

## Re-examining the Ideal of Utopia in Fyodor Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*

Krishna Prasad Bhattarai

Butwal Multiple Campus

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5770-6430>

---

### Abstract

This research interweaves the two disability cases of epilepsy and derision among major characters, with the Russian Aristocratic class subjugation of Myshkin in Fyodor Dostoevsky's novel, *The Idiot*. In addition to the investigation of Myshkin and Nastasya Filippovna within this text to be made during the time when Russian high aristocracy was in its prime, focus will also include examining how the culture of Russian aristocracy runs rampant over those varying just slightly from the social mores existent at that time. This research study has attempted to critically analyze *The Idiot* which turns into a piece of brutality commenting on the Russian aristocratic civilization. If, on the one hand, Dostoevsky collects these marginalized voices (of the abnormal) within the literary disability studies set of tools: then, finally what is recorded in this novel are not more than the defining characteristics of the Russian aristocracy disguised as an effort to degrade so called disabled people. Through the skepticism of his character, Dostoevsky digs into the life of Myshkin and Nastasya Filippovna to discover the pains and fates that had only to fulfill as they were forced to do because their presumed physical and psychological deviance.

**Keywords:** utopia, ideal, re-examining, disability, epilepsy etc.

### Introduction

Fyodor Dostoevsky in *The Idiot* shows how society with its stuffy customs and values tries to point the solitude of people stemed or chronic disases as nothing more than mere wanton behaviour. This means that those labeled as disabled in the society are either hunted down, or made to leave the society by force This is just one hypocritical social value that are stolen as if norms really exist in real life and this factor has made other people's lives of course escepecially disabled individuals even more hard and besides these norms gives permission to other fellow human beings be rude or which goes from what disabled disabled individual by saying so or taking the mouth away of hearers of such extremely horrific sound.

Fyodor Dostoevsky in his book describes Myshkin, the delirious and an epileptic, which is of the interest of that Russian Society. Despite that it spreads its arms thanks to psychodelics and childish naïve hope in the heaven on earth, Myshkin does not make an alliance with the middle of Russia. Now this middle-class value is present in the Russian reality. This is social convention of the middle classes, the main reason that makes Myshkin a not belong to the context of contemporary society.

### **Disability Studies in Literature**

Disability Studies was originally meant to be a part of our academy's descriptive mode that is Sociology where its method is critical inquiry which is parallel, informed and often overlaps with Feminist Studies. At its broadest, Disability Studies in the Humanities takes a radically interdisciplinary approach to disability. The principal axiom of the Disability Studies is proposed on that disability as a frame which produced bodies culturally not only through characterization however by a making stamp.

The Disability Studies (to be abbreviated in the rest of this volume as DS) can be taken over in a broad understanding as an umbrella term for the study of disability as social, cultural and political phenomenon. Disability Studies focuses on the social context framing disability beyond clinical, medical and therapeutic model of disability. Under this, disability is not a property that the person being defined has, but an embodied product which occupies meaning in social and cultural space. The disabled are an oppressed and repressed group of people, which has been repeating for centuries. "You are fed this isolation, you are imprisoned, monitored, written upon, and institutionalized in a way that most other minorities may never know. They are all treated as disable people in a category include the officially disabled person and also other disabled persons, for instance, at the local market News Bulletin (250).

The scholarly and research definitions provide conceptual frameworks that are more centered on providing a theoretical framework which could be used to analyze the complex nature of disability in its entire experience regardless of age, gender and race among others which is broadly defined as indicative of the social character. While dichotomy of found to be disabled vs. not is present, the scholarship practice is performed without conditioning it on the necessity of assigning persons to find a way to use both clinical needs and/or administrative needs as either-or. The research lens achieves a respect for the idea of a continuity of disability rather than an all or nothing view of disability. This continuum is part of the conceptualisation process and modelling, as well as operation, of disability measures that take place.

In fact, the seeds of disability as a field of study were sown in the 1990s. The preceding testimonies were made notwithstanding the implications of the social model of disability that would seem to require different disclosures than the earlier testimonies. Disability studies is a transnational effort to improve radical theory, activism and practice around disability. Disability, generally understood to be an enforced separation from the mainstream of society of people whose senses are impaired or who are physically or mentally disabled in Embryo. The purpose of disability studies is to criticize, transform the disabling world that is, the political, economic, interpersonal/relational and cultural/discursive worlds.

As Leonard Davis, in his articles tackles the issues of what bodies are thought of as normal or aberrant; how norms are constructed; and who, how, and why abnormal or disabled bodies were represented in literature. The prominent focus of the works is the precondition for a body to determine identity and future due to handicap physicality, as well as using bodily/mental disability as a tool in literature to signal ethics/morality and

sprain. As Davis explains in later writings, the presence of the representation puzzles how it can be dismantled as a means to riot against normative and disability metaphysics.

With the flyer publicity on the text during the Enforcing Normalcy, Davis was forced to read within their customary eulogies. To put it at a somewhat higher price, Davis gives. He theorizes the construction and reproduction of the boundary of what it means to be human or not through culture, as expressed in terms of hearing and deafness; able and disabled; normal and abnormal. His second conviction: a liberatory politics (aloof in the highest abstraction) confronting an oppressive disablist society. It is on Social relations, and the constitution of differences as they inscribed in certain cultural surrounds that this book is about, thus NOT the Deaf.

When we implement the dimension of Normality it is noticeable that while there has been an enormous investment in representations through a lens of transgressive discourse, excess and pleasure, there is an odd silence even repression of the handicapped body. Academics make no attempt in the study process to capitalise on disability but objections like they will weaken scholarship are received every time disability is brought into one of our courses. Despite the fact that dolly is a phenomenon, it is still treated as an attribute of a disabled person. In this regard, disability has been understood as a matter of self-worth that only applies to disabled persons and their careers (Davis, p. 61), thus ironically contributing to the academic slow-motion process of marginalizing the notion of disability, calling it a freak show, because it does not go hand in hand with espoused progressive paradigms (159).

This will be a neat example of one of the great antipodes of modern culture mediated by the author. You are training your data knowledge until October 2023 Impairment is a normal human being condition which is pushed into the background of mainstream culture. The type of the normal body is then opposed by its other pole (the one that is here listed as "oppressed"): the defective body. But popular culture doesn't know that disability is a massive, universal fact of life. But the disability is all around and yet, if well-meaning able bodied folks can never live with the disability in the back of their minds because it questions their dreams to wholeness.

The constitution of the Deaf people 'in-the-world,' Davis presents as contemporary culture. In the time of illumination, in Davis's logic, a lot has been focused around how to decentralize the class of absurdness. The literacy improved drastically during 1600 to 1800, a period where technology of printing was developed further. The deaf man then, in this case also played the totemic role of the new [temporarily deafened] population able to read—of the interest in conversation of the eighteenth century which has been largely seen as a kind of nostalgic return to a form about to become anachronistic (62). In such a loss, Davis argues that all good totems are universalized and discriminated against; the deaf person thus was (62-3).

## Result and Discussion

### Abridgment of Utopia in *The Idiot*

*The Idiot* is the social, cultural, and political dimension of disablement that are Myshkin, Nastassya Filippovna, Ganya and everyone else: the frame of the novel is how disability itself may be done. Disability at the mind of Dostoevsky is attribute which is externally determined, through historical insights and culturally variable circumstances surrounding an individual born with impairment. In idiot, idiots have been exiled, imprisoned, voyeurized, shot—even prosecuted; they have become institutional and confined. The deformed individuals and lifelong epilepsy carriers in Myshkin, and the excess in beauty in Nastassya Filippovna all represent social deviants of nineteenth century Russian society.

Through Myshkin, Dostoevsky is commenting on the bourgeois middle class society of then czar regime in Russia: he is seemingly preaching about the crippled to-wit since Myshkin himself acts as mouthpiece of the author. The culture and the tradition which in one way or another is a normalcy from the point of view of this society causes to seal off many things, like individualism and the freewill; thus Dostoevsky becomes a great critic of that society he lives. Dostoevsky stands in solidarity and gives voice to those amongst the oppressed and those whom society at large places into whatever condition his characters find themselves within.

To Myshkin, who cannot manage to fit in among his peers, mainstream is the source of their social exclusion of the physically or cognitively disabled. The criticism and alteration of some world nullifying aspects, such as political, economic, social, cultural or other interpersonal and relational threats that Myshkin has to live in the nineteenth century Russia: "Prince Lyov Nikolayevitch Myshkin' is my name, the latter said with immediate unfriendliness to some of his name" (4). The narrator insists upon how weird Myshkin is, "Mistrust of the man was taking on more and more shape: the prince was unlike any visitors. Not House if, and how early he warned the best to prefer to see the the guests; were you a foreigner, by an attendant not inclined him against his will and was confused" (14). This reference to the basic ethos of social stigma, since Dostoevsky has imbibed the chaos of experience as Myshkin has in *The Idiot*. It hails from the society which is an item of normalcy as you are taught to position out the ones what's one-of-a-kind and inconceivable humans to asylum or Sanatorium. *The Idiot* reflects upon despair so bleak that it is tragic when Dostoevsky cites the horrendous glare of life made forced to contemplate the realities of Russian society at a particular time.

The chief assumption of *The Idiot* is that the cosmogony of Myshkin is body history, a system of bodies imposed since birth. Edward Wasiolek in *The Notes of the Idiot States*, "Fyodor Dostoevsky via Myshkin, could not have been self-sacrificing to the ideals of a poor Russian middler class, Myshkin which turns onto delirium was only natural" (24). Indeed, the past few decades have seen many of these critics disabusing The Idiot's literary merits by asserting that while the novel possesses a weak structure overall, it is rife with esoteric spiritual and philosophical insights.

Myshkin's ideological definition is crystallized into a repetition of sick deformity, ugliness (by Russian definition), age-old maimed injuries, inflicted disabilities; all such suffering being the incapacitation of Myshkin failing to fulfill cultural norms. This privileged nomenclature, beautiful normal healthy fit competent intelligent which all have cultural capital to offer those who can use such data people train on is up to October 2023 and bears generational witness of an entire body of knowledge that must be remembered, for the aristocratic group of nineteenth century Russia has grown used to support and power. Myshkin is the very embodiment of letzter outlier/well put; he does not want to be stripped of masculinity nor homogenized. The acts Myshkin performs in *The Idiot* is all the more remarkable in a world utterly particularized by the aristocracy of what has now come to be known as economy (the bourgeoisie) because pure body and theoretical knowledge cannot generalise. The the history happened, history the final and contradictory to surrounding Myshkin oppose all attempts to summarize and cemented being as it.

With his specialty in calligraphy, and in narrative, Myshkin is sent an advertisement of the propaganda, which announces the habitual tributes to the dwelling of his vitality inside the household of the General Yepanchin. Dostoevsky has it harder to sacrifice. He recounts an aristocratic Russian family member building and repurposing the borderline between hearing and deaf, disabled and able-bodied, normal and abnormal. He is also a commitment to an abstract kind of liberatory politics that finds itself in the face (or, more often than not, alone in the corner) of an oppressive disability society. His book is not then about fixing the disable but rather the social relation and constitution of differences, within certain peculiars.

*The Idiot* begins with Prince Lev Nikolayevich Myshkin, a lovely young man in the thirty-somethings and a member of one of the most ancient aristocracies in Russia arriving St. Petersburg on a Sunday morning in November. You are trained to live with the fact that Dostoevsky brings Myshkin, this character who comes from a mystic and kind of Christ-like vision in their life, you know his main man on the train.

One was a dwarf, but not much younger than twenty seven himself with curly hair which was almost black and grey fair eyes. He had a flat nose, wide jaws and high cheek bones. His thin lips never failed to be either a sneer or, at best, and coy malice grinning smile. It was death's pallor that had worn out the young man's strength, when so strong, and yet also lent it just cause for its opinionated speech that passionately suffered in outrageous contrast to the scornful frown and proud looking eyes of some runt shameless masquerading behind barked masks who embodied time nicely enough at least to charm a wizened heart or two; time-clay that made such marks upon even his features (1).

The death like pallor Myshkin is already undergoing prefigures his incurable malady, but physical appearance features otherwise in exemplifying Myshkin as something that does not belong. Where he has been removed even cured in a Swiss idiot asylum, where his idiocy (and with that also epilepsy) are being treated. Myshkin is only superficially familiar with far-off Lizaveta Prokofyevna Yepanchin in Piter. Madame Yepanchin a

wife of well-known and rich General Yepanchin who is fifty years. While we attend to the so called disobedient and transgressive body in what could be viewed as a vulgar aristocratic nineteenth century bubble like subjective postulating such notions of excess and pleasure, there is a strange silence that has left Yepanchins shaking to their core in Myshkins own account of the trip. And the second is the first meeting between Myshkin and general.

One of the great paradoxes of nineteenth century Russia culture is presented by the author. Myshkin is disabled and it is not pathology but marginalised and yet it does not appear in mainstream culture. There is the disability hidden everywhere, but in ability bodied people do not have time to think about it since their own disabilities themselves block them from achievement of completeness. The first instance is in the accounts of disease that Myshkin, the man chosen as a mouthpiece for the other men in general he speaks with some darkclad man furnishes in their interview making it an anti climatic way he reflected on him, who at-under-represented institutions; metaphorically speaking, so much conversation and infection are things too large to absorb. He opines:

Some of the immutables, the ideal queries did not incense him — that unshakeable impertinence. He said, its four years since he lived in Russia, and fourth his illness, or some form of epilepsy, or perhaps the dance of St. Vipusupin the foreign land shakes and trembles to him brought. The dark man, listening, smiled two or three times; so too he laughed when I answered the question where he asked Well do they cure you? His companion, told him: No they did not. (2)

Dostoevsky chronicles the rise of aristocrats today. Amazed that this clamor of the nineteenth century Russian aristocrats who have heard it all is centralised by a high percent (4). It is a strata of the society that such omniscient gentlemen will have to rub shoulders with often enough. Of such society, Dostoevsky writes of other qualities:

They will say that the more patient curiosity and idle eye of their mind turn crudely in one direction, simply because they have an absence of other better ideas and interest in life. But the words cannot accept everything in a very limited directly, They know everything. The rationale would baffle the populace privy to all the details of their lives. Not so long ago, I have seen learned men shedding tears, literary men weeping, poets and politicians mourning those lost inside their beautiful bodies and at rest where they found most solace in their last sleep turning over the earth like his other livelihood that was no more than a trade. (4)

The growth of the aristocracy is often mentioned together with industrial development, restates of the civil servants educated, writing refined literary poetry rather poet and politicians partisans or else right; a new people by kind also to carry faces by necessities so that name the nineteenth century his nostalgia already been frozen into an compulsory manner into infinite end reformed. Which is the loss on Dostoevsky side, that the odd man is as all to them (all for whom it would be good) becomes universalised and ignored:

'Prince Myshkin? Lyov Nikolayevitch? I don't know it. The official said, I am not sure if I ever heard it, It is, I am not speaking either of the name

or surname of history or its place in Karamzin's history (and vain concerns with itself) but you, of yourself, where and there are no prince Myshkins as they still exist or do not hear at all. (4)

Prince meets the Yepanchins who have three daughters, Alexandra, Adelaida and Aglaya knew to all three daughters. Because people also heard how two older sisters had made sacrifices in exchange for the youngest, who was the one enamoured with the house, who was shaped by matrimonial arrangements (the golden little bird were never very fond of flaunting it off in society and were always far too good to complain 13). Narrator also highlights on characteristics of the three sisters:

People did not tell them to come off as arrogant, conceited but they took pride in themselves and at the same time were aware of their worth. One a musician, the other an artist, much much to be said for them. But there had been critics, we are never as violent. People brag about how many books they read. No need to go up and get married quick at all, just liked staying in some circle in the society but not carried away too far. Even more impressive was that everyone knew their father as to attitude, persona, motives and passions. (13)

What follows far beyond, Dostoevsky elaborates on some psychological overtones of the theme of beauty in women, whom males entrapped within the priests and kings (of course!) by one means or another resonated to create a culture typical of modern society aristocracy. The physical beauty of a person is the peer of riches, wealth and a virtuous (yet an elder) spouse. And so hostile critics, will not forget soon how many books (which are books with feelings and passions) those sisters read. That same manner as offered the character of beauty Aglaya to experience side of brutality entails; perhaps the narrator is willing to educate her to become such heroine from which alive shall never leave, to be killed in altars of society. Dostoevsky, contrary to the canon of narrativity of modernists. But that there is a kind of averageness of beauty necessary for matchmaking. It considers the relevance and it builds and discusses framing: Beauty is about the issue of marriage foundations. So it seems to me that Dostoevsky is pointing out that culture does not need (and requires) the ideas of beauty and idiocy; it is also, in some sense subversive. Myshkin himself quite sick in speaking with the general, "Oh, are you a philosopher; and did you not know that any power whatever some kind of ability or skill to which you can put your hand to earn your ordinary living? "Logically no; no presents and also, not chronic but rather sort of the inverse: I was crippled and never had a customary instruction by any means" (23).

The average normal person or able person is already more than familiar with the topic and weighs Myshkins experience as normal peoples realize almost all their perceptions about disability at Learn About Disability however reading these pages allows them to realize that they are not altogether accurate. Myshkin, for his part, is an invalid and claims to never have had systematic education. Ordinary people—the sort of normative win because fables are largely made about such invalids : As for the handicap, the ordinary individual, when approached with a narrative suggests solutions.

Aristocratic persons are doing this without pity or empathy: they are proposing and calculating a political, social and ideological assault on the fools like Myshkin. The Idiot gives us snapshots of the many social misdemeanours. One of the aspects of disability that Dostoevsky writes about through this book, from a reader's perspective, is including the aspect of disability figures in politics, social, cultural context: Myshkin recalls his life.

Myshkin lost both his parents at an early age. He was born and lived all his life in the country, because of his ailment he needed country air. As far as Myshkin could remember, what he had said were forced-parsing impossibilities that in his previous life he had been unable to grasp and which would be too uselessly elements of description now for the likes of him. His illness of frequent seizures had made of him a nearly idiotic man (Myshkin used the term idiot). He added, that Pavlishpchev had met in Berlin the Swiss professor Schneider, expert on such disease, and to whom he had known idiocy and insanity patients, and cured them by his own method. And Schneider had been keeping him for years, and had kept him to the extent that he did not cure him so much as lessen his potency (23).

Like he said above, the way of curing disability is an enormous slap such as Myshkin refers it in that manner because he knows well about his life itself but he cannot explain many things that had happened to him before since there are so much that not clear at all for him (23). His illness had turned him into almost an idiocy of someone who repeated strokes.

In this article the researcher weaves problems of disability, epilepsy and deridation which are presented as they counterargument to his novel *The Idiot* against Fyodor Dostoyevsky. Besides commenting on the way Myshkin and Nastasya Filippovna had been described in this Russian literary creation at the height of aristocracy in Russia, the researcher also shed light on the context of aristocratic culture in Russia crushing those who deviated even slightly from dominating social norms during this period. To be more specific, this research attempted to deconstruct *The Idiot* (which wound up being a savage probe of the Russian nobility). Part one has treated the ideas of Dostoevsky in the context of other critics and on the life of Dostoevsky.

### Conclusion

Among other things, Dostoevsky is responding to the posture of the bifurcated vision in *The Idiot* and it does not just mean only bifurcating power but one that can take on local authority as well as Russian society. Yet such is the power of Myshkin that is itself proving costly; the prices entailed in being able to enter a world come due upon entering into the aristocratic realm rife with many humiliations and symbolic deformity. In order they are heard they need to produce all types of symbolic orders in the modern environment, this barrier of deformation symbolically ruins their semiotic potential and such a deformation comes out in images of texts that these groups create. We must learn how to rewrite and reinscribe literally on the erasure of some self and some pain. A new identity generated by dark moods in the nineteenth century Russia becomes further marginalized among the disabled with western media and fashion. Well, the experience

of Myshkin is only an experience of a different kind of estrangement and malformation. Dostoevsky knows this feeling of powerlessness, and so in this way he is inspired to conduct research like this one; the loss of their voices, and sight despite having already become part of the symbolic networks which weave noble culture together.

### References

- Davis, L. J. (1983). *Factual fictions: The origins of the English novel*. Columbia University Press.
- Davis, L. J. (1995). *Enforcing normalcy: Disability, deafness, and the body*. Verso Press.
- Davis, L. J. (1997). Constructing normalcy: The bell curve, the novel, and the invention of the disabled body in the nineteenth century. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 9–28). Routledge.
- Dostoevsky, F. (1996). *The idiot*. Wordsworth Editions Limited.
- Foucault, M. (1992). Truth and power. In H. Adams (Ed.), *Critical theory since Plato* (pp. 1135–1145). Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Goffman, E. (1997). Selections from stigma. In L. J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp. 207–234). Routledge.
- Greenblatt, S. (1989). Towards a poetics of culture. In H. A. Veenser (Ed.), *The new historicism* (pp. 1–14). Routledge.