

RETROSPECTIVE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROFILING AS A METHOD FOR ANALYZING HISTORICAL SERIAL CRIMES: A CASE STUDY OF JACK THE RIPPER

(A Retrospective Analysis Using the Example of Jack the Ripper and George Chapman)

Kirill Romanov

Independent Researcher

Contact e-mail: r_kirill@mail.ru

Date: August 9, 2026

Status: Preprint. This version has not undergone peer review and has not been published in a scientific journal.

License: CC BY 4.0

Note to readers.

This paper is published as a heuristic experiment, not as a definitive historical claim. The author is fully aware of the methodological pitfalls (post-hoc selection, circular reasoning) and explicitly invites peer critique. If you spot factual errors, questionable inferences, or missing references, please write to me, and I will update the preprint accordingly.

Translation note.

This is an English translation of the original Russian preprint:

Romanov K.A. (2026). Retrospective psychological profiling as a method for analyzing historical serial crimes: a case study of Jack the

Ripper. [PREPRINTS.RU](https://preprints.ru). DOI: [10.24108/preprints-3116113](https://doi.org/10.24108/preprints-3116113).

The translation was prepared with the assistance of a language model (see Acknowledgements). The scientific content and conclusions are the sole responsibility of the author.

Abstract

Objective. To demonstrate the heuristic potential of the retrospective psychological profiling method (Bukhanovsky) when applied to a historical serial crime in the absence of direct physical evidence. The case of Jack the Ripper (1888) is used as an illustrative case study, with the biography of George Chapman (Severin Klosowski) serving as a candidate

for comparison. This is a methodological exercise, not an attempt at legal or historical identification.

Methodology. The study draws on three methodological foundations: A.O. Bukhanovsky's retrospective psychological profiling method, Yu.M. Antonyan's concept of the "pseudo-investigative" motive, and a clinical-psychological model of the avoidant-schizoid pattern. The profiling procedure comprised four stages: data collection and systematization, identification of stable patterns, reconstruction of motivational dominants, and construction of a socio-psychological profile.

Results. The biographical analysis of George Chapman demonstrated his correspondence to the reconstructed profile across key parameters. Convergence was established between the obtained profile and the independent assessment by J. Douglas (1988, developed for a television documentary, not an official FBI report), which was produced within a different methodological tradition.

Scientific novelty. For the first time in Russian scholarship, the application of the retrospective profiling method to a world-famous historical case is demonstrated, and a model linking the avoidant-schizoid personality pattern to the pseudo-investigative motive through the mechanism of victim objectification is proposed.

Conclusions. This work is not an attempt at identification. Its purpose is to demonstrate how a clinically grounded model of motivation can be applied to historical material, what conclusions follow, and what limitations such an approach entails. The proposed model may serve as a didactic tool in profiler training and as a heuristic framework for analyzing non-sexual serial homicides.

Keywords: retrospective psychological profile, Bukhanovsky method, historical case study, Jack the Ripper, George Chapman, avoidant-schizoid pattern, pseudo-investigative motive, profiling.

1. Introduction

The Jack the Ripper case remains, perhaps, the most famous unsolved case in the history of criminology. Between August 31 and November 9, 1888, five women were murdered in the London district of Whitechapel: Mary Ann Nichols, Annie Chapman, Elizabeth Stride, Catherine Eddowes, and Mary Jane Kelly. All belonged to the most vulnerable segments of society—they were prostitutes or women living in extreme poverty. The murders were characterized by a distinctive modus operandi: rapid throat-cutting followed by abdominal

evisceration and removal of internal organs. None of the victims were raped. After the murder of Mary Kelly, the series abruptly ceased. Despite more than a century of research (Rumbelow, 2004; Sugden, 1994; Begg, 2013; Evans & Skinner, 2001; Gordon, 2000), no consensus has been reached regarding the killer's identity. Dozens of candidates have been proposed—from obscure immigrants and butchers to members of the aristocracy, including members of the royal family (Knight, 1976; Marriott, 2005). Most of these versions share a common feature: they are built around sensational conjecture or dubious circumstantial evidence, but do not withstand scrutiny using the methods of scientific psychology.

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate how the retrospective psychological profiling method can be applied to historical material. Identification of a specific individual is not the task of this study; the biography of George Chapman is used as illustrative material to test the explanatory power of the model. The entire analysis is heuristic and should not be misinterpreted as a claim that Chapman was the Ripper.

2. Historical Cases in Profiler Training: Methodological Rationale

The development of criminal profiling methods requires not only the analysis of current investigations but also retrospective testing on the basis of solved or well-documented historical cases. Historical cases provide a unique opportunity: the researcher has access to the full body of information available to investigators at the time of the crimes and simultaneously knows the "answer"—the suspect's biography, subsequent crimes, and the outcome of the case. This allows testing explanatory models under conditions approximating "blind" analysis.

The Jack the Ripper case is an ideal testing ground for such verification for several reasons:

- The murders are well-documented (coroner's reports, police reports, witness statements);
- A consensus profile exists, compiled by J. Douglas (1988, for a documentary, later published in his book), which can serve as a point of comparison;
- Among the suspects, there is one proven serial killer (J. Chapman), which allows for a comparison of the profile with the real biography.

This study does not aim to "identify" Jack the Ripper in the legal sense. Its task is to demonstrate how a clinically grounded model of motivation can be applied to historical material, what conclusions follow, and what limitations such an approach entails.

3. Methodology

The study is based on three complementary approaches developed and tested in Russian science.

3.1. Retrospective Psychological Profile (Bukhanovsky A.O.)

In the 1980s-1990s, Professor A.O. Bukhanovsky, while working on the Chikatilo case, developed and successfully applied the method of retrospective psychological profiling – the reconstruction of the psychotype of an unknown offender based on the totality of traces left at the crime scene and on the victim's body. The method is described in detail and systematized in his monograph "Psychology of Serial Killers" (1998) [1]. It allows for the identification of stable behavioral patterns, motivational dominants, and sociopsychological characteristics of the wanted person.

3.1.1. Procedure for Applying the Method

The retrospective profiling procedure in this study comprised four sequential stages.

Stage 1. Data Collection and Systematization. Based on coroner's reports, police reports, and witness statements (Rumbelow, 2004; Sugden, 1994), the following parameters were identified for each of the five murders: localization and nature of wounds; depth and direction of incisions; signs of antemortem/postmortem damage; presence or absence of signs of sexual violence; time elapsed from death to body discovery; lighting and geography of the location; signs of organized/disorganized actions.

Stage 2. Identification of Stable Patterns. Parameters recurring in at least three of the five cases were classified as stable characteristics of the offender. These include: throat-cutting as the method of killing; abdominal evisceration; removal of internal organs; absence of sexual violence; compact geography; time intervals between murders indicating escalating audacity.

Stage 3. Reconstruction of Motivational Dominants. Based on the stable patterns, motivational dominants were reconstructed according to Antonyan's classification (Antonyan & Guldan, 2017) [2]. The absence of sexual violence and the nature of injuries (abdominal evisceration, organ removal) were interpreted as manifestations of the "pseudo-investigative" motive. Escalation in the degree of injuries from the first to the fifth victim — as an intensification of investigative interest.

Stage 4. Construction of the Socio-Psychological Profile. Based on the motivational dominants and behavioral patterns, a socio-psychological profile of the unknown offender (age, social status, occupation, marital status, lifestyle) was reconstructed, presented in Section 4.

3.2. The Concept of the "Pseudo-Investigative" Motive (Antonyan Yu.M.)

The leading Russian criminologist Yu.M. Antonyan, analyzing the phenomenology of serial murders, identified a special category of offenders whose motivation does not fit within the framework of sexual or acquisitive motives. He described the "pseudo-investigative" motive, in which the perpetrator perceives the victim as an object of cognition, seeks to "study" the body, and experiences satisfaction not from the act of killing itself but from the process of dissection and exploration. This motive is often combined with a lack of sexual sadism and a detached, clinical attitude toward the victim.

3.3. Biographical Method and the Clinical Model of the Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern

The biographical method in personality psychology (Ananyev B.G., Loginova N.A.) allows the reconstruction of stable traits and motivational complexes based on documented life events. As a key motivational dominant, we consider the avoidant-schizoid personality pattern — a stable configuration of traits characterized by: (a) irrational fear of emotional intimacy and rejection with preserved sexual drive (avoidant component, corresponding to the criteria for Avoidant Personality Disorder according to DSM-5); (b) emotional coldness, absence of friendships, and a functional attitude toward others (schizoid component, corresponding to the criteria for Schizoid Personality Disorder according to DSM-5) [3]; (c) aggressive reactions to frustration associated with the threat of emotional closeness.

In this paper, this construct is used not as a formal clinical diagnosis (the author is not a physician and does not purport to make a medical conclusion), but as a psychological model allowing description of the behavioral pattern reconstructed from documentary sources. The choice of the avoidant-schizoid construct — in contrast to the more popular but scientifically unestablished term "philophobia" — is due to its operationalizability through DSM-5/ICD-11 criteria [3, 4] and its comparability with existing empirical research.

The presence of the avoidant-schizoid pattern in Chapman is established based on a set of documented acts: flight from his first wife immediately after marriage (Poland, ca. 1887) — corresponding to the avoidant criterion of "avoidance of interpersonal contacts due to fear

of rejection"; death threats to his cohabitant Lucy Baderski using a knife — corresponding to the schizoid criterion of "inadequate response to frustration"; serial elimination of subsequent cohabitants (Spink, Taylor, Marsh) while outwardly observing the form of marital relations — corresponding to a combination of avoidant pattern (formal observance of social norms with an inability for emotional intimacy) and schizoid (cold, instrumental attitude toward the partner); complete absence of friendships throughout life — corresponding to the schizoid criterion of "lack of desire for close relationships, including friendships."

4. Results: Psychological Profile of Jack the Ripper

Application of the Bukhanovsky method to the five canonical murders allows the identification of the following stable characteristics of the offender:

- Absence of sexual motivation.** None of the victims were raped. The nature of the injuries (abdominal evisceration, removal of internal organs) indicates an interest in anatomy, not sexual sadism.
- Presence of anatomical knowledge, but not at the level of a professional surgeon.** Removal of the uterus and kidney was performed with relative precision; however, several incisions were unprofessional in character. This is consistent with the skills of a feldsher, barber-surgeon, or failed medical student.
- Local resident.** The murders were committed within a very compact area (radius of less than 1 km), which the offender knew thoroughly. He navigated confidently in the dark, knew patrol routes and escape routes.
- Low social status and social inconspicuousness.** The offender did not attract attention, blending into the crowd of the impoverished East End. His weapon (a knife) and possible bloodstains on clothing did not arouse suspicion, indicating an occupation that allowed for such "incidental" marks.
- Escalation of actions.** The degree of injuries and the duration of contact with the body increased from the first victim (Nichols) to the fifth (Kelly), indicating growing confidence and a shift in focus from the killing itself to the "investigative" phase.

Of particular note is the qualitative difference of the fifth murder (Mary Jane Kelly) from the previous four. While the first attacks bore the hallmarks of the disorganized type — impulsivity, high risk, subordination to external circumstances (darkness, patrols, random witnesses) — the murder in a closed room demonstrates a transition to organized behavior: the offender chose a location that ensured complete control over time and the victim's body, and realized his "investigative" inclinations without interference. This distinction precisely corresponds to the FBI classification (Douglas, 2000) [7] and indicates that within the 1888 series, an evolution from the disorganized to the organized type had already begun to emerge — a trajectory that later, after a period of adaptation, led to the poisoning series of 1897–1902.

•**Cessation of the series after the fifth murder.** The murders abruptly ceased after the most audacious and "complete" evisceration (Kelly), which is atypical for sexual maniacs but explicable within the "investigative" model.

Furthermore, the following personality traits are reconstructed: introversion, unsociability, bitterness toward women, inability to establish and maintain long-term emotional relationships with preserved physical attraction. This symptom complex fully fits the clinical picture of the avoidant-schizoid pattern (see Section 3.3).

4.1. Convergence with the Profile by J. Douglas (1988)

Before proceeding to the biographical analysis, it is methodologically important to compare the obtained profile with an independent expert assessment. In 1988, J. Douglas, FBI Special Agent and one of the founders of the Behavioral Analysis Unit, compiled a psychological portrait of Jack the Ripper for a television documentary, relying solely on case materials and without reference to any specific suspect. This profile was subsequently published in his book "The Cases That Haunt Us" (2000) [7]. It is important to note that this was not an official FBI investigative profile but a retrospective exercise for public broadcast.

A methodological limitation should be noted: both our profile and Douglas's profile are reconstructed on the basis of the same initial data — descriptions of the five canonical murders of 1888. Therefore, the coincidence of conclusions cannot be regarded as independent empirical validation. It is a matter of convergence — the agreement of two methods developed in different scientific traditions (the Russian Bukhanovsky school and the American FBI school) when applied to the same material. Such consistency increases confidence in the reconstructed profile but does not replace validation on independent data.

Table 1. Comparison of the Reconstructed Profile with the Assessment by J. Douglas (1988)

Key Parameter	J. Douglas's Conclusion (1988, for documentary)	Findings Based on Russian Methodology
Age	28–36 years	Approximately 30 years (Chapman was 23 in 1888, close to the lower bound given the weathered appearance of an immigrant)
Social Status and Occupation	Lower class; unskilled or semi-skilled labor	Low socio-economic status, social inconspicuousness. Occupation explaining

Key Parameter	J. Douglas's Conclusion (1988, for documentary)	Findings Based on Russian Methodology
		bloodstains and knife (barber-feldsher)
Marital Status	Not married; serious problems with women	Not married, living alone (first wife remained in Poland); documented patterns of fear of intimacy
Anatomical Knowledge	Some, but not at physician level; feldsher or butcher skills	Feldsher-barber training: basic knowledge for organ removal
Motive	Crimes are not sexual; element of depersonalization of the victim	Pseudo-investigative motive (according to Antonyan): evisceration as a method of study
Lifestyle	Withdrawn, unsociable; resided in the area of the murders	Residence on Cable Street within <1 km radius; complete absence of friendships
Fate after 1888	Cessation due to arrest, mental hospital, or death	Three proven poisonings (1897-1902); arrest and execution in 1903

As can be seen from the table, the profile reconstructed on the basis of Russian methodology and the portrait compiled by J. Douglas coincide across all significant parameters. This convergence of two methods developed independently of each other suggests that the reconstructed profile is internally consistent and may have heuristic value. However, it does not constitute proof of any specific suspect's guilt. Final verification would require independent empirical data, which historical science does not currently possess.

5. Illustrative Case: Biographical Analysis of George Chapman (Severin Klosowski)

Severin Antonovich Klosowski (1865-1903) was born into a poor Polish family. In his youth, he moved to Warsaw (then part of the Russian Empire), where he entered a feldsher school and received an official diploma as a "junior surgeon-feldsher." The training of feldshers at this level during that period included mandatory study of anatomy with practical dissections and basic surgery, as confirmed by the existence of specialized textbooks for feldshers, such as "Krótki rys anatomii opisanej dla użytku felczerów" (1862)

and "Przewodnik dla felczerów" (1886) [12], as well as the practice of training in hospitals under the supervision of physicians. This qualification gave him the right to perform minor surgical operations, bloodletting, tooth extraction, and midwifery, but did not allow him to engage in full medical practice. It is precisely this level of training — sufficient for organ removal but falling short of the level of a certified surgeon — that is key to our analysis.

In contemporary foreign scholarship, Chapman's personality continues to attract attention as one of the most substantiated candidates for the role of the Ripper [13]; however, a detailed psychopathological analysis of his motivation is absent in these works, making the present study a theoretically significant addition to the existing literature. At the same time, a number of authors (Gordon, 2000; Evans & Skinner, 2001) express skepticism regarding Chapman's connection to the Whitechapel murders, pointing to the absence of direct evidence.

Subsequently, Klosowski emigrated to London, where he worked as a barber. In 1903, he was convicted of poisoning three of his cohabitants (Mary Spink, Bessie Taylor, Maud Marsh) using antimony and was hanged. He is the only suspect in the Ripper case whose status as a serial killer has been established by court, exhumation, and chemical expertise [5].

Table 2. Comparison of the Ripper Profile and Chapman's Biography

Profile Criterion	Ripper Characteristic	Chapman Biography Fact
Anatomical Knowledge	Basic, not physician level	Diploma of junior surgeon-feldsher (Warsaw)
Place of Residence	Whitechapel, local	126 Cable Street (500-900 m radius from all murders)
Social Status / Occupation	Low social status and occupation	Poor immigrant, barber, later publican (pub owner)
Relationships with Women	Serious problems; fear of intimacy, aggression	Panic flight from first wife; knife threat to cohabitant; serial poisoning of wives/cohabitants
Motive	Pseudo-investigative; objectification of victim	Complete absence of sexual violence in both series; medicalized control over the victim
Marital Status in 1888	Not married, living alone	First wife left in Poland; unmarried in London

Profile Criterion	Ripper Characteristic	Chapman Biography Fact
Fate after 1888	Cessation due to arrest, death, or hospitalization	Three proven poisonings (1897–1902); arrested, tried, and executed in 1903

5.1. Objectification as the Linking Mechanism Between the Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern and the Pseudo-Investigative Motive

The key mechanism unifying the avoidant-schizoid pattern and Jack the Ripper's criminal signature is victim objectification — the transformation of a woman from a subject possessing her own will and emotional needs into an object suitable for absolute possession and "study." Avoidant-schizoid attraction is not that of partner interaction but rather a striving for undivided ownership of the body as a thing. As long as a woman does not manifest subjectivity — is silent, does not demand intimacy — she is safe and can exist nearby. But as soon as she asserts herself as a personality with emotional demands, a defensive mechanism is activated: the subject must be eliminated, and the body "disarticulated" into components over which the killer has complete power. It is precisely this dynamic that explains the paradoxical combination of terrifying cruelty visible to the external observer and the complete absence of affect or sexual arousal at the crime scene. The killer experiences neither anger nor pleasure — he is merely restoring control over the object.

5.2. Victimological Analysis: Functional Equivalence of Victims

Critical for the identification of a serial offender is not only the stability of the modus operandi but also the constancy of the functional role of the victim in his psychopathological dynamics. The change in victim social type (prostitutes → wives/cohabitants) might at first glance serve as a counterargument to the unity of the two series. However, a deeper analysis shows that Chapman's victimological profile remained unchanged: he invariably sought a "safe object," interaction with which would exclude the triggering of the avoidant-schizoid trigger.

In 1888, a poor immigrant without social status had access to the female body exclusively through transactional interaction with street prostitutes. Payment for services created the illusion of control and excluded emotional involvement. The prostitute functioned as a "pure object," which temporarily neutralized the fear of intimacy.

By 1897, Klosowski had legitimized his status, became a publican (pub owner), and gained access to a "safe object" through another social institution — marriage/cohabitation. A woman legally and economically dependent on him was also perceived as an object of possession, not as an equal partner in a relationship. Formal marital bonds were, in his psyche, equivalent to monetary transaction: they granted the right to the body without the need for emotional closeness.

The key moment triggering the elimination mechanism is identical in both series: as soon as the "safe object" manifests subjectivity — whether the prostitute refuses to submit to his conditions or the wife begins to demand love, attention, and emotional participation — the avoidant-schizoid anxiety reaches a critical threshold. The subject must be depersonalized (transformed back into an object) and destroyed. In the first series, this was achieved through instantaneous evisceration; in the second, through protracted poisoning.

Thus, Chapman did not change the type of victim. He sought the same functional object under changed social circumstances. This explains the apparent change in victimological profile and serves as an additional illustration of the unity of the two crime series.

5.3. Comparative Analysis: The Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern in Other Serial Killers

To demonstrate that Chapman's case is not isolated but represents a specific type of serial killer, a brief comparison with two other known offenders whose actions exhibit elements of avoidant-schizoid objectification is warranted.

Henry Lee Lucas (USA, 1970s-1980s). Lucas, like Chapman, demonstrated a stable pattern of avoiding emotional intimacy with preserved sexual drive. His victims were women with whom he cohabited; the murders were not accompanied by sexual violence. Lucas described his actions in terms of "control" and "getting rid of," rather than pleasure. However, unlike Chapman, Lucas lacked medical competence, so his modus operandi remained primitive (knife blows, strangulation), without the pseudo-investigative component. His case demonstrates that the avoidant-schizoid pattern can manifest in serial murders even without a paramedical "superstructure," but then it lacks the specific signature — detached "dissection" of the body.

Andrei Chikatilo (USSR, 1978-1990). Chikatilo's early crimes and his manipulations of victims' bodies contain elements of "anatomical curiosity," which A.O. Bukhanovsky himself interpreted as pseudo-investigative. However, Chikatilo exhibited a pronounced sexual component (somasochistic release), bringing him closer to sadistic psychopathy rather

than "pure" avoidant-schizoid objectification. Furthermore, Chikatilo was capable of long-term emotional relationships (marriage, children), which is uncharacteristic of the avoidant-schizoid pattern. His case demonstrates that the pseudo-investigative motive can combine with other motivational dominants, forming a complex rather than "pure" type.

Chapman occupies a unique position in this series. His crimes represent a "pure" case of avoidant-schizoid objectification, where the sexual component is entirely absent, and the pseudo-investigative motive is realized through paramedical competence, evolving from knife to poison. This "purity" makes him an ideal model object for studying this type of serial killer. The comparison with Lucas and Chikatilo demonstrates that the avoidant-schizoid pattern and pseudo-investigative motive are not a unique anomaly of one individual but a stable pattern that can manifest with varying degrees of expression and in different instrumental forms.

5.4. Dynamics of the Avoidant-Schizoid Cycle: Generalizing Scheme

Chapman's behavior in both crime series can be described as a cyclic sequence:

[PROXIMITY] → [SUBJECTIVITY TRIGGER] → [ANXIETY] →
[OBJECTIFICATION/ELIMINATION] → [RITUALIZATION]

- Proximity:** Establishing contact with a "safe object" (transaction with a prostitute / formal marriage with a cohabitant).
 - Subjectivity Trigger:** The object manifests signs of autonomous will or emotional demands.
 - Anxiety:** The avoidant-schizoid reaction reaches a critical level.
 - Objectification/Elimination:** The woman is deprived of subjectivity and physically destroyed.
 - Ritualization:** The body is subjected to "study" through evisceration (1888) or the process of dying is controlled through observation (1897-1902). After the ritual is completed, the cycle can resume with a new object.
-

5.5. Differential Diagnostic Considerations

Of course, retrospective diagnosis has fundamental limitations. The same behavioral patterns may be interpreted within other diagnostic models. Let us consider the main alternatives:

- Antisocial Personality Disorder (Psychopathy):** Characterized by chronic disregard for the rights of others, deceitfulness, and lack of empathy. Chapman undoubtedly exhibited

these traits. However, this model does not explain the specific pattern of avoidance of intimacy. The classic psychopath uses people instrumentally, easily forming and breaking ties; he does not flee from them in panic immediately after marriage, as Chapman did.

•**Acquisitive Motivation:** Chapman did receive financial gain from the deaths of his wives. But this explanation is not relevant to the Whitechapel murders, where he took nothing of value except organs. Greed was a concomitant, but not the primary, motive.

The avoidant-schizoid pattern model, in contrast to alternatives, economically explains the entire set of facts: the panic flight from intimacy, the non-sexual nature of the Whitechapel murders, the evolution of method, and the specific choice of victims in the second phase. Therefore, with all the caveats of retrospective analysis, it is the most substantiated among the available hypotheses.

6. Comparison with Other Suspects

Suspect Selection Criteria

For comparative analysis, we selected six historical figures whose names appeared in official police memoranda, reports, and contemporary witness statements: Aaron Kosminski, Francis Tumblety, Charles Cross (Lechmere), Montague Druitt, James Kelly, and Joseph Barnett. We deliberately exclude from consideration figures whose involvement lacks documentary basis and belongs to the realm of literary speculation (Prince Albert Victor, Sir William Gull, Masonic conspirators).

It should be emphasized that this table is not an instrument for proving guilt or innocence. It serves an illustrative function, showing the comparative degree of correspondence of each suspect to the reconstructed profile according to objectively verifiable criteria. High correspondence does not mean identification; low correspondence does not mean an alibi.

Table 3. Comparison of Suspects by Key Criteria

Criterion	Chapman	Kosminski	Tumblety	Cross	Druitt	J. Kelly	Barnett
Proven serial killer	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes (one victim?)	No
Anatomical knowledge	Yes (feldsher)	No	Yes (physician)	No	No	No	No

Criterion	Chapman	Kosminski	Tumblety	Cross	Druitt	J. Kelly	Barnett
Residence in Whitechapel	Yes	Yes	No (visitor)	Yes	No	No	Yes
Cover occupation	Yes (barber)	No	No	Yes (carman)	No	No (fish porter)	No
Non-sexual motive	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	No	No (suicide)	Yes	No (domestic quarrel)
Evolution of method	Explained	No	No	No	No	No	No
Appears in police memoranda	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Profile correspondence	Complete	Partial	Partial	No	Partial	No	Partial

Discussion of the Table. As can be seen from the comparison, none of the suspects except Chapman demonstrates complete correspondence to the reconstructed profile. The closest competitors — Kosminski and Tumblety — have only partial correspondence on individual criteria, with Kosminski's mental state (progressive schizophrenia) making his participation in the 1888 murders extremely unlikely, and Tumblety not residing permanently in Whitechapel. Druitt and James Kelly, despite their significance for the historiography of the case, do not correspond to the profile on most parameters.

Of particular note is Joseph Barnett — Mary Kelly's cohabitant, interrogated by police after her murder. In popular literature, he sometimes appears as a possible offender acting out of jealousy. However, his complete non-correspondence to the reconstructed profile (absence of anatomical knowledge, non-sexual motivation not established, absence of signs of seriality in subsequent biography) demonstrates the discriminant validity of the model: it can filter out even those candidates who appear plausible from an everyday standpoint but do not fit the criminological pattern.

The mental state of Aaron Kosminski during the period of the murders deserves special attention. According to available evidence, as early as autumn 1888, he exhibited pronounced signs of mental disorder: auditory hallucinations, untidiness, disorganized behavior, refusal of food. These symptoms are poorly compatible with the behavior demonstrated by Jack the Ripper: the ability to quickly gain the trust of victims, navigate dark alleys, avoid police patrols, and perform anatomically meaningful manipulations of

the body. The psychotic disorganization characteristic of Kosminski is not identical to the criminal audacity and calculation of the Ripper. Thus, even irrespective of other criteria, Kosminski's mental state in 1888 makes his participation in the Whitechapel murders extremely unlikely.

It is important to note that Chapman's high correspondence is not proof of his guilt — it is a basis for his priority consideration within the proposed explanatory model. The model itself does not depend on the choice of a specific candidate; the candidate serves as an illustration of the model's explanatory power.

7. Discussion and Limitations

The proposed model is not without limitations. The main one is the absence of direct evidence (eyewitness testimony placing Chapman at the crime scene in 1888, or his confession). However, this problem is common to all versions of the Ripper case without exception.

Methodological Limitation: The Problem of Post Hoc Candidate Selection

This study is vulnerable to criticism from the standpoint of confirmation bias. George Chapman was selected as the primary candidate post hoc — after his biography became known to the author, not as a result of a "blind" search based on the reconstructed profile. Since Chapman is the only proven serial killer among all the suspects in the Ripper case, his biography a priori contains traits that may be interpreted as "corresponding" to almost any profile of a serial offender.

Thus, the correspondence of the profile to Chapman's biography is not independent evidence of his guilt — it is a consequence of a research strategy in which the candidate was known in advance. We cannot claim that the reconstructed profile inevitably leads to Chapman; we can only claim that among the limited circle of suspects whose names appeared in police documents, Chapman demonstrates the greatest correspondence to the proposed explanatory model.

Testing the hypothesis would require a "blind" test: presenting the reconstructed profile to independent experts unfamiliar with the Ripper case, with the task of selecting suspects from an expanded database of Whitechapel residents in 1888. Such a test was not

conducted and is unlikely to be possible within the framework of historical research. This limitation is insurmountable for any retrospective analysis and must be taken into account when assessing the strength of our conclusions.

The State of Criminology and Forensic Psychiatry in 1888

To objectively assess the strength of circumstantial evidence, the historical context must be considered. At the time of the Whitechapel murders, criminology was in its infancy. Fingerprinting was not yet used in police practice (its introduction began only in the 1890s), DNA analysis appeared a century later, and crime scene photography was only just coming into use. The only method of identification was witness identification — an extremely unreliable tool, especially in the dark alleys of Whitechapel.

Forensic psychiatry was also in a period of formation. The classification of mental disorders was primitive; the term "serial killer" did not exist, and the phenomenon itself had not been conceptualized by science. Criminal behavior was explained either by moral depravity or madness, and the police had no methods of psychological profiling that allow today's investigators to link outwardly dissimilar crimes through a single psychotype. It is for this reason that the 1888 murders and the 1897-1902 poisonings were viewed by contemporaries as unrelated episodes, rather than as stages in the evolution of a single disorder.

This historical gap explains why even with the suspicions of Detective Inspector Abberline, Chapman was not identified as the Ripper. The absence of direct evidence in a case investigated with the tools of the 19th century does not disprove the hypothesis but makes reliance on circumstantial, psychological, and logical evidence inevitable.

Regarding the Date of Klosowski's Arrival in London

The first currently indisputable documentary confirmation of Klosowski's presence in London is the marriage certificate to Lucy Baderski dated October 1889, as well as registration at 126 Cable Street, in the immediate vicinity of the sites of all five canonical murders. Thus, only 11 months after the last murder, Klosowski was officially residing in the very center of Whitechapel.

This time interval is so short that the version of his arrival in London after November 1888 appears extremely unlikely: it requires the assumption that a person who had just

emigrated immediately settled in an area recently gripped by panic due to a series of murders, and yet did not stand out among the locals. Much more plausible is the assumption that Klosowski was already living in Whitechapel in 1888 but remained "invisible" to official registers, like thousands of other poor immigrants.

Moreover, mass emigration of the Polish population (both Jews and Catholics) from Warsaw and other cities of the Russian Empire to London in the 1880s is well documented. The main wave arrived precisely at London's ports and settled in the East End, primarily in Whitechapel, where an established Polish diaspora already existed. Thus, Klosowski's appearance in this area fully corresponded to the migration trends of the time, and his Polish origin made Whitechapel the most likely place of initial residence. The absence of records of arrival and registration of low-skilled immigrants in police and parish books was more the rule than the exception, as confirmed by historical studies of East End migration.

Furthermore, Detective Inspector Frederick Abberline, who led the investigation on the ground, publicly stated in an interview with the Pall Mall Gazette (March 24, 1903) that Klosowski "lived in Whitechapel in 1888." This statement was made after Abberline's personal meeting with the arrested man and conversation with his wife Lucy Baderski. As a senior officer with access to confidential police information, Abberline would hardly have publicly reported an unverified fact, risking his reputation. Thus, his testimony is a serious ground for considering Klosowski's presence in the crime area as historically reliable.

Reconstruction of the Polish Period and Emigration Chronology

Analysis of available Polish sources and biographical studies allows for a fairly precise delineation of the time frame of Klosowski's disappearance from the documentary field of the Russian Empire.

The last reliable mention in Polish parish registers dates to 1887, related to his first marriage at the church in the village of Nagórki, followed by an immediate rupture with his wife. Around the same period (1886-1887), he completed his training at the feldsher school in Warsaw and received a diploma as a "junior surgeon-feldsher."

After 1887, Klosowski completely disappears from Polish archives. His name is absent from Warsaw address books for 1888 (confirmed by contemporary Polish research), and there are no records of obtaining a foreign passport, permission to leave, or legal proceedings. This means he left the territory of the empire either illegally or in transit, without formal paperwork — a practice widely common among poor migrants of the time.

As noted by P. Sugden (1994), Klosowski "disappears from Polish archives in 1887-1888," and his first reliable appearance in London dates to October 1889. P. Begg (2013) clarifies that the emigration was "most likely illegal — through the border with Austria-Hungary or Germany — which explains the absence of customs records."

Thus, the time gap between the last Polish record (1887) and the first British document (October 1889) is about one and a half to two years. If we assume that Klosowski left Poland in the spring-summer of 1888, then considering the standard travel time from Warsaw to London (2-3 weeks), he could physically have been in Whitechapel by August 1888 — that is, by the time of the first canonical murder. This does not prove his guilt, but eliminates the chronological counterargument: emigration in 1888 was physically possible and is consistent with both the migration patterns of the time and the complete absence of documents regarding his presence anywhere else during this period.

The Issue of Letters and Graffiti: From Counterargument to Additional Verification

The presence of expressive communication attributed to the killer has traditionally been considered a counterargument to the Chapman hypothesis. Cold objectification of the victim and absence of affect are poorly compatible with a need for public dialogue. However, analysis of the key artifact — the "From Hell" letter with a kidney fragment — allows this objection to be overcome.

Context and Motivation. The "Dear Boss" and "Saucy Jacky" letters, almost certainly journalistic hoaxes (Begg, 2013; Sugden, 1994), may have provoked the genuine offender into a response. However, the response was addressed not to a newspaper but to a private individual — George Lusk — which is consistent with the profile of someone avoiding publicity.

Linguistic Observation. The errors in the letter ("Mishter," "Sor," "prasarved," absence of articles) are compatible with the hypothesis of a Slavic origin of the author but do not constitute proof: similar errors are possible among illiterate Cockney speakers or speakers of other languages. We present this observation as not contradicting the model, rather than as a decisive argument.

Content and Medical Aspects. The tone of the letter is detached, almost clinical, consistent with the pseudo-investigative signature. Preservation of the kidney in alcohol indicates paramedical competence, which Klosowski possessed.

Data Capable of Refuting the Model

- Documentary confirmation of Klosowski's presence outside London in August-November 1888. The most promising sources for such verification are: parish registers of Catholic parishes in the Łęczyca district and Warsaw for 1888 (records of participation in sacraments); passenger lists of ships arriving from Hamburg and Bremen at London's port in 1887-1889; registration books of the Polish Catholic Mission in London; records of employment of barber's assistants in Whitechapel for 1888.
- Discovery of DNA or other evidence pointing to another person at the site of the canonical murders.
- Emergence of evidence that Chapman in 1889-1896 committed violent crimes inconsistent with the avoidant-schizoid pattern model.

The clear definition of these conditions and falsifiers demonstrates that the model is not an ad hoc explanation but can be tested and, potentially, refuted by future research.

7.1. Behavioral Invariance or Change of Modus: Can the Ripper and the Poisoner Be Identified?

The key conceptual challenge to our model is the thesis of the rigidity of criminal signature, advocated both by classic FBI profiling (Douglas, 2000) [7] and by some schools of investigative psychology (Canter, 2004) [8]. According to this view, the transition from dynamic, bloody street eviscerations to passive, protracted domestic poisonings is unlikely for the same subject.

We accept this challenge and offer a counterargument: in Chapman's case, the observed transformation is a change not of the "signature" but of the "modus operandi" (MO). His criminal "signature" is not the knife or the poison in themselves, but the cold, unfeeling study and destruction of the object that evokes both fear and attraction. This "signature" remains stable for 15 years. Only the instrumental means change, which is an adaptive response to altered external (increased police activity) and internal (exhaustion of anatomical "curiosity") conditions.

Moreover, Douglas himself (2000), unwittingly, provided an argument in favor of our model. His 1988 profile, describing the Whitechapel killer, almost verbatim predicted the appearance of George Chapman, arrested 15 years later. The fact that the profiler himself did not connect his own profile with Chapman says not of the profile's weakness, but that the true "signature" may lie at a deeper motivational level than the specific behavioral act.

7.1.1. Signature in the Poisonings: "Medicalized Control" as an Invariant (Hypothesis)

Detailed analysis of the 1897-1902 poisonings reveals the same criminal signature as in the Whitechapel murders, but realized in a different instrumental form — this is our working hypothesis.

In both cases, the signature is hypothesized to be the same: control over the victim's body, realized through paramedical competence. In 1888, this was the competence of a surgeon-anatomist (rapid and precise organ removal). In 1897-1902, this was the competence of a feldsher-diagnostician (observation and "treatment" during poisoning). The difference lies solely in the temporal dimension: evisceration is an instantaneous act of knowing the dead body; poisoning is a temporally extended act of knowing the process of dying of a living body.

Significantly, the choice of weapon in the second series is also directly linked to his professional training. Antimony was a known substance available through medical supplies, and its effects (vomiting, diarrhea, weakness) mimic natural diseases — allowing the perpetrator to observe the process under the guise of "care."

Furthermore, the same element of depersonalization of the victim is present in the poisonings as in the knife attacks. For Chapman, the dying wife is not a suffering person but an object of clinical observation. His visits to doctors, his "concern" for the victim's health, his detailed descriptions of symptoms — all are part of the pseudo-investigative ritual in which he acts not as a killer but as a "specialist" studying the course of an illness.

This makes the connection between the series a plausible explanatory model: the *modus operandi* changed (knife → poison, street → home), but the signature — medicalized control over the body, pseudo-investigative motive, absence of sexual violence — may have remained unchanged.

Under these conditions, the criterion becomes the explanatory power of the model. The presented model explains:

- The absence of sexual violence;
- The escalation of injuries;
- The cessation of the series after Kelly;
- The nine-year pause;
- The change of weapon.

None of the competing versions possess comparable explanatory power, but this does not amount to proof.

7.2. Practical Significance of the Model for Contemporary Criminal Psychology and Education

The proposed model, despite its retrospective nature, has a number of implications significant for contemporary investigative, expert, and educational practice.

First, it offers an alternative explanation for those serial crimes in which traditional motives (sexual, acquisitive, sadistic) are absent, and the offender's actions are outwardly senseless but methodical in character. In such cases, the investigator or profiler may check not only the suspect's criminal past but also the presence in his biography of markers of the avoidant-schizoid pattern: panic breakups of relationships when faced with the threat of emotional closeness, threats against partners, instrumental attitude toward the body, social isolation with preserved sexual drive. These markers are specific and verifiable, making the model operational.

7.2.1. Markers of the Avoidant-Schizoid Pattern: A Checklist for Operational Use

Based on the conducted analysis, the following empirical indicators can be identified, the presence of which in the biography of a suspect in non-sexual serial homicide cases warrants heightened attention:

1. **Panic relationship breakups when faced with closeness.** The suspect in the past suddenly and without visible reasons broke off relationships, entered into marriage and immediately dissolved it, left without explanation.
2. **Instrumental attitude toward the body.** Profession or hobby connected with medicine, veterinary medicine, the meat industry, or barbering. Presence of anatomical knowledge or access to pharmacological substances.
3. **Absence of close friendships.** Complete social isolation outside the professional sphere. Absence of friends, confidants, participation in community or religious life.
4. **Cold, detached description of one's actions.** When giving testimony or in communication, the suspect describes violent actions in clinical, "technical" terms, without signs of empathy or remorse.
5. **Preserved sexual drive with inability for intimacy.** Presence of sexual contacts (including paid ones), but complete inability for long-term emotionally involved relationships.

This checklist is not a formal diagnostic tool and is subject to empirical validation. It is intended for primary screening and the formulation of investigative hypotheses, not for making procedural decisions.

Second, the model expands the understanding of the "signature" of a serial offender. Traditional profiling is oriented toward the stability of observable behavioral acts (method

of attack, weapon, ritual). This study demonstrates that when the modus operandi (MO) changes — for example, during the transition from knife to poison — the signature can be preserved at a deeper motivational level. This means that when analyzing cold cases or series from different regions, it is advisable to look not only for external similarity of actions but also for the invariant dynamics of the relationship with the victim.

Third, the model contains a prognostic component. The combination of identified factors — avoidant-schizoid pattern, presence of special skills (medical, pharmacological), access to vulnerable or isolated victims, and complete social isolation — may be regarded as a high-risk matrix. In forensic psychiatric assessment and in evaluating persons convicted of violent crimes against partners, the presence of such a combination may serve as a basis for more in-depth diagnostics and monitoring.

Finally, the work has pronounced didactic value. This study can serve as a ready-made case study for courses on criminal profiling, forensic psychology, and criminology. It demonstrates to learners the full cycle of method application: from operationalizing data to constructing a profile and testing it against a real biography.

7.3. Conditions of Inapplicability and Possible Refutations of the Model

A scientific hypothesis is more persuasive the more clearly it defines its own boundaries. The proposed model is not universal and has clear limitations.

Conditions under which the avoidant-schizoid pattern does not lead to serial murders:

- Presence of social brakes (friendships, community involvement);
- Absence of special skills that turn the body into an object of knowledge (medical, pharmacological);
- Presence of alternative channels of sublimation (professional fulfillment, hobbies);
- Low intensity of the pattern, not reaching the level of compulsive drive.

Facts in the Ripper case potentially contradicting the model:

- Eddowes's cut throat and other anomalies that may indicate a higher level of disorganization than the profile suggests.

Data capable of refuting the model (already listed above).

The clear definition of these conditions and falsifiers demonstrates that the model is not an ad hoc explanation but can be tested and, potentially, refuted by future research.

8. Conclusion

This study represents an attempt to demonstrate how the retrospective psychological profiling method can be applied to historical material. We reconstructed the psychological profile of the unknown offender, compared it with the independent expert assessment by J. Douglas (1988, for a television documentary), and illustrated the model's operation with the biography of George Chapman — the only proven serial killer among the suspects in the Ripper case.

The proposed model, linking the avoidant-schizoid personality pattern, the mechanism of objectification, and the pseudo-investigative motive, does not claim to be the ultimate truth. It is the most economical and internally coherent explanation of the known facts, but it remains a hypothesis. The work is not an attempt at legal identification; its purpose is to serve as a didactic tool and heuristic foundation for further research.

The convergence of two independent profiles suggests that the reconstructed portrait is internally consistent, but it is not proof of the guilt of any specific individual. This important methodological distinction should prevent incorrect interpretations in the media space.

All conclusions are exclusively hypothetical in nature. The question of Jack the Ripper's identity remains open to the extent that this is possible for events separated from us by a century and leaving no direct evidence.

References

1. Bukhanovsky A.O. Psychology of Serial Killers: Clinical and Criminological Analysis [Psikhologiya seriynykh ubiystv: kliniko-kriminalisticheskiy analiz]. — Rostov-on-Don: Fenix, 1998. — 352 p.
2. Antonyan Yu.M., Guldan V.V. The Psychology of Murder [Psikhologiya ubiystva]. — Moscow: Yurist, 2017. — 304 p.
3. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5). — Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing, 2013.

- 4.Smulevich A.B. Anxiety-Phobic Disorders // Psychiatry: National Guide [Psikhiatriya: Natsional'noye rukovodstvo] / Ed. by T.B. Dmitrieva, V.N. Krasnov, N.G. Neznanov, V.Ya. Semke, A.S. Tiganov. — Moscow: GEOTAR-Media, 2009. — Ch. 22. — P. 402–423.
 - 5.Rumbelow D. The Complete Jack the Ripper. — London: Penguin Books, 2004. — 384 p.
 - 6.Sugden P. The Complete History of Jack the Ripper. — London: Robinson, 1994. — 541 p.
 - 7.Douglas J., Olshaker M. The Cases That Haunt Us. — New York: Scribner, 2000. — P. 35–68.
 - 8.Canter D. Criminal Shadows: Inside the Mind of the Serial Killer. — London: HarperCollins, 2004. — 416 p.
 - 9.Begg P. Jack the Ripper: The Facts. — London: Robson Books, 2013. — 512 p.
 - 10.Knight S. Jack the Ripper: The Final Solution. — London: Harrap, 1976. — 240 p.
 - 11.Marriott T. Jack the Ripper: The 21st Century Investigation. — London: John Blake, 2005. — 320 p.
 - 12.Krótki rys anatomii opisanej dla użytku felczerów (1862) — see reprint edition: Anatomia dla felczerów: podręcznik z 1862 roku / Oprac. J. Kowalski. — Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Lekarskie PZWL, 1990.
 - 13.Fido M. The Crimes, Detection and Death of Jack the Ripper. — London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1987. — 240 p.
 - 14.Gordon R.M. The Thames Torso Murders of Victorian London. — Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000. — 248 p.
 - 15.Evans S.P., Skinner K. The Ultimate Jack the Ripper Sourcebook. — London: Robinson, 2001. — 768 p.
-

Acknowledgements

The author acknowledges the use of the DeepSeek language model (deepseek.com) for assistance in translating this work from Russian into English. All conceptual positions, source analysis, and scientific conclusions are the original work of the author.

Contact: r_kirill@mail.ru