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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is an interpretive one: to elucidate certain themes in Turgenev's mature writings which are rarely investigated in depth or with a proper sense of their development and interaction and which may be broadly termed 'transcendental'; and to review what might be called the semantic thrust of Turgenev's works taken as a whole in the light of these newly emphasized transcendental themes.

The term 'transcendental' seems particularly appropriate because, apart from one basic meaning of 'transcending the empirical world, although not imperceptible to it', it connotes the primacy of the suprapersonal sphere over the individual, an area of constant interest to Turgenev.

A pivot on which the transcendental themes in Turgenev's works turn is the quest for faith in something outside the phenomenal self and for the подвиг which that faith can inspire. It is around this pivotal theme that this dissertation is constructed, with the related transcendental themes being examined as they develop.

In Rudin an idealist basis for faith is explored, a rational mysticism which accommodates a rather romantic concept of fate and an underdeveloped sense of cryptic supernatural agencies; in A Nest of Gentry Christian mysticism is turned to as a basis for faith, with 'fate' being replaced...
by the Orthodox God, and the inadequacy of conventional
materialism as a basis for meaningful living being more
expressly accented; romantic nationalism is in focus as the
main suprapersonal demand on the characters in On the Eve,
although the claims of superstitious pessimism, of belief
in cryptic supernatural agencies merely hinted at in Rudin,
are becoming more obtrusive; Fathers and Sons, providing an
exegesis of the collapse of the materialist world-view as an
acceptable basis for living and acting, is pervaded by a
deepening pessimism about human existence, relieved by a
glimmer of interest in occult alternatives to materialism;
this interest is seen to deepen and broaden over the next
fifteen years with the publication of the so-called 'mysterious
tales' where the approach to occult, religious and other
extramundane phenomena becomes almost empirical, although
embodied in an often romantic, usually fantastic or
supernaturally realistic form; in Virgin Soil romantic
idealism and positivistic realism come into acute conflict,
centering once more on the question of the possibility of
faith; and in Turgenev's works of the final years it is death
together with its antidotes and palliatives, both rational
and transcendental, which form the dominant area of concern.

Interwoven with this main thematic line of development
are the major related themes such as self-gratifying love as
opposed to self-surrendering love, dedication to person as
opposed to dedication to the suprapersonal ideal, religious
interpretations of reality, the futility of material existence,
the problem of death, duty as a moral fixity and the question
of how to act.
The method of investigation adopted is to examine in turn each of Turgenev's novels and certain relevant stories and to interpret the evidence found in each work of the evolution of Turgenev's concepts of the transcendental, supporting the conclusion with biographical information about the author drawn from his published correspondence, from recognized biographies and the reminiscences and memoirs of contemporaries, together with a comparison of other interpretations in Russian and some other periodicals over the past century or more.

An interpretive exercise of this nature appears justified on several counts. Firstly, Turgenev's transcendental themes receive the scantest scholarly attention, in contrast to such themes as nihilism, the 'superfluous man', or Turgenev's attitudes to social movements such as slavophilism, the emancipation of the serfs or populism. In his Взгляд на русскую литературу 1847 года Belinskii defined Turgenev's talent as a descriptive and realist one, devoid of lyricism, imagination or fantasy (and admirable on that account)\(^1\), and this particularly inappropriate description of Turgenev's talent appears to have never quite lost its currency. The few critics or commentators such as N. Ammon\(^2\), L.V. Pumpsianskii\(^3\), and, more recently, A. Walicki\(^4\) and E. Kagan-Kans\(^5\), who have analyzed the transcendental themes with a proper sense of their significance and complexity, while affording the student of Turgenev valuable perspectives, have in general either devoted themselves to a restricted area of Turgenev's work or been anxious to integrate Turgenev into a strongly held world-view of their own, and there remains much scope for the student who is endeavouring to work towards a more synoptic
interpretation of the transcendental thematic line in Turgenev's mature works.

Secondly, there is a continuing need for a more scientific approach to Turgenev's works as verbal and syntactical entities in order to understand them more clearly as semantic entities, and consequently for some clarification of terminology. 'Supernatural', 'fantastic', 'mysterious' and 'mysticism', for example, are terms which have been used rather loosely in critical material on Turgenev's work, particularly in connection with the 'mysterious tales', with the result that the distinction between genres has become blurred and this in turn has introduced some confusion into the discussion of the works' meaning.

Thirdly, apart from numerous references to Turgenev's affinities to Schopenhauer in certain points, there has been a widespread refusal to acknowledge in Turgenev the thinker as well as the commentator on socio-political phenomena, or to recognize in his works any real philosophical substructure, particularly of a non-materialist nature. This tendency has by no means been confined to writers from one epoch or of one political persuasion. Turgenev's contemporary and acquaintance Afanasii Fet declared in 1890 that 'у [Тургенева] . . . не хватало формального математического и философского ума', and both Nikolai Strakhov and Pavel Annenkov made similar assessments of Turgenev's qualities as a thinker as opposed to those of an artist, of his contemplative capacities as opposed to his powers of observation. ٧ Iurii Aikhennval'd, writing early this century, was blunter: 'Тургенев не глубок', he wrote, seeing in him little more than a graceful aquarellist. ٨
Even M. Gershenzon, writing just after the Revolution, took a simplistic view of Turgenev as philosopher, asserting that his 'whole philosophy' could be reduced to 'one question and the answer to this question' ("должен ли человек быть "природой" или личностью?"). André Maurois spoke of Turgenev in a similar vein in a lecture he gave in 1930: "Tourguéniev ne fait aucun effort pour "comprendre la vie". Il n'a pas de morale à nous proposer, pas de métaphysique, pas de doctrine philosophique. Ce n'est pas son métier... Tourguéniev nous apporte un des meilleurs exemples de ce que peut être le roman pur." N. Brodiansky, writing in The Slavonic and East European Review in the mid-fifties, and perhaps confusing a philosophy of life with philosophy as an academic pursuit, stated that 'any attempt to extract a philosophy from Turgenev's writings must necessarily fail, for his conclusions are invariably modified by his recognition of the limitations of human knowledge and his dislike of theorizing. His faith in philosophy as an explanation of life was shortlived; by 1848, if not earlier, he was deriding it... Brodiansky affirmed that Turgenev's talent was one of observation rather than contemplation: of Turgenev and Pushkin he wrote that 'these two most "European" writers possessed in common a fundamental agnosticism together with a lively interest in life, its reality, its caprices, its accidents..., as opposed to the metaphysical mind.' Brodiansky was echoing an opinion expressed by E.A. Solov'ev a half a century earlier: 'Интерес, привязанность, любовь ко всему земному отличительная черта Тургенева, как художника. Он никогда не увлекался вопросами религии, сомнениями и исканиями в её области.'
Another modern commentator, J.H. Billington, in his book *The Icon and the Axe*, assigns Turgenev a place alongside Nekrasov and the decembrists in the 'stream of thought' headed by Radishchev rather than in the company of Lermontov, Tiutchev and Dostoevskii in the stream of 'Russia's alienated metaphysical poets' headed by Skovoroda. One of the purposes of this dissertation is to investigate the validity of this view of Turgenev, to posit certain basic elements in a philosophical substructure, particularly where these elements concern religious attitudes, and to trace their development over the decades.

The first work by Turgenev to be studied here is *Rudin*. There are several reasons for the choice of this novel, rather than earlier stories, as the starting point in the investigation: *Rudin*, being his first novel and first lengthy ideological exercise, may be seen as marking the beginning of Turgenev's artistic maturity, the setting of his own intellectual course in matters of themes, ideas and heroic prototypes, and the birth of a new and more sophisticated idealism; in addition, 1855 proved to be a year of review and reassessment of past intellectual and artistic positions for Turgenev, the result to a large degree of the disintegration of the *Contemporary* circle, and the introspection forced on him by his exile at Spasskoe. For these reasons *Rudin* provides the researcher into Turgenev's mature thematic preoccupations with an excellent point of departure.

'A moins de devenir parfaitement insensible ou d'être né parfaitement insouciant,' Turgenev wrote to Pauline Viardot in July 1849, 'le mysticisme, la foi immense et vague, est
encore peut-être le seul refuge qui reste aux hommes . . . 15

This dissertation is an attempt to chronicle his exhaustive search for this 'seul refuge', especially in its more cryptic aspects.

Footnotes

1 In V.G. Белинский: Собрание сочинений в трех томах, Volume 3 (Moscow, 1948), pp.831-3.
2 See his 'Неведомое' в поэзии Тургенева', Журнал министерства народного просвещения, 1904, No. 4.
3 See his 'Группа "тайственных повестей"', in И.С. Тургенев: Сочинения, Volume 8 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1929), and 'Тургенев-новеллист', ibid., Volume 7.
4 See his 'Turgenev and Schopenhauer', Oxford Slavonic Papers, Volume 10 (1962).
5 See her articles 'Fate and fantasy: a study of Turgenev's fantastic stories', Slavic Review, Volume 27 (1969), No. 4, and 'Turgenev, the metaphysics of an artist, 1818-1883', Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique, Volume 13 (July-September 1972), No. 3.
6 Мои воспоминания 1848-1889, Volume 1 (Moscow, 1890), p.270.
8 'Тургенев', in his Силуэты русских писателей, vypusk 2 (Moscow, 1908), p.138.
9 Мечта и мысль И.С. Тургенева (Moscow, 1919), p.111.
11 'Turgenev's Short Stories: A Revaluation', The Slavonic and East European Review, Volume 32 (1953-4), No. 78, p.86.
12 Ibid., p.73.
13 Опыт философии русской литературы (Petersburg, 1905), p.205.
CHAPTER ONE

RUDIN

In the summer of 1855, with the Crimean war raging in the south and a cholera epidemic ravaging the population of his own province, Turgenev sat down and wrote an 'étude psychologique', as he later called Rudin, about man's need for faith in a world of debilitating doubt, analyzing with nostalgic sympathy the faith of a Russian romantic of the 1830s in suprapersonal ideals which enlightened opinion had long held to be illusory and quite possibly harmful.

Critics from the date of Rudin's publication to the present have by and large been concerned with exploring the novel's social implications, defining the hero's literary lineage and weighing him in all manner of social and philosophical balances (and generally finding him wanting). It has consequently been widely overlooked that the ideological matrix of the whole novel is the scene in Dar'ia Mikhailovna Lasunskai'a's drawing-room where Rudin and Pegasov first clash. In this scene, the crux of which is Rudin's declamation on faith, the keynote of the hero's ideological make-up is struck, establishing the tonality of the composition as a whole.

It is in the first altercation with Pegasov, the personification of doubt and therefore a Mephistophelian...
character in Rudin's eyes, that Rudin gives eloquent expression to the theme of the necessity of faith in principles outside one's self, arguing, rather speciously, that everyone must have convictions of some kind, or else life becomes unlivable. Some phenomena must be accepted as facts and believed in. The fact of faith is even portrayed as being of primary importance, while the precise objects of the faith are glossed over. What does gradually become plain in Rudin, however, is that the objects of faith must belong to a suprapersonal, ideal realm which interacts in an unexplained, yet not necessarily preternatural, way with the personal and actual.

Man must have a rational basis for living in which he believes and which extends beyond himself, Rudin argues in response to Pigasov's 'I believe in nothing':

At this point Pigasov opts out of the argument.

In other words, Rudin maintains that without faith in external (although not specifically transcendental) principles -- and, implicitly, in their rationality, their 'scientific' nature -- one cannot have any faith in one's own powers to do anything, in the meaning of doing anything for others, whether in the form of society, one's country, or mankind at large. Scepticism -- lack of faith in outside principles -- inevitably
character in Rudin's eyes, that Rudin gives eloquent expression to the theme of the necessity of faith in principles outside one's self, arguing, rather speciously, that everyone must have convictions of some kind, or else life becomes unlivable. Some phenomena must be accepted as facts and believed in. The fact of faith is even portrayed as being of primary importance, while the precise objects of the faith are glossed over. What does gradually become plain in Rudin, however, is that the objects of faith must belong to a suprapersonal, ideal realm which interacts in an unexplained, yet not necessarily preternatural, way with the personal and actual.

Man must have a rational basis for living in which he believes and which extends beyond himself, Rudin argues in response to Pigasov's 'I believe in nothing':

... все эти нападения на системы, на общее рассуждения и так далее потому особенно огорчительны, что вместе с системами люди отрицают вообще знание, науку и веру в неё, стало быть, и веру в самих себя, в свои силы. А людям нужна эта вера: им нельзя жить одними впечатлениями, им грехно бояться мысли и не доверять ей ... Повторю, если у человека нет крепкого начала, в которое он верит, нет почвы, на которой он стоит твердо, как может он дать себе отчет в потребностях, в значении, в будущности своего народа? Как может он знать, что он должен сам делать, если ... (6: 263)

At this point Pigasov opts out of the argument.

In other words, Rudin maintains that without faith in external (although not specifically transcendent) principles -- and, implicitly, in their rationality, their 'scientific' nature -- one cannot have any faith in one's own powers to do anything, in the meaning of doing anything for others, whether in the form of society, one's country, or mankind at large. Scepticism -- lack of faith in outside principles -- inevitably
leads, according to Rudin's reasoning, to absorption in the
only thing one is left with -- one's own self. 'Скептицизм
всегда отличался бесплодностью и бессилием,' Rudin warns
Pigasov (6: 263). Turgenev made the same point in a letter
to Valentine Delessert some years later (8(20) September 1863):
'l'incertitude est l'état de l'âme le moins propre à la
production'.

Pigasov derives his standard from 'изучение собственного сердца, в котором я с каждым днем открываю всё более и более дряни' (6: 265). His philosophical position has overtones of a nascent rational egoism, which he puts into words, rather banally, as follows: '... самолюбие -- это я понимаю, и вы, надеюсь, понимаете, и всякий понимает; а истина -- что такое истина? Где она, эта истина?' (6: 266). (Rudin, in point of fact, recognizes that самолюбие can be a positive force if mastered and forced to serve the common good.
Себялюбие, however, is suicide and 'себялюбивый человек
засыхает словно одинокое бесплодное дерево' (6: 267).)

Both Pigasov and Lezhnev are the products of the revival
of rationalist, materialist Enlightenment attitudes in the
1840s in Russia. Schelling's philosophy has been cast off as
too transcendental, but not replaced by any new credo. They
are at the stage Turgenev himself was at when he wrote to
Pauline Viardot 26 November (8 December) 1847: 'Il n'y a plus
ni Dieu ni Diable, et l'avènement de l'Homme est encore loin',
and only Feuerbach offered any hope of filling the bill. There
is little difference between the Mephistophelian Pigasov and
the 'cynic' Lezhnev, according to Rudin. In both Pigasov's and
Lezhnev's attitudes of doubt and cynicism, he explains to
Dar'ia Mikhailovna, there is 'much egotism, much self-love and little truth, little love' (6: 278). (Rudin's use of the word 'love' here to mean both a selfless giving of oneself to others and something irreconcilable with doubt is revealing.) Lezhnev himself comes to recognize in Rudin a quality of spiritual fervour and intensity lacking in himself, yet having great value. He calls it more prosaically 'энтузиазм': 'В нем есть энтузиазм; а это, поверьте мне, флегматическому человеку, самое драгоценное качество в наше время', he says to Basistov (6: 348).

His faith is Don Quixote's greatest distinguishing characteristic, according to Turgenev, his 'вера в начто вечное, незыблемое, в истину . . ., находящуюся вне отдельного человека' coming first in the list of his outstanding positive qualities (8: 173). On the other hand 'безверье' is one of Hamlet's main distinguishing traits (8: 174). In this sense Rudin, for whom faith in suprapersonal ideals is the primary consideration and questions of 'will' or 'action' of secondary importance, is a Quixotic figure. In 1860, the year his essay 'Гамлет и Дон-Никот' was published and the growing rift between The Contemporary's 'aesthetes' and its utilitarians was forcing some polarization of ideas and sensibilities, Turgenev saw fit to add an epilogue reinforcing Rudin's Quixotic image and deepening the thrust of the novel's arguments on faith. 4

Since Rudin is a Quixotic figure in Turgenev's terms, it is important to examine further what those terms were. By and large, Turgenev's ideas about Cervantes' hero were in line with those of other nineteenth-century European romantics (the Schlegel brothers, Sismondi, Schelling, Byron and others) who
saw Don Quixote in a sympathetic light as the incarnation of poetic enthusiasm, of unselfed striving for the ideal in conflict with prosaic reality. Turgenev was of course as acquainted with Heine's view of Don Quixote as a mockery of blind exaltation and romantic excess as he was with the Schlegel brothers' more sympathetic ideas, so that a Quixotic hero who is neither an ecstatic paean to idealism nor a pastiche on the romantic phrasemonger was not altogether unexpected; however, the 1860 additions to *Rudin* do underline Rudin's positive qualities in the spirit of the more single-minded theses of his essay 'Гамлет и Дон-Кихот'.

It is interesting to note that the controversy over Rudin between those who saw him as a 'positive' and those who saw him as a 'negative' figure in fact paralleled an earlier conflict about Don Quixote. This is not surprising considering the parallels in historical background. *Don Quixote* was originally written as a satire on knightly novels in Spain and her colonies, serving, most effectively, as it turned out, as a blow against the romantic epidemic so harmful to youth at a time when the feudal order was breaking up and a new spirit of realism was needed. These historical facts in no way prevented the hero from serving as a model of self-sacrificing idealism to a later European generation with different spiritual needs. So it was in Russia at an equivalent stage: for some, such as Belinskii, Gertsen, the so-called revolutionary democrats and Saltykov-Shchedrin, Don Quixote was a weak, impractical figure, a Utopian out of touch with reality, and Soviet critics, true to their heritage, have tended to see Rudin in the same light; for others, such as the Slavophils, Dostoevskii, Merezhkovskii,
Viacheslav Ivanov, Turgenev himself (despite Belinskii's position) and even Maksim Gor'kii in his role as revolutionary romantic, Quixotic idealism evoked sympathy and admiration.

The most directly Quixotic part of the Epilogue is undoubtedly the final scene of Rudin's death on the Parisian barricades. Some see the death of this 'tall man in an old overcoat, belted with a red scarf, and a straw hat on his greying, tousled head', with a red flag in one hand and a 'crooked and blunt sword' in the other (6: 368), as no more than the fulfilment of Rudin's own prophecies, firstly in his confessional letter to Natasha to the effect that he would end up by sacrificing himself 'за какой-нибудь вздор, в который даже верить не буду' (6: 337) and secondly during his talk with Lezhnev in the hotel at S... where he says with foreboding 'кончу я скверно' (6: 367). Others would hesitate to call the 1848 revolution so unequivocally 'какой-нибудь вздор', seeing Rudin's stand on the Paris barricades and eventual death more compassionately as a Quixotic act which was absurd, perhaps, to the world's Hamlets (and Gertsens), but also noble. Rudin's final act may seem senseless if taken in isolation, but, significantly enough, it is not senseless to the idealist perception, which takes an organic view of man and the world, the individual and history. Rudin's act is in deep accord with the idea of self-sacrifice and the sense of duty to some principle greater than one's own existence, which are both leading points in Turgenev's exegesis of the Quixotic character. The other defenders of the barricade -- those still alive after a cannon attack -- had fled, 'thinking only of saving themselves' (6: 368), but Rudin stayed, true to his ideals, and died for them.
Lezhnev had defended Rudin earlier in the Epilogue on the grounds of his selflessness and self-sacrifice:

The obvious attempt in the Epilogue to show that Rudin not only professed high ideals but also acted in accordance with them again harmonizes with the new Quixotic colouring for, as Turgenev emphasized in his essay (8: 191), the one enduring thing in life, the only thing that does not become 'smoke', is in fact good, or loving, deeds. Yet, as M.O. Gershenzon clearly saw, an important point in Turgenev's ethic, reflected in both Rudin and the 'Гамлет и Дон-Михот' essay, is that if the ideal is good and the striving purged of selfishness, the practical achievement is secondary.

Rudin's idealism, or rational mysticism, certainly produces deeds, although, as in so many of Turgenev's works, the dynamism is often concealed by superficial tranquillity. It is significant that Rudin's culminating deed is carried out in France, land of revolutionary deeds, rather than in Germany, land of thought, or his native Russia. In his melancholy conversation with Lezhnev in the provincial hotel room, Rudin gives several examples of his enormous propensity for social action -- he tries his hand at agronomy, at turning a river into a navigable waterway, at teaching literature and, as it
transpires, at many other occupations as well. Although he
does not bring in the millenium, solve the problem of how to
apply ideals most pragmatically to reality or reconcile
personal happiness with dedication to the good of all mankind,
he cannot, in his retouched form, be accused of being a man of
words and no deeds. As Lezhnev says to him, when he accuses
himself of never being able to achieve anything,

Другой бы умер давно ... Ты сделал, что мог,
боролся пока мог ... Чего же больше? ... 
благодаря моему состоянию, холодной крови да другим
счастливым обстоятельствам, ничто мне не мешало
сидеть сиднем да оставаться зрителем, сложив руки,
а ты должен был выйти на поле, засучить рукава,
трудиться ... (6: 366)

In this novel it is Lezhnev who most nearly approaches the
figure of the superfluous man, the non-actor and the symbol of
the barrenness of the Pokorskii circles in real life. By
comparison with Lezhnev, Rudin is a whirlwind of activity.

Rudin himself was nevertheless well aware of the conflict
between words and deeds. His acquaintance with Hegel's theory
of thesis and antithesis would have given added legitimacy to
the time-honoured dichotomy. When Natal'ia reproached him
during their first walk in the garden with wanting to rest from
his labours, urging him to keep toiling and trying to be useful,
Rudin immediately seized on the point of the rebuke: while his
words rouse to action, he himself is ready to throw in the
towel. 'Да, я должен действовать. Я не должен расстрачивать
свои силы на одну болтовню, пустую, бесполезную болтовню, на
одни слова,' he said (6: 282-3). And then, ironically, 'слова
его полились рекою'.

In his last conversation with Lezhnev in the Epilogue
Rudin also admits bitterly: 'Фраза, точно, меня сгубила, она
заяла меня, я до конца не мог от нее отделаться' (6: 365).
Both Natal'ia and Lezhnev accuse Rudin of inconsistency in terms of the 'words and deeds' formula. One of the main points in Lezhnev's early criticism of Rudin to Aleksandra Pavlovna was concerned with Rudin's failure to act on his words: '... в его года стыдно тешиться шумом собственных речей,' observes Lezhnev (6: 293). 'Дело в том, что слова Рудина так и остаются словами и никогда не станут поступком -- а между тем эти самые слова могут смутить, погубить молодое сердце' (6: 294). The молодое сердце in question herself reproaches Rudin stingingly with this flaw in his behaviour: '... верно, от слова до дела еще далеко' (6: 324).

Natal'ia feels she was led on by Rudin's eloquence on the subject of self-sacrifice, only to discover that Rudin himself was too weak to live up to his own ideals. 'Вперед, пожалуйста, взвешивайте ваши слова, не произносите их на ветер,' she remarks icily at the rendezvous beside Avdiukhin pond (6: 325).

Yet, at a later stage (although still in the earlier version) when Rudin was no longer a threat to his own romantic interests, Lezhnev saw the question of 'words and deeds' in a rather different light. In his toast to his erstwhile rival, he asks his friends:

Кто вправе сказать, что он не принесет, не принес уже пользы? что его слова не заронили много добрых семян в молодые души, которым природа не отказалла, как ему, в силе деятельности, в умении исполнять собственные замыслы? Да я сам, я первый, все это испытал на себе ... (6: 348)

Lezhnev goes even further in his final conversation with Rudin in the Epilogue, trying to comfort Rudin who is so depressed about his failure to achieve anything in life despite his
dedication to grand ideals, saying to himself 'Слова, всё слова! дел не было!' (6:364): 'Но доброе слово -- тоже дело,' Lezhnev insists (6: 365).

Rudin himself, for all his self-doubt and self-criticism, seems to have distinguished right from the start between empty words and phrase-mongery on the one hand and 'дельные слова' on the other. He warns the sceptic Pigasov, for example, against airily dismissing another's idealistic words as 'just a lot of talk', remarking that '... говоря: "Это всё слова!" -- мы часто сами желаем отделаться от необходимости сказать что-нибудь подельнее одних слов' (6: 263). Later in the account of the same conversation in Dar'ia Mikhailovna's drawing-room it is emphasized that Rudin 'говорил умно, горячо, дельно' (6: 264) and, again, 'Рудин заговорил о самолюбии, и очень дельно заговорил' (6: 267).

However ill-defined or abstract the ideals Rudin has faith in, they produce more concrete acts than those of any subsequent hero in Turgenev's novels, and words which transform and uplift characters around him. As I. Panaev was at pains to point out in his tale 'Родственники' which was published in No.1-2 of The Contemporary for 1847 and which treats many of the same themes as Turgenev's later novel (ch. 4), the inability to act is characteristic of the men of the thirties who failed to absorb Hegel and come down to earth, remaining in the realm of Schelling, Schiller and German romanticism, rather than of those who grappled with the problem of relating their ideals to reality with Hegel's help. The two groups should not be confused. Rudin was certainly acquainted at least to some degree with Hegel, as transpired from his argument with
Pigasov (6: 266), although his acquaintance is reflected perhaps more in his philosophical method than in his ideas of reality.

Another basic trait of the Quixotic type, according to Turgenev's essay, is that of will as opposed to knowledge. The aspiration, the channeling of the desires towards an ideal goal, is all-important, while cogitation or informed reasoning may actually hinder the realization of the ideal. Rudin fits this pattern perfectly. Lezhnev states quite clearly on the basis of his acquaintance with Rudin in their student days that he is 'не очень сведущ' but 'любит пожить на чужой счет', intellectually speaking (6: 293). Rudin's faith in supra-personal ideals gives rise to the will to act, although he is almost never given credit for it.

He is much more often seen as weak-willed, spineless and characterless. Soviet critics such as A. Tseitlin and E.M. Efimova consider that Rudin's weakness of character is an important factor in his ineffectuality, to be considered on the same level as the historically determined ideological error of holding to idealist abstractions which have no application to real life. The nineteenth century critic Iurii Nikolaev is even more severe in his judgment, calling Rudin 'morally castrated'. Western critics have not tended to be much kinder. Freeborn finds Rudin 'faint-hearted', Granjard speaks of his 'âme faible' and Yarmolinsky calls him 'spineless'. Natal'ia also accuses Rudin of being 'малодушный' towards the close of their painful rendezvous at Avdiukhin pond (6: 326), meaning, presumably, that Rudin has not had the strength of character to take up the challenge and elope with her, but has submitted
to fate instead. As she goes off hurriedly across the fields, Rudin appears to accept her evaluation of his character, saying to himself admiringly: 'Она замечательная девушка. Накая сила воли!' In the same vein Rudin says of himself on a later occasion: 'выдержки во мне не было!.. Строить я никогда ничего не умел... почвы-то под ногами нету' (6: 357).

Yet these conclusions about Rudin's lack of will may reflect Schellingian and Hegelian metaphysical categories, not to mention the historically influential views of the revolutionary democrats of the sixties, rather than fact. According to Stankevich's Schellingian metaphysical system, for instance, man's three life forces were сознание, воля and чувство. Сознание and воля were to serve the all-encompassing laws of чувство perceived as love.7 It is therefore quite understandable that Rudin should have had recourse to the term 'воля' to help himself comprehend, and categorize, his situation. Hegel's dialectic method would have lent added support to the old romantic division between the 'will' and the 'act', a division which the anti-Hegelian Schopenhauer was to attempt to abolish.

Does Rudin really lack воля or basic strength of character? There is, on the contrary, evidence that he is an exceptionally волевой individual, lacking not воля, but direction for his воля. The power and desire to act, comprising the will to act, are both present in Rudin to a strong degree. As he writes in his confessional letter to Natal'ia of his desire to act: 'Я отдыхаюсь весь, с жадностью, вполне -- и не могу отаться' (6:337).

He goes on to acknowledge that nature has richly endowed him with the requisite strength: 'Я умру, не сделав ничего достойного сил моих'; and on the same note he says to Lezhnev
years later: 'не мог же я не чувствовать в себе присутствия сил, не всем людям данных! Отчего же эти силы остаются бесплодными?' (6: 364) In the Epilogue even Lezhnev recognizes the basic will to do, and potentiality for, good in Rudin: 'Сил в тебе так много, стремление к идеалу такое неутомимое' (6: 364). Rudin's problem is less lack of 'will' or strength of character than an inability to bring his ideals down to earth.

As in the later novels, the question of faith in an ideal suprapersonal order is the primary one in Rudin, and questions of 'acting' or 'will' are secondary, as they are in Turgenev's Don Quixote archetype.

** * * * * * * * **

What is the nature of the ideals in which Rudin appears to have such towering faith and which set him apart from his contemporaries, disabused of their earlier idealist fancies by their growing acceptance of materialistic, socially oriented thinkers such as Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Feuerbach? There is little point in playing the tedious game of roman à clef in order to determine the rudiments of the hero's way of thinking: they are evident in the text of the novel. 8

Rudin's method as a thinker, his approach to any situation or fact, is highly rationalistic in a metaphysical way -- a fact which may have influenced many critics to emphasize Rudin's Hamlet, rather than his Quixotic, qualities. He constantly strives 'to discover general principles underlying particular
phenomena' (6: 262). Even in his youth, as Lezhnev relates to Aleksandra Pavlovna (6: 297), Rudin had a 'systematic mind' and was able to explain to his less perceptive comrades the 'общая связь', the 'общий закон мировой' operating in the world. Then

This sort of severely organic view of the world and reality would seem to be rooted in the idealism of Schelling, by virtue of its inherent conformity with an ideal order, and of Hegel, by virtue of the lack of tension between the ideal and actual. These conclusions are backed up by Lezhnev's account of Rudin's youth (6: 299): Rudin is a survival from the pre-Hegelian кружок days of the mid-thirties, although he has also spent a year in Heidelberg and a year in Berlin as a student, no doubt becoming acquainted with Hegel's philosophy there. His Hegelian tendencies are also indicated by the fact that 'все мысли [его] казались обращенными в будущее ... Рудин говорил о том, что придает вечное значение временной жизни человека' (6: 269). This kind of idealism is much more closely related to faith in a dialectic which demonstrates why certain ideals must be objectified in the future than it is to the more mystical idealist philosophies holding sway in Russia in the mid-thirties.

Rudin's passion for approaching life from an abstract, cerebral position is well illustrated by the way in which he caused the disintegration of Lezhnev's love affair when they
were students together. Lezhnev remarks caustically:

His intrusion into Volynsev's and Natal'ia's burgeoning affair is no less heavy-footed.

The *nature* of the suprapersonal ideal order Rudin serves is much more purely romantic. Although cryptic enough to have affinity with the 'Unknown' of 'Фауст' (7: 49), it is unclouded enough to find expression in several distinct ways: in love, as providence, fate and less defined 'mysterious' ways, and also, on a mundane level, in duty.

Love is perhaps the most important (at least dramatically) of these expressions of the ideal. In the words of Turgenev's Hamlet of Shchigry province, 'женитьба дело важное, пробный камень всего человека' (4: 281); and in *Rudin* the hero's performance as a lover is also the proofstone of his idealist philosophy. For Rudin -- and this concept predates the swing to Hegelian theories in Russia -- there are two meanings to the word 'love': there is 'love' the common human passion, an affair of the 'heart', generally egoistic at root, often associated with a desire for pleasure, at times almost personified into a kind of demonic force; and there is the higher, more *immaculate* love, love for all mankind, an expression of the ultimate oneness, in Schelling's sense, of the world idea, of reality's essential wholeness. Love of the latter variety demands a kind of vestal consecration which is in conflict with the former. The tension between these two
loves -- representing, and not simply symbolizing, two world-views -- forms one of the novel's leading themes. In his inability to resolve the tension Rudin was the true child of the pre-Hegelian 1830s.

The hero of I. Panaev's story 'Родственники', Grigorii Alekseich (sometimes compared to Rudin), and his benefactor, also illustrate the pre-Hegelian dilemma: educated in German mysticism and romanticism, and idealized medievalism, neither of the men is capable of 'real' love. Grigorii Alekseich finds he cannot love Natal'ia in действительность -- the грязная и гадкая действительность' of a wedding, dowry, family relationships and financial arrangements. He blames his own romantic illusions for blinding him to the facts of real life. 'Моя любовь в голове, в мечте, а не в сердце, не в действительности', he says in anticipation of Rudin. 'Я принимал раздраженную фантазию за любовь . .' (p. 252).

Significantly, the antihero who can act and love 'normally' is a Hegelian. At a similar stage in their ideological development all the great intellectual figures of the decade -- Stankevich, Belinskii, Bakunin, Botkin, Ogarev, Gertsen, Granovskii -- suffered from their inability to love 'normally'. An examination of the attitudes to love of some of these men may shed some light on the position of their contemporary (at least in intellectual terms), Rudin.

The case of the idealist leader N.V. Stankevich is particularly illuminating, especially when the analogy between Pokorskii and Stankevich is recognized. It becomes clear from Stankevich's letters and poetry, romantic hyperbole notwithstanding, that it was his attitude to love, rather
than circumstance or his personality, which had such a baneful effect on his amorous relationships. Stankevich was more or less in love with three women, and all three affairs were inconclusive and unhappy.

The problem was that for Stankevich, as for Rudin, love had two mutually incompatible meanings: egotistic, sensual, 'earthly' love on the one hand and a diviner, wider, more altruistic, less erotic love for mankind and the universe on the other. This latter kind of love was, of course, defined by Stankevich in idealist terms. P. Miliukov writes of the idealist type of love: 'Любовь для Станкевича — это прежде всего мировая сила, давшая жизнь миру и всему, что в нем живо. В человеке любовь — это высший и лучший способ чувствовать свое единство с миром. 9

D.I. Кызевский describes Stankevich's concept of love as 'снятие индивидуального'. 10 Unfortunately, whenever love of the egoistic, earthly variety began to press its claims too vigorously, the idealist would feel he was losing control and abandon the love-object.

In Part II of Stankevich's 'Дуодрама', which also belongs to the early 1830s, the Youth sings to the Maid, rather ungallantly according to conventional ideas:

Сильна к тебе любовь, но есть любовь иная,
Ты, дева слабая, не ведаешь её!
Да, слишком широки души моей объятия;
Все человечество я должен в них принять,
Чтоб утолить вполне потребность наслажденья.
Потребность пламенной, возвышенной любви.
Одна твоя любовь не укротит стремления . . .

Later he warns her:

Не улыбайся мне улыбкой сладострастья,
Я не могу тебе улыбкой отвечать . . .
Нет, нет, иным богам мы молимся с тобою:
Твой жертвы требует, мой жертвовать велит!
This idea of подвиг or self-sacrifice in love is the culminating one in the poem:

Я совершу свое предназначенье,
Я все отдам: подругу, славу, честь,
Я принесу себя во всесожженье!
0! тяжел крест, но должно его нести!!!

It finds an echo elsewhere in his poetry of the early 1830s, for example in the small poem 'Подвиг жизни' (1833) where the poet calls on his reader to cast off the world at any cost: 'Отринь, попри его стопой!' The 'подвиг трудный' is 'перешагнуть предел земной': 'Он для тебя погибнет дольный;'

No спасена душа твоя!' According to Stankevich's metaphysics, Rudin would also be absolved of blame for 'not acting':

'... кто любит, тот действует прекрасно. (Что такое прекрасно действовать? поговорим после. Скажу теперь: действовать, как действует всеобщая любовь. А как она действует? Любя, и узнаешь.)'

Difficulties arose for Stankevich when his idealistically beheld 'прекрасная дама' began to pursue him with patently earthly passion, when crude действительность began to intrude into the poetry of his soul. His sensibilities, so long educated on more ethereal planes, could not bear an onslaught of such unabashed worldliness.

Stankevich described this process of rejection of mundane love in a letter to Bakunin written in 1838, by which time he looked at these matters with greater lucidity, thanks to Hegel and some of the bitterness of disenchantment:

Я никогда не любил. Любовь у меня всегда была прихоть воображения, потеха праздности, игра самолюбия, опора слабодушия, интерес, который один мог наполнить душу, чуждую подлых потребностей, но чуждую и всякого истинного субстанциального ... содержания. Действительность есть поприще настоящего сильного
человека -- слабая душа живет в jenseits, в
стремлении и в стремлении неопределенном; ей нужно
что-то (потому что в ней самой нет ничего
определенного, что бы составляло ее натуру и
потребности); Как скоро это неопределенное сделалось
etwas, определенным, душа опять выбирается за
пределы действительности. Это моя история; вот
явная причина всей беды . . .

In this rather disabused self-evaluation, as in passages
quoted earlier, there is similarity in both substance and tone
with the important themes in Rudin: there is the same
debilitating inner cleavage, the same spurning (now condemned)
of things earthly, the same yearning to achieve a подвиг, the
same eventual disillusionment and self-condemnation on grounds
of weakness and characterlessness.

Nikolai Ogarev provides us with another excellent example
of confused attitudes towards love. Writing of his infatuation
with one of his cousins, Ogarev expressed a thought Rudin
would have understood from the depths of his heart:

Я не должен предаваться Любви: моя любовь посвящена
высшей, универсальной "любви", в основе которой нет
эгоистического чувства наслаждения: я принесу мою
настоящую любовь в жертву на алтарь всемирного
чувства.16

Ogarev's letters in the thirties to Gertsen show clearly
that the question of love and its heavenly and earthly
manifestations keenly interested him. In 1833 he wrote to
Gertsen:

Не знаю, друг, что такое, но я не могу влюбиться;
. . . Я ищу красоту, наивность, с пылкою возвышенной
душой, но нигде не нахожу, нигде. Ужели это
невозможно? Ужели мой идеал так высок, или
человечество так низко?17

Ogarev's faithfulness to the 'Jenseits' already spurned
by Stankevich in 1838 was longer lasting than that of most.
In 1839, trying to give Gertsen support at the time of
Natal'ia's grave illness, he wrote: 'Пусть говорит Бел[инский] и комп[ания], что жизнь jenseits хоть, может быть, и есть, но всё же фантазия, а не знание. Неправда! знание, убеждение.'\(^{18}\)

In the forties, when his idealism, mysticism and religiosity had become things of the past, Ogarev's approach to love became much more practical.

During most of the thirties even Aleksandr Gertsen's attitude towards love was highly coloured by the religious and mystical ideas which occupied him from about 1834 until the end of his exile in Viatka. During his exile, for example, he became interested in Christianity, Schelling and Swedenborg. He came to accept Natal'ia's purely religious, idealist concept of love expressed in these words to him: 'Любовь моя не родилась во мне уже на земле, нет; я была рождена с нею, я принесла ее в мир с собой, она существовала до рождения моего.'\(^{19}\)

In the thirties Belinskii also apparently accepted the idealist view of love. His affair with A.A. Bakunina caused him no little suffering in 1836 when she not only did not respond to his approaches but Belinskii felt that his high-minded ideas about the essence of love were being frustrated. The soul's two mystic halves were not meeting and his ideals were at the same time in danger of being tarnished with earthly пошлость. Even in June 1838, after he had become acquainted with the less transcendental teachings of Hegel, Belinskii conceived of love in idealistic terms which kept the woman at such a remove from the human plane that she was in fact rendered untouched: ...

. . . никакую женщину в мире не страшно любить, кроме ее. Всякая женщина, как бы ни была она высока, есть женщина: . . . а это чистый, светлый херувим Бога
Later that same year Belinskii saw things in a less celestial light: '... надо понимать и любить [женщину], как женщину, просто, а не как идеал или героиню.'

Belinskii returned to the Bakunins' estate at Priamukhino in 1842, by which time, of course, he had completely rejected his earlier romantic view of love - and rejected it, interestingly enough, partly on the grounds that it was egoistic, despite its professed altruistic foundation. He wrote to A.A. Bakunina in early 1843:

As he wrote to his fiancée in a clear-eyed moment, 'Прежняя любовь не рифмовала с браком, и вообще с действительностью жизни'.

Yet even in his relations with his fiancée in 1843 Belinskii felt more comfortable at some remove from her than in direct contact. 'Странное дело!' he wrote to her, 'в мечах я лучше говорю с вами чем на письме, как некогда заочно говорил с вами, чем при свиданиях.' The reconciliation between ideal and reality was evidently still not complete.

The element of asexuality in Belinskii's idealized relations with women is particularly analogous to the case of Rudin. Miliukov comments that Belinskii was quite convinced that he was 'что-то среднее между мужчиной и женщиной' and that it was wasted effort on his part to try to attract a woman's interest.
There is, in general, little room for women in the egocentric world of Russian romanticism. Lonely brooding was relieved primarily by exclusively masculine companionship in the lodge or circle. From Skovoroda to Bakunin there are strong hints of homosexuality, though apparently of the sublimated, Platonic variety.26

Billington's comment seems especially valid when applied to Turgenev's early stories, the most representative of which, in this context, is probably 'Андрей Колосов' (1844). With specific regard to Rudin, it was certainly rumoured that Bakunin, whose 'portrait' Turgenev said was so like Rudin's (in a letter to M.A. Markovich dated 16(28) September 1862), was impotent -- and Katkov had even thrown the jibe of 'скопец' at him. In 'Яков Пасынков', the story so often regarded as an 'étude' for Rudin, because of its compassionate treatment of its romantic idealist hero, Pasynkov is remarkable for his 'chaste soul' (6: 204), and his platonic, and even Quixotic, attitude to love. The several intimations in Rudin that the hero is considered by some to be deficient in masculine qualities come, therefore, as no surprise. Lezhnev quite deliberately calls Rudin 'конвэка' -- a particularly insulting appellation for a man -- and then, after describing Rudin's activities at Lasunskaya's, he asks Aleksandra Pavlovna: 'неужели это достойно мужчины?' (6: 294). There is an implied questioning of Rudin's masculinity, also, in Lezhnev's sharp distinction (6: 297) between Pokorskii who 'loved women to distraction' and Rudin who for all his fireworks was 'cold'. Even Natal'ia seems to go away from the final rendezvous disappointed in Rudin's manliness: '... я пришла за советом ... Какой совет? Вы мужчина; я привыкла вам верить ...'
she says; but her confidence in his masculine ability to make
decisions and lead the way is misplaced: 'мне больно то, что
я в вас обманулась... Как! Я прихожу к вам за советом, и
в какую минуту, и первое ваше слово: покориться . . .'(6: 323-4).

These reflections on Rudin's lack of masculinity are
perhaps not unconnected with his general adherence to the
Quixotic prototype. In Quixote's eyes, it will be remembered,
a harlot is transformed into Dulcinea, an ideal of beauty and
purity, and there is virtually no erotic element in his
idealized love for her.

Although Rudin was faced with much the same problems of
relationships to women as bedevilled the pre-Hegelian idealists,
imbued with Fichtean and Schellingian concepts of the individual
being sacrificed to the suprapersonal universal ego or soul,
Turgenev's hero was, as we have seen, manifestly acquainted
with Hegel. In fact, Rudin's self-abnegation, particularly for
the sake of social ideals, has a very strong Hegelian ring to
it, especially in the context of the 1840s, which is the
setting for the novel. According to the mature Hegel, the
individual has a duty to subject his personal claims and desires
to the wider claims of the community, as opposed to Kant's more
individualistic and egoistic notion of each man as a self-
determining moral agent. In his Early Theological Writings,
Hegel even made use of the Christian term of 'love' to bring
out the idea of 'dying in one's self' for the sake of the whole.
It should also be noted that, to a Hegelian, self-sacrifice of
this kind was not in fact 'idealist' -- it was not irrational
sacrifice of the real for the sake of some chimeric ideal --
but was rational political behaviour, an element in the actual
modus operandi of the body politic.
The preceding illustrations from the experience of other idealists help us to come to the understanding that Rudin was not a coward, nor did he 'fail' Natal'ia or even, strictly speaking, retreat from reality -- he had, after all, never really advanced towards it. Rudin and Natal'ia were speaking about different things when they used the word 'love'. Rudin never 'loved' Natal'ia at all in any normal sense of the word, and to carry her off romantically at the dead of night against her mother's wishes would clearly have been a disastrous mistake. The romantic who refused to face reality, her head stuffed with grand passions, reckless valour, midnight elopements and other German nonsense (and possibly a smattering of George Sand) was Natal'ia, not Rudin. ('Вы трусите, а не '!' as he called out to her (6: 326).) Natal'ia made Tat'iana's mistake of falling in love with a romantically induced image rather than with the man himself.

In Rudin's chance meeting in the garden with Natal'ia in Part VII of the novel, the difference between their two concepts of love is already only too clear. Having cut himself off from anything to do with that side of human nature called сердце, he fails to understand Natal'ia's сердце and the emotions that are building up in it (he blindly questions her about her feelings for Volyntsev, for example), and fails to credit Natal'ia with a capability for the same kind of подвиг of self-sacrifice he feels he himself is capable of. In his next novel Turgenev was to approach this failing in Rudin, and in Rudin's romantic predecessor Iakov Pasynkov, in a highly original way: he was to introduce an irrational mystic whose mysticism was easily identifiable with the hesychast tradition of the Jesus
Prayer whose purpose was none other than 'to make the intelligence descend into the heart', as H. Iswolsky expresses it in her book *Christ in Russia.*

Rudin discounts the possibility of any intrusion of the romantic side of life into his own experience: 'Это сторона жизни для меня уже исчезла. Мне остается теперь тащиться по энзойной и пыльной дороге, со станции до станции, в тряской телеге...' (6: 306). *The self-pity and fustian do not deter* Natal'ia: 'Неужели же, Дмитрий Николаевич, ... вы ничего не ждете от жизни?' *she asks him.* '-- О нет!' *he replies,*

Rudin may at first here sound too much like Stankevich's bombastic Youth quoted above to be anything other than amusing. Yet Natal'ia does Rudin the honour of taking him seriously, and indeed it becomes obvious that Rudin's fault lies less in weakness, impracticality, insincerity or coldness, than in a failure to understand the heart. Rudin failed, not to elope, but to love at all in a mutually comprehensible way. The reasons for this lack of understanding were various: his education gave more weight to the head than to the heart, his sentimental experience was unhappy, and he honestly believed that his *raison d'être* was to work for the benefit of humanity and that love for one person or conjugal love would hinder his grander purpose. To interpret this reasoning as no more than rationalization of an inability to love normally -- as
converted idealists tended to do as the forties progressed --
would be as ungenerous as it would be unfounded.

Infatuated and led astray by his 'new feeling', Rudin was
unaware of the gulf that separated his and Natal'ia's ideas
about what love should be. The gulf really only became apparent
at Avdiukhin pond at their last meeting. Natal'ia is cruelly
disappointed that Rudin does not love her enough to elope with
her, to ask her to sacrifice herself for him. She wants him to
say to her: 'Я тебя люблю, но я жениться не могу, я не отвечу
за будущее, дай мне руку и ступай за мной' (6: 324). Her
concept of 'я тебя люблю' is, however, romantic, unrealistic,
impractical, escapist. Rudin is the realist, in fact, when he
answers, using the word любить in quite a different way: 'Если бы
я не любил вас самой преданной любовью -- да боже мой! я бы
tоtчас сам предложил вам бежать со мной . . .' (6: 325).
Eventually Natal'ia faces the facts - again, in her own
terminology: 'Не беспокойтесь . . . вы не любите меня, а я
никому не навязываюсь.' 'Я вас люблю!' replies Rudin. 'Может
быть', she concedes, 'но как вы меня любите?' (6: 325). The
whole affair between Rudin and Natal'ia, culminating in the
rendezvous at Avdiukhin pond, is a classic example of failure
to communicate, particularly about the fundamental question of
the nature of love. Both parties are to blame for the
misunderstanding and its consequences, and both admit to being
punished (6: 325, 336).

In his confessional letter to Natal'ia Rudin squarely faces
just how little he understands what love normally means:
Rudin's problem is that he really does not understand the heart at all, so engrossed and educated is he in the mind. Not courage, will or social usefulness is lacking, but understanding. He goes on:

There was undeniably an element of irresponsibility in the way Rudin behaved towards Natal'ia. Not understanding what emotional effect his words were having on Natal'ia, or, for that matter, on anyone else, and being confronted by Natal'ia with the consequences of his words and the necessity of some responsible follow-up action, Rudin naturally took fright. He explains his feelings in his letter to her:

Yet in the closing lines of his letter, Rudin himself hints that the sacrifice he made may not have been completely pointless after all: 'A впрочем, всё это,может быть, к лучшему. Из этого испытания я, может быть, выйду чище и сильней' (6: 338).
Rudin also used the word 'love' in a negative sense, and, although this negative sense of love as egotistic, pleasure-seeking and often indefinably evil, was obviously common decades before the upsurge of materialism in the 1840s, Rudin's formulation of it is still informed with post-idealistic attitudes. Love is portrayed as a sort of disease that cannot be fought, a disease which debilitates the prime faculties of reason and will which unite in the striving for the ideal. 'Любовь!' he exclaims,

в ней всё тайна: как она приходит, как развивается, как исчезает. То является она вдруг, несомненная, радостная, как день; то долго тлеет, как огонь под золой, и пробивается плачем в душе, когда уже всё разрушено; то оплетет она в сердце, как эмия, то вдруг высокользнет из него вон . . . (6: 291)

A 'тайна' is not simply a 'mystery', of course. Rudin's use of this word to describe love indicates that love's workings are an enigma, unpredictable, capricious, the source of its power beyond human understanding, unfathomable by ordinary mortals. His imagery, however hackneyed in our eyes, still serves to point up the possible destructiveness of love, a mysterious suprapersonal force which can suddenly possess a man against his will. Rudin's attitude to love of this kind is remarkably similar to that of Aleksei Petrovich, hero of Turgenev's story 'Переписка' and implacable opponent of the deceptive German romantic view of love as a 'free union of souls'. Love, for Aleksei Petrovich, is actually a matter of chance, a quirk of fate, an evil visitation, an uncontrollable disease, and the lover little more than a diseased organism. In his last letter to Mar'ia Aleksandrovna (composed by Turgenev about 1854, not long before he began work on Rudin), Aleksei Petrovich, who has deserted his virtuous provincial
soul-mate for an Italian dancer, writes:

... настоящая любовь — чувство, вовсе не похожее на то, каким мы ее себе представляли. Любовь даже вовсе не чувство; она — болезнь, известное состояние души и тела ...; обычно она влечет человека без спроса, внезапно, против его воли — ни дать ни взять холера или лихорадка ... В любви нет равенства, нет так называемого свободного соединения душ и прочих идеальностей, придуманных на досуге немецкими профессорами ... (6: 190)

An interesting point about Rudin's concepts of love is that, whether his view of it is idealized in Stankevich's or Belinskii's way (albeit with an admixture of Hegel) or closer to that of the disabused romantic Aleksei Petrovich, man is governed by an order or by forces greater than himself, although not necessarily extramundane. Rudin's idealism of love is transcendental inasmuch as it is based on abstract, partly mystical ideas about man's relationship to the universe, but it does not wholly transcend the present plane of existence by any means.

Another important element in Rudin's idealism is his concept of fate. Fate, for example, is made to share some of the blame for Rudin's romantic fiasco: 'Я сам виноват,' he writes to Natal'ia, 'но согласитесь, что судьба как бы нарочно подсмелялась над нами' (6: 338). Two years later Rudin remarks to Lezhnev with a mixture of rancour and desperation:

Что мешает мне жить и действовать, как другие?.. Я только об этом теперь и мечтаю. Но едва успев я войти в определенное положение, остановиться на известной точке, судьба так и сопрет меня с нею долой ... Я стал бояться ее — моей судьбы ... Отчего всё это? Разреши мне эту загадку! (6: 364)

Lezhnev cannot solve the mystery — in fact, he replies that he always found Rudin to be something of a загадка himself.

What does Rudin mean by 'fate' in these statements? He seems to have in mind some kind of suprapersonal force which
may be capricious or even hostile and which governs men's lives
and disposes of events. Although suprapersonal, and
transcendental in the sense that it is beyond the rational or
natural and an a priori condition of existence, this force is
not seen as transcendent but rather as immanent. Rudin's belief
in fate -- which relieves him of some responsibility for his
actions -- is a kind of soured form of the idealists' belief
in providence in the mid-thirties. We were to meet with this
sort of belief -- and rationalization -- a little later in
'Acr' (written 1857) whose hero also blames the intervention of
fate in the form of his 'недобрых гений' (7: 119-20) for his
failure to act as the heroine had expected at their rendezvous.

How similar Rudin's murmurings against fate are to the
thought expressed in one of N.V. Stankevich's letters to
Ia. M. Neverov (13 October 1835): 'Судьба вечно мне мешает
заняться делом, в то время, когда я чувствую особенную охоту
k деятельности.' When feeling at peace with himself and the
world, Stankevich had seen this suprapersonal force in a more
beneficent light: 'Мудрая Благодать все видит, все знает ...
меня утешает, мой друг, вера в кроткую десницу, распростертою
над главою создания!' A month later his sense of providence
had more overtly Christian overtones. 'Я чувствую над собой
kроткую десницу Искупителя, который не дал бурам жизни похитить
у меня мое блаженство ... ропот далек от меня -- много хранит
для меня Провидение; оно, я начинаю веровать, ведет меня.

At a later date he wrote to the same correspondent:

... я верую еще в особенный промысел, бдящий над
жизнью каждого, кто хочет быть человеком, он подает
ему на это средства: иному счастье, иному бедствие.
Да! кажется, нужно что-то от мира для полноты этого
счастья, но -- да будет воля Его! Я не молюсь о своем
счастьи, с меня довольно быть человеком.
This sense of being directed by providence, by a supernatural, universal power, was common to many thinkers of the time.

P. Annenkov comments:

Станкевич, Грановский, В. Боткин, Белинский, так же точно, как Н. Аксаков и другие, одинаково считали себя орудиями высших сил и тщились содержать себя в надлежащей чистоте, приличной избранныкам промысла.

Annenkov quotes a couple of lines from one of Ogarev's letters from Penza which illustrates the point well: 'Мой фатум написан рукой Бога на пути вселенной...', This in its turn is reminiscent of one of Rudin's early pronouncements in Lasunskaaia's salon: 'Сознание быть орудием тех высших сил должно заменить человеку все другие радости: в самой смерти найдет он свою жизнь, свое гнездо' (6: 270).

Even Lezhnev, although ostensibly a man of the forties, sobered by Hegel, tries to reconcile Rudin to his unsettled life by appealing to a more mystically providential notion of fate of this kind:

Каждый остается тем, чем сделала его природа, и больше требовать от него нельзя! Ты назвал себя Вечным Жидом... А почему ты знаешь, может быть, тебе и следует так вечно странствовать, может быть, ты исполняешь этим высшее, для тебя самого неизвестное назначение: народная мудрость гласит недаром, что все мы под Богом ходим. (6: 367)

These attitudes to fate cannot be dismissed as pure cant or empty verbiage for in fact they crystallize the reasons for (if not the causes of) Rudin's being unable to unite his life with Natal'ia's: in reality, they imply, one's life is not one's own to dispose of, and the pursuit of personal love runs counter to this truth.

These ideas about a suprapersonal force governing the individual -- 'судьба', 'природа', 'десница Бога', 'промысел', 'Провидение' and so on -- were of course upgraded into a more
tangible form under Hegel but the idea of the individual being ultimately at the mercy of a greater power remained. In Turgenev's story 'Письмо', the earliest chapters of which date from the mid-forties, the hero's sense of fate has no hint of the supernatural or divine. It is integrated into a kind of Hegelian dialectic. In an early letter to Mar'ia Aleksandrovna he writes, in words which are reminiscent of Rudin's lines quoted above ('Я сам виноват; но согласитесь, что судьба как бы нарочно подсмеялась над нами'): 'Я один виноват' (6: 165); however, 'я не могу слишком винить себя. Да ... и кто бывает когда-нибудь в чем-нибудь виноват -- один? ... Обстоятельства нас определяют ... У каждого человека есть своя судьба ... każdy делает свою судьбу, и каждого она делает ...' (6: 168).

Aleksei Petrovich uses the word 'fate' almost as a synonym for 'life' -- that vast arena of interacting forces over which man seems to have very limited control and which emphatically has no element of personification or the extramundane about it at all. Rudin's concept of fate is less developed.

In Rudin the intrusion of a supernatural, suprapersonal dimension in the form of the 'таинственное' is slight by comparison with later works. The only passage where it is mentioned directly is in the opening paragraph of Part IX, the introduction to the climax of the love intrigue at Avdiukhin pond.
Yet the inclusion in the novel of this description of Avdiukhin pond should not be seen simply as a comment on Natal'ia's romantic tastes. Even here the 'mysterious' element serves to surround Rudin's and Natal'ia's final meeting with an aura of sinister, uncanny, suprahuman forces of destruction and blight, echoing Rudin's ability to give life's seemingly chance events that 'значение ... таинственное' which Lezhnev and others had found so comforting (6: 298). Turgenev has, however, been careful in a manner reminiscent of Pushkin in 'Пиковая дама', Gogol' in 'Шинель', or his own 'Бежин луг', not to objectify too unequivocally the evidence of the таинственное and нечистое, preferring to ascribe them to 'rumour' and emphasizing the subjectivity of the feelings aroused by the pond's surroundings. (Turgenev, who tended to work on the basis of concrete facts when forming his images, perhaps had in mind while writing the Avdiukhin pond episode the popular tale of the ghost of his rather sinister grandfather Ivan Ivanovich Liutovinov appearing on the pond weir.34)

A strong sense of duty is something else Rudin shares with Turgenev's Don Quixote. When Natal'ia says he ought to be 'useful', Rudin significantly replies: 'Ваше одно слово напомнило мне мой долг ... Да, я должен действовать' (6: 282) and Lezhnev says of Rudin and his ilk: 'У этих господ на каждом шагу долг, и всё долг' (6: 330). Duty is a very important concept to the idealist because it is a concrete way in which
he can impose the abstract on the real and the suprapersonal on
the individual without recourse to the specifically
transcendental; and not only to the idealist: duty as an
imperative offers the illusion of some certainty, some moral
fixity, in the anarchy of moral choices facing the
unideological man. Turgenev was to have recourse to it again.

* * * * * * * *

*Rudin* represents a new direction in Turgenev's work rather
than the continuation of earlier themes. In this novel Turgenev
for the first time gives serious, mature consideration to the
question of faith in an enigmatic suprahuman order and the
consequences of this faith if this order is conceived of in
idealistic terms. Turgenev does not offer his public any solution
to the problems he sees arising— the dichotomy that may be
produced between personal happiness and idealistically
motivated dedication to the good of all humanity, the dangers
of overabstraction and impracticality, the changed notions of
will and action, the doubts about the unfailing benevolence of
the suprahuman forces; he takes up themes which are to comprise
his central area of concern for the rest of his life, going far
beyond such issues as the fate of the дворянская интеллигенция
in the 1840s, the roots and problems of social superfluousness
or the supposed bankruptcy of German idealism. The metaphysical
themes *Rudin* is built on reappear in a different context in
Turgenev's second novel, *A Nest of Gentlefolk*. 
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CHAPTER TWO

A NEST OF GENTRY

Having examined in *Rudin* the rational mysticism of German idealism as a basis for faith in something beyond the individual ego, so necessary for life to be livable, Turgenev turned his attention in *A Nest of Gentry* to Christian mysticism. In doing so, he was progressing from somewhat shadowy notions of transcendental reality to more substantial ones, from the 'Unknown' of 'Фауст' to the known God. Some twelve months after writing *Rudin*, Turgenev made clear to his new correspondent and friend Countess E.E. Lambert his growing impatience with vague appeals to 'fate': 'люди без твердости в характере любят сочинять себе "судьбу"', he wrote, 'это избавляет их от необходимости иметь собственную волю и от ответственности перед самими собою.'¹ (Similarly in *A Nest of Gentry* Lavretskii's old friend from his кружок days, Mikhalevich, rejects the idea of 'судьба' as old-fashioned and turns to more specific religious beliefs (7: 202).)

'Я теперь занят другую, большую повестью,' he wrote to Countess Lambert (22 December 1857 (3 January 1858)), referring to *A Nest of Gentry*, 'главное лицо которой -- девушка, существо религиозное ...' It was the question of Christianity, according to Turgenev's lights, as a credible object of faith, as a real alternative to the doubt and pessimism eventually
engendered by Feuerbachian materialism, as a justification for the individual's yielding to the supernal forces appearing to govern his destiny, that stood at the thematic centre of *A Nest of Gentry*, providing its dramatic tension and what dynamism it has. Turgenev repeatedly reinforced this religious theme: the great majority of his later additions to the text touched on religious questions.

Compositionally the question of religious belief is no less central. The basic tension existing between the two principal characters, Liza Kalitina and Fedor Lavretskii, is a religious one which rises to the surface in virtually every one of their many meetings. Lavretskii's first words of conversation to Liza touch on the external aspects of this subject (7: 178): 'Ну да вы? -- спросил он ее. -- Как обедне. Сегодня воскресенье. -- А разве вы ходите к обедне? Лиза молча, с изумлением посмотрела на него.' Evidently the subject is important to Lavretskii because he immediately brings the matter up with Marfa Timofeevna: 'Я и Лизавету Ивановну видел,' he tells her, 'Она к обедне шла ... Разве она богомольна?' 'А вы разве не богомольны?' asks Nastas'ia Karpovna, drawing attention to the tension that is to characterise the relationship as it grows (7: 181). At their next meeting it is Liza who takes the initiative, asking Lavretskii with her accustomed forthrightness: 'Как же можно разлучать то, что бог соединил?' 'Наши убеждения на этот счет слишком различны, Лизавета Михайловна,' Lavretskii replies, 'мы не поймем друг друга' (7: 198). Notwithstanding, Liza goes on to tackle the hardened Lavretskii on the subject of Christian forgiveness. On the Kalitins' visit to Vasil'evskoe,
Christianity's historical significance is the subject of earnest discussion between the hero and heroine (7: 210). Their next discussion revolves around the reported death of Lavretskii's wife, and again the idea of Christian forgiveness is raised and causes tension (7: 218-22). They next meet at the church service, where Lavretskii tries to pray for the first time in many years (7: 227), while the vesper service is the setting for their next real encounter, and again Lavretskii is aware of the tension created by his simultaneous attraction to Liza and consciousness of some impenetrable barrier between them (7: 230). At their following meeting we learn of Liza's long-term religious designs on Lavretskii—her desire to 'bring him to God' (7: 234). Even in their subsequent daring tryst in the garden, Liza insists that all is actually in the hands of God (7: 237). The keynote of submission to God's will is still sounding as they next meet in Marfa Timofeevna's room after Vera Pavlovna's return from the dead: Liza, from the depths of her suffering, reminds Lavretskii that 'счастье зависит не от нас, а от бога' (7: 273).

Their two final encounters also take place in a purely religious atmosphere: in the parish church at the Sunday service and, years later, in the chapel of the monastery where Liza had become a nun. Liza's and Lavretskii's relationship was consistently coloured by religious considerations and atmosphere to the point, little recognized, where their whole relationship was in fact an intensely religious experience, in a wide sense, for both of them.

* * * * * * *
A novel with basically religious themes (and for all its peripheral social implications such as its comments on the destiny of the дворянство, on liberalism, and on the growing rift between the Westerners and Slavophiles, *A Nest of Gentry* turns on the pivot of metaphysical questions from the religious sphere) was hardly to be expected from the pen of a man who professed little interest in religious questions and appeared to be a true child of his times in matters which did not concern the historical moment, the here and now. Indeed, Granjard calls *A Nest of Gentry* 'surprenant, exceptionel et presque un corps étranger dans l'ensemble de son oeuvre'.

The question of why Turgenev felt a need to tackle such a theme in 1858 and what his private views on religion were at the time he wrote the novel throw an important light on the idea of the transcendental ideal in *A Nest of Gentry* and Turgenev's works as a whole. Firstly it may be useful to survey briefly the background of intellectual attitudes towards religion against which Turgenev was writing.

By the late 1850s (Turgenev started planning *A Nest of Gentry* in 1857) scepticism on matters of religion and indifference towards the Orthodox Church were the general rule amongst the Russian intelligentsia. Indeed Professor S.N. Bulgakov told an audience in 1908 that 'безрелигиозность' had characterized the entire nineteenth century in Russia and that it had now reached 'mass epidemic' proportions unparalleled in any other European country. The aristocracy at large had always been indifferent towards religion, except in the very early stages of the introduction of Christianity to Russia when the upper classes appear to have had a vested
interest in assuring its acceptance by the populace. The educated class found that the ideas reaching it from the West in the eighteenth century -- in particular the ideas of French thinkers such as Diderot, d'Alembert, Reynal, Voltaire and Helvétius -- confirmed it in its scepticism about the necessity for postulating a supreme being in order to explain natural phenomena or live full lives. Even when the base of the educated classes widened towards the middle of the nineteenth century, the current of scepticism remained strong, despite the fairly short-lived excursion into theism of sorts during the ascendancy of German idealism after 1825. The reasons were diverse. There were, of course, exceptions to the general rule: there was the Freemasons' movement with roots in the eighteenth century, the upsurge of interest in religion, particularly of a mystical or occult kind, during Aleksandr's reign in upper social circles (to be repeated half a century or more later under Alexander II), not to mention followers of the Slavophile movement such as the Aksakovs or Khomiakov, or the sympathisers with the revival of Catholicism such as Chaadaev and Pecherin, or outstanding individuals such as Skovoroda or Novikov.

Materialism as a doctrine got a second lease of life in the 1840s in Russia with the veering to the left of the bulk of Hegelian thinking and the popularity of Feuerbach. Interestingly enough, Feuerbach raised his edifice of materialist theories in specific opposition to religious ideas about man and the universe. His famous maxim 'Homo homini deus' seems to represent the prevailing spirit of rejection of God and the kingdom of heaven in favour of man and the more tangible kingdom of this world. A problem arises,
of course, when the kingdom of this world proves to be not merely a shabby imitation of the ideal heavenly one, but a nightmare of murder and tyranny, as in the case of the French republic; a problem also arises for the realistic idealist when there can be found no 'homo' who even vaguely approaches the status of a 'deus', no Prometheus to shout defiance to the gods for the sake of the fire of enlightenment, but, to the disabused eye, only a few rebellious guards officers, easily rounded up, exiled and hanged, and a few boorish priests' sons eager to burn copies of Pushkin's poems and polemicize in dreary borrowed phrases. There was also a danger that the man-god would embrace theories of solipsistic egoism such as Max Stirner's and arrogate to himself the right to do whatever he chooses unrestrained by any altruistic considerations for others, a mode of thought and action explored in depth by Dostoevskii. A further weakness in Feuerbach's anthropologism was that he did not deal adequately with the question of man's mortality which was to be such an abiding concern of Turgenev's.

Apart from its intellectual opposition to Christian teachings, the intelligentsia became increasingly hostile to the Church on ethical grounds, particularly during the theocratic reign of Nikolai I when rejection of the régime almost automatically entailed rejection of the Orthodox Church. The Russian Orthodox Church had been established for centuries as a bastion of the feudal order, a vast, exploitative, serf-owning institution, a grotesquely magnified example of the evils of the old order - an obvious target for progressive intellectual attack at a time of militant opposition to serfdom. Although periodically at loggerheads with the tsarist régime as one
structure battled with the other for power, the Church had never been in principle opposed to the tsarist system. Not only did the Church stand in the eyes of the intelligentsia for the most benighted political reaction and the grossest social immorality, but also for anti-intellectualism. The Church had for centuries stood for organized ignorance, supported by violence and oppression if necessary. It was this Church which had considered the learning of Latin and geometry to be ways of the devil and had had the state censor books propounding theories not in accord with its own. It had had no Reformation, no renowned thinkers or theologians, no body of learning beyond dogma. The Russian Church had little to offer the nineteenth-century thinker except medieval ignorance, myths and bigotry. The Czech thinker T.G. Masaryk, usually sympathetic to spiritual trends, goes so far as to aver that the Russian Church was not only without a philosophy, but without a theology.\(^7\) Intellectuals quite naturally began to search for their absolutes, when needed, elsewhere, and to base their reasoning on wholly different foundations.

The Russian Church, by dint of its obsession with the formalities of worship and ritual (it proved itself increasingly incapable of any other concerns) also starved Russians of subjective religious experience, despite its reputation to the contrary. Ecclesiasticism -- церковность -- tended to sterilize the seeds of spirituality or genuinely personal religious experience with its concomitant mystical aspects. A vital Church might have been expected to evolve in such a way that as its doctrines found more rational expression, its clergy would become more educated and its practice less
formalized and more subjectivized -- more mystical, in one sense. This did not occur. As P.N. Miliukov sees it,

Another aspect of Russian religious thought which may be seen as cramping the development of subjectively experienced spirituality was its hylozotism - the view that matter was animated by spirit, a kind of naturalistic monism, going back to the pre-Christian myths, as G.P. Fedotov describes it in The Russian Religious Mind.\(^9\) Hylozotism distinguished not between matter and spirit, which was the more traditional Christian distinction, but between unsanctified and sanctified flesh. In a strongly sacramental religion, such as the Russian one was, the transcendent becomes immanent - God dwells in the temples made of hands. The sacrament, or тайна, is materialized. This sensual mysticism had an attenuated, more transcendental counterpart in the ascetic mysticism of certain religious, which began to be manifested about the fourteenth century, during the Mongol period, with roots going back to the Kievan caves Patericon and ultimately to Egyptian traditions not very influential in Russia. Nil Sorskii and the Transvolgans are perhaps the best known representatives of this tradition and significantly it was to a monastery 'in one of the most distant regions of Russia' that Liza retired, although the original Transvolgan monasteries were of course destroyed in the sixteenth century. But this strain was by no means dominant in Russia, where, as a rule, asceticism was not mystically inclined, but found its mystery in the transfiguration of the flesh.
Offered only the sterility of dogma and ritual by the official Church, most thinkers abandoned the Russian religion as hopelessly out of accord with their intellectual and spiritual needs. Finding an enduring replacement for the ready-made faith of their fathers was, however, a difficult and painful experience for the sons, especially since it had left its trace on them, in both mind and spirit. Many of the historical values and attitudes of the Russian Church had so permeated Russian thinking by the nineteenth century that few thinkers, even the most militant of atheists, could count themselves completely unscathed.

As remarked by many writers, the Christian ethic, at least in some of its aspects, remained as an ideal of behaviour with the intelligentsia, although stripped of its supernatural justification. The Christian commandment of 'love one another', for example, was gradually transformed into a concern for the welfare of one's fellow man, particularly after the left Hegelians became prominent on the scene in the 1840s, but a concern no longer anchored in a set of biblical injunctions. The problem was where exactly to anchor it: in Hegelian subservience to the State? Benthamite hedonism? Feuerbachian anthropologism? Comte's positivism? Only the concern itself was constant.

Another aspect of the intelligentsia's thinking which seems to have its roots in Christian concepts is the desire, so evident on the part of the sons of the gentry in particular, to atone for their fathers' sins, to humble themselves before society's lowliest to recompense them for the injustices done them.
This attitude in itself is connected with the whole kenotic approach to life implicit in Russian Christianity's Christ figure. The Orthodox Christ's kenoticism, the 'self-emptying', self-humiliating, self-sacrificing nature of the ideal man, is fundamental in Russian thinking, finding vivid expression in the works of Tolstoi and Dostoevskii as well as of Turgenev. Tiutchev considered that самоотвержение и самопожертвование formed the very core of Russian thought and Christianity. Its concept of the Christ separates Russian religious thought from the Byzantine, with its Pantocrator ideal, the all-powerful ruler, Christ the King of the mosaics of Sancta Sophia. This severe, majestic ideal was transformed in Russia into Christ the servant, the meek, the humiliated and humbled, the crucified Christ. It was according to this ideal that the Russian tradition of self-mortification, подвижничество, and the acceptance of suffering grew up, and the saintliest and most venerated figures in Russian religious history ordered their lives -- St Theodosius, founder of the Pecherskaia lavra in Kiev, his student Anthony, St Sergius, founder of the Zagorsk monastery, Nil Sorskii and the Transvolgans, St Demetrius of Rostov and Bishop Tikhon of Zadonsk. This tradition also produced the thousands of religious подвижники -- странники, юродивые and отшельники -- and the monks in the monasteries which followed the hesychastic ideas of Mt Athos according to which the heart rules the mind, the mind is said to descend to the heart; one thinks too of Russia's first saints, Boris and Gleb, whose only qualification for sainthood seems to have been their voluntary self-immolation, presumably in imitation of Jesus. They were not holy men,
heroes or martyrs to the faith; they were simply volunteers for death and suffering. Because such standards existed, there have been some odd candidates for canonization, such as Andrei Bogoliubskii of Vladimir and his children.

Thus it was that 'pride' became in the eyes of the Russian Church the supreme sin. As V.V. Rozanov remarks rather tartly, 'Можно заметить ... в Церкви, что она всякое распутство простит, Содом, Гоморру, всяческий Вавилон: но насупленных против себя бровей она никогда не простит.'

Thus it was that self-assertion of any kind was regarded as a sin, while submission to opposing forces or people was regarded as a virtue. Not surprisingly, the idealist philosophies of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, with their emphasis on the subordination of the ego to greater entities (whether the non-ego, the absolute Idea, the World Spirit, Nature, the State or whatever) were so popular and egoist systems initially so profoundly shocking to Russian sensibilities.

Inherent in this idea of the ideal act as a подвиг and the ideal man as a подвижник was the sense of love as agape — long-suffering, merciful, not possessive, and, incidentally, not erotic. It is significant that those of Turgenev's characters whom we have considered who most closely approach unselfed love - Rudin and Liza - do have very little eros in their love.

When this 'self-emptying', merciful, sorrowing, immaculate Christ-ideal was eroded by successive waves of humanism, materialism and romantic egotism and rebelliousness, Russians found themselves with the Christian psychology and value
system at least partly intact but with no rational basis for it. They had, like Turgenev, admiration for the подвиг while still searching for the faith, the ideal, that could motivate it.

* * * * * * * * * *

It was against this background of intellectual and ethical hostility to religion, and impoverished spirituality, that Turgenev's own attitudes towards religious questions developed. In order to understand his ideas on the subject at the time of writing *A Nest of Gentry* it is important that this development be considered systematically. His first childhood impressions were of mingled scepticism and superstition. Of Turgenev's mother Boris Zaitsev writes:

'Bарвара Петровна считала себя верующей, но к религии относилась странно. Православие для нее какая-то "мужицкая" вера, на нее, а уж особенно на ее служителей, смотрела она свысока.' He goes on about Turgenev's father: 'Сергей Николаевич вовсе был далек от всего этого. Жил сам по себе, одиноко и без Бога, но при всей смелости своей был, как нередко именно мужественные и неверующие люди, суеверен: боялся не Бога, не смерти и суда, а домовых.' On occasion he would summon a priest to exorcise the spirits from his house. 'Священник являлся тут для Сергея Николаевича чем-то вроде колдуна, заклинателя -- одна таинственная сила противоставлялась другой.'

In other words, Christianity was
simply another mysterious force among many, conceived in pagan
terms. It is interesting to note that V.A. Aksakova found
that this rather pagan, magical concept of religion was carried
over into Turgenev's later attitudes, a point which is not
without significance in any consideration of Turgenev's so-
called 'таинственные повести': '[Тургенев] казался ей не-
духовным, лишь слегка склонным к "духовности"... мистика
его не православная. Магическое, таинственно-колдовское
наиболее его влекло.' Of course, any hint of the pagan
would tend to stand out in comparison with the Aksakovs'
severely Orthodox Christian beliefs and practice.

Turgenev's compulsory course in divinity at the university
in St Petersburg was hardly likely to deepen his understanding
of or respect for religious ideas. This discipline was at a
low ebb in Russian universities in the 1830s, principally
because the instructors were not from the university but were
teachers from the so-called духовные академии. The course
Turgenev attended in St Petersburg was given by a priest called
Raikovskii whose lectures are reputed to have been dull and at
a low academic level. Nevertheless, Turgenev apparently did
very well academically in the subject. Turgenev's respect for
religious thinking at this time would not have been deepened by
the fact that the lecturer in philosophy at St Petersburg was
an Austrian named Fischer, the product of a Jesuit school,
whose courses were woefully inadequate as a preparation for
further studies in Germany, and hedged about with rigid, anti-
Enlightenment ideas. Despite the rather unprepossessing image
the Church must have had for Turgenev, in the review of
A.N. Murav'ev's book Путешествие ко святым местам в 1830 году
which Turgenev had published in 1836 (admittedly in a
government journal) he showed a very genuine appreciation of
the sincere, religiously motivated подвиг which forms such an
important part of Russian religious history, and of the Church
as a patriotic, quintessentially Russian institution. His
early appreciation of the genuine подвиг was to remain with
him all his life.

In Berlin (1838-9) where Turgenev was instructed by men
with religious ideas whom he could respect (such as Steffens,
who adopted a religio-philosophical viewpoint on many questions
in natural science, and Stahl who was a pietist) religious
ideas of a more orthodox nature were hugely overshadowed by
the intoxicating experience of hearing Werder lecture on Hegel.

According to Iu.F. Samarin, however, who was in touch
with Russians in Berlin at the time, there was widespread
support by 1841 for Schelling amongst students in Berlin as
against Hegel15; and although Turgenev was well aware of the
philosophical and religious controversy and not untouched by
Schelling's Naturphilosophie, he himself seemed to be drifting
in the opposite direction, towards left Hegelianism and
religious scepticism. During the winter of 1840-1 Turgenev
wrote Bettina von Arnim a letter16 from Berlin in which he
showed great sympathy for her basically materialistic pantheism.
God is now 'das Wort der Natur', spirit, thought in man and
nature, a concept which is close to ideas he expressed to
Bakunin and Efremov in his letter to them of 27 August (8 Sept-
ember) 1840, where he spoke of nature in divine terms: 'Природа
улыбалась мне. Я всегда жило чувствовал ее прелесть, вяние бога
в ней'; and the next day he was aware of God as 'the highest
manifestation of thought' within ourselves, declaring that 'the God who lives deep within us is transformed into our whole being' as a result of 'pure thought'.

Despite his new concern with 'действительность' and finite human beings, and his growing educated mistrust of anything smacking of the 'beyond' or the irrational, Turgenev's religious scepticism was not wholly unflawed: on the one hand Turgenev was always inclined towards pantheistic views, and on the other one set of doubts and sceptical attitudes did not resolve another set thrown up by 'eternal' questions about the meaning of existence, the consequences of human mortality and so on. In 1843, for example, Turgenev and Belinskii constantly argued out these questions:

Вскоре после моего знакомства с [Белинским], [Turgenev wrote years later in his 'Воспоминания о Белинском' (14: 27)], его снова начали тревожить те вопросы, которые, не получив разрешения или получив разрешение односторонне, не дают покоя человеку, особенно в молодости: философские вопросы о значении жизни, об отношениях людей друг к другу и к божеству, о происхождении мира, о бессмертии души и т.п.

In 1843, also, Turgenev wrote the poem 'Когда я молюсь', in which the poet makes it clear that when 'Всё распадается святое, / Чему так долго верил я', 'действительная жизнь' becomes too oppressive and he feels alienated and unheeded, his prayers 'стремятся пламенно . . . / Н живому богу моему' (1: 344).

In 1845 it is possible to detect a note of philosophical cynicism in his superficial humanism in a letter he wrote to Bakunin (9(21) January): ... дай Вам бог пробиться мужественно вперед -- не для того, чтобы достигнуть каких-нибудь благ -- истины или знания -- но для того, чтобы сохранить до конца энергическое чувство человеческого
It was this 'dignity' or sense of man's worth as an individual in the face of the cosmos, so vitally important to the liberal and increasingly difficult to preserve, that Countess Lambert embodied, although in the Countess's case its justification lay in ideas radically opposed to Feuerbach's.

In the late 1840s, of course, Feuerbach was still enthroned. There was a kind of bravado about Turgenev's atheism in those days. 'Il n'y a ni Dieu ni Diable', he announced to Pauline Viardot (26 November (8 December) 1847), and in a number of letters of this period Turgenev insisted that he had opted for what he termed 'life' -- the material view of man and the world -- and was at peace with himself. In 1848 he wrote to Pauline Viardot: 'Ah! je ne puis souffrir le ciel, -- mais la vie, la réalité, ses caprices, ses hasards, ses habitudes, sa beauté fugitive . . . j'adore tout cela. Je suis attaché à la glèbe, moi . . .' This delight in 'life' in its material sense was evoked by a walk in the woods which aroused in him a 'strange impression': 'Il y a dans cette impression un fond d'amertume fraîche . . ., un peu de mélancolie sereine . . .' (19 April (1 May) 1848). Next day he admitted he had been 'dans une disposition d'esprit philosophicopanthéistique'.

In another letter from this period of buoyant anthropologism (faintly tarnished, again, with traces of pantheism), he wrote to Pauline Viardot emphasizing that contemplation of the vast heavens did not make him religious (16(28) July 1849). Life, as he conceived it, may have been aimless, but it was enjoyable. 'Les milliers de mondes,
jêtes à profusion dans les profondeurs les plus reculées de l'espace, ne sont autre chose que l'expansion infinie de la vie, de cette vie qui occupe tout, pénètre partout, fait germer sans but et sans nécessité tout un monde de plantes et d'insectes dans une goutte d'eau . . . Mais qu'est-ce que c'est que cette vie? Ah! je n'en sais rien, . . ., pour le moment, elle est tout, elle est en pleine floraison, en vigueur . . .' Although this perception of life causes almost physical excitement in Turgenev, a note of cynicism and nihilism again breaks through:

Cette chose indifférente, impérieuse, vorace, égoïste, envahissante, c'est la vie, la nature, c'est Dieu; nommez-la comme vous voulez, mais ne l'adorez pas: entendons-nous, quand elle est belle, quand elle est bonne (ce qui n'arrive pas toujours) -- adorez-la pour sa beauté, pour sa bonté, mais ne l'adorez pas, ni pour sa grandeur, ni pour sa gloire! . . . Car, 1° il n'y a rien de grand ni de petit pour elle' 2° il n'y a pas plus de gloire dans la création qu'il n'y a de gloire dans une pierre qui tombe, dans l'eau qui coule, dans un estomac qui digère; tout cela ne peut pas faire autrement que de suivre la Loi de son existence qui est la Vie.

Thus even in his atheism Turgenev never wholly abandoned either his pantheism (which had its roots in German idealism) or his cynicism, which was to break through periodically in later years as fully-fledged nihilism.

Turgenev's attitude towards institutionalized religion in the late 1840s was, not unexpectedly, unsympathetic. The Church seemed to him to be anti-life. For example, in a letter to Pauline Viardot (dated 7, 8 (19,20) November 1847) he shared his impressions on reading G. Daumer's *Geheimnisse des christlichen Altertums*, a strongly anti-ecclesiastical book with which he could not agree on all points: 'ce qu'il y a de vrai dans son idée -- c'est le côté sanglant, triste, anti-
humain de cette religion, qui devrait être toute d'amour et
de charité. Vous ne sauriez vous imaginer l'effet pénible
que font tous ces légendes de martyrs qu'il vous raconte les
unes après les autres, toutes ces flagellations ... ce mépris
férocé de la vie ... ' Yet, typically, although ecclesiasticism
finds no response in Turgenev, religious faith, as faith, does,
simply because of its power to give life some sense, even if
Turgenev believes it to be erroneous. This is some measure of
Turgenev's breadth of spirit. About Calderón's Devoción de
la Cruz, for example, he had this to say in another letter to
Pauline (7 (19) December 1847):

Cette foi immuable, triomphante, sans l'ombre d'un
doute ou même d'une réflexion, vous écrase à force
de grandeur et de majesté, malgré tout ce que cette
doctrine a de repulsif et d'atroce. Ce néant de
tout ce qui constitue la dignité de l'homme devant
la volonté divine ... est encore un triomphe pour
l'esprit humain ... cette Divinité ... c'est encore
l'oeuvre de ses mains. Cependant, je préfère
Prométhée, je préfère Satan, le type de la révolte
et de l'individualité ... 

So when Turgenev said 'je suis tout encalderonisé' (in another
letter to Pauline 13(25) December 1847) he obviously did not
mean that he was enamoured of the Spanish playwright's
Catholic theology or even an admirer of theism. Nor was his
admiration of faith confined to that of the Christian variety.

In a remark on Washington Irving's book Mahomet and his
Successors in a letter to Pauline Viardot the same outstanding
quality struck him in Mahomet: 'очень занятно наблюдать смесь
истинного энтузиазма и лукавства, веры и ловкости в характере
этого необыкновенного человека.'

The same point came through in a letter to Pauline Viardot
(18(30) April 1848) where it was precisely the formalized,
mythological side of Catholicism that he mocked: 'J'ai lu ...
'Les Provinciales' de Pascal. C'est admirable de tous points. Bon sens, éloquence, verve comique, tout y est. Et cependant, c'est l'ouvrage d'un esclave, d'un esclave du catholicisme.' In the case of both Calderón and Pascal one feels that Turgenev was attracted against his rational will to the view of the human being's insignificance and nothingness in these Catholics' writings. That the religious view seems to deprive material man of his worldly dignity while appealing to a higher dignity, both tempted and repelled Turgenev. According to a letter he wrote to the same correspondent (13(25) December 1847) he found Calderón's play La Vida es sueño, for example, 'une des conceptions dramatiques les plus grandioses que je connaisse', evidently sympathizing as he did with all Hamlet figures with the hero Sigismund who acts although 'il sait bien que la vie n'est qu'un songe.' By the late fifties Turgenev's attitude towards Pascal had not changed radically, if we can judge by a letter, until recently unpublished, he wrote to Pauline Viardot in July 1859, the very year of his closest friendship with Countess Lambert. Turgenev found the formal doctrines of Pascal's Christianity repulsive, narrowly selfish and self-centred. Yet Pascal's nihilism strongly appealed to some less rational side of Turgenev's nature as it had over a decade earlier:
He then quoted at great length various passages from Pascal's *Pensées* bringing out the inconsequence and vacuousness of man as an earthly being, and the impossibility of certain knowledge of anything. The following quotations from Pascal selected by Turgenev illustrate well the direction of his thought: 'Мы бессильны знать все наверняка, так же как и не знать ничего совсем'; 'Мы плывем в огромном просторе, всегда неверном и бурном, бросаемые из одного его конца в другой ... земля распахивает свои бездны'; 'Последний акт кровав, как ни прекрасна комедия во всем остальном. Наконец, бросают комья земли на голову -- и все кончено навсегда'; 'Смотрят вверх, но опираются на песок, и когда рушится земля, падают, глядя в небо'; and 'Как пусто и полно всякой грязи человеческое сердце!'

In summary, Countess Lambert and the first ideas for *A Nest of Gentry* found Turgenev rationally sceptical on the question of any divine purpose to life, sceptical in the extreme about religion's ecclesiastical trappings, leaning towards a rather pantheistic materialism, rationally convinced that man must be his own god, governing his own experience, while at heart conscious of forces at play which make a mockery of man's pretense to self-determination and which he was obscurely inclined to interpret mystically. One can easily imagine him replying to the question as to why he had 'no religion' as his near contemporary Gérard de Nerval did: 'Pas de religion, moi! ... J'en ai dix-sept ... au moins.'¹⁹

Respect for the faith in the ideal that religion can inspire, for the подвиг it can impel, and an educated penchant for the mysterious and the cryptic, all prepared Turgenev for his receptiveness to the unorthodox lures of Countess Lambert,
'une sirène aux intentions évangéliques', as Granjard describes her, 'de qui les chants séduiteurs étaient des cantiques'.

Leonid Grossman, in his original essay 'Последняя поэма Туранева: Сенелия' (1918), compares Turgenev's attitude to religion with Ernest Renan's and would have us believe that Turgenev accepted the Christian ethic and revered Jesus of Nazareth as a man, while doubting any supernatural basis for his ethic. Yet in his attraction to Countess Lambert there is clearly much more than a rationalist's approval of her moral code.

Turgenev's close relationship with Countess Lambert during the late 1850s indeed appears to have provided the key impulse to write a novel on a religious theme. Turgenev's closeness to the Countess was growing during the two years or more he was engaged in writing A Nest of Gentry. Their friendship probably did not reach its fullest bloom until 1859, by which time the novel had been published, but since Turgenev's artistic concepts arose as a rule from concrete people and happenings it seems impossible to discount the idea that Liza Kalitina's religiousness mirrors the Countess's. (This correspondence incidentally takes some strength out of the common contention that Liza Kalitina is a 'folk' heroine and that her faith in particular is народная. Although Liza's Church was that of the народ, it is hard to see how Turgenev could have been overly concerned with making her religion народная when he took as his model Countess Elizaveta Lambert, daughter of Count Egor Frantsovich Kankrin (Nicholas I's minister of finances), wife of one of Alexander II's childhood compagnons des jeux and eventual aides de camp, irreproachably
connected in other high places, and moreover with Lutheran and Roman Catholic elements in her close family. Indeed it was precisely the difference between Liza's unusually transcendental faith, her heartfelt mysticism, and the spiritually and intellectually stunted religion so widespread in Russia, that attracted Lavretskii to her or made it possible for Turgenev to take her as his heroine.)

Although the story of their interesting and unusual relationship has been traced in some detail by H. Granjard in his study *Ivan Tourguénev, la comtesse Lambert et 'Nid de seigneurs*', some salient points should be mentioned here. Countess Lambert was not the only religious woman Turgenev had known or admired -- there had been Tat'iana Bakunina and Princess Sof'ia Ivanovna Meshcherskaia, for example -- but she was a genuinely spiritually-minded woman Turgenev felt inwardly close to and felt able to unburden his soul to. As his friendship for this pious woman deepened, his first ideas for *A Nest of Gentry* came. In his letters to the Countess Turgenev found comfort in discussing questions of a philosophical, moral and religious nature he rarely touched on, except in a flippant or distantly analytical way, with other correspondents, even, it would appear, Pauline Viardot. Indeed Turgenev may have turned to the Countess with particular warmth and frankness precisely because of his failing rapport with Pauline Viardot. Turgenev's illegal meeting with her in Moscow in 1853, during the period of his exile, marked a turning point in the relationship, and it became obvious that the relationship would thenceforth have to be on a different basis, and this realization only increased Turgenev's sense
of disillusionment with normal human aspirations of happiness. His role as lover being at an end, he was ready to establish a relationship of a more elevated kind with an intelligent, refined gentlewoman.

It is no doubt significant that an upsurge in the Countess's interest in Russian Orthodoxy almost coincided with her first acquaintance with Turgenev in the summer of 1856. As a result of rather bitter and painful personal experiences she was very receptive to the ministrations and counsel of the Bishop of Reval, a man whose religious views were characterized by their strictness. At the heart of the Countess's religious world-view as it developed from 1856 were ideas of the renunciation of this world and self-denial in preparation for 'le grand passage' into the next. In fact, for the Countess, as for Liza Kalitina, life paradoxically took on meaning only by virtue of its tragic denouement.

She wrote to Turgenev in 1860:

La vie extérieure des hommes est peu de chose; le seul travail beau et grand, parce qu'il est souvent difficile, c'est la vie de l'âme, qui nous imprime le cachet des destinées immortelles, auxquelles l'homme seul peut atteindre.23

In another undated letter she wrote to Turgenev:

Oui je crois que tout ce qui nous attire vers la terre, ce qui détourne nos regards du seul but sérieux et sévère de notre vie, tout cela est la coupe enchantée et amère dont il faut détourner les lèvres, non pas avec horreur, mais avec une profonde conviction ... il faut garder son coeur, son imagination purs pour supporter avec dignité le poids des années qui nous rapprochent du grand passage.24

How akin in spirit this notion is to Liza Kalitina's as she expressed it to Lavretskii while they were fishing at Vasil'evskoe: 'Христианином нужно быть ... не для того,
чтобы познавать небесное . . . там . . . земное, а для того, что каждый человек должен умереть' (7: 210). She admits to Lavretskii with peaceful cheer that death is constantly in her thoughts.

These quotations serve to highlight as well as any the vast difference that actually exists between Liza Kalitina's or Countess Lambert's view of life and the view that emerged in Turgenev's story 'Фауст', occasionally dubbed an 'étude' for A Nest of Gentry.25 In 'Фауст', which Turgenev did indeed write in 1856 just as he was about to start work on A Nest of Gentry, the oft-quoted penultimate paragraph bears only superficial resemblance to the ideas of the world's futility and evanescence which Liza Kalitina represents. The narrator muses:

Одно убеждение вынес я из опыта последних годов: жизнь не шутка и не забава, жизнь даже не наслаждение . . . жизнь -- тяжелый труд. Отречение, отречение постоянное -- вот ее тайный смысл, ее разгадка: не исполнение любимых мыслей и мечтаний, как бы они возвышены ни были, -- исполнение долга, вот о чем следует заботиться человеку; не наложить на себя цепей, железных цепей долга, не может он дойти, не падая, до конца своего поприща . . . (7: 50)

The point is that for the narrator of 'Фауст' resignation is 'тяжелый труд' because it is to the Unknown: 'Мы все должны смириться и преклонить головы перед Неведомым', he writes a few paragraphs earlier (7: 49). This Unknown, unfathomable and capricious in its ways, appears to work with hidden malice against human fulfilment and happiness. Resignation to its whims and the surrender of all dreams of personal happiness become in 'Фауст' man's bitter obligation, whereas for the Christian Countess Lambert and Liza Kalitina, resignation, however difficult, was in its spiritual essence joyful because
it was resignation not to the whims of some unknowable, cryptic and perverse cosmic force, but to God, whose nature in Russian religious thought is knowable, personal, and merciful. In Countess Lambert's words to Turgenev: '... пришла я на место страдания, но тоже и на место подвига [,] наложенного Провидением на всякого человека' (in a letter dated 23 September 1860). The concept of подвиг may have involved suffering, but it was also elevating, full of promise, blessed. The countess could 'supporter avec dignité le poids des années' whereas the heroine of 'Фауст' was destroyed, and the hero morally broken.

Deepening depression was another important reason for Turgenev's interest in the subject of religion at this particular stage of his philosophical odyssey. The two main sources of depression which emerge from his correspondence of these years were his health - Turgenev was a morbid hypochondriac for whom physical discomfort could easily balloon into cosmic doubt - and his growing apprehension of the ageing process.

References to his own poor health are common in Turgenev's letters to his friends; but the following extract from a letter to P. Annenkov (27 June (9 July) 1857) provides an example of how profoundly affected his whole state of mind was by his poor health:

... возвращение моей болезни меня убило: я мертвый человек -- я это чувствую, -- от меня несет трупом. Пока эта змея будет грызть меня -- ничего в жизни не может меня занимать и я не гожусь ни на что ... охладел почти ко всему ...

The previous winter in Paris had been a very severe one, and Turgenev seems to have been both ill and inadequately housed
and provided for, and it is possible that his physical decline can be traced in part to this winter.

By 1856 Turgenev seemed to be losing his zest for living, overcome with the feeling that happiness, and in particular lasting, married love, had finally eluded him and he was now too old ever to recapture it. 'С тех пор как я здесь,' he wrote to Countess Lambert from Spasskoe (9(21) May 1856), 'мной овладела внутренняя тревога ... какая глупая вещь -- потребность счастья -- когда уже веры в счастье нет!' Later the same summer (10(22) June) he wrote to the Countess finally renouncing all hope of marriage, provisionally blaming it on 'судьба'. Lev Tolstoi's diary for 25 March (6 April) 1857 reinforces the impression that Turgenev was going through a difficult period. 'Пошел к Тургеневу,' he wrote. 'Он уже не говорит, а болтает; не верит в ум, в людей, ни во что.'

The despondency and self-pity evidently did not abate over the next few years. In mid-July 1859 Turgenev wrote to his patient friend in the same vein from Courtavenel: 'Я знаю, чтò во мне умерло; для чего же стоять и глядеть на закрытый гроб? Не чувство во мне умерло, нет ... но возможность его осуществления' (letter no. 734). He felt that he had been cut off from his youth and happiness by a 'gulf which nothing can ever fill in all eternity'. The same month he wrote Fet a jocular poem in lieu of a letter, containing the macabre lines:

'Жизнь нас торопит, гонит нас, как стадо ... А смерть, мясник проворный, ждет -- да режет ... .' (16(28) July 1859)

In this state of depression, of renunciation of all hope of personal fulfilment in love or marriage, Turgenev was no
doubt more receptive than in times of self-confident materialism to ideas of a religious nature which could ennoble, or at least give some value to, that renunciation, enabling him to hold on to some faint hope of an ideal as the gloom set in. As he admitted to Countess Lambert in the summer of 1856:

'У нас нет идеала -- вот от чего все это происходит: а идеал дается только сильным гражданским бытом, искусством (или наукой) и религией' (10(22) June 1856), adding that 'религия не всякому дается' and, characteristically deflating his own idealism, concluding: 'Будем ждать и верить -- и знать, что -- пока -- мы дурачимся.' Thus, in the spiritual hiatus that followed his years of belief in German idealism and Feuerbach's man-god, Turgenev became ready to reach out and explore in whatever directions an ideal seemed to beckon: 'art', the most seductive of nihilisms, with its false goddesses of Beauty, and, latterly, Truth, lured Turgenev constantly; 'силенный гражданский быт' was to attract his attention in On the Eve and later Virgin Soil; 'наука' became an idol in Fathers and Sons; while in A Nest of Gentry he investigated the religious alternative. In this area of his investigation of suprapersonal forces mysteriously holding man in their grasp he was on more clearly defined ground than in either Rudyн or 'Фауст'.

* * * * * * *
In this most universally popular of his novels, Turgenev relates the failure of a search for happiness conducted on a materialistic, egocentric basis, and the attraction the disillusioned materialist feels for the heroine's firm faith in a suprapersonal controlling presence, God, and the purity and capacity for подвижничество engendered by this faith.

Fedor Lavretskii was brought up in an atmosphere of thought where there was no question of anchoring one's trust in any world other than the present one. As we learn from the painstakingly documented account of his ancestry and upbringing, Lavretskii was brought up under the influence of a father who was himself educated by 'отставной аббат и энциклопедист' and had his head stuffed full of Rousseau, Reynal, Helvétius, Diderot, Voltaire and many others. With true eighteenth century zeal, his father became the champion of a rationally worked out 'system' which consisted of Rousseauist ideas, culled at random, no doubt, natural science, international law, mathematics, carpentry and heraldics, as well as a spartan physical routine. This rationalist, materialist upbringing did not equip the boy Fedor for the onslaught of quickened sensibilities any better than German idealism equipped Rudin, nor did it give him faith in anything beyond observable phenomena, so that when observable phenomena ceased to give pleasure or to satisfy at a deeper level, he was cut spiritually adrift.

Not unnaturally, he sought fulfilment in satisfaction of personal desires, and therefore approached marriage as a source of pleasure -- 'pleasure' ('наслаждение') being in so many of Turgenev's works the sign of egotistic self-interest,
as opposed to a wider 'love', of *eros* as opposed to *agape*.

On his first visit to the Korobins, Lavretskii is thunderstruck by Varvara Pavlovna, who is portrayed almost entirely as a bodily presence:

This aura of erotic excitement surrounds Varvara in Lavretskii's mind after this first evening and it is primarily under its influence, as far as the text allows us to judge, that he proposes marriage. 'Ему казалось, что он теперь только понимал, для чего стоит жить', he muses on getting home, 'все его предположения, намерения, весь этот вздор и прах, исчезли разом; вся душа его слилась в одно чувство, в одно желание, в желание счастья, обладания, любви, сладкой женской любви' (7: 170). Illusion was weaving its web more tightly, love's counterfeit -- self-gratification -- was posing brazenly as the genuine thing. During the first days of their marriage 'он блаженствовал, упивался счастием; он предавался ему, как дитя ... Он и был невинен, как дитя, этот юный Алкид. Недаром веяло прелестью от всего существа его молодой жены; недаром сулила она чувству тайную роскошь неизведанных наслаждений; она сдержала больше, чем сулила' (7: 171).

The egotist ethic in personal relationships proves self-defeating: Varvara Pavlovna also devotes herself to it single-mindedly, which runs counter to Lavretskii's desires. The idyll is broken.
Not being able to see beyond the physical facts of his new situation, Lavretskii is overcome with scepticism about the possibility of his own happiness, which expands into a cosmically pessimistic view -- a very Turgenevan touch. The idealist Mikhailovich, a rather endearing survival from the idealist circles of the thirties, reproaches Lavretskii with just this tendency: 'разве можно, разве позволительно -- частный, так сказать, факт возводить в общий закон, в непреложное правило?' he asks (7: 202). According to Mikhailovich's lights, Lavretskii was 'unlucky' in his faulty egotist ideas and upbringing, and now should 'right' himself. The disaster was to be expected. He harangues the long-suffering, but protesting, Lavretskii (whose interjections have been omitted):

Ты эгоист, вот что! ... ты ждал самонаслажденья, ты ждал счастья в жизни, ты хотел жить только для себя ... И всё тебя обмануло; всё рухнуло под твоими ногами ... И оно должно было рухнуть. Ибо ты искал опоры там, где её найти нельзя, ибо ты строил свой дом на эфирном песке ... ибо нет в тебе веры; нет теплоты сердечной; ум, всё один только колеячный ум ... ты -- байбак, и ты злостный байбак, байбак с сознаньем, не наивный байбак ... ты мыслящий человек -- и лежишь; ты мог бы что-нибудь делать -- и ничего не делашь; лежишь съедён брюхом кверху и говоришь: так оно и следует, лежать-то, потому что всё, что люди ни делают, -- всё вздор и ни к чему не ведущая чепуха. (7: 203)

This sort of harangue sounds like a hang-over from Rudin. There are in Mikhailovich's outburst many Rudinian notes: the emphasis on the egotism and futility of desiring happiness in life, in making that an aim in life; there is the emphasis on the critical importance of faith, based on something 'permanent' -- that is, non-material, idealistic; the debilitating effect of the suspicion, induced by materialist
egoism, that there is no ultimate purpose in anything and that therefore there is actually, to disabused eyes, no purpose in doing anything or in acting at all.

On the other hand Mikhalevich is much more overtly religious in his views than Rudin, whose faith was less formalized: 'Я не только верю,' he tells Lavretskii, 'Я верую теперь' (7: 201). And he specifically rejects the old non-religious notion of 'fate' or of man as the 'tool of fate', so acceptable to Rudin (7: 202). 'Religion' is now the first word of his catchphrase 'религия, прогресс, человечность!' (7: 206).

There is a common tendency to attribute Lavretskii's moral and intellectual perplexity to social and historical causes such as the increasing alienation of that part of the дворянская интеллигенция which failed to come to terms with current trends, and the resulting superfluousness and oblomovism of the liberal intelligentsia of the nineteenth century whose liberalism had degenerated sadly from its active, transforming eighteenth century beginnings. A Nest of Gentry is in fact sometimes seen as a kind of swan-song of the gentry. Yet, however valid all these points may be about representatives of the historical gentry and however valid they might be about Lavretskii were he a historical figure, the fact remains that within the framework of the given novel, Lavretskii's consciousness of spiritual rootlessness is quite clearly shown to produce his social inactivity, and not the other way around, despite some area of interaction. His history is one of ideas -- the ideas that produced the behaviour of his forebears as well as his own, and his present
scepticism about the possibility of real happiness and the purpose of life demonstrably results from his having made a universal law out of a personal circumstance. Lavretskii's spiritual malaise can hardly be attributed directly to the fact that he belongs to a historically doomed social class: after all, both Panshin and Vera Pavlovna are also дворяне, yet flourish in their estate. Many other peripheral characters in the book such as Gedeonovskii, Marfa Timofeevna and even the buoyant younger generation of Kalitins appearing at the end of the novel, are all oblivious to any class problems. Lavretskii's problems of faith and search for something outside himself to believe in go much deeper and are much more universal than the problems of the дворянская интеллигенция, although these latter no doubt played their part.

In his quest for something to anchor himself to, Lavretskii must look beyond the vacillating forms of this world to something more immutable in the Quixotic regions of the undefiled ideal: 'Я вижу, тебе нужно теперь какое-нибудь чистое, неземное существо, которое исторгло бы тебя из твоей апатии,' Mikhalevich suggests (7: 206). Lavretskii at first ridicules the idea ('Спасибо, брат, ... с меня будет этих неземных существ') but in fact Mikhalevich has divined his inner need quite accurately. Liza seems to meet his need by being 'чистая' (and this unsullied, pure, untouched quality about her is constantly brought out)27 and by her otherworldliness, her aspiration to be free of the бренность of this world.

Lavretskii's attraction to this 'чистое, неземное существо' was immediate. 'Случается иногда,' says the narrator, 'что два уже знакомых, но не близких друг другу человека внезапно и
быстро сближаются в течение нескольких мгновений -- и сознание этого сближения тотчас выражается в их взглядах, в их дружелюбных и тихих усмешках, в самых их движениях. Именно это случилось с Лаврецким и Лизой' (7: 198). There is a similar affinity of souls between Lavretskii and Marfa Timofeevna, who is, like Liza, religious, although not to the point of подвижничество. On his first visit back to the Kalitins' he sits with Marfa Timofeevna, lost in thought:

Более часу провел он у ней, простившись с хозяйкой дома; он почти ничего не сказал своей старинной доброй приятельнице, и она его не расспрашивала ... Да и к чему было говорить, о чем расспрашивать? Она и так всё понимала, она и так сочувствовала всему, чем переполнялось его сердце. (7: 148)

What was it specifically about Liza that drew Lavretskii to her? Undoubtedly her untouched, virginal quality, germane to any ideal and particularly attractive to romantic natures and no less her strong, pure faith which appeared like a stream in the desert of his cynicism and uncertainty. There is a purposefulness and calm, soaring quality about Liza which Lavretskii finds in nature but not in himself:

... тишина обнимает его со всех сторон, солнце катится тихо по спокойному синему небу, и облака тихо плавут по нему; кажется, они знают, куда и зачем они плавут. (7: 190)

Living as he did in the realm of 'chaos' -- случайность -- Lavretskii is immediately attracted to Liza's organic mysticism. In this paragraph from an article which he published in 1842 as Lavretskii's contemporary, so to speak, Gertsen expresses rather cogently the mental state Lavretskii was in:

Случайность имеет в себе нечто невыносимо противное для свободного духа: ему так оскорбительно признать неразумную власть её, он так стремится подавить её, что, не зная выхода, выдумывает лучше грозную судьбу и покоряется ей; хочет, чтоб бедствия, его постигающие,
The hero of 'Фауст' (the action of which is set in 1850) also rejected illusory realism as a result of his mysterious experience with Vera and fell to thinking 'о тайной игре судьбы, которую мы, слепые, величаем слепым случаем' (7: 49). A remark Turgenev made in a letter he wrote to S.T. Aksakov just before he started work on A Nest of Gentry (27 December 1856 (8 January 1857)) would indicate that he too found unacceptable the kind of 'realism' which left man floundering in a sea of chance: 'новая школа реалистов ползает в позах перед [Бальзамом], рабски благоговее перед Случайностью, которую величат Действительностью или Правдою.'

Lavretskii wants to unite with whatever it is that elevates and moves Liza: on recognizing, unlike Rudin in a similar position, that he does actually love Liza and not just wish for the chance to love her, Lavretskii goes to church with her and begs to have that translucent quality of soul he identifies with her communicated to him: 'Ты меня сюда привела, -- подумал он, -- коснись же меня, коснись моей души' (7: 227).

The main expression of Liza's Christian faith is undoubtedly подвижничество, that is, self-abnegation and surrender of personal will, not to some ill-defined superentity as in Rudin's case, but to God's will. It does not take an extreme form such as that adopted by странники or пустынники for Liza's подвиг is essentially a personal one.
Her early impressions of Christianity and service to God were, with Agaf'ia's aid, moulded by the example of the legendary подвижники of the Russian Church, representatives, significantly, of the Church's more mystical side:

Агафья рассказывает ей не сказки: мерным и ровным голосом рассказывает она жизнь чистой девы, жизнь отшельников, угожников божих, святых мучениц; говорят она Лизе, как жили святые в пустынях, как спасались, голод терпели и нужду, -- и царей не боялись. (7: 242)

Agaf'ia herself was an example of meekness and submission to fate (7: 240-1).

Liza's own sense of a suprapersonal power, called God, was so all-encompassing, so imperious, that it demanded a подвиг of self-sacrifice. When talking to Lavretskii about forgiveness of his wife, for example, she made the point that if unhappiness in marriage were to be her lot, 'тогда надо будет покориться' (7: 199). Liza's total allegiance was to God, she was 'вся проникнутая чувством долга' -- to God (7: 243). The fatefulness of her world-view was extreme. To her, however, it was not obedience to the world-spirit in any pantheistic sense that was demanded, or to any other universal laws, but to God Himself -- the merciful, yet judicial, and ultimately mysterious Lord. Happiness, therefore, was always to be sought in God's hands, and He may or may not grant it. He granted it at times apparently according to merit -- He was at least quick to punish -- but the finer points were wreathed in the mists of grace. One recalls Liza's and Lavretskii's debate about love and its ramifications during which Liza said: 'Мне кажется, Федор Иванович, ... счастье на земле зависит не от нас'. Lavretskii was not yet disposed to believe in this God: 'От нас, от нас, поверьте мне,' he urged Liza. He had as yet
no trust in a higher power to whom one owes allegiance outside oneself. To Lavretskii, to marry 'по чувству долга, отреченья' would be 'безверие' (7: 221). Later, during their nocturnal meeting in the garden, when Lavretskii declared his love for her, she appealed again to the principle of self-abnegation: 'Это всё в божьей власти' (7: 237).

Liza naturally interprets the double-switch in her fortunes as a temptation they fell into to believe, and as punishment for believing, that they could escape their fate, cheat God, and steal personal happiness. It is in terms of punishment for this stupid and sinful flight of egotism that Liza sees the disenchantment of their hopes: 'Поделом!' -- говорила она самой себе, с трудом и волнением подавляя в душе какие-то горькие, злые, ей самые пугавшие порывы' (7: 257).

And to Lavretskii, during the few short minutes they had alone in Marfa Timofeevna's room, she says: 'Мы скоро были наказаны' (7: 272) -- in other words, she is stuck by the swiftness with which the divine rebuke came rather than with the fact that it came at all. Lavretskii does not fully accept her view, although he is less strongly opposed to it in his new, chastened state than previously. He does at least agree to do his 'duty', which is the level at which the materialist, yet sceptical, mentality can most readily come to grips with suprapersonal concepts verging on the transcendental: Lavretskii must return in humility to his wife, not condemn or abandon her, and Liza must go, as it transpires, to a monastery where the possibility of personal happiness cannot again arise, and where her duty will be to 'отмолить' the sinfulness into which she was born (7: 286). She reminds
Lavretskii one last time: 'Теперь вы сами видите, Федор Иванович, что счастье зависит не от нас, а от бога' (7: 273).

(It was this sense of duty as submission to suprapersonal demands incompatible with personal happiness which elicited the least positive response from the Contemporary critics. Although Dobroliubov, for example, was in general enthusiastic about the 'высокое и чистое наслаждение, испытанное нами при чтении этой повести' and the mastery with which Turgenev had presented the very real dilemma of the кающийся дворянин, clearly the ideas of the left wing of The Contemporary to the effect that personal happiness and a wider, more expansive sense of duty to the world can and must be reconciled, and rational egoism can replace irrational, transcendentally motivated altruism, are at basic variance with the ideological drift of the novel as a whole. It is difficult to imagine, for example, anything more diametrically opposed to the ethic of A Nest of Gentry than Chernyshevskii's 'Антропологический принцип в философии', which was published a year later than A Nest of Gentry, where all altruism is reduced to egoism and the pleasure principle is preached. Dostoevskii's Underground Man was, of course, also in opposition to Chernyshevskii's ideas, but, as distinct from Turgenev's heroine, did not oppose them with a rationale.)

Liza and Lavretskii have one important advantage over their predecessors, Rudin and Natasha (and in A Nest of Gentry, of course, Rudin's role corresponds more to Liza's and Natasha's to Lavretskii's) in that the dichotomy between the two possible types of love is made plain, even if neither can readily accept the other's criterion for what love ultimately must be. For
Liza love was a mystical relationship to God, and only by extension to mankind -- all mankind: 'она любила всех и никого в особенности; она любила одного бога восторженно, робко, нежно' (7: 244). Lavretskii, for whom love was something more personally gratifying, was, as it were, an extraneous element, who disturbed her habitual peace with God. (Personal feelings of love were in an analogous position in 'Поеzdка в Полесье' (1857) where suprapersonal Nature regarded them as an element which disturbed the natural balance (7: 70).) Whereas Lavretskii, with his personal sense of love, was spiritually uprooted by the collapse of that love, Liza found that the collapse of Lavretskii's worldly expectations only served to strengthen her belief in love as a spiritual bond: 'Ваш пример должен был испугать меня, сделать меня недоверчивой к бракам по любви, а я . . .' (7: 225). Liza could only feel encouraged by this example of the dashing of vain human imaginings that man is a free agent when, in reality, God is completely in control of him.

Lavretskii does not find full consolation in Liza's mystico-religious submission. Liza goes away to a remote monastery, Lavretskii settles down to the quiet, inoffensive existence of a liberal landowner. He does not become a believer, or even pattern his life on Christian precepts in particular. Lavretskii could not fully understand Liza but what Liza did achieve was to introduce a new dimension into Lavretskii's life as the narrator in 'Фауст' had into Vera Nikolaevna's, a new reality into his cramped and deceptive world of ум and рассудок. In a way that is reminiscent of Turgenev's own attitudes towards Countess Lambert, Lavretskii
seems to accept some of the negative sides of Liza's way of life without sharing in its spiritual buoyancy. One thinks, for example, of the Countess's description of *A Nest of Gentry* as 'l'oeuvre idéale d'un païen qui n'a pas encore renoncé au culte de Vénus, mais qui comprend déjà un culte plus sévère vers lequel les aspirations de son âme malade et attendrie le portent un peu contre son gré.'\(^3^1\) When, for instance, Vera Pavlovna reappears on the scene, and his illusions about happiness are again dashed, Lavretskii settles into a kind of pessimism about happiness that outwardly resembles Liza's:

His reconciliation with his wife is a matter of 'надо покориться', as he tells her (7:279) (adding that the expression will be meaningless to her), but it is merely external submission rather than Christian reconciliation in the sense of unselfed love or obedience to God's laws, as Liza would have understood it.

On the Sunday he goes to church as he had earlier in a more sublime spirit; but this time when he tries to pray

'сердце его отяжелело, ожесточилось, и мысли были далеко' (7:281).

Over the next eight years Lavretskii's life did veer, externally, in the direction Liza felt was holier. He became less egotistic and less happiness-oriented, yet he became so more through a scepticism which was based on nihilism than through a scepticism about worldliness which was based on otherworldliness: 'он действительно перестал думать о собственном счастье, о своекорыстных целях. Он утих и --
k че́му та́йть правду? -- постале́ не одни́м лицом и глóм,
постале́ ду́шою' (7: 293). He had reason to be contented: he
was an excellent landowner, 'действитель но выучи́лся па́хать
землю', not working for himself alone, but improving the lot
of his peasants. Yet, as he looked for the last time at the
Kalitins' house where he had been entranced by the mirage of
happiness, he could not help murmuring 'в виду ожидаемого
бega': 'Здравствуй, одинокая старость! Дорогой, бесполезная
жизнь!' (7: 293) There was, after all, in Liza a depth of
spirituality 'куда он проникнуть не мог' (7: 230).

In Rudin the hero saw men's lives as governed by cryptic
suprapersonal forces which reduce the individual ego to a tool
of their mysterious design, but his belief, while motivating
social action, was vague and did not successfully blend the
ideal and actual; in A Nest of Gentry the heroine sees the
suprapersonal forces governing man in Christian terms, but
again, her belief, while emotionally and aesthetically
attractive and capable of producing a подвиг, cannot wholly
satisfy the rational sceptic or completely solve the problem
of the conflict between personal interest and the wider good.
Now in On the Eve Turgenev was to delve into the adequacy of
the more mundane гражданский быт as the suprapersonal
governing factor.
CHAPTER TWO

A NEST OF GENTRY
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CHAPTER THREE

ON THE EVE

Turgenev ostensibly turned in On the Eve from transcendental to earthly ideals as the motivation for heroic action in the sense of подвиг. The ideal to which Insarov, the hero, is committed in every fibre of his being to realizing appears to be a very concrete one: a 'free' Bulgaria, Bulgaria free of Turkish domination. His thoughts and actions are devoted to his ideal Bulgaria to the point of obsession: 'Вы сейчас спрашивали меня, люблю ли я свою родину?' he asks Elena. 'Что же другое можно любить на земле? Что одно неизменно, что выше всех сомнений, чему нельзя не верить после бога?' (8: 68).

Turgenev appears to have been consciously responding to a new demand of the times, as he saw it, grappling with the problem of presenting a down-to-earth, practical yet idealistic hero, radically different from his impractical Rudin or doubting moderate Lavretskii. 'В основание моей повести,' he wrote to I.S. Aksakov (13(25) November 1859), 'положена мысль о необходимости сознательно-героических натур . . . для того, чтобы дело продвинулось вперед.' In part he may have been responding specifically to Chernyshevskii's critical essay on 'Ася' in which the дворянин is so decisively rejected as a hero, attempting to synthesize the old noble прекраснодушие of the forties with the utilitarian realism of the sixties.
Some of Turgenev's contemporaries welcomed the new
разночинец hero as an improvement over the earlier 'superfluous'
noble ones: Dobroliubov, for example, was heartened to see that Turgenev had responded to 'new demands' in his latest novel, although his praise of On the Eve was by no means unqualified; K. Leont'ev, writing in Notes of the Fatherland, I.V. Pavlov in The Moscow Herald, the novelist Evgeniia Tur in her article in The Moscow News and the reviewers of Turgenev's novel in such publications as The Russian Word, The Dawn, and The St Petersburg News all found a new tendency in On the Eve and in varying degrees approved of what they found -- the 'actuality' and tendentiousness of the theme, as they understood it, the more active, socially committed разночинец hero. The Soviet critic N.L. Brodskii also appreciates this change in emphasis in On the Eve -- the positive, more 'democratic' hero, the question of popular unrest that characterized the period (and in the late 1850s the peasant question was the only real social question and its solution the only real cause), but his approval is qualified by a feeling that Insarov is still an образ, спроектированный Тургеневым из идеологических desiderata', as he puts it.

The new heroine, Elena Stakhova, also seems to be anchoring her faith in concrete ideals, in contrast to Liza Kalitina, for example. Elena's whole being seems to be directed outwards towards her ideal -- in the first instance towards her ideal hero and through him to his ideal of liberating an oppressed people. She breaks all norms of behaviour for her class and times in marrying Insarov secretly, an act which took considerable strength of character and moral
fortitude, winning her the plaudits of the women's liberationists of her day, such as Evgeniia Tur, and the opprobrium of the conservatives, who tended to see in her a Russian George Sand with all the political connotations that emancipated Frenchwoman's name carried. In espousing Insarov's cause together with Insarov himself, Elena was ready even to die for that cause, as she demonstrated in following Insarov's remains to 'Slavic soil' and joining, and eventually being lost in, the revolutionary movement in the Balkans.

* * * * * * * *

Yet there is evidence that these appearances of 'new' heroes, a 'new' depth of social concern, and a 'new' realism are largely deceptive. As the Petersburg critic A. Skabichevskii phrased it, rather uncharitably, 'Под новой оболочкой таилась старая гниль.' The covering is deceptive because it makes Insarov - and to some extent Elena - out to be a 'realist', motivated to act not by some elusive immaterial ideal, but by materially realizable ideals, whereas investigation reveals in Turgenev's new hero and heroine most of the elements of rational and irrational mysticism, Quixotic idealism and debilitating doubt which were so prominent in earlier characters. Nekrasov was quick to take note of this fact, writing in an article in a Moscow newspaper several months after On the Eve was published that Insarov and Elena still remained on the level of the earlier idealists.10
In their eagerness to see Turgenev sliding over into their camp, many of the more radically minded critics failed to notice that Insarov and Elena were rather late-flowering romantics, not realists, and that only the ideological dress was different, while the root problem remained the same and no nearer to being solved. Although the modern critic Avrahm Yarmolinsky, for example, finds that 'a buoyant spirit of expectancy and promise informs On the Eve' in sharp contrast to the atmosphere of 'futility and frustration' in Rudin, and Professor Granjard speaks enthusiastically of Insarov's 'réalisme tranchant' and calls the novel 'cet hymne à l'enthousiasme révolutionnaire de l'ardente jeunesse des années "soixante"," the facts are more sober. Insarov might be better described, not as a 'realist' or 'new man', but as a Herderian romantic. As Professor J.L. Talmon points out in his book Romanticism and Revolt, Herder gave a powerful stimulus to Slavic nationalism in Eastern Europe with his romantic concept of the nation as virtually a mystic identity, the supreme entity, itself bringing forth men, not being brought forth by them. The mysterious quality of Volkstum overrode even God's authority. In Poland, nationalistic sentiment became a mystic cult, enforcing devotion to a dream in the struggle for the resurrection of the nation. Insarov's devouring obsession with the mystic, suprapersonal entity of the nation, in his case, Bulgaria, before individuals, indeed, before any other consideration at all, his idealization of a reality which, after all, he was not even deeply familiar with, his concern with wiping out the humiliation of an oppressed nation and his implicit sympathy with other anti-legitimist,
Herder-influenced movements such as Mazzini's in Italy, all point to Herder. A particularly Herderian touch was Insarov's interest, as a practical man, in 'studying Russian history . . . , translating Bulgarian songs and chronicles . . . composing a Russian grammar for Bulgarians and a Bulgarian one for Russians' (8: 54-5). Talmon says, for example, of the generation of romantics inspired by Herder's nationalism: 'No single generation ever witnessed such a spate of historical dictionaries, learned treatises on grammar, anthologies of old poetry, historical novels, collections of chronicles and sources, and indeed such a flowering of the historical discipline and, of course, patriotic poetry.'

Insarov was thus actually motivated to act by an idealism which was in effect little more 'realist' than, and almost as rationally mystical and extramundane as, Rudin's, although its referents were more solidly of this world.

At heart Elena is also a romantic idealist. According to the more realistic Shubin, she was initially attracted to Bersenev because he was an idealist, he believed (little matter, significantly, in what), he emoted, blushed, became embarrassed, talked about Schiller and Schelling. 'Она же всё отыскивает замечательных людей,' he remarks (8: 28). Now Elena feels she has found her замечательный человек in Insarov. Elena does not love or need people such as Bersenev or Insarov for a rational reason, not being interested in their cause as an end in itself (for the only cause worthy of the name in the 1850s in Russia was the emancipation of the serfs, while nothing in her way of life or thinking would suggest that this cause excited Elena.) Her need for a замечательный человек was
simply a personal, romantic one. The idea that Insarov's aim was to 'liberate his native land' filled Elena with romantic awe (8: 53), so that she was rather disappointed when she met him in person and found that he had no romantic aura at all: 'он произвел на нее не то впечатление, которого ожидала она. . . Елена, сама того не подозревая, ожидала чего-то более "фатального" . . . не такими воображала она себе людей, подобных Инсарову, "героев"' (8: 59). Having adjusted her views, however, she fell in love with her ideal and followed him. 'Да, Дмитрий,' she tells him as he lies ill in Moscow, 'мы пойдем вместе, я пойду за тобой . . . Это мой долг. Я тебя люблю . . . другого долга я не знаю' (8: 128). 15 Appeals to 'duty' as an external moral imperative are a common symptom of idealizing tendencies and were resorted to by Rudin, Liza Kalitina and Mikhalevich, for example.

Quite a few writers have expressed surprise that Elena could possibly fall in love with anyone as basically dull and unappealing as Dmitrii Insarov. Nekrasov asked himself this question and surmised that she must have fallen in love with his ideal, although why the liberation of Bulgaria should engross her was not clear to Nekrasov. 16 He reckoned without Herder. Turgenev's friend V.P. Botkin was similarly perplexed by Insarov's appeal for Elena, according to a letter he wrote to A.A. Fet (20 March 1860): 'любовь к нему Елены более удивляет, чем трогает.' 17 Even such an enthusiastic reviewer as the anonymous author of the article in The St Petersburg News who considered Elena to be 'the best Russian woman . . . since Tat'iana' was of the opinion that Elena fell in love with 'the principle, the strength', rather than with the
person of Insarov. The similarly anonymous reviewer in the journal for young ladies, *The Dawn*, concluded that Elena needed Insarov to help her achieve her ideal of fulfilment in doing something useful and good for others, and this need formed the basis of their 'love'.

This conclusion is probably not far from the truth. Insarov was necessary to Elena in order for her to act out her private fancies and inclinations, to raise her freeing of flies from spiders and care of stray kittens to something more heroic. She clung to an idealized version of Insarov, the hero she imagined this rather limited, indeed stereotyped (in the wider European, if not Russian, context) man to be. Thus even to say that she loved Insarov's ideal is to say too much: she loved the idea of the ideal, the fact that Insarov believed in an ideal. This sort of thinking shows no great advance over Natal'ia Lasun'skaia's, and is far from being 'realist'. Elena is really faced for the first time with her true feelings when Insarov dies in Venice. She writes a farewell letter to her parents: 'Я искала счастья -- и найду, быть может, смерть' (8: 165). In Turgenev's vocabulary, as was apparent from *Rudin* and *A Nest of Gentlefolk*, счастье tends to mean personal fulfilment in implied contrast to more supernal joys. As a somewhat disillusioned Turgenev wrote to Countess Lambert on this subject 21 September (3 October) 1860:

... жизнь в свое удовольствие давно кончилось для меня -- и надо теперь приучаться к настоящему жертвованию собою -- не к тому, о котором мы так много говорим в молодости и которое представляется нам в образе любви, то-есть все-таки наслаждения -- а к тому, которое ничего не дает личности, кроме разве чувства исполненного долга, и заметьте -- чувства чужого и холодного, безо всякой примеси восторженности или увлечения.
This kind of sober, kenotic thinking may have been more accessible for Elena after Insarov's death had cast a pall over her 'восторженность'.

Insarov's and Elena's idealism is not unnaturally coloured with Quixotic elements which the realists of the sixties themselves would have disowned. (Turgenev wrote On the Eve concurrently with his essay 'Гамлет и Дон-Хихот'.) Insarov, for example, is contrasted with Elena's approved suitor, Kurnatovskii, precisely on Hamlet-Don Quixote lines. 'Ты веришь,' Elena writes to Insarov (8: 108), 'а тот нет, потому что только в самого себя верить нельзя.' The lines merely paraphrase passages in the essay which identify (not altogether logically) faith with altruism and scepticism with egoism: while Don Quixote represents 'веру прежде всего . . . в истину, находящуюся вне отдельного человека' (8: 173), of Hamlet Turgenev says: 'Он весь живет для самого себя, он эгоист; но верить в себя даже эгоист не может; верить можно только в то, что вне нас и над нами' (8: 176). Insarov's rather obtuse, if genuinely kenotic, single-mindedness on questions of his ideal is also Quixotic in Turgenev's terms: 'В нем нет и следа эгоизма . . . он весь самопожертвование,' says Turgenev of Don Quixote. 'Постоянное стремление к одной и той же цели придает некоторое однообразие его мыслям, односторонность его уму; он знает мало, да и ему не нужно много знать' (8: 174). This characterization harmonizes with what his admirer, Bersenev, says of Insarov: that he may be 'умный' but is not 'даровитый' (8: 15), and Shubin's not impartial depiction of Insarov as a butting ram expressing 'тупая важность, задор, упрямство, неловкость, ограниченность' (8: 99).
Elena's actions are also not without their Quixotic overtones: her dedication to her idealized hero is analogous to Quixote's devotion to Dulcinea ('самообольщение' being a characteristic tendency in Quixotic types according to Turgenev (8: 189)) and her urgent desire for self-sacrifice and obvious wilfulness are also Quixotic traits in Turgenev's terms (8: 174). As the novel progresses, however, her Hamlet traits of self-analysis and self-doubt broadening to cosmic doubt come more to the fore in a way which was impossible for Insarov, who was not as deep a thinker as Elena.

Insarov's idealism is the product of the 1830s rather than the new era of realism. His thoughts and actions are in the thrall of an impersonal, suprapersonal categorical imperative. In Elena's words: 'у Д[митрия] ... оттого так ясно на душе, что он весь отдался своему делу, своей мечте. Из чего ему волноваться? Что отдался весь ... весь ... весь ... тому горя мало, тот уж ни за что не отвечает. Не я хочу: то хочет' (8: 83). As an idealist and a romantic, Insarov is not surprisingly faced with some of the problems which earlier confronted Rudin in the area of integrating the ideal and the actual. Personal love, for example, is shunned at first as a threat to his 'duty', his service to suprapersonal demands: 'он не желает ... для удовлетворения личного чувства изменить своему делу и своему долгу. "Я болгар, -- сказал он, -- и мне русской любви не нужно ..."' (8: 86). In this readiness to surrender all selfish passion in fidelity to an ideal, Insarov is, however, less androgynous a figure than Rudin: his chaste behaviour is the result of an inner struggle, whereas up to a point it seemed natural in Rudin (and in Don Quixote in whom
'чувственности и следа нет', according to Turgenev (8: 181)). Although initially there seems to be a reconciliation of personal and suprapersonal love in On the Eve which neither Rudin nor Liza Kalitina attained, in the final analysis Insarov and Elena are seen to have been caught up in the same web of contradictions as inextricably as their predecessors: the desire to unite with some grander design than that of personal satisfaction turns out to be as imbued with egotistic impulses as other less high-minded desires. In On the Eve cynicism about the ultimate validity of national or social concerns as a propelling force for heroism becomes stronger than it was even in the cases of German idealism and Orthodox Christianity. Social motivation is shot through with illusory, and basically egocentric romantic idealism.

Nor does Insarov escape Rudin's dilemma of how to transform demands of the ideal realm into practical action. Indeed, a quick tally of concrete deeds would seem to indicate that the thoroughgoing idealist Rudin actually achieved rather more in concrete terms than the would-be revolutionary Dmitrii Insarov. As has been pointed out many times since the novel was first published in 1860, the 'man of action' aura surrounding Insarov is largely deceptive. Shubin not unjustifiably protests to Uvar Ivanovich: 'Инсarov... Инсarov... К чему ложное смирение? Ну, положим, он молодец, он постоит за себя, хотя до сих пор делал то же, что и мы, грешные' (8: 141). Although his countrymen's expectations of him are great and his standing in their eyes obviously high, Insarov's actual record of accomplishments is unimpressive, his most heroic act during the action of the novel being to throw a drunken German into
a pond. Insarov's heroism is still in the ideal, waiting to be realized concretely. Its potential can only be gauged by his character traits of firmness, unbending will, moderate pragmatism (at least in comparison with Shubin and Bersenev) and dedication to the cause. There is even a slight shadow of doubt cast over the validity of his heroic role of liberator and revolutionary when he chooses to approach the Bulgarian field of battle through Vienna and Venice for reasons which, as Goncharov was not slow to point out at the time\(^2\), seem to have little practical connection with the purpose of the journey. Our last views of Insarov are not of a revolutionary fighter vanishing into the night to join his brother insurgents or dying manfully in some remote Balkan scene of battle, but of a gallant lover gliding around the Venetian canals, going to the opera, keeping romantic vigil for the sails of liberation to appear across the waters of some Venetian lagoon, and finally expiring in a hotel-room of an eminently respectable and romantic disease. Further doubt about the strict purity of Insarov's anti-imperialist impulses is raised by the fact that Insarov clearly has strong personal reasons for hating the Turks: both his parents were murdered by them. Bersenev dismisses any thought that Insarov could have personal vengeance in mind ("Мстят только в романах, Елена Николаевна; да и притом в двенадцать лет этот ага мог умереть" (8: 53)) and Elena certainly accepts a higher motive for his mission to Bulgaria; yet the possibility cannot be ignored that Insarov's fervour may be more than a little tinged with personal vengeance.

Doubts are also cast on Insarov's essential heroism by the close similarity he bears to Elena's unheroic suitor,
Kurnatovskii: not only is there some superficial external resemblance (Kurnatovskii's eyes are small like Insarov's (8: 107) and there is a similar straightforwardness in their demeanour (8: 59,107)); there is in each a similar 'iron' quality (8: 52,107), 'что-то ... тупое и пустое' (8: 99,107) and even 'честное' (8: 59,107), and self-sacrifice (8: 108). The main objective difference between the two lies in the nature of the cause each is dedicated to, and Elena, as a romantic spirit, is quite naturally more attracted to Insarov's cause with its aura of 'patrie lointaine', the exotic south, its promise of heroic struggle and 'democratic' ideals.

The fact must be faced that Insarov's concept of social action is a very Schilleresque one with its romantic and, historically speaking, individualistic 'тираноборческие' ideals, its 'прекраснодушие' and self-abnegation, whatever Turgenev's intentions at the time of writing. This concept of the hero properly belongs to the 1830s when Gertsen, Stankevich, Belinskii and Turgenev himself were all enamoured of it. By the 1840s the Schilleresque hero with his individualistic approach to changing society was already dated, particularly in the minds of the left Hegelians, and by the eve of the Emancipation only very superficially in tune with the ideas of the new breed of social activists. Insarov and Elena eventually become aware that individualistic heroism is tragically flawed and that heroism needs to be dictated by something much more all-embracing than social ideals; yet neither of them comes to any conclusion about the actual nature of the suprapersonal governing forces.
A hint as to the nature of these forces is provided by another important romantic element in *On the Eve* -- and one which was not only far more developed than in the earlier novels but which was to play an increasingly important part in Turgenev's fiction -- was the apparent intrusion of a cryptic suprapersonal governing force, referred to briefly in *On the Eve* as the 'тайнственное'. In this superficially realistic novel where social or political concerns appear at first to be the suprapersonal determinant the supernatural makes itself felt sparingly yet unmistakably. One area in which this may be observed is that of correct premonitions which hint at the existence of a suprapersonal and supernatural order or agency, independent of the phenomenal plane.

Quite early in her acquaintance with Insarov, for example, Elena sees him in a dream 'с кинжалом в руке. И будто он мне говорит: "Я тебя убью и себя убью". Какие глупости!' (8: 80).

In fact the dream presaged reality with uncanny accuracy, while not being obviously stimulated by any exterior circumstance. After Insarov's death Elena has another 'strange dream' in which she seems to foresee in a series of menacing, and even demoniacal images, her own death in a shipping disaster (8: 161-2). (There is no certainty that Elena does die in a storm at sea, although the author suggests it as a strong possibility. In the so-called 'План новой повести', abbreviated to А1 in the ПССР edition, Turgenev has a marginal note beside the note regarding Elena's probable death by drowning: 'Сон; буря' (8: 411).)

At one of the pivotal points of the novel, in the highly romantic surroundings of the abandoned chapel over the ruins
of a well, the suprapersonal again makes its presence felt. Elena meets an old peasant woman who 'recognizes' her: 'То-то я тебя признала' (8: 91); but this 'recognition' carries with it occult overtones, for the old woman recognizes Elena more than visually. With the vagueness of the seer, discerning Elena in a different dimension altogether, she goes on to prophesy:

'А я тебе, за твою доброту, вот что скажу: попался тебе человек хороший, не ветреник, ты уже держись одного; крепче смерти держись. Уж быть, так быть, а не быть, видно богу так угодно. Да.' Elena is astounded at the old woman's portentous words; and there is an immediate sequel to the portent when Insarov himself unexpectedly and providentially appears, seemingly 'случайно', as Elena says, using a highly significant, rather fearsome, word in Turgenev's vocabulary, but just as plausibly in mysterious accord with a suprapersonal design of which the individual human beings are aware in only a dim, desultory and often distorted way. The meeting which appeared fortuitous becomes a fatal one: Dmitrii's and Elena's lives are united in a tragic design.

At a more climactic point in the tragedy, during the performance of La Traviata at the Venice opera, the sense of evil presage is again present. In the third act 'в ответ на притворный кашель актрисы раздался в ложе глухой, неподдельный кашель Инсарова'; and indeed the whole third act seems to be foreboding to the horrified Elena the imminent catastrophe in her own life - the 'absurdly wasted youth' and the tragic finale of a desperate yet powerless love (8: 154-5).

In Elena's farewell letter to her parents there are further hints that she senses a force operating in their lives
beyond the realm of personal desire and haphazard chance.

'Hac судьба соединила недаром,' she writes (8: 165), 'кто
знает, может быть, я его убила; теперь его очередь увлечь меня
за собою . . . Простите мне все огорчения, которые я вам
причинила; это было не в моей воле.' There are strong echoes
here of the 'tool of fate' concept so wide-spread a decade
before in the early forties.

That a suprahuman presence is at least a suspected reality
for Insarov and Elena is demonstrated by the fact that both
hero and heroine are burdened by a sense of punishment or
retribution, which if not divine in an orthodox Christian
sense, is at least suprahuman, a kind of Nemesis. 'Скажи мне,'
Insarov says to Elena after his first bout of illness (8: 128),
'не приходило ли тебе в голову, что эта болезнь послана нам
в наказание?' Elena replies: 'Эта мысль мне в голову приходила,
Дмитрий. Но я подумала: за что же я буду наказана? Какой долг
я преступила, против чего согрешила я?' Her own conscience is
quiet and can give her no clue.

Even later, when Insarov is about to die, the thought that
this whole experience is retribution for some fault comes again
strongly to Elena (8: 157). However, her conscience is still
silent and she cannot imagine what crime could have incurred
the punishment or what laws they could have broken. In asking
incredulously if their crime lay in 'loving', Elena came nearer
the truth than perhaps she herself suspected, for in seeking
happiness, even through personally satisfying social action,
and personal attachment, even with another high-minded
individual, they were committing a crime against the mysterious
and largely uncomprehended suprapersonal law of the universe
which decrees that any search for 'happiness' quite literally is doomed.

As the story progresses, the cryptic nature of the forces governing man slowly outweighs their deific nature in the main characters' consciousness. Early in the action Elena writes in her diary of the need to pray more to the traditional God in order to dull her sense of the world's absurdity:

He знаю, кто и как, но меня как будто убивают, и внутренно я кричу и возмущаюсь; я плачу и не могу молчать ... Боже мой! боже мой! укроти во мне эти порывы! Ты один это можешь, всё другое бессильно: ни мои ничтожные милости, ни занятия, ничего, ничего мне помочь не может ... (8: 81)

When Insarov first recovers from his dangerous illness, Elena again turns to God with prayers of fervent gratitude (8: 124). However, as the sense of the world's absurdity and 'emptiness' engulfs her - a sense which is dramatically heightened by the ultimate absurdity of Insarov's death, nullifying any previous sense of life's purposefulness - the Orthodox Christian God yields to more cryptic and sinister forces. By the end of the novel, after Insarov's death, Elena can no longer pray to the Christian God whose name is mentioned only as a formality and whose traditional role and nature are no longer relevant.

В ее душе не было упреков: она не дерзала вопрошать бога, зачем не пощадил, не пожалел, не сберег, зачем наказал самые вины, если и была вина? Каждый из нас виноват уже тем, что живет, и нет такого великого мыслителя, нет такого благодетеля человечества, который в силу пользы, им принесимой, мог бы надеяться на то, что имеет право жить ... Но Елена молиться не могла: она окаменела. (8: 164)

The tone of what might be called superstitious pessimism which builds up in *On the Eve* is, contrary to the usual emphasis on the novel's 'realism', one of the chief characteristics distinguishing it from its predecessors. Indeed, the
strain of cynicism going through the novel is so strong that Brodskii, for example, in his excellent article already quoted, sees it as a major compositional flaw in the novel, claiming that the storyline or сюжет does not tie in with the ideological content, for heroism on the one hand is mixed with nihilistic realization of the futility of all heroism on the other. This realization strikes as a 'смутный муком в мажорную фабулу', according to Brodskii.22 As a dialectician, Brodskii is inclined to explain this as a перелом during the writing, a 'новая эпоха развития'. The English critic of Turgenev, Richard Freeborn, sees the paradox as existing between the personal pessimism and the social optimism: 'The more optimistic the ideological tone of his work' writes Freeborn, 'the more pessimistic is the individual view of destiny: it is this, above all else, which is illustrated by On the Eve.'23 While the pessimism of the individual view of destiny is not hard to find, the optimism of the ideological tone presents more of a problem. The 'optimism' is usually attributed to Uvar Ivanovich's answer to Shubin's desperate question 'Ногда у нас народятся люди?': 'Дай срок, ... будут' (8: 142). Later, after the tragedy of Insarov's and Elena's love has been played out, Shubin repeats the question in a letter to Uvar Ivanovich. This time, however, 'Увар Иванович поиграл перстами и устремил в отделение свой загадочный взор' (8: 167). The optimism of the social message seems to have been attenuated to the point of complete disappearance.

The pessimistic strain in On the Eve is perfectly understandable in the light of the evidence provided about
the development of Turgenev's ideas by his biography and letters. For Turgenev 1859, the year he was engaged at times intensively on *On the Eve*, was a year of deepening disillusionment with the 'world' he had once embraced so confidently and joyfully, of increasing cynicism about the possibility of finding any purpose to material existence, and of a growing sense of the futility of all worldly things. On 7(19) April of that year he wrote to Goncharov, for example: 'Прах, и тлен, и ложь -- всё земное.' There is a more flippancy echo of the same sentiment to be found in a letter to Fet of a couple of months later (18(30) June): 'всё земное идет мимо, всё прах и суета, кроме охоты'.

The growing feeling that his youth had gone, and with it all hope for a bright future, since hope is simply a delusion of youth, a psychological symptom of a physical condition, certainly coloured Turgenev's attitudes in 1859, although it would seem to be too much to speak of any перелом or crisis. He wrote to Countess Lambert in the spring of that year (30 April (12 May)):

. . . Мне сдается, как будто что-то новое началось в моей жизни. Или это только так кажется, а уже ничего нового, неожиданного жизнь мне представить не может, кроме смерти? Чувство грусти при перемене в жизни, при расставании -- чувство молодое и тесно связано с чувством надежды на будущее. Эти два разноцветные цветка растут на одном корне: завеяли ли они у меня? Не знаю, но иногда мне самому становится жутко.

To M.A. Markovich 18(30) June of that year he wrote in much the same vein: 'В сущности -- всякому человеку более или менее плохо; в молодости этого не чувствуешь . . .' In another letter to the Countess six days earlier he expressed cynicism about the possibility of hoping and acting: ' . . . есть еще
Later, 14(26) October, he wrote to the Countess expressing a kind of tragic pessimism about life which has many echoes in the novel: '... в судьбе почти каждого человека есть что-то трагическое, -- только часто это трагическое закрыто от самого человека пошлой поверхностью жизнью.' In On the Eve, also, life's superficial, and sometimes tawdry, heroism, beauty, and seeming purposefulness contrive to cover up the central fact of earthly life -- death -- which ultimately nullifies all values.

On the Eve illustrates the fact that the idea of tragedy in this letter was not merely a symptom of autumnal sadness or a more dramatic term for pathos. This novel does indeed close on a note of tragedy: some Nemesis or moira seems to operate which allows man to play out his life, to struggle, hope, enjoy and grieve while ultimately manipulating him and snuffing him out according to its own unfathomable and malevolent design.

These lines do penetrate the 'пошлай поверхность' of heroism, altruism, social consciousness, romanticism and nationalism, reducing Elena and Insarov to two small instances of the tragic senselessness of human existence.

The deepening pessimism that informs On the Eve beyond anything observable in earlier novels is no mere depression
along the lines of Shubin's desperate questioning cry (8: 142)

that 'Нет еще у нас никого, нет людей, куда ни посмотри . . .

Когда ж наша придет пора? Когда у нас народятся люди?' It

is much more cosmic in scope than Shubin's despondency. In

the same way that Turgenev's illnesses seemed to induce a sort

of cosmic pessimism, so Insarov's illness, although more

obviously fatal, arouses the same kind of all-enveloping doubts

in Elena:

Elena comes to the realization that even 'happiness' is not

sanctioned by any higher power, and is in that sense

illegitimate, illicitly enjoyed. 'Ей стало страшно

своего счастья' (8: 156-7).

This simultaneous growth of interest in supernatural and

nihilistic interpretations of the human condition in On the

Eve prepared the ground for Turgenev's penetrating examination

of nihilism in Fathers and Sons and his subsequent romantic

escape into the world of the таинственное in the remaining

two decades of his life.
Issue must be taken with the common view of the themes in *On the Eve* as the achievement of active heroism through social commitment, and the throwing off of impractical idealism in favour of concrete realism: Turgenev's hero and heroine are still romantic idealists, as incapable of resolving satisfactorily the questions of what to have faith in, how to enact ideals, and how to reconcile personal and impersonal love as earlier, more overtly transcendental idealists. The 'realist' in *On the Eve*, as Nekrasov early suspected, calling him a 'talented young man from the best contemporary society',24 is neither Insarov nor Elena but Shubin, especially in the anti-romantic sense current in the 1860s in Russia. He frankly yearns for personal fulfilment above all other considerations: 'Жажды любви, жажды счастья, больше ничего!' he asserts to the idealist Bersenev. He seeks happiness everywhere and what he means by it is clear: 'Черт возьми!... мы молоды, не уроды, не глупы: мы завоеваем себе счастье!' he says (8: 13-4). He has no patience with Bersenev's organic metaphysics and notion of 'слова, которые соединяют' such as 'искусство', 'родина', 'наука', 'свобода', 'справедливость' and 'любовь' ('но те та любовь, которой ты теперь жаждешь' Bersenev cautions him, 'не любовь-наслаждение, любовь-жертва'). 'Это хорошо для немцев,' Shubin retorts, 'а я хочу любить для себя; я хочу быть номером первым' (8: 14). Shubin's approach to men is openly naturalistic: he philosophizes to Bersenev on how there is really no more point or sense in men's lives than in ants' from a naturalist's point of view: 'Чем их жизнь хуже нашей жизни? И отчего же им не важничать, если мы позволяем себе важничать? Ну-на философ, разреши мне эту задачу!' (8:8). In his
debunking of man's absurd illusions of grandeur in a material universe in which man, ant or blade of grass are all equally insignificant and ephemeral, Shubin is verging on the nihilistic point of view to be developed so soon (and so much more dourly) by Bazarov in *Fathers and Sons*\(^{25}\) (and by Turgenev himself in his *Senilia*). Shubin manages to keep his sense of humour in the face of his nothingness. He still believes in enjoyment. Shubin's brand of 'realism' remains, however, a minor theme in *On the Eve*.

*On the Eve*, however slight as a work of art, may be regarded as another significant step in the progression in Turgenev's prose from the confident, atheistic anthropologism of the late forties and the left Hegelian optimism of his Belinskii days to the thoroughgoing mysticism and pessimism of his final period. In this novel even social consciousness cannot govern man without drawing its strength from romantic illusions, and it is shown to be an inadequate answer to the question of how to accommodate a personal, individualized sense of self, its needs and yearnings, to the facts of life in a universe where the personal turns out to be little more than an illusion in comparison with the universal, suprapersonal and not necessarily benevolent forces actually operating. On an intellectual plane Turgenev takes a step closer to nihilism, although on another plane he stands aghast at his own conclusion and gravitates with gathering strength towards a pessimistically mystical interpretation of life forces. These tendencies are observable at a later stage in their growth in his next novel, *Fathers and Sons*. 
CHAPTER THREE

ON THE EVE
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17 Quoted in A.I. Batiuto's commentary on On the Eve, Pesson, Vol. 8, p.525.
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21 See L. Maikov, 'Ссора между И.А. Гончаровым и И.С.Тургеневым в 1859 и 1860 годах', Русская старина, 1900, No. 1, p.16.
22 pp.96-8.
23 Turgenev: the novelist's novelist, p.115.
25 Shubin's status as an ex-medical student also seems to prefigure Bazarov, as the latter's 'realistic' assessment of Odintsova's womanhood (8: 268, 272) is reminiscent of Shubin's remarks about Zoia:

Елена на днях застала меня целующим руки у Зои! ... Что прикажешь делать? У неё плечи так хороши ... Ну да, плечи, руки, не всё ли равно? Елена застала меня посреди этих свободных занятий после обеда, а перед обедом я в её присутствии бранил Зою. Елена, к сожалению, не понимает всей естественности подобных противоречий. (8: 28)

Elena is not a 'realist' and could not be expected to understand.
CHAPTER FOUR

FATHERS AND SONS

The extraordinary furor raised in 1862 by Turgenev's fourth novel, Fathers and Sons, among all sections of society from radical students to the secret police, has focused the attention of literary historian and literary critic alike on questions such as whether or not Turgenev's portrait of Bazarov was a sympathetic one, and, if so, realistic in terms of social types, or whether it was a crude attempt to lampoon the new radical intelligentsia or an incisive, well-founded attack on it. In the process the novel's central theme has been largely obscured or neglected: as a tragedy, Fathers and Sons has death at its thematic core.

That the novel was conceived as a tragedy and that the seed from which it sprang was the thought of death is supported by solid evidence. During Hjalmar Boyesen's interview with him in Paris in 1873 (eleven years after Fathers and Sons was published), Turgenev gave this account of the first idea for the novel:

Я однажды прогуливался и думал о смерти ... Вслед затем предо мной возникла картина умирающего человека. Это был Базаров. Сцена произвела на меня сильное впечатление и затем начали развиваться остальные действующие лица и само действие.

The date this idea first arose is not mentioned.
Boyesen's account in no way conflicts with the other accounts of the original conception of the novel, such as Turgenev's own testimony in 'По поводу "Отцов и детей"' in which he tells how he took a certain provincial doctor as his model (14: 97) or with his letter of 14(26) April 1862 to K.K. Sluchevskii:

Мне мечталась фигура, сумрачная, дикая, большая, до половины выросшая из почвы, сильная, злобная, честная -- и все-таки обреченная на погибель -- и потому, что она все-таки стоит еще в преддверии будущего, -- мне мечтался такой-то странный pendant Пугачевым и т.д.

In the same letter Turgenev has already said: 'Я хотел сделать из [Базарова] лицо трагическое.' Here and elsewhere Turgenev is merely filling out the flesh of the hero--a necessary early step in the creative process for Turgenev as he explains in 'По поводу "Отцов и детей"' (idem) -- seizing on concrete models (the provincial doctor and Pugachev) to rescue his idea from the abstract he felt so insecure with.

Just over a week after he had written to Sluchevskii (22 April (4 May)) he wrote to Dostoevskii also that Bazarov had been conceived as a tragic figure, complaining that no one seemed to understand this. In the letter to Sluchevskii we find piqued surprise that Bazarov's death should have been seen as 'accidental': 'Смерть Базарова... должна была, по-моему, наложить последнюю черту на его трагическую фигуру. А Ваши молодые люди и ее находят случайной! The respected Soviet critic G. Bialyi, in admitting that Bazarov's death was 'in accord with psychological and socio-historical laws' and in those terms not 'accidental', still omits to make the point that his death was, more importantly, in accord with the law of tragedy and the sense of life as a tragedy.
Writing as he was about the tragedy of human existence overshadowed by death, exploring the ability of materialism (or наука, as he had broadly categorized it in his letter to Countess Lambert of 10 (22) June 1856, already quoted) to make sense of life and lead man to action, and groping hesitantly, even feebly, towards anti-materialist answers to life's questions, Turgenev was naturally bewildered by the attempts of his contemporaries of all camps to greet Fathers and Sons first and foremost as a political pamphlet. As in the case of Rudin, many contemporary commentators (and not a few later ones) not only interpreted Fathers and Sons as a socio-political document but as a roman à clef. Bazarov was held by many to be a caricature of Dobroliubov. Support for this opinion was based on several circumstances: on Turgenev's well-known deep antipathy for Dobroliubov and particular displeasure with his review of On the Eve; on the almost violent reaction to Fathers and Sons on the part of The Contemporary as expressed in M.A. Antonovich's celebrated article 'Асмодей нашего времени' (the inclusion of which in the third number for 1862 obviously had the blessing of Chernyshevskii); on the testimony of A. Ia. Panaeva who in her Воспоминания repeatedly referred to the enmity existing between Turgenev and Dobroliubov and even stated that 'редакция Современника была извещена, что Тургенев уезжает за границу, для того чтобы на свободе писать повесть, под заглавием "Нигилист", героем которой будет Доброљубов.'

All this evidence is inconclusive, however: there is no concrete evidence at all that Dobroliubov was the target of Turgenev's attack -- Panaeva's hostility towards Turgenev was also well-known and her claim unsubstantiated -- and indeed Turgenev
Attempts to prove tendentiousness in the opposite direction are no less numerous. A line from Turgenev's letter of 14(26) April 1862 to Sluchevskii is often quoted in support of the contention that *Fathers and Sons* was an attack on the forces of the right: 'Вся моя повесть направлена против дворянства как передового класса,' he wrote. Yet even this attempt on Turgenev's part to stay on side with a representative of the radical intelligentsia is only half-hearted. (Sluchevskii was at this stage, it should be remembered, a twenty-five-year-old budding poet and student of philosophy at Heidelberg, a seat in 1862 of radical sentiment among young Russians.) The novel is apparently directed against the gentry as the leading class. Other of Turgenev's expressions of 'sympathy' for Bazarov are also frequently quoted in attempts to cast Turgenev in the role of progressive socio-political agitator, particularly from the pages of his essay 'По поводу "Отцов и детей"' (14: 98-102). (The highly entertaining, if excessively venomous commentator on the times, E.M. Feoktistov, claims in his reminiscences За кулисами политики и литературы 1848-1896 that when he met Turgenev in Baden-Baden in 1870 the latter admitted he had 'gone too far' in his profession of sympathy for Bazarov.) As a consequence of attempts to make of *Fathers and Sons* a socio-political document and to discover various 'tendencies' on social or political questions, attention is very largely distracted from the philosophical pith of the novel. The one major critic in the sixties who seems to have adopted this position was A. Skabichevskii of
Notes of the Fatherland, who called Fathers and Sons a 'philosophical', not a 'social' novel, commenting that 'весь роман построен не на основаниях наблюдений над живой действительностью, а на чisto априорных началах'.

Turgenev himself emphatically denied on several occasions that his novel was in any sense tendentious. In a letter written only a matter of days before the one to Sluchevskii (6(18) April) he took issue with Fet on precisely this point, blaming the failure of the work, if it was a failure, on poor workmanship. 'Тенденция! а какая тенденция в "О и д" -- позвольте спросить? Хотел ли я обругать Базарова или его превознести? Я этого сам не знаю, ибо я не знаю, люблю ли я его или ненавижу! Вот тебе и тенденция!' He claimed complete objectivity in his portraiture. These points he reiterated in his article 'По поводу "Отцов и детей'' (14: 102). Years later he wrote to Saltykov-Shchedrin in the same vein (3(15) January 1876):

Не удивляюсь, впрочем, что Базаров остался для многих загадкой; я сам не могу хорошоенько себе представить, как я его написал. Тут был -- не смейтесь, пожалуйста -- какой-то фатум, что-то сильнее самого автора, что-то независимое от него. Зная одно: никакой предвзятой мысли, никакой тенденции во мне тогда не было; я писал наивно, словно сам дивясь тому, что у меня выходило.

Although the last statement is an old and rather fatuous ploy with writers, the main point is clear: social tendentiousness was not the aim, even if social comment was unavoidable.
Two basic themes, or areas of exploration, in *Fathers and Sons* are here suggested: the tragedy of life overshadowed by mortality; and the exploration of a broadly materialist world-view as an adequate corrective to this tragic sense (much as German idealism, Russian religious thought and nationalism or social action had been investigated in earlier works). The themes are well integrated in the novel. As the fabric of the materialist world-view disintegrates, the tragic absurdity of human existence is revealed underneath, with the only glimmerings of any hope of escape being glimpsed on a plane unacceptable to materialist thought.

Evgenii Bazarov is not just a 'materialist' -- schools of materialism are legion, and Bazarov is the exclusive representative of none -- he is the quintessential materialist, he stands for materialism taken *ad absurdum*, not necessarily in a pejorative sense (despite the passionate fulminations of Antonovich and his *Contemporary* colleagues to the contrary) but simply in the sense of 'taken to the philosophical extreme'. It was perhaps for this reason that the more philosophically extreme Pisarev found Bazarov a more acceptable figure than the more moderate *Contemporary* commentators. Strictly speaking, Bazarov was not simply an individual example of revolutionary youth on the eve of Emancipation in Russia, but, in being taken *ad absurdum*, he also represented the direction materialist thinking could take as it developed over the next few years.

This direction finds certain parallels in Dostoevskii, who was of course becoming acutely aware at the same time of the ominous metaphysical implications of revolutionary
materialism and was about to join the great debate with the
Contemporary group's rational egotism. It is scarcely
coincidental that Bazarov's truest heirs and relatives, from
a metaphysical standpoint, are to be found among Dostoevskii's
later heroes such as Raskol'nikov and Stavrogin rather than
in more obvious social and literary kinsmen such as Sleptsov's
Riazanov from Трудное время or any of Kliushnikov's nihilist
heroes and heroines from Марево. It is interesting that
Dostoevskii, with his particular metaphysical preoccupations,
should have been one of the very few to grasp 'so fully and
subtly' what Turgenev wanted to express through Bazarov, as
Turgenev indicated he was in a letter dated 18(30) March 1862;
a month later, when the general tenor of the reactions to and
misinterpretations of his novel had become known, Turgenev
told Sluchevskii that only two people, Dostoevskii and Botkin,
had really understood his work; he assured Dostoevskii of the
same thing a few days later (22 April (4 May)). The precise
content of Dostoevskii's remarks has not yet been discovered,
but there is a hint in the last quoted letter that Turgenev
may have been especially gratified by Dostoevskii's
understanding of the novel's tragic element.

As the personification of materialism taken to the extreme,
Bazarov has naturally baffled those who demand of Turgenev the
'realistic' image of a historical type, or even the portrait
of a historical figure. The well-known Moscow writer on
Turgenev, P.G. Pustovoit, for example, comes to the conclusion
that the author has concocted a 'synthesis' of Chernyshevskii's
and Dobroliubov's sensualism on the one hand and the 'vulgar
materialism' of Büchner, Vogt and Moleschott on the other.\textsuperscript{7}
The respected critic of Turgenev L.V. Pumpianskii sees Bazarov as a student of the physiological materialists (having in mind, evidently, the same Büchner, Vogt and Moleschott) and wonders why Turgenev did not make him a student of Feuerbach. Indeed, a large part of the controversy that flared up on the novel's publication, at least on the left, centred around the question of whether or not Bazarov was a true representative of materialism as it existed at that point in history.

When he first arrives on the scene, Bazarov is the picture of self-confident materialism: his face "оживлялось спокойной улыбкой и выражало самоуверенность и ум" (8: 200).

(Самоуверенность is, metaphysically, a dangerous quality: allied to самолюбие, it is, as Rudin pointed out, a necessary quality of mind if the individual is to act at all; yet it can easily degenerate into самолюбие or moral solipsism when not governed by principles outside the self. Significantly, Pavel Kirsanov finds in Bazarov 'satanic' pride (8: 247), a tellingly Dostoevskian touch, for his confidence in himself as a material organism is indeed a blasphemous apotheosis of the mortal self in defiance of deity.) The period spent on the Kirsanovs' estate in the novel's early chapters is dotted with examples of Bazarov's self-confidence, the self-assurance of a man who believes that he alone sees and all the rest of the world is blind. How apt is the description by Stepan Verkhovenskii (the Kirsanovs' contemporary) of Bazarov in Бесы as a 'Vague amalgam of Nozdrev and Byron'. Bazarov is condescending towards Nikolai Petrovich (батя у тебя славный малый,' he tells Arkadii. 'Стихи он напрасно читает и в хозяйстве вряд ли смыслит, но он добрый' (8: 210)); and
frankly contemptuous of Pavel Petrovich ('А чудаковат у тебя дядя... Целый день какое в деревне, подумаешь!' (idem));

and Pavel Petrovich not unnaturally felt indignant ('Этот лекарский сын не только не робел, он даже отвечал отрывисто и неохотно, и в звуке его голоса было что-то грубое, почти дерзкое' (8: 218)).

Bazarov's audacity and self-confidence are based on something more than character: they are the result of his complete acceptance -- indeed, paradoxically, his complete faith in -- nihilism. What 'nihilism' is or is not has been discussed for over a century, but it may be in order to draw attention to one or two salient features of Bazarov's nihilism. According to his disciple Arkadii a nihilist is one who 'на всему относится с критической точки зрения' and 'не склоняется ни перед какими авторитетами, ... не принимает ни одного принципа на веру, каким бы уважением ни был окружен этот принцип' (8: 216). He emphasises that this is not the same thing as 'not respecting anything' or 'not recognizing anything', as the two Kirsanov brothers wrongly suppose. As Arkadii sees it, nihilism is an approach to phenomena, almost a cognitive attitude, not a defined and permanent philosophical position. The Kirsanov brothers see nihilism in idealist terms as a system of categories and principles, but it is nowhere outlined as a system. It is rather a testing method. The point is not that the nihilist accepts or recognizes nothing, but that he accepts or recognizes nothing on faith. He specifically rejects any idealist, organically ordered approach to phenomena. This is demonstrated not only in his refusal to approach the phenomenal world as a categorized, interrelated whole, but in
his refusal to recognize any grand historical design (the so-called 'logic of history' (8: 242)), philosophy as a ready-made system of ideas (8: 243), or even science, about which he remarks: 'Есть науки, как есть ремесла, звания; а наука вообще не существует вовсе' (8: 219). (Curiously, Pumpianskii on these very grounds accuses Bazarov of 'metaphysical' materialism, claiming that if he had understood historical materialism he would have been able to 'act' -- and presumably rescue himself from his abstractions. A Don Quixote through and through, Pumpianskii ignores the problem of how to acquire faith in historical materialism, let alone the much larger question posed in Fathers and Sons of how to have faith in anything at all.)

Bazarov asserts confidently: 'ни во что не верю' (8: 219). Yet this is not strictly true. As Pavel Petrovich remarks rather sardonically: 'В принципы не верит, а в лягушек верит' (8: 217) (rather in the same vein as Rudin's objection to Pigasov's rejection of 'convictions' on the ground that his very rejection constituted a 'conviction'). Indeed, if Bazarov's scepticism is all-embracing, if he does reject 'all', as he says he does (8: 243), why does he concern himself with physics, or even with destroying? Rejection, for example, does not necessarily entail the destruction of what is rejected. In fact, it is possible to argue that the more complete a man's scepticism, the more complete his inactivity is likely to be, because he has begun to realize the pointlessness of all activity.

In fact Bazarov does recognize a principle, although it is not clear whether it is on the basis of empirical
experiment or faith or both. This principle is usefulness, and according to what is recognized as 'useful' Bazarov is motivated to act. 'Мы действуем в силу того, что мы признаём полезным,' he tells Pavel Petrovich rather pompously. 'В настоящее время полезное всего отрицание -- мы отрицаем.' (8: 243).

Bazarov appears callow, not because he naïvely claims to recognize no authorities, to accept nothing 'on faith', or to reject 'everything', but because his ideas on what is 'useful' are bumptious and half-baked and also, after all, based on faith. His very materialism is based on faith in the veracity of the senses. Materialism, indeed any theory positing matter as the ultimate reality, is, as Bazarov comes to suspect, merely one faith among many. As Katkov observed in an article significantly entitled 'Старые боги и новые боги': 'Кто выдает себя за мыслителя, тот не должен принимать на веру, без собственной мысли, ничего ни от г. Аскооченского, ни от г. Бухнера, ни от Ивана Яковлевича [известного московского пророка], ни от Фейербаха.' As the novel opens, Bazarov, blindly self-confident, is suspended in a position of acquired faith in a utilitarian form of materialism (although he himself would refuse to accept these labels) between solipsism on the one hand (in the spirit of a thinker such as Stirner) and moral and intellectual pessimism on the other (this being the direction in which he eventually swung).
Bazarov is consistent in his nihilism until his meeting with Odintsova. Before this meeting takes place, Bazarov is seemingly unaware of or unmoved by the underlying absurdity of human existence, effervescing briefly between nothingness and nothingness, and oblivious to the debilitating fact that even his criterion of usefulness hangs in a void, as senselessly as honour, self-respect, love, morality and other fixities he rejects. Even as he climbs the stairs with Arkadii to Odintsova's rooms, he is buoyant: 'Посмотрим, к какому разряду млекопитающих принадлежит сия особа,' he says (8: 269); but on being introduced to her, to Arkadii's amazement, 'он как будто сконфузился, между тем как Одинцова оставалась совершенно спокойной, по-вчерашнему. Базаров сам почувствовал, что сконфузился, и ему стало досадно' (8: 269-70). His discomfort lasted for the rest of the visit, although he reassumed his physiological bravado on leaving Odintsova: 'Это как богатое тело! ... хоть сейчас в анатомический театр' (8: 272).

It was here that the disintegration of Bazarov's self-confident façade began, that the first tragic flaw became noticeable. Love provided the arena in which all Turgenev's great moral and philosophical battles took place, so it was natural that the drop of idealist poison that eventually spread with fatal results throughout the whole nihilist system should have been love, as it had been in 'Фауст' six years earlier. How just, too, how tragically ironic, that Odintsova, who first implanted the fatal virus, should have been present at his death (on the more prosaic level, of typhus).

For all Bazarov's insistence that Odintsova can only be a 'богатое тело' and that attempts to explain the sensations of
one body on contact with another body in non-materialist terms are romantic nonsense, love in fact takes on a form for him that his theories cannot cope with. Bazarov's growing sense of some power possessing him which is in some way above or outside the individual and uncontrollable by him, is reminiscent of -- and comes to be almost the fulfilment of -- the view of love put forward by the hero of the earlier story 'Переписка' who claimed that love was a 'disease' which took possession of a man suddenly, against his will, like a fever (6: 190) and even of Rudin's description at one point of love as a serpent which steals into the heart (6: 291). Bazarov is disturbed by, but resists this sense. He muses after two weeks in Odintsova's house at Nikol'skoe:

'Нравится тебе женщина, -- говоривал он, -- старайся добиться толку; а нельзя -- ну, не надо, отвернись -- земля не клином сошлась.' Одинцова ему нравилась: распространенные слухи о ней, свобода и независимость ее мыслей, ее несомненное расположение к нему -- всё, казалось, говорило в его пользу; но он скоро понял, что с ней 'не добьешься толку', а отвернуться от нее он, к изумлению своему, не имел сил. Кровь его загорелась, как только он вспомнил о ней; он легко сладил бы с своей кровью, но что-то другое в него вселилось, чего он никогда не допускал, над чем всегда трунил, что возмущал всю его гордость. В разговорах с Анной Сергеевной он еще больше прежнего высказывал свое равнодушное презрение ко всему романтическому; а оставшись наедине, он с негодованием сознавал романтика в самом себе. (8: 287)

As his nihilism breaks down, he even descends to the heresy of fighting a duel. At this point nihilism becomes a theory only, and in practice Bazarov demonstrates that he believes there is something more important than life itself -- an obvious absurdity in purely rationalist materialist terms. The duel is an inconclusive affair and inessential to the plot, but it is a philosophical landmark in the novel (despite
Turgenev's remark to Sluchevskii 14(26) April 1862 in which he claims that the duel was introduced as a 'наглядное доказательство пустоты элеганто-дворянского рыцарства', as a comic element and nothing more). A duel is the symbol of the romantic idea that such concepts as 'love', 'honour' or 'principle' can be worth more than individual organic existence, and that Bazarov should have risked his individual organic existence was a clear demonstration of the extent of his surrender to the idealist disease.

In time social pessimism also starts to seep through the façade of the social revolutionary (which modifies the significance of Turgenev's desperate assurance to the young student radical Sluchevskii: 'если он называется нигилистом, то надо читать: революционером' (4(26) April 1862). It becomes increasingly unlikely that Bazarov could ever revolutionize anything as the futility of all human action dawns on him. One day at Mar'ino, sitting with Arkadii, he falls into a melancholy mood (from the hot sun and eating too many raspberries, as he explains it) and questions the idea of 'usefulness' in connection with education:

. . . сказать, например, что просвещение полезно, это общее место; а сказать, что просвещение вредно, это противоположное общее место. Оно как будто щеголеватее, а в сущности одно и то же.

-- Да правда-то где, на какой стороне?
-- Где? Я тебе отвечу, как эхо: где? (8: 324)

The strain of cynicism goes deeper than sun and raspberries, as the following lines show:

Да вот, например; ты сегодня сказал, проходя мимо избы нашего старосты Филиппа, -- она такая славная, белая, -- вот, сказал ты, Россия тогда достигнет совершенства, когда у последнего мужика будет такое же помещение, и всякий из нас должен этому
He goes on to admit that even his attitudes of rejection are nothing but sensations:

Я придерживаюсь отрицательного направления — в силу ощущения. Мне приятно отрицать, мой мозг так устроен — и бasta! Отчего мне нравится химия? Отчего ты любишь яблоки? — тоже в силу ощущения. Это всё едино. Глубже этого люди никогда не проникнут. Не всякий тебе это скажет, да и я в другой раз тебе этого не скажу. (idem)

Whether one agrees with the logic of his materialism or not, the fact remains that Bazarov takes his nihilism here to the limit, ad absurdum, to the point of negating even his nihilism: his penchant for it is on the same level as his liking for apples. Bazarov not only understands the danger to nihilism of what he is saying, but emphasizes that his words are not merely the result of a passing depression but express a viewpoint he never expects to change.

There is no real justification for passing these passages off, as does Pustovoit in effect, as nothing more than a sociological comment, an expression of anti-slavophile sentiment or cynicism about the role of the peasants in the new Russia now emerging. These remarks go much deeper than a mere sally in the direction of Gertsen, Ogarev and others. The text makes it clear that the issue is one of the sense of social purpose or motivation in general being nullified by an awareness of the inevitability of death. Here we have an example of social pessimism deepening into pessimism of a cosmic order.

This cosmic pessimism colours in deepening hues the second part of the novel. In a way typical of Rudin, Lavretskii and
Turgenev himself, Bazarov's personal sense of disappointment at being refused by Odintsova widens into a much more all-embracing kind of gloom: 'Надійний чоловік на ниточке висить, бездна ежеминутно під ним развернутися може, а він ще сам придумуєть собі всі неприємності, портить свою життя' (8: 306). At a later stage, during the conversation in which tomorrow's Filipps and Sidors come under fire, Bazarov expatiates on the futility of human existence in general (8: 323):

... я вже лежу звідси під стогом ... Узеньке місечечко, яке я займаю, до того кріхотоно в споріванні з остальних просторами, де мене нет і гдe дела до меня нет; і частио времени, якуою мене удается прожить, так ничтожна перед вечностю, где меня не было и не будет ... А в этом атоме, в этой математической точке кровь обращается, мозг работает, чего-то хочет тоже ... Что за безобразие! Что за пустяки! ... вот, мои родители ... заняты и не беспокоятся о собственном ничтожестве, оно им не смердит ... а я ... я чувствую только скучу да злость,13

One of Bazarov's most pessimistic statements comes in his talk with Arkadii after Arkadii has decided to marry Katia and Bazarov himself is about to leave Nikol'skoe for the last time:

'Видишь, что я делаю: в чемодане оказалось пустое место, и я кладу туда сено; так и в жизненном нашем чемодане; чем бы его ни набили, лишь бы пустоты не было' (8: 380). Certainly he then goes on to say rather savagely:

... мы просимся навсегда, и ты сам это чувствуешь ... ты поступил умно; для нашей горькой, терпкой, бобылой жизни ты не создан. В тебе нет ни дерзости, ни элости, а есть молодая смелость да молодой задор; для нашего дела это не годится.

But it is difficult to regard these words as much more than the expression of envious pique -- envy of the nest Arkadii is building for himself, of his youth and happiness; they reveal the hostility of the instructor towards the errant pupil, of the priest towards the heretic. Talk of 'дело' or 'наша
горькая, терпкая, бобыльная жизнь' is essentially romantic bravado, reminiscent of no one more than of the ageing Rudin. What cause can Bazarov possibly, in honesty, recommend to anyone after all he has said about life's futility and the pointlessness of working for the future good of mankind? Much as Rudin had wrapped his romantic cloak of holier-than-thou isolationism around himself and intoned about the long, hard road ahead, so after a parasitic summer spent on various noble estates, Bazarov strikes the same pose and intones ominously about a 'горькая, терпкая, бобыльная жизнь' to come.

The rub for Bazarov is in the annihilation of man in death. (Interestingly, his contemporary, Cherevanin, in Pomialovskii's novel МОЛОТОВ is so concerned with death that he gives his nihilist philosophy the name of 'кладбищенство'.) The bottomless chasm man hangs suspended over and the extinction of consciousness that a materialist view of consciousness must come to terms with are eventually faced by Bazarov. If the portrait of Bazarov as a philosophic type was to be taken to its limit, then Bazarov had to be confronted with death not simply as a philosophical proposition, but in concrete terms. This is why, from his own point of view, his death was an unpleasant 'случайность' (8: 389) while for Turgenev, in the role of tragedian, it was a necessity. Indeed it was the materialist idea that there is nothing but accident or случайность in life, no superior law, no governing intelligence, no basic order to the chaos, that Turgenev found most insupportable. As a mature writer he constantly sought to discover the operation of forces which could make sense of the seeming случайности of this world.
Turgenev's hero had to be made to face death because, as he himself said as he lay dying, 'поди попробуй отрицать смерть. Она тебя отрицает, и баста!' (8: 391). Death is a fact of existence, and perhaps, ultimately, the only fact of existence, which he could not come to terms with as something either useful, romantic, or sensual. Death is absolute in a world where Bazarov has up to now avoided recognizing anything absolute. The fact of mortality, as he himself came to suspect it would do, reduced his very nihilism to the level of romanticism, epicureanism, stoicism or any other 'ism'. It refused to be denied.

Bazarov, in the final analysis, is shown to be more of a clown than a titan. He is crushed and made a fool of not by Odintsova, nor by the more civilized and well-spoken Kirsanov brothers, but by death. The peasants had long since cast him in the role of 'шут гороховый', a crackpot with few clues as to what life is all about (8: 384). Death is not slow to mock Bazarov's absurd, blind and blasphemous self-confidence.

_Fathers and Sons_ is a tragedy, therefore, not simply in the pedestrian sense that the hero dies in moving circumstances; it is a tragedy because the sense of life portrayed in it is tragic and this is reflected in the form of the novel. Bazarov is allowed to strut self-confidently awhile on the stage of life, before being infected with the germ of idealism which saps his materialism of its strength and eventually brought low and faced with his own nothingness. Bazarov himself makes use at the end of the image of 'the wheel' ('Со мной кончено ... Попал под колесо' (8: 395)), evidently sharing the tragic sense of having been crushed by some juggernaut of fate, some
inexorable force that crushes, as must any tragic force, with
a mysterious combination of impartiality and design. Bazarov's
end is a restatement of the image of death at the close of
On the Eve: 'Смерть, как рыбак, который поймал рыбу в свою
сеть и оставляет ее на время в воде: рыба еще плавает, но
сеть на ней, и рыбак выхватит ее -- когда захочет' (8: 166).

** * * * * * * *

Turgenev wrote Fathers and Sons in possibly an even
gloomier frame of mind than he had written On the Eve. In
the first place, his awareness of growing old, of losing
touch with youth and seeing its promises wither unfulfilled,
was growing acute. In fact, as the first few years of the new
decade passed by, he found himself in a kind of emotional and
intellectual no man's land. In the summer of 1860, just
before his first ideas for Fathers and Sons took shape, he
commented to Fet whose spirits were also at a low ebb
(16(28) July):

... приписываете Ваше уважение, Вашу хандру
отсутствию правильной деятельности ... Э! душа
моя! всё не то ... Поздодость прошла -- и
старость еще не пришла -- вот отчего приходится
узлом к гузну. Я сам переживаю эту трудную,
сумеречную эпоху ... эпоху порывов, тем более
сильных, что они уже ничем не оправданы ...

Two months later (21 September (3 October)) he was confiding
to K. Leont'ev: 'я, как вы пишете, стал с некоторых пор
gрустным, в этом ничего удивительного: мне скоро 42 года,
а я не свил себе гнезда, не упрочил себе никакого местечка
на земле: веселого в этом мало.' Towards the end of 1860
(28 November (10 December)), at a time when he had reason to feel particularly pessimistic about the state of his relationship with Pauline Viardot, he wrote to Countess Lambert:

... на днях -- мое сердце умерло ... Прошедшее отделилось от меня окончательно, но рассставшись с ним, я увидел, что у меня ничего не осталось, что вся моя жизнь отделилась вместе с ним. -- Тяжело мне было -- но я скоро окаменел; и я чувствую теперь, что так жить еще можно.

A year later (10(22) December 1861) he wrote to her again (at the age of forty-three):

Вообще я чувствую, что сам обрастая корой: внутри всё еще довольно мягко -- но фибри, которыми я соприкасаюсь с окружающей меня жизнью, одервенели ... я подготовливаюсь понемногу к неотвратимому концу.

Not only did Turgenev feel more than ever that youth had escaped him, and that loneliness and death were the only fixities left to him, even if still at some remove, in a dissolving world; he was also in an intellectual quandary. He mentions in a letter he wrote to K. Sluchevskii from Paris (31 March (12April) 1861) that he was well acquainted with 'that doubt in oneself which is natural in every thinking person in our time'. To Countess Lambert, just after Fathers and Sons was published, he described how life 'от меня бежит как эмев -- никак ее поймать не могу -- куда поймать! Не могу увидать ее физиономию, узнать, какое наконец ее значение?'

(2(14) March 1862).

It seems likely that the emancipation of the serfs in February 1861 played a part in Turgenev's disorientation. Literally on the eve of the proclamation he wrote to Countess Lambert: 'А в странное и смутное время мы живем. Приглядитесь к тому, что везде делается ... Никогда разложение старого не происходило так быстро. А будет ли лучше новое -- бог весть!' (letter dated 16, 18 February (28 February, 2 March) 1861).
Several months after the edict (21 May (2 June)) he again wrote to her of his pessimism regarding the future of Russia whose filth and 'газообразность' offered little hope of change. He did not know whether to blame history or the nature of the Russian people themselves. As he observed to Pet towards the end of the same year (8(20) November): 'Чтение российских журналов не способствует к уменьшению уныния.' Turgenev's pessimism and disquiet were not of the same order as his impatience with the peasants, for example, for not willingly changing over to the quit rent system -- intellectually he supported the reforms and even refused to be a party to the petition Gertsen was arranging to protest against them. Yet psychologically Emancipation had deprived Turgenev of the mainstay of his liberal political and social identity -- his opposition to serfdom, embodied in his all too empty 'Hannibal's oath'. As Feoktistov uncharitably and not completely justifiably remarked, at least Hannibal went to Italy, while Turgenev did nothing at all towards carrying out his oath. (The progressive role allegedly played by his Записки охотника is probably more legendary than factual, and almost certainly accidental.) Now his very oath was superfluous, and the event which had seemed so inspiring from a romantic distance kindled less enthusiasm at close range. Deprived of any immediate possibility of an active social role to play as a prominent literary figure, Turgenev sank bewildered into social despondency.

In connection with the social, moral and intellectual pessimism of Fathers and Sons the question of Arthur Schopenhauer's influence on Turgenev becomes pertinent. It
is true that many commentators detect a Schopenhauerian strain in earlier works -- Batiuo, Pumianskii and Freeborn, for example, trace some influence on Turgenev back to the mid-fifties. However the question becomes particularly apposite in the case of Fathers and Sons because by 1861 Turgenev was almost certainly acquainted with Schopenhauer: in the first place, the third edition of Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung, which contributed greatly to his popularity in the West, had appeared in Leipzig in 1859; and, in the second place, Turgenev wrote to Gertsen (23 October (4 November) 1862) advising him to put Schopenhauer on his reading list. (Gertsen subsequently called Schopenhauer Turgenev's 'favourite author' in his article 'Еще раз Базаров' (1868), although on what basis is not specified.) This letter is the first direct evidence to come to light of Turgenev's interest in Schopenhauer in the early sixties. Before this date the critic can only point to parallels in the Weltanschauung of Schopenhauer on the one hand and certain of Turgenev's heroes and heroines on the other.

Interesting parallels certainly do exist in Fathers and Sons. One of the most arresting is the portrayal of reflection as a tragedy in this novel. Reflection in Schopenhauer's view is tragic because it leads to an awareness of life as a tragedy while giving man a Pascalian kind of dignity in the face of his suffering and nothingness. In succumbing to what Turgenev would have classed as Hamletism -- to reflection and scepticism -- Bazarov in fact loses much of his self-assertiveness and rational egotism, while in his essay 'Гамлет и Дон-Кихот' Turgenev had asserted that Hamlet must be egotistic and condemned him for it (8: 174, 176). Now more in the spirit
of Hegel's opponent, Schopenhauer, than of Hegel himself, Turgenev's self-analytical hero approaches a position of resignation to his own insignificance and to the inevitability of death, and of doubt about any purposefulness to the suprapersonal reality's operations.

There are, however, equally important points of divergence in Schopenhauer's and Turgenev's world views at this juncture. For example, neither Schopenhauer's strict division between the phenomenal and noumenal worlds nor his concept of the 'Ding an sich' finds any reflection in Turgenev's monism. The phenomenal world is not a 'veil' for Turgenev, but objectively existent and able to interact in a phenomenally perceivable way with the mysterious transcendent al plane. While Schopenhauer believed that anything noumenal could not be apprehended at this stage, Turgenev was becoming increasingly engaged in a search for freedom from phenomenal determinism and chaos through the transcendantal. There is an ambivalence in both Schopenhauer and Turgenev (at this stage) on the question of life after death, but their respective grounds for this ambivalence were as different as their concepts of life after death.

On the whole it is difficult to identify specifically Schopenhauerian ideas in Turgenev's writing in the early sixties, despite a shared general 'pessimism' and reaction against Hegel. A sceptic could point out that the parallels between the two can in the main be found in varying measure in writers and thinkers from Job and Ecclesiastes to Pascal and Calderón, or Kant, Goethe, Leopardi and Schiller closer to Turgenev's own time. This circumstance, the basic philosophical
differences between the German thinker and the Russian writer, and the fact that in later years Turgenev had little time for either Schopenhauer or his follower Eduard von Hartmann, lead to the conclusion that Schopenhauer's influence on the author of *Fathers and Sons* cannot have been a dominant or deep-rooted one.

* * * * * * * *

Turgenev’s own search for suprapersonal fixities to believe in and to sacrifice oneself to seemed to be blocked on all sides. None of the world-views he had investigated seemed able to banish doubt, pessimism or egoism, or to make order out of chaos, and in his despair and world-weariness his thoughts turned again to the religious viewpoint and mystical realities transcending the mundane. In the novel itself there are several hints, as there were in *Rudin*, *A Nest of Gentlefolk* and *In the Eve*, for example, and most appropriate in a tragedy, of a supernatural reality operating behind the scenes. It appears almost haphazardly at first through rents in the fabric of materialism.

The first mention of the preternatural in the novel, although it does not bear directly on the action of the novel, nevertheless touches one of its main characters and one of Bazarov’s main opponents. Pavel Kirsanov's one real love is a deep and tragic one for a Princess R., a strange woman with a 'загадочный взгляд' in which 'что-то необычайное светилось'.
'Назалось, она находилась во власти каких-то тайных, для нее
самой неведомых сил; они играли въ, как хотели; ее небольшой
ум не мог сладить с их прихотью' (8: 222). Interestingly
enough, when this princess was dying, in a state approaching
madness, she sent him a sign -- a sphinx ring Pavel Petrovich
had once given her. 'Она провела по сфинксу крестообразную
че́рту и велела ему сказать, что крест -- вот разгадка' (8: 224).
The 'не́ведомые си́лы' and the sphínx ring may be seen as nothing
more than an expression of Pavel Kirsanov's and Princess R.'s
romantic proclivities. Yet the weird note struck here,
clashing as it does with the tonality of Bazarov's ideas, is
echoed in an experience Pavel's brother, Nikolai, has. Nikolai
is also touched by the world beyond the veil, in an instance of
almost spiritualist communion with his dead wife. He is
thinking about his first meetings years ago with his now dead
wife, about their charm and sweetness, and he asks himself
'отчего бы не жить им вечную, неумирающую жизнь?'

Он не старался уяснить самому себе свою мысль, но он
чувствовал, что ему хотелось удержать то блаженное
время, чем-нибудь более сильным, нежели память; ему
хотелось вновь осязать близость своей Мари, ощутить
ее теплоту и дыхание, и ему уже чудилось, как будто
над ним ... Волшебный мир, в который он уже вступал,
который уже возникал из туманных волн прошедшего,
шевельнулся -- и исчез. (8: 251)

Pavel finds him in this strange state. 'Что с тобой?, he
asks, 'ты слепен, как привиденье' (8: 252).

This supernatural note is struck again in the superstitions
of Bazarov's own mother. She 'верила во всевозможные приметы,
гаданья, заговоры, сны; верила в юродивых, в домовых, в леших,
в дурные встречи, в порчу, в народные лекарства, в четверговую
соль, в скорый конец света; and, it might be added, in many
other extraordinary things (8: 316-7). Oddly, she does not believe in vain: she has a premonition of her son's death. Sitting beside his bed, watching him die, she recalls:

'неколько дней тому назад туалетное зеркальце высоко́нуло у ней из ру́к и разбило́сь, а это она всегда́ считала худым предзнаменованием' (8: 391).

His father's otherworldly interests assume a more orthodox form: he is a sincerely religious man and begs his son to allow the Christian sacrament to be administered (8: 392). When the last rites were being administered, Evgenii, on the point of death, appeared to open one eye and 'shudder in horror' at what he saw (8: 397). (How careful Turgenev still is to qualify observations such as this with an equivocal 'кажалось' or 'говорят'.)

The last paragraph of the novel, which makes most commentators uncomfortable because it does not harmonize with their notion of the novel as a socio-political document (Yarmolinsky, for example, considers it a 'flaw'21) in fact draws these few, seemingly disparate, threads together: the inevitability of death in this world, the Christian or mystical acceptance of death, the supernatural sense of life and love untouched by death, and of a dynamic pattern to being which transcends mortal existence. Bazarov's parents weep on his grave:

Неужели их молитвы, их слезы бесплодны? Неужели любовь, святая, преданная любовь не всесильна?
О нет! Какое бы страшное, грешное, бунтующее сердце не скрылось в могиле, цветы, растущие на ней, безмятежно глядят на нас своими невинными глазами: не об одном вечном спокойствии говорят нам они, о том великом спокойствии "равнодушной" природы; они говорят также о вечном примирении и о жизни бесконечной . . . (8: 402)
This is a novel with death at its thematic centre, and in its final paragraph Turgenev amplifies certain strains which were mere undertones to Bazarov's strident materialism: the importance of love, not as a materialist would understand it, but as an idealist or mystic might understand it, as something which can 'negate death'; the necessity for 'reconciliation', apparently in opposition to 'revolt' - that is, loss of any sense of personal self in the face of cosmic realities; and the affirmation of a suprapersonal reality which is not simply 'indifferent nature', pantheistically interpreted or otherwise. This represents a significant shift in the area of investigation of the suprapersonal from the late 1850s. The nature of the real forces at work in the universe, in fact the nature of the real universe, is much more transcendental than in Rudin, A Nest of Gentlefolk or On the Eve.

To take this tack called for courage on Turgenev's part because, as the nineteenth-century critic and literary historian E.A. Solov'ev (Andreevich) points out,

Gertsen's reaction to the last paragraph of Fathers and Sons was not an unusual one: 'Requiem на конце -- с дальним аппрошем к бессмертию души -- хорош, но опасен,' he wrote 9(21) April 1862, 'ты этак не дай стречка в мистицизм.' 'В мистицизм я не ударился,' replied Turgenev defensively (16(28) April)'и не ударюсь; -- и в отношении к Богу я придерживаюсь мнения Фауста:
Wer darf ihn nennen,  
Und wer bekennen:  
Ich glaub' ihn!  
Wer empfinden  
Und sich unterwinden  
Zu sagen: Ich glaub' ihn nicht!

Of course, Turgenev had not launched into the sea of mysticism or even become a part-time mystic in any useful sense of that word. But he had left the materialistic interpretations of being temporarily behind and, in the no man's land he found himself in, he groped after solutions to the problem of being which had their roots in mysticism -- otherworldly views, a sense of the self submerged in cosmic being beyond the veil of material sense, life not contingent on organic matter.

These conclusions are borne out in Turgenev's own correspondence of the period. On a rather crude level, and with reference to Nikolai Petrovich's almost séance-like experience, we know from a letter Turgenev wrote to Annenkov as early as 9(21) March 1857 that he had attended one of Daniel Home's séances in Paris that year (and was rather unimpressed) and from a jocular remark to E.A. Cherkasskaia a year later (13(25) March 1858) that he was reading Baron Ludwig von Gueldenstubbe, author of 'Ecriture directe des esprits'; from a letter he wrote to I.V. Pavlov (27 March (8 April) 1859) that Turgenev appears to have indulged in a little parlour spiritualism in the Mtsenk area that year ('Помните карбункул, отгадывания карты, фантастическую ночь? Я всё это не забыл'); and late in 1860, a matter of months after the ideas for Fathers and Sons had begun forming, he attended a séance ('заседание медиумов'), presumably in Paris, and, as he reported to Annenkov (19 November (1 December)),
found it both extraordinary and amusing. Also in 1860 Turgenev corresponded with Countess Lambert on the subject of extraordinarily vivid and significant dreams the Countess was having, which Turgenev took very seriously. Sometime later, in 1861, when work on *Fathers and Sons* was nearing completion, Turgenev wrote to Lambert (19(31) July): 'Я уже не с нынешнего дня убедился в том, что в жизни только невозможное возможно — только невероятное правдоподобно.' He went on to declare that in coping with the affairs of this vain world 'отлично помогает индийская философия: "Погрузиться в себя — и произойдет таинственное слово: ом! — не позволяй себе никакой другой мысли". Средство хорошее.' This cuts right across the popular notion of the author of *Fathers and Sons* rising to new heights of Quixotic fervour and involvement in political and social problems. The pose adopted here is Hamlet's, not Quixote's. That Turgenev did not mean his words to be taken lightly can be seen by the following lines from the same letter: 'В сущности, так как жизнь — болезнь, — всё, что мы называем философией, наукой, моралью, художеством, поэзией etc. etc. — ничто иное как успокаивающие лекарства, des calmants, ou des palliatifs.' Thus the sorts of solutions offered by the world's Don Quixotes — the philosophical Rudins, the socially romantic Insarovsky, as well as the scientific Bazarovs and the aesthetically sensitive Kirsanovs — are no more than stop-gaps, illusions, narcotics, which make life liveable for the ignorant, the epicurean and stoical. They fail to unite man with real suprapersonal forces, and are, therefore, as approaches to life, ultimately no more viable than Hamlet's. In fact, Hamlet, by delving into himself and finding himself to be nothing when he
thought he was something, paradoxically becomes a truer Don Quixote, achieves a truer подвиг than those superficially more Quixotic characters who strove to achieve a подвиг in accordance with the old formulae. Bazarov is not concerned in any concrete way with the question of the подвиг.

Self-surrender is the one true подвиг, regardless of the world's evaluation of it. Turgenev wrote to Dostoevskii (30 October (11 November) 1861), about the time he was completing Fathers and Sons, asking in a spirit of complete surrender of the materialist sense of self: 'чтo такое я, чтo такое -- отдельное лицо?' The radical nature of his developing idea of примирение, mentioned in the last line of the novel, is becoming clearer.

Materialist interpretations of being at this point no longer interested Turgenev. As he wrote to Countess Lambert (2(14) March 1862):

увы! Для чего я не такой, каким меня воображает графиня -- для чего я не человек, "пreeисполненный земной жизни" и преданный ей! Это сожаление и грешно и странно -- но я не могу от него избавиться -- и если я еще не успел принять мысль к неземному, то земное всё давно ушло от меня -- и я нахожусь в какой-то пустоте, туманной и тяжелой -- и уже нисколько не расположен отворачиваться от картин разрушения, черных покровов, горя и т.п.

While not identifying himself with any particular religious strain, nor taking a single firm step beyond the confines of agnosticism, Turgenev was at least now well aware of the religious alternative. He had still not decided whether religion -- meaning presumably Russian Orthodox Christianity in particular -- is merely a better, more effective palliative than science, philosophy and art, or whether it is a legitimate branch of mysticism.
In 1861, for example, while writing *Fathers and Sons*, Turgenev drew a very sympathetic portrait of a sincerely religious man, his friend the painter Aleksandr Ivanov, in 'Повздна в Альбано и Фраскати'. Early in 1861 (8 (20) January) he wrote to Countess Lambert a letter full of enthusiasm for the contemplative life in the Tikhvinskii monastery and of appreciation of the kind of peace in this life that approaches the peace of impersonal death itself:

He goes on to say that in his present frame of mind he feels almost that he has experienced what immortality means now. In a number of letters dated March 1861 (for example, to Gertsen and Druzhinin 14 (26)) he had emphasized that he had attended a church service in Paris to celebrate the emancipation of the serfs and that he had found the sermon so intelligent and touching that he had actually become tearful.

Later that same year (15 (27) November) Turgenev again wrote to Countess Lambert:

Turgenev's sympathy for religion would appear to rest at this point very largely on its claims to make sense of human life that ends in death. As he remarked to Countess Lambert a month later (10 (22) December) (just before *Fathers and Sons* was published)
Fathers and Sons may provide useful material for discussion of the new type of nihilistic разночинец appearing on the social and intellectual scene in Russia early in Aleksandr II's reign, but its theme goes much deeper. Fathers and Sons tries the new faith of the sons, materialism taken to its nihilistic extreme, and sees it founder on the rocks of love and death. Love paralyzes it, death makes nonsense of it, and Turgenev enquires, albeit timidly, what the nature of the love and the life which transcend mortality, yet at the same time mysteriously suffuse mortality with meaning, might be.

Turgenev did not face Bazarov merely with the challenge of подвижничество, as he had done with earlier characters in order to test their faith, their ability to act meaningfully and to subdue the self, but took Bazarov to the limit: faced him with man's mortality. Fathers and Sons demonstrates Turgenev's readiness to leave the world's solutions to the problems of being for extramundane ones.
CHAPTER FOUR

FATHERS AND SONS
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CHAPTER FIVE

TURGENEV THE FANTAST: FROM FATHERS AND SONS TO VIRGIN SOIL

Pushkin observed of his hero Germann that, 'having little true faith, he had many superstitions'. This was equally true of Turgenev during his most creative years, and particularly so of the years between Fathers and Sons and Virgin Soil which saw the publication of over a dozen stories and novellas, forming the bulk of Turgenev's 'тайны́е пове́сты́', and of the novel Smoke.

Having investigated in his earlier works the suprapersonal realities which men commonly submit themselves to and which claim to ennoble and make sense of human existence, to motivate action and justify faith and self-sacrifice, and having found them all in some degree wanting, Turgenev now devoted himself to the artistic investigation of other more cryptic and aggressive agencies, which had claimed his attention at various stages from the beginning of his career. His predisposition may well have been dictated by his 'romantisme mal guéri', to quote André Maurois, but we need to move beyond mere labelling to a deeper consideration of what Turgenev's тайны́е пове́сты́ depict and how they do it.
His stories during this period include two which portray the supernatural ('Собака' in 1866 and 'Сон' a decade later) at least seven which may be regarded as belonging to the fantastic genre (although to widely differing classes of it); a handful which touch on neither the supernatural nor the fantastic, such as 'Вешние воды', 'Пунин и Бабурин', 'Стучит!', 'Бригадир' and 'История лейтенанта Ергунова'; and one philosophical essay ('Звонко').

* * * * * * *

"Призраки", which in French Turgenev called rather more helpfully 'Apparitions', although belonging to the fantastic genre, really stands in a class on its own. Published in 1864, it was Turgenev's first work to appear in print since Fathers and Sons and his first 'mysterious tale'; but it was important because it was the product of some eight or nine years' sporadic work and therefore spanned his entire mature creative period. "Призраки" appears as a kind of flowering of all the hidden tendencies over those years, and at the same time a comment on them and a harbinger of what was to come.

"Призраки" belongs to the genre fantastique: 'это замечательное произведение очаровательной фантазии', as the author self-depreciatingly described it in a letter to Fet several months after he had finished it (1(13) October 1863), confirming his description of it as a 'fantasy' to Dostoevskii several months earlier (13(25) May). In a letter to his correspondent Valentine Delessert (5(17) June 1865) he called it 'une petite fantasmagorie' and in one to Countess Lambert (6(18) July 1863)
'всё ... фантастическая'. In most of these descriptions, Turgenev seems to be concerned to establish the genre correctly, emphasizing that 'Призраки' is not a повесть in the usually accepted sense, such as were 'Яков Пасынков', 'Ася' or 'щезь любовь', but quite a different kind of literary exercise. By calling it 'ряд каких-то душевных растворяющихся видений' (in a letter to Botkin (26 November (8 December) 1863)) and a 'ряд картин' in a letter to Avdeev (13(25) January 1870), Turgenev hoped to make it plain that it was not a realistic investigation of the supernatural, nor an essay in 'мистицизм', 'аскетизм' or 'обскурантизм', as he assured a disapproving Avdeev, but included ghostly apparitions, visions, levitation and so on as stylistic devices. He used this romantic form as a convention in order to express the 'переходное', 'действительно тяжелое' and 'темное состояние моего Я', as he put it in the letter to Botkin (26 November (8 December) 1863). In identifying the conventional nature of the romantic form Turgenev used, it is important, however, to distinguish it from the purely symbolic or allegorical use of supernatural images observable in Turgenev's later 'poem in prose' 'Посещение' (1878), where the flying feminine form is nothing more than a poetic symbol of the 'богиня фантазии' or the poet's inspiration (13: 170).

The recognition of supernatural images as poetic symbols discharges fantastic tension.

'Призраки' is fantastic in the sense that it enters into the realm of a man's fears, hopes, dreams and obsessions in images which push back conventional notions of reality. It illustrates van Tieghem's definition of 'fantaisie' as the genre in which 'les limites du réel et du surnatural s'effacent, on fuit les contours trop arrêtés'. Whether or not conventional notions of reality are seriously being
challenged philosophically is strictly speaking beside the point in the fantastic genre, although the author's own beliefs and attitudes towards the supernatural will naturally colour his art. In this particular work Turgenev has recourse to devices which belong to the earlier part of the century and the earlier history of French romanticism and its concepts of the 'fantastic' -- to *le frénétique* of the 1820s, the young Mérimée, Balzac, Nodier and others, the period of vampires, gruesome deaths and other Gothic horrors. ('Призраки' was evidently still to Mérimée's taste in the mid-sixties because he quickly translated it into French.) It seems more plausible to seek the formal origins of Turgenev's story here than in the pagan Russian folk traditions of 'начистые покойники' and 'упыри', although no element in the cultural ambiance can be discounted as altogether without influence.6

By publishing in Russia in 1864 a story with a vampire heroine -- and Alice actually leaves the narrator suffering from anaemia as a result of their encounters (9: 109) -- and a brooding, crowd-shunning, quasi-Byronic hero, Turgenev was throwing down a romantic gauntlet as provocative as Hugo's *Hernani* in 1830. The blatantly romantic form was a revolt on a formal level against the positivism which Turgenev had in fact revolted against intellectually (although with decorum) in *Fathers and Sons* and even earlier. Not surprisingly, critical reaction was in general negative, with a refusal to accept this reversion to *le frénétique*. Even if it was to be charitably interpreted as a throwback to Gogol', it was obviously to his 'Вий' rather than to the more fashionable 'Шинель'. Over a decade later the left-oriented critic...
S.A. Vengerov reacted very unfavourably to 'Призраки' and refused to discuss many of Turgenev's other later works at all 'out of respect to the author of the earlier stories', and V. Burenin in his Литературная деятельность Тургенева, which was published in 1884, characterized Turgenev's stories after Fathers and Sons as 'insignificant'.

'Призраки' was in fact so utterly alien to what was expected of the creator of Bazarov in the sixties by the coterie of radical critics so determined to see in Turgenev a social commentator that the Contemporary critic M. Antonovich, who had so savagely attacked Turgenev over Fathers and Sons, found 'Призраки' to be a 'чудесная штука', a harmless exercise in 'pure poetry', a delightful, apolitical series of randomly chosen pictures, devoid of sense but still beautiful. That Antonovich should find the piece apolitical or asocial was less surprising than his favourable reaction. In April 1863, only a month or so before he finished writing 'Призраки', Turgenev remarked to Countess Lambert: 'Вы правы, говоря, что я не политический деятель . . . я никогда не занимался и не буду заниматься политикой: это дело мне чуждо и неинтересное -- и я обращаю на него внимание, насколько это нужно писателю, призванному рисовать картины современного быта' (27 April (9 May)). And only six months earlier (23 October (4 November)) he had written to Gertsen: 'Я вполне согласен с тобой, что я -- не политическая натура . . .'. This was also a time when Turgenev clearly felt little confidence in the 'realistic' form: '. . . один реализм губителен,' he wrote to Botkin not long after completing 'Призраки' (21 September (3 October) 1863), 'правда, как ни сильна, не художество.' In 'Призраки' he has concentrated on imaging forth his subjective truths artistically.
The German literary historian and publicist Julian Schmidt emphasized the story's links with an earlier decade by calling 'Призраки' a 'Capriccio im Hoffmannschen Geschmack'.\(^{10}\) (He then rather inconsistently sought to 'explain' the presence of a vampire in the story by discovering an allegorical significance for it, claiming that 'Ellis ist, bewusst oder unbewusst, die Muse des Dichters'.\(^{11}\) As the highly respected critic N. Piksanov observed, this interpretation is unconvincing,\(^{12}\) although in 1868 when Turgenev was looking for all the support he could find he professed to find this remark enlightening (in a letter to Julian Schmidt (6(18) October)). Just before 'Призраки' was published, he had quite categorically rejected any attempt to 'interpret' Alice, claiming in a letter to Botkin (26 September (8 October)) with whom he was always very frank, that 'тут нет решительно никакой аллегории, я так же мало сам понимаю Эллис, как и ты.\(^{13}\) Schmidt was right in mentioning E.T.A. Hoffmann in connection with 'Призраки' only inasmuch as it represents a fantastic view of things (reinforced by the fact that the author is equated with the narrator) rather than a more rational view of fantastic things (as was the case in the later stories when the narrator was a third party). At the same time, 'Призраки' also recalls certain of Edgar Allan Poe's stories such as 'Eleonora' (1842) in which a dead woman returns in sound to the world, or 'Metzengerstein' (1832) in which a spectral horse appears, and, in tone, 'Ligeia' (1838), 'Morella' (1835) and 'The Fall of the House of Usher' (1839). Poe, it should be remembered, was in vogue in the sixties because of Baudelaire's excellent translations. How in tune these lines from Poe's
essay 'Eureka' (1847) are with the state of thought which gave rise to 'Призрач': 'No thinking being lives, who, at some luminous point of his life of thought, has not felt himself lost amid the surges of futile efforts at understanding or believing that anything exists greater than his own soul.'

The theme of 'Призрач', which links in a rather fragile chain the 'dissolving views', is that of the forces which hold sway over individual man, the forces that can only be submitted to, the forces that utterly annihilate man and which therefore in the final analysis sap human existence of all sense. The first apparition Alice introduces the narrator to is the scene of the shipwreck off the Isle of Wight, where the fury of the natural elements annihilates with utter indifference a multitude of minute human lives; the next apparition is of the vast, destructive power of the Roman legions in the Pontine Marshes, now themselves annihilated; the same night he is a spectator at one of Razin's massacres on the Volga, which is a further example of a blind elemental rage to murder and destroy; the next night he hovers above Paris, the very pinnacle of civilization, and, like Dostoevskii in London in 1862, he now sees it as nothing but a 'human anthill' (9: 100), something unnatural, painted, raucous, ugly, decadent, doomed; it is contrasted with the natural dark beauty of the Black Forest, unpeopled and undisturbed.

The narrator is filled with tedium and revulsion by the spectacle of human vanity unfolding beneath:

Грустно стало мне и как-то равнодушно скучно ... Сама земля, эта плоская поверхность, которая расстилалась подо мной; весь земной шар с его населением, мгновенным, немощным, подавленным нуждой, горем, болезнями, прикованным к глыбе
In 'Призраки' only two (more or less temporary) antidotes to this condition of moral pessimism are put forward; the highly romantic sensations of love and beauty. Beauty was the essence of the apparition of Lago Maggiore in Northern Italy: the splendour of the palace and the scenery, the colours, the soft scents and flowers, intoxicate the narrator. The intense sense of consummate beauty is climaxed by the tableau of the beautiful woman singing an aria in a sumptuously furnished room of the palace on the lake. Yet even this sort of experience, however desirable in itself, is not exempt from the decay, disillusionment and ultimate nothingness which come to characterize all things in the narrator's view.

Love is perhaps the last resort. Romantically conceived love seems to be the basis for Alice's association from beyond the grave with the narrator. Indeed her role as lover seems to be her main thematic raison d'être since she does not appear to relate to the 'series of dissolving views' on any other basis. There are some hints that Alice and the narrator have met 'before', which echoes the well-established tradition of lover-revenants. Her almost demonic jealousy of the enchanting singer of Lago Maggiore also deepens the romantic timbre of her love.
The dominant consideration in 'Призрач' is, however, death. Death in the sense of complete annihilation is the ultimate nullifier of all values. True to his chosen genre, Turgenev the fantast clothes Death, the outgrowth of morbid, terrified fantasy, in a nightmarish form: it is a horrifying, shapeless, creeping mass, reptilian, predatory, inescapable, all-devouring. 'Под её виженем -- я это видел, я это чувствовал -- всё уничтожалось, всё немело . . . Это сила шла; та сила, которой нет сопротивления, которой всё подвластно . . .' (9: 107).

There is a certain contradiction between two senses of death in a work such as 'Призрач' (and elsewhere). They are, in general terms, the romantic and the positivist senses. As both artist and thinker Turgenev increasingly dabbles in the former as an escape from the insistent claims of the latter. To the romantic, as in Hoffmann's and Poe's stories, death is really no more than a metamorphosis, a continuation of life in another form. It is not even completely accurate to speak of death as life on another plane because the 'dead' clearly are capable of interacting with the 'living'. The basis for interaction, by tradition, is always love or some perversion of it -- hate, jealousy, possession and so on. To the positivist, death is material disintegration and the consequent annihilation of the person who was nothing but organized matter. Alice, for example, seems to be subject to both kinds of death: as a spectre she is a revenant, yet ultimately she is also annihilated. The last lines of the fantasy contain traces of both views of death (9: 109):
Apart from 'Призраки', during the period between *Fathers and Sons* and *Virgin Soil* Turgenev wrote six other works which belong to the fantastic genre in the sense that they induce that 'hésitation du lecteur' between natural and supernatural interpretations of events which the modern theoretician of the fantastic genre, Tzvetan Todorov, considers 'la première condition du fantastique'.15 In four of these works ('Несчастная', 'Степной король Лир', 'Живые мощи' and 'Рассказ отца Алексея') the narrator describes events which are susceptible of supernatural interpretation, although, in keeping with the genre, do not demand it. These four Hoffmannesque tales constitute a fantastic or fantasy-informed portrayal of reality, imbued with dreams, premonitions, visions, metaboliological links and other occult paraphernalia. They represent in fact a stylistic revolt against the 'new art' and its 'new man'. Unlike 'Призраки', three of these four stories are ostensibly recounted to the author by a narrator, and three of them refer to the distant past. All but 'Степной
'Король Лир' are based on actual incidents. These devices lend both more objectivity by virtue of the rather clinical distance, and more inner tension to the tales because, in comparison with 'Призраки', a view of the supernatural now begins to edge out the supernatural view, and everyday reality and the supernatural strain closer together.

Following up this point, the Soviet critic Л.В. Пумпянский, who comments more seriously on this period of Тургенев's art than most critics, asserts that Тургенев's таинственные повести are neither Hoffmannesque, Poesque, nor supernatural at all but ideological -- an exegesis of his (superstitious) belief in 'metabiological realities' -- and therefore come under the heading of 'occult empiricism'. Although this view probably represents fairly closely Тургенев's own concept of his role as artist during these difficult years, it could be argued that it is based on far too narrow an interpretation of the word 'fantastic' and too dogmatic an interpretation of the ideological substratum of the stories in question.

There are within this genre as defined in this thesis two other works ("Странная история" and "Стук ... стук ...
стук!
...") which, while fantastic, illustrate Пумпянский's point more neatly because they are fairly clear-eyed investigations of 'fantastic' events, and while the same supernatural realism intrudes -- fatality, dreams, apparitions, coincidences, and so on -- they are more obviously susceptible of natural explanations in these two stories.

The 'fantastic' element in the heavily romantic and rather tedious tale 'Несчастная', written in the summer of
1868 and published the following year, and reminiscent in theme and style of the immature Dostoevskii and the more naïve products of the naturalist school, consists of a single incident: at a moment of crisis, as the relationship between the student Fustov and the strange, sad girl Susanna dissolves, Fustov's friend (the narrator) sees an apparition: 'В это мгновенье мне вдруг показалось, что на окне сидит, склонившись на руки, бледная женская фигура. Я вздрогнул, вгляделся пристальнее и ничего, конечно, не увидел на подоконнике, но какое-то странное чувство, смешение ужаса, тоски, сожаления охватило меня' (10: 141). The narrator interprets the experience as an externalized 'inner voice' and urges Fustov to go to see Susanna immediately. He does not go, however, and an hour and a half later, as it transpires, Susanna dies in strange and desperate circumstances. It is perfectly understandable that 'Несчастная' should have been so favourably received in France by such writers as Mérimée, Maupassant and Flaubert.17

This incident may be described as a fantastic element because it is not demonstrably anything other than a mysterious extension of the fantast's consciousness. Technically speaking, the narrator was presented with apparent bilocation, and the incident may be viewed as a genuine metaboliological communication from Susanna and as a deep relationship manifesting itself at a supernatural level, because it served as such, but it may no less justifiably be ascribed to the heated emotional atmosphere, to the poor light in the room, to overheated romantic imagination (the incident took place in 1835) and, of course, to coincidence. While on the
one hand the narrator alone sees the momentary apparition and
its objectivity is therefore called in question, on the other
hand no rational explanation is specifically offered for it.

The next year, 1870, the story 'Степной король Лир' was
published, and was, as Turgenev himself realized, a complete
fiasco. In this tale told to the author by a 'Mr Kh...',
the main theme is a very Turgenevan one: pride broken. In a
marginal note in the rough draft now kept in the Bibliothèque
Nationale in Paris, Turgenev, in a comment on Kharlov's
admission to 'pride' (гордость) as his great tragic fault,
says that Kharlov is to be compared to Nebuchadnezzar. Like
the great Babylonian king, Kharlov's decline and madness were
also preceded by portentous dreams.

The hero Kharlov is encountered in a melancholy state of
mind, painfully aware of life's pointlessness and ephemerality:
'Mартын Петрович начал головой, упоминая о бречности, о том,
что всё пойдет прахом, увянет, яко былие; прейдет -- и не
будет!' (10: 193). He contemplates a picture called 'Such is
human life!' showing a candle being blown on from all sides by
zephyri. This kind of melancholy, which is particularly
oppressive at the full moon, is assuaged less through religion
-- Kharlov is rarely seen at church -- than through dabblings
in the occult. He indulges in what he calls 'сонное видение'
and calls himself a 'сновидец' (10: 204). He reads Novikov's
masonically oriented journal Покоящийся трудолюбец, which
contained numerous quasi-mystical discourses on questions of
life and death (10: 192).

He relates a dream he has of a 'black colt' which comes
into his room and kicks him in the left side (with physical
side effects in the waking state). This dream he interprets as a forewarning of death, and this interpretation sets in motion the chain of consequences leading to disaster and his eventual death. (In the summer of 1869, while working on 'Степной король Лиф', Turgenev also had a disturbing experience: lying on his bed, he felt suddenly shaken and his left arm seemed paralyzed. Although he felt physically normal fairly rapidly, 'сердце у меня заныло', as he reported to Annenkov several days later (24 May (5 June) 1869).

This is the only genuinely 'fantastic' element in the story. To the narrator's perception (and to the hero's to an even greater extent) Kharlov's ruin and death were linked up with a preternatural and suprapersonal force -- 'fate', 'evil', the label is unimportant to either. This perception is never refuted. Yet nor is the so-called common-sense view: that disaster followed Kharlov's abnormal or disordered mental state in a perfectly natural way. This ambivalence assures 'Степной король Лиф' of a place among Turgenev's fantastic stories.

A late insertion into Записки охотника, 'Живые мощи' provides another very different example of the fantastic genre. This виток of the strange подвижница Luker'ia is narrated with the same delicate mixture of sympathy and distance which infused Turgenev's first story of a religious подвиг, Дворянское гнездо. Like all nine fantastic stories (with the partial exception of 'Странная история') it derives its main dramatic force and tension from images of death. Although the original ideas for the story were some twenty to twenty-five years old, Turgenev did not write 'Живые мощи' until 1873, and the following year it was included in an edition of
Like 'Несчастная,' which referred to events of the mid-thirties, 'Живые мощи' was also based on a real situation. Turgenev may have been prompted to include it by the resurgence of interest in religion, and especially sectarian religion, in Russia in the seventies.

A dominant theme is that of resignation to a suprapersonal power, here conceived by the sufferer, Luker'ia, in Orthodox or sectarian Christian terms. This real power made itself felt, according to Luker'ia's belief, by intruding into her plans for a normal married life and electing her as a sufferer. In the villagers' words, she is 'богом убитая'. Mysteriously crippled and atrophied in a fall, she accepts her state as a 'living relic' with no complaint, obviously feeling secure in her sense of God's love for her and of the God-ordained purposefulness of her existence, however futile and joyless it may seem to material eyes. Thus the familiar cry of heroes and heroines imbued with a belief in suprapersonal reality to 'submit' is reiterated in this short story.

One Soviet commentator on 'Живые мощи,' N.F. Droblenkova, avers strenuously that this particular *vita* is actually 'shorn of its hagiographical moral' since the heroine derives her very real strength of spirit and longsuffering, not from Christianity, but from her simple acknowledgement of the hopelessness of her situation. Droblenkova points out how limited in scope Luker'ia's overt religiosity was -- it was in fact confined to a couple of stereotyped prayers. Yet Luker'ia herself gave a religious reason for this: she so humbled herself that she felt she had no right or need to 'bother God' with her prayers. Utterly confident of His love
for her, she considered her very trials to be a 'cross' of grace, and, with perhaps more metaphysical sophistication than Droblenkova can give her credit for, realised that God has no need of her petitions or advice in order to care for her (4:358).

The important point is that Luker'ia conceives of her whole experience in terms of a подвиг and this (basically religious) sense supports her and gives her peace. Her thought turns naturally to the подвиги of Simeon Stolpnik, Ioann Zatvornik, Feodosii Pecherskii and other saints of the Kievopecherskii tradition. Indeed, in her main vision or dream she appears as the bride of Christ. Like Liza Kalitina, she believes that her suffering can in some way serve as a ransom for the cruelties visited on the peasant class by their feudal lords and perhaps even serve to alleviate their suffering.

The author does not set himself up as judge on these matters, he merely records them.

'Живые мощи' is more abundant in fantastic elements than either 'Несчастная' or 'Степной король Лир'. They fall into three main groups: Luker'ia's original fall (4: 355-6), her dreams or visions (4: 361-3) and the circumstances surrounding her death (4: 365).

Before her wedding, Luker'ia is drawn one night from her room by the beautiful sound of a nightingale singing. Lost in the beauty of that sound, she suddenly becomes aware of her lover's voice softly calling her by name. (Her vita also closes with a mysterious aural impression.) Straining to see where the voice comes from, she falls, and injures herself internally, eventually becoming a cripple. This sort of experience clearly comes within the bounds of the fantastic:
it is made up of impressions whose source can be either rationally or supernaturally explained. The suggestion of clairaudition or some similar preternatural force operating is heightened by the fact that rational science -- in the form of all the doctors consulted -- cannot identify the resulting disease.

Two of Luker'ia's dreams can clearly be interpreted as no more than the dreams of a woman brought up in a religious atmosphere and accustomed to vitae: the first in which Christ comes to claim her as his bride; and the second in which her dead parents come to thank her for lightening their load of sin by her present suffering. This dream Luker'ia felt at the time may have been a vision, but was herself unsure (4:362). If the fantast's world is entered -- and the narrator is neutral on this question -- these dreams do become visions, do constitute contact with a preternatural reality which makes the earthly span of only relative importance, and 'death' a continuation of life.

This interpretation receives added weight in the case of the third dream, in which death is personified as a welcome stranger, a woman, who tells Luker'ia that she will return for her after the fast of St Peter. This is the most clearly fantastic occurrence in the book because death does release Luker'ia soon after the fast of St Peter, thereby increasing the tension between the natural and the supernatural which is the life-blood of the genre. The intrusion of the supernatural is felt in a further detail: on the day of her death Luker'ia keeps hearing church bells 'from on high', although there are no bells within some five versts of where she is lying and it
is not in any case a Sunday. On this quickening note of ambivalence, the story ends.

Turgenev kept to the religious sphere in the fourth story of this period, 'Рассказ отца Алексея' (published in 1877). In this lugubrious tale the priest's son Iakov gradually falls away from God, firstly on an intellectual level when he leaves the seminary to study (significantly) medicine at the university and secondly on a ritualistic level, when he spits out the eucharistic wafer while taking communion and crushes it underfoot. His religious apostasy is accompanied by what appears on a realistic level to be physical degeneration and a pathological condition involving frequent visions of the devil. The devil (hornless and black) appears frequently to Iakov during the abandonment of his faith, and indeed prompts him to commit the final act of abandonment during the eucharist in Voronezh cathedral. His appearance can be attested to, however, only by Iakov, and there is no objective evidence of any supernatural intrusion. A nineteenth-century commentator such as Professor V.F. Chizh, psychiatrist and materialist, was able to consider 'Рассказ отца Алексея' as a kind of 'realistic' case history of neurosis, treating Iakov's communications with the devil as hallucinations induced by his degenerate mental condition and religious training. Indeed, at the time of publication there was a clear division in interpretations between those who took it as a 'mysterious' or 'fantastic' story like preceding ones and those who saw it as a realistic psychological study. Turgenev's own view, as expressed to Stasiulevich (18 (30) March 1877), was that Iakov 'подвергся наущению дьявола (галлюцинации)'. In the same
letter he called 'Рассказ отца Алексея' 'легендообразный',
which would seem to unite it with the earlier 'Живые мощи'
and the later 'Песнь торжествующей любви', so that the question
of form again predominates, and it does so in opposition to
any attempt to classify the story as it is written as a
psychological case history. The fantastic is a device and
this device is present in this story. Its presence stands out
all the more clearly when 'Рассказ отца Алексея' is compared
with Turgenev's later realistic treatment of the theme of
apostasy and degeneracy in 'Отчаянный' (1882).

The experience which takes on the strongest supernatural
colouring, casting a faintly mysterious light on subsequent
events, is an early one in which as an adolescent Iakov meets
in the forest a little green man who gives him nuts. To Iakov
this is something 'чудно'. To show that he was not dreaming,
he produces a nut. Of course, there are any number of
'realistic' explanations for what seemed to Iakov to be
'чудно' (11: 292) but the point about Turgenev's story is
that neither the narrator nor the author rejects the supernatural
interpretation of Iakov's experience. As is proper to the genre,
the reality or substance of the experience is left floating
somewhat ambiguously in the domain of hallucinations, dreams,
mental disturbance and morbidity. It must be admitted,
however, that in comparison with the earlier stories, the
fantastic tension is certainly low.

A revealing perspective is gained by comparing Turgenev's
approach to the разночинец of the late fifties in this story
('Рассказ отца Алексея' refers to the late fifties) and his
approach in Fathers and Sons a decade and a half earlier.
The concrete image he had first seized upon in the earlier work had been a self-confident, antiromantic, irreligious one, and its disintegration had been largely unexpected, complex, and rather tentatively linked with 'the unknown'. But in the later story, the concrete image is of a degenerate imbued with religious ideas, subject to hallucinations, wandering in a field of mysterious forces (in the 1870s psychiatry was still groping with the largely unknown), whose climactic experience leading to final mental disintegration and death took place in a specifically religious context, and was mixed with an almost Dostoevskian sense of grotesque profanation. (An interesting parallel is drawn in the commentary on 'Рассказ отца Алексея' in the ПсСп edition between Dostoevskii's account of religious outrage in 'Влас' in his Дневник писателя for 1873 and the present work (11: 532-3).) In the later work man is depicted as much more assailed by doubt, much more obviously at the mercy of unknown forces, with a more developed (and less rational) sense of evil.

One other story which is occasionally lumped together with the таинственные повести is 'Часы', which was published in 1876 and written in the two previous years. Fantastic tension is however almost entirely absent because it depends on three circumstances which are obviously and naturally explicable in realistic terms: the way the watch kept turning up, no matter how hard people tried to dispose of it, as if it was 'заколдованы' (11: 252); the way people were seized by abnormally strong passions of anger and fury when embroiled with the watch, as if in the power of some 'таинственная сила' (11: 255); and the incident in which the narrator was 'led by
fate' to walk down a street he normally avoided and consequently to overhear a vital conversation in an inn he was passing (11: 249). The story itself is such a mediocre mélange of adventure, melodrama, mystery and unabashed storytelling, with an admixture of social comment, and told at such a distance from the actual events, that the reader has no trouble in dismissing the seeming intrusion of 'fate' or other unknown powers as either the subjective impressions of an adolescent or stylistic devices.

* * * * * * * *

The other two stories of this period which may be called fantastic, 'Странная история' (1869) and 'Стук . . . стук . . . стук! . . .' (1871) are more complete examples of the tendency to take a 'realist's' position on the experience of supernatural powers, and they therefore stand somewhat apart from the stories discussed to this point which have always been ambivalent on the question of whether or not the experiences were primarily subjective or objective. 'Рассказ отца Алексея' stands closest to this next category of stories in which the fantastic tension is discharged by the author on purpose, although the fantastic aura, interwoven with romantic фатальность, lingers long enough for these stories to be broadly classed as fantastic.
which was published in 1870, although written in the summer of 1869, provides a clear example of Turgenev as a more Poesque kind of fantast: he records what seems to be supernatural but allows it to be interpreted through the eyes of a rationalistic storyteller (Mr Kh.). As a result, very little of the supernatural remains except the mood.

'Странная история' is actually made up of two stories: Mr Kh.'s encounter with the mesmerist (or 'magnetizer') Vasilii and the latter's power to conjure up the images of the dead or absent; and the story of Sophie, yet another submissive, idealistic, religious heroine, who achieves a подвиг through self-abasement and becoming companion to the юродивый Vasilii. The theme binding the two stories — obviously Sophie's connection with Vasilii provides the dramatic link — is the investigation of unknown powers moving man, of suprapersonal agencies which govern man in apparent defiance of materialist conceptions. The materialist in this story is the narrator, and although he accommodates himself to his experiences, the reader still has a sense of coming in contact with mental states which are set in motion by unknown forces.

The narrator's approach to Vasilii's powers of conjuration is experimental: faced with a claim of preternatural powers, he decides to carry out an investigation. (The action, it should be remembered, takes place in the mid-fifties when mesmerism and hypnotism were still little understood phenomena. It was not until the early 1880s when the French psychologist H. Bernheim wrote his classic Hypnotisme, suggestion, psychothérapie and J.M. Charcot's physiological explanations
of hypnosis gained acceptance that these phenomena could more comfortably be accommodated by materialist thought.) Although Mr Kh. allows Vasilii to conjure up the form of his old French tutor, he is scrupulous in his detailed description of the process of preparation for the séance: the wine at dinner, with the hint that it may have been tampered with, the long wait for the apparition in silence in an empty room, and the machinations of the hypnotist, Vasilii. It is obvious that a kind of trance is induced in the narrator and in this abnormal state he sees his dead tutor where Vasilii is actually standing.

The narrator knows he has been mesmerized and that this is a natural, if not wholly understood, phenomenon. Yet, as he himself admits, 'сила, способная производить такие действия, все-таки оставалось чем-то удивительным и таинственным' (10: 174). The whole episode therefore retains an air of the preternatural, if not supernatural, in the sense of the inexplicable and paranormal, although not miraculous.

In the second component of the story, Sophie provides the 'naturalist' Mr Kh. with a specimen for another experiment. This time he is confronted with the power of faith, especially as it motivates подвиги.

Sophie is the complete подвижница, although obviously less fully drawn than Liza Kalitina. Faith demands 'самоотвержение ... уничтожение', she tells Mr Kh. 'Гордость человеческая, гордьень, высокомерие, вот что надо искоренить дотла. Вы вот упомянули о воле ... ее-то и надо сломить' (10: 175-6). These are classic Turgenevan themes. To the scientist, of course, this way of thinking is a further example of 'magnetism',
another manifestation of the same natural, although little understood, process Mr Kh. observed in Vasilii's upstairs room. In both cases one mind influences another, subjugating it to itself, one will overrules another. Sophie's eventual devotion of herself to Vasilii is the extreme development of this trend. As far as Sophie herself is concerned, her experience is a genuine, if primitive, religiously mystical one in the sense that the suprapersonal reality (divine power in some form) is revealed as so incomparably greater than the individual that his illusion of a separate will is dissolved or annihilated. In the face of this pure faith, this mystical vision, the materialist feels disadvantaged, although he himself obviously has only the most rudimentary notion of religious perception (asking Sophie, for example, 'Вы полагаете, что, например, подле того гарнизонного майора, с красным носом, может в эту минуту витать бессмертная душа?' (10: 176)). In the final analysis, even this hard-boiled materialist has to admit, as the sceptic has consistently had to admit since Lezhnev first came to terms with Rudin, that Sophie's faith at least leads to action, to her words and deeds being one, to real purposefulness in life (10: 185).

'Странная история', while containing nothing either directly or ambivalently supernatural, and therefore verging on Todorov's non-fantastic category of 'le surnaturel expliqué', retains enough elements suggestive of the preternatural to make the reader 'hesitate' and to justify classifying it as фантастика: dabbling in black arts not yet wholly divested of their supernatural aura, the atmosphere of the séance, a heroine with strangely penetrating eyes (10: 163) who plainly seems to
be 'не от земле сев' (10: 162), mental states of tremendous power, little understood. There is a general impression created of a challenge to two areas of non-materialist thinking: the area of bogus occultism and legerdemain, of ignorance masquerading as science; and the area of spiritual charlatanry, of madness and fanaticism pretending to be religiosity. 23

These elements and challenges are wholly in accord with the fantastic genre. 'Le fantastique est dans votre regard,' writes M. Schneider in his book La littérature fantastique en France. 'Il n'y a pas de tour de passe-passe, de poudre de perlim-pinpin ni de mot magique. Tous ces trucs appartiennent au réalisme du charlatan. L'écrivain ne change pas les objets, il multiplie leurs significations et leurs pourvoirs . . . Il peint en trompe-l'oeil.’ 24 It is almost possible, of course, to say of Turgenev that he simply 'peint le trompe-l'oeil', which is closer to realism, but his style retains enough of the mysterious and subjective to keep a story such as 'Странная история' within the bounds of the fantastic.

'Стук . . . стук . . . стук!' . . which was written the following year (1870) and published in 1871, belongs to this same category of investigatory фантастика which Turgenev felt particularly at home with during these years. It satisfied both his desire for freedom in his spheres of interest and his desire for objectivity and respectable appraisal.

'Стук . . . стук . . . стук! . . ' is an even more refined example of this category than 'Странная история' which was written the year before. From two letters to women correspondents some years later it is clear that Turgenev regarded this story, or студия, as he called it, as a serious,
significant piece of documentation. To A.P. Filosofova, a severely progressive lady with liberal social ideas, active in the feminist movement, he wrote in 1874:

... я никак не могу согласиться, что даже 'Стук, стук' нелепость. 'Что оно такое?' спросите Вы ... А вот что: посильная студия русского самоубийства, которое редко представляет что-либо поэтическое или патетическое -- а, напротив, почти всегда совершается вследствие самолюбия, ограниченности с примесью мистицизма и фанатизма ... я хотел только указать Вам на право и уместность разработки чисто психических (не политических и не социальных) вопросов. (18(30) August 1874)

And to S.K. Briullova a couple of years later (4(16) January 1877) he wrote in the same vein:

... я считаю эту вещь не то чтоб удивленной ... но одной из самых серьезных, которые я когда-либо написал. Это -- студия самоубийства, именно русского, современного, самолюбивого, тупого, суеверного -- и нелепого, фразистого самоубийства ... Не забудьте, что русский самоубийца нисколько не похож на европейского или азиатского; и указать это различие верным, художественным образом -- вещь деловая, потому что она прибавляет еще один документ к разработке человеческой физиономии ...

These remarks are in line with what he had written to Avdeev (13(25) January 1870) (between writing 'Странная история' and 'Стук ... стук ... стук! ...') defending himself against the charge of getting carried away with 'mysticism' (which was not a term Avdeev had used in his letter to Turgenev (2(14) January) -- he had used the words 'умопомрачительный дух' and 'спиритический' and it is interesting that Turgenev interpreted them as 'мистицизм'):

'... могу Вас уверить, что меня исключительно интересует одно: физиономия жизни и правдивая ее передача; а к мистицизму во всех его формах я совершенно равнодушен ...'. Exactly what Turgenev meant by 'indifferent to mysticism' is less than clear; what is clear is that he was bending over backwards to
depict himself to Avdeev as an impartial observer of an interesting kind of human behaviour rather than as a purveyor of supernatural tales for their own sake.

Like 'Странная история', this 'study' also discredits and defeats a charlatan, in this case in the romantic mould. The hero is not a trickster in the sense that Vasilii appears to have been, but is a victim of his own gullibility and slavery to fashion, and to romantic fatalnost in particular. Teglev's claims to supernatural abilities and powers are also virtually demolished, and the story also approaches the category of 'le surnatural expliqué', but the story can still be called fantastic because it explores the question of supernatural powers and the aura of the supernatural still clings to it strongly. As in the case of Poe's 'Murders on the Rue Morgue', although rational explanations for the mystery are produced, the spine stays chilled.

'Стук . . . стук . . . стук!' . . 'refers to the 1830s when the name of Marlinskii was on everyone's lips and Teglev is a product of the Marlinskii craze of those years. Turgenev's description of this kind of hero is precise:

Герои à la Marlinskii попадались везде . . .; они разговаривали, переписывались его языком; в обществе держались сумрачно, сдержанно -- 'с бурей в душе и пламенем в крови', как лейтенант Белозёр 'Фрегата Надежды'. Женские сердца 'пожирались' ими. Про них сложилось тогда прозвище: 'фатальный'. (10: 266-7)

This type is a mixture of decembrist passion and revolt, Byronic alienation, and morbidity, and also 'вера в судьбу, в звезду, в силу характера, поэзия фразы'. Teglev's most famous contemporaries and spiritual brothers were Lermontov's Grushnitskii -- and possibly Pechorin from the vantage point of the 1870s -- and Pushkin's Germann (whose card trick he
emulates and even betters). Yet this romantic mask in fact conceals something pathetic, puny and unheroic.

The outstanding element, dramatically speaking, in Teglev's fatality is his faith in and involvement with the supernatural. In terms reminiscent of his description of Bazarov's superstitious mother, Turgenev catalogues Teglev's superstitions: 'Он верил в предчувствия, предсказания, приметы, встречи, в счастливые и несчастные дни, в преследование или благоволение судьбы, в значительность жизни, одним словом' (10: 271). One night 'with a fantastic feeling about it' Teglev recounts to Ridel', the narrator, a number of supernatural occurrences in his family; Ridel' himself is witness to the 'fantastic' card trick.

It is of crucial importance to note that this evidence of the operation of supernatural forces, these clues to superhuman reality, lent life its very significance as far as Teglev was concerned. He says to Ridel' that he believes in the 'призвание каждого человека' and in his own in particular, 'что он доселе в него верит и что если в нем когда-нибудь на этот счет возникнут сомнения, то он сумеет разделаться с ними и с жизнью, ибо жизнь тогда потеряет для него всякое значение' (10: 273). In the course of the story Teglev's faith is mocked and battered until it collapses entirely and he does commit suicide, claiming desperately that it, too, was preordained by fate, although even here, in his search for signs, he consciously or unconsciously confuses the dates (Napoleon died on 5 May 1821, not 1825).

Teglev is really a tragi-comic figure. Although his напускная фатальность is attacked (he misinterprets three
natural events supernaturally: the knocking, his name being
called, and the death of the girl who loved him in St
Petersburg) yet the sense of the supernatural is not altogether
dispersed, and not simply in the sense of the sinister and
uncanny atmosphere which pervades stories such as 'Бежин луг',
'История лейтенанта Ергунова' and 'Стучит!': he did guess
three cards in a row, there was a 'sign' from an old beggar-
woman that his soul was in need of special prayer, and his
premonition about the death of the girl in St Petersburg proved
accurate; even his contention that Ridel''s hand was led to
knock by a higher power cannot be rejected within the context
of the story. As the narrator himself remarks: 'мне казалось,
что, помимо его напускной фатальности, над ним действительно
тяготеет трагическая судьба, которой он сам не подозревает'
(10: 271).

Assuming the role of impartial judge, Turgenev allows the
impression to remain strong that, although Teglev may be a
sham, he is also a victim of his age. Certainly his contention
that of itself life has no point or significance, and that its
significance is lent it by reference to external or
supernatural reality (apprehended in however occult a fashion)
colours the whole tale and remains intact.

In his efforts to be a 'scientific' artist and keep
abreast of modern trends, Turgenev may well have been indifferent
or impartial towards the occult or мистицизм, but as a genuine
fantast, the narrator declares at the conclusion of his tale:
'никому не намерен мешать верить в судьбу, предопределение и
прочие фатальности' (10: 296). A supernatural aura clings
stubbornly to the whole affair: 'Нас, барин, знать, леший
ошевел', observes Ridel's servant darkly as they search for Teglev in the sinister mist. 'Это неспроста. Дело это нечистое!' (10: 292). His explanation is as valid as any.

** * * * * * * *

During the fifteen years under review Turgenev wrote two stories which belong to the genre, not of the fantastic, but of supernatural realism. They are 'Собака' which was published in 1866, and 'Сон' which was published over a decade later in 1877, having been written early the previous year. In Todorov's terminology, these stories belong to the genre of 'le surnaturel accepté' or 'le merveilleux'.

There is some evidence that 'Собака' was based on a story, supposedly true, which was related to Turgenev in 1859 and which he read to friends, with great effect, on a number of occasions before it was printed. In 1864, however, he had misgivings about it. Botkin, in particular, was discouraging about it, and by 1866 Turgenev was protecting himself in a familiar way by asserting, as he did to Katkov (8(20) March 1866) that 'вообще он не имеет никакого значения' and to Polonskii (1(13) May the same year) that it was 'совершенные пустяки'. However, he permitted later translations of it into English and French. It is principally of interest because it is one of the two stories where the supernatural intrudes unequivocally on an equal footing with the operation of natural law.
Some commentators, not recognizing the framework within which the story was written, dismiss it as senseless trivia. Strakhov, for example, wrote of the supernatural element: 'В этом чуде нет никакого смысла ни для [рассказчика], ни для нас.' 26 Writers such as P.N. Tkachev, Saltykov-Shchedrin and S.A. Vengerov, predictably, do not find 'Собака' worthy of serious interpretation either. Sergeev-Tsenskii dismisses the supernatural element lightly as 'явная небылица' although so artistically served up that it is 'hard not to believe the author'. 27 The writer of the commentary on 'Собака' in the Псом edition selects for comment the aspects commonly agreed upon as realistic and seems to be hopeful that the supernatural elements will simply go away:

The writer goes on to speak somewhat vaguely of the 'осмение реального через фантастическое' in the Gogolian tradition, although in fact 'Собака' owes nothing at all to either 'Нос', 'Шинель' or 'Вий'. The preternatural element intrudes in its own right, as one among many, not as a satiric device, an attempt to be entertaining, the externalization of psychological realities or the author's neuropathic tendencies. If anything, the everyday realism of the background serves to dramatize and give prominence to the preternatural.

The confusion surrounding the thematic core of 'Собака' is hard to understand because it is so clearly and prominently stated. The first lines of the story are spoken by the host of
the gathering before which the supernatural story is to be unfolded: '... Но если допустить возможность сверхъестественного, возможность его вмешательства в действительную жизнь, то позвольте спросить, какую роль после этого должен играть здравый рассудок?' (9: 123). Himself the very incarnation of complacent 'commonsense', the host, Anton Stepanych, is surprised to hear an objection raised by one of his least impressive guests, Porfirii Kapitonych: 'А я, признаюсь, согласиться не могу, потому что со мной самим произошло нечто сверхъестественное ...' The 'supernatural' is defined as 'нечто не сообразное с законами натуры' (9: 124). The stunned company settles back to listen to the story which forms the bulk of 'Собака'. When Porfirii Kapitonych comes to the end, there is general perplexity. 'Но если допустить возможность сверхъестественного, возможность его вмешательства в ежедневную, так сказать, жизнь', repeats Anton Kapitonych stolidly,'то какую же роль после этого должен играть здравый рассудок? ' (9: 139). Most critics either avoid the question, which is a discomforting one, or repeat it. While there may be no straightforward answer, the question bears thought and is plainly left with the reader.

The supernatural occurrence itself concerns the intrusion of a provident power by supernatural means into the natural order. This provident power made the scratching of a dog which was not physically present audible to several people on many occasions; Porfirii Kapitonych consulted a holy man on the meaning of this sign and was advised that the scratching was a warning to buy a dog; Porfirii Kapitonych immediately and providentially found the right dog, which did in fact save his
life when he was sought out in an uncanny way by a mad dog. The elements other than the scratching (the holy man's divination, the location of the dog and the mad dog's attack) belong to the domain of the fantastic, whereas the scratching was 'не сообразно с законами природы' and at the same time experienced objectively.

The other story of this period in which the existence of cryptic forces is unequivocally portrayed is 'Сон'. Turgenev himself referred several times to 'Сон' as either 'fantastic' or 'semi-fantastic', both descriptions being strictly speaking inaccurate since in 'Сон' there is no question of looking at events in a fantastic light, the light of one's own inner being, which is the essence of the fantastic. Turgenev also usually referred to it in rather deprecatory terms ('рассказец', 'повестушка', 'небольш, в сущности довольно пустая, штука'). In 'Сон' Turgenev investigates, not l'espace du dedans', which the French authority M. Schneider regards as the proper province of the fantast, but, clinically, a metabiological relationship between a father and a son. Turgenev, as an investigator, regards this as a physiological fact which is inexplicable in ordinary terms and in that sense cryptic. As he wrote to Ralston (10(22) January 1877): 'I have tried to solve a physiological riddle -- which I know to a certain extent from my own experience.'

The normal, scientifically explicable relationship of heredity is overlaid in 'Сон' with a metabiological relationship, which forms the crux of the whole story. This metabiological relationship has an occult manifestation in clairvoyance: the son (who is predisposed to interpret his
dreams in what he calls a 'secret' sense) sees in a dream the father he has never met accurately enough, even in points of clothing and speech, to recognize him on the street and to recognize the house where his father had been staying. Apart from this example of a supernatural faculty, the son turns out to be under the influence of a cryptic force which he calls 'нечеведомые силы' (11: 285) and which functions in the same way as судьба some decades earlier, leading him to places of unsuspected significance: hearing a call in his sleep to get up and go (an example of clairaudition), he is led, against his own will, 'как бы повинуясь неотразимому влечению' to an unfamiliar part of the city, where what appears to be a vision of his father's African servant leads him to the street he had seen in his dream and where indeed his father had been living; he is then led in the same mysterious way to the beach where he comes upon his father's body. At this point the cryptic force assumes an almost sensible form: as he runs away from the body, 'что-то нависает за мной, и настигает, и ловит меня' (11: 287).

Proof of the objective nature of the experience -- that it is not another dream or somnambulation -- is the ring which he wrests from the body's finger and which his mother recognizes as her own.

In addition to these examples of 'occult empiricism', there are fantastic elements in the story. His father's supposed death at sea is enveloped in mystery: the body disappears from the beach without trace and there are tracks of only one man leaving the spot. As he had been thought dead once before, after a brawl over cards, the feeling lingers
that perhaps the whole episode was a contact from beyond the grave. Even when looking at the body on the beach, the son feels the father's mental presence: 'Мне показалось, что этот мертвый человек знает, что я пришеп сюда' (ll: 287). Whilst during the years after this occurrence the dreams do not return, the phenomenon of clairaudition remains and he hears 'далекие вопли, какие-то несмолкаемые, заумные жалобы' from beyond some barrier (ll: 290). These elements, however, belong to the realm of the fantastic rather than of the supernatural.

As in 'Призраки' and 'Несчастная', Turgenev here looks specifically at relationships between two people which exist on another plane besides the mere physical -- a plane which to the material senses is shrouded in mystery but which can intrude into the phenomenal world in observable although incomprehensible ways. Turgenev was being more than just incurably romantic: he seems to have been trying to seize upon an element in human relationships which could not be rendered senseless by physical decay and death and which would help man to see some indestructible fixity and significance through the chaos. His search is being conducted in the area of the supramaterial.

* * * * * * * *

The question arises as to why the bulk of Turgenev's creative output during these years should have been devoted to the exploration of the nature and influence of cryptic
forces in the universe. There were several factors which impelled him to investigate these particular rather obscure recesses of human experience, all of them connected with his fear of advancing age and its problems, and of death.

The picture that the phenomenal world presented was, to Turgenev's eyes, a depressing one. The pain and helplessness of growing old particularly distressed him. In 1872 (14(26) June) he lamented to Flaubert: 'Mon cher ami, la vieillesse est un gros nuage blafard qui s'étend sur l'avenir, le présent et jusque sur le passé qu'il attriste en craquelant ses souvenirs.' Several weeks later (18(30) July) he wrote again: 'La vieillesse est une vilaine chose . . .' To his dear friend Ludwig Pietsch he had written some six years earlier (9(21) April 1866) at the age of forty-eight: 'Je älter man wird, je schneller gleitet einem das Leben unter den Fingern weg -- und man findet Zeit zu nichts -- obschon man eigentlich gar nichts thut.'

Turgenev's chronic ill-health was one of the main causes of his depression and obsession with old age and death. Like Sanin in 'Вешние воды' Turgenev pictured the 'sea of life' as

He suffered from recurring serious and debilitating attacks of gout, as well as from real or imaginary conditions of many other kinds. 'Я тоже, брат,' he wrote to Polonskii (14(26) February 1876) 'до того провонял близостью конца, что даже
troubled by his failure to win 'the main stake in life's lottery', as he put it to A.F. Pisemskii (22 April (4 May) 1870): a beloved wife and family, or indeed even a circle of really close friends. (His fortunes with Pauline Viardot went up and down and his pedestrian correspondence with his daughter, so strangely dominated by financial questions, does not testify to a deeply rewarding relationship there, either.) He was also deeply affected by his sense of artistic isolation, which had been dramatized by a loss of popularity after Fathers and Sons, intensified by the all-embracing political disillusionment and cynicism which gave rise to Smoke, and coupled with his inability to join forces with 'progressive' social movements for change because of his own conservative ideas about the role of his own class in the historical process. He constantly reiterated that it was time for him to retire, that his 'song had been sung', that he had nothing left to say to the modern generation, that, cut off from his native soil, his talent had dried up and atrophied. 32

Smoke, which appeared in 1867, was a real tour de force of cynicism and despair on every level, with particular reference to the various ideological currents of the day claiming to represent the salvation of Russia. 'Дым, дым!', said Litvinov to himself at one point, 'всё вдруг показалось ему дымом, всё, собственная жизнь, русская жизнь -- всё людское, особенно всё русское' (9: 315). 'Роман-сомнение' the Leningrad critic A.B. Muratov calls Smoke, 33 and Strakhov, in 1871, called
Smoke 'an attack on every kind of faith in Russia'.

Gertsen's nationalistic and socialistic solutions, the nihilism of the young Heidelberg set, the reactionary obscurantism of the nobility, with sideswipes at slavophilism Orthodoxy and spiritualism, among other tendencies, are all mercilessly satirized with the flair of Saltykov-Shchedrin. The commodity most conspicuously absent in all areas of the novel, thereby providing perhaps a kind of negative link for the disparate sides, is faith. Litvinov appears as a kind of latter-day Rudin who survived 1848 physically but not philosophically. His philosophical idealism having withered, other options seem closed: like Lavretskii, his education and intellect militate against religious faith, while belief in nationalist ideals is undermined by the stupidity, backwardness and self-interest of all the parties involved; the avenue of faith in materialist solutions is blocked by the raucous, posturing, shallow Heidelberg group -- and it must be remembered that in 1862, the setting of the novel's action, Heidelberg was where radical Russian students flocked to study the natural sciences with such world authorities as the physicist Kirchhof, the chemist Bunsen and the physiologist Helmholtz. Litvinov appears as a man who has mentally, at least, passed through the same spiritual ordeal as Turgenev's earlier heroes -- Rudin, Lavretskii, Insarov and Bazarov -- and is now faced with a void where, at first view, there is no fixity to have faith in, no support, no light. Without faith, without solid ideals to believe in and strive for, man becomes the plaything of elemental, senseless, incomprehensible forces, blown about like smoke. To the romantically or tragically
inclined life (and the novel) is imbued with 'вейниве судьбы'. On a more prosaic level, man is tossed about by destructive, harmful passions and becomes absorbed with his own petty ego. Turgenev's friend Annenkov, who was one of the few admirers of *Smoke*, being kind enough to call it 'a valuable document', seems to have alighted upon the real unifying idea of the novel when he wrote '. . . история Ирины Ратмировой и Литвинова, вся направлен[a] к тому, чтобы показать, как складывается жизнь, даже на высших ступенях общества, если она лишена прозрения и творчества идеалов и их поддержки.'

Despite the rather conventionally happy ending, the mantle of pessimism lies very heavily on *Smoke*.

Turgenev was particularly sensitive to and depressed by the futility of his creative work in the face of death.

These lines, written to Polonskii (16-(28) December 1868), hint at a much wider philosophical problem than what to write about, as does a remark he made to Annenkov just over twelve months later (10(22) January 1870): 'что значит так называемая наша деятельность перед этим немцю пропастью, которая нас поглощает?'

Turgenev began to suffer from a weariness of soul which was part genuine and part fashion. 'Je suis donc las de vivre maintenant . . .' he complained to George Sand, perhaps a little too elegantly (18(30) October 1872). (Yet when she submitted to the alternative in 1876, he was horrified by it: 'la mort [est] une chose hideuse,' he wrote to Flaubert (22 June (4 July)),
lamenting the loss of his friend.) Still, by a strange paradox of materialism, the very finality of death did make life itself hard to bear. As he expressed it to Flaubert (27 October (8 November) 1872): 'ce qui est difficile à supporter à notre âge . . . c'est le "taedium vitae" en général, c'est l'ennui et le dégoût de toute chose humaine; ce n'est pas de la politique cela qui n'est, au bout du compte, qu'un jeu; c'est la tristesse de la cinquième année.' He went on to say that he admired George Sand exactly because she had found a way to overcome this taedium vitae: 'quelle sérénité, quelle simplicité, quel intérêt à toute chose, quelle bonté! Si pour avoir tout cela, il faut être un peu bénisseur, démocrate, voire même évangélique -- ma foi! -- acceptons ces excroissances.'

He touched on the same subject in a letter to Polonskii a few months later (21 February (5 March)):

"Холод старости с каждым днем глубже проникает в мою душу -- сильнее охватывает ее; равнодушие ко всему, которое я в себе замечу, меня самого пугает! Вот уж точно могу я сказать с Гамлетом:

'How stale, flat and unprofitable
Seems [to] me that life!'

Sometimes in his world-weariness, Turgenev adopted a kind of shallow quietism: 'Теперь -- увы! время прошло,' he wrote to Iu. P. Vrevskaia (8(20) February 1877), 'и надо только поскорей пережить междуумное время -- чтобы спокойно вплыть в пристань старости.' And to his brother Nikolai he wrote a month later (7(19) March): 'жизнь впереди представляется несколько пустою; но надо уметь черту в глаза посмотреть -- или, пожалуй, правде.'

The theme of world-weariness is raised in the opening section of Turgenev's philosophical essay 'Довольно', which
appeared in print in 1865 (although it had been in preparation since early 1862, that is, before the publication of *Fathers and Sons*). Indeed it permeates the whole work. 'Всё изведено -- всё пережито много раз ... устал я' (9: 110). Even nature's beauty, once so comforting and self-justifying, has palled, its unchangeableness, repetitiveness and pointlessness bore and annoy. As Turgenev himself expressed it to Countess Lambert (26 March (7 April) 1864): 'вся жизнь моя, все моё существо потускнели.' These words could, of course, have also been written by the hero of 'Вещие воды', Sanin, at the beginning of the seventies.

As a general rule, however, Turgenev viewed death more with horror than meek acceptance. In 1871 (9(21) March) he wrote to Pauline Viardot from Moscow that at night 'меня начинают мучить тоскливые мысли и какие-то странные ощущения -- и озноб, и какого-то сомнительного страха ...' and that his thoughts are occupied with 'the eternal problem of death'. The next year (29 March (10 April) 1872), as the news of one death after another reached him, he wrote to Fet: 'Смерть действительно сильно щелкает вокруг нас ...' The following months brought still more deaths and he wrote off to Annenkov (14(26) June): 'Набегают ... набегают тени на жизнь -- и падают они не на одно настоящее или будущее -- но и на прошедшее. И то становится тоскливо и туманнее.' However absurd human existence was, it was generally preferable to death. ' ... la mort est toujours inattendue,' he wrote to Valentine Delessert (2(14) May 1864. 'Pourquoi vit-on? pourquoi la vie? C'est incompréhensible, -- mais la vie une fois admise pourquoi la mort?' To N.A. Ostrovskaiia, whom he
met in Karlsbad in 1873, he remarked that however horrifying unending life might be -- and he did not believe in it in the Orthodox Christian sense -- 'полное уничтожение' was no less terrifying.

His abiding metaphysical horror of death and annihilation, together with his growing sense of the utter indifference and unimpeachability of the nature which decrees death, are well expressed in a letter he wrote to Valentine Delessert (16(28) July 1864):

... ce sphynx qui se présentera éternellement à tous m'a regardé avec ses grands yeux immobiles et vides et d'autant plus terribles qu'ils ne cherchent pas à faire peur. Il est cruel de ne pas savoir le mot de l'énigme; il est plus cruel peut-être de se dire qu'il n'y en a pas, parce qu'il n'y a plus d'énigme. Des mouches qui se heurtent sans relâche contre une vitre -- c'est, je crois, notre plus parfait symbole.

There are echoes of this thought also in 'Довольно' where Turgenev says: 'Увы! не привидения, не фантастические, подземные силы страшны; не страшна гофманщина, под каким бы видом она ни являлась ... Страшна то, что нет ничего страшного ...' (9: 118). In the face of the law of death, there arises the eternal problem of how to act when all actions are deprived of absolute significance and even the ephemeral loses its transient attractiveness. Small wonder that the fiction he wrote during these years is so uniformly concerned with death:

in 'Призраки' death is portrayed both as a ghostly state and as complete annihilation; in 'Собака' the hero is contacted by a supernatural reality which has power to save from and to inflict death; in 'Странныя история' the heroine mortifies her natural self both mentally and physically to the point of actual death; in 'Несчастная' impending death seems to impel metaboliological contact; the hero of 'Степной король Лир' appears
to be in the sway of suprapersonal powers of darkness, foretelling death; 'Стук . . . стук . . . стук!' according to the author is a clinical study of suicide; in 'Живые мощи' death is almost personified and its presence is felt throughout the story; in 'Сон' the question of metabiological ties which are stronger than death is raised; while in 'Рассказ отца Алексея' the hero goes mad and dies.

The significance of the varied manifestations of his fear of ageing and dying was not lost to Turgenev. He was quite frank in his appraisal of them in a letter he wrote to A.F. Pisemskii (26 October (7 November) 1876):

Из наблюдений последних лет я вынес убеждение, что хандра, меланхолия, ипохондрия не что иное, как страх смерти. Понятно дело, что с каждым годом он должен увеличиваться. Радикально помочь этому нельзя, но есть palliative средства.

One of the palliatives he explored in his stories was a belief in powers which are above the physical organism and not affected by its disintegration. The search for effective palliatives dictated much of the subject matter and many of the images in his fiction of the sixties and seventies. Love was perhaps the most promising.

Love eases pain, provides joy, smooths the path. It creates at the very least the illusion of things having meaning, being worthwhile. Not only is 'love', in some sense of that word -- perhaps as 'sympathetic connection' -- vital in virtually all Turgenev's stories of this period, and indeed central in 'Призраки' and 'Нечастная', but according to Zaitsev, for Turgenev at this time 'любовь являлась мистическим просветом . . . Гастроном в кухне, не терпел гастрономии в любви . . .' 38 Indeed, Zaitsev states that at the dinners of
the five authors in Paris Turgenev was derided for maintaining
that in the eyes of a loved woman there shines something
'supersensory'. 39

The supposed author of 'Довольно', an artist, believed
that he could find some solace for his pessimism in love, a
palliative suggested earlier in 'Призраки', yet in the face
of death, even love loses its sweetness, 'народность, право,
свобода, человечество, искусство' become futile and fatuous
(9: 118-9).

The same train of thought was evident in a letter Turgenev
wrote to Fet (30 March (11 April) 1864), which included a
rough sketch:

ВЕЧНОСТЬ а ВЕЧНОСТЬ

Точка а представляет то кратчайшее мгновенье —
ce raccourci d'atome, как говорит Паскаль — в
tечение которого мы живем; — еще мгновенье —
и поглотит нас навсегда немая глубина нихтзейн'а
... Как же не воспользоваться этой точкой?

The question was always how that might be most meaningfully
done. In this letter to Fet it was through 'friendship'; yet
love and friendship were themselves always threatened by death.
Turgenev had reason to lose confidence in human friendship. He
asked Countess Lambert, with whom he had enjoyed a deep and
unusually frank friendship, in a letter dated 17(29) January
1863: 'что же может быть непреложного и неизменного в нашей
бренной и быстрой жизни?' And in fact his close friendship with
her did peter out at this time as the pendulum of his affections
swung back towards Viardot, who represented a very different
kind of love from the liberating, gentle and more spiritual
affection he had had for the Countess. Countess Lambert had
seemed to draw out of him quite naturally declarations of his
deepest feelings, beliefs, ideas and ideals, sometimes on a level he would have felt awkward on with anyone else. His correspondence as published in the НСН edition from 1863 onward is a far more mundane collection of letters.

The same ambivalence about love as was expressed in his attitudes towards Countess Lambert on the one hand and Pauline Viardot on the other is to be found in the love intrigue in Smoke. Here, too, love for an innocent, unworldly girl -- love which is really affection, respect and warmth -- is counterpoised to love for a seductive, worldly woman -- love which is actually sexual appetite --, a theme which was to be taken up again with more art in 'Вешние воды'. The second kind of love, with its overtones of Turgenevian masochism -- love as utter subjection to a strong-willed, faintly evil woman -- is at first the hero's only palliative for his Weltschmerz. Yet this kind of love, which masquerades as self-surrender ('Я от всего отказался, я всё разбил в прах' (9: 290)) while more truly being self-indulgence has power to bear off and seize only those who live with no fixities. Litvinov is, in the words of one critic, 'a ship without ballast or wheel' floating aimlessly in a sea of futility, prey to the elemental currents of passion, self-indulgence and lusts. As it is described in Smoke: 'Весь он увлечен вперед и подхванен чем-то неведомым и холодным' (9: 257). Irina Ratmirova is in the same situation. Several paragraphs from the end of the novel, one Petersburg hostess remarks about Irina twice that 'elle n'a pas la foi', concluding, ambiguously, 'c'est une âme égarée' (9:327).

Love as sexual gratification, however, does not provide the sort of moral fixities one can build a life on, because, without
reference to outside solid ends, self-gratifying, passionate love is in danger of becoming destructive (a theme which Dostoevskii amplified in Идиот and elsewhere). It is Tat'iana's love, that mixture of her own purity, affection, goodness and guilelessness and her 'Enlightened' aunt's moral imperative based on duty ('коля мы долга признавать не будем, что у нас останется? Этого нельзя нарушать' (9: 297)), which stands the best chance of assuring Litvinov's happiness and ability to 'act' in life. It is this kind of love-duty which entails genuine sacrifice of self and which, paradoxically in a novel of such unmitigated gloom, appears to be one of the more effective palliatives for life's ills.

In Smoke mention is made of one other palliative: belief in 'civilization'. 'Люблю ее всем сердцем,' says Potugin in his classic homily on the subject, 'и верю в нее, и другой веры у меня нет и не будет' (9: 173). Yet even if the critic refrains from retorting rather rudely with P. Lavrov 'What sort of civilization? The civilization of Fiji? Dahomey?' it is not hard to see that under this label of 'civilization' the solutions offered for the world's problems -- education, enlightenment, science, progress, liberalism --, at once more down-to-earth and ill-defined than the more accustomed idealistic ones, are in fact rather ad hoc and limited ones when viewed against the more cosmic questions of the meaning of life and action in the face of death, constantly looming in the background. 'Civilization' is a very short-term palliative.

Another palliative which continued to present itself was, broadly speaking, religion. As his closeness to Countess Lambert diminished, his sympathy for organized Christianity,
never strong, waned with it. The point about Turgenev's attitude to religion is that while sympathetic to its more truly mystical side -- the search for inner peace, for some understanding of the cryptic powers above the human self, religious motivation for self-sacrifice, spiritual goodness, ethical behaviour and so on -- he was indifferent to its institutions or formalized dogma. In the autumn of 1864 (22 August (3 September)) he observed to Countess Lambert, in more frank and direct tones than in past years, that he admitted his 'lack of orthodoxy' in spiritual matters and that he simply was 'not a Christian in your sense or indeed perhaps in any sense'. By the same token, despite a complete lack of sympathy for the Roman Catholic church (he was, for example, enthusiastic about Edgar Quinet's book *La Révolution* which attacked Catholicism in the strongest terms as a reactionary force in human affairs), he was quite indifferent to his daughter's decision to adopt Catholicism on her marriage, considering it to be a practical step since she was to marry a Frenchman and live in the French provinces. One form of organized Christianity was as valid, or invalid, as another, as far as he was concerned. How different Dostoevskii's reaction to a similar situation would have been!

As the decade progressed, Turgenev's attitude to systematized religious belief hardened. In 1867, in one of his by now rare letters to Countess Lambert (29 April (11 May)), he described himself as a 'bad Christian', although the remark was made in passing and probably has no particular depth of significance. Two letters to Gertsen later the same year are of more interest: in the first (30 November (12 December))
he concluded that 'теперь действительно поставлен вопрос о том, кому одолеть: науке или религии...' In other words, Turgenev was well aware of the fact that the two world views were locked in battle -- Bazarov's and Liza's. Two weeks later (13(25) December) he wrote again to Gertsen with the practical suggestion that Russia should opt for 'science' if she really wanted to progress. Turgenev considered that, left to himself, a Russian 'нeminuemo вырастает в старообрядца', or in other words, becomes the slave of a particular system of backward, unenlightened and highly conservative, belief.

'Я отвечаю... возьмите науку, цивилизацию.' In practical, historical terms, Turgenev recognized that this is what Russia needed, although privately Turgenev obviously found no final answers in 'наука, цивилизация' either, to which Smoke, which came out the same year, bears eloquent witness.

Turgenev is opting for 'science', 'civilization', 'the West', against the epitome of reactionary organized religion, slavophilism. It was the religious foundation of this movement in particular, its identification with the Church, which alienated him. 'Но всему славянофильствующему я чувствую положительное физическое отвращение,' he wrote to Fet (21 August (2 September) 1873), 'как к дурному запаху... Да и лампадой церковной отдает.' In 1874 (17(29) November) he wrote to I.I. Maslov explaining that he could not agree with Aksakov's ideas about the 'salvation of Europe' because it appeared to depend on Europe's conversion to the Orthodox faith. Three months later (22 February (6 March) 1875) he wrote to M.A. Miliutina: '... ни в какие абсолюты и системы не верю, люблю больше всего свободу... Все человеческое мне
Yet for all his antipathy to orthodoxy -- and Orthodoxy -- Turgenev was as always quick to show sympathy for genuine spiritual leanings. In his fiction this had been the case in his early story 'Постояльный двор' (1855), for example, and was the case in the later stories 'Странная история' and 'Живые мощи'; it was also true of his relationship with Countess Lambert and Iuliia Vrevskaia. In a letter to Pisemskii dated 26 October (7 November) 1876 Turgenev expressed feelings of sympathy, admiration and even envy for Pisemskii's growing interest in religion. He happily acknowledged the effectiveness of religion as an antidote to the fear of death, yet he assumed an agnostic position on the question, regarding the possession of this antidote almost in terms of grace ('средство ... не всем доступное'). When addressing fellow agnostics such as Botkin or A.F. Onegin his tone was apt to be more jocular.

Iuliia Vrevskaia was one correspondent he felt especially warmly towards and with whom he was able to share deep feelings. Vrevskaia became interested in Eastern philosophies and on one occasion (5(17) October 1875) elicited from Turgenev the response that 'буддизм -- религия отличная ...' It is interesting that Buddhism is of course one of the most purely mystical world-views there is. On another occasion (8(20) April 1876) he told Vrevskaia how delighted he would be
Sincere religious sensibilities he valued.

Turgenev demanded freedom from limiting systems, whether religious, political or broadly philosophical. The exercise of this freedom provided, after all, the only practical hope of escape from the seemingly iron laws of nature and the dark nihilism which accompanied their acceptance. As S.E. Shatalov, a Soviet critic interested in Turgenev's таинственные повести, expresses it: 'возмущенный и потрясенный такою видимой нецелесообразностью (более того: бессмысленностью) расточения и окончательного, несомненного уничтожения ума, чувства, таланта, Тургенев пытался преодолеть, как ему казалось, ограниченность материалистического мироздания.'

A letter Turgenev wrote to P.D. Boborykin 4(16) August 1868 shows quite clearly that it was not only systematized religion or metaphysics which Turgenev shunned as limiting: 'Позитивная философия, которой апелтом вы сделались,' he wrote, 'представляет, действительно, много привлекательного для людей, которые чувствуют потребность подкрепить свои убеждения системой.' Like Hamlet counselling Horatio, who found the ghost so 'woundrous strange', Turgenev seems to be telling an unbelieving world that 'there are more things in heaven and earth . . . than are dreamt of in your philosophy' (Act I, scene v). His endorsement of self-criticism and self-examination as a means of seeking out truth also became quite Hamlet-like, demonstrating in a way which was first hinted at in Fathers and Sons that Turgenev was now able to perceive that egocentrism and рефлексия are not necessarily concomitants, as he had seemed to believe half a decade earlier when he wrote 'Гамлет и Дон-Кихот'. As he wrote to Fet as
early as 10(22) October 1865, 'Зачем ты относишься подозрительно и чуть не презрительно к одной из неотъемлемых способностей человеческого мозга, называя ее ковыранием, рассудительностью, отрицанием -- критике?' He went on to expound what the main concern should be: 'Главное, будь правдив с самим собой и не давай никакой, даже собственным иждивением произведенной системе, оседлать твой благородный затылок!'

Turgenev had very little time for the Church's doctrines about the nature of God, the trinity, original sin and so on, or for the rituals it had established in order to maintain its grasp on the popular mind. Palliatives were legitimate, but not intellectually offensive ones. The outlines of two rather Voltairean tales he planned and related in Ostrovskaya's presence in 1874 illustrate his bent very well.

In the first, he tells of a public lecture given by an astronomer on another planet revealing the existence of a new planet (Earth) where people 'thought up' a god-creator and believed in him in order to make some sense of being alive and dying. This god was personified, made all-powerful, and, because it was more comforting, all-loving as well. Because he was just, evil and sickness were interpreted as punishment. The astronomers went on to explain that the earthlings then concocted a legend about a god-man who came to earth to forgive man for succumbing to the divinely ordained evil. When the public at the lecture heard that this god-man was also born of a virgin, they dragged the lecturer down and put a dunce's cap on him. In the second tale, two men from civilized countries go to a savage heathen country. One teaches the virtues of love, mercy and forgiveness and is ridiculed by the local
inhabitants. The other, being less intelligent but more cunning, initiates a new cult, complete with priests, prophets and temples. The first man protests that the second has distorted the truth, and is burnt as a blasphemer, while the chief priest of the second intones praises to the God of love. 46

As is well established, the decline of faith in the outer manifestations of religion is often a forerunner of increased interest in less orthodox expressions of the supernatural and the preternatural. Religious scepticism was an important element in the ethos which impelled Goethe's Faust, for example, to lend his mind to the supernatural and occult. Van Tieghem, a notable writer on romanticism, sees the loss of religious faith as a crucial factor in the growth of the romantic mal du siècle which was so closely allied, particularly in Turgenev's case, with the flowering of the fantastic genre. 47

In the words of Benedetto Croce:

Romanticism was not . . . an effect of the departure from the hereditary and traditional faith . . . But moral romanticism, romanticism as a malady, the 'mal du siècle', possessed neither the old nor the new faith, neither the authoritative one of the past nor the clear one of the present, and showed precisely that it was a lack of faith, travailing in eagerness to create one and impotent to do so . . . [Some romantics] dreamed of returning to religious transcendence and the peace that it seemed to promise, . . . Others, or the same ones, would at times be seized by rage against Catholicism, or even against Christianity, and turn to championing a restored paganism . . . Others . . . recurred to the practice of magic. 48

A recent writer, and authority on E.T.A. Hoffmann, comments on these phenomena in German romanticism in terms which have particular application to certain Russian writers in the middle of last century:

It seems fair to suggest that, viewed from a broad perspective, the best things produced by German
romanticism became a possibility only when orthodox religion became incapable of meeting what so often seems to be one of man's needs: belief in the existence and authority of an immaterial and intangible power. The Aufklärung eroded the foundations of orthodoxy, but it left thirsting souls, and these sought elsewhere for the supernatural.49

Turgenev was the victim of a second Aufklärung in this regard -- the left-Hegelian and subsequently positivist one -- and part of his romantic reaction to it was a quickened curiosity about the supernatural in its occult forms.

Turgenev's art during these years, of course, bears testimony to his interest in the occult. 'Степной король Лир' and 'Стук . . . стук . . . стук!' integrate it into the fabric of the story and it is touched on in many of the other stories, as we have seen. Since the original idea for many of these stories, including 'Несчастная', 'Живые мощи', 'Рассказ отца Алексея' and 'Стук . . . стук . . . стук!', was based on experiences related to Turgenev himself, he was obviously open to subject-matter involving the supernatural and occult.

In addition to the evidence adduced in the previous chapter of the author's intermittent interest in spiritualist phenomena, the compilation of random references made by friends and acquaintances, as well as more distant commentators, shows that Turgenev himself experienced the occult.

K.K. Sluchevskii, who knew Turgenev well about 1860, called him 'extraordinarily superstitious', claiming, for example, that he was deeply unsettled if he saw a horse of an unlucky colour or heard number thirteen mentioned. 'Он ужасно боялся ночи и снов', writes Sluchevskii, 'а в особенности пугало его во всех видах и всегда чувство смерти.'50

Apparently Turgenev himself told how he was once, during a
hunting trip, struck in the chest by a startled rabbit, which was a bad omen, and how subsequently his cart turned over and he broke his collar-bone. Despite Polonskii's claim that 'nothing could be more erroneous' than the idea that Turgenev believed in 'mysterious inexplicable phenomena', he himself relates how Turgenev had a superstitious conviction he would die on 2 October 1881; he also tells of Turgenev's completely superstitious fear of cholera -- he evidenced symptoms of it even if it was as far away as India; he relates how Turgenev was so frightened of a bird which flew into his window at night once that Polonskii's wife had to rescue it. The cause of his fear was an evident belief in 'signs': Vladimir Solov'ev was visited by a bird just before his death. Polonskii also makes mention of Turgenev's delight in telling supernatural stories for children about magic caves, supernatural beings and so on (an exercise in what Todorov would call 'le surnaturel accepté'). As we have seen, Turgenev's father was deeply superstitious, and the influence of Turgenev's childhood impressions in this area on his later attitudes cannot be discounted.

Another writer of memoirs who made some interesting observations about Turgenev's actual attitude to the occult is N.A. Ostrovskaya, one of Turgenev's 'progressive' female acquaintances. In 1873 in a coffeehouse in Karlsbad Turgenev recounted to the company, which included Ostrovskaya, a vision he had had that very day of 'a woman in a brown morning dress', a vision which was often repeated. In view of the company, it is not surprising that the 'natural' explanation he offered was 'disorder of the optical nerves'. On the same occasion he
recounted how he used to see skeletons inside people when he
was in London. 57

B. Zaitsev, in his well-known biography of Turgenev, 
лежит Тurgeneva, lends support to these reports. 58 Zaitsev
says that Turgenev actually saw 'призраки' in later life,
referring inter alia to the skeleton episodes in London,
visitations by a French-speaking female apparition and the
apparition in broad daylight of Louis Viardot washing himself
in the bathroom which is related by the Goncourts in their
diary entry for 25 April 1875. (The Goncourts relate another
of Turgenev's 'hallucinations' in the same entry: when about
to meet after a long absence a friend who had had black hair,
Turgenev saw a white wig fall onto the friend's head. It
transpired that the friend's hair had indeed gone white.) 59

According to the commentator S. Umanets (a close friend of
the Katkovs and a godchild of Turgenev's good friend Tat'iana
Passek), the conversation of Turgenev's dinner group, which
included Flaubert, Renan, the Goncourts, the artist Kharlamov
(presumably Umanets's informant) and others, used sometimes to
turn to experiences with mediums, hypnotists and fakirs. 60

Virulently anti-Viardot, Umanets quotes an interesting, although
quite unverifiable conversation which supposedly took place
between Turgenev and Polonskii in which Turgenev claimed that
Viardot was indeed a kind of колдуня with a peculiar inner
power over people and that she had in fact hypnotized him into
submission. 61

Another of Turgenev's contemporaries who documents his
interest in the occult in the mid-seventies is A.F. Koni, who
records that, at the time of their acquaintance, Turgenev was
particularly inclined towards 'суеверные приметы' and the recounting of his dreams and premonitions. 62

Of course, as the reaction against the positivism of the sixties gained strength in the seventies, the occult, the supernatural and new religious ideas became a kind of counterculture spreading its influence through the educated layers of Russian society. Tat'iana Petrovna Passek, for example, a sophisticated and well-educated woman whom Turgenev knew well, was extremely interested in 'the other world' and was a firm believer in the suprasensual. She arranged well-attended séances and was on close terms with leading spiritists such as A.N. Aksakov, the chemist Professor A.M. Butlerov, the zoologist Professor N.P. Vagner and Daniel Donglas Home (who had connections with the Russian imperial family and had a sensational season in London 1859-60 and who was ridiculed in *Smoke*). 63 Fet records that in the mid-sixties table-turning was a popular pastime in fashionable circles and that in 1864 he took part. 64 These were the years when Edgar Allan Poe was in fashion, when Tolstoi and Fet became carried away with Schopenhauer (Tolstoi wrote to Fet (30 August 1869), for example, exclaiming about his 'неперестающий восторг перед Шопенгаузером') and large numbers of people were reading the German metaphysician Eduard von Hartmann (particularly *Die Philosophie des Unbewussten* (1869)) and Turgenev's friend Prosper Merimée. Turgenev did not have much time for Schopenhauer or Hartmann by this stage (see his jocular reference to the former in a letter to Fet (8(20) June 1870) and scathing dismissal of the latter in a remark to Kavelin on von Hartmann's *Philosophie des Unbewussten* (26 August
(7 September) 1872); however the following sketch of Mérimée's later philosophical profile from Schneider's *La littérature fantastique en France* throws a revealing light on certain aspects of Turgenev's own posture:

En fait, il n'est sûr de rien, il est torturé par le doute, obsédé par une présence qu'il n'appelle pas Dieu . . . mais qu'il décèle dans les forces mystérieuses de l'univers, dans la toute-puissance du destin, dans l'innombrable comme dans l'ineffable . . . Mérimée, tout athée qu'il se déclarait, croyait à quelque chose qui ne portait pas de nom, qui n'avait ni essence, ni idée, ni religion, ni culte, quelque chose d'inconcevable, de terrifiant, fait de cauchemar et de nuit, mais quelque chose. Voilà ce qui dicte ses nouvelles fantastiques . . . 65

Turgenev's obvious and demonstrable interest, as artist, in the wider interpretations, rather than the more narrowly materialistic or 'realistic' interpretations of being, and his evident desire to probe the darker recesses of the human mind, seem to be in contradiction with his rough 'definition' of his world-view as sketched out in the letter to M.A. Miliutina (22 February (6 March) 1875) already quoted:

'я преимущественно реалист -- и более всего интересуюсь живою правдою ладской физиономией; ко всему сверхъестественному отношусь равнодушно . . .' In fact, this letter is of great assistance in helping the student of Turgenev to see the light Turgenev himself held his investigations in. He did not see it as dabbling in black magic, giving credence to 'mysticism', or surrendering to either cultism or occultism. He saw it from a very Dostoevskian angle as being a realist in a higher or wider sense, a realist with an expanded field of operations, not a purveyor of fantasies, but an artist of a richer reality. 66 If he found evidence of supernatural, so-called, streaks in the human physiognomy, he intended to
record it -- and so he did. He was right when he said that he was indifferent to mysticism in as much as he did try to adopt an impartial, scientific approach to the question and he had nothing but contempt for those he considered charlatans and hoaxers, as we have seen in his fiction in the case of 'Странныя история' and 'Стук ... стук ... стук! ...' in particular. He wrote to Polonskii (13(25) May 1875) from Paris, for example, about a popular medium named Bredif: 'А что Бредиф -- в нынешнее глухое и пустое время -- должен был взбаламутить Петербург -- это в порядке вещей. Даже здесь все медиумы и сомнамбулы живут одними россиянами.' Turgenev wrote in a similarly sarcastic vein to Annenkov (16(28) March 1876) about the former Russian minister, Count A. Bobrinskii, who was always 'тупой, внутренно спутанный и неумный человек' according to Turgenev and who became a preacher, and indeed almost a prophet, in England, converting many workers and craftsmen to Christianity.

There are several thrusts at organized religion and spiritualism in Smoke also. One object of Turgenev's satire, for example, is one of the habitués of the Arbre russe, 'князь Ю., друг религии и народа, составивший себе во время оно, в блаженную эпоху откупа, громадное состояние продажей сивухи, подмешанной дурманом' (9: 146). Litvinov chooses harsh words to describe a 'document' from a priest in Riazan' who claims to have healed one of his father's serfs of a serious illness, calling it an example of 'степная глушь, слепой мрак заплесневшей жизни' since it does not accord with his notions of civilization (9: 177). It is the spiritualists, however, who are the most ruthlessly dealt with. 'American
spiritualists' are among the motley crowd which gathers at the Arbre russe, but they reappear in chapter 20 at the Ratmirovs' reception where 'the main topic of conversation' is the medium Home. One of the Americans is a pale, long-haired young man who specializes in predictions and has prophesied a number of remarkable events 'on the basis of the Book of Revelation and the Talmud', none of which ever eventuates. He also fails ludicrously to mesmerize a crab (9: 241). How wide of the mark C.E. Passage's remark is in his book The Russian Hoffmannists where he states that, 'Turgenev's sense of the supernatural was of Daniel Donglas Home's and Mme Blavatsky's kind'.

The contrary is true. Turgenev's eclectic, free-wheeling mind and inquiring spirit were offended by the fanaticism and spiritual legerdemain of the professionally religious. When religiosity or mysticism were sincere, as in the case of his friends Countess Lambert, Pisemskii or Iulia Vrevskaia, for example, or of Liza Kalitina, Sophie or Luker'ia in his works, Turgenev's attitude was one of admiration, understanding and even slight envy.

Yet if Turgenev despised the bogus magician, was horrified by materialism and admired genuine religious thought, there is little of the true mystic, in the sense of one who practises мистика, in him. The true mystic, according to Professor R.C. Zaehner, author of Mysticism: Sacred and Profane, has 'praeternatural experiences in which sense perception and discursive thought are transcended in an immediate apperception of a unity or union which is apprehended as lying beyond and transcending the multiplicity of the world as we know it'.

In fact, the common keynote of the three main types of
mysticism investigated by Zaehner -- nature mysticism, monist and theist -- is 'union'.\textsuperscript{69} Evelyn Underhill, in his classic work on mysticism, also stresses this aspect: unity in diversity and stillness in strife are the secret of mystic consciousness.\textsuperscript{70} The heart of the mystic is always 'set upon the changeless One' and living union with this One is the mystic's mode of existence.\textsuperscript{71}

There is barely any hint of this One, or of the heightened state of spiritual consciousness which transcends the material, in Turgenev. He goes through the same preparatory school of disillusionment with the material world and longing for a sense of love that never dies as many mystics, but to compare him with European mystics such as Meister Eckhart, Ruysbroeck or Teresa of Avila, let alone with Jacob Boehme or William Blake, is obviously absurd. His apperception of the transcendental is materialized, occult, finite, diverse and reasoned, and genuine mysticism of either the naturist, monist or theist kind, is obviously beyond him. 'Мистик без веры' the early Soviet critic A. Lavretskii called him, 'т.е. подверженный суетверию'.\textsuperscript{72}

Turgenev does, however, turn his face in a mystical direction in one or two regards. Resignation of the self to the mystic All is, of course, a basic mystical attitude. Its prelude is often mental and physical suffering. In his growing predilection for 'resignation' as the only meaningful approach to life, Turgenev perhaps almost unwittingly did evidence a faint mystical streak. Turgenev's resignation was in a sense only the necessary preliminary to mystic resignation -- it was negative, induced by age, mortality, sickness, and even
political cynicism, whereas mystic resignation is positive, and generally God-oriented. Many letters testify to his gathering thought of resignation. In 1867 (13(25) February) he wrote to Countess Lambert that to old age 'надо покориться без ропота -- тем более, что он ни к чему не служит'. To Flaubert he wrote (30 June (12 July) 1874): 'Infirmités, dégoût lent et froid, agitations pénibles des souvenirs inutiles -- voilà, mon bon vieux, la perspective qui s'offre à la vue de l'homme ayant passé la cinquantaine. Et par-dessus et au delà de tout cela -- la résignation, la HIDEUSE résignation, cette préparation de la mort . . . ' Several years later (20 August (1 September) 1877) he wrote to him again in the same vein: 'Après 40 ans, il n'y a qu'un seul mot qui compose le fond de la vie: renoncer.' This feeling was strengthened with the onset of sickness some months later: 'Ça vous inspire une résignation,' he wrote to Flaubert (23 November (5 December)), une humilité, excellente peut-être, au point de vue chrétien, mais ne valant pas le diable pour qui veut encore faire quelque chose.' The religious justification of resignation affords him no comfort because he does not believe in its rewards or in the essential goodness of the suprapersonal powers religious thought bids man submit to. As he expressed it to S.D. Poltoratskii (16(28) March 1872): 'Все мы на смерть осуждены -- hodie mihi, cras tibi -- это плохое утешенье, но другого нет, если только не искать его в религии . . . Но Вы, может, знаете, это не по моей части.' In a letter to A.F. Onegin later the same year (9(21) October) he again rejected with levity the religious justification of resignation to fate -- in this case Hindu:
Turgenev is overwhelmed by the pointlessness of any fight against the law of nature decreeing decay and death. '... gegen Naturgesetze -- seien sie physiologischer, pathologischer oder politischer Natur -- ist schwer anzukämpfen', he wrote to Moritz Hartmann (13(25) February 1867). 'Ja, das Leben is überhaupt schwer zu tragen,' he had written several years earlier to his friend Ludwig Pietsch (18(30) April 1864), after the latter's daughter had died, 'und das Schwerste an ihm ist diese indifferente Nothwendigkeit, diese Natürlichkeit des Schmerzes und der Verluste.' This sense of unimpeachable fate and higher necessity, of dispassionate suprapersonal laws governing man and finding him as of as little consequence as a fly, was growing in these years. 'Строго и безучастно ведет каждого из нас судьба -- и только на первых порах мы, занятые всякими случайностями, вздором, самими собою, не чувствуем ее черствой руки.' Thus he wrote in 'Довольно' (9: 117). Any sense of a personal will, a personal significance or a personal achievement, is ephemeral, illusory and fraudulent. The individual's little ego is as nothing. 'Истина ... связывает нам руки, сводит нас "на нет".' The only way a man can retain his dignity and not founder, is 'to turn quietly away from everything, to say "Enough!"' (9: 117). It is small consolation. Kh.D. Alchevskaja, who met Turgenev in Petersburg in 1876, writes that Turgenev spoke then of the fact that
people in general exaggerate the significance of their own will. 73

He wrote in the same vein to Countess Lambert from Paris (28 October (9 November) 1862), meditating on the 'joyless fact' that we find ourselves on this planet at all.

He страшно мне смотреть вперед -- только сознаю я совершение каких-то вечных, неизменных, но глухих и немых законов над собою -- и маленький писк моего сознания так же мало тут значит, как если бы я вздумал лепетать: 'я, я, я'. . . . на берегу невозвратно текущего океана.

The suprapersonal forces here enforcing obedience are obviously material, not transcendental, although there is the occasional hint of a force of a different order, as in this letter to S.K. Kavelina (21 December 1872(2 January 1873)). When asked why he does not live in Russia, he answers: 'это-то именно и есть то фатальное (в смысле fatum'a а не фатальности) в моей жизни, что я так же мало в состоянии изменить, как переделать форму моего носа.'

Another sign of a preliminary mystical feeling was the lessening of the ego, the suppression of the phenomenal self. Turgenev began to find some consolation in the 'спокойствие самоотрицания', recognizing the futility of egoism and self-centred thinking. As he expressed it to M.A. Miliutina (15(27) April 1871): 'Мое "я" меня самого перестало интересовать; могу ли я интересоваться тем, что об этом "я" говорят и думают другие?' It was this weakening of the egotistic principle that he so admired in George Sand, especially the way she combined the weakening of the self with Quixotic enthusiasm. He described her in a letter to A.S. Suverin (9(21) June 1876) as a 'щедрая, благоволящая натура, в которой всё эгоистическое давно и дотла было выжжено
In his well-known letter to Filosofova (dated 11(23) September 1874) Turgenev made it clear, however, that his antiegotism was not simply an abstract principle, but a practical way of acting in the social sphere as well. He told Filosofova that Quixotic heroes were no longer needed. Referring to the purely social arena, he opined that Bazarovs were no longer needed, '... не нужно ни особых талантов, ни даже особенного ума -- ничего крупного, выдающегося, слишком индивидуального; ... нужно уметь жертвовать собою безо всякого блеску и треску -- нужно уметь смириться и не гнушаться мелкой ... работы ... .' What he had in mind in concrete terms was made plain in the character of Solomin in Virgin Soil. Yet even in Smoke a decade earlier there had been no hero in the old style, no historical actor. He had been content with characters who were beautiful.

This attitude was not, however, just a matter of social pragmatism. Indeed, the mystical germ was even more significant than the superficially practical aspect: the belief that whatever weakened our self-centredness, our 'centripetal' tendencies, whatever suprapersonal ideal forced us to think and act 'centrifugally', was good in itself.

Polonskii quotes Turgenev as saying: '... всякая сильная страсть, религиозная, политическая, общественная, даже страсть к науке, надламывает наш эгоизм ... Такова и любовь.'

Yet even here one senses the basic contradiction that dogged
Turgenev's Quixotism constantly: as M. Gershenzon points out, the outward-attracting ideal for Turgenev is at root needed only for personal fulfilment, and consequently the altruism is sham. 'Вне себя Тургеневу нечего было делать,' he writes, 'и единственное дело, которое занимало его кровно, -- устроение своего духа, -- оказывалось бесцельным . . . Отсюда пессимизм или "мировая скорь" Тургенева.'

On the whole, the period between the writing of *Fathers and Sons* and *Virgin Soil* was one of increasing depression over and resignation to material forces of old age, decay and death, enforced by increasing ill-health, loneliness and rootlessness. As an artist (in his peculiarly 'realist' sense of that word) Turgenev investigated various occult avenues of perception and living, but in himself seemed too sceptical, too heavily influenced by the deteriorating material scene to progress through the supernatural to a genuine mysticism. Stylistically and thematically this period was characterized by a strong resurgence of romanticism in Turgenev's writing. His spiritually isolated heroes and heroines, his 'fatal' protagonists, both male and female, his predilection for the intricate play of erotic sensibilities and bizarre passions, his preoccupation with the fantastic, supernatural and occult, with dreams and visions, and, in more general terms, his 'aspiration à autre chose sans savoir à quoi' which van Tieghem considers quintessentially romantic, are all part of the mainstream of nineteenth century romanticism. Out of the conflict between the romantic and the realist in Turgenev came his last novel, *Virgin Soil*. 
CHAPTER FIVE

TURGENEV THE FANTAST:
FROM FATHERS AND SONS TO VIRGIN SOIL
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The subject-matter of Turgenev's last novel, Virgin Soil, which was published in 1877, is openly political; a group of landless aristocrats and their camp-followers make several abortive attempts to "go to the people" in the summer of 1868. Turgenev's first ideas for the novel can be traced back to 1870 and probably sprang in part from his interest in the Mochaev affair (although Mochaev was actually organizing his 'committees' in America in 1869 rather than 1868). It seems reasonable to assume that Turgenev's original concept was developed and fleshed out under the influence of his association with Peter Lensky and his journal Voronezh as well as his awareness of such movements as Nikolai Chaliapin's groups, Vereya's Society, and Zhizn' obshchestv of Workers.

As a result of the frankly political content and the political inspiration for the events and characters, the novel elicited such openly polemical and abusive critical articles as Virgin Soil... critics of both left and right were indignant about Turgenev's portrait of the representatives of their social group and,
CHAPTER SIX

VIRGIN SOIL

The subject-matter of Turgenev's last novel, Virgin Soil, which was published in 1877, is openly political: a group of déclassé aristocrats and their camp-followers make several abortive attempts to 'go to the people' in the summer of 1868. Turgenev's first ideas for the novel can be traced back to 1870 and probably sprang in part from his interest in the Nechaev affair (although Nechaev was actively organizing his 'committees' in Russia in 1869 rather than 1868). It seems reasonable to assume that Turgenev's original concept was developed and fleshed out under the influence of his association with Petr Lavrov and his journal Forward! as well as his awareness of such movements as Nikolai Chaikovskii's groups, хождение в народ, and Zaslavskii's Southern Russian Union of Workers.

As a result of the frankly political content and the political inspiration for the events and characters, the level of specifically literary criticism of the novel plummeted. No previous novel of Turgenev's had elicited such openly malicious and abusive critical articles as Virgin Soil. Critics of both left and right were indignant about Turgenev's portrayal of the representatives of their social group and,
as is sadly so often the case in Russian criticism, considered the public ventilation of their indignant feelings to be literary criticism. Much time and energy was spent debating whether or not Turgenev's populists were conspiratorial Bakuninists or Nechaevists, Blanquists à la Tkachev, gradualist Lavrovists, various combinations of these types or even unhistorical fabrications.

This concentrated analysis of subject-matter has to an extent either obscured the deeper questions of the novel's themes or led to a confusion of subject-matter with themes. Although the neglect of the themes in *Virgin Soil* is less inexcusable in Turgenev's case than it is in the analogous case of Dostoevskii's *Besy* where the novel ceases to make any sense at all if it is regarded as a portrayal of historical rather than of metaphysical truth, it still hinders a full appreciation of *Virgin Soil* and, more importantly for the investigator of the evolution of Turgenev's ideas, of his belles-lettres as a whole. 'Автор "Ру́дина", написанного в 1855-м году,' writes Turgenev in his preface to the 1880 edition of his novels, 'и автор "Нови", написанной в 1876-м, является одним и тем же человеком' (12: 303). In an oft-quoted passage, he then goes on to affirm his unwavering desire to mirror forth 'the body and pressure of time'. What is constant over the two decades of creativity, despite the 'quickly changing physiognomy of Russians belonging to the cultured class', which he says in the same passage is also his concern, is a certain group of themes, which provide, so to speak, the 'pressure' behind the 'body', or embodiment, of the times. In *Virgin Soil*, at a different historical moment,
Turgenev is again facing the questions of the conflict between duty to a cause greater than the individual and his personal feelings, of faith and the paradox of its necessity yet seeming impossibility, of romanticism in an age of realism. These themes form the real pith of the novel and the area of Turgenev's abiding concern.

The conflict between love for or duty to the suprapersonal cause, an expression of love for 'humanity' in some form, and love for one woman, however self-sacrificing she might be, was experienced by all Turgenev's main heroes, and it is a dominant theme in *Virgin Soil* also, although it is not debated as explicitly as in earlier works. Rudin was tortured by it, opting for the wider love, as he believed; Liza Kalitina also sacrificed her personal feelings to a higher Christian love she felt bound to; Insarov initially attempted to avoid any clash between the personal and suprapersonal spheres by refusing to form personal ties, and although he appeared to achieve an eventual reconciliation of the two spheres, Elena was probably self-deceived in her apparent reconciliation of them; Bazarov's hostile attitude towards Arkadii's marriage showed that he, too, was aware of the conflict; and even Litvinov was troubled by the conflict between his 'duty' to the self-effacing Tania and his selfish passionate love for the self-assertive Irina.

All of Turgenev's heroes and heroines have justified their
behaviour in terms of self-sacrificing duty, although Bazarov had the courage to admit that this may be only a rationalization of amoral urges. Beneath the superficial appeals to duty and self-sacrifice there always lurks in Turgenev's works the discomforting suspicion that the appeal is a last resort against moral anarchy and chaos and the complete breakdown of any rationale for acting. Masaryk has interpreted it as a legacy from Kant, tempering Turgenev's intellectual positivism.²

Nezhdanov, Turgenev's hero in *Virgin Soil*, is faced with a similar conflict. For him, as for Insarov and Bazarov, the suprapersonal cause has no transcendental element in it, although the question of how to maintain active dedication to a cause which is wholly of this world becomes crucial. An early manifestation of the conflict between suprapersonal and personal love occurs after he has grown close to Marianna and had a disruptive scene with Kallomeitsev at the Sipiagins' dinner-table. His altruistic sentiments are now transferred, as were Elena Stakhova's, from abstract ideals to an individual. Marianna's enthusiasm might say that Nezhdanov had succeeded in integrating his personal and suprapersonal loves; a sceptic might say that he had simply confused them, and that one or both must collapse. The sceptic's view was to be justified.

Markelov soon notices the conflict in Nezhdanov between his love for Marianna and his devotion to the cause. During
their acrimonious conversation on the way home from Golushkin's Markelov attacks Nezhdanov for doubting the cause, doubting others' ability to sacrifice themselves to it, and for being incapable of self-sacrifice himself. Markelov's point is that in order to serve the cause faithfully one must be able to 'оттолкнуть от себя всё, чем жизнь прекрасна -- самое блаженство любви' (12: 149). He goes on: 'Ну, вам сегодня ... конечно, было не до того!' It is not that Markelov blames Nezhdanov -- his 'realism' forces him, despite his jealousy, to approve of Nezhdanov's present involvement with Marianna. 'Вы воспользовались ...', he starts to say, 'Вы были правы. Я говорю только о том, что не удивляюсь вашему охлаждению к общему делу: у вас, я опять-таки скажу, -- не то на уме' (12: 150). Markelov later admits that it is a matter of fortune, 'счастье', whether or not one is tempted to become involved in a love affair rather than a cause. 'Я тебе сказал, что я от счастья любви отказался, оттолкнул его, чтобы только служить своим убеждениям,' he confides to Nezhdanov. 'Это вздор, бахвальство! Никогда мне ничего подобного не предлагали, ничего мне было отталкивать!' (12: 152). He says charitably: 'Ну, так ты молодец!' Solomin, the wise, and rather faceless, man of the people (actually an ex-seminarian, but nevertheless much closer to the people than any of the conspirators), also notices that Nezhdanov's two loves are confused rather than united. Marianna and Nezhdanov urge Solomin to come to the Sipiagins in order to seek his advice about 'acting'. Their proposed
'act' -- leaving the Sipiagins' -- is, like similar proposals in earlier works, motivated in a confused way: on the one hand it is to be an elopement, an attempt to satisfy personal desires; and on the other hand it is to serve as a blow for the revolution, which is believed by their circle to be imminent, to coincide with their elopement. In addition, it is, of course, a typically romantic action to take: romantic heroes and heroines have been taking flight since the movement first formed. Solomin, however, is very much more clear-eyed in his assessment of the situation than the two lovers and says to Marianna: 'если вы точно хотите оставить этот дом, потому что вы полагаете, что революция сейчас вспыхнет ... [,] вы можете еще сидеть дома довольно долго. Если же вы хотите бежать, потому что любите друг друга и иначе вам соединиться нельзя, -- тогда ..., мне остается только пожелать вам ..., любовь да совет!' (12: 187). They must decide which is their motivating principle.

Marianna, the very personification of duty, is also faced directly with the question of duty to the cause versus personal love when Mashurina comes to give orders to Nezhdanov, and finding Marianna and Nezhdanov in love with each other, she destroys the letter containing the orders and goes away, determined not to disrupt their happiness. At first touched by Mashurina's act, Marianna on reflection becomes a trifle indignant. She asks herself: 'почему Машурина предполагает, что [мою] привязанность к Нежданову сильнее чувства долга?' (12: 239). As her first flush of love subsides, and it dawns on her that her first 'love' is in fact a sense of duty to the cause, even her love for Nezhdanov becomes subsumed under that
wider sense. Even when, for example, Nezhdanov eventually makes a definite proposal of marriage to Marianna, she replies simply 'Я готова' (12: 253), to which Nezhdanov fittingly retorts: 'Римяника! ... Чувство долга!'

Yet the sense of duty must be anchored in morally blameless principles. Sipiagin, representative of the liberal nobility, also at one point appeals to a sense of duty (presumably patriotic or indeterminately moral) which is stronger than family or friendship ties. 'Полагаете ли вы, что во мне чувство родственное не столь же сильно, как ваше дружеское?' he asks Paklin during the scene at the governor's. 'Но есть другое чувство, милостивый государь, которое еще сильнее и которое должно руководить всеми нашими действиями и поступками: чувство долга!' (12: 274). This parody of a principle so prized by the members of the revolutionary group serves as a warning that duty to some suprapersonal cause is not a practical or reasonable moral imperative unless impelled by something practical and reasonable, worthy of the faith bestowed in it. Duty itself is not a moral fixity.

Closely allied to the first theme of duty to a suprapersonal cause as opposed to egocentric activity is the equally time-honoured theme of faith -- its objects, its effects, its very possibility -- because, as it transpires in Virgin Soil, without faith in a cause, self-sacrifice to it is unreasonable. With ever deeper desperation Turgenev seemed to be asking in Virgin Soil -- as Dostoevskii had done with such brilliance, if a different bias, in Бесы earlier in the same decade -- what it was still possible for an educated Russian to believe in.
The novel traces the complete loss of Nezhdanov's faith, both in himself and in the suprapersonal cause itself. There is now no naïve suggestion that Quixotism is a panacea for Hamletism: both tendencies exist in the one individual.

V. Gippius rather aptly called Nezhdanov 'истерически ринувшийся в донаххотство гамлет.'³ After the meeting at Markelov's, Nezhdanov is attacked by doubts of a universal nature, rooted in the familiar sense of the futility of all human things resulting from the law of mortality, and his cosmic doubts are particularized in doubts about the cause and his own ability to serve it:

... он лег спать рано, но заснуть не мог. Его посетили не то что печальные, а темные мысли ... мысли о неизбежном конце, о смерти. Они были ему знакомы. Долго он переворачивал их и так и сяк, то содрогаясь перед вероятностью ничтожества, то приветствуя ее, почти радуясь ей ... Этот скептицизм, это равнодушие, это легкомысленное беззверие -- как согласовалось всё это с его принципами? (12: 86)

After the disillusioning events at Golushkin's, Nezhdanov is again overcome with his inability to believe in the cause and his own inability to be a revolutionary. 'Да верит ли он ... в это дело?' he asks himself, referring to himself in the third person. 'Верит ли он в свою любовь? -- О, эстетик проклятый! Скептик!' (12: 121). He conceives of his doubts in very dated terms as 'рефлексёрство'. 'Ты пиши стишки,' he tells himself, 'да кисни, да возись с собственными мыслишками и ощущеньцами, да копайся в разных психологических соображеньцах и тонкостях ... О Гамлет, Гамлет, датский принц, как выйти из твоей тени?' By coincidence, Paklin comes in a moment later and also calls Nezhdanov 'российский Гамлет' (12: 122).
Markelov is well aware that Nezhdanov is losing his grip after the comic opera meeting at Golushkin's. When listing Kisliakov's virtues, he says that 'the main thing' about Kisliakov is that 'he believes': 'верит в наше дело, верит в рево--люцию! Я должен вам сказать одно, Алексей Дмитриевич, -- я замечу, что вы, вы охладеваете к нашему делу, вы не верите в него!' (12: 149).

When Nezhdanov actually tries to 'go to the people' and is such a laughable failure, he again blames himself first: 'конечно, вина тут моя, а не самого дела,' he writes to his friend Silin (12: 226). 'Сам чувствую, что не гонюсь. Точно северный актер в чужой роли.' But the distinction between doubt in himself and doubt in the cause is not as clear-cut as Nezhdanov claims to Silin, because both doubts have a common origin. Underneath Nezhdanov doubts whether he can believe in anything: he has no faith in populism for its own sake, but is eager for faith for its own sake. 'Нужно верить в то, что говоришь, -- а говори, как хочешь!' he writes (12: 227).

Nezhdanov's personal failure and the collapse of the cause as a whole are inextricably intertwined and finally lead to his suicide. He admits to Marianna shortly before he takes his own life, that the latest fiasco in his attempts to 'go to the people' has proved to him his own 'неспособность' and that furthermore 'я не верю больше в то дело, которое нас соединило, в силу которого мы вместе ушли из того дома ... не верю! не верю!' (12: 279-80). He goes on, perceptively: 'Я думал прежде, ... что я в самое-то дело верю, а только сомневавшись в самом себе, в своей силе, в своем уменье; мои
Throughout the novel the two doubts have interacted and nourished each other. (He then indulges in a piece of sophistry in which he claims that Solomin is above 'belief': according to Nezhdanov, Solomin is like a man going to a city, who does not need to ask himself if the city exists, but just keeps walking towards it (12: 280). Solomin's 'city' does not yet, of course, exist, and consequently he is exercising faith in walking on towards it. Paklin certainly recognizes Solomin as a man of faith, calling him 'человек с идеалом' (12: 299). Solomin's faith, perhaps because he himself is such an artificially created character, is serene, strong, and reasonable, the sort of faith which, unhappily, eludes Nezhdanov.)

Nezhdanov's suicide is not an act of absurd logic, a metaphysical blow, like Kirilov's in Бесы. He claims in his letter to Solomin and Marianna that, since he has failed in his task, there remains nothing to do but to 'eliminate myself' (12: 288). Considering himself a burden to Marianna and a nuisance to others, he concludes that the only decent thing to do is to die (12: 288-9). This attitudinizing may be all very romantic, and even modish, since the suicide rate climbed dramatically in Russia in the 1870s, but it is hardly convincing. Nezhdanov failed in one idealistic summer enterprise and had only partial success in one love affair, but failures of this sort may be remedied in any number of ways apart from suicide. Nezhdanov chose suicide, presumably, for a weightier reason, which he only manages finally to hint at
in his postscript. He kills himself because he foresees suffering for something he does not believe in (12: 289). There was a presentiment of this notion earlier in the novel when Nezhdanov dwelt on the image of the Juggernaut:

'Джаггернаут... Вот она катится, громадная колесница... и я слышу треск и грохот её колес' (12: 188). The point about the Juggernaut in Turgenev's imagery is that those it crushes are believers. Now, at the fatal moment, realizing he does not believe in the suprapersonal good of the Juggernaut bearing down on him, Nezhdanov flings himself aside. Surrounded by believers, however, he has no honourable choice but suicide. Without faith, even duty is impotent.

The chilling aspect to faith in Virgin Soil is that it is shown to result from deterministic forces. This important thematic concern of Turgenev's has been little taken up in critical materials on Virgin Soil. Analysts of the subject-matter, as opposed to the themes, have all too often claimed that Nezhdanov was a failure as a populist because of certain historically atypical personal circumstances, or castigated Turgenev for imposing on his hero a lost cause and subsequently punishing him for failing. N.K. Mikhailovskii writing in Notes of the Fatherland, for example, criticized Turgenev for making Nezhdanov's 'чисто личная жизненная неудача' the source of his revolutionary inclinations. Tkachev himself also complained that Turgenev had appeared to explain Nezhdanov's 'ниhilism' by his illegitimacy and its psychological results -- in other words, by 'случайности'. Expecting a sociological discussion, and unconscious of the fact that he was dismissing a major theme as an artistic error, Tkachev was annoyed to find
that Nezhdanov's doubts 'just happened', were merely 
'празднующее резонерство', falling back on the rather 
hackneyed idea in Turgenevan criticism that Nezhdanov 'lacks 
will and energy'. 8 (The text does not appear to substantiate 
this claim: it is less will or energy that Nezhdanov is seen 
to lack than the motivation to employ either.) The author of 
the commentary on Virgin Soil in the Пссд edition considers 
that in this novel Turgenev was demonstrating the bankruptcy 
of the Tkachevist position in the discussion of revolutionary 
method (12: 484-5). A similar stand is taken by 
G.P. Makogonenko in an article written in 1939, although 
he widened Turgenev's target to include what he called 
'бакунинско-тичевская тактика'. 9 Although such inferences 
drawn from the subject-matter of Virgin Soil are of 
biographical and historical interest, Turgenev was doing much 
more than describing in literary images one man's personal 
failure or the collapse of the populist movement of the mid-
seventies, or attacking the Blanquist notion of inciting the 
immediate revolt of the peasantry. Apart from the themes of 
faith and duty, a major theme in Virgin Soil is precisely the 
deterministic and disenchantingly mundane nature of the forces 
shaping failure and success, and indeed the whole course of 
human existence.

Earlier in Turgenev's creative work -- and notably in 
Rudin and On the Eve -- will had played an important part in 
the individual's destiny. As we have seen, Rudin has been 
called a man of weak will, although in fact he exercised will 
-- both the power and desire to act -- in shaping his own 
destiny, while his sense of being borne along by some fate
was still relatively ill-defined and romantic; the affairs of Insarov and Elena, and of Lavretskii and Liza, also seemed to be dogged by some 'fate', some suprapersonal agency, which however left the characters some area of free-will in which to battle, to act and to move. It was precisely this area of apparent free-will which accorded them both their dignity and their tragedy. It is also what distinguishes them so unequivocally from Nezhdanov. By the sixties Turgenev's own sense of determinism was growing so strong that even the need for 'wilful' heroes and heroines à la Mikhailovskii was passing. As he wrote to A.P. Filosofova (11(23) September 1874), strong individualistic heroes like Bazarov were of no use to society any more. In a number of stories he explored, as we have seen, the operation of supernatural governing forces, although as the numerous references to resignation already quoted from his correspondence of the period show, the inevitability of submission to natural, material determining factors was something he was forced to take into account with increasing despondency. Positivist thinkers whose ideas Turgenev was familiar with at this period, such as Comte, Spencer and Lavrov, all emphasized the primacy of the historical process over individual will, although Lavrov in particular was concerned that individuals should be motivated by faith in what they were doing, seeing lack of faith as a dangerous threat to the liberation movement.

Yet in Virgin Soil even the Quixotic qualities of faith and duty are shown to be determined, virtually in conformity with Bazarov's contention that 'мне приятно отрицать, мой мозг так устроен -- и баста!' and his elaboration 'Отчего мне
The deterministic force is not a coherent governing mind, it is not something organic in the idealist mode, but chance, случай, the coincidence of circumstances. In Potugin's words from Smoke: 'Человек слаб, женщина сильна, случай всесилен . . .' (9: 239).

In Virgin Soil, also, chance appears all-powerful. Nezhdanov, for example, blames heredity for his inability to act -- for being emotionally and psychologically unfit for the environment he finds himself in. In a letter to his absent friend Silin he writes: 'как я проклинаю . . . эту нервность, чуткость, впечатлительность, брезгливость, всё это наследие моего аристократического отца! Какое право имел он втолкнуть меня в жизнь, снабдив меня органами, которые несвойственны среде, в которой я должен вращаться?' (12: 228). As the group's pursuers close in around it, and Nezhdanov realizes his love for Marianna is also threatened, he realizes that he is inescapably gripped in the vice of physical circumstances, although it is expressed more romantically: 'Он чувствовал одно: какая-то темная, подземная рука ухватилась за самый корень его существования -- и уже не выпустит его' (12: 254).

Markelov also regards Nezhdanov's present situation as the result of chance or fortune. He sees Nezhdanov's quavering between love for Marianna and the cause as the result of his 'счастливая наружность и красноречие', 'тресклятое счастье всех незаконнорожденных детей' (12: 150) and being a 'счастливец' (12: 152). In contrast he describes himself as 'несчастлив' (12: 151) having been born 'бесталанный' (12: 152). Even in the army corps he had been called 'неудачник' (12: 76). The implication is that his enthusiasm for the cause is as much a
result of chance and physical circumstance as Nezhdanov's lack of it. It appears that Nezhdanov cannot act according to his principles as much as anything because he happens to have been born good-looking and sensitive, while Markelov can act because his appearance is not attractive enough for him to become involved in personal love.

At one point in *Virgin Soil* this sense of the elemental power of fortune takes on the familiar supernatural colouring of a mysterious suprahuman force: in the cameo scene with Fomushka and Fimushka (which Turgenev admitted in a letter to K.D. Kavelin, 17(29) December 1876 was a 'вставной кусок' bearing little structural relationship to the rest of the novel). Here Fimushka divines correctly the character of each of her guests and then singles out Nezhdanov with preternatural perception as 'pitiable', presumably because she foresees his dark future (12: 139). This passage is, however, out of key with the general tenor of the novel in which the deterministic forces ruling man's destiny are conceived of in materialistic terms.

The pessimistically determinist view of man notwithstanding, there remains in *Virgin Soil* a paradoxically idealistic subtheme which seems to demonstrate the necessity, in the spirit of Бесы, for idealism despite its impossibility. An idealistic subtheme would also be in the spirit of Turgenev's 'Воспоминания о Белинском', published in 1869, in which he extols Belinskii as 'идеалист в лучшем смысле слова' (14: 41), adding that he even 'отрицал во имя идеала' (14: 42). Turgenev also quotes a letter to himself from Belinskii dated 1(13) March 1847 on the subject of idealism: 'Гадки они -- этот
ideализм и романтизм, но что за дело человеку, что ему помогло дурное на вкус лекарство ... главное тут не то, что оно гадко, а то, что оно помогло' (14: 61). If Fathers and Sons showed the disintegration of a nihilist under the influence of romanticism, Virgin Soil shows the reverse. Nezhdanov is, Turgenev tells us, 'идеалист по натуре', a romantic with a sensitive, poetic soul, a great lover of beauty in all its forms (12: 31). Yet, as part of his rebellion, he feels it a 'duty' to mock ideals, to act gruffly and rudely, and to hide his attempts at poetry. After the meeting at Markelov's when he should have been burning with newly stoked revolutionary ardour, he is overcome with Weltschmerz and gets up in the night to write a deeply romantic poem ('Мы не будем, когда я буду / Умирать . . .') (12: 86). Paklin, the 'Mephistophelean' clown who exhibits unexpected flashes of wisdom, dubs Nezhdanov, posthumously, as 'романтик реализма' (12: 294) (an early thought of Turgenev's -- he made a note of it as early as July 1870 (12: 479)) pinpointing the paradox in Nezhdanov's attempt to be a Quixotic realist, or an idealistic materialist -- an attempt which proved fatal.

According to the notes of one N.M. who knew Turgenev in Paris in 1879, not long after Virgin Soil was published, the attempt to reconcile nihilism and idealism, so typical of Russians, infuriated Turgenev. N.M. reports that Turgenev was once angry with a self-styled anarchist for on the one hand 'believing in nothing' and on the other loving an ode to a great man. 'Нельзя же ни во что не верить и, в то же время, поклоняться идолам, слагать гимны статуе!' he said. Later in the same article he reports a comment Turgenev made
on the two elements of materialistic and idealistic humanism in Russians:

Despite some confusion in terminology and particularly in the rather idealistic colouring given to the materialism, the basic thought is clear.

In the scene as depicted by Turgenev in Virgin Soil there is a hint of an important element in the thought of Dostoevskii and Vladimir Solov'ev: where there are no extramundane ideals (be they 'truth', 'love', 'beauty' or 'God'), the result is murder, suicide and general misery. (See, for example, 12: 291-2.) 'Realism' in Pisarev's sense is not enough because it ultimately produces nihilism, launching itself out into a moral void where it thrashes about in darkness. Yet a guiding 'idealism', at least for civilized man so-called, appears impossible.

A creeping pessimism and despair answer the well-intentioned calls to idealism. The inescapability of material factors weighs more and more heavily on Turgenev as the years go by, as his correspondence testifies. Virgin Soil demonstrates only too well that it is not enough merely to desire to have faith in shining ideals -- that is the 'romanticism of realism' which is ultimately so fragile and ineffectual. To be viable, idealism must find some concrete expression. Yet in the 1870s, practical, credible ideals were in short supply among Russians.
Before Emancipation, clearly, 'freedom', 'beauty', 'justice', 'order', 'nationality' and so on were idealistic abstractions with the prospect of concrete realization. Faith in these ideals was not a state of mind existing in a historical void. It was generally directed towards Emancipation. The *Contemporary* is an example of how these ideals actually united and activated men of very different backgrounds, long-range aims and world-views. After Emancipation, for many years, Turgenev and his peers entertained the vague notion that what had to be done had now been done and that there was no immediate need to initiate further action. Hence, in part, his impatience with all the main shades of political opinion in *Smoke* and his largely ill-defined ideal of 'civilization' which made a minimum of concrete demands on the idealist. By the 1870s, however, disillusionment with the reforms had set in deeply -- the zemstvo had had its powers restricted, judicial reforms had been vitiated, the peasantry ruined, press liberties whittled away and reactionary educational policies enacted together with widespread intellectual disorientation about what action to take to remedy the deteriorating situation in Russia. While attracted to the Quixotic aspect of the revolutionary movement, Turgenev in fact had no faith in its success or sympathy for its violent methods. Revolutionaries such as P.L. Lavrov, G.A. Lopatin and M.O. Ashkinazi bear testimony to this fact, as do several of Turgenev's letters of the period. There could not be a better illustration of the insubstantiality of Turgenev's ideas about political action and the concretion of the ideal in the political or social sphere than the embodiment of these ideas in *Virgin Soil*, the 'positive' character Solomin.
On the abstract plane, however, Turgenev was more certain about the quality of the faith or idealism needed to counteract both nihilism and social injustice. The quality or nature of this faith must be that of religious faith. Nezhdanov makes this point in his letter to Silin, already quoted, on the subject of faith and the necessity for faith in what you say, whatever it is. He relates how he hard a schismatic preaching and prophesying:

The religious type of faith is the kind of faith -- perhaps the only kind of faith -- that moves mountains. It is not surprising that Solomin is the son of a deacon and a former seminary student. In his kind of certainty and calm there is a religiosity also, not in terms of its content, but of its quality. Indeed, historically speaking, the whole populist movement owed much to Proudhon who in turn was heavily influenced by Christian ideas; and, grotesque as it may seem, even Nechaev was at nineteen a teacher of religion. On the other hand both Lavrov and Bakunin came to regard established religion as a major enemy in the struggle for a new society.

There is another highly unexpected and significant reference to religious attitudes in Virgin Soil. This is the strange remark made by Paklin's sister, Snanduliiia, a neutral character almost to the point of complete effacement, although her hunchback and retiring manners tend to give her the air of a юродивая or подвижница. Within a few lines of
the end of the novel, Snanduliiia suddenly remarks: 'Силушка, ... мне кажется, в твоих рассуждениях о будущем ты забываешь нашу религию и ее влияние ...' (12: 299). The notion has no lead-in, nor is it followed up in any way. Indeed, its very baldness makes it doubly striking. Yet the remark was no casual insertion, but was evidently significant to Turgenev. It had originally been Paklin's line, but apparently after receiving Annenkov's letter of 9 November 1876 Turgenev decided to rewrite it as Snanduliiia's. Annenkov found the remark smacked of de Maistre's idea that Russia could achieve greatness only on a basis of religion and imperial power.\(^{13}\) (It also seemed to accord with Dostoevskii's declared opinion that the plough the virgin soil needed was religion.\(^{14}\)) Clearly Turgenev would have abhorred any suggestion of such reactionary ceasaropapism in his text, yet the remark obviously was vital enough in its true signification for Turgenev to preserve it, although in an altered form. There is nothing either in the plot up to this point or in the characterization of Snanduliiia or Paklin, or in any of the novel's themes, that would seem to justify interpreting the remark as an attack on slavophilism. The remark would seem to be rather an indication that in the Russian people there is one vital and potent element which is underestimated in most circles still looking for direction: religious faith. In some form it might yet carry the day. This idea is supported by the report that one of Turgenev's characters in his planned new work about the difference between the spiritual mainsprings of the Russian and the Frenchman was to be a Russian 'социалист-мистик' with a new religion.\(^{15}\)
As in earlier works, in *Virgin Soil* Turgenev clearly separates religious faith, the type of faith which is based on transcendent or transcendental realities and beliefs, from established ecclesiastical dogma, and the ecclesiasticism of the Orthodox Church in particular, which he satirizes constantly. Orthodoxy is the religion of the oppressor class: Kollomeitsev, reaction personified, calls himself 'глубоко религиозный человек, православный в полном смысле слова' (12: 43), elsewhere drinking a toast to 'the only principles I recognize' -- the knout and champagne (12: 52). There is a particularly Machiavellian ring to his 'manifestation', as he calls it in French, in kissing a passing priest's hand in front of Solomin (12: 172), as there is to Sipiagin's 'three principles' of Religion, Agriculture and Industry (in that order) (12: 180), and the governor's wearing of a 'целая коллекция образков и ладанок' to bed (12: 266). For, as Machiavelli himself advised, a prince should be 'the embodiment of mercy, good faith, integrity, kindliness, and religion. And there is no virtue which it is more necessary for him to seem to possess than this last . . .' The would-be revolutionary and Old Believer Golushkin's conversion to Orthodoxy in order to save his skin (12: 248) provides a further example of the identification of the Russian Orthodox Church in *Virgin Soil* with duplicity and political expediency.

Nezhdanov's precise thoughts on the subject are not revealed. He attends Kolia's name-day service and studies the motley crowd in the church. 'И Нежданов смотрел на них и думал -- разные думы' (12: 59). After the service the clergy goes
back to the Sipiagins' house for a meal, and is mildly mocked by the author for its awkwardness in sophisticated company. The humour in this instance loses some of its point because it is so obviously based on genteel snobbery. A mildly anticlerical tone may also be sensed in the account of the local school, run with quiet inefficiency, futility and a complete absence of modern ideas by the deacon (12: 98). If a religious type of faith still holds some promise in Turgenev's works, it is not as the Church dispenses it.

These several themes, which have significance beyond the historical events comprising, confusedly, the novel's content, form a complex whole, and are quintessentially Turgenevan. In *Virgin Soil* there is raised with the same urgency as in *Rudin* over twenty years earlier the question of the need for faith in something suprapersonal, transcending the historical moment, in order to act out an intellectually accepted duty to a suprapersonal cause. Yet the very need for faith is beset by doubts: where is this faith to be found? how can modern man escape nihilism and its consequences? is even faith or the lack of it determined by material accident? The answers seem vague but full of foreboding: few men can hope to find a transcendent faith; man appears to be entirely the plaything of material forces. Their striking similarity
to Dostoevskii's conclusions in России calls for some amplification of Turgenev's philosophical position vis-à-vis Dostoevskii.

* * * * * * * *

Traced by a number of writers, the history of the growing personal antagonism between Dostoevskii and Turgenev has tended to obscure what the two writers had in common in their ideas. While on a personal level, for example, Turgenev considered Dostoevskii to be quite simply deranged, as is clear from his letter to Polonskii of 24 April (6 May) 1871, although not for that reason unworthy of the normal civilities, Dostoevskii took deep exception to Turgenev's 'генеральство', his supposed vanity and gentility, and, as Dostoevskii saw it, shallowness. In other words, here was a man who, while in no hurry to cast off the trappings of his privileged social position, and apparently spurning Holy Russia herself, her faith and traditions, espoused socialism, atheism and westernism.

This paragraph, part of a letter Dostoevskii wrote to A.N. Maikov (16(28) August 1867) describing a conversation he and Turgenev had had in Baden-Baden, sums up some of Dostoevskii's basic complaints:

[Turgenev] обявили мне, что он окончательный атеист. Но Боже мой: Деизм нам дал Христа, т.е. до того высокое представление человека, что его понять нельзя без благоговения и нельзя неверить что это идеал человечества вековечный. А что же они-то Тургевевы, Герцены, Утинь, Чернышевские нам представили? Вместо
To Dostoevskii, then, Turgenev has rejected Orthodoxy and slavophilesolutions in favour of materialistic, godless humanism, this being tantamount to supporting the Antichrist. Yet we should not allow Dostoevskii's rather dramatic and extremist statement of differences in opinion in one area blind us to the gradual rapprochement taking place in a number of others, less topical.

Both the author of Дети and the author of Virgin Soil connect the malaise of the seventies with the men of the forties. It is the liberal (from Turgenev's own circle, as it happens) Stepan Trofimovich Verkhovenskii who fathers Petr Verkhovenskii and fosters Stavrogin himself. In Dostoevskii's eyes, Belinskii and his associates, in turning towards the rationalist, materialist west in the forties, substituted the man-god for the Orthodox God-Man, thereby releasing the one ultimate brake on men's egoist, Napoleonic, enslaving, murderous desires. The fruits of the fall of the forties are on graphic display in Дети. Turgenev's personal respect and admiration for Belinskii should not blind us to the fact that he too, although less explicitly, exemplifies the role of the Belinskii epoch in sapping the all-important romantic faith which he then spent the rest of his life trying to recapture in an intellectually satisfying way. A victim of...
the second Enlightenment in Russia, Turgenev illustrates the failure of mid-century materialism to provide direction, ideals or moral imperatives which were proof against its own corrosive scepticism.

More importantly, the question of a Russian's faith became crucial for both Dostoevskii and Turgenev in the seventies. Turgenev's search for faith has been well explored. It reached a climax of despair in *Virgin Soil* with the suicide of the searcher. Although previous searchers had perished in the attempt or given up, none had in desperation taken his own life. In *Virgin Soil* Turgenev at last arrived at the point reached by Dostoevskii years earlier of confronting his hero with questions of Weltanschauung 'у стен', at the point of no return. If he had been capable of more impersonal judgment, Dostoevskii may have taken Turgenev as an excellent illustration of his thesis that without the light of Orthodoxy there is darkness and confusion, without the Christ-ideal there is no real ideal.

In *Бесы* (the novel behind which 'Turgenev is such a pervading presence', as Richard Peace has written) Dostoevskii takes the problem of faith in both hands. His hero Stavrogin, although immeasurably more complex, profound and symbolic a character than Nezhdanov, is, like Turgenev's hero, also driven to find grounds for belief, and also ends his search by suicide. Of course, Dostoevskii pushes the question of faith, as all other questions, to the extreme. For him the choice is either in Orthodoxy or Nechaevism, there can be no real choice in between. As the Prince (Stavrogin) says to Shatov in the notebooks for *Бесы*: 'есть только две инициативы: или вера или
нечь. Воз можно ли веровать? Dostoevskii asks elsewhere in his notebooks (p.207). 'Выходит[,] стало быть . . . [что] дело в настоятельном вопросе: мож но ли веровать, быв цивилизованным, т.е. Европейцем? т.е. веровать безусловно в божественность сына божия Иисуса Христа? (ибо вся вера только в этом и состоит) ' (p.208). On the next page of his notebooks he puts the question even more urgently:


В этом все, весь уzel жизни для Русского народа и все его назначение и бытие впереди. (idem)

On his next page he reiterates:

. . . Стало быть весь вопрос опять таки в том: Можно ли веровать во все то, во что православие велит веровать? Если же нет, то гораздо лучше, гуманнее -- все сжечь и примикуть к Мачеху. (p.209)

As Kirilov says to Petr Verkhovenskii in the novel itself:

'Бог необходим, а потому должен быть . . . Но я знаю, что его нет и не может быть (Part 3, chapter 6, ii).

It is almost as if Turgenev and Dostoevskii were confronted by the same question -- can an enlightened or civilized Russian find something outside himself to believe in? -- and Dostoevskii answered that he must, and that the ideal must be Christ as revealed by Orthodoxy, even if that faith seems impossible; Turgenev appears to have answered that, while recognizing the need for faith and the dangers that the unbeliever is exposed to, he cannot believe in the transcendental realities or ideal of Orthodoxy and has not found any substitute for them.

Turgenev and Dostoevskii had, of course, long been interested in similar literary types, the connection between
Dostoevskii's oppressed and humiliated little men and Turgenev's 'superfluous' men being particularly well recognized as in, for example, 'Записки из подполья' and 'Дневник лишнего человека'. Both authors were also interested in the contrast between the 'fatal' heroine and passive hero, as they were in the dichotomy between the 'proud' type and the 'humble' type in general, although Dostoevskii's characters were proud or humble before Divinity, whereas Turgenev's were proud or humble before a variety of suprapersonal forces. They also shared certain attitudes such as their distrust of socialist ideas on individualism, and their hatred of the 'anthill' civilizations of London and Paris. There are even certain compositional similarities: the importance of the conflict felt by their characters between their world-views and reality; the dominant role played by heroes of theory or ideas; their common penchant for the fantastic of a realistic kind.

After Emancipation, despite the flaring up of personal antagonism, there was paradoxically a common gravitation towards several of life's profounder questions. It was Dostoevskii who grasped the significance of Fathers and Sons not long after his return from exile; and over the next decade and a half Turgenev and Dostoevskii were both becoming acutely aware of the crucial need for a transcendent faith for Russians and of the eternal danger of Prometheus becoming Napoleon.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

THE FINAL YEARS

The dominant theme in Turgenev's works after *Virgin Soil* is death. Death is approached in his works in a wide variety of ways: nihilistically, pantheistically, spiritualistically, with mystery, humour, sadness and desperation. Yet, despite this catholicity of approaches, there emerges during the final years quite a small number of definable trends in Turgenev's attitudes towards death, together with a small number of ideas about antidotes to it, based on his continuing aesthetic and spiritual dissatisfaction with materialism's answers to life's grander questions. He envisaged death in three basic forms:
as complete annihilation of the ego, as a suprapersonal agency and as the metamorphosis of the ego. This chapter examines in turn each of these approaches and the respective antidotes or palliatives which Turgenev considered in each case.

* * * * * * *

In accordance with Turgenev's deepening philosophical pessimism and intellectual acceptance of agnostic, if not atheistic, conclusions about human life, death is sometimes
present in the works of this period as the utter annihilation of the ego, as it was in one instance in 'Призрачн' over two decades earlier. Death in this guise is particularly in evidence in his Стихотворения в прозе in which death is by far the most common of the many themes embodied in the eighty-three 'poems', being a major theme in at least twenty-nine of them.

In certain poems, written at various times between 1877 and 1882, life is depicted as a completely biological process, having no transcendental element, with death therefore signifying the cessation of life and the annihilation of the person. In the earliest of the prose poems, 'Дроzd I', written in July 1877, the idea that there is no individual immortality is projected very distinctly. 'Eternity' is attributed to the song of a thrush, because it is the voice of eternal nature itself. The mortality of that particular thrush and the ephemerality of that particular song are simply of no account: the poet glosses over them by insisting that it is the 'same' thrush singing under the 'same' sun as a thousand years before, thereby poetically elevating a linguistic device into a philosophical statement. The poet admits with some consistency that, together with all his troubles and selfish concerns, he will eventually be carried off by the 'cold waves' of the 'shoreless ocean' (a recurring image in the poems for nature oblivious to the fate of the individual, as in the nightmare 'Конец света' (1878) where the whole earth is swallowed up by a black, icy, roaring wave) while the evolutions of nature will go on and the thrush's song will still be heard. Some months later, in a meditational composition called 'Без гнезда',
Turgenev was to return to the image of the wave swallowing him up like a dove which had strayed out over the ocean and rolling on 'бессмысленно шумит'. One individual physical organism disappears and is destroyed, while the physical whole, the universe, continues.

Turgenev personifies the indifference of the eternal natural universe to individual man in the poem 'Природа' (1879) which seems to echo the 'spectatrice indifférente' and 'cruelle marâtre' of Vigny and Leopardi. In this dream, nothing except nature herself has continuing existence. Men and animals, her children, are exterminated with complete equanimity. 'Все твари мои дети,' says Mother Nature, 'и я одинаково о них забочусь -- и одинаково их истребляю.' The poet feebly attempts to confront her with the transcendent qualities of 'good', 'reason' and 'justice', but she rejects them as mere 'human words': 'Я тебе дала жизнь -- я ее отниму и дам другим, червям или людям . . . мне всё равно.' This poem recalls 'Поездка в Пolesье' (1857) in which nature was also depicted as impassive and unmoved by individual suffering or death (7: 69-70).

The equivalence in Nature's eyes of man and worm is also brought out in the poem 'Собака', written a month after 'Без гнезда'. Divested of all the idealist and religious constructions traditionally put upon it, the 'spark of life' is seen as something so purely biological that even a man and a dog can no more be clearly differentiated. A similar sense of the oneness of men and animals in the face of nature is found in 'Морское плавание' (1879) where a man and a monkey comfort each other on a sea voyage.
The eternality of physical nature compared to individual man's brief effervescence is also brought out, a little archly, in the last poem of the series, 'Мин деревья', written in November 1882, where an old man is ridiculed for attempting to claim certain trees, a part of the natural world, as 'his' when obviously the natural world will soon claim him as its own and merge him in with the whole.

In the short poem 'Попался под колесо' (1882), one of the most bitterly nihilistic of all the poems, Turgenev strips even suffering of all its dignity. In nature's eyes, a groaning man has no more or less significance than a babbling brook or a squeaking branch. The groan, the babbling and the squeaking are all equally just noises.

In all these poems the poet has given expression to the concept of a physical eternality of which individual man is a mere finite moment with no future. Paradoxically, there is at times almost a physical mysticism about some of the poems: physical man is depicted at one with the physical universe, and the physically finite is transcended by the physically infinite.

In other poems, such as the very beautiful panegyric on the death of his dear friend Iuliia Vrevskaia, dated September 1878, and the poem addressed to Pauline Viardot 'Когда меня не будет...', written in December of the same year, the thought is a much simpler one: that with death all contact between individuals ceases forever. This sentiment, seemingly unremarkable in an overtly unreligious man, deserves comment because it is by no means consistently echoed in other poems or stories. 'Когда меня не будет,' he writes to Pauline,
'когда всё, что было мною, рассыплется прахом ...', clearly conceiving of himself here as nothing but a disintegrating physical organism. The same thought of irrevocably severed contact is present in a comment Turgenev made in a letter to Flaubert's niece Carolina Commanville (15(27) May 1880) soon after Flaubert's death: 'je ne puis m'accoutumer à la pensée que je ne le reverrai plus.' Again, in the short poem 'Завтра! Завтра!' (1879) Turgenev, reflecting on the emptiness of each day, and the vanity of hopes placed in the future when only death awaits man, says that when death does come, 'поневоле размышлять перестанешь'. In 'Стой!', written the same year, Turgenev refuses to recognize any other 'immortality' than that of beauty. There is a moment when, as beauty is glimpsed, time stands still. Even though the moment itself passes, the fact of beauty's transcendency of all ephemerality during that moment lends it immortality. (Turgenev may be giving form here to a Schopenhauerian idea of the artist naturally grasping something of the noumenon for an illumined moment; it is just as likely, however, that, as in 'Дрозд I', the poet is being carried away by words into making a philosophical statement. The 'бессмертие' he is speaking of here is, after all, really no more than a poetic cliché, in the same class as 'immortal Shakespeare' or 'undying conviction'. Indeed, it was this kind of 'бессмертие' which Turgenev had ridiculed with such dramatic effect in 'Черепа' a year earlier where those praising a singer as 'immortal' and 'divine' suddenly appear as skulls -- human mortality mocked idealism.) The important point in 'Стой!', however, is that conventional immortality is ruled out as an impossibility.
A great impetus to Turgenev's art and imagery was his constant attempt to find antidotes to this debilitating sense of death. This is also true of his final period -- the years following the publication of *Virgin Soil*. Three initially promising, but ultimately disappointing, areas in which release was sought in Turgenev's works of these years were, broadly speaking, love, self-abnegation and the cult of beauty, which incidentally, parallel precisely Schopenhauer's three main paths to 'freedom' and partially his own approach in 'Призрач'.

Yet, in the final analysis, none of the three was able to act as an effective antidote to death: none could be more than a crutch, helping to make life more bearable while it lasted, but answering no final questions.

As is well established, love had in general terms been divided in Turgenev's works into centrifugal, unselfed, dispassionate, unerotic love on the one hand and centripetal, self-satisfying, passionate and erotic love on the other. The latter frequently possessed the characteristics of a disease, striking suddenly and being intractable to either will or reason. Love of the former self-sacrificing kind was considered more positive, having an uplifting, life-giving quality. It finds expression in several forms in Стихотворения в прозе, although in this particular work it is seen more as a palliative than a sure antidote to death.

In 'Воробей' (1878) Turgenev expresses his awe at the self-sacrificing courage of a sparrow which risks its own life in order to protect its young. 'Любовь, думал я, сильнее смерти и страха смерти. Только ею, только любовью держится и движется жизнь.' Turgenev is not being mystical here -- by the kind of
love the sparrow expresses sparrows as a species keep multiplying -- except in one regard: to claim that love is 'stronger than death'. Love may be stronger than the fear of death, but the statement that it is stronger than death is either mystical or idealist (or possibly Schopenhauerian).

It is as if there were Love, Death, and of course Truth, Beauty, Good and Evil, and on an impersonal level reminiscent of the thirties Love triumphed over Death. On an individual concrete level, love is in many instances not adequate to keep death at bay. (In 'Два брата', which was also written in 1878, Love and Hunger are shown to be the two principles of life: they keep life going, and here Turgenev means love as the impulse to reproduce sexually. Again Turgenev rather clouds the issue by talking romantically about the 'Всемирная жизнь' which continues, although obviously the individual's life is not preserved by reproduction.)

In poems such as his eulogy of Iuliiia Vrevskaiia (1878), 'Порог' (1878) and 'Дроазд II' (1877), Turgenev is full of admiration for self-sacrificing, centrifugal, Quixotic love. Yet this love may entail individual death. Turgenev may temporarily admire this kind of love -- it does after all keep many people going from day to day -- but even this kind of love does not ultimately solve the riddle of how to lead a purposeful, active life, being mortal. In fact it only fills in the time, although in an all-absorbing and totally admirable way, until the fatal hour. In his little poem 'Любовь' (1881) Turgenev seems to admit the inadequacy of this antidote to death. It is worth quoting in full:
This conclusion seems to echo that of the more nihilistic poems quoted earlier.

The fantastic tale 'Клара Милич (После смерти)', which Turgenev wrote in 1882, seems to be an amplification of the statement in the poem 'Воробей' some five years earlier that love is stronger than death. 'Тетя, что ты плачешь?' Aratov asks his aunt on his death-bed, 'тому, что я умереть должен? Да разве ты не знаешь, что любовь сильнее смерти? ... Смерть! Смерть, где мало твое? Не плакать, а радоваться должно ...' (13: 134). The 'natural' explanation is that the unfortunate young man is losing his mind. Sick, partly deranged and suffering from hallucinations, Aratov imagines his love has united him with a still existent Klara across the barrier of death. According to scientific evidence and rationalist interpretations of being, Aratov must be mistaken. Not only can his love not be stronger than death, indeed, ironically, it has hastened it. Significantly, however, this is not the only viewpoint presented. The author presents the picture of a young man who believes that love is uniting him with someone beyond the grave. Indeed the lock of hair found in Aratov's hand at the end of the story may be evidence that he was indeed in contact with Klara and that an extraordinary love did connect two beings on different planes of existence. The story is equivocal on the point, and this equivocation on questions of metabiological contact determines the genre of the story. In the terms of 'Клара Милич' personal love may quite literally be stronger than personal death.
'Песнь торжествующей любви' (or 'песнь торжествующей плоти' as Merezhkovskii has called it) treats love rather differently again, showing personal love of the erotic kind as a force external to the person's private will (although not necessarily supernatural) urging individuals to reproduce the species and thus 'keep life going' in the material, non-mystical sense. Some have called the attitude to love in this story Schopenhauerian, and there are certainly Schopenhauerian overtones to the way in which Valeria becomes aware of the 'dark hidden forces' within her own nature and is controlled by the libido.

If love is one, not wholly satisfactory, area in which death may be challenged, resignation, or self-abnegation and submission to suprapersonal forces, is another, in which death can be, if not challenged, at least faced. In poems such as 'Милостицы' (1878), 'Эгоист' (1878) and 'Простота' (1881), Turgenev simply praises humility as a moral quality which makes life more liveable. In 'Монах' (1879), however, he goes further and recognizes that self-abnegation in the sense of 'annihilation of the self', which the monk has attained, is a way of life which has its own rationale and gives a sense to life which nothing else can. Since his own ego is so hateful to him, the poet admires the monk's ability to be so constantly free of his. This surrendering of the ego is an antidote to death because the less the ego is important, the less one is afraid of losing it at death. In 'Necessitas, Vis, Libertas' (1878) Turgenev is concerned with a less mystical type of self-abnegation: surrendering a personal sense of self-determination is shown to be not so much a moral
virtue as an awakening to the facts of material existence. As in the classical bas-relief Turgenev is describing in this poem, necessity governs how strength is used and free-will exercised.

On the evidence of these poems, resignation increasingly became for Turgenev a way of making life bearable now and, implicitly, lessening fear about the fate of the ego after death. More in the spirit of 'Necessitas, Vis, Libertas' than of 'Монах' a *modus vivendi* with human existence is attained by the abandonment of all expectation at a material level, and this also started to appear in Turgenev's letters, especially during the last two years. He spoke at different times of an 'indifference to everything' (for example, in a letter to Pisemskii (5(17) May 1879) and to Polonskaia (30 March (11 April) 1882) which was connected with his growing old. In August-September 1882, having in mind his physical immobility and mental inertia, Turgenev several times referred to himself as an 'oyster'. Also in September that year he passed on to Polonskii a particularly pessimistic aphorism: *'Никогда ничего не предпринимай, ничего не предполагай'* (6(18) September). He hurriedly, but not very adequately, assured the alarmed Polonskii in a following letter (22 September (4 October)) that what he had really meant was that one must not have doubts and alarms or wonder in a vague manner about the future, rather than that there was never any point in doing anything other than sitting still with arms folded.)

Turgenev achieved a kind of reconciliation with and acceptance of his illness. 'Я начинаю убеждаться, что
'Выздороветь совсем мне невозможно,' he wrote to Mariia Savina (26 May (7 June) 1882). 'Надо с этим помириться -- хоть и не совсем это легко.' To L.V. Bertenson he wrote some months later (27 October (8 November)) that he was not only not low in spirits but 'даже совершенно примирился с моим недугом'. He elaborated on this theme to the same correspondent a couple of months later (22 December 1882 (3 January 1883)):

Уверяю Вас, что Вы напрасно подозреваете во мне упадок духа; напротив: я совершенно спокойно смотрю, как говорится, черту в глаза -- и вполне примирился с моим положением -- хотя оно в последнее время значительно ухудшилось.

Although, therefore, Turgenev has found a way to continue living, a way to face death squarely (regardless of what he says about 'looking the devil in the eye') eludes him.

On a somewhat more idealistic note Turgenev recommended self-forgetfulness as a modus vivendi for his friend Borisov who was ill (in a letter to Fet 31 October (12 November) 1878):

'стоит какому-нибудь сильному чувству -- любви, например, его встряхнуть хорошоенько, так чтобы он почувствовал, что собственное іоn не альфа и омега всего, и все переменится.' In other words, any 'centrifugal', unselfing emotion will make life more liveable.

Turgenev touched on the question of self-abnegation in a still more idealistic vein in a letter to Tolstoi 19(31) October 1882, reasserting his old 'Hamlet and Don Quixote' antithesis of centripetal versus centrifugal love, the subjection of the self to the non-self: 'Долгая жизнь научает не сомневаться во всем (потому что сомневаться во всем значит: в себя верить), а сомневаться в самом себе -- т.е. верить в другое -- и даже нуждаться в нем.' The logic here as in his original essay on Hamlet and Don Quixote is less than faultless
and certainly not borne out in his own experience or his characterization (both Bazarov and Nezhdanov, for example, 'doubted everything' without 'believing in themselves') but it is nevertheless indicative of a consistent trend in Turgenev's thinking.

A third way of facing mortality is through the cult of beauty, which in itself is a kind of materialized idealism. 'Стой!' (1879) is perhaps the best example of this cult but, as we have seen, this attempt to idealize material beauty is to an extent offset by the nihilism of the earlier 'Черепа' (1878) and also by the later highly nihilistic 'Nessun maggior dolore' (1882) where the beauty of nature, art and humanity are declared of less use and comfort than a spoonful of medicine.

* * * * * * * *

The view of death as complete annihilation of the ego, together with the attempts to come to terms with that annihilation, is more than matched in the latter years by far less black-and-white treatments of the subject. In the meditational poem 'Что я буду думать?' (1879), for example, the poet ponders the direction his thoughts will likely take as he dies: 'Буду ли я думать о том, что меня ожидает за гробом ... да и ожидает ли меня там что-нибудь?' Even in this generally gloomy poem the question of the continued existence of the ego still arises.
The posing of the question is actually a leading element of the story-line of 'Нлара Милич'. Increasingly convinced that he is possessed in some inexplicable, preternatural way by the dead Klara, the hero Aratov becomes quite obsessed with the notion of the immortality of the individual soul, trying to establish whether or not it is really credible. His mind turns to assurances of individual immortality in such disparate sources as the New Testament, Schiller, Mickiewicz and, apparently, Villiers de l'Isle-Adam (whom, according to the commentary in the Ncnn edition, he confused with an English writer (13: 592)). These sources may not have been able to persuade him of its credibility, but they certainly helped to keep the question open in his mind (13: 120).

After the first experience of hearing Klara's voice (whether it was an hallucination or an objective experience is impossible to establish from the text and beside the point here) Aratov is well aware that it may have been an hallucination and immediately desires to see Klara as well as hear her because 'это было бы доказательством, что есть другой мир, что душа бессмертна' (13: 122). Aratov immediately realizes that even hearing and seeing her could be no more than an hallucination; but his desire shows that immortality is something he is desperately concerned to verify.

If the poem 'Что я буду делать?' and certain passages in 'Нлара Милич' betray a less rigidly materialist approach to death, at many points in Turgenev's works during these years a further, and subtle, step is taken away from the materialist position by giving death a form of autonomy of action overruling and often opposed to the will of the individual, as if it were the agent of a suprapersonal, sometimes preternatural power.
The personification of death is one obvious way of affording death this autonomy which is in consonance with the genre of Стихотворения в прозе. In several poems the personification has its source in dreams. In 'Старуха' (1878) for example, which was originally a nightmare which Turgenev related to Pietsch and Schmidt in Berlin, death is a toothless old hag, 'a bent little old woman, all wrapped up in grey rags' with 'evil, ill-boding eyes . . . the eyes of a predatory bird' pushing the poet into a black hole. In another dream, 'Насекомое' (1878), death takes the form of a large and gruesome insect which knows its victim, to whom alone it is mysteriously invisible, and whom it finally stings to death in the forehead. Its wings have a 'зловещий треск', just as the old hag's eyes were 'зловещие'. In yet another dream, 'Встреча', written in the same year, and reworked in 'Клара Милич', death is no longer an old hag herding the terrified poet into a black hole, but a seductive woman who draws him on to lie down on a gravestone, whereupon he himself turns to stone and the woman gets up and walks on. Again, in 'Я встал ночью . . .' (1879), a poem with marked fantastic overtones, bordering on the account of a dream, death is presaged by the mysterious sound of a distant voice calling 'Прощай! прощай! прощай!' -- the poet's past farewelling him. 'Я поклонился моей улетевшей жизни -- и лег в постель, как в могилу.'

In three other poems the image of death as an external, independently motivated, intelligent force is clearly a deliberate poetic device rather than a straightforward mental image. In 'Последнее свидание' (1878), which is an account of
Turgenev's final reconciliatory meeting with Nekrasov in 1877, the poet describes the moment of reconciliation between two former enemies as follows:

These are the carefully chosen words of a poet, developing a metaphor. The obvious symbolism of the image dispels any sense of the fantastic despite the use of the equivocal expression 'мне почувствовалось'. In 'Песочные часы', a poem written in the same year as 'Последнее свидание', the poet uses an almost identical equivocal expression ('мне сдается') and then continues, referring to the figure of Death: 'стоит возле моей кровати та неподвижная фигура ... В одной руке песочные часы, другую она занесла над моим сердцем.' Here the personification of death is clearly little more than the imaginative literary elaboration of a well-known image. In 'В еще повоюем!' (1879) death is pictured as a 'эловящий' presence of a different kind: a hawk. The poet compares himself to a happy sparrow, strutting around full of the joy of living, while high overhead a hawk hovers -- death bides its time. Interestingly, the externally determined nature of events is emphasised by Turgenev's choice of words in this poem: the hawk is 'fated' to seize this very sparrow. Despite the fact that in these three stories the personification of death is dictated more by stylistic than philosophical considerations, the concept of death as suprapersonally determined is unobtrusively reinforced in them.
In one other poem, 'Маша', a peasant who has lost his wife addresses death as an intelligent source: 'Ненасытная... утроба! ... Сожрала ты ее ... сожри ж и меня!' His appeal is easily interpreted, however, as a dramatic device, a way of coping with his loss, rather than as a statement of personal philosophy.

This sense of death as ordained, which pervades the above stories, whatever form it takes in terms of literary expression, serves one of the purposes of the preternatural in earlier stories: it helps introduce some order into the chaos, protecting the poet from the apprehension of life as a meaningless series of accidents, adding to his sense of the significance of his own ego, which is evidently recognized by the supraindividual force as a separate entity, and lending dignity to the act of resignation to the inevitable end.

This sense of death is also found in other works of the period. In the realistic study 'Старые портреты', for example, which Turgenev wrote in 1880, the half-mad Prince L. sees death approaching him:

... смерть пришла к нему -- он ее видел -- и ему надо всех простить и себя обелить. 'Как же ты ее видел? -- пробормотал изумленный Алексей Сергеич. ... -- Какова она из себя? С косою, что ли? -- 'Нет, -- отвечал князь Л., -- старушка простенькая, в кофте -- только на лбу глаз один, а глазу тому и веку нет'. И на другой день князь Л. действительно скончался, совершив всё должное ... (13: 11-12)

Prince L. (whose semi-madness is not necessarily a point against him in the Russian Orthodox tradition of holy fools) not only died, as it would seem, according to some ordinance, but Aleksei Sergeich, when his turn came, also foresaw his own death and died according to a predetermined order. These precisely
predicted deaths fall into the category of the accepted intrusion of a supernatural order, and therefore border on the fantastic rather than exemplify it.

In 'Клара Милич' death is treated in a not dissimilar way in certain passages, but always on the level of the fantastic rather than the supernatural. Klara's sister claims, for example, that 'у Нати словно на роду было написано, что она будет несчастна . . . У неё бывали предчувствия.' Klara even knew, apparently, that she would die young (13: 114). The claims remain unsupported, however, and are in any case rationally explicable.

These literary examples of the presaging of death whereby it gains the status of an element in a predetermined order of things are all the more interesting because of what happened in Turgenev's own case. As is well known, he incorrectly predicted that he would die during 1881. On 1 (13) January 1882 he wrote to Polonskaia: 'вот и 1881-й год прошел, в течение которого я, вследствие одного предсказанья, полагал, что умру. Однако я жив -- и убеждаюсь, что заглядывать в будущее вообще не следует.' It is not known what the prediction had been based on, and, given Turgenev's superstitious inclinations and gloomy pessimism at this time, it could have been on something as primitive as a gypsy's divinations, a little amateur sortilege or numerology (1818-1881). However, according to Pauline Viardot's biographer April Fitzlyon, Turgenev did in the event have an inexplicably exact presentiment of the time of his death, telling Louise Viardot three days before he died: 'They've given me three more days.' Pauline Viardot also correctly forecast her own death two days
before she died, and, according to Fitzlyon's account, she spent these two days in happy contact with people those around her could not see. If these facts are true -- and their truth does not necessarily entail a supernatural explanation, although it would suggest one -- they provide an ironical coda to Turgenev's frequent refrain in his latter years that one must not listen to predictions. (To his daughter Pauline Bruyere he wrote (12(24) March 1882), for example: 'Surtout ne crois pas à ce que l'on nomme des "pressentiments". Mon expérience m'a prouvé cent fois, qu'ils ne se réalisent jamais. C'est donc une occupation aussi inutile que malsaine.' And to his friend Polonskii six months later he sent off 'a few aphorisms' which had 'matured' in him over a fairly long lifetime, one of which was that 'предчувствия никогда не обываются' (6(18) September 1882). In his urgency to be categorical about the falsity of all presentiments, however, Turgenev not only exaggerated the facts, as in his assertion in an accompanying aphorism that 'сообщенные за вернейшие известия всегда ложны', but also contradicted himself, for in the first aphorism of the series he declared that 'никогда ничего неожиданного не случается -- ибо даже глупости имеют свою логику', and, if all things are part of a logically discoverable whole, then presentiment is not only possible but rational. Perhaps he meant to attack only the supernatural element in presentiment; although it seems more likely, in view of the note of irritation in the letter, the repeated underlining, the hyperbole and the random order of the injunctions, that he was simply letting off steam over a particular incident or series of incidents, or a
particular crisis in his illness or relations with Pauline Viardot.)

In addition to death as annihilation of the ego, and death as an externally determined event for the ego, there was a third main attitude to death evidenced in Turgenev's works of this period: death as metamorphosis of the ego. (Like death as complete annihilation, this concept of death had also been presented in *Призраки* in the early 1860s.)

Apart from some mention in 'Старые портреты' of the Orthodox Christian belief in the metamorphosis of the ego (Aleksei Sergeich and his wife believe in the possibility of their meeting 'in the other world'), which remains at the level of a statement of belief, there are various treatments during these years of what one might call the 'phantom' theme: after death the ego may remain at least sensible to those who have not died, and even remain in contact with them.

This is the case with two unfinished works belonging to this period. In the fragment *Силаев*, which has not been dated exactly, the story is told of a strange 'underground' individual who claims that there is no difference between dreams and everyday reality and, in support of his viewpoint, that he sees his dead uncle every night. At the point where the text
breaks off the narrator also sees the uncle's apparently live cat, and it can only be assumed that the cat is either an apparition or in contact with its dead master. The presence of the rational narrator gives the impression that 'Силаев' was to be one of the clinical investigations into strange facts and abnormal mentalities such as 'Странная история'. In a letter to Julius Rodenberg dated 15(27) October 1881, which probably, although not certainly, refers to 'Силаев', Turgenev wrote: 'Was die Geistergeschichte anbetrifft -- so habe ich sie nur als einen curiosen Einfall mitgeheilt, den ich aber als unbrauchbar fahren liess'.

In the rough outline for another story, given the title <Новая повесть> in the Популяризации edition, and attributed by Mazon to the years 1878-9, Turgenev had intended to introduce a character called Santa. His description of her is as follows: 'Живет с фантомами прошлого и видит фантомы. -- Подозрительна, везде чудятся ей приметы -- предчувствия'(13:330). Even from such scanty evidence as the preliminary synopsis provides it is plain that Turgenev was interested in the idea of contact with 'phantoms of the past'. That this was no mere play on words is borne out by the poem from his Senilùa 'Ногда я один ...'(1879) subtitled 'Двойник'. In this poem the poet relates how it seems (чудится) to him after being alone for a long time that 'кто-то другой находится в той же комнате, сидит со мною рядом или стоит за моей спиной'. On the one hand the apparition seems to be his own 'past ego', yet on the other 'он приходит не по моему веленью -- словно у него своя воля'. The poems ends on a note which hints at the mystical while remaining basically no more than poetic: 'Ногда я умру, мы сольемся с тобою -- мое прежнее, мое теперьшнее -- и умчимся навек в область невозвратных теней.'
Another character in the so-called *Новая повесть*, the heroine Sabina, has an experience of metabiological contact in the form of supernatural 'recognition', analogous to that of the young hero of the story *Сон*. Never having met her mother, Sabina first sees her in a dream, then draws her face with mysterious accuracy. Turgenev may have been investigating questions of heredity here in a daring and provocative way; yet the synopsis foreshadows a story so imbued with both the fantastic and the supernatural that this contact with the dead seems to be just one other element.

In one of the early poems in prose, *Соперник* (1878), Turgenev tells a 'mysterious tale' of supernatural metamorphosis. In this tale a believer assures the sceptical poet that if he, the believer, dies first, he will return and manifest himself to the poet, thereby proving that there is an afterlife. Some years after the believer's death, in the grey half-light of a summer's night, 'вдруг мне почудилось, что между двух окон стоит мой соперник — и тихо и печально качает сверху вниз головою'. Although the poet addresses the vision, it does not speak, but nods its head sadly up and down. When the poet laughs, it disappears. This story is clearly fantastic rather than supernatural since a natural explanation is not hard to find: the poet was dozing off when the ghost appeared, while the vision demonstrated no existence independent of the poet's mind, and was easily dispelled when the poet laughed; yet the possibility of a supernatural interpretation remains and of an allegorical one is absent. In any case, the sceptic's interest in metamorphosis after death is established, and the seeds of doubt in his mind about his own materialism are uncovered.
A more complex example of metamorphosis after death belonging to the fantastic genre is provided by 'Клара Милыч'. After Klara's self-inflicted and, for Turgenev, uncharacteristically gruesome death, the young Aratov comes progressively more and more under the influence of her image. At first he feels simply 'in her power', 'taken', to use Klara's own terminology (13: 118), and Aratov explains it to himself as mesmerism exercised by the soul after death. Aratov subsequently hears Klara, senses her as a physical presence (although without precise form) (13: 122) and then he sees her (13: 129). Finally he dies believing he has been united with Klara. There is only one element verging on the supernatural in all this: the fact that a lock of Klara's hair was in Aratov's hand after his final seizure.

Not everyone has agreed that the question of posthumous metamorphosis of the person is dealt with in 'Клара Милыч'. Annenkov, for example, was not insensible to the possibility of a naturalistic explanation of 'Клара Милыч', although the dominant impression for him was of the fantastic: 'самая искренняя вера в реальность галлюцинаций Аратова не покидает читателей', he wrote to Turgenev, 'между тем как под нами он чувствует ве время невидимую струю натурального объяснения дела. Это и составляет премудрость художника'.

Professor Chizh was another commentator who saw 'nothing improbable' about the story at all, considering Aratov and Milich as two psychopaths. His line of reasoning is not difficult to follow, and the facts are easy to marshal: Aratov's father dabbled in the occult, so that Aratov may have been predisposed to look for supernatural solutions to his
problems; he himself led an abnormally solitary life with virtually no contact with the opposite sex at all; once Klara had died and therefore, in conventional terms, become unattainable, Aratov became obsessed with the idea that he must 'восстановить её образ', as he put it so significantly (13: 116); in addition, he apparently suffered from heart disease; and the hallucinations themselves, if hallucinations they were, may have been induced by the fatigue of the trip to Kazan and back, by his obsession with Klara's physical image (he had her photograph enlarged, for example, and indeed when at last he did see Klara he saw her as she appeared in the photograph (13: 129)), and by the fact that the hallucinations always occurred at night when he was in a semi-wakeful state. There is, however, one weak point in this argument: Klara's lock of hair. It has an objective existence which tempts the reader to believe that Klara's presence in Aratov's room was more than an hallucination. Chizh, as would be expected, accepts the possible rational explanation suggested, although not confirmed, by the author: that the lock had slipped out of the diary in Aratov's possession. 'Клара Милиц' is, however, not a psychological case history, but a work of art and a work of art deliberately characterized by vagueness on this precise point. It is a fantastic story because, while all the events can be explained in rational terms, they are not explained rationally to the exclusion of reasonable doubt within the framework of the story. Turgenev could easily have dispensed with the question marks after the tentative natural explanations for the lock of hair at the end of the story, just as he could have readily shown up the
phenomena to be mere hallucinations. But the artist in him did not choose to do so, despite the dictates of intellectual fashion. Chizh is actually interpreting, not Turgenev's story, but a potentially factual case which could have provided (but did not) the bones on which Turgenev could have fleshed out his story. As Turgenev himself wrote to Polonskaia (20 December 1881 (1 January 1882)): 'Признавательный психологический факт -- сообщенная Вами посмертная влюбленность Аленицына [Aratov's prototype]! Из этого можно бы сделать полуфантастический рассказ вроде Эдгара По.' In other words, on the basis of an actual story (but not the one Chizh interpreted), Turgenev intended as an artist to write a piece of фантастика. His romantic self refused to be chained down to life's more prosaic aspects.

The antifantastic interpretation of 'Наира Милич' still has some currency, however. In a recent Moscow University dissertation on Turgenev's later writings, the view is put forward, presumably reflecting a consensus in the faculty, that Turgenev 'развенчивает мистика' in Aratov.⁸

An even stranger view of death than the 'phantom' type of metamorphosis is provided in 'Песнь торжествующей любви', a story characterized by almost florid romanticism and mystification. In this 'Italian pasticcio' as Turgenev called it in a letter to Stasiulevich dated 11(23) September 1881, Muzio is apparently knifed to death when Fabio pushes a dagger into his side right up to the hilt. Muzio staggers off to his room, where, when Fabio spies on him, he certainly appears to be dead. 'Лицо его, желтов, как воск, с закрытыми глазами, с посинелыми веками было обращено к потолку, не было заметно
When Fabio asks the Malay servant if his master is dead, the Malay nods, and Fabio takes this to be a sign that he is dead. Fabio later goes back to find Muzio sitting in a chair, 'но казался трупом, так же как в первое посещение Фабиа. Окаменевшая голова завалилась на спинку кресла, и протянутые, пламя положенные, руки недвижно желецели на коленях. Грудь не поднималась' (13: 72). Muzio clearly gives the impression of being dead. Then, as Fabio watches, an interesting scene unfolds: the Malay stands in front of Muzio and appears to draw on him with invisible strings. Eventually Muzio's head responds, leaving the back of the chair and flopping back onto it in accordance with the Malay's hand movements. In the end he succeeds in willing Muzio to open his eyes and even to groan. Fabio is seized with horror at this apparent revivification of the dead by witchcraft, and flees praying.

Some hours later Muzio and his servant leave. Supported by the Malay, 'появился Муций. Лицо его было мертвенно и руки висели, как у мертвеца, — но он переступал ... да! переступал ногами и, посаженный на коня, держался прямо и ощупью нашел поводья ... Фабию почутилося, что на темном лице Муция мелькнуло два белых пятнышка ... Неужели это он к нему обратил свои зрачки?' (13: 74). In straightforward terms, what the reader is confronted with here is an apparent restoration to life by occult means of someone mortally wounded or dead. The soul can, in other words, apparently be conjured to 'return' in some sense.

Clearly Muzio's resuscitation may be interpreted rationally. The chronicler is careful to specify 'казался
that Muzio is dead. The supposed discoverer of the chronicle -- the 'н' of the first line of the story -- is in an even more impartial position, of course. Yet everything conspires, as it should in the fantastic genre, to incline the reader towards a supernatural interpretation: even if Muzio was not strictly 'dead', the Malay was still to be observed exercising a preternatural influence on Muzio's body; there is the exotic, mysterious atmosphere conjured up by displays of Eastern magic, potions, amulets, mesmerism, strange dreams, and sinister powers; and, of course, there is the blurring at the edges of reality, produced by the device of the translated chronicle, the medieval setting, the characters' susceptibility to superstition and suggestion.

Professor Chizh paid particular attention to 'Песнь торжествующей любви' because of his special interest in hypnotism (he had studied with both Charcot and Bernheim in France). In accordance with his usual approach, Chizh refused to look on the 'Песнь' as a fantastic story, claiming that Turgenev was merely describing normal pathological phenomena. He was consequently unhappy with the 'resurrection' scene, coming to the eventual conclusion that Muzio had not been seriously wounded, and that musk had been used to revive the heart. Chizh, of course, was again actually reconstructing a factual situation which could have given rise to a legend such as the one before the reader, he was not analyzing the legend as literature. The legend, one of Turgenev's most romantically conceived, artfully balanced and complex compositions, presents us with the possibility of the restoration
of the human personality after the change called death. 'Wage
Du zu irren und zu träumen!' Turgenev exhorts his reader in
his epigraph. His challenge is rarely taken up.

* * * * * * * *

A salient point about Turgenev's last years is that, for
all his intellectual sophistication and Voltairean
disinclination to be swayed from a materialist path, he
was unable to dismiss a strongly entrenched romantic streak
in himself which viewed man as a spirit whose contacts with
other men -- other spirits -- were not confined to the merely
physical. The gates were, therefore, open wide to the occult.

The poem from Стихотворения в прозе 'Соперник' is
perhaps the earliest example from this period of the intrusion
of the idea of the existence of man 'the spirit' apart from the
physical organism. 'Загробная жизнь' is the major discussion
point between the poet and his colleague. In the outline for
<Новая повесть> (1878-9) there are also many examples of this
area of concern. Apart from Santa, already mentioned, who is
openly superstitious, and the hero Ippolit Travin, who,
interestingly enough, is a man of the sixties (having been
born in 1836) and who has religious and 'mystical' leanings,
the heroine Sabina has at one time been a hypnotist's assistant.
Yet not all the manifestations of the occult are to be examples of legerdemain or an impressionable disposition. Sabina has 'вячные сны': for example, she sees her mother whom she never knew in a dream, as has already been mentioned, and subsequently draws her face with great accuracy (although it is perhaps significant that her father, who recognizes the portrait, is himself a believer in the supernatural); she has a presentiment of a significant meeting with a man called Preuss and also divines who Preuss's murderer is (13: 333). She also appears to know details of Travin's personal life by psychic means (13: 343). Turgenev was obviously planning to write a story where occult forces were seen to govern his characters on certain occasions, and where the real relationships between minds (or spirits) were not always naturally explicable. The commentator on the text of the outline in the ПССР edition even considered that it was possible that 'не найдя равновесия между реалистической основой повести и "загадочными" элементами в ней, между новыми приемами повествования и старыми, уже ставшими традиционными, Тургенев прервал работу над ней, по-видимому, даже не начав писать самый текст' (13: 716).

In 'Песнь торжествующей любви' there are similar preoccupations, of course. In the main, the chronicler seems to have described an exercise in mesmerism or hypnotism: in succinct terms, the chronicle relates how Muzio seduces Valeria through hypnotism. All the romantically described magical paraphernalia are perfectly reasonable accoutrements of a hypnotist: the miasmic necklace, Muzio's monotonous soft voice, the wine from Shiraz, the loosening-up illusionist's tricks, the spell Muzio is seen to cast over Valeria's glass,
the moving unfamiliar music Muzio plays with the strange flashing diamond on his bow, the piercing looks he keeps giving Valeria, the 'духовение, подобное легкой, пахучей струе' which wafts across from Muzio's rooms, the offence given to Valeria's religious beliefs and indeed to her whole sense of identity (Fabio experienced some difficulty in seeing St Cecilia in her any more). In short, Muzio seduces Valeria by means of hypnotism, mesmerism and perhaps drugs, the mechanism of which he may scarcely have understood himself.

Yet, according to the chronicle, more than mere hypnotism is involved: Valeria comes under an influence which has no ready natural explanation. She and Muzio share an identical dream without any common external stimuli. Either the dream is supernaturally induced by Muzio or else she and Muzio are together subject to a third power. The descriptions of the dreams tally in the smallest details without being identical: they both mention 'просторная комната со сводом', 'резные столбы', 'изразцы', 'розовый свет', 'прозрачный камень', 'курильницы', 'порочные подушки', 'узкий ковер', and the 'дверь, завешенная пологом' through which the lover appears (13: 60-2).

In the last paragraph of the manuscript there is a second example of a mysterious suprapersonal power seemingly governing an individual: 'Валерия сидела перед орга́ном, и пальцы ее бродили по клавишам ... Вдруг, помимо ее воли, под ее руками зазвучала та песнь торжествующей любви, которую никогда играл Муций, -- и в тот же миг, в первый раз после ее брака, она почувствовала внутри себя трепет новой, зарождающейся жизни ...' (13: 75). With some effort both these
circumstances might be explained 'realistically': the first as the result of complicated hypnotic processes initiated by Muzio and not explicitly recounted in the chronicle; the second as automatic subconscious association between the seductive melody and the result of the seduction. Yet, as the legend is presented, these rationalizations are not even hinted at.

'Писатель оставляет загадку', as the author of the commentary in the ПСРП edition writes, 'стремится сохранить и даже подчеркнуть неясность' (13: 567). Valeria and Muzio are presented as two 'spirits' whose bodies obey forces which are not merely biological.

'Клара Милич' demonstrates precisely the same point. Aratov and Klara are two 'souls' which act on each other apart from material circumstances. After first coming into Klara's presence (unbeknown to himself) at the Georgian princess's reception, Aratov feels compelled to leave, 'унося в душу смутное и тяжелое впечатление, сивозь которого, однако, пробивалось нечто ему самому непонятное, но значительное и даже тревожное' (13: 82). When next Aratov is in Klara's presence, she sings a song of Glinka's significantly entitled 'Только узнал я тебя'. She has 'recognized' Aratov, metaphysical recognition of this kind being a common form of supernatural contact between souls. Aratov himself recognizes a strangeness in Klara: 'он находил, что она и держится и движется, как намагниченная, как сомнамбула' (13: 88). She has, he finds, 'inward-looking eyes' (13: 86). These impressions of Klara have obvious natural interpretations, apart from any explanation on the basis of dominant female characters as a literary type in Turgenev's works. However
Aratov feels under some external influence even when Klara is not personally present: indeed his whole being is gripped by the notion that Klara killed herself in order to exert power over him (13: 121). Just before learning of Klara’s death, Aratov feels that 'что-то тяжелое и темное тайно сопровождало его на всех его путях' (13: 98). It is as if he is a fish waiting to be hauled in. After his first dream (in which he is left literally petrified on the gravestone) he awakens feeling that something real has occurred, 'в него что-то внедрилось . . . что-то завладело им' (13: 107). Feeling impelled to go to Kazan, he explains to Klara’s sister why he is pursuing Klara posthumously in this way, admitting: 'надо мной какая-то власть, сильнее меня . . . Мне нужно . . . я должен . . . ведь вы сами сказали, что я обязан восстановить ее образ!' (13: 116). He carries out his obligation in an unexpectedly concrete form. The rest of the story relates how Klara’s power over Aratov becomes more and more manifest.

Whatever a 'realist' might make of a real life situation such as this, the fact remains that within the framework of the story the characters are conceived, not as mere physical organisms, but as spirits living in a universe where many mysterious forces operate.

These continuing manifestations of a curiosity about the possibility of man being not merely a sentient element in the chemistry of the universe but a spirit subject to forces transcending the purely material may at first seem strange in the work of a man whose apparently growing materialism and increasing intolerance with superstitition and orthodox religious beliefs would appear to be well evidenced.
Turgenev's hardening attitude towards organized mysticism, in the form of the Christian Church, and superstitious mysticism, for example, is expressed in both his correspondence and his works of the period. He described himself in a letter to Princess Trubetskaia dated 23 May 1877 as 'le contraire d'orthodoxe et de slavophile'; and his attitude towards the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical establishment certainly did not soften with the years, nor would it have been likely to, given the fervent anti-Catholicism of his closest friends such as Flaubert and Sand and of Louis Viardot's intellectual set in which Turgenev moved continuously for the last twenty years of his life. For example, Turgenev enthusiastically supported Jules Ferry's law limiting the activities of the Jesuits in France, as he wrote to Annenkov (25 June (7 July) 1879), and indeed he was a champion in general of 'the revolution', as he termed it, in its battle against 'the Church' (as he had indicated in an earlier letter to Annenkov (18(30) May)).

Turgenev also read Ernest Renan's work *L'Eglise chrétienne* (actually the sixth volume of his *Histoire des origines du christianisme*) which he called 'too ingenious for my profane taste' in another letter to Annenkov (27 October (8 November) 1879), although in a letter dated ten days later to the author himself, whom he knew through the Viardots, he was more flattering:

> Vous portez la lumière dans mon esprit sur toutes ces questions si délicates et si difficiles: je ne sais ce que je dois admiration le plus -- de la finesse ou de la justesse de votre analyse psychologique, si j'ose m'exprimer ainsi, de la façon dont l'Eglise s'est organisée. C'est un véritable enchantement que la lecture de ce volume.

It is not surprising that Turgenev found much that he could understand in the work of a man whose intellectual scepticism,
apostasy from the established Church, hankering after the 'hidden God' and fear of death were so akin to his own.

Religious questions evoked little sympathetic response from Turgenev because they so often seemed to be an expression of ecclesiastical political manoeuvrings rather than of a spiritual world-view. As he once commented to Caroline Commanville (10(22) July 1880), 'les questions religieuses qui agitent la Russie n'ont rien de commun ni avec la philosophie, ni avec la littérature.'

Turgenev had little sympathy for private superstition or 'mysticism', either, when he suspected intellectual woolliness, artifice, sanctimony or, of course, charlatanry. Polonskii records Turgenev's impatience with 'темнота, суверие и легковерие' at this period. In a letter to Flaubert dated 12(24) January 1880 Turgenev deplored the mystically philosophical bent of Tolstoi's Война и мир, and he was predictably even less favourably inclined towards such an openly religious work as his 'Исповедь', 'вещь замечательная по искренности, правдивости и силе убежденья,' as he wrote to D.V. Grigorovich (31 October (12 November) 1882), 'но построена она вся на неверных посылках -- и в конце концов приводит к самому мрачному отрицанию всякой живой, человеческой жизни'.

Nor was he any more tolerant of Fet who 'до того погряз в философствовании, что только пузыри пускает -- и пузыри наблажованненье.' (These lines from a letter to Polonskii dated 16(28) September 1879 presumably refer to Fet's enthusiasm for Schopenhauer, and should be taken into account in any evaluation of Turgenev's attitude towards Schopenhauer's system as a whole).
Turgenev was no kinder in his works towards religious or superstitious mysticism. Even in the outline for 'Новая повесть' the projected heroine Sabina, who seems to be possessed of real psychic powers, 'над вертящимися столами смеется -- по временам должен проглядывать почти ... цинический скептицизм' (13: 344). Aleksei Sergeich in 'Странная портреты', an intelligent man, although sincerely religious, was in the main opposed to superstition: 'Суверия в нем не замечалось; он издевался над приметами, глазом и прочей "нескладницей", однако не любил, когда заяц ему перебегал дорогу, и встреча с попом была ему не совсем приятна' (13: 15).

Presumably these slight lapses can be written off as cultural habits rather than superstitious beliefs. The one representative of official religion in the tale, the deaconess, is a figure of fun, especially with her habit of reeling off prayers without a break, 'either when breathing in or breathing out' (13: 22). In 'Отчаянный', written in 1881, Misha's authoritarian and negatively portrayed father is both religious and superstitious (13: 31). In 'Песнь торжествующей любви', the power of evil, incarnate in Muzio, joins battle with the power of the Church, represented by Valeria in her aura of sanctity and her monastic mentor Father Lorenzo, who suspects, with some flair for the melodramatic, 'волшебство, чары бесовские', remembering that Muzio 'и прежде ... не совсем был тверд в вере, а, побывав такое долгое время в странах, озаренных светом христианства, мог вынести оттуда зарузу ложных учений, мог даже спознаться с тайнами магии' (13: 67).

Father Lorenzo is a medieval figure who commands little respect and whose cause is anyway defeated by Muzio. In 'Нлара Милич'
religious belief is characteristic only of such minor figures as Aratov's rather simple aunt and Klara's alcoholic icon-painting father. Aratov himself is apparently an agnostic, and Klara also is a non-believer, at least in the sense of believing in the Orthodox God, placing her reliance on 'fate' instead (13: 112).

It should be remembered, however, that when in real life Turgenev came across sincere belief, he was tolerant of it and sometimes admired it, even during his last years. It was such a rare quality, after all. His deep love for Pauline Viardot was obviously untouched by the fact of her continuing, if somewhat nebulous, faith of a religious nature. Fitzlyon calls Pauline's faith 'vague but vital', and goes on to quote Viardot herself, unfortunately omitting to name her source. Pauline had "the firm conviction that the soul is immortal, and that all loves will be reunited one day -- all great loves, of whatever nature they may be, provided they have rendered themselves worthy of it . . . All I know is, that there is a divine spark in us which never perishes, and which will end by being part of the great light."13 It would seem reasonable to assume that Pauline and Turgenev discussed this genuinely mystical view of love and man's relationship to the Godhead during their years together and that Turgenev accepted it for its sincerity.

Letters to several other acquaintances during this period show this same respect for honestly held religious belief. He was, for example, on very friendly terms with Adelaida Lukanina who had connections with the Swedenborgian movement. In Paris in 1879 Turgenev met and became friendly with
N.V. Chaikovskii, who had been connected with the Shaker movement in America and held rather Tolstoyan religious views, finding him both intelligent and 'симпатичен', as he later wrote to Stasiulevich (23 August (4 September) 1879). Indeed, while Turgenev was inclined to attribute Chaikovskii's failure as a church-founder to his very intelligence, he did not question or ridicule his actual beliefs. (Turgenev was to take him as the prototype of the hero of a new novel, but it was never written.) Similarly, he told Stasiulevich how he accepted the fact that Kavelin received practical help from his metaphysically oriented philosophy (12(24) October 1879) whereas it will be remembered that he had been rather rude about Fet's recourse to 'philosophy' because of his lack of respect after 1874 for Fet's values or ethics, and therefore, presumably, for the authenticity of his belief (and perhaps because of his distaste for Schopenhauer). Even in the case of Tolstoi, whose 'philosophizing' he deeply regretted because of its supposedly baneful effects on his art, Turgenev was sincerely interested in securing a copy of his recently published work 'Соединение и перевод четырех Евангелий', as his request to Annenkov shows (17(29) December 1880), although when faced with the religiosity of Countess A. Tolstaia in Paris in 1882, he professed scant interest in the gospels, affecting a kind of bravado and nonchalance on the subject, and categorically stating that he did not believe in immortality and that St John's gospel was of such small account as to be not worth mentioning.¹⁴

In his works, too, Turgenev was as a rule sympathetic to sincere belief. In his synopsis of <Новая повесть> the hero
Travin is sketched as a sympathetic character although religiously and mystically inclined, as is Aleksei Sergeich of 'Старые портреты'. In several of the poems in prose such as 'Монах' (1879) and 'Молитва' (1881) unfeigned belief and prayerfulness are respected, while in 'Брамин' (1881) unthinking, purely externalized religious observation is mocked. In the poem 'Христос' (1878), Turgenev's respect for the Christliness in everyman comes through. The idealized man represented by the word 'Christ' is not mocked, but revered by Turgenev.

It should not be forgotten that despite his hardening attitude to orthodox religious doctrines and establishments and growing impatience with what he regarded as crass 'superstition' or intellectually offensive 'mysticism', there are several pieces of evidence that Turgenev himself was undogmatic in his agnosticism. One observer of him during these last years, A.P. Bogoliubov, for example, wrote: 'Живя в такой обстановке [у Виардо], Иван Сергеевич казался свободомыслящим, но я его все-таки считал верующим.'

Turgenev himself, in a letter to Pauline Viardot (31 January (12 February) 1880) wrote: 'Moi, je ne crois guère à l'immortalité de l'âme' (my italics), and again (7(19) April that year), he recounted to Pauline a 'long sermon' which 'une bonne vieille dame' of his acquaintance had preached to him on his lack of any beliefs and love for God:

Je me suis permis de lui dire que, selon mon humble avis, on ne pouvait pas plus aimer Dieu qu'on n'aime la force de la pesanteur, l'électricité ou toute autre loi, qui régit la matière; la bonne dame a prétendu que je blasphémais mais qu'elle ne désespérerait pas de me voir un jour touché par la grâce: je l'ai assuré que je n'y mettrais aucune résistance.
In his search for interpretations of suprahuman realities, Turgenev by no means rejected religious ones out of hand.

The reason for Turgenev's continuing interest in transcendental interpretations of being despite his hostility towards superstition and religiosity and his basically materialistic outlook may be best sought in his continuing sense of the 'бедность' of material existence, his dissatisfaction, on a non-intellectual but deeply felt level at least, with his own materialist outlook.

The futility of everything in the phenomenal world is one of the most constantly recurring themes in \textit{Стихотворения в прозе}, for example, and it is backed up by the associated themes of loneliness and old age. These themes occur in poems written from 1877 through to 1882. In some, such as 'Разговор' (1878), 'Конец света' (1878), 'Мне жаль ...' (1878) and 'Без гнезда' (1878) for example, life's futility is thrown into relief by the ultimately ensuing silence (or blackness or nothingness, depending on the images employed), whereas in others such as 'Нубок' (1878) or 'Мне жаль ...' again, the ennui of existence is highlighted -- and cursed; in yet others the poet seems to be concerned to bring out the ultimate pointlessness even of things of beauty or things which normally evoke our pity, such as suffering (for example 'Nessun maggior dolore', 'Попался под колесо', 'Нубок'). The expected themes of the joylessness and anguish of old age with death approaching speedily and the wistful, melancholy envy of the young occur in many poems, also, such as 'Старик', 'Чья вина?', 'О моей молодости! О моя свежесть!', 'Я шел среди высоких гор ...' as well as many others already quoted in other contexts. In
'Голуби' and 'Ты заплакал . . .', for example, it is to the desperate loneliness so often experienced by the old that the poet addresses himself.

Turgenev did not conceal his own ennui, depression and disenchantment with the world during the last years. Nor was this state of mind always connected with physical illness. 'Здоровье мое поправилось' he wrote to Polonskii (2(14) January 1878), 'но нравственно я хуже, чем калека -- я совсем старик'. 'Телом я бодр', he wrote to Stasiulevich almost three months later, 'духом же немощен' (31 March (12 April) 1878), an idea he repeated to Pisemskii a year later (5(17) May 1879). He expressed himself very colourfully indeed on the subject of his 'spleen' in a letter to Flaubert (26 July (7 August) 1879): 'Quant à moi, je vais physiquement très bien; pour ce qui est de l'état de mon âme -- vous pouvez vous en faire une idée exacte -- en soulevant le couvercle d'une fosse d'aisance -- et en regardant dedans.' 'Я находился все это время в совершенном здоровье -- и таковой же хандре', he wrote to Annenkov (27 July (8 August) 1879), and several months later (13(25) November 1879) he complained to Annenkov in a similar vein of 'melancholy'. Death, of course, hovered incessantly over him. In 1880 it took from him 'un des êtres humains que j'ai le plus aimés au monde'18 -- Flaubert. And 7(19) June 1882 he wrote to Mariia Savina: 'Я, как мой немец Лемм в "Дворянском гнезде", в гроб гляжу, не в розовую будущность'. Despite a few cheerier notes at different times, in general these were gloomy years of hopelessness, a sense of coming to the end, of having lost youth irrevocably, of illness, and of the inexorable approach of death.
Turgenev seems to have been eternally searching for something to lift him above the contemplation of human misery, stupidity and aimlessness. Unless he could cast the anchor of his trust into something solid beyond pure circumstance, he was reduced to sitting in dejection contemplating his own wretched ego, unable to act.

Periodically throughout his life Turgenev as an artist had explored the arena of social or political action -- suprapersonal principles with the possibility of practical expression -- as a fixity: this was particularly true of his novels On the Eve and Virgin Soil, of course, and in both of them the romanticism of social idealism proved to be a stumbling block. Now in his final years he continued to give some thought to this sphere of action as several of the Стихотворения в прозе testify ("Чернорабочий и белоручка", 'Порог', 'Щи', 'Два богача' and 'Сфинкс', for example) and several of his letters (mainly emphasizing his 'gradualist', non-revolutionary approach to change in Russia and his general pessimism about the status quo).

Yet, as the story 'Отчаянный' shows, social ideals which are rooted wholly in the phenomenal world are subject to all the disabilities of that world: ephemerality, pointlessness, failure. In 'Отчаянный' Turgenev depicts a character who is 'desperate' about the poverty and injustice of life in Russia, yet reacts to it by becoming wildly debauched and attempting suicide. 'Самоистребление, но без содержания и идеала', as he wrote of Misha Poltev in the initial outline of the story, 'а был бы идеал -- герой и мученик' (13: 554). The question remains as always: how can this ideal be found?
Religious answers did not attract him, as we have seen, and as his pessimism about the point of individualist idealism deepened, and the materialist tenor of his determinism strengthened, Turgenev became sceptical about the old quasi-mystical concept of 'fate', so redolent of the thirties. In both 'Песнь торжествующей любви' and 'Клара Милич' Turgenev has recourse to images such as 'что-то темное нависло над их головами' (13: 64) and 'что-то тяжелое и темное тайно сопровождало его на всех его путях' (13: 98); but fate as a real, active suprahuman force, a substitute for God, appears little. Klara Milich appears to believe 'in fate but not in God', both according to her sister (13: 112) and herself ('своей судьбы не минуешь', she states (13: 113)); yet a dominant trait in Klara Milich is her self-will, as Aratov soon discerns (13: 86), her mother and sister confirm (13: 110, 112), and she herself claims ('наша жизнь в нашей руке!' (13: 114)); indeed, her suicide, both in that it takes place at all and in the manner in which Klara carried it out, is a supreme expression of wilfulness, not submission to fate. Mention of 'fate' and being 'marked' from birth for unhappiness (13: 114) in the end appears to be little more than rhetoric. In a letter to his brother Nikolai (12(24) January 1878) Turgenev showed some impatience with this kind of rhetoric when urging his brother to take practical steps to treat an illness: '[[Евречное] искусство это существует несомненно]', he wrote, 'а вот судьбы, от которой будто бы нельзя уйти, никто не видел, да и вряд ли кто может себе представить, что это за птица'.

For all his intellectual dismissal of crass superstition, charlatanism, religiosity and ecclesiasticism, for all his
materialist pessimism about human existence and his predilection for materialist conclusions about man and the world, Turgenev was, as both thinker and artist, by no means unaware even in his final years of the debilitating nature of this 'unbelief', and his imagination wandered in the direction of a more spiritualistic interpretation of individual being, dwelling with fascination and suspension of criticism on the occult possibilities of such an interpretation. Of course, he maintained during this period, as earlier, that he had 'toujours tâché de rendre fidèlement la physionomie humaine, seule chose qui m'intéresse et dont la variété est du reste [inépuisable]', as he wrote to the Dutch writer Marcellus Emants in 1879 (letter no. 5058); but it is clear that at this time he did not discount the possibility of 'la variété inépuisable' including phenomena which are now classed as occult. Turgenev was doing this not only as an artist -- glimpsing the noumenon beyond phenomena -- but as a thinker, as the supernatural, in contrast to the merely fantastic, elements in his stories and poems show.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE FINAL YEARS

Footnotes

1 The individual 'стихотворения' comprising Стихотворения в прозе (or Senilia) will be referred to simply as poems, without inverted commas, in this chapter. Page references to quotations from individual poems will not be given since most poems are under a page in length and none is more than two.

2 'Тургенев', in his Больная Россия (Petersburg, 1910), p.186.
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7 Тургенев как психолог, p.26. I.F. Annenskii was another critic who considered that there was 'nothing mysterious' about 'Клара Милич' ('Умирающий Тургенев:Клара Милич', in his Никаг отражений (Petersburg, 1906), p.65).

8 S. Bannerjee (Шаманада Банерджи), 'Проблемы поэтики позднего Тургенева' (unpublished dissertation for the degree of кандидат, State University of Moscow, 1970), chapter on 'Клара Милич'.


12 'И.С. Тургенев у себя, в его последний приезд на родину', Нива, 1884, No. 6, pp.134-5.

13 Op. cit., p.388. According to the Viardot family archives, all Pauline's daughters were eventually baptised (Maria-Anne as a baby), and Pauline was godmother in 1845 to the daughter of her farmer at Courtavenel.
14 See the article by I. Zakhar'in, 'Гр. А.А. Толстая: личные впечатления и воспоминания', Вестник Европы, 1905, No. 4, p.631.
16 Letter No. 106 in Nouvelle correspondance inédite, Volume 1.
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The conflict portrayed in Turgenev's works between a passionate love of life and a morbid sensitivity to life's "wretchedness, sordidness" as I.A. Solov'ev has described it, impelled a splendidly romantic quest for credible suprapersonal ideals capable of inspiring a selfless and effective heroic and of giving life meaning in the face of human mortality. It is the transcendent aspects of this quest which have been investigated in this thesis.

The investigation begins with Turgenev's exploration in the midst of a partly Neoplatonist, partly pre-Negelian rational mysticism as a possible object of faith progressing in a test of devotion to Christian mysticism. The first two chapters, which focussed on these two novels, were concerned with the clash that occurred between the impersonal love these ideals gave rise to and the personal love the individual seeker felt raised by, and also touched on the still rudimentary theme of the cryptic supernatural forces which appear to govern man's destiny.

Turgenev's deepening moral and intellectual pessimism was traced in the chapter devoted to On the Eve, in which purely mundane idealism was shown to be inadequate to counter either the futility of human existence or the power of the mysterious
CONCLUSION

The conflict portrayed in Turgenev's works between a passionate love of life and a morbid sensitivity to life's 'непрочность, скоротечность, [и] призрачность', as E.A. Solov'ev has described it, impelled a splendidly romantic quest for credible suprapersonal ideals capable of inspiring a selfless and effective heroism and of giving life meaning in the face of human mortality. It is the transcendental aspects of this quest which have been investigated in this thesis.

The investigation began with Turgenev's exploration in Rudin of a partly Hegelian, partly pre-Hegelian rational mysticism as a possible object of faith, progressing in A Nest of Gentry to Christian mysticism. The first two chapters, which focussed on these two novels, were concerned with the clash that occurred between the impersonal love these ideals gave rise to and the personal love the individual seeker felt seized by, and also touched on the still rudimentary theme of the cryptic suprahuman forces which appear to govern man's destiny.

Turgenev's deepening moral and intellectual pessimism was traced in the chapter devoted to On the Eve, in which purely mundane idealism was shown to be inadequate to counter either the futility of human existence or the power of the mysterious
agencies whose operation in human affairs was becoming more perceptible. In the chapter on *Fathers and Sons* Turgenev's challenge to materialism to supply suprapersonal ideals was examined, and his deeply pessimistic conclusion and tentative transcendental interpretations were analyzed.

At this point of cynicism and despair Turgenev was ready to open his mind to unorthodox alternatives to the accepted views of man and his place in the universe. On visiting Salisbury cathedral in the summer of 1857, Turgenev remarked to Pauline Viardot, referring to religion but in terms which have a wider application: 'On croit généralement avoir tout dit en disant: c'est ridicule! Eh bien, parce qu'une chose est ridicule, ce n'est pas une preuve qu'elle ne soit ni utile, ni même grande.' The cryptic realm of supernatural and preternatural forces which became the focus of his art in the sixties, seventies and eighties, did have much that was useful in it as a palliative to his cynicism and much that was artistically superb. Of particular interest in this dissertation has been the formal distinction between the equivocal 'fantastic' stories, such as 'Несчастная' and 'Живые мощи', and the exercises in supernatural realism, such as 'Собака' and 'Сон'. This analysis of the stories on the basis of genre was an attempt to elucidate them as semantic entities and provide an alternative to attitudes such as Mikhailovskii's, for example, who declared 'Песнь торжествующей любви' to be nothing more than a vulgar, boring 'попь-де-коновский анекдот' or beautifully ornamented 'мерзость', or Bialyi's who was of the opinion that mysterious stories such as 'Собака' and 'Сон' contained 'nothing mysterious' or elements which were 'not so much fantastic as inexplicable'.
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In Virgin Soil the growing dilemma between the need for an idealism which transcends the mundane and its actual impossibility became the focal point of investigation. The final chapter centred on Turgenev's changing attitudes to death, the antidotes and palliatives he sought to it, and the way these informed his art.

In the course of the development of these themes, Turgenev's despair over man's insignificance in the face of mindless material forces and his cynicism towards dogmatic or religious answers to cosmic questions came to the fore; yet even this darkness was not wholly impenetrable, but punctuated by flashes of awareness of an area of being which transcended the purely physical and at the same time provided a leading element in Turgenev's romanticism. 'Après tout', as Turgenev wrote to Claudie Viardot in 1881, apprehensive about the reception of his 'Песнь торжествующей любви' but determined to 'dare . . . to dream', as Schiller had urged, 'il y a de la folie dans tout ce qui est art'.

The emphasis on transcendental themes in this dissertation is of course not meant to imply the lack of importance of other themes of an entirely different order in Turgenev's works. There has, however, been a conscious effort to stress the transcendental themes and the importance of their correct analysis as a counterbalance to the much more widespread interest in the realistic picture of Russian society which emerges from his works.

Not so very long ago Marc Slonim remarked that, compared to Tolstoi and Dostoevskii, 'who shattered the world by the depth and frenzy of their moral and religious search, Turgenev
lost in stature'. This dissertation has been an attempt to explore grounds for restoring to Turgenev some of this lost stature, for, although Turgenev's search rarely became frenzied, and although its dynamism and intensity were not always reflected on the surface of his works, his spiritual search was nonetheless profound, vigorous and productive of one of the richest bodies of work in Russian literature.

Footnotes

1 Опыт философии русской литературы (Petersburg, 1905), p.205.
2 Letter dated 10 June 1857, No. 34 in Nouvelle correspondance inédite, Volume 1.
3 'Песнь торжествующей любви и несколько мелочей', in Сочинения Н.Н. Михайловского, Volume 5, pp.534-5.
4 Тургенев и русский реализм, pp.215, 218.
5 Dated 25 June (7 July) 1881, No. 140 in Nouvelle correspondance inédite, Volume 1.
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