

ADELE LINDENMEYR

## Raskolnikov's City and the Napoleonic Plan

Dostoevsky, having lived in the area of central Petersburg around Sennaia Ploshchad' (Haymarket) for several years, was well acquainted with the problems (prevalent in this section) created by the rapid, unplanned growth of the city. In a little-noted passage in *Crime and Punishment* which recounts Raskolnikov's thoughts just before the murder (part 1, chapter 6), Dostoevsky connects these urban changes to Raskolnikov's thoughts and subsequent actions. Raskolnikov imagines a reconstruction of Petersburg aimed especially at the improvement of the wretched, crowded Sennaia area. This passage reveals important facets of the character of Raskolnikov and of the thematics of the novel. The city has two forms, both of which have a powerful psychological influence on Raskolnikov: his motive and rationale for the murder draw support from both the squalor of Sennaia Ploshchad' and the model of Napoleon III's reconstructed Paris. For Dostoevsky, however, the reality of Sennaia undermines the rational, utilitarian schemes of Napoleon and Raskolnikov and, by extension, Raskolnikov's whole intellectual rationale for the murder.

Dostoevsky made extensive use of the types and settings of Petersburg in his works.<sup>1</sup> Several commentators have pointed out the close attention he paid to urban reality and the resulting authenticity and topicality of his works for contemporary readers.<sup>2</sup> Donald Fanger has argued further that Dostoevsky's re-creation of mid-nineteenth-century Petersburg serves succeeding generations of readers as "realistic ballast" for the fantastic in his stories.<sup>3</sup>

The Petersburg which Dostoevsky most often portrays has a distinct geographical and socioeconomic identity. Fashionable districts very seldom appear in his writings. The classical architecture of Petersburg, Dostoevsky remarks in *Diary of a Writer* for 1873, "is extremely characteristic and original and it always struck me—in that it expresses all its [Petersburg's] characterlessness and lack of individuality. . . ."<sup>4</sup> The Sennaia area, however,

1. Twenty-four of the thirty-five novels, stories, and sketches listed in the index to the 1956 Soviet edition of his works are set in Petersburg. Donald Fanger, *Dostoevsky and Romantic Realism* (Chicago, 1967), p. 291, n. 3.

2. For example, see Fanger; N. P. Antsiferov, *Peterburg Dostoevskogo* (Petersburg, 1923); L. Grossman, "Gorod i liudi Prestupleniia i nakazaniia," in *Prestuplenie i nakazanie* (Moscow, 1935); E. Sarukhanian, *Dostoevskii v Peterburge* (Leningrad, 1970).

3. Fanger, p. 134.

4. F. M. Dostoevskii, *Polnoe sobranie khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii v trinadtsati tomakh* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1926–30), 11:109.

where Dostoevsky lived in the 1860s (on the corner of Stoliarnyi Pereulok and Malaia Meshchanskaia Ulitsa), and similar quarters of the city fascinated him. His daughter describes how he “roamed along the darkest and most remote streets of Petersburg. While walking he talked to himself, gesticulating so that passers-by turned around to look at him.”<sup>5</sup> He often chose as the setting for a story the middle and lower-class parts of the Admiralty district around Voznesenskii Prospekt and Sennaia Ploshchad', which in the mid-nineteenth century had little in common with the classical buildings and squares of the administrative and fashionable parts of the district. The neighborhood of Sennaia Ploshchad' is especially prominent in *Crime and Punishment*.

What exactly was the urban reality of this part of mid-nineteenth-century Petersburg? Rapid, unplanned expansion in the 1860s was changing Peter I's carefully planned city and creating serious urban problems unbefitting the capital of a huge and powerful empire. With the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, peasants migrated in ever greater numbers to the capital to seek jobs in the city's growing industries. This influx and the economic and social changes brought on by the growth of manufacturing strained Petersburg's already inadequate facilities—water supply, health and sanitation services (there were cholera epidemics in the city in 1848 and 1866), and housing.<sup>6</sup> The consequences for the population were manifest: disease, unemployment, crime, prostitution, and drunkenness were widely discussed in the contemporary press of the capital.<sup>7</sup>

The market in Sennaia Ploshchad' was one of the largest, oldest, and busiest centers of small-scale retail trade in the city. Surrounded by polluted canals, it was an especially filthy part of the city: “Such markets like Sennoi . . . served as the breeding ground for various infectious diseases.”<sup>8</sup> The Sennaia area had the highest population density in the city—247 persons per house;<sup>9</sup> it was characterized by high rents and “huge, ill-equipped houses,” every corner of which was rented out. A landmark of the area, nicknamed the “Viazemskaia Monastery [*lavra*],” was a great block of tenements owned by Prince Viazemskii, “a model of unsanitariness.”<sup>10</sup> It served as the location for the “Crystal Palace” tavern in *Crime and Punishment*. As a center of trade, not only for the capital but also for the surrounding region,

5. Quoted in Antsiferov, p. 20.

6. See Reginald E. Zelnik, *Labor and Society in Tsarist Russia: The Factory Workers of St. Petersburg, 1855–1870* (Stanford, 1971).

7. See Grossman, “Gorod i liudi”; and Fanger.

8. Akademiia nauk SSSR, Institut istorii, *Ocherki istorii Leningrada*, vol. 2 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1957), p. 147.

9. Zelnik, p. 242.

10. *Ocherki istorii Leningrada*, p. 826.

Sennaia Ploshchad' was crowded with cheap eating houses and taverns. Stoliarnyi Pereulok (where Dostoevsky and Raskolnikov lived) was notorious for drunkenness: eighteen taverns were located in the sixteen houses on the street.<sup>11</sup> According to Saltykov-Shchedrin, Sennaia Ploshchad' was the only place in the city where the police did not demand even "outward decency."<sup>12</sup> Conditions in the Sennaia area finally forced the government to establish a commission in 1865 to investigate "St. Petersburg's most decrepit, impoverished, and disease-ridden neighborhood."<sup>13</sup>

This, then, was the Petersburg that Dostoevsky knew well and chose to depict in *Crime and Punishment*. The Sennaia area serves as background to the thoughts and actions of Raskolnikov. These two components of the novel—Raskolnikov and the city—are closely connected. The people and conditions of Sennaia Ploshchad' are often introduced through Raskolnikov's consciousness. Both the urban reality and Raskolnikov's state of mind are disclosed in this way.<sup>14</sup> For example, the novel opens with Raskolnikov's reaction upon descending from his room onto Stoliarnyi Pereulok on a July day:

The heat on the street was terrible, and the closeness, crowds, lime everywhere, scaffolding, bricks, dust and that particular summer stench so well-known to every Petersburger who did not have the possibility of renting a summer house—all this together shook the young man's nerves, already unsettled without it.<sup>15</sup>

This part of Petersburg, to which Dostoevsky immediately gives a tangible atmospheric, social, and economic identity, has a powerful attraction for Raskolnikov. The magnificent panorama of the capital city along the Neva had always left Raskolnikov, like Dostoevsky, "with an inexplicable coldness" (p. 90). Even though Sennaia's stifling atmosphere and drunken population revolt Raskolnikov, Sennaia stimulates thought and raises questions. Drawn to it many times throughout the novel ("By force of habit, following the usual course of his former walks, he headed straight for Sennaia" [p. 121].), Raskolnikov observes there the debilitating effects of nineteenth-century urban reality—the exploitation of women and children, the drunkenness and destitution. In one of the many taverns of Sennaia, for example, Raskolnikov hears Marmeladov's autobiography. These observations

11. Sarukhanian, p. 164.

12. Quoted in Sarukhanian, p. 165.

13. Zelnik, p. 58.

14. Another part of Petersburg, the Petersburg Side, is also portrayed through the consciousness of a character—Svidrigailov (see Antsiferov, p. 67).

15. F. M. Dostoevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridsati tomakh* (Leningrad, 1973), 6:6. All further quotations from *Crime and Punishment* are from this edition.

provide one rationale for the self-willed and utilitarian aspects of the theory which he develops in his article. In fact, Dostoevsky uses the reality of mid-nineteenth-century Petersburg not only as background but also to influence Raskolnikov's thoughts and actions and to develop his theme.

One particular passage in part 1, chapter 6 of the novel illustrates both Dostoevsky's sensitivity to the city and his incorporation of it into the themes and polemics of his writing. This passage records Raskolnikov's thoughts as he is walking to the pawnbroker's house to commit the crime. It begins with Raskolnikov, distracted from thoughts of the impending murder, lost in certain "extraneous [*postoronnie*] thoughts":

Before, when he happened to picture all this in his imagination, he sometimes thought that he would be very much afraid. But he was not very afraid now, he was even completely unafraid. He was even occupied at this moment by certain extraneous thoughts, though not for long. Passing by the Iusupov Garden he even began to consider the construction of tall fountains and how well they would freshen the air in all the squares. Gradually he came to the conclusion that if the Summer Garden were extended to the whole Mars Field and even joined with the garden of the Mikhailovskii Palace, it would be a beautiful [*prekrasnaiia*] and most useful [*polezneishaia*] thing for the city. [P. 60]

These "extraneous thoughts," reminiscent of Raskolnikov's other dreams, directly refer to contemporary problems in the planning of Petersburg. Architecture greatly interested Dostoevsky. As a student at the Main Engineering School, located in Mikhailovskii Castle in Petersburg, Dostoevsky had enthusiastically studied the history of architecture, and this interest continued throughout his life.<sup>16</sup> Dostoevsky, therefore, was probably familiar with the history of architecture and city planning in Petersburg and with the ultimate failure to deal with problems caused by urban expansion.

The ambitiousness of Raskolnikov's scheme corresponds to the monumental scale and conception of the tradition, inaugurated by Peter I, of Petersburg architecture and planning. But even the Admiralty district, the political and social center of the capital and the empire (as well as the location of Sennaia Ploshchad'), revealed the limits of this grand tradition. The district was the focus of much planning and construction in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but most of these projects were concerned with the creation of a magnificent architectural ensemble of palaces, government complexes, and vast squares for military drill and parades. The development of this district, and of Petersburg in general, tended to follow two independent courses: one, directed by Russia's architects and planners, toward the creation

16. See L. Grossman, *Dostoevskii* (Moscow, 1965), p. 31.

of an ensemble modeled on Western European capitals; the other, the spontaneous, haphazard development of the living and working areas of the city and the resulting inadequacy of services and serious social dislocation.

The provision of waterways and parks is one example of the failure to respond to the pressures created by urban expansion. The construction of canals, ponds, fountains, and gardens had not only an aesthetic purpose but practical importance as well. Situated on the delta of the Neva, Petersburg was vulnerable to flooding. Waterways were essential to lessen the impact of flooding and to drain the marshy land to make it habitable. Fountains, which create currents of cool air, would help alleviate the heat of the Petersburg summer (the heat with which Dostoevsky opens his novel). They also would serve to combat the frequent fires in the city (there was an especially serious outbreak of fires in 1862, which sparked a polemic between Dostoevsky and Chernyshevskii on politically motivated arson) and also to augment the city's water supply, for even in the 1860s water had to be brought to houses from the rivers and canals by water-carriers. Parks and landscaping were essential for public recreation, especially in view of crowded housing conditions.

Provision of these facilities by the 1860s lagged far behind need, and Dostoevsky is referring directly to these needs and the failure to meet them in the passage quoted above. Petersburg's waterways, like the Catherine Canal which Raskolnikov crosses on his way to the pawnbroker's house, were notoriously polluted. Little had been done to upgrade Petersburg's water supply or to alleviate the oppressive summer conditions, despite the fires and cholera epidemics of the 1860s. Raskolnikov's proposal to build tall fountains to "freshen the air in all the squares" is not unusual. Like the problems of crime and drunkenness, the inadequacy of Petersburg's water facilities was pointed out by the contemporary press; in July 1865, three Petersburg newspapers, *Peterburgskii Listok*, *Invalid*, and *Golos*, simultaneously called for the building of more fountains in the city.<sup>17</sup> The only park built in the Admiralty district in the first half of the nineteenth century was K. I. Rossi's ensemble of the Mikhailovskii Palace and Garden of 1819–25. Built as a palace for Alexander I's brother Mikhail, the Garden was still closed to the public in the 1860s. The Iusupov Garden, which Raskolnikov passes on the way to the pawnbroker's house, was "not extensive and rather sparse, with a pond in the middle, decorated with a fountain, . . . [and] in the summer always jammed with crowds"—predominantly the lower-class inhabitants of the Sennaia area.<sup>18</sup> Even it had been privately owned until

17. Editors' note in F. M. Dostoevskii, *Prstuplenie i nakazanie* (Moscow, 1970, "Literaturnye pamiatniki" edition, eds. L. D. Opuł'skaia and G. F. Kogan), p. 741, and in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Leningrad, 1973), 7:333. I am indebted to Professor Nathan Rosen for this reference and also for the reference in footnote 30.

18. Sarukhanian, p. 167.

1863, when the city acquired it for a park. Raskolnikov's plan to extend the Summer Garden to the Mars Field and the garden of the Mikhailovskii Palace would have created one great park for the Admiralty district—a "beautiful and most useful thing for the city."

The boldest effort to resolve the dichotomy in city planning between the aesthetic demands of a capital city and the needs raised by changing demographic, social, and economic conditions—and the most prominent example of far-reaching city planning in Raskolnikov's day—is to be found not in Russia but in the France of the Second Empire. The rebuilding of Paris by Napoleon III and his Prefect of the Seine, Georges Haussmann, provided Dostoevsky with the model for Raskolnikov's plan to rebuild Petersburg.

Napoleon III fancied himself a landscape architect and city planner. From diverse sources, including the earlier efforts to rebuild Paris by his uncle, Napoleon Bonaparte, he adopted the idea of transforming the capital.<sup>19</sup> In 1852, at the start of the Second Empire, Paris was an "overgrown medieval city," with crowded and disease-ridden slums, dark, winding streets, inadequate water and sewer systems, treeless boulevards, and "crowding unrelieved by parks"<sup>20</sup>—conditions similar to those of Sennaia. In less than twenty years Napoleon and Haussmann had straightened and widened streets, cleared slums, constructed public buildings and parks, and redesigned the water and sewer systems.

Particular attention was paid to the creation of parks and open spaces. Napoleon III instructed Haussmann to establish "pocket parks" throughout the city, wherever building construction presented the opportunity. He believed that these neighborhood parks would beautify the city, improve public health, and elevate working-class morality. Twenty-two such parks, planted with trees and flowers and furnished with benches and fountains, were eventually created. More famous than these neighborhood parks were the major municipal parks established by Napoleon and Haussmann—the Bois de Boulogne, the Bois de Vincennes, and three large parks within the city. The emperor personally supervised the transformation of the Bois de Boulogne from an "arid promenade" into a vast area for public recreation with lakes, winding paths, cafés, a grotto, waterfalls, and a racetrack, finally providing Paris with a municipal park. Napoleon also initiated and directed the creation of a similar park for the crowded districts of eastern Paris, the Bois de Vincennes. By 1870, Paris had 4,500 acres of municipal parks, compared to the 47 acres of twenty years before.<sup>21</sup> As David Pinkney has concluded:

19. David H. Pinkney, *Napoleon III and the Rebuilding of Paris* (Princeton, 1972), pp. 33–34.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 24.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 104 and chapter 4, *passim*.

First among practical planners and builders Napoleon and Haussmann thought not only of the vistas and facades of a "parade city," but also of the needs of traffic, of water supply and sewers, of slum clearance and open spaces. Here they were concerned as no planners before them with social utility and . . . they made to Paris and to city planning sociological contributions of the first order.<sup>22</sup>

Along with his fellow Russians of the 1860s, Dostoevsky followed closely events in Western Europe such as the rebuilding of Paris. The journal *Sovremennik* frequently published commentaries on French affairs, and featured a regular section on foreign affairs entitled "Politika," by E. K. Vatson. The publication of Napoleon III's *Histoire de Jules César* in early 1865 created a sensation in Russia<sup>23</sup> and elicited a special review article by Vatson in the February 1865 issue. In the preface to his book, Napoleon declared:

When extraordinary deeds testify to a high genius what can be more repulsive to common sense than to attribute to this genius all the passions and all the thoughts of an ordinary man? What can be more false than not to recognize the superiority of these exceptional beings. . . ?<sup>24</sup>

In his review, "What Are Great Men in History? (Apropos of the Introduction to Napoleon III's *History of Julius Caesar*)," Vatson found the introduction the most important part of the book and quoted it in full along with his commentary.

Like *Sovremennik*, Dostoevsky's own journals, *Vremia* and *Epokha*, reported and interpreted events in Western Europe and America in articles and in a regular column in *Vremia* ("Politicheskoe obozrenie") written by A. E. Razin. The perspective of the various commentaries reflected the general attitude of Dostoevsky and the other *pochvenniki* toward reform and the issue of Russia and the West: although some positive aspects of European society are noted, their overall evaluation is critical and cautionary about importing European methods and ideas into Russia.<sup>25</sup> In the May 1862 issue of *Vremia*, Razin scathingly criticized the regime of Napoleon III—the

22. *Ibid.*, p. 221.

23. Fanger, p. 188. Fanger points out one of the calligraphic exercises in Dostoevsky's notebooks to *Crime and Punishment*: the carefully traced names of Napoleon and Julius Caesar.

24. Quoted in Fanger, pp. 188–89.

25. For detailed discussion of Dostoevsky's journalism and *pochvennichestvo* see V.S. Nechaeva, *Zhurnal M. M. i F. M. Dostoevskikh "Vremia," 1861–1863* (Moscow, 1972) and Ellen Bell Chances, "The Ideology of *Pochvennichestvo* in Dostoevsky's Journals *Vremia* and *Epokha*" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1972).



financial speculation, public morals, police reforms, and the rebuilding of Paris:

There are no obstacles on the path of harmonious development of the internal and external strengths of the state, prosperity, well-being, etc. Is there some deficit of several hundred million?—it is nothing: posterity will pay the interest on it. Send a corps of troops across the ocean?—it is nothing: posterity will pay the interest on the war costs and glory will be pure profit. Rebuild the city?—it is nothing: posterity will answer for everything. Now the city of Paris is taking out a new loan for 125 million francs for new works for the public welfare. . . . For these “public welfare” things an additional 139 million has been put into the budget. . . . But what do these millions signify now, when posterity will pay the interest on them, thanks to the loan system!<sup>26</sup>

Just after this article appeared Dostoevsky visited Europe for the first time, and traveled there again in the summers of 1863 and 1865. In letters home he expressed a qualified admiration for Paris. During his second trip he wrote his brother Nikolai, a civil engineer:

I liked the appearance of Paris this time, that is the architecture. The Louvre is an important thing and that whole quay right up to Notre Dame is an amazing thing. It is a pity, Kolia, that you, having qualified as an architect, have not gone abroad. An architect cannot not go abroad. No plan will give the true impression.<sup>27</sup>

To his sister-in-law, however, he complained:

I do not like Paris, although it is terribly magnificent. There is much to see, but when you look around, a terrible weariness comes over you.<sup>28</sup>

Discussing Paris in *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* (1863), Dostoevsky uses a sarcastically critical tone similar to Razin's in the *Vremia* article. His admiration of certain aspects of Parisian architecture does not ameliorate his general contempt for the Second Empire, especially its bourgeoisie:

*Bribri* [a bourgeois French husband] is extremely naïve at times. For example, while walking about the fountains he will start to explain to *ma biche* [his wife] why fountains spurt upwards, he explains to her the laws of nature, he expresses national pride to her in the beauty of the Bois de Boulogne, the lighting, the play of *les grandes eaux* at Versailles, the

26. “Politicheskoe obozrenie,” *Vremia*, May 1862, p. 6.

27. Letter 172, Paris, August 28, 1863, in A. S. Dolinin, ed., *F. M. Dostoevskii: Pis'ma*, vol. 1 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1928), p. 321.

28. Letter 174, Paris, September 1, 1863, *ibid.*, p. 323.



successes of Emperor Napoleon and *gloire militaire*, he revels in her curiosity and contentment, and is very satisfied.<sup>29</sup>

Thus Dostoevsky seems to have been aware—and skeptical—of the reconstruction of Paris by Napoleon III, and he incorporated it into *Crime and Punishment* as the source of Raskolnikov's plan to rebuild Petersburg.

In general, Dostoevsky drew heavily upon the example of Napoleon III, especially the justification of Caesar, Napoleon I, and Napoleon III in the introduction to *History of Julius Caesar*, for the character of Raskolnikov and his theory of the exceptional man, superior to ordinary laws and morality.<sup>30</sup> The parallel between Napoleon and Raskolnikov is illustrated very clearly in Raskolnikov's plan, just before the murder, to rebuild the city. While on his way to commit the crime, which his theory justifies, Raskolnikov develops the theory further. Emulating its contemporary exemplar (Napoleon III), he devises a plan for a city both beautiful and useful. Raskolnikov's plan for the rebuilding of Petersburg is based on the assumption that a rational, superior man can control and change his environment. Thus the plan and the crime are directly connected: they share the same ideological foundation and draw upon the same example—Napoleon.

Raskolnikov can also rationalize both the crime and his plan to rebuild Petersburg in the same terms, for they serve similar ends. The crime is conceived as a means to improve the lives of himself, his family, even the whole of mankind, while his plan for a reconstructed Petersburg has for its object the improvement of the lives of the inhabitants of Sennaia. One conceivable result of Raskolnikov's plan, for example, would be to channel currents of cooler, fresher air around Sennaia by building fountains around the city, much in the same way that Napoleon built his pocket parks. Such fountains could serve other useful ends, such as supplying water for consumption and fire-fighting, as well as beautifying the city. Raskolnikov's plan would also provide the inhabitants of Sennaia with a large park like Napoleon's great municipal parks, a need which the Iusupov Garden failed to meet. Since Sennaia Ploshchad', with its strange power of attraction, is for him the center of Petersburg, Raskolnikov not surprisingly devises a plan which meets some of the needs of this most miserable part of the city.

29. F. M. Dostoevskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Leningrad, 1973), 5:93–94.

30. An indication that Dostoevsky knew Napoleon III's introduction and used it as a source for Raskolnikov's theory can be found in the third notebook for *Crime and Punishment*: "Porfirii. NB. Tell me, is the article in 'Vedomosti' yours? Did you study it, or write it [*ili učit'sia, ili pisat'*]?" F. M. Dostoevskii, *Prestuplenic i nakazanie* (Moscow, 1970), p. 577. The editors comment that both the *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* and the *Moskovskie vedomosti* printed Napoleon III's introduction to *History of Julius Caesar*, *ibid.*, p. 795.

Raskolnikov's plan to rebuild Petersburg, based on the same principles of utilitarianism and superior will that underlie the crime, should have buttressed his conviction that the murder is justifiable. But his train of thought suddenly shifts, and the passage continues:

Suddenly here he became interested in just why, in all big cities, people lived and settled not solely by necessity, but by some particular inclination, in just those parts of the city where there were neither gardens nor fountains, where there was dirt and stench and all kinds of squalor. Then he was reminded of his own walks around Sennaia, and for a moment he awoke [*ochnul'sia*]. "What nonsense," he thought. "No, better not to think of anything at all!"

"So, truly, those being led to execution fix their thoughts on every object which they meet on the way," flashed through his mind, but only flashed like lightning; he himself extinguished this thought as soon as possible. . . . [P. 60]

The inhabitants of Petersburg, and of "all big cities," seem indifferent to the kind of rational improvements in their environment which Raskolnikov has just been contemplating. Their indifference and their irrational "inclination" to live in the squalid parts of the city seem to undermine his plan to rebuild the city. Raskolnikov recalls how he himself has been drawn many times to the squalor of Sennaia for no particular reason. The next words—"and for a moment he awoke"—are elliptical. What they may represent is Raskolnikov's momentary realization that if his Napoleonic, utilitarian plan for rebuilding the city is undermined by the behavior of the inhabitants of Sennaia, his Napoleonic, utilitarian rationale for the crime may be in question as well.<sup>31</sup>

By now, however, Raskolnikov has almost arrived at the pawnbroker's house, and his momentary realization is lost to the dominant Napoleonic motive. He emphatically rejects the entire train of thought, especially the implications that question his original justification for the crime: "'What nonsense,' he thought. 'No, better not to think of anything at all.'"

This interpretation of a passage in *Crime and Punishment* reveals much about Dostoevsky's depiction of Raskolnikov. Raskolnikov's thoughts just

31. Sennaia plays a role in another of Raskolnikov's short-lived awakenings. The day before the murder he had gone to Vasilevskii and Petrovskii Islands, where he fell asleep and dreamed of peasants killing a mare. He awoke to renounce his plan for the murder, praying "Lord, show me the way, and I will renounce this accursed . . . dream of mine" (p. 50). But perversely he takes an indirect route home, by way of Sennaia Ploshchad', instead of by the "very shortest and direct way," the "most advantageous to him" (p. 50). At Sennaia he gets information from Lizaveta giving him the opportunity to commit the crime.

prior to the murder bring out the importance of the Napoleon figure and principle in his thinking, and the influence upon him of contemporary developments in Western Europe—in this case Napoleon's rebuilding of Paris. He emerges as a young man representative of his decade, when educated Russians paid close attention to ideas and changes in Europe, and Russian society itself was undergoing substantial reforms. The attraction of Europe for Raskolnikov is a fundamental element of his character and thought. It leads him to various ideas and plans, like the rebuilding of Petersburg, as well as to the theory justifying the crime.

The further conclusion which this analysis suggests is the important role of the city in Dostoevsky's novelistic technique, even more important than previous commentators have affirmed. The city serves as more than background. Dostoevsky was highly sensitive to the two forms of the city: the grim reality of nineteenth-century urban conditions, like those of Sennaia; but also the city as an abstraction, like the Petersburg of Peter I or the Paris of Napoleon III. He uses the dialectic of these two forms of the city in the early passage in *Crime and Punishment* presented here. As an abstraction, the city serves as a reinforcement of Raskolnikov's theory of superior will and utilitarian action. But Raskolnikov is also highly conscious of the irrational substantive reality of Petersburg, which complicates his theory and purpose—even leading him to a fleeting realization of his error. In Raskolnikov, Dostoevsky shows how the city, working as both ideal and reality, has a direct psychological impact upon ideas, plans, motives, and actions.