A FORMAL LITERARY ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURE OF FATHERS AND SONS by I.S. TURGENEV

ANALYSE LITTERAIRE CONVENTIONNELLE DE LA STRUCTURE DE PERES ET FILS de I.S. TOURGUENIEV.

par

BRONISLAWA MUSZKATEL

THESE SOUMISE EN VUE DE L'OBTENTION D'UNE MAITRISE ES ARTS

RESUME

Par l'application des principes de critique littéraire, l'auteur étudie le roman Pères et Fils de I.S. Tourgueniev en adhérant étroitement à la lecture du texte et en analysant les moyens artistiques employés par Tourgueniev dans la création de cette oeuvre d'art spécifique.

L'introduction présente un bref historique de la critique se rapportant à Pères et Fils et un exposé des méthodes de critique qui seront utilisées par l'auteur dans cette thèse.

La première partie décrit les différentes attitudes des critiques de la littérature, en apportant une attention spéciale à l'école positiviste, laquelle fut originairement utilisée dans la critique de Pères et Fils au cours du siècle dernier.

Le développement contemporain de la pensée critique y est minitieusement examiné. La méthode utilisée dans l'analyse de Pères et Fils est décrite dans la deuxième partie.

La deuxième partie traite d'une analyse textuelle très fidèle au manuscrit de Pères et Fils en soulignant ses valeurs intrinsèques et en élucidant les moyens de structure utilisés par Tourgueniev.

L'auteur se préoccupe le moins possible des références biographiques, sociologiques et historiques.

Département des études Slaves et Russes
McGill University
1973

A FORMAL LITERARY ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURE OF FATHERS AND SONS by I.S. TURGENEV

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

by

Bronislawa Muszkatel

Department of Russian and Slavic Studies

McGill University

1972-1973

A FORMAL LITERARY ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURE OF FATHERS AND SONS by I.S. TURGENEV

by

Bronislawa Muszkatel

A thesis submitted for
the degree of Master of
Arts

An Abstract

Through the application of the principles of literary criticism, the author studies the novel Fathers and Sons by I.S. Turgenev adhering to close text reading and analysing the artistic devices employed by Turgenev in the creation of this particular work of art.

The introduction presents a brief history of the criticism pertaining to Fathers and Sons and an outline of the critical method to be used by the author in this thesis.

Part I is concerned with the various critical approaches to literature, paying special attention to the positivistic school of criticism which was the one primarily used for the criticism of Fathers and Sons during the last century. The contemporary development of critical thought is being scrutinized and the method used in the analysis of Fathers and Sons in Part II of the thesis described.

Part II deals with the close textual analysis of the text of Fathers and Sons, stressing the intrinsic values and elucidating the structural devices used by Turgenev. The least possible attention is paid to biographical, sociological and historical references.

Department of Russian and Slavic Studies
McGill University

1973

PREFACE

A close text reading should normally be applied to the work in its original language and version. However, since this thesis had to be written in English, it was decided to use the text of Fathers and Sons as translated by Ralph E. Matlaw in order to avoid long transliterations of the many quotations used in this study.

My deepest gratitude is directed to Professor J.G. Nicholson for his encouragement and guidance throughout the writing of this thesis, which took place during a personally trying period of my life.

I wish to express a profound appreciation to Professor P. Austin whose invaluable assistance in the final stages of the writing of this thesis helped me to overcome most of the difficulties encountered.

Most sincere thanks are extended to Professor N.V. Pervushin for his advice and helpful suggestions.

I wish to thank my husband, N. Muszkatel, for his devotion in helping me formulate my thoughts in English and editing this thesis.

Finally, many thanks to the Department of Russian and Slavic Studies for providing financial assistance in the form of a Graduate Teaching Assistantship for the years 1968-1970.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The controversy around Fathers and Sons by I.S. Turgenev is still continuing despite the fact that more than a century has elapsed since the novel appeared for the first time. Even while submitting the chapters to Katkov's literary journal, Russian Herald, Turgenev was embroiled in a battle over literary autonomy, struggling for the independence of his protagonists. His publisher, Katkov, was applying political criteria to the novel and its protagonists, Bazarov in particular, and their views, forcing the author to alter, edit and rewrite some parts of the novel. Finally, the novel was published in 1862 and -

> ever since, the views and the actions of its hero, Bazarov, have been constantly analyzed and praised or condemned as a social and political program in the light of the author's real or alleged views. The author, himself, in turn, has been persistently identified with this or that political group or movement.[1]

Turgenev was attacked by old and young, the "fathers" and the "sons" of his generation. In the words of Lunacharsky, the novel became "tsentralnoye yavlenye vo vsey russkoy zhizni" and polemics among the critics about the novel kept raging and, in fact, have not yet completely ceased. It is characteristic of the controversy surrounding the Fathers and Sons that in the Soviet Union of today a new discussion was initiated and

brought to a boiling point by V. Arkhipov's article "On the Creative History of I.S. Turgenev's Novel Fathers and Sons", which appeared in the first issue of the literary periodical "Russkaya Literatura". The Soviet Critic, a follower of the principles of Socialist realism, considers Bazarov an artistic failure because, despite his progressive views and proclamations, he did not succeed in the struggle with himself. The very fact that literary critics are still actively involved in arguments and polemics, siding with or against the author and Bazarov is a proof of the extreme vitality of the novel.

On the other hand, the analysis of the tremendous bulk of criticism written about Fathers and Sons shows that it is the critical approach towards literature in general which creates the controversy. The novel has been given a political, sociological and biographical trial, but never a truly literary one. It is typical not only of the Russian civic criticism of the XIX century and of Soviet socialist realism to apply the touchstone of reality to literature since Western criticism dealing with realism in literature has shown similar traits in its analysis of fiction. By applying the acid test of reality to a work of fiction, the critic was out to prove the extent to which the novel was "real", "historically true", "typical" and "sociologically important"; the latter to be understood as the measure of the novel's "topicality", i.e. how much could

its contemporaries identify themselves with the novel's protagonists.

The aim of this thesis is to look at Fathers and Sons in the light of literary criticism. This method, contrary to the traditional ones, disregards most external data concerning the novel and its creator, e.g. biographical information, sociological background, political views and other extrinsic, source-hunting scholarship. It is hoped that by using the achievements of modern critical thought and through close analysis of the novel's structure one should be able not to criticize but to elucidate its intrinsic qualities.

In the coming pages the method of analysis will be clarified, the existing criticism of Fathers and Sons scrutinized and, finally, the work itself will be given a new reading.

PART I

The nineteenth century saw a tremendous development of empirical sciences which created as a by-product a positivistic method of scholarship. This scholarship was created primarily in Germany and adopted by American and British universities. Its pivotal point, as far as literature was concerned, was the subscription of all criticism to the "Doctrine of Relevance." This "Doctrine of Relevance" is very simple. It means that the subject matter of literary work must not be isolated in terms of form - it must be tested (on an analogy to scientific techniques) by observation of the world that it "represents." Are the scene, the actions, the relations of the characters in a novel, in some verifiable sense true? This theory of Relevance has great difficulties with poetry, but with the novel the case is different, because the novel is very close to history - indeed, in all but the great novelists, it is not clearly set off from history. The novel points with some directness towards history, to the historical process.[2]

Among the various methods employed by the positivistic scholars, the historical and sociological approaches were considered as the most scientific ones and therefore became the most widely used. The sociological and historical scholars could always derive from the large referential material the

proof of their criticism and the data presented by them was accepted as "scientific". Their method undermined the significance of the material investigated but the routine reflected the "temper of the age" and was, therefore, safe. By using this method the literary scholar, condemned to live in the age when technology and empirical sciences were triumphant, could, at least, strive toward an equal share of public attention with his fellow scientist. The positivistic critic concentrated his research on gathering extrinsic information about the work of art, enriching this data with bits of biographical gossip about the author's private life, his socio-political background and views; meanwhile, the novel, the poem, the unique fruit of imagination was not really important for the critic as his investigation's aim was to show how much it "fit" real life and history. Such scholarship entailed a constantly growing interest in politics on the critic's part and brought him eventually to a positive conviction regarding the social determinism of literature. Finally, for those scholars, literature ceased to exist per se, becoming simply one among many forms of sociological and political expressions. As A.Tate expressed himself on this subject: "Have the scholars not been saying all along that literature is only politics? Well, then let them suppress it, since the politics of poets and novelists is notoriously unsound."[3]

An analysis of positivistic methods in criticism helps one to understand the Russian civic critics of the 19th century and their conviction that literature serves exclusively the purpose of social and historical commentary on events. This type of literature had to produce political implications and be reduced to a role of nothing but a "mirror of life," a kind of "artistic photography" of reality, retouched with idealism and glossed up with a bit of social prophesy. The writings had to be didactic and include pragmatic instructions and answers to the question "Cto delat'?" ("What should be done?").

In his book Russian Formalism V. Erlich claims that:

> ... The positivistic views of literature with the emphasis on the message, the tendency to account for literature in terms of political ideas remains a silent feature of Russian literary studies. The civic criticism, initiated by V. Belinsky, looked at the creative writer with "the stern, distrustful eye of a prosecutor". The defendant had to prove his innocence, or, more exactly, justify his right to exist by an explicit and progressive social ideology. [4]

A Russian novelist of the nineteenth century was confronted with a critical approach which, in practical terms, forced him to take a political stand and pass judgement in his writings. The widely accepted axiom of the times was that "the virtue of art is to judge." Any attempt to restrict one's writings to disinterested, non-aligned political novels was

condemned as irresponsible, a failure to partake in the striving for social reform and even classed as irrelevant. There was simply no way, as Turgenev was to find out in the case of Fathers and Sons, of writing a non-aligned novel that would, as Turgenev hoped, define an age, without it becoming a subject for party politics.

In order to illustrate the positivistic school of thought in Russian criticism of the XIX century, let us examine some of the views of its most important representatives. V.G. Belinsky, to whom Turgenev dedicated Fathers and Sons, identified the action of any individual with social progress and with absolute truth. In his essay "The Idea of Art," he wrote:

> Art is the immediate contemplation of truth, or thinking in images ... the starting point of thought is the divine absolute idea; the movement of thought consists of the growth of this idea from within itself in accordance with the laws of higher (transcendental) logic or metaphysics ... Thinking, as an action, essentially presupposes two opposite things - the subject and the object - and is inconceivable without a reasoning creature, man ... Nature is the initial moment of the spirit striving from potentiality to become actuality ... Nature is a sort of mode by which the spirit becomes actuality and perceives and cognizes itself. Hence, its crowning achievement is man ... Civil society is a mode for the development of human individuality ... Every important event in the life of mankind occurs in its time, never before or after. Every great man performs the deeds of his

> time ... Man is reason incarnate ... The focal point of his thought is his I ... All phenomena of nature are but the particular manifestations of the universal. The universal is the idea.

(These universal views on art are followed by a terse statement concerning the specific role of the Russian writers):

> ... the public ... looks upon Russian writers as its only leaders, defenders and saviors against Russian autocracy, orthodoxy, and nationality, and therefore while always ready to forgive a writer a bad book, will never forgive him a pernicious book. [5]

Literature for Belinsky was "the record, in terms of beauty, of the striving of mankind to know and express itself." Belinsky believed literature to be tied to life, the expression of national spirit, and said: "Art is social, yet it serves society by serving itself. Art purifies reality." Belinsky's belief in the importance of art as an implement of social progress is well illustrated by the following quotation:

> To deny art the right of serving public interests means debasing it, not raising it, for it means depriving it of its most vital force, that is the Idea, and making it an object of sybaritic pleasure, a plaything of lazy idlers. Scientists and philosophers by their statistics prove a condition, while the artist, by an appeal to his audience's imagination, shows pictures of conditions. The former are listened to and understood by few; the latter by all. The highest and

> most sacred interest of society is its own welfare, equally extended to each of its members. The road to this welfare is consciousness, and art can promote consciousness, no less than science and philosophy. [6]

Another major exponent of the positivistic criticism in Russian literature of the XIX century, N.G. Chernshevsky, maintained that art and the function of literature should be didactic and provide an answer to pragmatic, everyday problems. Literature is a surrogate for life, a passive mirror of society. Contrary to the view of Belinsky that "art purifies reality" Chernshevsky believed that art is an inferior reproduction of reality:

> What is beauty? Beauty is life. Words are always general, hence pale and feeble. A woman walking the Petersburg streets is more beautiful than Venus de Milo. Poets write their autobiographies. Why then art? Because our imagination is feeble, and we need reminders of what we want to keep. The most art can be, is a handbook for those studying life. [7]

N.A. Dobrolyubov argued along similar lines that "literature only reproduces life, it never portrays what does not exist in actuality." Literature reflects existing tendencies in society. It may help give "greater fullness to the conscious work of society." It is "an auxiliary force, the

importance of which lies in propaganda."

As well as Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov expected the writers to produce "the New Man" for society, one who could direct the reforms and lead the reading public onto the path of social progress.

Many writers, including Turgenev, were censured by the critics for not providing the pragmatic solution to the problems posed in their works. The public, conditioned to interpret fictional works as reflections of reality, connected actual events with literary images and often condemned the author for his alleged views and the actions of his protagonists.

> I shall not enlarge on the impression this novel (Fathers and Sons) has created. I shall merely say that when I returned to Petersburg, on the very day of the notorious fires in the Palace, the word "nihilist" has been caught up by thousands of people, and the first exclamation that escaped from the lips of the first acquaintance I met on Nevsky Avenue was: Look what your nihilists are doing! They are setting Petersburg on fire! [8]

The extreme outcome of this approach to literature can be seen in the Soviet Union of today, where writers are sent to labour camps because their fictional presentation of reality does not fulfill the expectations of their literary judges, that is, it does not conform to the critic's political

viewpoint. The trials of writers in the U.S.S.R. bear witness that this tradition continues to prevail. During their trial Y. Daniel and A. Sinyavski were repeatedly asked why they placed their "sickly phantasies" in the U.S.S.R. while A.I. Solzhenitsyn is constantly harassed by the representatives of the Union of Soviet Writers for presenting only negative aspects of life in the Soviet Union. Sinyavski said to his judges: "The word is not an act but only a word, and the author is not to be identified with his protagonist (A. Terz "Mysli vrasplokh" page 7).

While Gogol already faced similar accusations from his censurers, it is clear that such interpretation of literature has to be attributed to people, critics included, who consider literature as an implement to serve the didactic goals of the ruling régime.

The clash between positivism and nonconformist writer was not restricted to Russia alone. While, due to specific local conditions, it had a primarily political background in Russia, it took on a different form in the West. As one of the most characteristic examples could serve the trial of Lady Chatterley's Lover by D.H. Lawrence. This time it was the right of the writer to interpret morality, sexual relations and other social values that was being questioned. Principally, there was no difference to what was happening on both sides of

the World; it all boiled down to the same suppression of literary imagination by the adherents of the positivistic approach to criticism in literature.

The beginning of the twentieth century saw the emergence of new trends in critical thought, which were, for different reasons perhaps, opposed to the traditional, positivistic approach to criticism in literature. Through active and constant exploration of both literary and extra-literary sources of knowledge, modern criticism has created a multiplicity of viewpoints of various continuity which were all based on one premise: the work itself should be treated as an entity and serve as the primary subject of critical studies, while all extrinsic data is only of supplementary importance. Thus, as René Wellek points out:

> ... the work of literature is the central subject-matter of a theory of literature; not the biography or psychology of the author nor social background nor the affective response of the reader. A work of art is not a social or historical document, not rhetorical exhortation, not religious revelation, not philosophical speculation - even if it can for certain purposes be viewed as such. [9]

It is very interesting to note how much the above views correspond with those of B. Eichenbaum, the representative of Russian Formalism:

> Literature is a specific "phenomenon" of our consciousness. Whether this phenomenon is dependent upon external reality and how it relates to other phenomena of life is a problem which lies outside the domain of literary criticism. A literary critic should consider as fully sufficient the fact that literature exists as a separate, specific phenomenon, a separate, specific object of study along with others.[10]

And -

> Our method is usually referred to as "Formalist". I would prefer to call it morphological, to differentiate it from the approaches such as psychological, sociological and the like, where the object of inquiry is not the work itself, but that which in the scholar's opinion is reflected in the work.[11]

Russian Formalism established the autonomy of literary scholarship as its basic tenet, placing the emphasis on analysis of the literary work and its constituent parts. As Ehrlich notes,

> as an organized movement, Formalism was fundamentally a native response to a native challenge. But as a body of critical thought, it was part and parcel of that trend toward the re-examination of aim and method which during the first quarter of this century became discernible in European literary scholarship ... Viewed in a broader perspective, Russian Formalism appears as one of the most vigorous manifestations of the recent trend toward close analysis of literature and art - a development, which

> found early expression in the works of Hanslick, Woelfflin, Walcel and in the French explication des textes, and which in the last decades has made substantial inroads in English and American literary study.[12]

Russian Formalism was the first movement to endeavour separation of literature from neighbouring disciplines in the Soviet Union. After the suppression of Formalism, " ... the emphasis on the message, the tendency to account for literature in terms of political ideas, was to remain a salient feature of Russian literary studies for years to come."[13]

In spite of the previously mentioned multiplicity of approaches in modern criticism of literature and arts, at least one, and the most important, view emerges unanimously agreed upon by the majority of modern critics.

> I have myself always considered that the first duty of a literary critic is to focus all his attention on the literary work, which I regard as an end in itself, complete and absolute. Like many Anglo-Saxons, I believe in studying literature from the inside, concentrating on its intrinsic qualities ... For a work, be it poem or novel, is sufficient unto itself, endowed with its own power and containing its own clues. These are to be found simply by examining the text: criticism begins and ends above all as textual elucidation, as <u>explication de texte</u> ... What is there to elucidate? It is the peculiar property of literature to be able at the same time to excite an aesthetic pleasure and to communicate an intellectual message. Of all the arts,

> it is the most intellectual in its expression, and of all intellectual activities it is the most artistic. [14]

The modern criticism set out to probe, examine and revise the established scientific school of thought in literary criticism. Even the most eminent representatives of the scientific positivism were submitted to a re-appraisal in the light of the new approach. Hippolyte Taine, for one, whose theories were based upon the practice of empirical methods in literary studies, was scorned by J.P. Sartre, who described his works, epigrammatically, perhaps, as an unsuccessful effort to set up a realistic system of metaphysics, Taine's idea that "Vice and virtue are products like vitriol and sugar" brought this riposte: "We are not shocked by the audacity that reduces moral issues to chemical formulas; we are amused at the naiveté that undertakes to solve them both by single equation."[15]

The psychological approach of the positivistic critics came under fire as well. The warning of Dostoevsky that psychology is a knife which cuts two ways, became the probing weapon for the modern criticism's approach to the analysis of literary works.

> One may look <u>for</u> a man in his books, or one may look <u>to</u> the man for explanation of his books. The serious objection to environmentalism is that it failed to distinguish, not between

> one personality and another, but between personality and art. It encouraged scholars to write literary histories, which, as Ferdinand Brunetière pointed out, were nothing but chronological dictionaries of literary biography. It discouraged the realization which Brunetière called the evolution of genres, that literary technique of its own. [16]

The modern critics contended that the use of scientific vocabularies and application of particular sciences (like history, biology, psychology) to the examination of literary texts has created or is at least an expression of a spiritual malaise which characterizes our age.

> In our time the historical approach to criticism in so far as it has attempted to be a scientific method, has undermined the significance of the material which it proposes to investigate. On principle the sociological and historical scholar must not permit himself to see in the arts meanings that his method does not assume. To illustrate some of the wide implications of this method I will try to see it as more than a method: it is the temper of our age. It has profoundly influenced our politics and our education. [17]

The historical routine which the positivistic critics were applying to the evaluation of literary works was submitted to the strongest attack:

> The routine is "safe" and it shares with the predatory social process at large a naturalistic basis. And this naturalism easily bridges the thin gap between the

> teacher's college and the graduate school, between the sociologist and the literary source-hunter, between the comptometrist of literary reactions and the enumerator of influences. The naturalism of the literary scholar is too obvious to need demonstration here; his substitution of "method" for intelligence takes its definite place in the positivistic movement which, from my point of view, has been clearing the way for the slave state; and the scholar must bear his part of responsibility for the hypocrisy that will blind us to the reality of its existence when it arrives. What the scholars are saying, of course, is that the meaning of works of literature is identical with their method of studying it - a method that dissolves the literature into its history. Are the scholars studying literature, or are they not? That is the question. If they are not, why then do they continue to pretend that they are? This is the scholars' contribution to the intellectual hypocrisy of the positivistic movement. [18]

In his introduction to The Practice of Criticism, Ray B. West, Jr. elucidates the position of modern criticism in regard to positivistic scholarship.

> To say that modern criticism is in rebellion against genuine scholarship is completely to misunderstand (or willfully to misstate) the problem. It is in rebellion against the positivistic kind of scholarship ... which saw in the biographical details of an author's life or in sociological details of his background the pertinent clues to the meaning of his work. By the beginning of the present century such study had deteriorated in the majority of cases to a thoroughly piecemeal preoccupation with isolated details of an

> author's life or with the minutiae of his social background. When applied to the teaching of literature, such an approach resulted in two significant errors: 1) the student was taught more about the author's life than about his work; 2) when the works were considered, they were seen more as monuments of a past time than as examples of living literature in pertinent relationship to the student's moral and aesthetic sensibilities. In its most pernicious form, such scholarship acquired so great a devotion for factual information concerning biography, bibliography and classification of the texts that it failed to concern itself with the more important aims of criticism: understanding and evaluation. [19]

The preceding review has emphasized the points on which modern criticism considered the positivistic approach as wrong. But diagnosing the disease does not necessarily provide the cure. What were the critical approaches, recommended by these scholars, which should supplant the "ossified" methods of the positivism? How should a literary work be analyzed without scrutiny of the historical, biographical and other extrinsic data?

Modern criticism refrained from recommending a "panacea", a universal method that will allow to analyze a literary work in a way which will be plausible to one and all. While its basic premise is to analyze literature <u>per se</u>, the modern criticism does not follow any dogma and does not prescribe any particular method of work; it does not attach "good" or "bad" labels to the literature it analyzes - it is

concerned solely with the elucidation of the texts, not with the classification of their merits.

> On the whole, the modern criticism (both English and American) has repudiated its nineteenth century legacy in favor of something both less impressionistic and less academic. For impressionism and academicism are the two opposite poles from which the modern critic flies equally. Impressionism is a discussion of a work of art in terms of autobiographical chat about the state of mind it produces in the reader, while academicism includes both the amassing of factual details about works and their authors which have no relevance for the evaluation of those works. One result of the repudiation of impressionism is that criticism has become less merely descriptive and more sternly normative, while the insistence that scholarship is not criticism has led to a more firmly drawn division between activities than was early thought necessary. Further, the discussion of literature in the context of the history of ideas, as a keynote to the thought of the past, has given way to a tendency to treat every work as though it were contemporary and anonymous, concentrating on its "timeless" meaning and value.[20]

Therefore, the conclusions of E.M. Forster seem relevant at this point:

> ... all literature tends towards a condition of anomymity, and, so far as words are creative, a signature merely distracts us from their true significance. I do not say literature "ought" not to be signed ... It wants not to be signed. That is my point. It is always tagging in that direction and saying in effect: "I, not my author, exist really."[21]

René Wellek is even more unequivocal in his scorn for the "historical" style of criticism:

> Obviously the emphasis on the work of art as a totality of meaning and value implies a distrust of the old factualism, the literary history preoccupied with anecdotes, sources and influences, the whole mosaic of information accumulated in the last two centuries. Antiquarianism has no doubt its place as an auxiliary for criticism, and is enjoyed by its practitioners, for its own sake. But erudition must not be confused with criticism. [22]

Daiches reassures critics of the "old" school that while their methods are not obsolete, the role of the historical critic is no longer as highly regarded as that of the "evaluative" critic:

> This is not to say that historical criticism is dead, but it does mean that evaluative criticism, scrutinizing individual works of literary art and carefully assessing the literary worth, has increasingly become a separate discipline from literary scholarship and literary history. [23]

The belief that the literary work itself is the all-important object of the critic's activity constituted the cornerstone of modern criticism's approach to literature. The isolation of subject matter, regardless of all practical efforts, good, bad or indifferent, is the way to a better understanding of a literary work. Literature and art in general are to be

considered as: "What it is and not another thing,"[24] a fictional illusion, where the world is changed into language, paint, sound or other means of artistic expression and as such presents a totality of meaning and value to be studied from within, not from outside. Each work of fiction must be considered unique, possessing its own structure and therefore the world of novel is not to be confused with reality.

> The world made by the writer is fictional therefore artificial and while it's based on reality it is not real because literature, we say, neither reflects nor escapes from ordinary life; what it does reflect is the world as human imagination conceives it in mythical, romantic, heroic and ironic as well as realistic and fantastic terms. [25]

It is wrong to test the world of the novel in terms of reality and classify its protagonists as being not true, good or bad, because:

> works of art are wholes conceived in the free imagination, whose integrity and meaning are violated if we break them into sources and influences ... the dusty slums and dreary provincial towns of Dostoevsky haunted by possessed and ardent hearts, or the far more elusive worlds of a Mallarmé or Rilke should not be confused with the real world. [26]

Foerster agrees with this separation of the novel from "real" life and elaborates on the nature of the special world in which works of art exist:

> A novel is a work of art, with its own laws, which are not those of daily life, and a character in a novel is real when it lives in accordance with such laws ... (the novelist) ... will give us the feeling that though the character has not been explained, it is explicable and we get from this a reality of a kind we can never get in daily life. [27]

Henry James is obviously in agreement with the above as we can see from this quote from The Art of Fiction:

> A novel is a living thing, all one and continuous, like any other organism, and in proportion as it lives will it be found, I think, that in each of the parts there is something of each of the other parts. [28]

These assumptions change drastically the traditional goal of the literary critic; instead of gathering extrinsic information, he must try and elucidate the literary text. Like the artist himself, he must become interested in the technique, the process of creation and especially in the structure of the work; he must analyze the whole mosaic of patterns of which the unity is achieved when all the components, i.e., the emotions described, images, allusions, ideas, ethical insights, have been brought into a more or less complete interplay and fullness of tension. The building of the fictional world, the creation of the unique structure demands skills on the part of the author, but the critic must try to elucidate them in his analysis of the artistic achievements. The procedure is complicated,

because aesthetic unity must be conceived of:

> ... not as "logical" unity, or as mathematical, or as one purely of composition considered by itself in abstraction from that which is composed; aesthetic unity is achieved by a tight relationship, an intimate going together which binds the parts into a single, self-contained object of experience in which every part carries its own meaning, a meaning which is homogenous with the whole and is literally inextricable part of it. Through this interdependence, the whole controls the specific value of each element at the same time that each element controls the whole. When skill has been spent in the construction, the embodied meaning achieves an intense vividness and specificity which objects of recognition cannot possibly elicit. [29]

While trying to understand the artist's creation, the new critic must consider but never challenge the different viewpoints and the artist's bias, because questioning them would be possible only by application of criteria external to the work of art. There is no doubt that the new critic will encounter tremendous difficulties in the process of identification with the fictional world of the artist. The process deprives him of the opportunity to judge by his own experience, to apply the standards of reality he knows so well; instead, he must move to the world of fiction, which requires an imagination almost of a creator, but, when achieved, will put the critical activity in the right place among other disciplines, thus

counteracting the famous dictum of Jean Sibelius: "Show me a critic for whom a monument was ever erected." On the other hand, if a critic whose experience and knowledge are limited to his own, were to analyze literature solely on this basis without trying to live the fictional world as such, he would have discarded many works of art for various reasons; this has been done quite often even before the emergence of the Soviet Union. The bitter remark by E. Vivas illustrates the point perfectly:

> The Metamorphosis is inadmissible since, from what we know of biology and evolution, it is not possible for a man to turn into a beetle overnight. But anyone who has read the story knows such objection is silly. But why is it silly? Because from the first two or three lines Kafka plunges us into an universe, that of the story, in which questions of possibility and impossibility are irrelevant. And they are, because the story is self-sufficient, autonomous, and its autonomy or self-sufficiency forces us, the readers, to stay within the universe, to read it intransitively. We have nothing to compare it with. And in the world of the story, the ordinary laws of reality have no authority. The work of art makes its own laws, and enforces them, by the isolation it imposes on the spectator. [30]

In other words, only by using the work itself for elucidation can one achieve a coherent picture of the universe which one is trying to understand. Vivas concludes with the following ironical advice:

> I have heard Dostoevsky and Kafka condemned by a very nice professor, a man devoted to Reason and social welfare of mankind, because neither of these two men gave him, my friend, the kind of picture of the world he expected of them. He found them untrue to what he knew about the world. And, of course they are. When that happens in your presence, you have to summon your manners. Don't forget, a Professor is next to God in the Hierarchy of Being. While you are a student, let me advise you, never let the question come up in your mind: What does that man know about life to judge Dostoevsky and Kafka? And when you get yourself a job, it's best not to say in public what I am now writing to you - not until you get your tenure. 31

These sarcastic remarks show clearly that the analysis of fictional worlds by the means of non-fictional tools is still an important issue in American universities. It constitutes the basic handicap and limitation for a modern critic and the traditional approach prevails very often. It would seem too much to expect a critic burdened with the "truth" of his experience to understand the secrets of the imaginary world. The situation here is reminiscent somewhat of that in visual arts; no amount of extrinsic data will provide a clue to the works of Kokoschka, Picasso, or moreover, the modern abstractionists. What "objective truth" will help one to delve into the imagination behind the rhythmic labyrinths of linear colour streams created by Jackson Pollock, the private, deeply communicating

symbolism of Paul Klee or the purely formal, geometric abstractions of Piet Mondrian? Fiction is an art, just like painting or music and, like them, it is ambiguous. This ambiguity provides at least a partial answer to the problem of analyzing fiction.

> Nobody knows what truth is. It is the thing that seems so. Nobody knows what fiction is. It is the thing which is not "true." Fiction is older than truth and sprang from an attempt to communicate emotions. Its truth is its own and lies in what it makes you feel. Its value is in direct ratio to the intensity of emotion. It uses words, for the most part deprived of the aids of face, voice and gesture. The sounds of the words upon the mental ear must take the place of voice. The words flowing must alter like a face, gesture like a body. Fiction then is what man does with the truths of his world by way of adopting them to physical and emotional needs. Man's own nature, the law of his being, is the sole material of the drama and fictional writing. Things outside of him intrude, as they do in his life, but they cannot exceed that common in life itself; for general semblance of life is indispensable if physical sensation and memory are to be appealed to and emotion be aroused. 32

It is startling to note the agreement between Overton in The Philosophy of Fiction and N. Foerster in Esthetic Judgement and Ethical Judgement in that the following statement seems to have been written as a continuation of the previous one:

> ... or we might reasonably say that literature has its centre in the narrative, poem or in the novel, since such works as the "Iliad" and "Wilhelm Meister", like "Hamlet" and "Ghosts", are, whatever their personal content and accent, primarily imaginative representations of life ... and that ... it is the very nature of literary philosophy to be loose, to be unsystematic, to be open not closed, to be generous not exclusive, to be suggestive not decisive ... The informal philosophies of our writers can be appropriately judged only by literary critics, who, being literary, share the writers' distrust of fixed systems, the writers' assumption that reason cannot exhaust the whole of reality, the conviction of a man like Plato, who was a man of letters as well as philosopher, that logical explication must give way to symbol and myth when the brightest truths are to be adnumbrated. 33

The inner processes of the artist's mind which lead to the creation of great fiction cannot possibly be explained by the critic, who can only try to elucidate the means by which the work was accomplished, and this elucidation must be done logically, step by step. However, this inevitable rationalization, while serving as a tool in the critic's method, constitutes at the same time one of his limitations, because no critic can hope to escape fully from his psyche's bent showing through in his analysis of the given work of fiction; no two men's experience of a piece of art can be identical and therefore, regardless of the amount of the critic's effort in trying to remain absolutely objective in his analysis, his individual

taste is bound to emphasize or overlook certain aspects.

> Not only are some works of art incompatible in one sense or another with other works, but the values and meanings to be found in one work by diverse critics or by the same critic at different times (one should think about the changing views of Belinsky - B.M.) are often incompatible with one another. As a presentation the work of art is a fact; it is something there, to be perceived intransitively, to be fully possessed. But possession requires interpretation, and there are as many interpretations possible as there are acts of interpretation. This makes a work of art inherently ambiguous, ineradicably so.[34]

The modern critic, being well aware of the impossibility of achieving the ideal of perfect objectivity in the analysis of literature, applies the formal elucidation of fictional material to his task, using the test itself as much as possible, thus avoiding impressionistic judgements, since to judge is by itself to voice certain moral opinions. The critic must always remember that his goal is not to create an allegory but to separate elements. He should appraise no less than evaluate and in the process should explain and elaborate, distinguish and classify, compare and juxtapose, weigh and contrast - all this in order to reach a rational conclusion. To reach this final stage of his task, his own philosophy must be controlled at all times by his rationale. He should neither condemn nor praise, only elucidate technique and meaning, since

his ethical judgement at this stage is irrelevant. This is corroborated by Read in his Philosophy of Art:

> For, unlike a scientific hypothesis or a mathematical proposition, an aesthetic judgement is incapable of proof and can never, therefore, be conclusive in the same way. But this does not invalidate the principles on which it is based nor does it lessen the importance of the critical faculty which is not only allied to the creative, but as such to that which Gianbattista Vico, the founder of modern aesthetics, regarded as primitive and fundamental - the power of imaginative expression. On the contrary, if, as Croce contends in his exposition and development of this theory, the creation and critical faculties differ not in kind but only in degree, it may even be said that the fallibility of the judgement is a proof that it belongs, like other vital and formative processes, to the perpetual "becoming" of life, of which finality, in one sense, must always be a negation. Moreover, in so far as the exact sciences are tending increasingly toward the acceptance of "the principle of indeterminacy", the fact that aesthetics, must likewise be "satisfied with probabilities" may be regarded as significant. [35]

The task of criticism can thus be considered as purely formal; therein lies the sole guarantee of its universality. It does not consist in "discovering" in the work (or the author) under analysis something "hidden" or "profound" or "secret" which has so far escaped notice (through what miracle? Are we more perceptive than our predecessors?) but only in fitting together the fumbling interlocks - two parts of a complicated

mechanism - the language of the day and the language of the author, i.e. the formal system of logical rules that he evolved in the conditions of his time.

It would seem that one of the very important assumptions of modern criticism is this conclusion:

> The artist solves no problems, he answers no questions. Art merely presents. It does not teach; it does not plead; it does not judge; and, therefore, it can neither be conservative or liberal, atheistic or theistic, Freudian or Thomistic. For this reason, the artist that condemns a work of art on any other than purely aesthetic ground, unless he qualifies with care, is apt to fall into serious confusions. 36

To be consistent, the modern critic must suspend his own code of ethics and moral values when dealing with the fictional world. Were he to apply his beliefs to his work, the resulting criticism passed on values presented in fiction would have become extrinsic and create practical reactions which have nothing to do with the piece of art being investigated. The question of morality is altogether misplaced insofar as the fiction is concerned. No temporary codes of current morality should be applied to a book which shocked its readers. From the point of view of the modern criticism, immoral is anything that promotes meanness and smallness of the human spirit.

> But rebelliousness, for example, is not immoral. Rebellion may take an indecent form, that is the form violative of the current morality; but in itself it is a reach toward human freedoms, and largeness of spirit. There is nothing in it essentially subversive of timeless morality. On the other hand, utter and irreproachable decency may be profoundly immoral; immoral because smug, because hypocritical, because contracting.[37]

Since the modern critic should avoid passing judgement and concentrate his efforts on elucidation of the techniques and meaning, it is obvious that critical proof does not lie in discovering the work under consideration, but, on the contrary, it consists of covering this work to the greatest extent with the critic's own language. The formal activity of criticism should be primarily logical and not aesthetic. Criticism should not endeavour to decode the meaning of the analyzed work but should try and reconstitute the rules which directed the construction of the particular work of art; in other words, the critic should always regard the work of literature as a very special semantic system, in which the goal is to elucidate the meaning of the word and not to put "a meaning" into it. Great works of literature have the unique power to confront the readers with questions to which they do not supply any answers, since no great work is "dogmatic." The proper role of the critic is elucidated in the following quote from L. Teeter's Scholarship and the Art of Criticism:

> Literature, since it consists at one and the same time of the insistent offering of meaning and the persistent elusiveness of that meaning is definitely no more than a language, i.e., a system of signs; its being lies not in the message but in the system. This being so, the critic is not called upon to reconstitute the message of the work, but only its system; just as the business of the linguist is not to decipher the meaning of a sentence but to determine the formal structure which permits the transition of its meaning. It is precisely through the admission, on the part of criticism, that it is only a language (or more accurately, a meta-language) that it can, paradoxically yet genuinely, be objective and subjective, historical and existential, totalitarian and liberal. The language that a critic chooses to speak is not a gift from heaven; it is one of the range of languages offered by his situation in time and, objectively, it is the latest stage of a certain historical development of knowledge, ideas and intellectual passions; it is a necessity ... Criticism is neither the "tribute" to the truth of the past nor to the truth of the "other" - it is the ordering of that which is intelligible in our own time.
>
> It is, I suggest, the function of the critic to establish such relationships between the work of art and present values as may seem to him significant. His success will be due in part to his fidelity to the spirit of the author, but even more to his response to those new insights and richer associations that are the contributions of time and the sensitivity of man. For if the past has made the present, the present no less modifies the past and thus preposes the future. 38

Taking in consideration all the views and opinions expressed on the preceding pages, it would be impossible to ignore the fact that any attempt at a new analysis of a novel

must be influenced by the contemporary development of literary thought and criticism. The subject matter of this study is to be the novel Fathers and Sons, itself, not its author I.S. Turgenev or his life, his times and his political views. The method of this approach will be based on the study of the multiplicity of critical views and derivation of certain conclusions - establishing an individual approach and following the basic rules of literary analysis. The aim of this study is not to criticize - in the sense of measuring the author's success by comparison with the reality of his or our times - but to elucidate and organize structural elements and to expose the various relationships between them; to see how from a word, a sentence, a dialogue and other formal means a unique world was created. Finally, while realizing that the fictional world of the novel was not created in a vacuum but in a concrete historical period with an abundance of referential data existing - it will not concern this study or influence its elucidation; timelessness and anonymity will prevail.

PART II

This portion of the thesis is devoted to a close textual analysis of Fathers and Sons (1862) in the manner described in the first section. The discussion will proceed according to the various structural devices Turgenev uses and we shall always have recourse to the words of the novel. Our analysis must be unbiased and objective, never allowing the political, the sociological, or the biographical to take precedence over that which is truly literary. We will return again and again to what was said and how it was said. This novel is so chatty that words will apply where actions are scarce. Finally, we will understand the effect words have on a character and how he reacts with words.

The novel opens on Nikolai Petrovich Kirsanov awaiting his son's return from the university. His son, Arkady Nikolaich Kirsanov, arrives with a college friend Eugene Vassilich Bazarov in tow. The two friends spend a few weeks at the Kirsanov family estate, Marino. Before they leave to visit the nearby town, Bazarov and Pavel have an argument which sets out the basic themes of the novel. In town they meet Sitnikov, an old disciple of Bazarov's, and have lunch in the home of Avdotya Evodoksya Kukshin, a 'liberated' woman. She tells Bazarov of Anna Sergeyevna Odintsova. Arkady later meets her and

impressionably falls in love. Odintsova invites the two friends to her country estate expressing interest in Bazarov and they accept. The visit turns into a lengthy stay. Bazarov and Odintsova begin to fall in love. Arkady is left to Odintsova's younger sister Katya. Suddenly, Timofeich, an old servant of the Bazarov family, appears and requests Bazarov to visit his parents, Vassily Ivanovich Bazarov and Arina Vlasyevna. He leaves with Arkady; his affair with Odintsova is incomplete. They stay at the Bazarov family home for a short time and becoming bored, leave to return to Marino. While they are at the Bazarov farm, Bazarov and Arkady nearly come to blows. Returning to the Kirsanov estate, Bazarov becomes absorbed in scientific experiments and Arkady tries to help his father manage the farm. Soon, however, Arkady rushes off to the Odintsova estate to be with the two sisters. While Arkady develops an intimate relationship with Katya, the sisters transform him from a disciple of Bazarov's to one of their own. During Arkady's absence, Bazarov flirts with Fenichka, Nikolai's mistress, and is forced to fight a duel with Pavel, who secretly loves Fenichka himself. After wounding Pavel, Bazarov returns to his parent's home stopping at the Odintsova's on the way. He concludes his affairs with Odintsova. After living at home for a short period Bazarov contracts blood poisoning and dies. Arkady and Katya, and Nikolai and Fenichka are married. Pavel

and Odintsova leave for Europe. Bazarov lies in a lonely grave.

The pairing of characters is a technical device Turgenev uses throughout his literary career. We find Elena and Insarov paired in On the Eve (1860) and Arkady and Bazarov paired in Fathers and Sons. Also in Fathers and Sons we find Bazarov paired with Odintsova. Turgenev uses this technique to bring out aspects of each character in conversation and thus in comparison. Elena, the zealot, rejects inadequate Russian men and runs away with Insarov, a Bulgarian insurrectionist. Arkady and Bazarov are almost always together in Fathers and Sons. In fact, when they are not together, each is manifestly transformed and soon the novel ends.

We would be considerably short-sighted if we tried to deny that this relationship was an important one. In The Two Friends (1853) we find one rough and the other timid, and for this they seem to count as a unit in the novel. Each one is used by Turgenev to reveal the other as a standard device of characterization. It worked well for him, especially in the world of love. The use of two characters to illuminate the frailties of each other is one of Turgenev's literary strengths. The theme of the demanding woman or of the inadequate man appear over and over again. In conversation the characters come out so openly and fully that we scarcely notice that they have very little interior development.

> As a rule the action of Turgenev's characters is not accompanied by such long and at times tormenting reflections as frequently occurs in Dostoevsky (it suffices to mention Raskol'nikov). Nor do Turgenev's novels contain extensive 'interior monologues' characteristic of Tolstoy's heroes. This fact is explained by Turgenev's special view of the role and place of psychology in the artist's creative process.[39]

Turgenev believed that the psychology of the characters in a fictional work must be laid below the surface, like a skeleton. The author, he believed, must have a firm grasp on who his characters are prior to the act of writing. As he said,

> (The author's) characters must be in his complete power when he presents them to us. We will be told that that is psychology; very well, but the psychologist must disappear in the artist, as the skeleton disappears beneath the living body, which it serves as a solid but invisible support.[40]

This point of the critic P.G. Pustovoyt is well-taken. Instead of the tediousness which we sometimes find in a great psychologist like Dostoevsky where we tire of a long interior description, we find in Turgenev chapter-length background laid out in such a way that he almost seems to be a naturalist, like Emile Zola, without the geneticist's rhetoric. The reason he does so is to preserve the unity of meaning and personality in the character. We will discuss this further when we deal with

Turgenev's psychological dualism found in Hamlet and Don Quixote. For now let it suffice to say that when Turgenev does attempt to write interior description the writing becomes stilted and awkward; the persona suffers because of it. For all his genius at the reproduction of the exterior Turgenev fails in the interior in much the same way that Dostoevsky fails at the exterior. However, rather than being vapid and empty Turgenev's characters are developed in a parallel mode to each other. The pairs of these parallels act to shed light on the themes Turgenev discusses. If we examine each pair, we find statements about love, society, the class structure, Russia, revolution and liberalism. One element of the pair may take one position, say, defending the established order, while the other may take the antithesis, advocating change. The implicit relationship of one to the other is that of the 'devil's advocate' and the technique works very well. These, of course, are not false stands, for each of Turgenev's characters represent a definite point of view on Russian society prevalent at the time. The actions of each are consistent with what he says and does. We find no hypocrisy of action and belief here. Honesty in Turgenev is much like honesty in André Gide: ruthless, searching, accurate. The pairing device worked so well for Turgenev in bringing out honestly the themes he wanted and the characters he created that we find it in early

works, like The Two Friends, and in his latest works, like Fathers and Sons and Smoke (1867). This technique welds the device of structure with the illumination of character in a way that is virtually unique with Turgenev.

The kinds of themes that the pairing device brings out are the same ideas that were 'in the air' at the time Turgenev was writing. He had a marvelous sense of 'what was important' at the time in Russia. After his final exile, self-imposed, he seemed to lose his penetrating grasp on Russian society and Virgin Soil (1877) bears this opinion out. Its criticism of stagnant bureaucracy is quite empty itself. However, during the writing of Fathers and Sons ten years earlier he still saw Russian society in unreflected light. The themes Turgenev traverses were important at that time and, it so happens, are relevant to any culture emerging as a new and separate world identity. At the time, Russian culture was being fragmented by the wholesale ingestion of foreign ideas. There was a great deal of discussion about the 'imitative' and the 'indigenous' elements of Russian life. The imitative elements are represented by Westernizers and Anglophiles. Turgenev himself was on this side of the argument as he says in Apropos of Fathers and Sons, an essay written in explanation of the novel, "I am an inveterate and incorrigible Westerner. I have never concealed it and I am not concealing it now."[41] His

need to always be truthful led him to be as fair to the indigenous forces in Russia as he was forceful for the imitative. He shows us the Slavophiles in favourable and unfavourable lights in A Nest of Gentry (1859) and in Fathers and Sons. This is not groundless vacillation on Turgenev's part. He is drawn to his fictional conclusions according to the structure of the characters represented.

> Why did I do it (give Lavretsky ascendency over Pashin in Nest), I who consider the Slavophil doctrine false and futile? Because in the given case life, according to my ideas, happened to be like that, and what I wanted above all was to be sincere and truthful.[42]

Turgenev was great friends with Belinsky, the chief proponent of the Westernizers, yet he could see the validity of the Slavophile position in history. Ivan Kireyevsky, the leader of the Slavophiles, upheld a love for Russia that was divorced from the empty future of copying proposed by the Westernizers. Although both opinions tend towards an extremism which ultimately leads to biased, unobjective criticism and censorship, they were very real elements of mid-century Russian life. In Fathers and Sons the discussion is taken up by Pavel, Bazarov, Sitnikov, Kukshin, Arkady and Nikolai. Each cultural force that the characters represent expresses itself about the indigenous and the imitative elements arising in Russian life.

This discussion had been going on for over a generation, long enough for two different mentalities to develop from the evolution of the imitative elements. The Man of the Forties was influenced by Hegel. He had a love for abstract, general principles and had a vaguely defined but high-minded sense of liberalism. He stood for culture and learning. Indeed, it was through learning that his opinions were first developed. The cultivation of the finer human emotions and a love of the beautiful in nature was encouraged. This Man of the Forties was given a name by Turgenev; Rudin in Rudin (1856). Rudin is a man who can present the poetry of others, but who cannot make it himself. The Man of the Sixties on the other hand is one who has had his detachment inherited from the Forties shattered by the aborted revolutions of the 1840's and 1850's. Because of the hopelessness of the liberal position in the Sixties the New Man must advocate more abrasive principles or, as in Bazarov's case, no principles at all, the most caustic maxim of the day. This New Man was in Turgenev's view the precursor of future generations of Russians. But the character of Bazarov is greater than a real life hero.

> If he (Bazarov) calls himself a nihilist, one ought to read - a revolutionary ... I dreamed of a figure that should be gloomy, wild, great, growing one half of him out of the soil, strong, angry, honorable, and yet doomed to destruction - because as yet he stands on the threshold of the future.[43]

We will take up a greater discussion of Bazarov in a later section of this thesis. The New Man of the Sixties was typified by Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov and, we have seen, their opinions are characteristic of the modern, contemporary age rather than the older, classical one. The Man of the Forties was influenced by Hegel and would have liked to read Wordsworth, while the Man of the Sixties was influenced by Schopenhauer and would rather read Darwin. Fundamentally, the distinction between these two generations comes down to their respective attitudes towards idealism. The Man of the Forties was an idealist and partly a romantic. The Man of the Sixties was anti-idealist and thoroughly scientific. Both appealed to reason as the ultimate judge, but the Man of the Forties could be seen smelling roses while he waited for the decision to come. Turgenev believed quite correctly that attitudes of this sort often spring from the class in which one was raised. The class question in Russia, of course, was and has been a focus for literature. The extreme separation of classes, the totally disenfranchised and the immensely powerful tapering towards the middle, has inspired almost every Russian writer. For them not to present abject poverty and purposeless struggle as they existed would be to represent Russia by her privileged few, who did not have to submit to the irrationality of the caste but who rather enjoyed its conferred wealth.

Turgenev's honesty could not allow him to do this. As Ralph E. Matlaw says of him:

> Throughout his life he was conscious of the artist's socio-political responsibility, established as a creed by Belinsky, and constantly attempted to justify his beliefs to friends, editors, and to the public ... (yet) It is relatively easy to find, within extremely brief periods, a series of contradictory statements on the same subject in Turgenev's correspondence, since his political opinions and his aesthetic judgements remained disparate.[44]

In the same way that Nikolai represents the New Man of the Forties gone soft Turgenev paints him as a boob and a babbler in his dealings with the gentry and peasants. Nikolai understands the peasants even less than Bazarov, the New Man of the Sixties, does. Nikolai realizes that he doesn't understand them and then decides to keep trying, while Bazarov sits complaisantly with his understanding, which it turns out is false.

Again, we find that the pairing device gives us important clues not only to the characters involved but to the times. The most obvious use of the pairing device comes with the forms of love themes Turgenev uses. As a structural element the pairing device functions to cast light on the other themes we mentioned while still primarily focusing on the idea of love. The most significant pair is between Bazarov and Odintsova. The other pairs which illuminate specific points

of view are Nikolai and Fenichka, Pavel and Fenichka, and Arkady and Katya. We will discuss the ways in which these structural details represent the themes of the novel in greater depth shortly. So far, we have seen that the themes Turgenev uses were topical in the culture of his time. The ideas he examines were 'in the air' at the time and under a good deal of investigation.

> Turgenev's biggest weakness is his inability to weave a plot. He himself states, in his defense of Fathers and Sons, that he was not endowed with a large gift for free invention, that he constantly needed living models, and that he always used these as his starting point, and never an "idea."[45]

These "living models" can represent "ideas" rather than vice versa, which is where so many writers start. Because of this we will see that Turgenev's work is organic and unified. His plots are series of scenes containing the examination of one pair after another evolving through time. At the end of a chapter we know what will happen next, because someone has said "let's go here" or "let's visit there." The novel operates according to its own rules rather than conforming to a structure the author has predetermined. The structure of the plot evolves from within the action of the novel rather than from without it. And although Turgenev uses a device like

pairing to simplify his own grasp of the characters, he does not allow the device to hinder "the way life happens to be."

Another device Turgenev uses to relate the story he is telling is the use of arguments. Throughout the novel there are fits and spurts of altercation. It's true that some of those quarrels do not reach the heights and that, like an iceberg, the emotional esprit behind them lies under the surface. But this is characteristic of any people who are thrown together for many months of the year as a result of the winter's snows. Pavel Petrovich is generally considered "refined" and "stuck up." Within his breast lies the capacity for a duel, even to the death, and in many of which he participated during his younger days. When he comes to Bazarov and challenges him, Pavel is not responsive to any discussion, except the formalities of the duel he proposes. Just because the fire lies below the surface, like the "skeleton" of psychology, we cannot deny its significance. The tone of the characters' discussions melodically moves from tension to resolution. These moments of tension are the argument scenes.

The mood of the argument is an expository technique and the character of the speaker is revealed through it. In the first argument we notice Arkady and Nikolai, his father, are riding back to Marino after their first meeting. Each of them is trying to achieve a certain effect on the other:

Arkady "who, in spite of the genuine, almost childish delight filling his heart, wanted as soon as possible to turn the conversation from the emotional to a commonplace channel;"[46] while Nikolai's aims are more far-reaching:

> We shall get on together splendidly, Arkasha (a familiar form of Arkady): you shall help me in farming the estate, if it isn't a bore to you. We must draw close to one another now, and learn to know each other thoroughly, mustn't we?[47]

Under the influence of Bazarov, the nihilist, Arkady has partly learned to shun the romantic, the philosophical, and the emotional. Bazarov's sway over Arkady is, however, only partial, as Turgenev demonstrates for us during this same carriage ride home. The discussion between Arkady and Nikolai is broken by the older man's spells of guilt and silence. He is one of the inadequate Russian men about whom Turgenev liked to write. He describes his affair with Fenichka in a jerky style alternating between loquaciousness and silence. He is confused and vague in his opinion of himself. Nikolai candidly says,

> A severe moralist would regard my openness as improper; but in the first place, it can't be concealed, and secondly, you are aware I have always had special ideas as regards the relation of father and son. Though, of course, you would be right in blaming me ... that girl, about whom you have probably heard already ...

> "Fenichka?" asked Arkady easily. Nikolai Petrovich blushed. "Don't mention her name aloud, please ... Well ... she is living with me now. I have installed her in the house ..."[48]

Nikolai again begins his stammering and guilt-ridden stuttering. Nikolai, the Man of the Forties, is at odds with himself in this matter of sexual liberalism, precisely because his opinions are not firmly lodged in his life-style and because they are not well thought out. Arkady, a protegé of a Man of the Sixties, reveals himself at the end of this segment of the carriage ride discussion to be an ill-fated New Man. In response to Nikolai glancing "at him from under the fingers of the hand with which he was still rubbing his forehead" Arkady says,

> "Nonsense, dad, nonsense; please don't!" Arkady smiled affectionately. "What a thing to apologise for!" he thought to himself, and his heart was filled with a feeling of condescending tenderness for his kind, soft-hearted father, mixed with a sense of a certain secret superiority. "Please stop," he repeated once more, instinctively revelling in a consciousness of his own advanced and emancipated condition.[49]

The mentality of a subjugator clearly constitutes the major part of this reaction. As long as men are taken up with the need to be filled with feelings of "condescending tenderness" and "secret superiority," there will concomitantly be a need for someone to whom these feelings are directed. Bazarov, the

New Man, does not feel this sort of need, although at times he does feel pity. The mitigation of Bazarov's influence over Arkady, another form of subjugation, is demonstrated in this passage. Turgenev makes it clear later during the discussion with Pavel that Arkady at this time wants to be a disciple of Bazarov. It is plain to everyone; Pavel goes so far as to point it out. While Nikolai feels guilty and remains silent, Arkady indulges in romantic reflections on Nature. These reflections occur over and over during the course of the novel and contrast sharply with Bazarov's attitude toward Nature. Besides characterizing Arkady as fundamentally a romantic, and a late-comer Man of the Forties, they also serve to interrupt more sober reflections about necessary reforms, more characteristic of a Man of the Sixties. Arkady admits to himself that reforms are needed, but "even as he reflected, the spring regained its sway."[50] The mood of the discussion, or more generally, the argument, between Arkady and Nikolai is frenzied and intense for the latter and reflective and commonplace for the former. This opening tone will characterize each of the Kirsanovs throughout the novel, although Arkady does squirm a little.

In as much as the pairing device is a technique which helps Turgenev grasp his characters' personalities, the argument device is one which helps him structure the themes.

What are arguments but heated discussions about themes? The themes developed in the first discussion between Nikolai and Arkady are the "special" relation of father and son, the relation of landowner (Nikolai) to peasants (Fenichka notably, but Nikolai's valet Peter, the carriage servants and farm serfs as well), and the Man of the Sixties against the Man of the Forties. These three themes might be reduced to a single one; the oppressor-slave mentality in some of its forms. But such a reduction would easily lead to a social and political commentary, which we wish to avoid. This abstraction is one that is easy to defend, especially when we see how badly an oppressor like Pavel reacts to becoming a slave to a person like Bazarov. This occurs just prior to the second discussion, in chapters five and six, in which Pavel and Bazarov bring out additional themes and expand ones already presented. As the novel goes on, the arguments and discussions work the themes through. The problem of liberation appears during the discussions at the home of Kukshin: liberation of Russia, of the serfs, of women, and of the self. The problem of love is confronted in Bazarov's discussion with Odintsova; the fourth argument. During the brief appearances of Sitnikov we have foolish Slavophilism contrasted with the best of Westernism. The scene in which Pavel challenges Bazarov to a duel reveals Bazarov's emptiness and the vagaries of his (Bazarov's) liberalism. These vagaries together with his inadequacies cause

Bazarov to be defeated in every social circumstance. The pattern of these themes is the structure of the novel according to the movements of the characters, the plot. In general, we will see that after the themes are introduced Bazarov becomes the man of the hour and all voices are directed to his ear, yet finally these voices turn away, even Odintsova, and he is left silent in his grave. This structure is a result of arguments in which the themes are worked out.

During the carriage ride sequence in the first chapter, Nikolai attempts to gauge Arkady's "interest in farming." Being on the threshold of old age, Nikolai would like Arkady to take over the management of the farm. Nikolai has failed in his endeavours as a landowner; the primary reasons for his lack of success were financial mismanagement and inability to understand the peasants. He finally achieves this goal by the end of the novel, but only after Katya has convinced Arkady to repudiate Bazarov. Had Arkady continued along the lines that his mentor followed, he may have fallen into the sink of simpering sardonicism that held Sitnikov. Had Arkady been morally stronger, he might perhaps have entered the "world of eternal reconciliation and of life without end" instead of suffering Sitnikov's fate. To his father's query, however, Arkady replies with a seeming <u>non sequitur</u>. He says that: "You've no shade; that's a pity," a reply perfectly repulsing, and

revealing Arkady's callousness by its coldness. Nikolai, eager to please Arkady even to the point of abandoning his primary aims, replies in kind; that is, they talk about the weather and the beauty of the land. Arkady expresses a 'special attraction' to it, yet becomes aware that, instead of condemning everything with a wave of the hand - as Bazarov would have had him do - he genuinely appreciates the land and in his way 'worships Nature.' This indeed is one of the causes behind the altercation with Bazarov later. During the silence that Arkady enforces on himself, Nikolai characteristically rambles on explaining that a 'special attraction' to the land that has borne him, is perfectly natural. Suddenly impatient with this line of conversation, Arkady objects sharply: "Come, dad, it makes no difference where a man is born."[51] This is needless cruelty. Its meaning, however, is so full that it towers above the mawkish phrases Arkady usually babbles. If "it makes no difference where a man is born," then the later discussions about Russians, Germans, and French are superfluous. Further, the class system itself is called into question, for a man's social standing are as much a place as his geographical locality. Bazarov, a man ahead of his time, according to Irving Howe, would not be only possibility and no potentiality.[52] He would be able to actualize all his strength, because fate would be with him rather than against him. The strength of

the statement, whatever its truth and applicability, perplexes Nikolai, the Man of the Forties. His vague liberalisms cannot sustain this power. This inadequacy is inextricably bound with Nikolai's personality. The peasants take advantage of it and Pavel Petrovich lords over him. When Bazarov both expects and accepts dinner from the Kirsanovs upon their first arrival at Marino before the second conversation, his attitude arises not as much from his sense of the Kirsanov hospitality as from the knowledge that for those few moments before Pavel appears he is the undisputed master of the house. Arkady, fresh from a spring's seasoning with Bazarov, shows us this same strength with statements as those above. But this strength is not permanently his. It is only the last of the "toys of the child" he is to put down, before he grasps the "tools of a man." He has inherited Nikolai's inadequacy and Katya uses this to "transform" him. Once he has uttered the thrust above and demoralized his opponent, the game is over. Arkady has not yet learned to sustain his own power and, because Bazarov's influence becomes slowly dissipated, he ultimately never learns. He can no more do it than he can sustain the talk he feints in the carriage conversation. The talk quickly ends for about five minutes, while each of them tries to collect his wits! When it resumes, we again are trapped into listening to banalities and finally we have the reflections on reform and Nature

we discussed above.

The language Turgenev uses is so accurate that merely from reading the conversations we can gather a wealth of ideas about each character, about the character's milieu, and about the state of Russian culture at the time. In addition to this, because the argument device is used consistently throughout the novel, we can see how the various themes relate to each other according to the interactions of the personalities of the characters. We can also see how the themes emphasized by each character are affected through the characters' reactions to Bazarov. The structural device shows us how these personalities react to Bazarov and around Bazarov, and consequently how the themes are affected by the cutting edge of nihilism.

The second conversation contains comments on all of the social questions taken up by the novel. The disputants are Bazarov, the New Man, and Pavel Petrovich. Pavel's position in the novel is as important as Odintsova's, the female lead. If Turgenev himself has a place in the novel it would be in parts of two characters: Turgenev's lifestyle was close to Pavel's, but his ideas were close to Bazarov's.[53] Pavel is a representative of the entrenched minority that rules Russia. He is too much of a <u>poseur</u> to hold even vague liberal notions.

> ... in general he arranged his
> whole life in the English style,
> rarely saw the neighbors, and only
> went out to the election of marshals,

> where he was generally silent, only occasionally annoying and alarming land-owners of the old school by his liberal sallies, and not associating with the representatives of the younger generation. [54]

Pavel's figure is that of a man without a country. He is drawn in contrast to Bazarov, however, the separation between their attitudes upon second viewing is not so great. He affords himself "liberal sallies" and Bazarov does the same thing. He is not gregarious and neither is Bazarov. They differ with respect to the younger generation. Bazarov is a stalwart member of the "common herd" while Pavel refuses to associate with them outside the rigors of formal conversation. Another difference between them is their hands. Bazarov's are "red" and "bare,"[55] while Pavel Petrovich's are pampered.

> Pavel Petrovich took out of his trouser pocket his beautiful hand with its long pink nails, a hand which seemed still more beautiful against the snowy whiteness of the cuff, buttoned with a single, big opal, and gave it to his nephew. [56]

Bazarov is exposed as "growing one half of him out of the soil." He has bumps on his head and calls his coat a "rag." He knees before the aristocratic status of Odintsova, a status she explicitly repudiates. Bazarov is as trapped into the false humility proper to one of low birth, even

though he has partly succeeded in thinking his way out of it, freeing one wing and perhaps two or three legs, as Pavel Petrovich is trapped into acting the part of an old society lion and an aristocrat. The clash between classes is brought out directly in the second conversation.

This second conversation is so important that we will analyze it quite closely. It is divided into three sections: the prelude, the argument, and its aftermath. The prelude runs through chapters 4 and 9. The argument lies in chapter 10. The aftermath is in chapter 11. Needless to say, with six chapters to build an argument the compression, the intensity, and the scope of the argument, all contained in one chapter, make this one of the finest chapters in the novel. The prelude to the argument begins with the first meeting of Pavel and Bazarov.

> Nikolai Petrovich presented him to Bazarov; Pavel Petrovich greeted him with a slight inclination of his supple figure, and a slight smile, but he did not give his hand, and even put it back into his pocket.

Pavel is content to exhibit his hand to his nephew and to even "kiss him thrice after the Russian fashion," but these statuesque 'obsequities' are not extended to Bazarov, whom Pavel calls an "unkempt creature." He goes so far as to suggest that Arkady is degrading himself by keeping company with

Bazarov; "I fancy Arkady s'est dégourdi."[58] Bazarov himself reacts as he should. He suggests that Pavel is "a queer fish" and that his nails are fit to be sent to an exhibition. He finally asks Arkady whether he thinks Pavel's finery and posing is ridiculous in the country. The attitudes of the antagonists in this second conversation are firmly cemented from the first meeting. The prelude next contains several chapters, each of which serve partly to elaborate on the personalities of Pavel and Bazarov. Bazarov becomes 'the hardworking medical student' and everyone gets used to him, except, of course, Pavel. Pavel Petrovich continues his existence. The morning after the arrival of the two young friends Arkady again magnanimously forgives his father for his affair with Fenichka. He makes it plain that that "special relation between father and son" is one of mutual respect and deference:

> "... a son cannot judge his father,
> - least of all, I, and least of all
> such a father who, like you, has
> never hampered my liberty in anything." [59]

A short while after this Pavel Petrovich engages Arkady in a discussion about his friend Bazarov. In this intimation of later battles Pavel learns Bazarov is a nihilist. Although the concept was not entirely new to Russian literature, the word was as yet unfamiliar enough to need a definition. Turgenev gives us three points of view on the concept immediately,

"A nihilist," said Nikolai Petrovich. "That's from the Latin, nihil, nothing, as far as I can judge; the word must mean a man who ... who accepts nothing?"

"Say, 'who respects nothing,'" put in Pavel Petrovich, and he set to work on the butter (for his bread) again.

"Who regards everything from the critical point of view," observed Arkady.

"Isn't that just the same thing?" inquired Pavel Petrovich.

"No, it's not the same thing. A nihilist is a man who does not bow down before any authority, who does not take any principle on faith, whatever reverence that principle may be enshrined in."

"Well, and is that good?" interrupted Pavel Petrovich.

"That depends, uncle. Some people it will do good to, but some people will suffer for it." 60

Nikolai is the Man of the Forties, who loves education for its own sake, and derives the Latin for us nicely, although it gives him only a small clue to the meaning of the word. Pavel, who is aware of the concept already, clarifies the word for Nikolai. For Pavel principles are very important irrespective of what they are. Arkady recites a definition memorized from somewhere, probably Bazarov. Thus, with just these three reactions to the concept of nihilism - confusion,

distaste, and imitation - we have each character revealed in his own peculiar way in relation to the concept of nihilism. Throughout this series of lines Bazarov's name is not mentioned, even though his quality nihilism brings the discussion about. Only when Arkady says "a man who does not bow," we think of Bazarov, but certainly not before, in the three points of view. This is a device to lift the concept of the nihilist from Bazarov's head for a moment and to allow it to be applied in general.

In allowing the concept to rest momentarily in universal terms Turgenev breaks down the wall between the reality of the literary object and the reality of the Real World. He is saying "this is a novel but it is not necessarily fiction." For this reason Turgenev allowed himself to have abuse and condemnation piled upon himself. By forcing the reader to relate to the conflict of themes in the novel as being real rather than as being fictional he asked for all the confusion and repudiation that overly-sensitive, emotionally-disposed readers could afford. This point is verified by the fact that Pavel Petrovich understands the concept very well, although he is unfamiliar with the name given it.

> " ... We are old-fashioned people; we imagine that without <u>principles</u>, ..., without <u>principles</u> taken as you say on faith, there's no taking a step, no breathing. Vous avez changé tout cela ...

> " ... Yes. There used to be Hegelists, and now there are nihilists. We shall see how you will exist in a void, in a vacuum; and now please ring, brother Nikolai Petrovich; it's time I had my cocoa."[61]

He identifies the idea with the Hegelians, that is, with the philosophy of the Man of the Forties, and this is perhaps an equivocation. His point about principles, however, is well-taken. When seen in general, nihilism approaches the degree of negation found in a more modern philosophy, existentialism, and it assumedly reaches the same heights. Without principles of some kind it is not possible to move or breathe. In other words, it is not possible to live. A simple reason for this flows from the nature of nihilism itself. If one denies everything, then he will not fail to finally exterminate his own élan vital; as Bazarov says, "If you've made up your mind to mow down everything, don't spare your logs."[62] Life does not "exist in a void, in a vacuum" and Pavel Petrovich is correct in this, but neither can life grow in the midst of honey, the glycernous antiseptic. Pavel's dismissal of Bazarov and his ideas, even before he meets him squarely is indicative of the aristocratic mentality that Pavel had so long cultivated. The initial refusal to remain open-minded about Arkady's friend springs not so much from an intellectual, philosophical rationalization than from an emotional predisposition toward being

socially hidebound. It should be said in Pavel's defence that he possessed a love for life of such breath that it led him to the brink of madness and death. It is unfortunate that millions in Russia had to suffer because of the magnitude of the inherited and cultivated joie de vivre of a few. After the skirmishes between Pavel and Bazarov in the prelude, Pavel visits Fenichka, his brother Nikolai's mistress and the mother of Nikolai's infant son Mitya, and asks her to order some green tea for him. During the history Arkady relates to Bazarov during the prelude, we learn that both the younger generation and the older one respect Pavel.

> ... for his fine aristocratic manners; for the rumors of his conquests; for the fact that he was very well dressed and always stayed in the best room in the best hotel; for the fact that he generally dined well, and had once even dined with Wellington at Louis Philippe's table; for the fact that he always took everywhere with him a real silver dressing-case and a portable bath; for the fact that he always smelt of some unusual, amazingly "aristocratic" scent; for the fact that he played whist in masterly fashion, and always lost; and lastly, they respected him also for his incorruptible honesty. Ladies considered him enchantingly romantic, but he did not cultivate ladies' acquaintance ... [63]

We might, as Pavel did, throw away our career just at its outset for the love of a vastly dissipated, schizophrenic, religious zealot, who draws us near only to our own destruction.

We might be willing to throw away the tedium of unrelieved prosperity in a duel over nothing more than an infantile, social gesture. We would dance at balls and laugh at parties. We would love to the hilt of our hearts. And we would have nothing but our honour, our status that is, to protect. In short, we would be aristocrats. If this seems unrealistic, it should; however, this was the style and the flavour of life that Pavel and his bed-fellows enjoyed. Their hold on life was so great that it had to be literally wrenched from their grasp. This is the same mentality that demands that there be "principles" of some kind, of perhaps any kind. And the demand is a valid one, but there is more to it than that. If we could somehow combine Pavel and Bazarov, then there we would have a New Man. As it is, Bazarov lives and dies in a vacuum. His death is caused by the absence of a certain medicine. And at the same time Pavel lives in a profusion of things. He has so many of them that he can choose to use only those that in some way uplift his aristocratic air. Pavel's principles are as superfluous as the things he surrounds himself with. We will see during the second argument that Pavel holds aristocracy to be one of those principles, without which Bazarov will suffocate. Thus, Pavel's condemnation of nihilism and thereafter Bazarov is not so much an intellectual condemnation of a philosophical principle but an emotionally-founded rejection of a

way of life which rejects his own way of life. The fact that Bazarov will not "bow" infuriates Pavel for two reasons: first, Bazarov has offended Pavel's aristocratic status and therefore Pavel's honour; secondly, Bazarov represents a threat to the Russian people which Pavel tries to excise later with words. After a preliminary skirmish between Bazarov and Pavel in which Bazarov expresses his distaste for art, except "The art of making money or to 'shrink hemorrhoids'!" cried Bazarov with a contemptuous laugh,[64] Arkady relates Pavel's history. He remarks to Bazarov that he should "remember his (Pavel's) education, the age in which he grew up." But instead of giving Bazarov an insight into the personality of his uncle, Arkady instead allows Bazarov to utter a maxim: "Every man must educate himself, just as I've done, for instance."[65] Bazarov's view of education refers more to the art of self-criticism than to the institution. One must learn about one's self, he says. But, as Plato indicates, the wise man does not think he is wise; nor does the educated man think he is educated. Bazarov's maxim is a paradox. He is fond of coming up with paradoxes whether maxims or pseudo-maxims. On one hand this use of platitudes gives Bazarov an air of "growing one half out of the soil," but on the other it betrays his lack of refined education; it reveals him as a boob. He goes so far as to condemn the use of platitudes by Arkady in argument five,

the fight at Bazarov's parent's home, or rather the use of a "commonplace in reverse." However, his lack of education is revealed here as well, since Arkady doesn't realize that a "commonplace" is a platitude. The platitudes give Bazarov a provincial flavour. They make him seem to be the representative of the masses of people, some of whom were pulling themselves up by their bootstraps. Bazarov's affinity with peasants is examined in many ways. When we first meet him arriving with Arkady prior to the carriage ride sequence, Bazarov talks to peasants in a manner that they seem to understand. Nikolai can not talk to them, even though he must. And Pavel refuses to give them any words but orders, occasionally saving one from a flogging. We see Bazarov hire two children to catch frogs for him. He exercises all his insolence and superiority over them, but strangely they understand this and work for him. Fenichka, originally of humble origins, is the next sort of peasant that crosses Bazarov's path. She is duty-bound and love-bound to Nikolai. After the history Arkady gives Bazarov, we see Pavel visit Fenichka ostensibly to ask her to order one-half pound of green tea for him. He fumbles about never quite making contact with the pretty girl. The formalities that they impose on themselves due to their respective social positions prevent Pavel and Fenichka from knowing the ease of communion that she acquires with Bazarov. This loss is as much Fenichka's

fault as it is Pavel's, for as yet unsure of her own position she goes so far as to use formal speech to her former associates and friends. Nikolai, who doesn't marry her until the end of the novel, could have at any time thrown her over and disowned her infant son. This, in addition to the fact that she is of peasant origin, makes her relationship with Pavel unstable. Bazarov, on the other hand, easily gains both her confidence and her trust by allowing her to think of him as a doctor. In the middle of the night she calls Bazarov to treat her son Mitya's convulsions, an act which is plainly an imposition on her part. We are not told until after the duel that Pavel Petrovich himself loves her, that she bears a resemblance to a "certain Princess R ---," Pavel's lost paramour. Arkady has been active during the time that Pavel has been fuming and Bazarov experimenting with frogs. He reaches the height of Bazarov's influence over him. One afternoon he took a copy of Pushkin his father Nikolai was reading and replaced it with a popularized scientific text on physics. Nikolai, who could not understand the text, moans that he has been surpassed by his son and that there is no chance that they will come to "intimate terms." After Nikolai and Pavel discuss this, Pavel indicates that he believes a "tussle with that doctor fellow" is before him. And sure enough the "tussle" immediately follows. This argument, the high-point of the second conversation, contains the most active exposition of the nihilist's

views and those of the educated aristocracy. It is this chapter which caused the most furore and the most confusion among the readers. And yet it is the most revealing. In it Bazarov links himself with the historical aspects of the revolutionary movement in Russia, while Pavel resolutely maintains that "aristocracy is a principle" necessary for the continuation of the culture. They argue over the Russian people first and then over Arkady. So far as blame for the fight is concerned, both parties seem to be at fault.

> Pavel Petrovich came into the drawing-room, all ready for the fray, irritable and determined. He was only waiting for an excuse to fall upon the enemy; but for a long while an excuse did not present itself. [66]

The reason the opportunity did not present itself, Turgenev tells us, is because Bazarov was in the habit of remaining silent in the "presence of the 'old Kirsanovs'." Finally, when discussing a neighbouring landowner, Bazarov, who has met the man in Petersburg, ventures an opinion; "Trash, a rotten little aristocrat," Bazarov said indifferently.[67] With this comment Bazarov makes Pavel leap to the field. His lips, we are told, are trembling. He clarifies for himself that Bazarov holds "the same opinion of aristocrats as of rotten little aristocrats." And seizes this opportunity to become insulted.

There are aristocrats he respects, he says,

> "the English aristocracy. They do not abate one iota of their rights, and for that reason they respect the rights of others; they demand the fulfillment of obligations in dealing with them, and for that reason they fulfill their own obligations. The aristocracy has given freedom to England, and supports it for her." [68]

Pavel's statement can be seen as one derived from Hegel's theory of Classical Greek society. There only some were free. Hegel reasoned that if all were free, then none would be free; so if some were slaves, others would be free. Pavel himself, of course, would be aghast at our derivation. His idea of the 'good' aristocrat is bound up with the idea of rights, responsibilities, and personal dignity. If the English aristocracy is a machine of perpetual freedom enforced by the privileged few, the Russian aristocracy is a monster because of the unparalleled poverty of the 'free' serfs. Bazarov is aware of this apparent contradiction in Pavel's words and the situation as it exists. He says drily: "We've heard that song a good many times," replied Bazarov; "but what are you trying to prove by that?"[69]

The use of the word "we" indicates the level at which Turgenev is approaching this discussion. Ordinarily, if Pavel had used the word, we would have called it the aristocratic

singular. However, Bazarov repudiates this interpretation by his very life-style. Another explanation of the use of the word relates back to what we said earlier about the general nature of the themes. Bazarov represents the New Man, who comes from the peasant class but who soars with the high born, the one who has 'pulled himself up by his bootstraps.' He represents the enlightened peasantry and this is the meaning of the word "we." Bazarov never doubts his affinity for and his rapport with the serfs, even though this link with them turns out to be false. In saying that "we've heard that song before," he is saying that the peasants have had their masters' boot heel rationalized to them many times before. The words by now are empty of their social significance, even though they hold a certain element of truth. Pavel's reaction to Bazarov's statement comes in two forms: first, in his enunciation; and second, in his intention. While speaking about the need for personal dignity within the social fabric, he falls back on a speech pattern that was used by the court of Tzar Alexander I, a clipping short of his words. The juxtaposition of a remnant from an earlier court with a speech on character, the social fabric, and the duty to remain dignified is a caustic form of irony which exposes Pavel's character quite effectively. Bazarov asks Pavel how what he has just said "with his arms folded" benefits the society as it exists.

And at this point Pavel Petrovich says, as we indicated he would earlier, that

> "It's absolutely unnecessary for me to explain to you now why I sit with my arms folded, as you are pleased to express yourself. I wish only to tell you that aristocracy is a principle, and in our days none but immoral or silly people can live without principles. I said that to Arkady the day after he came home, and I repeat it now." [70]

"There is no need for me to explain the relevance of what I say," Pavel says. He is content to speak about principles and not consider the effect the principles have on society. His opinion is plainly constructed through hindsight. He has taken the system as it exists, compared it to similar systems, gathered good points from those analogous systems, and applied them in general to his home society. English aristocracy and Russian aristocracy had one major facet shared between them, aristocracy, but no others; the cultures are different. The idea that "aristocracy is a principle" is a rationalization for allowing the social fabric to remain as it is. The principle holds in general irrespective of the society to which it is applied. This tendency of Pavel's to use general statements and talk about abstract principles is a characteristic of the Man of the Forties. Bazarov indicates his contempt for Pavel's generalization by saying:

> "Aristocracy, Liberalism, progress, principles," Bazarov was saying meanwhile; "if you think of it, what a lot of foreign ... and useless words! No Russian needs them, even as a gift." [71]

and after denying these unquestionable facets of the personality of the Man of the Forties, Bazarov sees that Pavel, not quite a Man of the Forties, is yet unconvinced. Bazarov denies logic and history.

> "You don't need logic, I hope, to put a piece of bread in your mouth when you're hungry. What are these abstractions to us?" [72]

Pavel throws up his hands, we are told. He doesn't know where to hit Bazarov to inflict a wound. This knowledge will come only after a few minutes in the form of Arkady's discipleship. This master-follower relationship is, as we said, at the crux of the aristocratic mentality; without this relationship aristocracy falls flat. Arkady, who up until now has been silent, begins to speak, but only to repeat what Bazarov has just said or what Bazarov has taught him to say. Pavel tries to use a 'shotgun' effect asking three questions at once. Only one of these takes immediate effect, while the others come up in sequence later. The first concerns the principles which Bazarov and Arkady use to guide their actions.

> "Ive told you already, uncle, that we don't recognize any authorities," put in Arkady.
>
> "We act by virtue of what we recognize as useful," observed Bazarov. "At the present time, negation is the most useful of all - and we deny - "
>
> "Everything?" (Pavel)
>
> "Everything!" (Bazarov)
>
> "What, not only art and poetry ... but even ... horrible to say ..."
>
> "Everything," repeated Bazarov, with indescribable composure.
>
> Pavel Petrovich stared at him. He had not expected this; while Arkady fairly blushed with delight. [73]

This brings the concept of nihilism out into the open: the denial of everything. Nikolai Petrovich fills in for Pavel during the resulting silence. Denial is equated to destruction. Nikolai desires to know what Bazarov would build in place of that which he has destroyed, but Bazarov says "that is not our business now ... The ground has to be cleared first." Here we have the first full statement of Bazarov's functionalism. Functionalism is the ethic which views everything according to its usefulness and its use. This same attitude will arise in his dealings with Odintsova later. We shall see how Bazarov fails to deny everything; everything is too vast a thing for him and he is too small. Pavel recovers himself, after Arkady suggests that the "present condition of the people"

demands that the ground be cleared. Pavel refuses to accept that Bazarov and Arkady know the needs of the Russian people, that Bazarov is their representative. Those objections prove nothing, but bring out yet another denial. Pavel himself tries his hand at denying in his own defence. He says "I can't acknowledge you as Russian." But Bazarov by this time counters easily by pointing to his own history; his grandfather ploughed the land with his own hands. He challenges Pavel to ask the peasants to decide who is a Russian and who is not. From here the argument breaks down into a juvenile session of name calling. After Nikolai Petrovich breaks this up, the battle resumes. When asked what he advocates, Bazarov responds nothing. "What do you do then?" Pavel asks him. Bazarov responds historically as well as personally,

> "I'll tell you what we do. Formerly, not long ago, we used to say that our officials took bribes, that we had no roads, no commerce, no real justice ..."
> "Then we figured out that talk, perpetual talk, and nothing but talk about our social sores, was not worthwhile, that it all led to nothing but banality and doctrinairism. We saw that even our clever ones, so-called advanced people and accusers, were no good; that we were occupied by nonsense, talked about some sort of art, unconscious creativeness, parliamentarianism, the legal profession, and the devil knows what all, while it's a question of daily bread, while we're stifling under the grossest superstition, while all our corporations come to grief simply because there aren't enough honest

> men to carry them on, while the very emancipation our Government's busy upon will hardly come to any good, because peasants are glad to rob even themselves to get drunk at the pot-house."[74]

Contained in this response is the heart of the problem in Russia: the vastness of the governmental machinery, the poverty of the people, and the frailties of human nature all unite to create what seems to be an insolvable problem. Bazarov's emphasis is on the problems of communication and governmental responsiveness. The profusion of foreign ideas, such as the German theory of unconscious creativity, has diluted the strength of the minds directed at the renovation of Russian society. When a mind is thinking about creativity, art, rules of procedure or legalisms, then those who need bread or respite, which could be gotten by this mind, must suffer. In addition to this, the mentality of the people is so diverse that at times it is difficult to conceive of them as one culture. Further, the gap between the sophisticated minds which might have a chance of saving the people and the minds of the average people is so great that it would take years to break down the barriers of superstition and misbelief. This is so, even granting that there are "honest" and capable men dedicated to the job. This speech dissipates the tension that was building in this argument section. The

aftermath begins when Pavel understands precisely what nihilism is. At that stage, at a loss for any weapons to use, Pavel turns on his nephew Arkady, but his words are aimed at Bazarov as well. When Bazarov finishes his speech, Pavel interposes his comment, "you've become convinced of all this, and decided not to undertake anything seriously yourselves ... But to confine yourselves to abuse."[75] This, Bazarov says, is nihilism. The threat of action lies beneath this definition. Pavel seems to sense this. "Don't you do as much talking as everyone else?" he asks. And Bazarov simply denies that they make that sort of mistake. When asked whether the 'nihilists' are "preparing for action," Bazarov remains quiet and this response is more nerve-wracking than any verbal response could be. Pavel turns the concept over in his mind. Arkady enters the discussion with another memorized observation. He tells Pavel that they shall "destroy" because they are a "force." This causes Pavel to thrash his nephew verbally, while, as we said, striking out again at Bazarov. He denies the potency of the force to which Arkady alludes. Bazarov utters another maxim: "All Moscow was burnt down, you know, by a penny candle." And Pavel retorts by ascribing nihilism first to sheer pride, "almost Satanic," and then to blockheadedness. He says that the technique of ridicule is the honey that attracts the young, "that's what gains an ascendancy over the inexperienced hearts

of boys." This is a direct slur to the friendship of Arkady and Bazarov. Pavel points out the master-slave relationship existing between the two friends. His last major thrust is aimed at the efficacy of Bazarov's education and questions his motives for affecting the young.

> " ... that's how young men of today ought to express themselves! And if you come to think of it, how could they fail if they followed you! In old days, young men had to study; they didn't want to be called dunces, so they had to work hard whether they liked it or not. But now, they need only say, 'Everything in the world is nonsense!' and the trick's done. Young men are delighted. And, to be sure, they were simply blockheads before, and now they have suddenly turned nihilists."[76]

Bazarov responds to this onslaught phlegmatically, while Arkady flares up. This is a natural reaction rather than a pose. Pavel has rather childishly attacked Bazarov's motives, but it is Arkady who becomes heated. This, of course, is the universal principle of the 'aged malcontent' speaking here, although this does not consume Pavel's personality. He is determined to win, even at the cost of the truth. Bazarov phlegmatically challenges him to " ... bring forward a single institution in our present mode of life, in family or in social life, which does not call for complete and unqualified repudiation."[77]

And although Pavel mentions first the Peasants' Commune and then the peasant family itself, Bazarov remains the quiet victor in his own eyes. He attempts only sarcastic but yet telling answers. When Pavel utters his statement about blockheads, Bazarov reacts phlegmatically, yet we wonder what is going on underneath, behind his mask. He comments that Pavel's "vaunted sense of personal dignity" has broken down, meaning by this that Pavel has insulted him with his childish comment. Pavel has become "personal" just as Nikolai has warned them not to do. In spite of Pavel's failure not only to be the immediate winner in this verbal battle, but also to maintain hold on his principles of mutual respect and personal dignity it is Bazarov who is wounded more grievously though more subtly. Bazarov repeats his challenge to Pavel:

> "Go through all our classes, and think well over each, while Arkady and I will ..."
>
> "Will go on turning everything into ridicule," broke in Pavel Petrovich.
>
> "No, will go on dissecting frogs. Come, Arkady; goodbye, gentlemen!" [78]

But their departure comes only moments after Pavel's insult. Could Bazarov be running away from Pavel? He says that "our argument has gone too far," but what does he mean by this? It could be that which appears obvious to the reader:

if the argument continues, both combatants will be forced to escalate into a more permanently destructive domain, like a duel. Knowing Pavel's background Bazarov may be wary of just this fact. Another explanation revolves around the subject of the relationship between Bazarov and Arkady. Ever since Bazarov forces Pavel to acknowledge the meaning of nihilism, Arkady has been taking random shots at Pavel by repeating opinions and observations which Bazarov has taught him. In this way Arkady is much like a mosquito, irritating but not deadly. It is easy to see that Arkady was influenced by Bazarov during his post-adolescent identity crisis, that he might have been attracted by Bazarov because of the fun of ridicule, but that instead of being a convert to Bazarovism emotionally he was simply unable to defend himself when he first met the nihilist. Arkady is a country bumpkin overpowered and awed by another bumpkin, who has learned a few tricks. Pavel's statements about "a pride almost Satanic" and "the hearts of inexperienced boys" then have wounded Bazarov more deeply than he gives us to expect. The precise location of the wound is in Bazarov's 'Arkady.' Pavel has sniffed out the master-slave there and stepped on it soundly. Perhaps to show off his continuing dominance over Nikolai's son and Pavel's nephew Bazarov says "come, Arkady," as though he were Bazarov's dog. Nikolai seems to perceive the first, more obvious

interpretation. After the two friends leave, he bemoans the 'generation gap' consigning himself to his coffin. Nikolai's sensitivities about growing old are affected by this conversation. He wanted his son to save him from his romantic preoccupation with his coming death, but he can see that this will be impossible. He takes an almost perverse delight both in this chapter and in the next in this consignment to the coffin. Pavel, on the other hand, still has fight left in him. He is more apt to see Bazarov's abrupt exit as a rout than a tactical retreat. He repeats his statement about "insolent conceit," as though he is checking the breach of a rifle when the attack has been lifted. Just before Pavel abruptly leaves his brother for the night, he strikes on the matter of the nihilist's importance. The closing statement he makes is in the way of mollifying Nikolai and dispersing his own anger.

> "I'm convinced, on the contrary, that you and I are far more in the right than these young gentlemen, though we do perhaps express ourselves in old-fashioned language, <u>vielli</u>, and have not the same insolent conceit ... And the swagger of the young men nowadays! You ask one, 'Do you take red wine or white?' 'It is my custom to prefer red!' he answers, in a deep bass, with a face as solemn as if the whole universe had its eyes on him at that instant ... " 79

In the first part Pavel contrasts the young from the old. It is reflected in their language; Pavel's is ornate and

full of French nuances, Bazarov's is clipped and full of folk wisdom. However, if language were the only factor separating Pavel and Bazarov, words would be forgotten in an instant. It is the nihilist's sense of importance, perhaps, of destiny, that irritates Pavel. A man filled with a vision of cultural transformation cannot be expected to bend to customs which will be shortly overturned. Pavel, however, so well entrenched, does not understand this. Bazarov's vision is not communicated in a manner that Pavel can understand. We will discuss this further when we consider the final conversation. One reason Pavel does not understand is a narrow-mindedness associated with members of the ruling class. Another reason is that Bazarov does not adequately understand his vision in terms that he can relate to others. The distinction between the constructive solution and the destructive solution is an important one here, because, while Bazarov demands the latter during this second conversation, he realizes that the former is the one needed during the final conversation.

The second conversation is admittedly one of the most important in the novel. The themes of the class society, the future of Russia, the state of Russian politics at present, the New Man against the Man of the Forties, indigenous and imitative influences in Russian life, and the relation of young to old are all dealt with either within the dialogue

or more subtly in the actions of the characters. Turgenev uses an omniscient authorial style to convey the various opposing points of view without undue prejudice. This conversation is nearly devoid of authorial comments and editorial insertions. When Pavel begins clipping the ends of his syllables after the manner of the court of Alexander I, Turgenev merely reports this, where authors such as Joseph Conrad or H. Melville might give us pages of superfluous, historical details. During one of his few entries into the conversation, Nikolai struggles to keep the antagonists from becoming "personal." This reflects the tendency of the Man of the Forties to remain on an abstract plane even when dealing within practical realities. Pavel's defense of the English aristocracy gives words to his love for institutions and "principles." This is Westernism not only of technology but of the soul, what Bazarov later calls Anglomania. Yet the Anglomaniac can muster the courage it takes to deny Bazarov of his Russian heritage. All of this reflects on those "special relations between father and son" Nikolai mentions earlier. Without these "special relations" none of the conversation could have taken place without some blood shed. A son would never have taken upon himself to allow such an argument to transpire in his father's presence, let alone take part in the argument as well. The relations between the old and young, between the tried and

untried, between the indigenous and the imitative are all solidly bound together here in this conversation. They will be examined more closely in subsequent chapters and there will be less compacting of themes. One of Turgenev's continuing themes is almost entirely missing from the climax of the second conversation, the theme of love. Apart from the conflict between Pavel and Bazarov over Fenichka, a relationship developed more to heighten the energy between an inadequate and an adequate man, there is no mention of love. Except for the final interchange between Fenichka and Nikolai the whole episode is devoid of it. But here too Turgenev has an object: to point out the master-slave relationship between them. The themes are so compressed in the second conversation that most everything of value is at least alluded to.

The third conversation takes place at Avdotya Nikitishna Kukshin's house in the town near the Kirsanov estate. We will call her Kukshina throughout. She is the wayward wife of a nobleman, from whom she is not yet divorced. Bazarov and Arkady meet an old disciple of Bazarov's, Sitnikov, in town. Sitnikov introduces the two friends to Kukshina, a woman of indeterminate age, although she is treated as though she is seeding the last of her wild oats. Like Pavel, she is of aristocratic stock and intent on the outside world. A profusion of things surrounds her: "cigarette ends,"

"Russian journals," "papers," and "letters." Her conversation is cluttered with references to popular issues and popular names. She is very flighty and 'scatter-brained.' Bazarov comments on the nutritional value of food and she replies:

> "Are you studying chemistry? That's my passion. I've even invented a new compound myself."
>
> "A compound? You?" (Bazarov)
>
> "Yes. And do you know for what purpose? To make dolls' heads that won't break. I'm practical, too, you see. But everything's not quite ready yet. I've still to read Liebig. By the way, have you read Kislyakov's article on Female Labor, in the Moscow Gazette? Read it, please. You're interested in the woman question, aren't you? And in schools too? What does your friend do? What is his name?" 80

The end of the sequence that begins with chemistry is an introduction to Arkady. To get to this we must go through dolls' heads, the German chemist Liebig, the woman question, and schools. Kukshina is a dilettante. She somersaults through her interests like an acrobat, but unlike an acrobat her performance is not coherent nor consistent. She barely manages to complete thoughts in her enthusiasm either to just talk, to impress visitors, or to console herself with the cul-de-sac into which educated Russian women of the time were pushed. Her views about herself are reflected in her opinion of Odintsova, whom she first describes to Bazarov.

Bazarov asks whether there are "pretty women" about in the town.

> "Yes, there are," answered Evdoksya (Kukshina); "but they're all such empty-headed creatures. Mon amie, Odintsova, for instance, is nice-looking. It's a pity her reputation's rather, well ... That wouldn't matter, though, but she has no independent views, no breadth, nothing ... of that sort. The whole system of education wants changing. I've thought a great deal about it; our women are very badly educated." [81]

Kukshina has no independent views either, but not because she lacks the education. She has culled from her private readings enough knowledge to formulate the 'liberal' position of the times for herself, yet there is no rime or reason, no definite direction to her studies or her conversation. The four bottles of champagne the four consume make the conversation no more rambling than it was begun, but serve as a sort of grease for the gears of social interaction. In addition to being an intellectual dilettante Kukshina is an inveterate name-dropper. During the course of this brief transitionary chapter she mentions the names of Liebig, Kislyakov, George Sand, Emerson, Elisevich, Bunsen, Pierre Sapozhnikov, Lidia Klostatov, Proudhon, Macaulay, Michelet, and sings a song by Schiff, a German. With the exception of Sapozhnikov and Klostatov, who are Russian social figures,

the names belong to famous artists, writers, and scientists of Western Europe. Kukshina's intellectual dilettantism extends into this region as well and, in fact, might be partially caused by this aberration. Commenting on George Sand, she says:

> "A retrograde woman, and nothing else! How can people compare her with Emerson? She hasn't any ideas on education, nor physiology, nor anything. I am sure she's never heard of embryology, and in these days - what can be done without that?"[82]

What indeed can be done without embryology? The study of embryos is, of course, a cruel joke on Turgenev's part, since Kukshina, who presumably can do nothing without the new science, has no children. She manages to stop the conversation momentarily when she mentions Michelet's book, De l'amour, enjoins the men to speak of love, and lets "her arm fall languidly on the rumpled sofa cushion." On the whole Kukshina seems to surround herself with things that might give her a clue to her inner reality. She always utters 'safe' statements, ones she knows cannot be attacked by the avant-garde. She represents the New Woman in Russia, the precursor of the thousands of women scientists and engineers. Yet she is trapped: first as a personality in the body of a woman; second by her noble background; third by her 'liberal'

inclinations; and fourth by her inability to conceive of a coherent plan or system of her own. Her plight is close to that of Fenichka's, although she is less timid, better educated, and more in command of herself. Our opinion of her wavers between tragedy and comedy as Kukshina attempts to find her inner self rummaging through all the ideas at hand. She is a much stronger character than Bazarov's friend Sitnikov. He, like Arkady, learned the magic phrases from his teacher. The two disciples' fates are roughly similar: both of them are ultimately 'transformed' by women. Both Arkady and Sitnikov are sybarites and mosquitoes. Sitnikov, however, is a much more ruthless social-climber than Arkady is, and his fate is so much the worse for it. During a little show Sitnikov puts on for Bazarov's benefit he condemns women, whom Kukshina has been defending as quoted above.

> "There's no doing anything with them," put in Sitnikov; "one ought to despise them, and I do despise them fully and completely!" (The possibility of feeling and expressing contempt was the most agreeable sensation to Sitnikov; he used to attack women in especial, never suspecting that it was to be his fate a few months later to cringe before his wife merely because she had been born a princess Durdoleosov.) "Not a single one of them would be capable of understanding our conversation; not a single one deserves to be spoken of by serious men like us!"

"But there's not the least need for them to understand our conversation," observed Bazarov.

"Whom do you mean?" put in Evdoksya (Kukshina).

"Pretty women." (Bazarov)

"What? Do you share Proudhon's ideas, then?" (Kukshina)

Bazarov drew himself up haughtily. "I don't share any one's ideas; I have my own."

"Down with all authorities!" shouted Sitnikov, delighted to have a chance of expressing himself boldly before the man he slavishly admired. 83

The contradictions in Sitnikov's personality become apparent in this extract. He loves to condemn women, but his social climbing will lead him to subjugation by one. He shouts "down with authorities" in hopes of earning praise from his master. Kukshina accuses him of being a Slavophile, because he is wearing traditional Russian dress, after the Slavophile manner, but he repudiates this opinion leading us to suspect that he is as superficial as his jacket. This is a portrait of one of the younger generation, yet Turgenev makes it plain that Sitnikov is not one of the New Men. And for particular reasons. Most notably among these is the need Sitnikov has for external reinforcement. He must have people say 'yes, Sitnikov, you are a good boy; now run along.' Like Kukshina,

Sitnikov has no opinions of his own. He needs the class system to support his life-style. His father owns a series of "pot-houses," liquor bars that is, and makes money selling liquor to peasants. Sitnikov will never be a revolutionary any more than Kukshina will. Neither have the intellectual stamina to remain strong in an argument going heavily against them. Nor do they have the emotional commitment to their opinions necessary to provide momentum when their intellects fail. They both are portraits of potential revolutionaries, but their power is cut short by their inadequacies. Turgenev uses this technique to point out certain stumbling blocks in the developing revolutionary consciousness of the Russian people. Jean-Paul Sartre used the same technique in his famous trilogy of novels: he points out specific flaws in the existential personality of his characters. Turgenev, however, does not overawe us with failure of this kind.

Anna Sergeyevna Odintsov, Odintsova, is another form of social-climber. In the history Turgenev traces of her, he makes it clear that she sacrificed everything for her position. She lives in the style of a well-to-do noblewoman in a house built like a church outside of the same town. Like Kukshina's, her opinions are unformed concerning the 'liberal' position, not because she lacks the ability to formulate a coherent plan but because her education did not

include political fine points. She supports a maiden aunt of royal stock and a younger sister, Katya. She is thirty years old; a few years older than Bazarov. Of course, she is still beautiful and the very essence of decorum. Bazarov is attracted to her because of a certain sexual attraction. Odintsova is attracted to Bazarov because she is "very curious to see a man who has the courage to believe in nothing."[84] She is a practical woman, who manages her own estate, and can in no way be thought of as an idealist, or a romantic. Within her household the class system is rigidly maintained. There are no exceptions where servants are treated familiarly, as in the Kirsanov household with Prokofich or in the Bazarov household with Timofeich. At the Odintsova's they all wear livery and are invisible. At the governor's ball she is swept up by the host with all the grandeur of the most entrenched of the aristocracy. She is a representative of everything Bazarov has set himself against, yet she has something Pavel does not have, her body. Bazarov's sexual interest in women is aroused at first sight. Her character is not affected in the Western manner, like Pavel's is. The theme of the indigenous and imitative elements in Russian life is not present in the third conversation. Rather Turgenev presents us with an analysis of love.

The extensive discussion we carried on concerning the second argument has its structure mirrored by the remainder

of the novel. After the transitionary chapter at Kukshina's we have three different love affairs developed extensively. The first is between Bazarov and Odintsova, the second between Arkady and Katya, and the third between Pavel and Fenichka. The first is dominated by fear, the second by inadequacy, and the third by idealism or romanticism. Bazarov and Odintsova begin the development of their relationship in the fourth conversation. This is the prelude to their departure in the sixth conversation, which comes after Arkady and Bazarov nearly come to blows, the fifth conversation. The sixth conversation also contains the duel between Pavel and Bazarov and Arkady's marriage proposal to Katya. The final sequence, the seventh conversation, is between Odintsova and Bazarov on the nihilist's deathbed. In each case we have an extensive layering technique during the prelude, a quick climax in which everything in the prelude is worked out, and a gentle aftermath. The layering technique is consistent with the various points of view of each character, so that on first sight it appears deceptively complex. Thus, for Pavel, the second conversation we analyzed is itself both a climax for earlier development and a part of a larger climax, the duel. For Odintsova, the prelude is the fourth conversation, where her relationship with Bazarov is developed, and the climax comes in the sixth conversation. For Arkady, the prelude is the bulk of the novel, the climax

his fight with Bazarov, and the aftermath his marriage to Katya. What is the prelude, climax, and aftermath for Bazarov? The answer to this is obvious, although unsavoury. The novel itself is the prelude for Bazarov's death, the moment of death is his climax, and the grave is his resolution and "eternal repose." We see then that the structure of Turgenev's Fathers and Sons can be seen in Aristotelian terms. This simple structural form, he set in the Poetics, is fundamental to the dramatic form. The form for the novel is found in microcosm in the second conversation.

The affair between Bazarov and Odintsova develops in a very smooth manner. Odintsova married her late husband for his money and made herself "frigid," as Bazarov describes her. She has seen her "ups and downs" and she knows "what it is to be hard up." These are obvious puns on Turgenev's part. She begins with an interest in Bazarov that she cannot quite explain adequately, although she gives us several reasons for her attraction. Bazarov supplies a few of his own. Eventually, she becomes emotionally attached exhibiting signs of falling in love. The fourth conversation brings these feelings to a head. This conversation is devoted to love and the relationship between lovers. Odintsova finally tells us what she expects in such a relationship and Bazarov cowers before her expectations. Finally, he confesses that he loves her,

but denies the relationship any future development. He leaves, fights a duel because of his mild flirtation with Fenichka, and returns. Odintsova is cold to him. He leaves again and they only meet again on his deathbed. The contradiction in Odintsova's personality is shown by the following two extracts.

> She liked Bazarov for the absence of gallantry in him, and even for his sharply defined views. She found in him something new, which she had not chanced to meet before, and she was curious.[85]

> Like all women who have not succeeded in loving, she wanted something, without herself knowing what.[86]

Odintsova has a question mark in her life. This void, of course, is derived from her past fortunes. She has made herself "frigid" and the void is the opposite of fulfillment. If she could find a man strong enough to hold her, this void would fill up and the question mark would dissolve. This is what interests her about Bazarov. Odintsova's tragedy is that the centre of her being is and remains an unknown to her, even though she seeks it.

> He (Bazarov) had struck Odintsova's imagination; he interested her, she thought a great deal about him. In his absence, she was not dull, she was not impatient for his coming, but she always grew more lively on his appearance; she liked to be left alone with

> him, and she liked talking to him, even when he irritated her or offended her taste, her refined habits. She was eager, as it were, both to put him to the test and to analyze herself.[87]

Bazarov is a renegade and, because she is like him, this attracts her. However, because she has not succeeded in loving, she does not recognize what her need is. Instead of reaching out in a way that only experience could teach her, she has settled down in a dull routine, which she feels strange out of. Had she gained fulfillment in the past, even for a moment, she would know exactly the attitudes to hold and the movements to make which would bring her the most happiness in Bazarov's case. But:

> ... (she) had conceived a secret repugnance for all men, whom she could only figure to herself as slovenly, heavy, drowsy, and feebly importunate creatures.[88]

Her conception of men is only a half-truth. Bazarov denies by his very being a part of this half-truth, but even the nihilist is a "feebly importunate creature." After the first part of the conversation at Odintsova's estate, Bazarov regards her as a "stale loaf." He knows that she will not be an easy conquest, if in fact, a conquest at all. In his relationship with Odintsova we begin to see deeper into Bazarov's

character. Odintsova has brought a feeling of "newness" in Bazarov. Turgenev tells us that Bazarov has a great appreciation for women and for "feminine beauty; but love in the ideal ... romantic sense, he called gibberish, unpardonable imbecility;"[89] but that he would never let one control him.

> "If a woman takes your fancy," he used to say, "try and gain your end; but if you can't - well, turn your back on her - there are lots of good fish in the sea."[90]

This maxim of Bazarov's is suddenly thrown aside by circumstances. He has become emotionally tied to Odintsova. She had, as it were, "taken his fancy." He caught himself in all sorts of "shameful thoughts" and he was "driven on by a devil mocking him." This is a picture of a strong man breaking down not only psychologically but ethically as well.

> In his conversations with Anna Sergeyevna (Odintsova) he expressed more strongly than ever his calm contempt for everything romantic; but when he was alone, with indignation he recognized the romantic in himself.[91]

Turgenev has sketched out the prelude to the climax between Odintsova and Bazarov partly in an authorial comment. This is unusual for him, yet in this case, it saves a great deal of dramatic exposition. Finally, we come to the point where Odintsova explains what she wants.

> "My idea is everything or nothing. A life for a life. Take mine, give up yours, and that without regret or turning back. Or else have nothing."[92]

Bazarov instead of plunging himself into romantic, idealized sentimentality chooses to reject her offer. She has even tried to tempt him with fame and fortune. His decision is clearly against his own better instincts and emotional proclivities. He has refused her love, not out of love, but out of conviction. If he accepts her proposal, he will make everything he has told her about love false. The following morning alone with Odintsova he confesses his love for her in an outburst of weakness. From this point, even though his affair with Odintsova has not reached its culmination, Bazarov begins the journey down. Odintsova has brought out the inevitable contradictions in his make up and Bazarov the rationalist, the nihilist, cannot justify them to himself. He leaves to visit his parents taking Arkady with him. He begins to set himself up for the eventual severing of relations with Odintsova. His flirtation with Fenichka is made more from desperation than from genuine interest. She might be an easy conquest. When Bazarov returns, during the sixth conversation, he is only a shell of what he formerly was. He doesn't tell her of the duel he fought. He is so shaken by her presence that he cannot address himself to her.

> " ... before everything else I must set your mind at rest. Before you is a mortal who has come to his senses long ago, and who hopes other people, too, have forgotten his follies. I an going away for a long while; and though, as you will allow, I'm by no means a very soft creature, it would be anything but cheerful for me to carry away with me the idea that you remember me with repugnance." 93

Bazarov is begging for a last benediction. He has become the weak creature that remained after the contempt had been boiled out of him. He begs her to regard love as "a purely imaginary feeling." And she tentatively agrees. Bazarov has transcended his juvenile stage of denying everything on principle, that we have seen him so well maintain during the second conversation. Yet even though he is no longer a prisoner of his accusations but neither is he a prisoner of love. Had he given in to his contradictory and romantic tendencies, he would have been just as broken and just as empty. His fate would have been close to that of Sitnikov's. Instead of this, his is free to build a new life. Bazarov, of course, has probably never told any of the women he has made love to that he loved them, judging at least from the fumbling way he tells Odintsova so.

> "Let me tell you then that I love you like a fool, like a madman ... There, you've forced it out of me."[94]

In addition to this, he probably never has been in a situation where he had actually to love someone. When we meet his parents during the fifth conversation, we see that he doesn't know how to accept his mother's blubbering sentimentality. He continually criticizes his father's faults, but his father continues to wallow in them. After he begins to recover from his shattering experience with Odintsova, Bazarov begins to construct his new life. He works with his father, a village doctor. Given time, Bazarov might develop a concrete form of his vision. He might succeed in bringing his times closer to his life. But this does not happen. Odintsova visits him on his deathbed, the last of the seventh conversation.

During the fifth conversation Bazarov airs some of the energy that Odintsova aroused in him. Bazarov and Arkady argue in the hayloft at the home of Bazarov's parents. The unmistakable signs of the failure at Odintsova's are all around Bazarov. In contrast to Pavel's opinion after the second conversation that Bazarov exhibits "insolent conceit" and in contrast as well to old Bazarov's aspirations that his son gain some measure of fame and not be swallowed up by provincial obscurity Bazarov begins telling Arkady that he feels cosmically insignificant.

> "The tiny space I occupy is so infinitely small in comparison with the rest of space, in which I am not, and which has nothing to do with me; and the period of time in which it is my lot to live is so petty beside the eternity in which I have not been, and shall not be ... And in this atom, this mathematical point, the blood circulates, the brain works and wants something ... Isn't it hideous? Isn't it petty?" [95]

Had Odintsova and Bazarov gotten along in some other way, say, if Odintsova found fulfillment through a sexual union with Bazarov, he would not feel this, even though it is a natural and essential part of a well-rounded development. He would have found his insignificance mirrored within Odintsova and love instead. But now his brain "wants something" and we can only guess what. Shortly hereafter the friends return to the Kirsanov estate and Bazarov flirts with Fenichka. In the fifth conversation in the hayloft we find out that Bazarov has actually been wounded, even to the point of demanding that a lie be true. Bazarov says that he prides himself on not having crushed himself so a "skirt" cannot crush him.[96] Thus, he wants us to believe that he has not been affected by Odintsova. He wants to maintain that mask of detachment he wears. The real blow which Odintsova delivers to Bazarov does not come until after the duel with Pavel, that is, not for a few weeks. Bazarov's desire "not to have been crushed" is so far

true, even though it contradicts his earlier statement about 'mowing down one's own legs.' The truth of the combined statement is dubious: is it true that if one hasn't crushed oneself then someone else can't crush him? Bazarov's aim, which is to "quarrel for once till we're both laid out dead, until we're destroyed," is not well-met by Arkady, who at first doesn't believe that his friend is serious, and is finally interrupted before any fury is unleashed by the intrusion of Bazarov's father. Bazarov uses Arkady's proclivity to "speak fine words" as an excuse for insulting Arkady. He says Arkady is following in his uncle's footsteps. Although he threatens to resume the fight at a more appropriate time when his father comes in, Bazarov soon forgets his pent-up energy. Perhaps it is dissipated by the return journey to the Kirsanov estate. Arkady has decided by this time not to follow his friend Bazarov anymore. He got the idea during their stay at the Odintsova's estate. Because of the quarrel in the hay Arkady sees that Bazarov is full of contradictions, like other men. The fifth argument is a clash between the contradictory elements of Bazarov's personality. It does not involve the elaborate social themes the other conversations do. However, they are subtly present in the background. The contradictory elements that arise are Bazarov's desire for a woman, preferably Odintsova, against his need to be alone; his desire to be loved

and not to be shown love; his need to be accepted against his father's wish that he be famous; the desire to be at peace with himself against the fury of his personality. In this space between his visits with Odintsova Bazarov begins to dissolve. In the end he will be so weakened by life that, when he learns he will die of blood poisoning, he tells his mother that he merely is suffering from a cold. The argument between Bazarov and Arkady is a symptom of this inner decline. Bazarov must die because he is not prepared for the times and the times, according to Lenin, were not prepared for him.[97] As Irving Howe says,

> The fate of accident that kills him comes only after he has been defeated in every possible social and personal encounter: it is the summation of encounters.[98]

Bazarov has been defeated in the master-disciple relationship with the loss of Arkady. He has been defeated in love and even in sex. He plays cards with Father Alexi at the home of his parents. Contradictions and romanticisms arise in his personality. He becomes a contrite creature before Odintsova during the sixth argument. He even participates in a duel with Pavel, an action which, even though he emerges victorious on the field, signals a defeat of the new in Bazarov by the old in him. His fight with Arkady is the first

step in the decline of the nihilist. Thereafter, he allows his father to bring in the village priest, Father Alexi, and he is even quite civil to the cleric. On the return trip to the Kirsanov estate Bazarov indulges Arkady's desire to stop at the Odintsova estate and meets Odintsova as coldly as she meets him. Needing to be alone he locks himself up in his laboratory at Marino occasionally carrying on hesitant relations with Pavel. His flirtation and duel. His departure to the Odintsova estate and finally his parent's home. Death. Once the spiral of energy, which might have been spent with Odintsova begins to escape, as it does with the quarrel, begins to turn in its eventual course toward death dissipating itself futilely in isolation, we know that Turgenev cannot allow his hero to achieve greatness.

The sixth conversation is a combination of several conversations between several people. It contains the duel, the proposal of marriage between Arkady and Katya, and the climax of Odintsova's and Bazarov's affair. The duel, we said, is the defeat of the progressive elements in Bazarov's personality. Irving Howe puts this defeat in social and political terms. For him Bazarov's defeat is the triumph of the "archaic" elements of Russian society.[99] With Arkady's attachment of his loyalty to Katya he has transferred his hopes and desires in her direction. She has him "at her pretty

feet," as she says. As soon as she accepts him, he no longer thinks of his former teacher. Even after Bazarov's death Arkady does not venture to mention the nihilist's name aloud, when Katya suggests a toast to the teacher at their marriage celebration. When Bazarov returns to Odintsova after the duel, we saw he was a mere shell of what he was before. The themes are continued to their eventual end. The relationship between Nikolai Petrovich and Fenichka is put on firmer ground, when Nikolai proposes marriage. Pavel's anxieties about Fenichka's fidelity are assuaged. This is a partial resolution of the class question in their relationship. The classical elements of Russian culture are covered over and incorporated with the slowly evolving synthesis of indigenous and imitative elements. The character traits of the Man of the Forties found in Nikolai are transferred to Arkady. The stasis of life at Marino is maintained. The pressing areas of reform that Arkady notices at the beginning of the novel are still as apparent now as they were then. Arkady has become, in Bazarov's words, "a jackdaw," "a most respectable family bird;" an old crow. The sixth conversation is the turning-point for the majority of characters, yet nothing is achieved but the death of one nihilist.

This death comes in the final conversation. Bazarov accidentally has contracted blood poisoning and has called Odintsova to his side. He tells her that he is a "hideous

spectacle; the worm half crushed but writhing still." He says that his father will rave about the loss Russia will sustain at his death, but he cautions her that he was not the sort of man Russia needs. The practical and functional men are the ones who are powerful enough together to build a new Russia. This is the final defeat for Bazarov, for he recognizes that he is not fit for his own vision. His final conscious act is to negate his own life. Odintsova's kiss helps to put out the "dying lamp." The death of the visionary nihilist is so much the more tragic, because we know that he never could talk to the peasants. The peasants in fact regarded him as a sort of buffoon.[100] Bazarov never did have his hand on the pulse of Russian society, just as Pavel had said. Although he does not know this specifically, that is, he thinks he has a rapport with the peasants, he knows that he is not in step with the times. He has arrived half a century too early.

This extensive textual analysis of the arguments found in Turgenev's novel Fathers and Sons has proceeded, as we said it would, in as unbiased and objective manner as possible. The class question, probably the most important social problem attacked in the novel, remains unresolved. It provides the anxiety between Fenichka, Pavel, and Nikolai. It is one of the causes for Bazarov's inability to join with

Odintsova. Peasants still try to drown their troubles in liquor at Sitnikov's father's pot-houses. They live lives apart from all other classes with their own rules, their own mythology, and their own thoughts. They serve aristocrats, like Pavel and Odintsova, and die in the same obscurity that takes Bazarov's father. The programs of the Men of the Forties are laughed at by those they seek to help. Only the New Man, the Byronic hero becoming popular in nineteenth century Russian literature, can hope to change the lot of the masses on the bottom of the social pyramid. Bazarov was not pure enough to carry out any of his visions. It will take another fifty years of arguing and revolt to finally break the dam both of government and personality. If Bazarov had been able to find love with Odintsova, perhaps she might have driven him up the path of conviction to the house of gold. But, as it was, he would not let her crush him and thus he would not allow himself to be swallowed up by the blind devotion to reform necessary to alleviate the sufferings of millions. He would not lose himself to love nor to his own vision. The imitative of Western influences on Russian life will continue on, but finally Russia will leap ahead to her fateful series of revolutions. What is necessary is a fundamental love for one's own culture. A love great enough that it can survive even in the presence of foreign elements incorporated by

selection and necessity. Bazarov failed to pass the torch to Arkady partly because the younger man was not sufficiently ideologically prepared to accept it. Instead of finalizing Arkady's position, as any teacher would, Bazarov becomes entrapped in his own contradictory elements. He transfers his attention to Odintsova when Arkady needed it most. Turgenev was completely successful in creating a man "gloomy, wild, great, growing one half of him out of the soil" and yet "doomed to destruction." The times, as Turgenev paints them, are not with Bazarov, "he still stands on the threshold of the future," a future when the class question begins to be resolved.

The structure of the arguments we traced reveals the relationships of the themes represented by each character. Bazarov, the New Man, is defeated by the Westernist, classicist Pavel and by the aristocratic Odintsova. The Man of the Forties succeeds in becoming close to his son, Arkady, and transferring through the agency of Katya his way of life. The purity of love is tarnished by thoughts of social position in Bazarov and Odintsova. Vision and reality clash and inevitably reality wins. Bazarov moves through the arguments at first a victorious master and finally a "worm." The layering of the action, that is, the prelude, climax, and aftermath construction, provide a great deal of momentum to an otherwise 'chatty' novel. As Bazarov moves from character and place

to character and place, he moves from a highly dense atmosphere of ideas, as we saw in the second conversation, to a sparse one, in the home of his parents. The number of ideas discussed in the novel decreases as the number and complexity of the arguments increases. This, as we said before, is as a result of the layering technique. The second conversation in which every theme except love is discussed is a microcosm of the structure of the remainder of the novel. As Bazarov moves through these arguments, each theme in turn is discussed. Slavophilism, Westernism, politics, reform, education, fame and obscurity, love; and always the class question. The pathway through the arguments is an effective means of exploring the themes through the use of characters as thematic representatives.

One of the approaches Turgenev used to understand his own novel is through a duality which he was convinced existed in life. This is the duality described in an article called Hamlet and Don Quixote. The egoist's proclivity for analysis and his absence of conviction comes about, Turgenev explains, because he is preoccupied with finding himself, a being the existence of which he doubts. He is not concerned with exterior conditions or obligations, because he is attracted to the quality of his interior life and his personal situation. The weakness that results from this form of strength is a form of irony for Turgenev. This sort of personality is

represented by the Hamlets.

> The Hamlets are an expression of the basic centripetal force of nature, by virtue of which every living thing regards itself as the center of creation and views everything else as existing only for its sake. [101]

The 'center seeking' force of the egoist is counterbalanced by nature with the Don Quixote, the centrifugal force. For the Don Quixote everything exists for something else.

> These two forces of stagnation and movement, of conservatism and progress, are the basic forces of everything that exists. They explain to us the growth of a flower, and they offer us a clue to an understanding of the development of the most powerful nations. [102]

We have between Hamlet and Don Quixote contrasted the usual dualisms of the West: the 'head' and the 'heart' 'intellect' and 'heart,' movement and stillness, light and dark, life and death. Politically and socially important are the forces of conservatism and progress. In On the Eve the progressive takes precedence over the conservative, while in Rudin and A Nest of Gentry the opposite is true. This principle applies to the individual's relationship to his own life as well.

> Many receive their ideal ready-made, in already constituted, historically-defined forms; they live, making their lives conform to their ideal, occasionally falling away from it under the influence of passions or accidents - but they do not question it; others, on the other hand, subject it to the analysis of their own thoughts. [103]

The contrast is clear in Fathers and Sons. Bazarov and Pavel represent respectively Hamlet and Don Quixote. This should be obvious from our analysis of the second conversation. We saw Pavel surround himself with things that made his life what he wanted it to be. Bazarov thought the ideas that made him what he was. The resolution between the two principles never comes, Turgenev tells us, and this lack of resolve is mirrored by the progress of the novel. Principles for Pavel are higher than his own, personal ego, while for Bazarov, a man used to dealing within the abstractions found in the academy, principles are only ideas and ideas can be changed. This is Bazarov's failure with Odintsova. When confronted with the possibility of making a life-giving step towards love, a romantic, quixotic ideal, he lingers in his own static being. Love for Bazarov and Odintsova would have been the fruition of the progressive ideal, for they would have crossed ideological and class lines to be with each other. They would have mutually transcended themselves in this act. The explanation for Bazarov's death, then, is that it comes to him because he

denies the possibility that love could be motion rather than stasis. He fails to remain true to the movement in his own nature and finds eternal rest with this rejection. The other characters line themselves up according to this structural device quite easily. Arkady, who had been trained to be concerned with the exterior world, has a brief and apparently uneventful interlude with egoism before he returns to his preoccupation with the exterior world. The fact that he becomes a farmer and that the farm becomes a success confirms this opinion, since farming is one of the most powerful exterior tasks we have. It is fitting that he become attached to Katya, who is self-centered and an egoist. Odintsova herself is a quixotic figure remaining in her routine and surrounding herself with decorum. Nikolai lives in a cultured world that he partly makes himself; he too is a Don Quixote. This is true of Bazarov's parents as well. Every character except Bazarov then is convinced that there is a truth outside himself. This truth, of course, is the real nature of the character. The essence of the Don Quixote lies outside himself and in search for this essence the individual denies what is inside. He is not concerned so much with himself as with service to others. His life is valued to the extent that he recognizes this factor. His eyes turn to Bazarov because, being a Hamlet, he is not only different from the Quixotes but

appears to have an answer to that question they habitually ask. Bazarov appears to know what that something they search for is. Throughout the course of the novel one character after another learns that Bazarov actually does not know the secret. And one after another they turn away from him. His knowledge is actually just empty condemnation, which is essentially a static occupation. Had Bazarov been fully a Hamlet he would have given the Quixotes clustered around him the knowledge they asked for. But in order to do this Bazarov would have had to concoct a program for reform. He would provide constructive solutions for the thematic problems undertaken in the novel rather than destructive criticism. When the characters ask him, as Pavel does, 'what should we do?', the true Hamlet would have given them their answer, even though historically it would inevitably be inaccurate and insufficient. Turgenev believes that the Hamlet type provides the basis for tragedy. That Bazarov's life and death are tragic is beyond question. This structuring device - the Hamlet/Don Quixote duality - as provided by Turgenev himself is effective in understanding the thematic and character relations of the novel as well as its narrative movements.

We have shown three different structuring techniques that apply to Fathers and Sons: the pairing device, the layering of arguments or conversations, and the interior-

exterior duality. We have not been original entirely in our demonstration of these devices. P.G. Pustovoyt mentioned the argument technique as early as 1960. He points out, as we did, the extensive use of maxims by Bazarov. These we said lent an air of indigenousness to Bazarov, "growing half of him out of the soil," Pustovoyt said that the maxims function to concentrate the hero's ideas and he is right in bringing this out.[104] He notices in addition that Bazarov is capable of oratorical speech. After quoting Bazarov's speech in the second conversation, he says:

> The syntactical construction of that (his) sentence is itself enough to prove that before us is not an ordinary district doctor but an orator, a tribune, a leader of a certain party (that is, the presence of parallel constructions: "We figured out," "we saw," and before that "we said;" repeated conjunctions "that" and "while").

This method Turgenev uses to mould his characters through their language is subtly and effectively implanted in the novel. The "fine talk" of Arkady moulds his character, just as much as his actions do. The French inflections of Pavel's Russian and the mispronunciations of Vassily Ivanovich, Bazarov's father, indicate one is well-travelled while the other is not. This goes further to plumb the depths of their souls. Vassily Ivanovich has a passion for classical allusions. He

continually compares Arkady and Bazarov and even himself to characters found in Ovid. Odintsova is the portrait of graciousness and her words reflect as much. She speaks gently and with compassion, with interest and curiosity. When Turgenev intrudes on his own narrative by giving histories of characters, he does so from an omniscient position, yet he is careful not to reveal too much thus retaining the suspense of the novel. He chooses particular words that yield a particular associational response in the reader. Pustovoyt mentions Turgenev's sketch of Arina, Bazarov's mother. The use of diminutives, he says, creates the impression of someone "pitiful and insignificant."[106]

> In the same way and with the help of similar diminutives, the author paints a portrait "of a real Russian little gentlewoman of the former, ancient days;" "the door was flung open, plump, short, little old woman in white cap and a short little stipped jacket appeared on the threshold. She oh'd, swayed, and would certainly have fallen had not Bazarov supported her. Her small plump hands were instantly entwined around his neck." (Pustovoyt's italics) [107]

Arina carries out our expectations of her completely. She cries, moans, and prays. Vassily Ivanovich mentions that she wanted a Te Deum sung on Bazarov's return home. She does almost nothing so far as the plot itself is concerned, but

the reader is given a very strong impression of her. This same accuracy of portraiture is found with every other character. We mentioned those of Pavel and Bazarov earlier. Turgenev does not need action to characterize his personalities. He uses his ability to manipulate the language instead. His psychological method lies next to this principle, for he believes, as we said at the outset, that the psychology of the characters he presents should remain out of sight supporting the character invisibly as does a "skeleton." As Matlaw says, "the novels (of Turgenev) catch a personality at a vital moment and expose it to us."[108] This exposure comes through the language Turgenev uses much more than it does through the actions of the characters. Even when the characters tread on the soil of politics in their conversations their words tell us more about them than the political situation.[109] This is not to say that Turgenev was not a politician or aware of his political duty as a novelist. However, as Matlaw suggests, Turgenev may have found it difficult to overcome the lack of synthesis of his artistic and political visions, "that his private dichotomy between politics and aesthetics affects his ability to integrate them artistically."[110] This in addition to the rigorous censorship practiced by the Tsar may have soft-pedalled the overt political aspects of the novel. Also, from the indications we gave earlier, Turgenev was overly fair-minded concerning such exterior factors as Slavophilism.

He preferred to leave this sort of thing to his characters and their fiction. Turgenev, of course, consistently exhibited in the novel the class system as a prevailing evil. The pairing device Turgenev used emphasizes his politics very well, especially through the use of the love relationship. Richard Freeborn pointed this out.[111] The relation of the landowner to the peasant girl, the aristocratic lover to the low-born lover, the principled lover to the unprincipled lover. As Freeborn says, each of these love affairs in some way brings out an aspect of the "conflict between Fathers and the Children."[112] The relationship between Fathers and Children is comprised of the interrelations of the various levels of meaning for the words: between aristocracy and peasantry, between people and government, between the older generation and the younger generation, between two fathers and their sons. Perhaps, we will some day find that these parallel problems have parallel solutions.

In any case, the solutions we will find will, like in this thesis, depend upon the approach to the problems taken. The structure of our answers will partly be determined by the structure of the questions asked. The most objective and universal solution, the one which is the most for all aspects concerned, must spring from an unbiased and uncensored questioning. This is what I have tried to provide in this thesis.

CONCLUSION

An attempt has been made in this thesis to analyse through close text reading the literary techniques used by I.S. Turgenev in Fathers and Sons. It was hoped that by employing this particular method, a deeper insight will be gained into the artistic devices used by the author in his greatest novel, avoiding the pitfalls of irrelevant biographical and political data, which have caused so many critics to misinterpret Fathers and Sons in the past.

One of the major devices used in the novel is the "pairing device" which helps the author establish the themes and, simultaneously, illuminates the characters created. This is a technique unique with Turgenev. The close text reading reveals the fundamental differences between the two generations in their approach to idealism as the most important theme of the novel. These differences appear in the relations of all major pairs of characters (each of whom represents more of an idea than a person); thus, the discussions and arguments remain more in the realm of ideological polemics than in that of personal clashes. Nevertheless, Turgenev is uniquely successful in blending the ideological conflicts with the life of his characters in the novel. The characters and their dialogues always

remain an integral part of the novel's structure and this is what makes Fathers and Sons a great work of fiction although it is almost plotless.

Through a masterful usage of language in a truly Pushkinian tradition, the characters and their backgrounds come to life in the arguments. Turgenev does not have to resort to lengthy descriptions or psychological analyses in order to establish his characters; the language they use becomes a source for the reader giving him all the information he might desire about the character's milieu and his era. Thus, the language becomes the most important structural device in Fathers and Sons. At the same time, Turgenev refrains from didactic commentary; he retains an omniscient authorial style, relating the various opposing viewpoints without expressing his own.

The layering technique is another device employed by Turgenev. By providing each character with a prelude, a quick climax in which the happenings of the prelude are consummated, and a gentle aftermath, the author employs a simple structural form which was already used by Aristotle in his Poetics. In the light of this device, the death of Bazarov, which so many critics considered a facile escape from a probably unavoidable cul-de-sac, becomes logical. The novel itself is the prelude for Bazarov's death, the

moment of death is his climax and the grave is his aftermath.

Finally, one must stress the timelessness of the novel's major themes. They are relevant to any era and the lack of didactics and universal solutions, the fact that the novel does not offer any panaceas for an ailing mankind makes it ambivalent, as any great work of art must be.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Zbigniew Folejewski, The Recent Storm around Turgenev as a Point in Soviet Aesthetics, in Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw (New York, W.W. Norton and Co., 1966) p. 324-325.

[2]Allen Tate, Collected Essays, (Denver, Allan Swallow, 1963) p. 11-12.

[3]Ibid., p. 45.

[4]Victor Erlich, Russian Formalism, (The Hague, Mouton, 1969) p. 20.

[5]F.D. Reeve, The Russian Novel, (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966) p. 124-125.

[6]Ibid., p. 127.

[7]Ibid., p. 129.

[8]I.S. Turgenev, Apropos of Fathers and Sons, in: Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw (New York, W.W. Norton and Co., 1966) p. 170.

[9]René Wellek, Some Principles of Criticism, in: The Critical Moment; Essays on the Nature of Literature, (London, Faber & Faber, 1964) p. 41.

[10]Boris Eichenbaum, Literatura (in Russian), Leningrad, 1927.

[11]Boris Eichenbaum, Lev Tolstoy (in Russian) Leningrad, 1928.

[12]Victor Erlich, op. cit., p. 132.

[13]Victor Erlich, op. cit., p. 133.

[14]Raymond Picard, Critical Trends in France, in: The Critical Moment, Essays on the Nature of Literature, (London, Faber & Faber, 1964) p. 106.

[15]H. Levine, Literature as an Institution, in: The Novelist as Thinker, edited by B. Rajan (London, Denis Dobson Ltd., 1947) p. 142.

[16]Ibid., p. 144.

[17]Allen Tate, Present Function of Criticism, in: R.B. West Jr., Essays in Modern Literary Criticism, (New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961)

[18]Ibid., p. 149-150.

[19]Ray B. West Jr., Essays in Modern Literary Criticism, (New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961) p. 324.

[20]D. Daiches, The Present Age, after 1920, in: Dobrée, Bonamy, Introductions to English Literature, Vol. 5, (London, 1958)

[21]E.M. Forster, Anonymity: an Inquiry (London, Hogarth, Bess, 1925)

[22]René Wellek, op. cit., p. 42.

[23]D. Daiches, op. cit., p. 122.

[24]John Holloway, The Charted Mirror, Literary and Critical Essays, (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960) p. 164.

[25]N. Frye, The Well-Tempered Critic, (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1963) p. 155.

[26]René Wellek, op. cit., p. 43.

[27]E.M. Forster, Aspects of the Novel, (New York, Harcourt, Brase, 1954) p. 96-98.

[28]Henry James, The Art of Fiction, in Ray B. West Jr., op. cit., p. 42.

[29]Eliseo Vivas, The Artistic Transaction, (Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1963) p. 50.

[30]Ibid., p. 159.

[31]Ibid., p. 91.

[32]G. Overton, The Philosophy of Fiction, (New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1928) p. 4.

[33]N. Foerster, The Esthetic Judgment and the Ethical Judgment, in: Ray B. West, op. cit., p. 210, 214.

[34]Eliseo Vivas, op. cit., p. 64.

[35]H. Read, Philosophy of Art, (London, Faber & Faber, 1944) p. 42.

[36]Eliseo Vivas, op. cit., p. 149.

[37]G. Overton, op. cit., p. 355.

[38]L. Teeter, Scholarship and the Art of Criticism, in: English Literary History, September 1938 (Baltimore, John Hopkins Press) p. 192.

[39]P.G. Pustovoyt, Some Features of Composition in Fathers and Sons, in: Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 323.

[40]Ibid., p. 323.

[41]I.S. Turgenev, Apropos of Fathers and Sons, in: Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 171.

[42]Ibid., p. 171.

[43]Irving Howe, Politics and the Novel, (New York, Horizon Press Book, 1957) p. 132.

[44]Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 262.

[45]Ibid., p. 268.

[46]I.S. Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, in: Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 5.

[47]Ibid., p. 9.

[48]Ibid., p. 7-8.

[49]Ibid., p. 8.

[50]Ibid., p. 9.

[51]Ibid., p. 7.

[52]Irving Howe, Turgenev: The Politics of Hesitation, in: Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 300.

[53]I.S. Turgenev, Apropos of Fathers and Sons, in: Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 171. "With the exception of his views on arts, I share all Bazarov's convictions."

[54]I.S. Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, in: Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 24.

[55]Ibid., p. 4.

[56]Ibid., p. 11.

[57]Ibid., p. 11.

[58]Ibid., p. 12.

[59]Ibid., p. 15.

[60]Ibid., p. 17.

[61]Ibid., p. 17.

[62]Ibid., p. 104.

[63]Ibid., p. 24.

[64]Ibid., p. 19.

[65]Ibid., p. 25.

[66]Ibid., p. 37.

[67]Ibid., p. 37.

[68]Ibid., p. 37.

[69]Ibid., p. 37.

[70]Ibid., p. 38.

[71]Ibid., p. 38.

[72]Ibid., p. 38.

[73]Ibid., p. 39.

[74]Ibid., p. 40-41.

[75]Ibid., p. 41.

[76]Ibid., p. 42.

[77]Ibid., p. 42.

[78]Ibid., p. 43.

[79]Ibid., p. 43.

[80]Ibid., p. 52.

[81]Ibid., p. 54.

[82]Ibid., p. 53.

[83]Ibid., p. 54.

[84]Ibid., p. 58.

[85]Ibid., p. 69.

[86]Ibid., p. 70.

[87]Ibid., p. 74.

[88]Ibid., p. 70.

[89]Ibid., p. 73.

[90]Ibid., p. 73.

[91]Ibid., p. 73.

[92]Ibid., p. 78.

[93]Ibid., p. 141.

[94]Ibid., p. 82.

[95]Ibid., p. 102.

[96]Ibid., p. 102 (paraphrase)

[97]Irving Howe, Politics and the Novel, op. cit., p. 119 (paraphrase)

[98]Ibid., p. 133.

[99]Ibid., p. 130 (paraphrase)

[100]I.S. Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, in: Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 151-152.

[101]I.S. Turgenev, Hamlet and Don Quixote, in: Sobraniye Sochineniy N.L. Brodskogo, (1949), 11 volumes. Extracts in: Literary Reminiscences and Autobiographical Fragments, translated by David Magarshack (New York, Farrar, Strauss and Cudahy, 1958) p. 180.

[102]Ibid., p. 180.

[103]Ibid., p. 169.

[104]P.G. Pustovoyt, op. cit., p. 315.

[105]Ibid., p. 316.

[106]Ibid., p. 322.

[107]Ibid., p. 322.

[108]Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 271.

[109]Ibid., p. 266. (paraphrase)

[110]Ibid., p. 266.

[111]Richard Freeborn, The Structure of Fathers and Sons, in: Ralph E. Matlaw, op. cit., p. 292-294.

[112]Ibid., p. 292.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1953.

Booth, Wayne C. The Rhetoric of Fiction, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Chatman, Seymour and Levin, Samuel R. eds. Essays on the Language of Literature, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1967.

Eichenbaum, Boris. Literatura. (in Russian), Leningrad: 1927.

Eichenbaum, Boris. Lev Tolstoy. (in Russian), Leningrad: 1928.

Eliot, T.S. Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism, New York, Barnes and Noble Books, 1950.

Folejewski, Zbigniew. The Recent Storm around Turgenev as a Point in Soviet Aesthetics, in: Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1966.

Foerster, N. The Esthetic Judgment and the Ethical Judgment in: Ray B. West Jr., Essays in Modern Literary Criticism. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Forster, E.M. Anonymity: an Inquiry, London: Hogarth, Bess, 1925.

Forster, E.M. Aspects of the Novel, New York: Harcourt Brase, 1954.

Freeborn, Richard. The Structure of Fathers and Sons, in Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1966.

Freeborn, Richard. Turgenev, the Novelist's Novelist, London, Oxford University Press, 1960.

Frye, Northrop. Anatomy of Criticism, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1971.

Frye, Northrop. The Critical Path, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1971.

Frye, N. The Well-Tempered Critic, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1963.

Holloway, John. The Charted Mirror, Literary and Critical Essays, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960.

Howe, Irving. Politics and the Novel, New York, Horizon Press Book, 1957.

Howe, Irving. Turgenev: The Politics of Hesitation, in: Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1966.

Istorya Russkovo Romana (in two volumes) Leningrad, ANSSR, 1962.

James, Henry. The Art of Fiction, in: Ray B. West Jr., Essays in Modern Literary Criticism, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Langer, Susanne K. Philosophy in a New Key, Harvard, Harvard University Press, 1942.

Levine, H. Literature as an Institution, in: The Novelist as Thinker, edited by B. Rajan, London: Denis Dobson Ltd., 1947.

Lubbock, Percy. The Craft of Fiction, New York, Viking Press, 1957.

Matlaw, Ralph E. Turgenev's Novels and Fathers and Sons, in: Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw, New York, W.W. Norton, 1966.

Mirsky, D.S. A History of Russian Literature From its Beginnings to 1900, New York, Vintage Books, 1958.

Picard, Raymond. Critical Trends in France, in: The Critical Moment, Essays on the Nature of Literature. London: Faber & Faber, 1964.

Pospelov, G.N. Istorya Russkoy Literatury XIX veka, Moskva, Izdatelstvo Moskovskovo Universiteta, 1962.

Pustovoyt P.G. Roman I.S. Turgeneva "Ottsy i deti" i ideynaya borba 60ykh godov XIX veka, Moskva, Izdatelstvo Moskovskovo Universiteta, 1965.

Pustovoyt, P.G. Some Features of Composition in Fathers and Sons, in: Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw, New York, W.W. Norton and Co., 1966.

Read, H. Philosophy of Art, London: Faber & Faber, 1944.

Reeve, F.D. The Russian Novel, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Stevick, Philip. The Theory of the Novel, New Jersey, Free Press, 1967.

Tate, Allen. Collected Essays, Denver: Allan Swallow, 1963.

Tate, Allen. Present Function of Criticism, in: Ray B. West Jr., Essays in Modern Literary Criticism. New York, Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Teeter, L. Scholarship and the Art of Criticism, in: English Literary History, September, 1938, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Timofeev, L.I. Osnovy Teorii Literatury, Moskva, Uchpedgiz 1963.

Turgenev, I.S. Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1966.

Turgenev, I.S. Hamlet and Don Quixote, in: Sobraniye Sochineniy N.L. Brodskogo, (1949) 11 volumes. Extracts in: Literary Reminiscences and Autobiographical Fragments, translated by David Magarshack, New York: Farrar, Strauss & Cudahy, 1958.

Turgenev, I.S. Apropos of Fathers and Sons, in: Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1966.

Turgenev, I.S. Letters, in: Ivan Turgenev, Fathers and Sons, edited by Ralph E. Matlaw, New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1966.

Turgenev, I.S. Sobranye sochineniy v dvenadtsati tomakh Moskva, Gosudarstvennoye Izdatelstvo Khudozhestvennoy Literatury, 1954.

Vivas, Eliseo. The Artistic Transaction, Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1963.

Wellek, René. Concepts of Criticism, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1963.

Wellek, René. Some Principles of Criticism, in: The Critical Moment, Essays on the Nature of Literature.

Wellek, René and Warren, Austin. Theory of Literature, New York, Harcourt, Brace & World Inc., 1956.

West, Ray B. Jr. Essays in Modern Literary Criticism. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.