

5-2015

Finding a resolution : religion's role in resolving man's internal dyad.

Marianna Michael
University of Louisville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.louisville.edu/honors>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Michael, Marianna, "Finding a resolution : religion's role in resolving man's internal dyad." (2015). *College of Arts & Sciences Senior Honors Theses*. Paper 61.
<http://doi.org/10.18297/honors/61>

This Senior Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Sciences at ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts & Sciences Senior Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of ThinkIR: The University of Louisville's Institutional Repository. This title appears here courtesy of the author, who has retained all other copyrights. For more information, please contact thinkir@louisville.edu.

Finding a Resolution:

religion's role in resolving man's internal dyad

By Marianna Michael

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Graduation *summa cum laude*
and for Graduation with Honors from the Department of Humanities
University of Louisville May 2015

Introduction

Arthur Schopenhauer states, “For every animal, and more especially for man, a certain conformity and proportion between the will and the intellect is necessary for existing or making any progress in the world. The more precise and correct the proportion which nature establishes, the more easy, safe and agreeable will be the passage through the world” (*Religion: A Dialogue and Other Essays* 89). Schopenhauer differentiates two natures within man and labels the dyad as will and intellect. He maintains a need for “a certain conformity and proportion” between the two natures in order to experience an “easy, safe and agreeable” life. Man’s division into two natures is a theme that is revised through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Friedrich Nietzsche, Fyodor Dostoevsky, Thomas Mann, and Hermann Hesse rework Schopenhauer’s dyad and attempt to resolve the natural tension found between two competing natures.

The end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century ushered in scientific discoveries and new technological innovations. As the influence of these fields grew, subjects that depend on a suspension of disbelief, such as religion and art, lost their hold on popular imagination. It is during this time that shaping two inner natures becomes an established endeavor. Philosophers and novelists move away from the physical world and initiate the quest to understand the uncharted territory of man’s interior. The first step in resolving man’s inner nature is to classify the forces. Schopenhauer identifies the forces as will and intellect. Nietzsche characterizes the natures based on characters from Greek myth: Apollo and Dionysus. These natures are complementary, yet in constant strife with one another with rare instances of reconciliation that creates art. Dostoevsky seems to recognize the natures as reason and will. Peter Roberts describes Dostoevsky’s perspective on the natures and states “If we were to abandon desire and willing and get ‘completely in cahoots with reason’... We might still discover

that ‘reason is only reason and satisfies only man’s reasoning capacity, while wanting is a manifestation of whole life’” (209). Both reason and will are necessary for “a manifestation of whole life.” Mann uses Nietzsche’s established dyad to comment on how art cannot sustain life or mitigate the effects of the competing natures. Hesse describes the dyad with the German words *Geist* and *Natur*, which translate into spirit and nature respectively. *Geist* embodies structure and *Natur* reflects spontaneity. The variety of terms and their definitions reveal that each author conceptualizes varied components of the dyad.

Though Nietzsche posits that art emerges due to reconciled natures, *The Brothers Karamazov*, *Death in Venice*, and *Narcissus and Goldmund* novels prove that man needs more than intermittent moments of reconciliation in order to live a full life. Dostoevsky subscribes to religion in order to provide his characters with a means to successfully balance reason and will simultaneously. Mann’s novel expounds the insufficiency of sporadic moments of creation to help man live a full life. By combining Gustav von Aschenbach’s narrative with dialogues between Socrates and Phaedrus, *Death in Venice* shows the importance of art as a reconciling force between Apollo and Dionysus, but the death of the protagonist reveals art’s shortcomings. Goldmund, Hesse’s protagonist, combines the religion utilized by Dostoevsky and the art used by Mann to experience a full life from beginning to end.

Dostoevsky, Mann, and Hesse present characters who suffer greatly due to dominance by a singular nature. Ivan Karamazov, Gustav von Aschenbach, and Goldmund suppress their emotions in favor of a logic driven existence. Dmitri Karamazov indulges in revelry and excess and chooses not to utilize reason as a means of discipline. Each of these characters experiences a formative change that grants them the opportunity to achieve homeostasis. Alexei Karamazov stands as the only character who embodies a balance of forces from the start of the novel; though

he falters, he is never at risk of completely losing his balance between the natures. Personal relationships with spiritual advisers and with women provide the characters a way to understand their natures. Spiritual advisers appear as tangible representations of religion. Women, who are generally projections of will or the Dionysian nature, assist the protagonists in recognizing their inner struggle. The characters who fail to form positive personal relationships endure greater struggles than the rest. Dostoevsky, Mann, and Hesse use dreams to make their characters confront the opposing natures. The blending of the physical world and the interior world allows the characters to easily view their tension. It is the characters' reactions to their dreams that determine their success in establishing balance. Through literature, the authors reveal their own opinions on the state of man's inner forces and their effect on the physical world.

A Revival of Myth

As the influence of art and religion progressively waned over the course of many centuries, the increased development of science and technology alongside the rise of globalization became the final force to end the dominance of emotion-based products and beliefs. Karen Armstrong's "The Great Western Transformation" from *A Short History of Myth* marks the decline of myth—one of the world's most potent religions and art forms—at the beginning of the sixteenth century. "The long process of modernization, which took Europe some three centuries, involved a series of profound changes: industrialisation, the transformation of agriculture, political and social revolutions to reorganise society to meet the new conditions, and an intellectual 'enlightenment' that denigrated myth as useless, false and outmoded" (Armstrong 120-121). Myth had been a way for humans to understand the world around them. In a world where illness, wars, and natural disasters were common, myth was a reliable means to understand the unfathomable. As learning institutions grew and knowledge spread through

numerous interactions between cultures, the physical world could be better understood. Myth was no longer needed with the emergence of quantifiable facts.

Karen Armstrong posits, “By the end of the nineteenth century, the severance of *logos* and *mythos* seemed complete” (132). Armstrong’s quote hinges on one word, “seemed.” By stating that the severance “seemed complete,” the author leaves room for myth’s return.

Armstrong expands her belief and says, “Friedrich Nietzsche proclaimed that God was dead. In a sense, he was right. Without myth, cult, ritual and ethical living, the sense of the sacred dies. By making ‘God’ a wholly notional truth, reached by the critical intellect alone, modern men and women had killed it for themselves” (132). Armstrong calls upon the philosopher who declares the rebirth of tragedy to reveal his belief that God is dead. With the loss of the sacred, Nietzsche attempts to reconcile the Apollonian and Dionysian natures solely through art. Art offers an intermittent resolution, but the natures spend the majority of the time competing. Sporadic resolves do not lay a firm foundation for man to live a well-balanced life. Nietzsche's contemporaries and successors revive religion as a means to achieve prolonged reconciliation.

Though Greek myth persists as a classic in higher education, through subjects such as history, anthropology, and literature, its direct practice is obsolete. The novel and religion universally adopt myth. The rituals from myth would be adopted by institutionalized religion while its stories would actualize in the form of the novel. Literature would surpass sculptures, paintings, and music in the struggle to represent man’s inner workings. The novel becomes the main form that represents expressive tragic narratives in the 19th and 20th centuries, though the art form’s roots were established well before the 17th century. Novels provide the artist the ability to explore the inner depths of a character and offer room to substantiate their claims.

Myth's Transformation

After being confronted by a student, Thomas Mann was made aware that he imitated the mythical heroic quest in *The Magic Mountain*. Armstrong explains that the figure of “the Quester Hero” exists in the collective unconscious and is perpetuated in society through literature. “The mythology of the heroic quest was embedded in [Mann’s] subconscious and he drew upon it without realising what he had done” (Armstrong 144). The themes and structures from myth translate into a more modern form of literature. Often including themes such as hubris, deus ex machina, and foreshadowing, the novel adopts myth and modernizes the way stories are told. Myth transitioned into the novel as its new manifestation in the age of technology. The literary manifestation corresponds to traditional myth in many ways including structural elements and themes. In *Aspects of the Novel*, E. M. Forster highlights the main components that shape the literary art form.

Focusing on plot, characters, themes, and structure, *Aspects of the Novel* reveals where the features of myth can be found in story form. Forster connects myth to the novel when he explains the novel's reliance on fantasy and prophecy. Each of the features brings in supernatural elements to the otherwise logical storyline. Fantasy and prophecy “are alike in having gods, and unlike in the gods they have. There is in both the sense of mythology which differentiates them from other aspects of our subject” (Forster 109). Fantasy establishes belief in the supernatural. Prophecy is set forth as a tone that allows readers to understand how to experience the text. Forster explains that prophecy answers, “what particular view of the universe is recommended” (126). The qualities associated with these themes are necessary for the novel’s universality and ability to connect to the supernatural. Fantasy and prophecy provide means to analyze hypothetical situations that could not be understood otherwise.

Forster also classifies the characters of the novel into two different groups: flat and round. “Flat characters were called ‘humorous’ in the seventeenth century, and are sometimes called types, and sometimes caricatures. In their purest form, they are constructed round a single idea or quality” (67). Round characters, though they can embody a single attribute, are “not tethered to those qualities” and have the ability to change (77). Dostoevsky, Mann, and Hesse each use flat characters as foils to their round characters in order to emphasize the characters’ inner battle. In *The Brothers Karamazov*, Dostoevsky sets aside Dmitri, Ivan, and Alexei as the characters with the greatest ability to change. People like Fyodor Pavlovich, Smerdyakov, and Rakitin are one-dimensional and assist in adding new layers to each of the brothers’ character qualities while maintaining their unchangeable characteristic. Lev Shestov expounds upon the apathy towards flat characters, “A person lives and learns from life. And he who has lived to old age without having seen anything new is more likely to astonish us for his lack of perceptiveness than to command our respect” (Shestov 157). Mann surrounds Aschenbach with inconsequential characters in order to draw attention to the main character’s inner struggle. Tadzio, the object of Aschenbach’s obsession, is merely a boy on vacation; any other qualities embodied by Tadzio emerge from Aschenbach’s affection. Hesse, like Dostoevsky, names his main characters in the title of his novel and builds the readers’ experience around Narcissus and Goldmund. Goldmund’s interactions with people act as learning experiences that shape the protagonist while rendering the other characters dispensable. Narcissus acts as Goldmund’s foil and mirror. The two characters, bearing different natures, influence each other and assist their counterpart to achieve their internal balance; though Narcissus is not physically present in the majority of the text, he is an important example of the dueling natures and round characters.

The Impact of Nietzsche's Birth of Tragedy

Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy* is a necessary component in the discussion of dyads, not because of its ingenuity or universality, but because of the description it offers about the competing natures. While a variety of terms and conceptions describe the pairing of logic and emotion, it is Nietzsche who adds substance to the forces. Nietzsche identifies both natures through the pantheon of gods. From the onset of the text, Nietzsche places Apollo aside from the original twelve Olympian gods. Nietzsche denies Apollo's equality with the other eleven gods and posits, "Apollo gave birth in general to this entire Olympian world, and so in this sense Apollo is its father" (Nietzsche 8). The paternal elevation of Apollo explains why his nature is innately more dominant in human consciousness. Social constructions value a detached and logical mind; this belief perpetuates through different ages and cultures. As the various novels show, man lives by his logical nature while repressing or ignoring his more passionate emotions. The acknowledgement of logic and denial of passion proves to be one way to live a well-ordered life, but causes great tension due to the subconscious undercurrents of passion. Dionysus, the offspring of Zeus and Semele, emerges as the antithesis to Apollo; Dionysus seemingly emerges without origin in Nietzsche's text. The importance of Dionysus does not come in his relation to the Greek gods, but in the challenge he presents to Apollo.

Dionysus emerges in *The Birth of Tragedy* much like he appears in nature—unprompted and sudden. In the beginning, Nietzsche simply associates the god with drunkenness and labels him a threat "to family life and its venerable traditions" (6). In Greek myth, Apollo and Dionysus are both patrons of the arts. It is Dionysus who guards the Oracle at Delphi when Apollo is away. The gods are, as Nietzsche explains, not two competing natures, but rather, two parts of a whole. Comparing the struggle between the gods to that between the genders, Nietzsche states that

tension is necessary for the creation of art. “[A]rt is bound up with the *Apollonian* and *Dionysian* duality: just as procreation depends on the duality of sexes, involving perpetual strife with only periodically intervening reconciliations” (1). Nietzsche’s comparison is quite striking. The Apollonian and Dionysian tension is only resolved through art. The image of man and woman’s struggle being reconciled through procreation leads to the conclusion that natural tension resolves into life. Nietzsche, therefore, posits that art is life. The main contention within Nietzsche’s argument is that art only offers “periodically intervening reconciliations.” The arbitrary appearance of reconciliation cannot consistently alleviate the tension within the dyad. By building a bridge between art and reality, man is able to experience life more fully; Nietzsche’s dreamer embodies this idea.

In the Apollonian state, the creator experiences the world through dreams as a detached viewer. The Dionysian state allows the creator to become an actor in the dream state of ecstasy. The artist can also, according to Nietzsche, experience the world through both stages and is then able to see the “*symbolic dream-picture*” (5).

But at this juncture, when the will is most imperiled, *art* approaches, as a redeeming and healing enchantress; she alone may transform these horrible reflections on the terror and absurdity of existence into representations with which man can live. These are the representations of the *sublime* as the artistic conquest of the awful, and of the comic as the artistic release from the nausea of the absurd (23).

The text not only uses two parts of Greek myth to explain man’s inner division, but redirects their influence back into myth. Nietzsche justifies his argument through the foundation of human art and Greek myth exists as the cornerstone for storytelling. By hearkening back to this ancient

art form, Nietzsche establishes that tragedy exists purely due to the strife between Apollo and Dionysus and any work of art exists due to attempts to reconcile both natures. Dostoevsky, Mann, and Hesse each utilize dreams in pivotal moments in their main characters' lives to emphasize significant occasions. It is through the resolution of tension present in the dream or after it that grants the characters relief.

Though being able to understand both natures is necessary in order to experience life fully, society often favors the Apollonian detached logic to the immersive Dionysus ecstasies. The perpetuation of Apollo as the more desirable nature finds its roots in Ancient Greece. Nietzsche, not disguising his anger towards a highly revered Greek philosopher states, "It was an altogether new-born demon. And it was called *Socrates*" (42). With the introduction of Socrates, the text shifts from an Apollonian and Dionysian struggle that resolves into art to a tension of form that cannot be reconciled. Nietzsche explains that Socrates' influence on Euripides introduced a new style of "*Socratic tendency*" as opposed to what had been described as "*Æschylean tragedy*" (42). Socrates' influence turns art and emotion into a calculated equation that is set forth in rhetoric. "These stimulants are cool, paradoxical *thoughts*, replacing Apollonian intuitions—and fiery *passions*, replacing Dionysian ecstasies; and it may be added, thoughts and passions copied very realistically and in no sense suffused with the atmosphere of art" (43). Not only does the "*Socratic tendency*" change art, it also changes the competing forces. Instead of inherent forces such as "intuitions" and "ecstasies," people experience artificial "thoughts" and "passions." Art, specifically the Euripidean play, is detached from natural emotion; there is nothing natural left in the tension between Apollo and Dionysus that can inspire art. Due to Socrates' manipulation of the perpetual strife between the gods, tragedy died. Long after Socrates' "contamination," myth would continue to emerge from a plethora of cultures, but

the potency and influence of such stories gradually waned into oblivion. Dostoevsky, Mann, and Hesse revitalize the art form as a means to expound upon man's inner dyad.

Fyodor Dostoevsky: A Spectrum of Tension

Temira Pachmuss describes Dostoevsky's novels as "a progression from a state of internal chaos to the realization of the many polarities existing in man, ending in an ultimate spiritual regeneration through man's acceptance of his chaotic nature" (212). Pachmuss asserts that chaos can only be resolved through recognizing "the many polarities existing in man." For the Russian author, man houses two natures: reason and will. Reason translates to the rational nature that allows man to reach plausible conclusions. Will emerges as a force connected with feeling and passion, rather than structured logic. Peter Roberts asserts, Dostoevsky "allowed us to see the tension at work between rationality and irrationality, prompting us to reconsider some of our most cherished assumptions about what is reasonable. Dostoevsky's work *unsettles us as reasoning begins*" (Roberts 216). Religion arises as the solution to avoid "either totalitarian tyranny, or else chaos and destruction" ("A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky" 169). Mitigating chaos is a two-part process: realizing "the many polarities existing in man" and "striving for religion" (169).

Religion played an important role in Dostoevsky's life. After experimenting with various political and philosophical movements, Dostoevsky subscribed to Russian Orthodox beliefs. "Dostoevsky adopted such a course not because he was absolutely convinced that he was right, but because outside it he saw nothing except chaos, destruction, and self-destruction" (*Nietzsche: an Approach* 141). Instead of embracing the madness located in the world, Dostoevsky chose to accept religion. Though Dostoevsky may have harbored feelings of atheism, he strove to rid

himself of them because he could not find another solution that did not end in “chaos, destruction, and self-destruction.” Dostoevsky accepted religion because he understood

God Himself as a kind of being that is ‘supplementary’ in relation to man, not opposed to him. From a transcendent Absolute, God turns into the immanent basis of the empirical individual person; God is the potential fullness of the person’s life manifestations, its potential absoluteness, which each person is called upon to realize at every moment of his life (Evlampiev 12).

The emergence of God as supplementary makes Him approachable; the necessity to establish a relationship with the Creator escalates. Through Christianity, Dostoevsky viewed men as “a social organism” or a brotherhood (“A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky” 168). Universal love is the only means to experience a full life. “But although aware of [mankind’s] weakness and their miserable condition (so scornfully enumerated by the Grand Inquisitor), he yet added to his sincere striving for religion and equally strong wish for universal sympathy for the very reason that outside it he saw either totalitarian tyranny, or else chaos and destruction” (“A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky” 169). For Dostoevsky, God exists as a supplement to man and together they can live a bearable and noble life, while looking forward to a better future.

Dostoevsky’s reliance on religion to understand life and man’s inner workings is evident in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Biblical allusions and parts of the Russian Orthodox services are major themes in the work. Alexei, the proclaimed hero of the novel, is the physical representation of religion. The brothers’ relationship with religion ultimately affects their ability to reconcile their inner dyad.

First published in 1880, *The Brothers Karamazov* is an immense work in length and structure. Containing four parts, eleven books, and an epilogue, the novel produces a narrative

that connects many characters, themes, and theories.

Each part of this monumental work is almost a novel in itself, yet they all converge towards the denouement in the finale. The contrast between the brothers is worked out with unsurpassed subtlety. Moreover, while reading this masterpiece, we actually follow its parallel development on the three mentioned planes. We watch the background of a Russian town, the involved psychological experiences of the main characters and the spiritual import of it all (*Dostoevsky: An Approach* 36).

Dostoevsky utilizes fragmentation and convergence of different storylines to portray the inner workings of man. The three brothers do not share many characteristics beyond having the same father, but each of them experiences important aspects of their lives through dreams. Dreams enable “the writer to employ the magical and the mysterious within the realistic texture of the novel, and to show that ‘life is a dream’” (Pachmuss 219). Utilizing the idea that “life is a dream,” Dostoevsky employs visions as the means by which the characters can find an inner resolution between reason and will. The actions that each brother takes after his dreams signal their ability to reconcile their inner natures. The author establishes female influences who help the brothers recognize their competing natures. Grushenka, a moneylender, and Katya, a woman with a high standing in society, emerge as opposites who have incestuous associations with the Karamazov men. The women’s fluidity between members of the Karamazov family reinforces the brothers’ relationships. Grushenka and Katya help further the distinction of the dyad and offer the brothers an opportunity to become self-aware. The Karamazov brothers reveal different stages of allaying the psychological tension between reason and will through personal relationships, dream sequences, and associations with religion.

The characters of *The Brothers Karamazov* can be located on a spectrum ranging from reasonable to willful, with some falling at the extremes and one establishing a place in the middle. Dmitri, Ivan, and Alexei appear at different ends of the dyad. Physique and personality differentiate each of the Karamazov brothers. Dmitri, a twenty seven year old retired lieutenant, is the physical manifestation of will; he indulges himself to the point that he looks spent and concentrates solely on his basic needs (Dostoevsky 67-68). Dmitri exists at the willful end of the spectrum. Twenty four year old Ivan is known as one of Russia's greatest minds, which comes as a result of his strong adherence to reason. From an early age Ivan "was somehow gloomy and withdrawn, far from timid" (15). Ivan inhabits the reasonable end of the spectrum. Dmitri and Ivan's characters dictate that they exist separately and at opposite ends of the spectrum. Alexei, though the youngest son, takes his place in between reason and will. The author describes Alexei as "a well-built, red-cheeked nineteen year old youth, clear eyed and bursting with health" (25). Alexei's inner resolution manifests itself through his healthy physical appearance as opposed to that of his brothers. The brothers emerge as physical representations of their natures, which their dreams later address.

At the start of the novel a nameless biographer recounts the importance of Alexei Karamazov as the narrative's hero. The biographer preemptively defends his choice and says, "he is a strange man, even an odd one" because he "bears within himself the heart of the whole" (3). Alexei is the hero due to his compassion, a trait that the people of his community lack. Compassion and spirituality are qualities Alexei uses for the betterment of his brothers. In introducing Alexei on the verge of permanently shutting "himself up in [a monastery] for the rest of his life," Dostoevsky binds the young man with religion, a theme that continues for the rest of the novel (18). Alexei is "not at all a fanatic" or "a mystic," but rather "an early lover of

mankind” (18). “Early lover of mankind” is an epithet the Orthodox Church uses for Christ; Dostoevsky aligns Alexei to the savior. Alexei must first achieve his resolution before helping his brothers establish their personal equilibriums. This process is illustrated, in part, by the novel’s representation of the dreams of all three brothers.

Dmitri and Ivan each experience two dream sequences. The first is a type of waking vision, while the second is a dream experienced full through sleep. Alexei, who dreams first, experiences one dream that is more of a waking vision. The death of Alexei’s spiritual father prompts his dream. The smell of corruption that comes from Father Zosima’s body (and signifies that the man will not become a canonized saint) cause the faithful who come to pay their respects to Father Zosima to reject the man’s holiness and overall value. Religion mediates Alexei’s reason and will; when Alexei’s faith is shaken by people’s indifference of his elder’s worth, his inner tension rises and he almost moves from his spot on the spectrum. Before leaving the monastery, Father Paissy—whom Father Zosima charged to watch over Alexei—stops the young boy after seeing “what a great change was taking place in him” (337). ““Have you, too, fallen, into temptation?” Father Paissy exclaimed suddenly” (337). The priest’s question forces Alexei to examine his internal “great change.” The loss of Father Zosima signals the loss of a teacher; the elder helped further Alexei’s understanding of religion, which is the one factor that assists his natures. Without Father Zosima, Alexei’s tension commences; the discomfort becomes evident as “his face wore an expression of suffering” and he willingly walks into compromising situations (341).

When Alexei’s faith falters, he leaves the monastery with his friend Rakitin to visit Grushenka—a moneylender that both his father and Dmitri pursue. Alexei chooses to go to Grushenka where he almost compromises his inner equilibrium, breaks the Lenten fast, and falls

“from the saints to the sinners” (343). Grushenka, who has been eagerly waiting to find him in her home, offers Alyosha champagne because “he is a prince” and she “want[s] to be naughty” (349). Alexei accepts the champagne as the next step to his fall from salvation. Before he is able to indulge, Grushenka finds out the cause of his grief.

‘The elder Zosima died!’ Grushenka exclaimed. ‘Oh, Lord, I didn’t know!’ She crossed herself piously. ‘Lord, but what am I doing now, sitting on his lap!’ She suddenly gave a start as if in fright, jumped off his knees at once, and sat on the sofa. Alyosha gave her a long, surprised look, and something seemed to light up in his face (351)

The light in Alexei’s face reveals that his reason and will reconcile. It takes one action from Grushenka, who calls herself “a low woman,” “a violent woman,” to rectify Alexei’s faith (350). Grushenka’s respect towards Father Zosima bolsters Alexei’s wavering belief. In experiencing an epiphany, the young Karamazov maintains his homeostasis and strengthen his inner resolve. Alexei realizes that even if Father Zosima is not a saint, he is still a good person and Alexei’s spiritual guide. The fact that someone like Grushenka who is given up to a life of sin and indulgence understands the value of Father Zosima shows the young protagonist that his elder is still worthy. Alexei praises Grushenka, “You restored my soul just now” (351). With the restoration of his soul, the young boy returns to his normal self and experiences his vision.

Unlike his brothers, Alexei’s dream comes after he restores equilibrium to his natures and not in order to find a balance. Being more a waking vision, Alexei’s experience epitomizes the sentiment that “life is a dream.” Returning to the monastery after his visit with Grushenka, Alexei finds Father Paissy reading the gospel story of the wedding at Cana by the dead elder’s body. The young man “tried listening to what Father Paissy was reading, but, being very worn

out, he began little by little to dose off..." (360). Venturing from a memory of Father Zosima to something Dmitri told him earlier, the walls of the room open around him. When Alexei notices the transformation he realizes that he is at "the marriage, the wedding feast" (361). A voice and form very familiar to the young Karamazov approach him. "'I, too, my dear, I, too, have been called, called and chosen,' the quiet voice spoke over him. 'Why are you hiding here, out of sight...? Come and join us'" (361). Father Zosima's presence at the marriage feast (which is a moniker for the eternal kingdom of heaven) shows Alexei that his spiritual father is saved. After the elder tells his student about the hope found with Christ and that "'he is ceaselessly calling new guests, now and unto ages of ages. See they are bringing the new wine,'" emotion fills Alexei. "Tears of rapture nearly burst from his soul" and he rushes past Father Paissy—who realizes "that something strange was happening with the boy"—and to the coffin. Alexei's sadness and fears assuage and his faith is restored.

The narrator leaves Alexei in his heightened state of emotion and turns to the inner workings of his eldest brother. When Alexei reappears after his dream sequence, he wears fashionable clothes. The change in his appearance after he leaves the monastery and starts helping his brothers is subtle, but greatly expounds his inner change.

Here incidentally, we must note that Alyosha had changed very much since we last saw him: he had thrown off his cassock and was now wearing a finely tailored coat and a soft, round hat, and his hair was cut short. All of this lent him charm, and indeed, he looked very handsome. His comely face always had a cheerful look, but this cheerfulness was somehow quiet and calm" (533).

A few lines in the massive book reveal Alexei's physical progression. The most dramatic change that happens to Alexei is his shift from cassock to fashionable clothing. Through his outward

change, the reader knows Alexei embraces the world and Father Zosima's instruction to watch out for his brothers. The change in apparel signifies that, "The mediator between both worlds is the young Alyosha" (*Dostoevsky: A Study* 120). The look of "quiet and calm" reasserts Alexei's inner harmony. His balanced nature never changes, but is continuously reinforced through different situations.

After establishing Alexei as the mediator between the two natures, the narrator shifts to documenting the trials of Dmitri Karamazov. The physical description of Dmitri Fyodorovich shares many similarities with the characteristics Nietzsche associates with Dionysus and his followers.

His face was lean, his cheeks hollow, their color tinged with a sort of unhealthy sallowness. His rather large, dark prominent eyes had an apparently firm and determined, yet somehow vague, look. Even when he was excited and talking irritably, his look, as it were, did not obey his inner mood but expressed something else, sometimes not at all corresponding to the present moment (*Dostoevsky* 67).

Dmitri, having lived a life that is devoted to excess and revelry, seems to be preoccupied by something beyond everyone else's consciousness. His figure is rent with passion to the point that it gives him "a sort of unhealthy sallowness." The author describes the eldest brother as "irritable by nature, 'abrupt and erratic of mind'" (68). The characteristics associated with the eldest Karamazov reveal a nature dominated by will. Dmitri's spontaneity controls his life and does not give him time to utilize his reason. Dmitri's love of Grushenka and "all his sudden decisions" leads him "passionately to every new idea" (383). While Grushenka's faith assists Alexei to bolster his resolve, it is Grushenka's love that Dmitri seeks. Grushenka's love helps Dmitri stabilize his natures. Dmitri's innate capricious nature sends him into a state of excess and

indulgence.

Before finding Grushenka, Dmitri decides, “his final clash” with Fyodor Pavlovich “was too near and must be resolved before anything else” (365). The father and son disagree over inheritance, debts, and Grushenka. Not being able to procure any funds, the eldest son goes to his father’s house in a jealous rage. Dmitri leaves without approaching his father when he realizes that Grushenka is not there. The eldest Karamazov brother almost escapes from the yard until Grigory, his father’s servant, catches him. Dmitri hits Grigory in the head with a pestle and runs to make extravagant purchases before tracking his lover to a different city. The carelessness Dmitri shows towards Grigory haunts him in his revelries. Later in the text, the reader encounters Dmitri “as if in a delirium, anticipating ‘his happiness’” and experiencing “almost an orgy, a feast of feasts” (432). Despite harming a man, Dmitri retains the capacity to revel. Dostoevsky reveals an interesting paradox in pairing “almost an orgy, a feast of feasts.” “Feast of feasts” is an epithet for the resurrection in the Orthodox Church. Dmitri experiences an aspect of religion in the middle of his “orgy.” The foundation for Dmitri’s salvation forms in the midst of a situation driven by will. When Dmitri learns that Grushenka chooses to love him instead of his father, he indulges in his newfound happiness. The appearance of investigators, coming to arrest Dmitri, comes at a time when Dmitri’s nature is most vulnerable.

The new vitality brought on by indulgence leads Dmitri to confess a recurring dream to his interrogators. In the middle of his interrogation, Dmitri tries to explain his innocence.

You see, sometimes I dream a dream in my sleep...one particular dream, and I often dream it, it keeps repeating itself, that someone is chasing me, someone I’m terribly afraid of is chasing me in the darkness, at night, looking for me, and I’m hiding from him somewhere behind a door or a wardrobe, hiding in a humiliating

way, and moreover he knows perfectly well where I'm hiding, but he seems to pretend not to know where I am on purpose, in order to torment me longer, in order to revel in my fear (471).

Emotions generated by will drive Dmitri's fear. The oldest Karamazov cannot find meaning in his dream until the interrogation. "This time it's not a dream! Realism, gentlemen, the realism of actual life! I'm the wolf, you're the hunters—so hunt the wolf" (471). By making a connection between his dream and his current situation, Dmitri utilizes reason to process information when he had previously relied on pure emotions to drive his decisions and actions. The lack of demarcation between his dream world and the physical world grants Dmitri a setting that is more conducive to his self-reflection. In answering the interrogation questions, Dmitri starts to understand himself and his thought processes; Dmitri's reason manifests. At this point in the story, Dmitri's tension starts to subside. Pachmuss asserts, "*The Brothers Karamazov* is built on the confessions of the main characters" (221). Confession removes the burden that weighs heavily on Dmitri's soul. After recounting his recurring dream, "Mitya boiled up again, though he had apparently unburdened his soul with this outburst of sudden anger and was growing kinder again with every word" (Dostoevsky 471). By using reason to connect his recurring dream to his current situation, Dmitri briefly controls will and "unburdened his soul." The actualization of reason continues through Dmitri's next dream.

Dmitri experiences a new dream after he "unburdened his soul." The eldest Karamazov brother, completing his interrogation, experiences a "strange physical powerlessness [that] gradually overwhelming him" leads him to sleep and dream. Detached from place and time, Dmitri "is being driven through the slush by a peasant" and notices that the inhabitants of the city are "thin, wasted, their faces a sort of brown color" (506). Seeing a cold baby held by its

mother, the eldest Karamazov interrogates his driver to find out why the people are in this state. When the man retorts that they are poor, Dmitri poses deeper questions and reveals that his nature has changed. ““No, no...tell me: why are these burnt-out mothers standing here, why are the people poor, why is the wee one poor, why is the steppe bare, why don't they embrace and kiss, why don't they sing joyful songs, why are they blackened with such black misery, why don't they feed the wee one”” (507). Dmitri's inquiries reveal that there is more to him than revelry and desires. In asking questions, Dmitri searches for logical answers and solutions to people's problems. The dream—coming after many discussions with Alexei about the life Dmitri leads and his sudden decisions—shows that Dmitri's tension starts to resolve. Dmitri hears Grushenka's voice assuring him, ““And I am with you, too, I won't leave you now, I will go with you for the rest of my life”” (508). The reassurance ends Dmitri's trial and he states, ““I had a good dream gentlemen, he said somehow strangely, with a sort of new face, as if lit up with joy”” (508). Dmitri's tension starts to resolve as he now moves to adopt religion and obtain a well-tempered nature.

Dmitri furthers his transformation and begins to understand his inner change during his time in prison. Speaking to Alexei, who acts as his spiritual father, Dmitri states, ““Brother, in these past two months I've sensed a new man in me, a new man has arisen in me! He was shut up inside me, but if it weren't for this thunderbolt, he would have never appeared...I'm afraid of something else now: that this risen man not depart from me”” (591). Dmitri believes that even if he is convicted, it is possible for convicts to “live, and love, and suffer,” yet all he wants is to retain the reason he gains from his dream (591). In analyzing why he dreamt of the poor citizens and the baby, Mitya resolves ““everyone is guilty for everyone else”” (591). He chooses to serve time for a crime he did not commit in order to metaphorically help the poor peasants and

experience the unity of brotherhood (591-592). The love of humanity signals a love of God, for as Dostoevsky believes, one needs “a spiritual or religious-ethical basis without which one cannot speak convincingly of human love and sympathy, least of all human brotherhood as such” (“A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky” 168). Dmitri’s isolation and awareness of reason lead him to confirm his belief in God, which grants him peace. For ““God gives joy, it’s his prerogative, a great one...Lord, let me dissolve in prayer,’... Mitya was almost breathless uttering his wild speech. He grew pale, his lips trembled, tears poured from his eyes” (592). The visceral reaction to God’s existence mirrors Alexei’s joy after dreaming of the wedding at Cana. Dmitri’s acceptance of faith solidifies his resolution. God’s presence in Dmitri’s speech is sudden and inspired. Roger B. Anderson explains, “The reality of Dmitri’s inner illumination is beyond them, and the last thing the audience can do is understand him for what he now knows himself to be” (153). What is important for the audience to understand is not how Dmitri came to a resolution, but the fact that he did. Dmitri’s resolution enables him to reconcile reason and will.

Before dying, the Elder Zosima exhorts Alexei to “Be near [his] brothers. Not just one, but both of them” (Dostoevsky 77). Alexei has a tendency to focus on one brother and forget about the other. After his meeting Ivan in the tavern earlier in the novel, Alexei “wondered how he could suddenly...so completely forget about his brother Dmitri, when he had resolved that morning, only a few hours earlier, that he must find him” (264). The elder brothers’ distinction in natures, separates them on the spectrum as well as in life. Chaos ensues every time Dostoevsky includes all three brothers in the same scene. Alexei—the “mediator between both worlds”— can only address one tension at a time. After completing his visit with Dmitri in prison, the oldest brother instructs Alexei to “love Ivan” (597). Dmitri, having reached his personal equilibrium, understands that something torments Ivan. Alexei is able to “love Ivan” because Dmitri no

longer needs Alexei's help.

Alexei describes Ivan as a person who “was preoccupied with something, something inward and important, that he was striving towards some goal, possibly a very difficult one, so that he simply could not be bothered with him, and that that was the only reason why he looks at Alyosha so absently” (31). The look in Ivan's eyes parallels Dmitri's “firm and determined, yet somehow vague” gaze. The absent stare signifies internal struggle. Ivan's dedication to reason causes him to strive “towards some goal” and in turn maintain distance from his family. Though he is educated in natural science, Ivan composes many works on ecclesiastical matters. His most noteworthy composition within the confines of the novel is “The Grand Inquisitor,” a poem in which Christ comes back to earth, but is treated as a criminal rather than a king. The tale describes an inquisitor confronting Christ about the state of the world. Though Christ offers hope, the inquisitor takes away the freedom Christ gave to the masses because it “forever burdened the kingdom of the human soul with its torments” (255). Ivan establishes himself as the Grand Inquisitor who would rather help the suffering population than believe in Christianity. Ivan does not accept religion because he does not think God cares enough for his creation. Alexei is the first person Ivan reveals his work to; by showing Alexei “The Grand Inquisitor,” Ivan reveals his soul. Ivan reveals his natural reason in his propensity to express himself through composed words. Everything he does is well thought out. As Ivan and Alexei become better acquainted towards the beginning of the novel, “Alyosha feels that [Ivan] had stepped a step towards him, and that he must have done so for a reason” (143). Alexei is able to support and encourage Ivan in his journey to reconcile his inner nature due to their newly established connection. By the time Dmitri instructs Alexei to “love Ivan”, Ivan has been absent from the novel for over three hundred pages. The middle son left town and fled to Moscow prior to his

father's murder. After leaving the town, Ivan felt "such darkness suddenly descended on his soul, and such grief gnawed at his heart, as he had never known in the whole of his life" (280). The description of Ivan's state after leaving the town signals the escalation of his inner tension.

Alexei and Ivan's meeting reveals what troubles Ivan's psyche. In discussing the impending trial, Alexei tells his brother that he must stop thinking that he is responsible for their father's murder. Ivan, astonished at his brother's comment, "stammered completely at a loss" (601). Revealing the depth of his insight, Alexei states,

'You've said it to yourself many times while you were alone during these two horrible months,' Alyosha continued as softly and distinctly as before. But he was now speaking not of himself, as it were, not of his own will, but obeying some sort of irresistible command. 'You've accused yourself and confessed yourself that you and you alone are the murderer. But it was not you who killed him, you are mistaken, the murderer was not you, do you hear, it was not you! God has sent me to tell you that (601-602).

Alexei confronts the godless Ivan with insight he received directly from God. Alexei's revelation isolates the cause of terror in Ivan's soul and reassures him that it is false. Being completely given to reason, Ivan is unable to believe his mystical brother; the encounter only heightens his tension. Banishing Alexei from his presence, Ivan goes to confront Smerdyakov—another one of Fyodor Pavlovich's servants. Dmitri and Alexei believe that Smerdyakov is the true murderer, but Ivan (not believing in Dmitri's innocence) has yet to be convinced. Smerdyakov emerges as Ivan's mirror; he challenges Ivan's theories and self-confidence. Ivan visits the servant three times and confronts the possibility that he implicitly instructed Smerdyakov to kill his father. On the third visit, Smerdyakov states plainly, "'You killed him, you are the main killer, and I was

just your minion, your faithful servant Licharda, and I performed the deed according to your word” (623). To verify that he killed Fyodor Pavlovich, Smerdyakov pulls out “three packets of iridescent hundred-rouble bills” that went missing from Fyodor Pavlovich’s bedroom (624). Being a servant, the only way Smerdyakov could have obtained such a large amount of money is by stealing it.

In obtaining a definite answer as to who killed his father, “It was as if a sort of joy now descended into [Ivan’s] soul” (633). The “sort of joy” contrasts Ivan’s naturally neutral emotions and gives Ivan a resolution that makes him kinder. On his way home, Ivan finds a peasant who he hit earlier in an angry rage, covered in snow, “lying in the same spot, unconscious and not moving” (633). Ivan “installed [the peasant] in the police station and [has] him examined immediately by the doctor while he once again provided liberally ‘for the expenses’” (634). The images of Ivan taking care of the peasant alludes to the parable of the Good Samaritan; Ivan is now associated with religion. Alexei’s relationships with his brothers assist them in understanding the importance of brotherhood and the unity of humanity. Ivan’s actions reflect the start of religious acceptance. In helping the peasant, Ivan also actualizes Dmitri’s second dream. Dmitri’s dream of poor peasants freezing in the snow causes him to realize his intellect. While the dream helped Dmitri to reach conclusions supported by reason, the real situation inspires emotion in Ivan. Pity and compassion influence Ivan to assist the peasant. Ivan’s actions both connect him to Dmitri and allow him to initiate his internal resolution. Dmitri and Ivan complement each other. It is during this juncture that Ivan resolves to help get Dmitri out of prison. Going back to his lodgings, “all his self-content vanished in a moment” (634). Ivan, now implicated in the patricide, encounters his first dream.

Dostoevsky’s chapter title, “The Devil. Ivan Fyodorovich’s Nightmare” signals the

intensity of Ivan's dream. While Alexei and Dmitri experience dreams, Ivan succumbs to terror. The term "nightmare" indicates that this vision is different than any of the dreams recounted before. After confirming that Smerdyakov killed his father, Ivan goes back to his lodgings where a man whose "physiognomy was not so much good-humored as, again, agreeable and ready, depending on the circumstances, for any amiable expression" joins him (636). The man appears out of nowhere and sits silently until he reminds Ivan that he failed to inquire after Katya when he saw Smerdyakov. Ivan, becoming angry with the visitor states, "Do you think I'll simply believe you prompted me and not that I remembered it myself?" (636). Ivan's familiarity with the devil shows that he has appeared many times and that Ivan has been constantly battling this creature intellectually for a prolonged period of time. The devil, who acts as a manifestation of Ivan's subconscious, inverts Ivan's reasoning and persistently challenges Ivan about the death of his father, his personal relationships, and God. As the arguments escalate and become more complex, the devil uses Ivan's own words against him. After quoting "The Grand Inquisitor," Ivan snaps. "I forbid you to speak of 'The Grand Inquisitor,'" Ivan exclaimed, blushing all over with shame" (648). Ivan's "blushing with shame" reveals an emotional and unprompted reaction, which signals the presence of the new and unrepressed will nature.

"The devil's thematic and synthetic dimensions join forces as Dostoevsky lays bare his own poetics by having Ivan produce a devil who discusses incarnation, an issue that evokes the image of Christ and thus reflects the battle between the devil and Christ in Ivan's heart" (Jackson 55). Being confronted by "the image of Christ" and "the battle between the devil and Christ in Ivan's heart" in his delirium, Ivan blushes "all over with shame." Robert Jackson charts shame as a theme in the novel and establishes that Ivan's nightmare as the epitome of shame. "The devil as Ivan's self-conscious thus epitomizes the central paradox of shame: a profoundly isolating

experience, shame intimately relates individuals to the universe and their place, or lack of place, in it. Ivan's devil represents Ivan's physical and metaphysical alienation" (54). The devil uses reason to physically and mentally isolate Ivan from Christ, his family, and his will; yet Ivan's visceral reaction to hearing his ideas and seeing "the image of Christ" show that will and religion are fighting against the devil. Alexei's appearance at Ivan's lodging removes Ivan's isolation and shame. Alexei brings with him a firmly resolved nature and a deep faith in Christ. Ivan's ability to confess his emotions to his brother grants him a brief reprieve. Though this calm does not last long—Ivan's tension reaches its peak during Dmitri's trial—it does foreshadow hope. Alexei "was beginning to understand Ivan's illness: 'The torments of a proud decision, a deep conscience!' God in whom he did not believe, and his truth were overcoming his heart, which still did not want to submit" (Dostoevsky 655). Alyosha is the antithesis to Ivan's "dreadful philosophy;" his presence is required for his brother's salvation.

In forming a story based on the relationship of three brothers, Dostoevsky uses women as devices to further plot progression. The incestuous undercurrent that progresses throughout the novel in the competition between the Karamazov men and their women reinforces the connections. Out of the two main female characters—Katerina Ivanovna, and Grushenka—Grushenka emerges as one of the most pivotal characters in the entire novel due to her influence on the natures of Alexei and Dmitri. It is through her character development that she "restores [Alexei's] soul" and saves Dmitri's soul. After she proclaims his innocence to the interrogators Dmitri thanks her. "'Thank you, Agrafena Alexandrovna, you have given my soul new courage!' Mitya responded in a trembling voice" (506). This instance becomes the second time that Grushenka helps the soul of a Karamazov brother. Grushenka emerges as a pivotal character who helps the brothers dream and establish interior homeostasis. In describing her physical

appearance Dostoevsky depicts her as having “the beauty of a moment, in short, a passing beauty, such as one often finds precisely in a Russian woman;” Grushenka embodies the characteristics of Russia (149). Though her characterization at the start of the novel establishes her as a seductress, Grushenka’s soul becomes her main attraction as her curves seem to fade. ““Before it was just her infernal curves that fretted me, but now I’ve taken her soul into my soul, and through her I’ve become a man”” (594). The combination of souls allows Dmitri to control his passionate will and “become a man.” Though Grushenka does not aid Ivan in his attempt to reconcile his inner natures, her influence on the rest of the Karamazov brothers is undeniable.

Ivan’s isolation and reliance on reason heightens his inner tension due to his inability to interact with women in a productive manner. Grushenka is unable to assist Ivan due to his rejection of women and passion. When Katerina Ivanovna (who was once engaged to Dmitri and is now loved by Ivan) resolves that, “*I still will not leave [Dmitri]*” she denies Ivan’s love in order to maintain an engagement that has long been denied by Dmitri (189). Katerina does this so that she is seen as the more worthy woman in society. Being insulted by the lack of reciprocated emotion, Ivan leaves town and promises to go ““far away and shall never come back”” (192). The distance separating Ivan and Katerina allows him to move away from emotion. Ivan finds reprieve in isolation where he can further repress the will and live a life dictated by reason. By removing himself from the situation, Ivan is able to distance himself from emotional immersion. When Ivan suppresses his emotions and asserts, “everything is permitted,” he tries to separate himself from women and religion respectively (263). Alexei sees that Ivan unconsciously accepts religion when he sees him after his nightmare. When Katerina Ivanovna later implicates Dmitri in the death of his father to save Ivan’s reputation at the trial, Ivan’s tension reaches its zenith and he collapses into a coma because she proves that she loves Ivan

more; Ivan can no longer suppress his emotions. After accusing Dmitri, Katerina says, ““The visiting doctor, at my request, examined him the day before yesterday and told me that he was close to brain fever—all because of him, all because of the monster”” (691). The woman does not understand that she is “the monster.” Katerina tries to save Ivan for her own conscience. By incriminating Dmitri, she hinders the truth and increases Ivan’s tension by simultaneously revealing her love and robbing him of the chance to help his brother—an act he attempts in order to restore his sanity. Grushenka works with Alexei and Dmitri to further their spiritual growth, while Katerina Ivanovna impedes Ivan’s journey.

Ivan’s last appearance in the novel finds him “in fever and unconscious” in Katerina’s house (757). The young intellect, not being able to save his brother from prison, “collapses under the weight of his own cleavage” (*Dostoevsky: A Study* 120). Placing Ivan in a coma gives him time to reconcile his natures by himself. Jackson asserts,

The Brothers Karamazov closes with Ivan still unconscious. We understand that the battle within him still rages. Yet in generating a progression from father to son, Dostoevsky gives us hope. Ivan’s devil may be an exhibitionist liar, but Ivan is not. Like Dostoevsky, Ivan creates fictions that have the power to change, even to save, their readers. In short, Dostoevsky gives Ivan the power to save himself (63).

Being given so fully to reason, Ivan is unable to be helped by characters he associates with will, such as Katerina, Grushenka, and Alexei. “The Grand Inquisitor” helps Ivan accept Christ despite his best efforts to rebuke religion. After hearing the story, Alexei cries, ““But your poem praises Jesus, it doesn’t revile him...as you meant it to”” (Dostoevsky 260). The perceptive ascetic sees through Ivan’s story even though Ivan cannot see his belief yet. Alexei’s confidence

in Ivan's abilities to establish reconciliation gives Ivan the support he needs to come to a resolution. In creating "fictions that have the power to change, even to save, their readers," Ivan saves himself.

Roberts asserts "Dostoevsky's work arguably tells us as much about *limits* of reason as it does about its strengths" (205). Dostoevsky's adherence to Russian Orthodoxy as a means to avoid the chaos of the world results in a complex narrative that reveals the differences in human nature. The Karamazov brothers start the novel at various locations across a spectrum ranging from reasonable to willful. The end of the texts shows the brothers converging into the middle range, with Dmitri advancing more quickly than Ivan. Through the connections of brotherhood and universal love, Dostoevsky makes it possible for the Karamazov brothers to mediate reason and will into existing simultaneously. Grushenka and Katya's influence on Dmitri, Ivan, and Alyosha's emotions help the brothers understand their inner workings and bolster their personal connections, which ultimately leads to inner growth. A combination of reason, will, and religion allows the brothers to develop personal associations and self-understanding. At the end of the novel, Dostoevsky leaves Ivan with the potential to accept "his chaotic nature." Through Ivan, Dostoevsky reveals that conflicted natures lead to stagnation and tension. Dmitri and Alexei, who are both leaving town for different lands, are able to progress in their lives due to their internal equilibrium. A resolved dyad creates potential for renewal and new experiences. Alexei and Dmitri's departure reveals that resolving the inner tension is not their final act in life; they must experience the world. As Father Zosima charges Alexei when he orders him to leave the monastery, "You will have to endure everything before you come back again. And there will be much work to do. But I have no doubt of you, that is why I am sending you. Christ is with you. Keep him and he will keep you'" (Dostoevsky 77). Having accepted Christianity and

establishing homeostasis, each of the brothers must go out and experience challenges. The main challenge is maintaining their equilibrium, but as Father Zosima warns, “Keep him and he will keep you.” Though the brothers may never see each other again in life, they will all reunite in the afterlife and experience the wedding at Cana.

Thomas Mann: A Life without Art

The relationship between Thomas Mann and Nietzsche is quite evident through Mann’s public work and personal writings. “To have Nietzsche as a teacher, he said in the *Observations*, is not so purely German a source of education as to have Schopenhauer and Wagner...According to Mann, Nietzsche was more than a German poet; he was a prose writer and intellectual of significance for all Europe...” (Nicholls 115). The influence of Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, and Wagner appear in Thomas Mann’s *Death in Venice*. Manipulating the relationship between Apollo and Dionysus as well as shaping the novel with elements of Wagner’s opera *Tristan und Isolde*, which was influenced by Schopenhauer, Mann creates a work that questions social constructions and issues a warning about indulgence. *Death in Venice* reveals tensions that arise when the Apollonian nature starts to subside in the realization of subconscious desires. Mann establishes the main character, Gustav von Aschenbach, as an artist who leads a highly disciplined life. Having won many accolades and received knighthood, Aschenbach surfaces as a conventional and highly successful figure who gained recognition at a young age. Unfortunately, his regulated nature prevents him from experiencing “leisure [and] the carefree idleness of youth” (Mann 13). The lack of idleness in Aschenbach’s life leads him to suppress emotions, specifically those that go against social normativity. In avoiding “leisure” and “idleness,” the protagonist misses the opportunity to have spontaneous experiences. Aschenbach’s drive to be successful results in his neglect of passion and spontaneity; he chooses to take the path of his

forefathers who lived “austere lives” (12).

Aschenbach comes from a long line of “officers, judges, and civil servants, men who led disciplined, decently austere lives serving king and state,” yet has a free-spirited element in his blood which originates from his mother, the daughter of a “Bohemian bandmaster” (12). She is “the source of the foreign racial features in his appearance” (12). Mann reveals that Aschenbach is formed as the result of a “union of the father’s sober, conscientious nature with the darker, more fiery impulses of the mother that engendered the artist—and this particular artist” (12). Aschenbach is the product of the “intervening reconciliation” between the Apollonian and Dionysian natures previously recognized by Nietzsche. The relationship between his mother and father is not returned to for the remainder of the novel, but provides a foundation for Aschenbach’s inherited natures. In favoring one nature over another, Aschenbach’s nature is naturally inclined to indulge, whether it is his intellect or emotion. The writer’s inherited Apollonian and Dionysian natures never simultaneously reconcile within the confines of the novel. Aschenbach vacillates between both natures, but never experiences a time of equality. Art can mediate a temporary reconciliation between Apollo and Dionysian, but the absence of religion makes Aschenbach’s death inevitable.

The story begins as Aschenbach has fallen victim to writer’s block. Described as an author who once composed “limpid and powerful prose,” he currently writes with a style that “lost its brashness, its fresh subtle nuances; it became fixed and exemplary” (10, 21). Aschenbach transitions from inspired artist to calculated success. When the protagonist represses his Dionysian nature in his life and work for the more structured Apollonian nature, he adds immense strain on his psyche, which heightens his inner tension. By ignoring Dionysus, a part of the protagonist’s life is missing. The missing element is an aspect of art that Nietzsche posits: the

product of the Apollonian/Dionysian reconciliation. From the start of the novel, Mann shows the reader that Aschenbach will never be able to achieve a work of inspired art due to his rigidity. Mann foreshadows Aschenbach's failure to experience a prolonged capability of creation from the start of the novel by stating,

On a personal level, too, art is life intensified: it delights more deeply, consumes more rapidly; it engraves the traces of imaginary and intellectual adventure on the countenance of its servant and in the long run, for all the monastic calm of his eternal existence, leads to self-indulgence, overrefinement, lethargy, a restless curiosity that a lifetime of wild passions and pleasures could scarcely engender" (23).

Following a description of Aschenbach's structured life, Mann shows that Aschenbach has not experienced "life intensified." By ending the second chapter with such a premonition, the reader knows that something is going to change in the main character who had been previously described as a tight fist (13). Mann's distinction that the production of art allows man to experience deepened life shows Mann's understanding of Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*. In using the words "self-indulgence," "overrefinement," and "wild passions and pleasures," the author reveals that art leads the artist to experiencing his Dionysian nature; art does not provide a permanent refuge from imbalanced natures.

Aschenbach's failure to resolve his competing natures offers the production of art as a transitory way to experience less tension, an alternative to religion as a reconciling force. Mann crafts his novel in a way that forces institutionalized religion to be noticeably absent. In describing the protagonist's lineage Mann sets forth "A certain inner spirituality has manifested itself in the person of the only clergyman amongst [Aschenbach's lineage] and a strain of more impetuous, sensual blood had found its way into the family in the previous generation through

the writer's mother, the daughter of a Bohemian bandmaster" (12). Religion and the Dionysian nature are both included within the same sentence. Aschenbach ignores both elements, which lead to his heightened psychological tension. Bruno Frank proposes that Mann's reliance on agnosticism emerges from an imitation of Nietzsche. Ellis Shookman reports Frank's opinion that Mann "is the first author who does not merely imitate Nietzsche, but instead bravely goes forth into a godless world. The other philosopher Frank cites is Schopenhauer, in whose *Metaphysik der Geschlechtsliebe* (Metaphysics of Sexual Love, 1844) he finds the first explanation for the emotional changes that overtake middle-aged men such as Aschenbach" (Shookman 30). Nietzsche, unlike Mann, did not completely reject religion; he saw that man could live a full life by realizing his inner potential. Mann—abandoning all aspects of religion—sees the intensity associated with art as the only means to experience aspects of a full life. Having established that neither art nor religion can save Aschenbach, *Death in Venice* emerges as a cautionary tale that reveals the dangers of extreme natures.

The reader first meets Aschenbach as he walks in a cemetery to relieve his writer's block. It is here that the protagonist encounters "the red-haired type" of stranger (Mann 4); this figure triggers such wanderlust that Aschenbach sets out of Munich and to an island located on the Adriatic Sea; he cannot rest at this location and is then propelled to Venice. The strangeness found in other characters as well as the city continues to force the author to confront his repressed Dionysian nature. On his way to the Grand Hôtel des Bains, Aschenbach encounters two more men who challenge his personal constitutions of self-control. Taking a boat to Venice, the author sees a man who, in trying to look young, wears

an extravagantly cut pale-yellow summer suit, a red necktie, and a rakishly uptilted Panama hat...he had wrinkles around his eyes and mouth; the matt

crimson of his cheeks was rouge; the brown hair beneath the straw hat with its colorful band—a toupee; the neck—scrawny, emaciated; the stuck-on mustache and imperial on his chin—dyed; the full complement of yellow teeth—a cheap denture; and the hands, with signet rings on both forefingers, those of an old man (27-28).

The decadence in which the man dresses himself shocks Aschenbach. The artificial youth manufactured by cosmetics signals a man with degenerate desires, which is expounded as the old man licks the corner of his lips. The old man's synthetic appearance does not hide his age; rather, it adds emphasis. The false appearance of the old man reveals a desire to appear as something he is not: young and at the height of his health and sexual abilities, which his words reveal to Aschenbach. The unnamed man is a mirror reversal of the detached author. He reflects the protagonist, but instead of viewing subconscious similarities or differences, Aschenbach shudders with disgust and ignores his inner tension. The "red necktie" associates the old man with the red-headed stranger Aschenbach encounters in the cemetery; both men cause the author to experience feelings he does not acknowledge. As Aschenbach leaves the boat for Venice, the old man confronts him, "'Our compliments,' he babbled on, placing two fingers to his lips, 'to your sweetheart, your sweet, your most beautiful sweetheart...'" And suddenly the upper denture slipped out of his jaw over the lower lip" (35). The personal encounter between the decaying man (as is evident through his shifting teeth and the recurrence of the color yellow) and the isolated author disturbs Aschenbach in ways he is unable to understand. Mann uses the old man to foreshadow his protagonist's future. The old man represents indulgence and abnormality, two things that Aschenbach avoids by following social convention until coming to Italy. The discomfiting feeling that is associated with the old character ensures that the readers do not

forget this figure throughout the novel. When Aschenbach undergoes his external transformation at the end, the reader is struck by the vast similarities between him and the old man he once condemned. By associating the old man and the stranger with the color red, Mann shows his readers that the color will symbolize Aschenbach's repressed emotions and desires.

The gondolier, who drives the protagonist to his hotel, completes Mann's foreshadowing of Aschenbach's final scenes. The gondola, being associated with water, death, and eternity, carries the author away from his intended destination. Once Aschenbach becomes aware of the fact that he is not being led to the vaporetto, he turns around and confronts his gondolier. The man, who wears "a yellow sash wound round his waist and a shapeless straw hat" and is "anything but Italian," ignores the author while "knitting his reddish eyebrows" (38). The color yellow and the straw hat create a connection between the driver and the old man from the boat. The recurrence of the color red associates the ferryman with a sublime danger. It is here that Mann employs his first mythical allusion. By primarily using the word "coffin" and the color black to describe the vehicle, Mann associates the gondola and its operator to Charon, the transporter of souls across the River Styx and Acheron in Greek myth. Aschenbach, who later dies by the sea, is literally being transported into the afterlife until he wakes up from his trance and confronts the ferryman. The mystery that shrouds the gondolier (for it is later revealed that he does not have a license and fled as the authorities were alerted) increases the tension surrounding the protagonist.

With the scene set for Aschenbach's steady decline, the writer arrives at the Lido where he encounters Tadzio. The young boy soon becomes the main object of Aschenbach's affection as well as the reason his Dionysian nature actualizes. At the start, it is Aschenbach's love of Apollo that sends him into his Dionysian nature. Mann describes Tadzio as "a consummate

beauty: his face—pale and charmingly reticent, ringed by honey-colored hair, with a straight nose, lovely mouth and an expression of gravity sweet and divine—recalled Greek statuary of the noblest period...” (45). By establishing that Tadzio “recalled Greek statuary of the noblest period,” Mann associates the young boy with Apollo who is associated with the art form of statues, while Dionysus is associated with music. Shookman states, “Indeed, what is new about this novella, according to [Wilhelm] Alberts, is the strong and striking influence of Greek concepts of life and art. Its subject matter and its style, he explains, bear witness to Mann's belief in beauty and to his desire for classical perfection...” (Shookman 35). Aschenbach, who composed an article on “Art and the Intellect,” becomes instantly enamored with the young boy. The homosexual undercurrents of this scene escalate throughout the novel as Aschenbach’s emotions turn into an obsession; his love for Tadzio becomes the most apparent deviance from social norms. By processing his inner workings in pure Apollonian terms, Aschenbach designates his emotions to a socially acceptable bond and further censors his Dionysian tendencies. Aschenbach’s emotions foreshadow the realization of Dionysus and his suppressed emotions.

As Keith May puts forth in “Death in Venice,” “To Aschenbach the virtue is self-control and the vice is self-abandonment” (90). He who lives a calculated life up to his journey to Venice and encounter with Tadzio never knew self-abandonment. His first inclination in feeling wanderlust is to journey to an exotic place, “But rain, a heavy atmosphere, the provincial closed society of the Austrian hotel guests, and the lack of a peaceful intimate rapport with the sea that only a soft, sandy beach can provide had soured him” (Mann 26). Aschenbach’s inner dialogue is a constant give and take between Apollo and Dionysus with the former slowly failing. The “closed society of the Austrian hotel guests” ruins the “exotic and distinctive” island destination

Aschenbach searches for (25). Homogeneity is what the writer attempts to avoid. Extending from his decision to go to Venice and to his death, Aschenbach slowly lets go of his self-control and willingly accepts “the vice [that] is self-abandonment.” Aschenbach’s perception of Tadzio acts as the precursor of his release of self-control.

The writer is able to entertain and hold his Dionysian nature at bay through his dreams. After seeing the stranger at the cemetery, Aschenbach experiences a type of daydream where he envisions “a tropical quagmire beneath a steamy sky—sultry, luxuriant, and monstrous” that is filled with lush greenery and flora (6). The imagery of vegetation signifies reproduction. The protagonist snaps out of his vision after he “saw the eyes of a crouching tiger gleam out of the knotty canes of a bamboo thicket” (7). The apparition of a tiger signals Dionysus, who is associated with the wild animal. When Aschenbach realizes that he has strayed too far from his dominant nature, he stops his dream and returns to the physical world. The encounter with the stranger inspires the hyper-sexualized images. After watching Tadzio during dinner on his first night in the hotel, the writer goes to his room and experiences a night of “deep sleep, unbroken, yet animated by a number of dreams” (49). Though the reader is not told what the writer dreams, Mann alludes that both sets of dreams are similar. Aschenbach uses his dreams to suppress his latent desires. Aschenbach’s repression of desires is the only way he can exist within the bounds of normative society. Subscribing to his Apollonian nature provides the protagonist with an honored spot within civilization as well as stability, things that Aschenbach needs. At the end of the novel, the protagonist experiences another dream that signals the complete abandonment of his Apollonian ideals. Mann’s use of dream sequences allow him to reveal how much Aschenbach changes from the moment he walks in the cemetery to the night he has his final dream.

Aschenbach spends his second day at the Lido watching Tadzio and his companions play on the beach. As the writer watches his muse, he makes out more of his physical features and personality characteristics. Though the Grand Hôtel des Bains had been previously described as a hotel that housed visitors of all nationalities, the idea of empire comes out when the German writer sees a Russian family and turns away from them in disgust. “In the Venetian potpourri of cultural style, an English travel agent’s sobriety is juxtaposed to the naïvete of Austrian tourists, the aggressive camaraderie of Russians, the aristocratic hauteur of Poles, and the devious hustling of Mediterranean panders. Nationalist rivalries flow through the story” (Heilbut 251). The move into a globalized world is represented through the many nationalities found in Venice and the hotel. There is a sense of impurity found within the city through the melting pot of nationalities. Juxtaposed with the “provincial closed society of the Austrian hotel guests” at Aschenbach’s first destination, heterogeneity defines Venice. The presence of multiple cultures positions *Death in Venice* as a twentieth century novel. The rise in industrialization and globalization signifies the introduction of goods, knowledge, and diseases. Once isolated to specific areas, illnesses are transferred with its people. The fluidity of movement across boundaries establishes a widening of community, which reflects Dionysian movement as opposed to the fixed Apollonian boundaries. Venice becomes the meeting point for civilization, which also includes elements of illness and decay.

As Aschenbach watches Tadzio the next day, the protagonist decides to explore the city and detaches himself from his newfound obsession. Walking through the city, “A repellant sultriness permeated the narrow streets, the air so thick that the odors emanating from houses, shops, and food stalls—the vapor of oil, the clouds of perfume, and more—hovered like fumes without dispensing” (Mann 62). This image of Venice portrays the city as stifling. These

conditions, as the reader later finds out, are perfect for the spread of cholera. Mann alludes to the physical manifestation of disease. Venice emerges as the perfect location for degenerate situations. George B. von der Lippe expounds upon the importance of Venice as a setting by revealing a binary relationship between Venice and Venus (35). Venice not only represents a decrepit land sinking into water, but also exists as the pinnacle of desire by being the physical representation of Venus emerging from the sea. Mann must set Aschenbach's story in Venice in order to heighten the desire that Tadzio raises in the protagonist. Venice was not Aschenbach's original destination, yet once he arrives, it seems he cannot leave. After deciding to leave Venice due to the effects of the weather upon his health, Aschenbach adopts the belief that fate caused his luggage to be sent elsewhere and he must stay at the Grand Hôtel des Bains. The decision to stay in Venice reveals the beginning of Aschenbach's indulgence of his repressed desires. Mann signals the initiation of indulgence when he describes the protagonist as having "made a slow, rising, circular motion that brought the hands forward in such a way as to indicate an opening and spreading of the arms. It was a gesture of willingness, welcome, of calm acceptance" (Mann 74). This image counters the description of Aschenbach as a clenched fist rather than one that hangs loosely, which one of his friends offered at the start of the text.

As Gary Johnson speculates, "At this point, Aschenbach has not yet abandoned self-criticism, and he seems acutely aware of the image that he presents as he looks at himself and the pose that he strikes from the observer's vantage point" (95). Johnson argues that prior to Aschenbach's indulgence of his unconscious, he consciously indulges in Tadzio in a proper, Apollonian relationship between artist and inspiration. Aschenbach's decision to not leave Venice and stay on despite obtaining knowledge of the cholera epidemic reveals a moral compromise an indulgence of ignorance. Due to his overwhelming desire to stay close to Tadzio,

Aschenbach rids himself of precaution. Mann's warning about overindulgence hinges on Aschenbach's staying in Venice; remaining in the city is what literally kills Aschenbach. "Aschenbach had difficulty maintaining the only plausible facial expression in the circumstances. A reckless joy, an unbelievable glee took almost convulsive hold of his breast" (Mann 70). The "reckless joy" and "convulsive hold" of joy signal one thing—Apollo has been retired and Dionysus starts to wield his influence on the writer's self-control.

Upon seeing Tadzio "in his striped linen outfit and red bow," Aschenbach "felt the casual greeting fade and vanish before the truth of his heart, he felt the rapture of his blood, the joy and agony of his soul, and acknowledged to himself that it was Tadzio who had made it so hard for him to leave" (73). By having Tadzio wear a "red bow," the young boy joins the ranks of the stranger in the cemetery, the old man, and the gondolier. After seeing the object of his desires, the protagonist unclenches his fists. Gone is the Aschenbach of old who was previously associated with a closed and firm fist. Aschenbach's acknowledgement of his feelings towards the young boy proves that he is conscious of the Dionysian influence. From this point on, Aschenbach's actions and emotions are openly known and pursued by him.

At the beginning of his acceptance of the Dionysian nature, Aschenbach is able—for a very short period of time—to experience "life intensified." Mann reveals the change in experience through the words he uses to describe Aschenbach's surroundings. Opening the fourth chapter with a description of "the god with the flaming cheeks," Mann once more alludes to Greek myth without naming the character that happens to be Apollo (75). Mann continues the omission of mythical characters when Aschenbach sees a tableau of Socrates and Phaedrus and recounts their discussion. Though the conversation is a philosophical discourse on love and the danger of the all-consuming desire that arises from beauty, an allusion to Dionysus appears.

“Should we not perish in the flames of love, as did Semele beholding Zeus?” (84). The result of Semele and Zeus’ union, Dionysus, survives Semele’s scorching. Dionysus emerges as a warning of the dangers of experiencing beauty in its full capacity—a warning Aschenbach disregards. Though Aschenbach never discusses myth, the narrator uses myth as a means of showing the inner change in the protagonist. Using Tadzio as his muse, Aschenbach is inspired to write something and be productive “at this point in his crisis” (86). The writing becomes the protagonist’s art piece. After writing a page and a half Aschenbach is spent and felt “as though his conscience were reproaching him after a debauch” (86). Despite giving into his Dionysian nature, the writer is still haunted by his Apollonian past. Aschenbach’s short essay is the last composition he writes in the novel as well as his last piece of art. The protagonist falls steadily away from Apollo and deeper into the realm of Dionysus.

Aschenbach spends the rest of the novel following Tadzio from afar at the hotel and in the city. Though there are moments where he almost breaks the boundary between artist and subject, but something pulls him back. In attempting to watch Tadzio and not make his obsession apparent (which is a difficult task that Aschenbach fails at) the protagonist ignores his surroundings. Aschenbach’s fixation with Tadzio leaves him defenseless to the cholera that descends on the city. Venice’s air had been filled with a strange smell “of squalors and sores and dubious hygiene,” but the writer does not paid attention since he concentrates solely on Tadzio (98). As he begins his search for an explanation of the warning posters plastered around the city, Aschenbach learns that it is only a precautionary measure. Due to his self-indulgence, the writer does not leave the city, but tries to find the real answer to the “unusual aroma in the air” (98).

It is in his search that Aschenbach meets another provocative man with red hair (112). Having spent his days following Tadzio—to the point that those around the young boy have

noticed—Aschenbach watches the young boy as the guests of the hotel watch a performance from local Venetians. One of the troupe, a man with red hair, goes around playing his guitar and regaling the guests with brazen songs. The red haired man’s licentious actions during the song recall the image of the old man from the boat. This time Aschenbach does not criticize the performer, but instead wants to talk to him. As the man with the red hair approaches Aschenbach for a tip, the protagonist asks him about the precautionary measures. The guitarist, seemingly under the same orders as those Aschenbach confronted before, shows a “grimace of comic helplessness” as he tells Aschenbach what he wants to hear: there is nothing wrong with Venice—it is only a precautionary measure (114). Aschenbach, though unwilling to believe the man, accepts this answer. Positioning the interrogation of the guitarist in a setting where Tadzio is present reemphasizes that the young boy is the cause of denial. That the writer would not leave the city now—though he tried to leave before due to the weather—augments Aschenbach’s repudiation of truth. The guitarist is the last red haired character to appear. Aschenbach’s final warning has appeared at his place of residence, but he chooses to stay longer and find the source of the warnings instead of taking precautionary measures.

The writer goes into the city once more to see if he can find an answer to the mysterious actions of the city officials. Going to a British travel agency, Aschenbach asks the clerk for an explanation. Starting off with the sanctioned reasoning, the clerk stops and tells Aschenbach the truth— “Indian cholera had displayed a growing tendency to spread and migrate” (119). Following the path attributed to Dionysus—starting “from the humid marshes of the Ganges Delta, rising with the mephitic exaltations of that lush, uninhabitable, primordial island jungle shunned by man, here tigers crouch in bamboo thickets” through Asia, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean—the cholera entered Venice and started killing its inhabitants (120). The city

officials' attempt of concealing the cholera parallels Aschenbach's repression of desires. By not addressing the issue, Venice and its inhabitants are put at great risk. The cholera "seemed to be undergoing a revitalization; the tenacity and fertility of its pathogens appeared to have redoubled;" the disease infects food and maintains an eighty percent mortality rate (121). The speed with which the disease kills its victims is equivalent to Aschenbach's instant infection by Dionysus. The city and the author experience the same effects of repression.

Despite being told by the Englishman to evacuate, Aschenbach decides to stay. The writer ponders telling Tadzio's mother so she could save herself and her children, but indulges his own desires instead and remains quiet. His decision to stay silent leads him into his final and most destructive dream sequence. Heilbut states, "Previously *Death in Venice* has consecrated a chaste, impossible love. This nightmare liberates the sexuality that can no longer be idealized in myth" (257). Aschenbach's final dream sequence is a Dionysian orgy that completely shatters any of the self-control the writer still possesses. Experiencing images of drunken and naked people, shrieking in their ecstasy against the backdrop of an "alluring flute," Aschenbach waits for "what was to come: *'the strangergod'*" (Mann 126). The protagonist detaches himself from the events happening around him. He is disgusted and feels the need to "defend his domain against the stranger, the enemy of the serene and dignified intellect." until he is "muddled by fumes," "blindness," and "numbing lust" and beholds a phallic image. As he embraces the dream Mann states, "But the dreamer was now with them, within them: he belonged to the strangergod" (128). Aschenbach's fear transforms into pleasure; self-control has been forsaken for self-abandonment. Accepting "the strangergod," Aschenbach changes his physical appearance to complete his transformation. After attempting to change his raiment, the protagonist goes to the barbershop and

[W]atched his eyebrows arch more distinctly and evenly, his eyes grow longer, their brightness enhanced by a light line beneath the lids, and farther down where the skin had been brownish and leathery, saw a blush of sparingly applied carmine, saw his lips, anemic only a moment before, swell raspberry-red and the furrows in his cheeks and around his mouth, the wrinkles under his eyes vanish beneath face cream and the glow of youth (132).

His look is complete with a necktie that is “red, his broad-brimmed straw hat wound round with a gaudy striped ribbon” (132). There is not another mention of a man associated with red because Aschenbach emerges as the embodiment of his own desires. The protagonist has completely transformed into the old man from the boat and the reader knows that the perversion of the Apollo-dominated Aschenbach is complete. “A tepid storm wind” follows the writer’s transformation, which leads to a sense of foreboding that hinders Aschenbach from eating for he could not “help imagining the food to be tainted by infection” (133). What Aschenbach does not realize is that he is tainted by the infection and the infection is Dionysus. By allowing the Indian cholera to move in the same route as Dionysus, Mann makes self-indulgence and cholera synonymous.

The extent of the city’s infection emerges as Aschenbach chases Tadzio through the city but must stop due to fatigue. Attempting to rejuvenate himself, the writer eats some “strawberries, soft, [and] overripe”(134). Being distracted by Tadzio, Aschenbach does not pay attention to the food and no longer cares if the food is “tainted by infection.” As he rests, Mann recounts the rest of the conversation between Socrates and Phaedrus. Socrates advances that one can find intellect through art, but the reverse is impossible. Pure love leads to intellect and a reverence of beauty. Aschenbach finds desire after devoting himself to Apollo. The transition

from one nature to another is too extreme. The forbidden love that Aschenbach experiences can only lead to his death. After Socrates' discourse, the reader finds Aschenbach leaving the hotel and learning that Tadzio and his family will be leaving Venice after lunch. Aschenbach, is described as "suffering from dizzy spells that were only partly physical: they were accompanied by a precipitously mounting anxiety and feelings of hopelessness and helplessness;" the writer is unwell (138). Going to the sea, the protagonist watches Tadzio for the last time as the young boy plays with his friends.

As Tadzio descends into the sea after a fight with his companions, he turns around to confront the steady gaze that has watched him for so long. Aschenbach's "face displayed the slack self-absorbed expression of a deep slumber" (141). It is in this state that the protagonist seems to see Tadzio, "beckoning to him, as if, releasing his hand from his hip he were pointing outward, floating onward into the promising immensity of it all. And, as so often, he set out to follow him" (142). Aschenbach succumbs to his death as he dreams of his muse leading him away from the infested city and "onward into the promising immensity of it all" (142). The writer, unable to live in a Dionysian state, dies in the sunlight of Apollo's gaze.

Aschenbach's death echoes his sentiment when he was riding the gondola to the Lido, "The ride will be brief,' he thought. 'Could it but last forever'" (36-37). Nicholls describes Aschenbach's end by stating, "Aschenbach loses all contact with the passions and primitive emotions that must be the genuine source of art. The disintegration of his world is the triumph of the Dionysus, whose power had too long been neglected" (114). In completely abandoning his Apollonian nature, Aschenbach loses all capabilities to experience "the genuine source of art." It is due to the destruction of his world that Aschenbach is unable to survive. As Nietzsche says, "[Art] alone may transform these horrible reflections on the terror and absurdity of existence into

representations with which man can live” (Nietzsche 23). Art is temporary. Without a sustainable development of art, the writer dies.

Hermann Hesse: A Winning Combination

Hesse emerges as a member of a third generation of authors who attempt to build on Schopenhauer’s division of will and intellect. Subscribing to the terms *Geist* and *Natur*, Hesse saw the inner divide existing between spirit and nature respectively. Being emotionally and psychologically effected by World War I, Hesse’s personal tension heightened extensively. As Joseph Mileck comments,

In Montagnola escape became quest, and in quest Hesse’s inner problems resolved themselves into the basic *malaise humain*, into the tension between *Geist* and *Natur*. For years he had vacillated between these poles, acclaiming first one, then the other, then neither. Always he hoped for a harmonious accord, though well aware that for him this was impossible (20).

For Hesse, *Natur* can be interpreted as “something close to the sensual side of life” as opposed to *Geist*, which represents the inner spirit (Wright 61). Hesse personally explored both natures and attempted to find a resolution for himself. By reaching an understanding of man’s inner workings, Hesse gained similar insight attributed to Schopenhauer, Dostoevsky, and Nietzsche. *Geist* and *Natur* describe two factors inherently located within man; *Geist* appears as a resolute spirit, while *Natur* is the natural impulses man feels. Hesse focuses closely on the inner workings of man as a whole being, rather than traits that define him. Though he knew he could never achieve “harmonious accord,” he would shape the lives of many characters toward achieving the resolution he could not. Goldmund, a character Hesse spends a lot of time developing, is able to experience a full life due to the reconciliation of his nature and it is through him that Narcissus

gains the opportunity to do the same. All of the authors who wrestled with the two natures knew that finding a resolution would be difficult and, at times, impossible.

Religion maintains a strong influence on Hesse and his works during his search for a personal resolution of his inner natures. The German author's view on religion was dynamic. Mileck charts Hesse's change in belief,

The first of Hesse's four attempts to solve his problem is his *Weg nach Innen*, a mystic emerging of the *Ich* and the soul (the Demian stage). The second is his acclaim of a Dionysian way of life (the Klingsor stage), The third is the road back to the *gross Mutter*, to the eternal life-death tension (the stage of *Narziss and Goldmund*). And the fourth attempt is the way of *Geist* and the evolution of the self (the stage of Knecht) (170).

Hesse is one of the many authors who turned to the East for alternatives to the Judeo-Christian influences present in his society. Though Hesse would adopt Buddhist elements and Christian features, he would opt out of fully accepting institutionalized religion and create his own hybrid of beliefs. "Instead he directed his entire attention to an (aesthetic religion) that measures all spiritual and material things in terms of their relationship to beauty" (Reichert 28). Hesse's devotion to art and beauty is found in the conversations between Narcissus and Goldmund.

Though Hesse attempted to completely break away from Christianity, it was a feat the author was unable to accomplish. What is clear is that Hesse's "religion ultimately embraces supreme faith as one of direct communion with the divine, and of the world's apparent diversity. It is a religion whose God seems more pantheistic and philosophical than Christian..." (Mileck 177).

The view of a pantheistic God as opposed to a strictly Christian God parallels the views of Father Zosima in *The Brothers Karamazov*, a text that Hesse found profoundly influential.

As is seen when Goldmund denies God, but accepts Narcissus' imposed penance, the idea of God remains whether it is a Judeo-Christian God or a pantheistic being. According to A. Colin Wright,

As Ernest Rose puts it, writing of *Narziss and Goldmund*, Hesse 'has clearly broken with orthodox Christianity, and his religion can be called Christian only when one defines Christianity as a wholly un-dogmatic religion of love.... Absent is the belief in the myth of Christ's life and the divinity of Jesus, in the redemption of sins through his death on the cross, and in resurrection and personal immortality.... Still, Hesse has by no means renounced the Christian spirit' (70).

Hesse had to remove Christianity from Christ in order to find value in the religious institution. The underlying theme of fraternal love becomes the central aspect of Christianity that Hesse adopts for *Narcissus and Goldmund*.

Hesse utilizes the doubling of characters to expound upon the differences and similarities between *Geist* and *Natur*. "Narciss and Goldmund for example, are usually viewed as the embodiment of the two extreme poles of human nature: Narciss embodies the pure intellect, Goldmund—the sensual and the feminine component in man's fundamental make-up" (Pachmuss 218). Though it is apparent from the start of the novel that the two title characters are to act as foils to each other, that is only a superficial understanding of their relationship. Narcissus and Goldmund emerge in a manner similar to Apollo and Dionysus; they complement and complete each other. From the start Narcissus "wanted the bright boy as a friend. He sensed in him his opposite, his complement; he would have liked to adopt, lead, enlighten, strengthen, and bring him to his bloom" (Hesse 18). The insightful ascetic shows the reader what Hesse

establishes in naming his characters. Narcissus and Goldmund's names do not reflect their own character, but that of their counterpart. Narcissus' name bears the most obvious relation to the mythical figure Narcissus who fell in love with his own reflection. The mythical Narcissus turns into a flower after he dies of grief. The relationship between Narcissus and nature is later reflected through Goldmund's communion with the natural world, especially his relationship to water and plants (Neuswanger 49). Goldmund's name derives from his patron saint, St. John Chrysostom. Russell Neuswanger describes the saint as, "a Greek, a Father and a Doctor of the Church, named for his eloquence, and noted for his asceticism...the selfless servant of the Word and of others, [and] schooled in self-denial" (48-49). Neuswanger goes on to explain how the description of St. John Chrysostom is synonymous with that of Narcissus. There are many qualities that Narcissus shares with St. John including the fact that the ascetic is a Greek teacher and inherits the name Abbot John by the end of the novel. Goldmund's first sculpture is inspired by Narcissus, but is made to represent the Apostle John. Though the two men do not have a volatile relationship like Apollo and Dionysus—a detail that could be attributed to the fact that they met in a religious cloister—Narcissus and Goldmund were destined to meet and challenge one another.

Hesse starts off his novel by concentrating on the figure of Narcissus and his position in the monastery. The author introduces the ascetic as a young, learned monk who possesses a talent for reading peoples' nature. Since the novel is a story about both characters, it only takes ten pages for Goldmund to appear as a quiet boy who is left at the cloister by his father with the sole purpose of joining the fraternal order. Though it takes a year for the two to form a connection outside of the classroom, where Narcissus reigns as teacher and Goldmund as student, both characters inspire each other from the start of their acquaintance. Narcissus, who up

to this point remains detached from his pupils, senses an instant connection with the boy.

“Narcissus was dark and spare; Goldmund, a radiant youth. Narcissus was analytical, a thinker; Goldmund, a dreamer with the soul of a child. But something they had in common bridged these contrasts: both were refined...both bore the special mark of fate” (Hesse 17). Their subdued natures, “both were refined [and] bore the special mark of fate,” signal an inherent quality that helps them “bridge these contrasts.” Religion and art emerge as the elements that aid in refining Narcissus and Goldmund. The presence of their “refined” qualities ensures that the two characters will reconcile *Geist* and *Natur*.

Narcissus is unable to approach Goldmund until the young boy is in need of Narcissus’ insight. The teacher attempts to help Goldmund at the height of his inner tension between spirit and intellect. Having gone to the village with his friends, the young boy encounters his first feelings of attraction when he meets two girls. Goldmund faces a great and apparent psychological tension that grabs Narcissus’ attention. Seeing that something is wrong with the young child, the teacher confronts Goldmund only to have the young boy erupt in tears. Understanding that the child is not physically sick, Narcissus takes the opportunity to form a connection that will help him “enlighten” Goldmund. Later in their acquaintance, the teacher challenges the young student. ““But you were not ill. You had no fever! And that is why you feel ashamed. No one feels ashamed succumbing to a fever, does he? You felt ashamed because you had succumbed to something else, to something that overpowered you”” (32). Narcissus’ ability to read people’s natures allows him to access the inner most part of Goldmund’s mind that the boy did not even fully understand. In recounting the story of his trip to the village, Goldmund tells Narcissus that he was on the verge of committing a sin fueled by passion, which could not happen due to his unspoken vow of becoming a monk. It is here that the teacher reveals his

purpose to his friend: “Some day you will think of what I am going to say to you now: our friendship has no other purpose, no other reason, than to show you how utterly unlike me you are” (34). Narcissus, unable to foresee the impact Goldmund’s friendship has wrought in his own nature, wants to help this “beautiful, healthy, flowering adolescent” acknowledge the figure of “Eve who stood behind” Goldmund’s emotions (34). The teacher suspects that Goldmund took after his mother due to the lack of information available about her prior to the boy probing his subconscious. Having heard stories about Goldmund’s father, Narcissus believes that the special characteristics Goldmund embodies must originate from his mother or from the “Eve who stood behind.” Once Goldmund remembers his mother, it is revealed that she had been a dancer who liked to “seduce men” and “acquired the reputation of a witch,” until the day she ran away (56). At the start of the text, Goldmund’s father is described as “an elderly gentleman with a worried, slightly pinched face” whose “conversation was courteous and cool” (11). The young student, who holds onto the nature he inherits from his father, is upset that his friend does not think they are similar. Goldmund enjoys spending his time singing with the youth choir, drawing nature and “was very fond of the hymns, especially of those in honor of Mary” (38). For Goldmund, these interests reinforce his desires to be an ascetic, but Narcissus sees beyond their superficial meaning. Nature, music, and the Madonna reflect the young boy’s inner nature.

During the discussion where Goldmund accesses his repressed memories, Narcissus describes their relationship. “We are sun and moon, dear friend; we are sea and land. It is not our purpose to become each other; it is to recognize each other” (42-43). In aligning them with “Sun and moon,” Narcissus creates a conscious divide between their dominant natures. “The moon and night, with its dreams of a lost childhood-*Heimat*, are associated with the sympathetic mother-principle. They become symbols of *Natur* ... Day represents the stern father-principle,

and the sun is *Geist*" (Mileck 23-24). Once Goldmund understands that his nature differs from Narcissus', he becomes violently upset, but "the extreme tension in Goldmund's soul did not dissolve itself in tears" (Hesse 46). Goldmund feels physical pains that lead him to faint. As the inhabitants of the cloister grow suspicious of Narcissus, the ascetic reveals to his abbot that the cause of Goldmund's suffering comes from "a forgotten part of his past," his mother (49).

Upon waking up from his slumber, Goldmund recalls seeing a "tall radiant woman with [a] full mouth and glowing hair" who was "looking at him with her regal light blue eyes" (53). Having told the young boy that he was "half awake, or completely asleep sometimes," Narcissus succeeds in waking Goldmund up spiritually (44). As with the Karamazov brothers and Aschenbach, dreams become the vehicle to self-awareness. Temira Pachmuss states, "The elimination of the demarcation line between reality and dream, or the real and the fantastic...enables the writer to employ the magical and the mysterious within the realistic texture of the novel..." (219). By being able to experience both worlds in a vivid manner, Goldmund exists in a realm where he can gain a more complete understanding.

Goldmund's reverence towards Narcissus grows after the boy acknowledges his inner nature, but the knowledge separates the two friends. Narcissus, who "completed his novitiate and had donned the habit," knows that he can no longer help his friend who will go "to regions in which he himself would never travel" (Hesse 57-58). The image of his mother drives Goldmund to seek new experience and knowledge through nature. His initial dream leads him to experience visions of his mother and nature that mix with his prayers to the Virgin Mary. Goldmund's dreams brought to him

childhood and mother love, the radiantly golden morning of life, but in them also the future swung, menacing, promising, beckoning, dangerous. At times these

dreams in which mother, Virgin, and mistress all fused into one, seemed horrendous crimes to him afterwards, blasphemies, deadly, unpardonable sins; at other times he found in them nothing but harmony and release (60).

The mother figure embodies womanhood; she transcends religion and social construction to emerge as different females “all fused into one.” The mother represents wholeness and brings with her life and death (59); she becomes a replacement for God. As Herbert Reichert asserts, “The God-Mother awakens both sensual and spiritual love, she encompasses not only the dark sinful world of the mother but also the bright virtuous (Christian) world of the father” (48-49). By combining Goldmund’s mother with the image of the Virgin, womankind transforms into the allegorical “God-Mother.” Womankind emerges as the force that can provide a natural education as opposed to the institutionalized education dictated by men in the cloister. The rediscovery of Goldmund’s mother leaves Narcissus goalless and without anything to contribute to the student’s life (Hesse 65). The ascetic, after bidding farewell to his friend, moves into the background of the cloister on the path to become a consecrated monk. Goldmund must now follow the “God-Mother” to experience more from life; the protagonist is only able to realize this after experiencing intercourse for the first time.

Goldmund’s religious devotion and knowledge of nature are the traits that send him into the arms of a woman and into communion with the natural elements. Father Anselm, the cloister’s doctor, asks Goldmund to gather a certain herb from the pastures beside the monastery. During his search, Goldmund loses himself in ponderings about nature and death and falls asleep in the middle of the fields. The cloister student, “returning from a forest of dreams,” wakes up to find his head “bedded softly; it was lying in a woman’s lap” (74). Rather than being afraid, the girl kisses Goldmund and he kisses back. The kiss is an initiation of Goldmund’s first sexual

encounter. By embedding sex with nature, Hesse expounds upon the reproductive nature of Goldmund's actions; the student's pleasure and productivity can only be found in nature. Goldmund's creative tendencies surface through his artistic abilities. When Goldmund "come[s] to himself" he asks the girl for her name and she responds, Lise (75). Lise's first initial recurs throughout the novel. Hesse utilizes names starting with the same letter to assign significance to supporting characters. A name starting with "L" signifies a woman who represents a new aspect of emotional attachment and growth; other women emerge as unimportant or didactic. The letter helps the reader distinguish who Goldmund pursues physical and emotional relationships with apart from the nameless women he sleeps with and those who are purely didactic. Lise is the prototype for Goldmund's desires.

After losing his virginity, Goldmund decides it is time to leave the monastery and that he must say goodbye to Narcissus. Goldmund finds his friend in seclusion, "like a corpse, rigid on his back, with pale, pointed face" and Narcissus has "difficulty recognizing his friend and understanding his words" (76). Despite his haggard condition, Narcissus still possesses the ability to tell Goldmund what is on his mind. The ascetic tells Goldmund that he has "fallen in love" and "met a woman" (77). Seeing that his friend understands, Goldmund makes last requests and asks Narcissus not to forget him. The teacher foretells the future and states, "You will come back, I ask it of you, I expect it. If you are in need some day, come to me, or call me. Farewell, Goldmund, go with God" (80). Narcissus' admonition to "go with God" echoes Goldmund's departing words to Lise. The phrase signals a shift in control. Narcissus is no longer able to protect Goldmund and so he must put the responsibility in God's hands. "Today he felt he had entered a country in which he must find his own roads, in which no Narcissus could guide him" (82). Goldmund now goes forth on the path to his mother.

After spending one more night with Lise, the girl leaves Goldmund and teaches him a new lesson about women and his living situation—everything around him is temporary. Having lived his life in a stable and secure cloister, Goldmund's living situation changes drastically. "Sometimes he had created creatures of his own imagination, like a small God, had drawn eyes and a mouth into the chalice of a flower, shaped figures into a cluster of leaves sprouting on a branch, placed a head in top of a tree" (89). The student attempts to merge religion and nature to make his new life resemble his life in the cloister. Nature, though warm and welcoming in the daytime, is frightening at night. Attempting to sleep in the forest, Goldmund fears wild animals and creatures that could attack him. Goldmund becomes "deeply disturbed. He realized that yesterday and today he had gone to sleep without saying his prayers. He got up, knelt beside his moss bed and said his evening prayer twice, for yesterday and today. Soon he was asleep again" (92). Goldmund's reliance on prayer reveals how much religion influences him; prayers connect him back to the cloister and Narcissus. His relationship with God assists him in mediating his natures. As time goes on, Goldmund will pray even less and stops believing in the Christian God. The scenes with Goldmund fashioning "a mouth in the chalice of a flower" and kneeling "beside his moss bed" signals a shift to a pantheistic belief in God. Once Goldmund starts sculpting, his religion will become a hybrid of beliefs that relies on reverence of the aesthetic.

Goldmund's artistic ability cannot be reached until he has experiences tension due to true love. Having slept with many women, relying on his good looks and "his childlike openness," Goldmund retains his willingness to experience everything (102). Coming upon his second or third winter (Goldmund has lost track of time since he lives outside of society), the vagabond stops at a knight's house for food and a bed for the night. After becoming aware of Goldmund's education, the knight invites his guest to eat dinner at his table. It is here that Goldmund meets

the knight's daughters, Lydia and Julie (104). This encounter instigates the protagonist's torrid love affair with Lydia and relationship with Julie, which leads to his first close encounter with death. Lydia represents a new understanding of love for Goldmund. With the knight's daughter he learns about prolonged courting and romance. His time at the knight's castle transforms Goldmund, "He was no longer a boy" (122). As Goldmund and Lydia's relationship progresses, her younger sister Julie starts to notice their connection and gets jealous. Julie walks in on the pair in the same bed and says, "I don't enjoy being in my room by myself all the time. Either you take me in with you, and we all lie together all three of us, or I go and wake father" (124). The proposition tantalizes and taunts Goldmund. The lover of experience has a choice to defy natural order and submit to his passions, which puts him in a very dangerous situation, or he could deny Julie and risk the anger of the knight. The choice is one where Goldmund loses in either situation. Inviting Julie to his bed, Goldmund "was aware how embarrassing and grotesque the whole situation was; it was becoming almost unbearable" (124). The protagonist's mistake comes when he indulges in the situation and Lydia becomes jealous of her lover and her sister. Ordering her sister to leave with her, Lydia reveals her bond with Goldmund to her father, while not implicating Julie in the relationship.

The next morning, the knight summons Goldmund and takes him for a walk. The knight banishes his guest, but allows him to keep his life. The knight tells Goldmund to, "Go now, and may God forgive you" (127). The knight's last words echo Narcissus' last words that place Goldmund in the care and judgment of God. Both encounters lead the protagonist on a different path from the one he had been following and remove the responsibility from the speaker. Goldmund is continuously pushed to experience more out of life as a consequence of his decisions; the protagonist experiences a loss of true love. After leaving the knight's castle,

Goldmund comes to a town where he watches a woman give birth. The learner watches the woman's face at the height of her pain only to realize, "Miraculously, without understanding why, he was surprised by the realization that pain and joy could resemble each other so closely" (131). This situation represents something Goldmund already experiences, but does not understand. Narcissus tries to explain to Goldmund that things could be similar and complementary in their opposition. Goldmund only understands the relationship between opposites when he becomes an artist.

Goldmund's path to becoming a sculptor does not start until he experiences every aspect of life. In witnessing the birth, he understands the beginning of life's journey. With the introduction of Viktor, the student learns about death. Viktor emerges as an antithesis to Narcissus. The man, "who looked half like a priest and half like a highway robber," spoke to Goldmund "with scraps of Latin," and called him "*amicus*"—a term hitherto used only by Narcissus (132). The main difference between Narcissus and Viktor is that the former leads Goldmund to life while the latter leads him to death. The similarities reveal that Goldmund desires to find another teacher and companion like Narcissus. In utilizing familiar discourse, Viktor appears to be a worthy proxy. After traveling with his new friend for a while, Goldmund sees the differences between himself and his companion. "[Goldmund] would never be able to learn Viktor's way of fighting the horror, his sly, thievish squeaking by, his loud brazen jests and wordy humor" (137). A few moments after making his observations, Viktor attacks Goldmund and the protagonist subsequently kills Viktor. Touching Viktor's blood and assessing the situation, the protagonist exclaims, "Now I have murdered a man... Dear Mother of God, I have killed a man" (138). In his time of need, Goldmund calls on the "Mother of God" to protect him. Mobilized by the sight of the dead man, he starts to wander around the forest. Goldmund

experiences despair for the first time. “Hunger cried in his belly like a wild beast; several times exhaustion overcame him in the middle of a field” (139). This situation teaches the protagonist about mortality. Being hungry and exhausted, Goldmund is on the verge of dying. In the middle of his wanderings and delusions, Goldmund calls out to Narcissus and mocks the cloister and institution, which he serves. “Building walls and dormitories and chapels and churches won’t keep death out; death looks in through the window, laughing, knowing every one of you” (140). Having killed a man and facing death, Goldmund begins to realize the ubiquitous quality of death. Even the cloister, Goldmund’s mental safe haven, is not immune to the influence of mortality.

The protagonist, starved and “half-dead,” returns to the village where he met Viktor (141). Christine, a woman who Goldmund had seduced during his first stay in the village, brings him back to life. Christine is the manifestation of the Mother of God Goldmund called upon after killing Viktor; her care and affection renew the protagonist’s life. “Soon he was able to walk again and eager to move on, but she held him back because on that day the moon was changing” (143). Being a woman associated with the moon, Christine protects Goldmund from himself and the natural elements. Continuing on his journey, Goldmund encounters priests, villagers, and nature that help him transition from being a murderer back into his regular routine. Finding a cloister, Goldmund stops to take refuge. The “memory of Mariabronn” moves the young man and instills in him the desire to confess (148). After accepting the priest’s warnings “without speaking of damnation,” Goldmund sees a statue of the Virgin Mary. The protagonist becomes enamored with the image and resolves to find the creator who could carve “the expression of her eyes above the grieving mouth and the gracefully rounded forehead [that] were so alive with spirit” (148). Master Niklaus, the sculptor, has the ability to combine all of the mother figures

from Goldmund's life into the form of the Virgin Mother. Religion and art exist simultaneously. The combination continues for the rest of Goldmund's life and greatly influences his own creations. The statues represent a marriage of Goldmund's past life and his current. Sculpting becomes the means in which the protagonist can process his experiences.

In finding Master Niklaus, Goldmund acquires a new teacher. The letter "N" associates Niklaus with Narcissus and signals to the reader that he will lead Goldmund to new understandings. The protagonist must show his abilities to the master before learning how to sculpt. At this moment, Goldmund creates his first serious drawing and it is of Narcissus. "Not since his departure from the cloister had he seen his friend so clearly, possessed his image so completely within him" (154). The appearance of Narcissus sanctions Goldmund's newest endeavor. Sculpting is a means to further Goldmund's knowledge of *Geist*.

It is in learning how to create art that Goldmund is finally able to understand the marriage of contradictions. "Death and ecstasy were one. The mother of life could be called love or desire; she could also be called death, grave, or decay. Eve was the mother. She was the source of bliss as well as of death; eternally she gave birth and eternally she killed; her love was fused with cruelty" (170). The nature of Eve, which Goldmund is devoted to, connects everything from the primordial creation to life's subsequent end. The protagonist's dependence upon nature and spontaneous inspiration causes him to hate the life Niklaus leads. The master creates art for money, while Goldmund "saw the possibility of reconciling his deepest contradictions, or at least of expressing newly and magnificently the split in his nature" (171). When Goldmund completes his statue of Narcissus, Niklaus approaches him to join the artist's guild, marry his daughter Lisbeth, and gain his fortune. Goldmund refuses. The wanderer states, "I must leave, I must travel, I must be free" (191). Having learned how to express himself under Master Niklaus'

instruction, Goldmund gains a new skill that assists in his journey. In order to reach his mother, Goldmund must keep moving.

Back on the road, Goldmund establishes new connections and encounters another natural phenomenon: the plague. Goldmund approaches a farmhouse with his new companion Robert and senses that something is amiss. The farmhouse contains a dead family, struck down by the disease. “The sights in this hut were ghastly and the stench of corpses dreadful; still, it all held a deep attraction for him. Everything spoke of greatness, of fate. It was real, uncompromising” (201). The artist in Goldmund appreciates the sight of the family. Their unity, both in death and life, revealed the “greatness of fate.” Having seen death before, most vividly when he murders Viktor, Goldmund’s understanding of life’s final moment deepens. The protagonist’s respect towards death shows his age; Goldmund is older and more attuned to the natural cycle. The plague takes Goldmund’s faith in humanity, Master Niklaus, and Lene (another one of the protagonist’s lovers). By experiencing life during the plague, the protagonist sees the evil side of men. He watches the last living souls indulge in hatred and nihilism as people try to find a source for the plague. “Often he participated in mad orgies, played the lute or danced through feverish nights in the glow of peat torches” (221). Goldmund loses God, which causes him to briefly succumb to a type of Dionysian nature. The mention of “orgies,” “lutes,” and “feverish nights” allude to Dionysus. Walking “through hell with wide open eyes,” Goldmund comes across a painting of the danse macabre, a “dance of death...pale bony death, dancing people out of life, king and bishop, abbot and earl, knight, doctor, peasant, lansquenet—everyone [death] took along with him, while skeleton musicians played on hollow bones” (222). For the artist, the image emerges as beautiful, but not accurate. Goldmund knows death as “sweet rather, and seductive, motherly, an enticement to come home” (222-223). Goldmund needs to understand

every aspect of death before finding his mother. His conception of the end leads him to complete his travels, find Master Niklaus, and return to Mariabronn and Narcissus.

Having reached his first destination and finding his old master dead, Goldmund returns to art. “Drawing had greatly lessened his feeling of heaviness and lightened the bursting fullness in his soul. As long as he was drawing, he did not know where he was” (238). The artist is able to transcend time and space through his work. The plague and all its sad associations vanish; Goldmund is renewed and becomes the lover he once was. Returning to the state he maintained in his boyhood, Goldmund courts the count’s mistress. The “tall figure and blond joyful energy reminded him of the image of his mother as he had once, as a boy in Mariabronn, carried it in his heart” (241). The woman—whose name is Agnes—reflects the image of the mother in her pure state, undefiled by images of death, birth, or agony. Goldmund finds himself in a situation similar to that of his stay at the knight’s castle. He makes an agreement with Agnes as to when he should come to her in the castle. The plague seems to have emptied Goldmund’s memory from the danger of unsanctioned love. Agnes’ name—which translates into “pure” or “holy”—is juxtaposed with her status as a mistress and physical relationship with Goldmund. By having a name that does not start with the letter “L,” the woman foreshadows danger for the protagonist; her physical similarities to his mother foreshadow death.

Though Goldmund is able to see Agnes in the castle once and escape unnoticed, he indulges in his affair and returns a second time. As Agnes reveals her fears for Goldmund’s life, the count starts coming towards her room. Finding Goldmund in the closet, the count has him taken to “the dungeon, and tomorrow morning the rascal will dangle from the gallows” (252). Goldmund finally faces death and, being tied up, can do nothing to save himself. The protagonist’s absorption with his impending death distracts him from noticing the priests, which

is unusual for Goldmund who gravitates towards priests throughout the novel. One of the priests, after seeing the prisoner, asks if the man had a confessor. When he finds out that Goldmund does not, the priest volunteers, “Then I shall go to him in the morning...[b]efore early mass I’ll bring him the holy sacraments and hear his confession. You will swear to me that he will not be led away before”(253). The guards agree to this request and lead Goldmund into his confinement. Pondering his future, Goldmund sees one way out: murdering the priest.

Goldmund, being greeted by a Christian greeting, fails to respond the first time. When he is addressed a second time, the protagonist looks up and “was shaken to the roots of his being. The whole world had changed and the sudden collapse of his superhuman effort threatened to choke him” (261). Goldmund finds that the priest is his friend, Narcissus. Narcissus saves Goldmund and takes him home to Mariabronn. Having experienced a prolonged traumatic period instigated by the plague, Goldmund needs Narcissus’ insight to process the effects of the disease in a logical manner and to regain his inner homeostasis. On the way back to their cloister, the two companions engage in a debate fueled by Goldmund’s plague experiences. After experiencing the many facets of death, Goldmund returns to the cloister. The protagonist’s life has come full circle. He “did not want to become a brother of the order. Or a pious or learned man; he wanted to make statues, and the thought that his youthful home was to be the of these works made him happy” (274). It is at the cloister that the artist is able to create once more and comes to terms with his religious beliefs.

Upon his return to Mariabronn, Goldmund finds that his friend has changed. “This man Narcissus was no longer the adolescent of old times, no longer the gentle, devoted St. John” (273-274). Narcissus became a man just as Goldmund matures, yet the friends differ in how they understand the world. Narcissus understands that Goldmund processes the world through art, yet

he holds to his belief that ideas must be expressed in abstract words that differ from images. Narcissus divides himself from Goldmund by stating, “for you, the world was made of images, for me of ideas” (279). The ascetic’s abstract understandings formed in the cloister, while the artist’s life had formed through experience. The abbot tells his friend, “Your life has been much harder than mine” (281). This statement shows that Narcissus understands the difference in experience that he and Goldmund encounter in life.

Though Narcissus’ argument could be defended through words, Goldmund requires work to prove his point. In return for staying at the monastery, Goldmund provides new statues and woodwork for the cloister. His first task is to create an ornament for the chapel’s raised niche. The artist creates a “small surging world [that] grew from the thick spiral of the stairs: creatures, plants, animals, and people. In their midst stood Noah between grape leaves and grapes. The work was a picture book of praise for the creation of the world and its beauty, free in expression but directed by an inner order and discipline” (289). Goldmund is the only artist who can create such a work combining nature and religion into art. At the same time, the artist works on sculptures of the evangelists, which reflect people from his past. It is through the sculptures that Goldmund affirms his connection with the ascetic. When the artist sees “an almost timid smile on that face of mind and will, a smile of love and surrender, a shimmer, as though all its loneliness and pride had been pierced for a second and nothing shone from it but a heart full of joy,” he knows that Narcissus understands (290). The debate between words and images unites the friends once more. Each man holds an understanding of life and together, Narcissus and Goldmund embody education and experience. Hesse’s dialogue between *Geist* and *Natur* reveals that both experiences are necessary.

The protagonist “could speak intelligently with men, and they understood an artist’s work, but for all the rest—chatting, tenderness, games, love, pleasure without thought—did not flourish among men, for that one needed women, wandering freedom, and ever new impressions” (296-297). Goldmund, having spent a lot of time in the company of men, needs to nurture his mother nature and find “ever new impressions.” His return to the monastery forces Goldmund to reflect on his life experiences. During this time, the artist realizes how close he came to death, but the idea of his life ending still frightens him. As Mileck states, “But *Geist* as a guiding principle of life could only mean greater individuation and more painful isolation; and as yet, Hesse lacked the firm conviction and the inner fortitude necessary to endure such consequences” (21). What Hesse lacked, Goldmund embodies. Goldmund faces “painful isolation” when he starts his journey to his mother. The first time he left the monastery, Goldmund was searching for new life experiences. The more he followed his will, the less attached to people and places he became. The comfort he feels after returning to the monastery bothers him. Goldmund needs to be isolated once more in order to accept death.

The penultimate chapter of Hesse’s novel proves to be a blaringly didactic addition to a tale about life experiences. After introducing Narcissus, Hesse spends most of the text chronicling the life of Goldmund. Chapter 19 offers insight into the Apollonian figure who initiates the text. The reader does not follow Goldmund into the forest, but learns more about the interior workings of Narcissus. By concentrating on the abbot, the author forces the readers to question their own beliefs. Narcissus, who has been devoted to the cloister life from a young age, starts to question the completeness of his life experiences after he sees Goldmund’s sculptures: “Goldmund had shown [Narcissus] that a man destined for high things can dip into the lowest depth of the bloody, drunken chaos of life, and soil himself with much dust and blood, without

becoming small and common, without killing the divine spark within himself..." (Hesse 301). Narcissus experiences life vicariously through Goldmund. As Goldmund travels one last time, Narcissus develops a relationship with "the Mary figure" his friend created after the image of Lydia, the knight's daughter. The figure teaches Narcissus of the life Goldmund lived. The Mary statue aids in Narcissus' education of experience.

Upon returning to the monastery, Goldmund is sick and dying. Hesse holds the protagonist's new experiences back from the reader in order to show Narcissus' growth. Seeing his friend in agony, Narcissus "touched Goldmund's hair and forehead with his lips. Astonished first and then moved, Goldmund knew what had happened" (310). The lover changes the ascetic. Goldmund realizes that Narcissus' *Geist* has been realized. The change in Narcissus is reinforced in his declaration of love to his friend. "If I nevertheless know what love is, it is because of you" (310). "The Lydia-madonna stood in the room, watching" the friends understand each other on a level that they could not access before (311). Goldmund's journey proves beneficial for himself and his friend. The declaration of mutual affection leads Goldmund to confess everything to Narcissus, including his excitement at the idea that death would lead him to his long-deposed mother.

Goldmund left the monastery to find Agnes, the embodiment of death. Agnes' rejection of Goldmund's sexual advances shows him that "force and youth and intelligence" abandoned him (312). The forces that helped him survive as a wanderer are lost and his opportunity to live has ended. After falling off of his horse and sustaining an injury, Goldmund experiences his mother, which helps prepare him for death; this is when the protagonist's *amor fati* is complete. Mileck asserts, "The assertive Nietzschean activism yielded suddenly to a Schopenhauer-like passivity, a restless quiet to a quietistic acceptance, and self-realization to a yearning for self-

obliteration” (20). Beholding the image of his mother once more “holding me in her lap, and that she opened my breast and put her fingers between my ribs to pluck out my heart. When I saw and understood that, [the pain] no longer hurt” (Hesse 314). Goldmund is able to die because of his mother. She symbolizes life and death; the return of her image assuages his fears and confirms that he has completed his path. His final words to Narcissus, “But how will you die when your time comes, Narcissus, since you have no mother? Without a mother, one cannot love. Without a mother, one cannot die,” show his concern for his friend’s salvation (315). Hesse reverses the roles between ascetic and artist. Goldmund does not think that Narcissus’ life is complete. His last words show that he still does not understand the extent of his friend’s love for him. Narcissus proves to Goldmund that he has the capacity to love when he declares his love for Goldmund. Narcissus’ bond to Goldmund is as strong as that of Goldmund and his mom. Goldmund, who represents the moon and its motherly nature, is the one who will usher Narcissus into death because he is the only person whom the ascetic ever loved. The artist’s last sculpture of the Virgin Mary provides Narcissus with a physical representation of a mother. When Goldmund dies, Narcissus is able to follow him because of the last work of art.

Conclusion

Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Dostoevsky, Mann, and Hesse reveal that recognizing two internal natures within man was not an isolated phenomenon, but rather a widespread realization. As myth subsided from society, each of the authors attempts to understand the inner workings of man in an era where scientific discoveries were more revered than art. Literature and art offered stories in response to human inquiry on subjects including creation, nature, and mankind. Once science and technology offered irrefutable answers about the physical world, theorists turned inside to understand man’s own nature. Karen Armstrong states, “The myth of the hero was not

intended to provide us with icons to admire, but was designed to tap into the vein of heroism within ourselves” (135). The heroic quest perpetuated through myth continued, but its destination was internal. Spanning different centuries and countries, the authors each refined the dyad and attempted to resolve the tension. After analyzing man’s interior and establishing a competing dyad between the head and the heart, the need for art, myth, and religion grew. A suspension of disbelief becomes necessary to avoid nihilism. Dostoevsky, Mann, and Hesse utilized similar structures to reveal the inner workings of man.

Dreams are a consistent theme within the novels to reveal the division found within man. Dreams initiate the resolution of Dostoevsky’s characters, punctuate Aschenbach’s repressive tendencies, and encourage Goldmund’s life of experience. By utilizing dreams, each of the authors blurs the lines between reality and sleep, the physical world and the interior psychology. Being able to exist between two realms allows the characters to develop a deeper understanding of their natures. Alexei, Dmitri, and Ivan confront their fears and desires as they experience didactic images. Aschenbach uses dreams to indulge in his Apollonian nature and suppress his Dionysian nature. By not learning from his dreams, Mann’s protagonist dies. Goldmund garners the most success from his dreams. Remembering his mother through his dreams inspires Goldmund to gain experience, find himself, and learn how to sculpt. His relationship with dreams, nature, religion, and art assist him in bridging his inner divide and the divide between the physical world and the spiritual realm, life and death.

Women emerge as important figures who influence the main characters into realizing their dual natures. In *The Brothers Karamazov*, Grushenka and Katya influence the brothers into becoming more self-aware. Grushenka, a woman of low social standing and a moneylender, is able to help Alexei and Dmitri’s reconciliation of forces because she supports them. Though a

woman of high social standing, Katerina brings more harm than help to Ivan's journey because her actions go against his attempt at resolving his dyad. Aschenbach's mother, the daughter of a "Bohemian bandmaster" and "source of [his] foreign racial features," becomes the source that contributes the Dionysian nature to the protagonist (Mann 12). Her evident absence accents Aschenbach's suppression of his passionate nature that later leads to his death. The memory of Goldmund's mother bookends his life. The quest to find his mother drives Goldmund to experience every aspect of life; she is his inspiration. Both Aschenbach and Goldmund share physical attributes with their mothers, which more closely aligns them to their passion driven natures. Though Aschenbach neglects his Dionysian nature for a prolonged period of time, Goldmund embraces his *Geist* from a young age and is able to live fully. Women, whether physically or spiritually present, augment the dyad's differences, yet simultaneously assist the characters at resolving their inner tension.

Spiritual fathers emerge as another necessity to temper the natures and ultimately survive. The advisers embody religion and serve as spiritual anchors to the characters. By following Father Zosima's instruction to stay near his brothers, Alexei's relationship with the elder enables him to assist his brothers in their spiritual growth. Goldmund's relationship with Narcissus acts as a guiding force throughout his life. The protagonist recalls Narcissus at his lowest points, like after he killed Viktor, and at his most productive moments, like when he sculpts the Apostle John. Aschenbach, who lives an isolated life, does not have an adviser to assist him in tempering his natures. He is the only character that dies as a result of unresolved natures.

Each of the novels ends with hope for a better end, whether or not the characters resolve their inner tension. Alexei and Dmitri end the novel with prospects of leaving the small Russian town; having resolved their inner tensions the brothers can advance in life. Ivan, not yet attaining

his resolution, lays in a coma, but is not dead—there is still hope for Ivan to understand his internal dyad. Tadzio points Aschenbach to the afterlife, though Aschenbach was not able to enjoy his inner peace on earth. The image of “the promising immensity” of the sea points the protagonist to a place of calm rest. In dying, Goldmund reaches out to another world to be united to his mother and to experience the afterlife. It is the presence of his mother and Narcissus that allow Goldmund to pass into his new experience.

Dostoevsky, Mann, and Hesse reveal the struggle housed within the form of man. In separating each nature, the authors each customize a dyad that consists of a logical nature and one of an emotional nature. Dostoevsky subscribes to Russian Orthodoxy to find a resolution. Aschenbach’s neither addressing the spiritual life nor ability to create art over a prolonged period of time reveals the dangers of the void created by unmitigated or unexercised natures. Hesse combines the works of his predecessors to create a rich chronicle that follows the progression of Goldmund’s life from birth to death. As time progressed and each of the authors added a new element to the established theories that came before them, an equation emerged. Man must first recognize his dueling nature. In understanding his personal dyad man can reconcile the forces through a religious spirituality. After achieving peace, man can live. *The Brothers Karamazov*, *Death in Venice*, and *Narcissus and Goldmund* solidify the importance of religion for a full life in modern society, despite the presence and potential dehumanization of science and technology.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Roger B. *Dostoevsky: Myths of Duality*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1986. Print.
- Armstrong, Karen. *A Short History of Myth*. Edinburgh: Canongate, 2005. Print.
- Austin, M. R. "Aesthetic Experience and the Nature of Religious Perception." *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. 14.3 (1980): 19-35. Web. 5 February 2015.
- Belknap, Robert L. *The Genesis of The Brothers Karamazov: The Aesthetics, Ideologies, and Psychology of Making a Text*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1990. Print.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *The Brothers Karamazov*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1990. Print.
- Evlampiev, I. I. "Dostoevsky and Nietzsche: Toward a New Metaphysics of Man." *Russian Studies in Philosophy*. 41.3 (2003): 7-32. Web. 29 September 2014.
- Forster, E. M. *Aspects of the Novel*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company, 1927. Print.
- Girard, René. "Dionysus versus the Crucified." *MLN*. 99.4 (1984): 816-835. Web. 30 January 2015.
- Golden, Kenneth L. "Archetypes and 'Immoralists' in Andre Gide and Thomas Mann." *College Literature*. 15.2 (1988): 189-198. Web. 22 January 2015.
- Gropper, Esther C. "The Disenchanted Turn to Hesse." *The English Journal*. 61.7 (1972): 979-984. Web. 30 May 2014.
- Heilbut, Anthony. "Death in Venice" *Thomas Mann: Eros and Literature*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996. 246-267. Print.
- Hesse, Hermann. *Narcissus and Goldmund*. New York: Picador, 1957. Print.

Jackson, Robert Louis. *A New Word on The Brothers Karamazov*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2004. Print.

Johnson, Gary. "'Death in Venice' and the Aesthetic Correlative." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 27.3(2004): 83-96. *JSTOR*. Web. 18 March 2014.

Lavrin, Janko. "A Note on Nietzsche and Dostoevsky." *Russian Review*. 28.2 (1969): 160-170. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 August 2015.

Lavrin, Janko. *Nietzsche: An Approach*. London: Methuen & Co., 1948. Print.

Lavrin, Janko. *Dostoevsky: A Study*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1947. Print.

Mann, Thomas. *Death in Venice*. New York: Harper Collins, 2004. Print.

May, Keith M. "Mann: Beyond Good and Evil." *Nietzsche and Modern Literature: Themes in Yeats, Rilke, Mann and Lawrence*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988. 79-110. Print.

Mileck, Joseph. *Hermann Hesse and His Critics: The Criticism and Bibliography of Half a Century*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1958. Print.

Neuswanger, Russell. "Names as Glass Beads in Hesse's *Narziss und Goldmund*." *Monatshefte* 67.1 (Spring 1975): 48-58. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 February 2015.

Nicholls, RA. *Nietzsche in the Early Work of Thomas Mann*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1955. Print.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1995. Print.

Pachmuss, Temira. "Dostoevsky and Hermann Hesse: Analogies and Congruences." *Orbis Litterarum*. 30.3 (1975): 210-224. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 17 February 2015.

Reichert, Herbert W. *The Impact of Nietzsche on Hermann Hesse*. Mt. Pleasant: The Enigma Press, 1972. Print.

Roberts, Peter. "Education and the Limits of Reason: Reading Dostoevsky." *Educational Theory*. 62.2 (April 2012): 203-223. *Wiley Online Library*. Web. 25 February 2015.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *Religion: A Dialogue and Other Essays*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1973. Print.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *The Pessimist's Handbook: A Collection of Popular Essays*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964. Print.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *The World as Will and Representation*. Indian Hills: The Falcon's Wing Press, 1958. Print.

Shestov, Lev. *Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Nietzsche*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1969. Print.

Shookman, Ellis. *Thomas Mann's Death in Venice: a novella and its critics*. Rochester: Camden House, 2003. Print.

Ward, Bruce K. *Redeeming the Enlightenment: Christianity and the Liberal Virtues*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010. Print.

Wright, A. Colin. "The Theme of Polarities in Russian and German Twentieth-century Literature: Mikhail Bulgakov and Hermann Hesse as Literary Cousins." *Canadian Slavonic Papers/ Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*. 25.1 (March 1983): 54-72. *JSTOR*. Web. 17 February 2015.

Vandenabeele, Bart. "Schopenhauer On The Values Of Aesthetic Experience." *Southern Journal Of Philosophy* 45.4 (2007): 565-582. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 3 October 2014

Von Der Lippe, George B. "Death in Venice in Literature and Film: Six 20th-Century Versions." *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature* 32.1 (1999): 35-54. *JSTOR*. Web. 4 February 2014.