicate the authentic experience of traumatic memory while permitting it to take form and coherence. Thus, both *Crime and Punishment* and *Notes from Underground* become case studies in how literature can position trauma without forcing it to surrender to a singular form of representation.

By connecting Dostoevsky's narrative with LaCapra's theoretical findings, this research contributes to trauma studies in two ways: it challenges the deterministic approach of Caruth's model, illustrating how Dostoevsky's fiction foreshadows contemporary understandings of traumatic representation and also positions trauma as a literary resource that fractures, but also redesigns time, morality and identity. Ultimately, this study reinforces the idea that although trauma is distressing, it is not simply a terminal collapse of meaning but also a crucible for reinvention proving that in literature, each experience is as legible as it is transformative, as demonstrated by Dostoevsky and his protagonists.

Works Cited

- Balaev, Michelle. "Trends in Literary Trauma Theory." *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2008, pp. 149–66. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44029500>.
- Bourgeois, Patrick Lyall. "Dostoevsky and Existentialism: An Experiment in Hermeneutics." *Journal of Thought*, vol. 15, no. 2, 1980, pp. 29–37. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42588842>.
- Caruth, Cathy. "Unclaimed Experience: Trauma and the Possibility of History." *Yale French Studies*, no. 79, 1991, pp. 181–92. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2930251>.
- Caruth, Cathy. "Violence and Time: Traumatic Survivals." *Assemblage*, no. 20, 1993, pp. 24–25. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3181682>.
- Dahlkvist, Tobias. "The Epileptic Genius: The Use of Dostoevsky as Example in the Medical Debate over the Pathology of Genius." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 76, no. 4, 2015, pp. 587–608. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43948762>.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. "Notes from the Underground." *Planet PDF*, www.planetpublish.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Notes_from_the_Underground_NT.pdf.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. "Crime and Punishment." *Google Books*, 1886, books.google.com.bd/books/about/Crime_and_Punishment.html?id=aCgVAAAAAYAAJ

[&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button&hl=en&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false.](#)

Fueloep-Miller, René. “The Posthumous Life of Dostoevsky.” *The Russian Review*, vol. 15, no. 4, 1956, pp. 259–65. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/126091>.

Jackson, J. A. “Freedom and Otherness: The Religious Dimension of Dostoevsky’s ‘Notes from Underground.’” *Religion & Literature*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2011, pp. 179–86. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23347097>.

Jackson, Robert Louis. “Dostoevsky’s Concept of Reality and Its Representation in Art.” *Close Encounters: Essays on Russian Literature*, Academic Studies Press, 2013, pp. 239–60. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1zxshr0.19>.

Kaminer, Debra, and Gillian Eagle. “Trauma as a Crisis of Meaning.” *Traumatic Stress in South Africa*, Wits University Press, 2010, pp. 60–79. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.18772/22010105096.7>.

Konstantin, Mochulsky. *Dostoevsky : His Life and Work*. Princeton University Press, 1967. *Google Books*, books.google.com.bd/books?id=mDKphT8_XLsC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false.

LaCapra, Dominick. "Trauma, History, Memory, Identity: What Remains?" *History and Theory*, vol. 55, no. 3, 2016, pp. 375–400. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24809608>.

Pederson, Joshua. "Speak, Trauma: Toward a Revised Understanding of Literary Trauma Theory." *Narrative*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2014, pp. 333–53. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24615578>.