Spring 2014

Raskolnikov: Not the Typical Criminal Man

Mary C. Noonan
Providence College, mnoonan1@friars.providence.edu

Mary Noonan

Dr. Hogan

Dostoevsky Colloquium

Research Paper Due: April 15, 2014

Raskolnikov: Not the Typical Criminal Man

In the nineteenth century, many developments in the field of criminal psychology and criminal anthropology were made. Social scientists began to study and qualify the characteristics and mindsets of the world's criminals. Cesare Lombroso is known as one of the fathers of criminology for his work in compiling many criminal statistics and theories on what he called the "born criminal man." In *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevsky creates one of the most well-known and analyzed criminal characters in all of literature: Rodion Romanovich Roskolnikov. By his fifth edition, Lombroso theories had been polished for several years and culminate in the suggestion that his criminological theories may be put to practical use, not only in identifying and convicting typical criminals, but in designating the proper punishments to contribute to the development of a less dangerous society as well as the reformation of criminal men. Lombroso's theories outlined in his famous work, *Criminal Man,* have influenced criminology and may provide a helpful lens for looking at some of the motivations for various criminals since it was written; however, Dostoevsky's Raskolnikov, in his criminal act and his subsequent psychological torment and reform, does not seem to be reducible to the description of such a criminal man. Not fitting into a specific category of criminal or type of legal punishment, Raskolnikov's crime is a much different type of transgression and requires more than typical reform.

Beginning in the 1850s, social scientists embarked in the new field of criminal sociology. This field involved a systematic study of criminals in order to help prevent crime. The fathers of criminal sociology combined the studies of criminal anthropology, physio-psychology, psychopathology and criminal statistics in order to make conclusions about the characteristics of criminals, and they used these conclusions in hopes of reducing crime and reforming criminals (Ferri 2). Emerging related psychological systems of the time included the study of physiognomy: the idea that one's character could be revealed through facial features, and phrenology, which suggested that one's character could be traced to the anatomy of the brain (Leatherbarrow 131). In his famous *Criminal Man*, Lombroso compiles a large range of statistics on various physical qualities of known criminals. Looking at skull sizes, cranial and facial abnormalities, height, hair color, and eye color of known criminals, Lombroso attempted to classify such a "born criminal" by these physical characteristics (Lombroso 56). He was one of the first scientists in this field to associate criminal attributes with an organic or natural genesis, and believed heredity to be a big determinant in one's potential for criminal activity (Ferri 2). Despite receiving some criticism for his theories and observations by other criminologists, Lombroso gained fame for having united many scattered observations about criminals into organized theories describing the "criminal man" (Ferri 40). His task and progress marked a shift from viewing the criminal as an ordinary man to using techniques of physical and psychological dissection to understand both normal and criminal men (and women) (Ferri 44).

The process of sifting through and looking for patterns in large amounts of criminal and anthropological data led to Lombroso's formation of the image and idea of the "born criminal:" a criminal whose physical and psychological characteristics are passed down through inheritance (Lombroso 221). Not only did Lombroso make the observations that born criminals were

generally taller, had darker hair, darker eyes, and more cranial abnormalities than non-criminal men, he identified that born criminals exhibited less sensitivity to pain than ordinary men (Lombroso 56). This lack of physical sensitivity could be related to the lack of moral sensitivity that criminal men experience leading to a lack of sympathy and the indifference that they feel toward their victims (Lombroso 63). Lombroso states that criminal men are rarely capable of truly loving a woman, and they often shy away from regular society. They may seem to be intelligent, in their planning and execution of their criminal acts, but in actuality, Lombroso says that criminals tend to be intellectually lower than normal men. This results in the tendency to not give any thought to consequences of their actions, and lack of ability to realize that their crime is both unjust and fruitless, always returning to haunt the criminal themselves (Lombroso 74). They often demonstrate a lack of stability and no thought about the consequences of their actions, exhibited in their tendencies to gamble and proclivities toward alcoholism (Lombroso 68). Even in his surface description of the born criminal, Lombroso's theories fall short in explaining Raskolnikov's criminal act. Raskolnikov, unlike this born criminal man with inferior intelligence, is initially respected as a very intelligent student, and he gives extreme and full consideration to his act and its consequences. Dostoevsky focuses less on the physical characteristics of Raskolnikov and more on his complex psychological identity. In addition to outlining the physical and psychological aspects of a born criminal man, Lombroso explores the similar and differing characteristics of several other classifications of criminals.

Whereas the born criminal is driven to crime by predispositions that are inherited from one's parents, Lombroso identifies several other types of criminals that are driven to crime by a variety of other reasons including the occasional criminal and the political criminal. The occasional criminal does willingly commit crimes in the eyes of the law, but usually not of the

same magnitude or with the same violent intentions as born criminals. Whereas nearly all criminal acts of born criminals are accompanied by opportunity, opportunity is not usually "the straw that breaks the camel's back" (Lombroso 289). In the case of the occasional criminal, though, crime is often characterized by minimal criminality and maximum influence of opportunity. If the temptation or opportunity is not present, these criminals are not likely to commit the crime (Ferri 154). These occasional criminals, including a group that Lombroso describes as "pseudo-criminals," pose much less of a danger to society than born criminals because they do not display the same tendencies to continually commit crimes (291). Lombroso continues to identify those criminals who are primarily motivated by fanaticism in a certain political idea or by extreme discontent with a government system (Lombroso 313). Though these criminals are also less dangerous than the born criminal, they often have no fear of punishment, and feel minimal repentance for their criminal acts because they fervently believe in their motivation and cause of their actions (Lombroso 315). In the case of Raskolnikov, the label of the occasional or fanatical criminal cannot suffice. At first glance, he seems to be motivated by his utilitarian theories, and resemble the occasional criminal. Many the instances that lead him to actually commit the murder are instances of fate or of "some form of predestination" (Dostoevsky 81). Looking more closely at his development after the crime, we see that Raskolnikov does not fit the mold of the fanatic who holds his theories firmly. In addition to his categorization of the born criminal, and the specifically motivated criminals, Lombroso distinguishes a group he calls the criminally insane from both of these subsets of criminals.

The criminally insane, for Lombroso, refers to the unstable and violent criminals that have a sickness that contributes to their total lack of morality and knowledge of "right" or "wrong." Looking at Lombroso's theories on the criminally insane may be relevant to the study

of Raskolnikov since he seems to be quite misguided in his sense of traditional morality. These criminals exhibit a range of neuropathic diseases and psychological disorders from epilepsy to partial paralysis and emotional imbalances (Lombroso 81). They commit crimes without any sensation of remorse, and they admit this truth, in contrast to born criminals who often attempt to hide their crimes and cover their lack of remorse. Other early criminologists described the criminally insane as those individuals who commit acts that would be punishable as crimes if committed by sane men (Ferri 141). These men are inclined to commit crimes because of the presence of some sort of mental illness, be it idiocy, violent mania, epilepsy, or other diagnosable disorders. They "chat about their crimes with pleasure" and are often convinced of their innocence. Unlike born criminals who often plot together their crimes, the insane are usually totally incapable of friendship (Lombroso 84). A subset of the criminally insane that Lombroso discusses is a group called the mattoids. The mattoids are characterized by their capability of succeeding in daily jobs as lawyers, doctors and politicians. They show affection for their families, but in a way that is excessive and most often insincere. They often display an exaggerated energy for things that are not a related to their careers. In addition, they frequently write, and it is in their writing that their egotistical sense of superiority becomes evident. The mattoids become a concern in the eyes of the law only when their "egoism gains the upper hand." Their crimes are associated with impulsiveness and often when they are committed, the criminal's mind is "truly out of itself" (285). Additionally, the mattoids claim that their crimes are of benefit to society in order to defend their inflated self-worth. Raskolnikov may resemble such criminally insane individuals in that he wrote extensively about his theories, and was previously successful as a student and a tutor. However, this state of mental illness, of being out of one's mind, and truly lacking a sense of right and wrong, is not something that can be

accurately attributed to the character of Raskolnikov during the novel. Though Lombroso describes a separate category of the criminally insane, he acknowledges that the line between crime and madness is very fine; this fine line often poses difficulties for the fair and just conviction and punishment of such "insane criminals" (Lombroso 83).

Another key aspect of the criminal mind that many social scientists began to explore was the motivations that criminals have for their criminal acts. Lombroso explored the idea of education or lack of education and its association with criminal tendencies. His results were fairly weak. In some cases, he observed that education could be a vehicle to access and discover new ways and methods of crime. Conversely, he also observed that where education was widely accessible, it may contribute to reducing the number of educated criminals (Lombroso 76). Natural and hereditary factors explain most criminal behavior in the findings of Lombroso's studies, leaving social and economic motivation as secondary to the nature of the criminals themselves (Lombroso 338). Along with the physical characteristics and motivations that Lombroso outlines in his theories, Sigmund Freud, another early psychologist, identifies two main traits that are essential in a criminal: "boundless egoism and strong, destructive urge." These two traits combined contribute to a total absence of love in criminals ("Dostoevsky and Parricide" 178). Though the emotions of sensitivity and love are often absent in the world's criminals, the passions of pride and immense self-worth do tend to exist in their minds. According to Lombroso, "the most common motive for modern crimes is vanity." A criminal's pride may even cause them to talk about their criminal acts both before and after committing them (Lombroso 65). In the case of Dostoevsky's Raskolnikov, as well as many other of Lombroso's criminal men, the criminal is motivated by this egotistical nature. The criminal dares to violate existing laws, and in doing so, makes his own laws. They may even commit the

crime, as is true for Raskolnikov, to exert their individual right to commit a crime (Bloom 12). In contrast to their egotistical natures, Lombroso presents the anomaly that many criminals tend to display acts of altruism, acting in a way to please others or doing good deeds for the poor. In response to this paradox, Lombroso refers to a specific neurological disease of hysteria, which often results in the traits of extreme egoism as well as altruistic acts. Therefore, altruism in criminals is nothing more than a side effect of insanity according to Lombroso (314). The acts of altruism that are seen in Raskolnikov provide an interesting perspective. He seems to be in tension between the part of him that wants to commit a murder and the part of him that wants to do good for others. Throughout the majority of the novel, he despises himself for doing these kind acts. Though he displays the symptoms of mental illness at times, Raskolnikov seems to be struggling more with the torments of discovering whether he is an extraordinary man or not, and he is not motivated by any diagnosable mental illness.

Following a thorough analysis of the different types of criminals and their motivations, Lombroso and other criminologists of the time proceeded to apply their observations in a practical way to assign appropriate punishments that would succeed in removing dangerous people from society and in reforming the individual criminal. In a similar way, near the end of the novel, Raskolnikov must experience both a punishment by the law, and a more personal form of punishment through his confession. The selection of specific punishments for the different types of criminals was addressed by criminologists. One observation that Lombroso made about criminals was that they exhibited a lack of physical and mental energy for laborious tasks, leading them to commit criminal acts. In order to foster development in these areas, punishment should involve some sort of labor or physically strenuous activity such as gymnastics (Lombroso 142). Rather than preaching theories to prisoners, theories that could have contributed to

motivating criminal acts, prisons should encourage good behavior, not just teach it theoretically (Lombroso 143). The purpose of punishment is not for pain, something that criminals often exhibit a lack of sensitivity to, but rather it is for both the well-being of society and restitution to the victim. The punishment should be less proportional to the seriousness of the crime and more related to the dangerousness of the criminal. In this way, crime is seen as an illness, and punishment is a "specific remedy for each patient" (Lombroso 341). Those criminals, often born criminals, who are most dangerous to society, ought to be given a life sentence in prison. On the other hand, political criminals and those who commit crimes of passion often experience remorse for their actions that qualifies as sufficient punishment, and their fanaticism usually fades with time, making them less of a threat to society (Lombroso 346). The issue of punishment for Raskolnikov is more appropriately viewed from a slightly different perspective. Raskolnikov, after his single crime, was no longer much of a threat to society. His punishment was more appropriate in fostering his rebirth as a more fully human character, and in accepting that he is not the man, capable of doing horrible things without any remorse, who he thought he was. Not only were the effects of these developing theories in the field of criminology seen in practice in judicial systems, but writers such as Dostoevsky were aware of the psychological context of their times.

At the same time that these criminological and psychological theories were emerging in Europe, Fyodor Dostoevsky was living and writing in Russia. It is understood that the author had knowledge of the psychological systems of his time, and these systems may have contributed in part to some of the ways he described his characters (Leatherbarrow 131). Literary analysts agree that Dostoevsky's psychological development of his characters does, in fact, display an influence of the traditional symptomology of his time including traits such as the focus on a

single concept, the acting out of theoretical positions, and the obscuring of the line between fantasy and reality (Leatherbarrow 133), as well as the issues of crime in society, and redemption, all of which are seen in his masterpiece, *Crime and Punishment.* In the same way that social scientists in the nineteenth century attempted to give more meaning to the observations of the world and make it more comprehensible, artists such as Dostoevsky embark on the same task: specifically, the search for understanding of the mind of a transgressor and the need for punishment and redemption (Sagarin 9). While Dostoevsky displays obvious knowledge of the psychological and criminological theories of his time, and many connections can be seen between analysis of both real life criminals and created characters in fiction, Dostoevsky's Raskolnikov is limited in his ability to be concretely understood through the lens of his contemporary's criminological theories.

Despite his complexity, Raskolnikov, one of literature's most well-known criminals, reflects many of the criminological theories that were prevalent at the time in which Dostoevsky wrote. The criminologist Gilbert Geis even admittedly turns to Dostoevsky, a novelist, rather than a criminologist to examine the issue of human motivation for crime (Sagarin 4). Raskolnikov, a young student in St. Petersburg, lives a life of isolation similar to many of Lombroso's observed criminals that tend to withdraw from society. It seems that his initial state of torment at the start of the novel is brought on by his economic poverty. As the novel continues, it is revealed that there may be some other factors contributing to his current state of misery and his serious contemplation of committing a crime. At first glance, Raskolnikov seems to resemble most closely the group of insane criminals that Lombroso refers to as mattoids. He was formerly successful as a student and teacher, he claims that his murder was ultimately a benefit to the general public, and his egotistical theories are clearly explicated in his writings.

However, his actions are not appropriately attributed to a mind that is outside of itself or a spontaneous and impulsive action. Raskolnikov contemplates this action for some time, and even goes through practice runs. The actual act seems to be the result of fate, but it was a crime that was a long time in the mind of Raskonikov, as he contemplated attempting to live out his theory of the extraordinary man. Despite similarities, Raskolnikov cannot accurately be identified as "criminally insane." He is responsible and aware of his actions for the majority of the story. Another group that Raskolnikov initially seems to resemble, in his circumstances and motivations, is the group Lombroso calls "political criminals."

Similar to Lombroso's political criminals, Raskolnikov is shown to be influenced by several utopian and socialist ideals. The reader learns that in his previous publications on crime, Raskolnikov supported the ideas that humanity can be divided into two classes: the extraordinary and the ordinary. If such an extraordinary man exists, he not only has the power, but the right, to step over the line of traditional laws. This is especially true if their action can be seen as somehow beneficial to the good of the general public. Raskolnikov becomes so obsessed with this social theory that he admits during his confession to Sonya, "I wanted to become a Napoleon, and that's why I killed" (Dostoevsky 495). In his mind, if he could become a Napoleon, he would successfully have been able to murder the old pawnbroker, on the pretense that society was better off without her, and feel no qualms about his act. He did not kill because of his socio-economic status; he did not kill because of a lack of moral sensitivity present in Lombroso's born criminals. He did not kill for money or power or to help his family. He says, "I simply killed; I killed for my own sake… I needed to know… whether I was a louse, like everyone else, or a man. Whether I could step across, or whether I couldn't" (Dostoevsky 500). In this sense, Raskolnikov may be interpreted as a variation of the political criminal that

Lombroso discusses. However, rather than killing because of a total faith in a theory, Raskolnikov kills in order to prove such a theory. He does not seem to fit the mold of the political criminal: someone predisposed to act unlawfully and fear no punishment because of his total faith in a political or social theory. Instead, he commits a crime to test out a theory. As he slowly realizes that this theory may not in fact be true, his fear and paranoia seem to increase, unlike the political criminal who remains steadfast. Raskolnikov also seems to differ from Lombroso's criminals in his psychological development and reaction after his crime is committed.

Lombroso describes the typical actions and emotions of a born as well as a political criminal after the crime is actually committed. One characteristic that these criminals share is the habit of talking about their crimes or leaving clues as a result of the pride that they have in their criminal acts. In this sense, Rasikolnikov does seem to share some qualities of a born criminal. Though he does not directly admit to his crime until the final third of the book, he indirectly discusses the murder on several occasions, and does not show much care in hiding the evidence of his crime. When he returns to his apartment after killing the two women, he falls asleep without locking the door to his apartment, cleaning any of the blood off himself, or attempting to hide any of the stolen objects that remained in his pockets. In addition, the way that Raskolnikov tells Zamyotov exactly how he would have committed the crime, hints that Raskolnikov initially shows some pride in his ability to not immediately be considered a suspect. When Zamyotov makes the claim that the murderer could not even go through with the robbery, "Raskolnikov almost took offence" (Dosoevsky 198). Literary critic, Harold Bloom, suggests that Raskolnikov acts in this way because, subconsciously, he needs to be caught and punished (10). In the novel, Porfiry expresses his theory that crime is the result of an illness that has two

symptoms: (1) the need to commit a crime and (2) the need to be caught (Leatherbarrow 139). Raskolnikov does express the need to commit this crime to test out his social theory of the extraordinary man. There comes a point of difference between Porfiry's theories about Raskolnikov and Lombroso's theories on criminality in general. Lombroso identifies the innate tendency for born criminals to repeat such criminal acts, even after some form of punishment. Porfiry on the other hand, seems to understand that Raskonikov is no longer a danger to society, and will not commit any future crimes, but will eventually confess. He tells Raskolnikov, "No, you won't run away… you can't get along without us… I'm even certain that you'll decide to accept suffering" (Dostoevsky 550). Whereas Lombroso's criminals tend to confess their crimes solely because of the egoism, Raskolnikov seems to confess for other reasons.

Raskolnikov's confession of his crime to the public is easily seen as the climax of Dostoevsky's novel. After a long internal struggle to grasp at a justification for his murder, Raskolnikov seems to find himself in a place with limited options. He must confess his crime and accept his suffering, or endure his torment forever. Lombroso conveys that the criminal men he has studied speak about and confess their crimes almost solely out of vanity and pride in what they have done. They brag about their crimes because they have inherited excessive egos that become a part of their personality. Any act of altruism that these criminals display is a deliberate and manipulative act to mask their vanity (Lombroso 284). Early in *Crime and Punishment*, Raskolnikov's desire to prove he is an extraordinary man and confirm his egotistical theories is evident in the way he smirks at his family and friends and the conversation he has with Zamyotov where he nearly confesses. As the novel continues, it becomes more evident that Raskonikov's ego is not so strong and does not compare to that of Lombroso's "criminal man." He repeatedly calls himself a louse, and often expresses hatred toward himself. Rather than

confessing because he still holds on to the idea that he is justified in his criminal act, he seems to confess out of "hopeless despair" (Dostoevsky 626). He is unable to commit a crime without any remorse, unable to justify his crime, and left with no other option but to confess. It does not seem to happen because he wills to brag and gloat about his crime to the world, but rather out of an "epileptic seizure," and as he proceeds the bureau to turn himself in, he does so "only just aware of what he was doing" (Dostoevsky 627). While Raskolnikov does not display the typical characteristics of Lombroso's criminal man, he does eventually have this confession, which literary critics look to frequently in order to analyze Raskolnikov's motivations as a criminal.

Lombroso would say that Raskolnikov committed a crime out of an inherited egoism; he confessed out of egoism, and he has a need for punishment in order to make society a safer place and hopefully reform the man to not exhibit criminal characteristics any more. While Dostoevsky does not ignore the physical and social identities of his characters that motivate them in certain ways, he focuses more closely on the psychological identity and development of his characters to convey their motivations in his novels. One literary critic, William Leatherborrow, in *The Cambridge Companion to Dostoevskii,* suggests looking at the seemingly unmotivated actions of the characters as a lens to see the character's "pure expression of their inner psyche" (Leatherbarrow 136). Lombroso attempted to learn about the criminal mind and motivations by studying their physical characteristics, the nature of their crimes, and their actions taken to either cover up or brag about their crimes. Leatherbarrow, on the other hand, looks at Raskolnikov's random and seemingly unexplainable acts, often of altruism, to reveal aspects of his character and themes of the novel. In this method, looking at the seemingly kind act when Raskolnikov gives to the Marmeladovs, the reader may be able to deduce that these altruistic acts are not deliberately done by Raskolnikov to cover up his vanity or his crime. In fact, not much of an

internal perspective or thoughts within the mind of Raskolnikov are given by Dostoevsky as he gives money to the policeman to help bring Marmeladov to his family. He simply speaks and acts; he "was in a state of violent excitement" (Dostoevsky 212). If Raskolnikov was Lombroso's cut and dry "political criminal," he would have been able to hold onto his utilitarian theories, and would not have shown these random acts of kindness, but felt the same way as the witnesses of the scene: indifferent toward the dying Marmeladov (Bloom 15). It is clear that these kind acts are not made in an attempt to cover up his crime and his vanity. Instead, he seems to forget his egotistical theories in these moments, and when he realizes the kind and sympathetic personality that he is displaying, he immediately dismisses the feelings and reverts back to his other self, the self that wants to be an extraordinary man. Leaving the Marmeladov's home after that night he reverts back into a different character saying, "That's enough! My life didn't die along with the old woman… enough, old lady, it's time you retired! Now is the kingdom of reason and light, and… freedom and strength…" (Dostoevsky 226). Abandoning his sympathy for the Marmeladovs, he tries to hold onto his theory again, dismissing the value of the old woman, and moving on with his life in search of his freedom: freedom to commit a crime with indifference.

The discrepancies between the character of Raskolnikov, his motivations, and resolution and the characteristics of the typical criminal men that the psychologist contemporaries of Dostoevsky studied suggest that Raskolnikov is not appropriately labelled as a criminal man. James Joyce was reported to have remarked that *Crime and Punishment* was a "queer title for a book which contained neither crime nor punishment" (Sagarin 19). This statement may be viewed as a bit of an exaggeration, since Dostoevsky's novel does chronicle a murder, and an eventual imprisonment in Siberia for the man who did the murdering, but it does illuminate the

idea that this novel about Raskolnikov is not simply about a specific classification of a type of man known as a born criminal, but it is more deeply about the complicated nature of humanity in general, a humanity that is both capable of love and of stepping over the line (Sagarin 19). Edward Sagarin points out that the Russian word for "crime" in the title of this novel would more accurately be translated as a "stepping across" or a "transgression," and the word for punishment would more accurately be translated as the English word "chastisement," which refers to a cleansing action, or a purification that takes place as a result of accepting responsibility (20). The significance of Raskolnikov's crime as being a murder seems to diminish in this context. Whereas Lombroso might classify Raskolnikov as a criminal because he brutally murdered two women, a deeper understanding of Raskolnikov's crime is that it involved a stepping over of the line of what is traditionally acceptable. In confessing his crime, Raskolnikov does not say he needed to know if he could kill someone, but he says he needed to know, "whether he could take the step across or whether he couldn't" (Dostoevsky 500). Sagarin suggests that the first victim of this crime is Raskolnikov himself (Sagarin 36). In support of this theory, after his confession to Sonya, she asks, "What have you gone and done to yourself," not, what have you done to these women (Dostoevsky 491). Sonya seems to understand the result of Raskolnikov's crime as more than an act that is disapproved of by the authorities, but as an act that attempts to cross the boundary of what a human has the right to do. For Raskolnikov, punishment is experienced almost throughout the entire novel in his internal torment, but it is not until the last few pages of the novel that there is a hope for a rebirth of a healed Raskolnikov, because he has begun to take responsibility. The key moment for this character is not the imprisonment that Lombroso advocates for as reform for dangerous criminals, or the remorse that Lombroso mentions as a consequence of some occasional and

accidental criminals (341). Raskolnikov never actually feels such remorse during this novel, and the terms of his imprisonment do not seem to influence any reform. Rather, it is a confession, a confession that is not provoked by a desire to brag, that contributes to his state at the end of the novel, a state on the verge of "gradual renewal, his gradual rebirth" (Dostoevsky 656).

Early criminologists, in particular Cesare Lombroso, dedicated years of their lives to studying the mind and body of criminals with the hopes of reducing the incidence of crime and making society less dangerous. In his final edition, Lombroso makes the claim that this new science, his study of "the criminal man" has led to several successful criminal convictions, as well as influenced works of art; he specifically mentions his theories influence on Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment* (Lombroso 352). While the fields of science and art have seemed to develop separately over the course of history, it has been suggested that the social sciences, such as Lombroso's criminology, may help bridge the gap between the two fields. The methods of the scientist and the artist differ, but they both aim at giving greater meaning to the human experience (Sagarin 9). Though comparisons between Lombroso's study and the character of Raskolnikov can be made, it seems that Dostoevsky acknowledges a deeper aspect of human nature than what Lombroso accounts for. Lombroso attempts to reduce a subset of the human population to a set of theories that explain their criminal motivations, actions, and subsequent reform. For the author, there may not be a specific line that divides the human race into criminal and normal individuals. It seems that for Dostoevsky, a fundamental part of human nature is that humans cannot be reduced to such theories. When Raskolnikov attempts to reduce his actions and his life outlook to a set of utopian theories, he falls flat and experiences great struggles and torments. Razumikhin expresses how socialist theories fail to account for the living soul of humanity; he says, "The living soul isn't obedient to the laws of mechanics" (Dostoevsky 305).

Similarly, the attempt to explain Raskolnikov's actions through a set of criminological theories is not successful. A character, a human being, cannot be reduced to such theories. Dostoevsky sympathizes with the well-rounded, even struggling and corrupt, characters more than such flat characters. For the characters that do not display tension within their personalities, Dostoevsky seems to struggle with whether these characters should even be considered human, or be living life at all. Raskolnikov is the human character; he tries to hold on to a political theory, like Lombroso's political criminals, but he also struggles with fully believing his own words and theories. He is egotistical, and he wants to remain this type of character, but he struggles to act in a totally selfish way throughout the novel. Dostoevsky avoids portraying the characters that can completely fit the mold of a certain stereotype or social movement. These characters are not fully human; Dostoevsky may not deem Lombroso's criminal man as fully human either. Raskolnikov, though he commits a crime, is never such a flat character. His crime does not define his character; his egoism does not define his character. Unlike Lombroso's criminal man, to whom a formula can be applied in order to characterize and reform him, Raskolnikov is characterized by the torment of a criminal act, the struggle for redemption, and the dynamic relationships and factors that contribute to his ultimate confession.

A close examination of one of literature's most infamous criminals may indicate that Raskolnikov is not actually the image of "A Criminal Man." Perhaps he is not this criminal man solely because of his failure to conform to the previously defined categories of criminals, but because Dostoevsky does not accept the claim that humanity can be divided into two classes: the criminal and the non-criminal. Rather, Raskolnikov, along with every other character, is a human character. He steps over the line of what is acceptable and must experience a cleansing, a

purification in order to be reborn into a human life experiencing love and growth and relationships.

Works Cited

Bloom, Harold. *Raskolnikov and Svidrigailov*. Broomall, PA: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004.

"Dostoevsky and Parricide" in Sigmund Freud, *Complete Psychological Works*. London: Hogwarth Press, 1961, Vol. 21, pp. 177-194.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment.* London: Penguin Books Ltd, 2003

Ferri, Enrico. *Criminal Sociology*. New York: Agathon Press, Inc., 1967.

Leatherbarrow, William J. *The Cambridge Companion to Dostoevskii*. 1st Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. *Cambridge Companions Online*. Web. 8 April 2014. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CCOL0521652537.

Lombroso, Cesare. *Criminal Man*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2006.

Sagarin, Edward. *Raskolnikov and Others*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1981.