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INTRODUCTION

It has been said that if Ivan S. Turgenev could have foreseen the repercussions of his great novel Отец и Дети, he would never have written it.¹ The controversy it created upon its publication in 1862 contributed to his decision to remain abroad for most of the remainder of his life and partially explains his greatly decreased literary productivity after its appearance.² He produced only two relatively inferior novels after Отец и Дети: Дым of 1867 and Море of 1871. Such a pivotal novel in the career of one of Russia's greatest novelists has long provided material for literary analyses both in Russia and abroad.

Invariably, these analyses have centered about the novel's protagonist, Евгений Васильевич Базаров, a controversial figure since the novel's first appearance in "The Russian Herald" in February 1862.

The majority of early literary criticism of Базаров tended to evaluate him and his confrontations with the other characters in the novel in terms of external factors such as social class conflict, the "generation gap," and the political environment. It will be worthwhile to review some of this criticism encountered in the course of research for this thesis.

Nineteenth and early twentieth century English-language critics, reflecting the growing social awareness in their own societies, expressed great interest in the
dichotomies which they thought to perceive in Russia. For them, Turgenev's novel confirmed the existence of these dichotomies:

Its [the novel's] main situation is the bringing face to face the old and young, the elder generation and the new.\(^3\)

and

Otyr i Deli is perhaps the most powerful picture of that unnatural—and yet not unnatural, often inevitable—divergence between the younger and the elder generation—it would be incorrect to say between youth and age—which so often embitters the life of parents and injures the character of children, which we remember to have met with anywhere.\(^4\)

and

The characters of the novel naturally fall into two groups, and nearly the whole book is made up of scenes in which the representatives of the old and the new school are brought into collision.\(^5\)

The evaluations of Bazarov as a person tended to stress those qualities which rendered him "out of tune" with the standards of "civilized" society and the enormous personal energy he seemed capable of bringing to bear against those standards:

[Bazarov] is one of the big careless slovens of fiction, large in mind as in body, perfectly indifferent to everybody's opinion, rudely sensual and disdainful, with no reverence for anything.\(^6\)

and

Here is a grim, pitiless, half-savage nature, with a suggestion of enormous power, disregardful of common sentiments, riding rough-shod over conventional values, a creature of merciless intelligence and violent passions finding no work for his energies save that of destruction.\(^7\)
These critics were understandably concerned with the effects of the Bazarovs of society and could not but evaluate him in terms of a potential threat to existing norms.

The tendency to impart a strong social and political significance to Bazarov was no doubt prompted to some extent by Turgenev:

Turgenev himself saw Bazarov in his political aspect:

If he [Bazarov] calls himself a nihilist, one ought to read—a revolutionary....I dreamed of a figure that should be gloomy, wild, great, growing one half of him out of the soil, strong, angry, honorable, and yet doomed to destruction—because as yet he still stands on the threshold of the future. I dreamed of a strange parallel to Pugatchev. And my young contemporaries shake their heads and tell me, 'You have insulted us....It's a pity you haven't worked him out a little more.' There is nothing left for me but, in the words of a gipsy song, 'to take off my hat with a very low bow.'

Seldom has an author given a better clue to the meaning of his work, and most of all in comparison between Bazarov and Pugatchev, the leader of an 18th century peasant rebellion who was hanged by the Czar. Pugatchev, however, had his peasant followers, while Bazarov ... what is Bazarov but a Pugatchev without the peasants?8

However, one must remember that Pugatchev was a real revolutionary who carried out an active uprising whereas Bazarov is an avowed "do-nothing" who has voluntarily lifted himself above the fray. "Bazarov is a revolutionary personality, but without revolutionary ideas or commitments. He is all potentiality and no possibility."9

With all Bazarovs, the revolution would never have come; consequently, it may be true that Bazarov "contains within
himself those mental and moral qualities by which alone
can be inaugurated a new and fairer epoch in Russian civil-
ization,"¹⁰ but these mental and moral qualities prove
powerless against the "system" because Bazarov can neither
bring out nor instill them in others.

Soviet critics have of course emphasized this social
significance of Bazarov and used Turgenev's own words to
justify it, for example: "V mnogočislennyx ob"jasnenijax
po povodu 'Otcov i detej' Turgenev často govoril o svoix
simpatijax k Bazarovu, o svoem stremlenii predstavit' v
oblike Bazarova 'toržestvo demokratizma nad aristokratiej."¹¹

They neglect to mention that Bazarov does not triumph over
the aristocracy at all! The Soviets also stress Turgenev's
relationship with the "civic critics": "V 'Otcax i detjach,'
esomnennno, skazalsja i položitel'nyj rezul'tat obščenija
Turgeneva s revolucionno-demokraticeskimi dejateljami
'Sovremennika,'¹² and explain Bazarov's inactivity thus:
"V dejstvitel'nosti že revolucionnye demokraty xotja i
ne dobilis' pobedy, po svoej dejatel'nost'ju i bor'boj oni
približili pobedu.revoljucii v Rossii."¹³ They recognize
Bazarov's difficulty in actually relating to the "people,"
but resolve it by stating, "byla v etom i bol'šaja nepravda."¹⁴

Such a position finds an ally in an English critic who wrote
a prophecy based on Otcy i Deti almost forty years before
the revolution:

It is precisely the moujik, with his unknown
wants, his untried capacities, and his unre-
dressed wrongs, that must form the chief and
principal figure in the future political and social programme of Russia. The wide chasm that separates him from the intellectual and titled classes must be bridged over; the tie that should bind the different ranks of society together in one mutual work of progress and civilisation must be recognised; and all attempts at reform will prove barren, unless founded on the great truth that it is in the people, rather than in the artificial refinement of the upper classes, that Russia must look for the real strength and power of a nation. 15

We have noted earlier that Turgenev used the term "Nihilist" in his work simply as a synonym for "revolutionary;" however, to Arkadij, heady with his new-found liberalism and influenced by hero-worship for Bazarov, the term encompasses some sort of vague, limitless political and social philosophy, quite undefined in Arkadij's own mind, yet he is confident that Bazarov has surely thought it all out and embodies this philosophy. This is not at all the case with Bazarov. He lets Arkadij and Pavel use the term, but to him it is just another of those artificial, vague epithets which are bandied about so much, which impart false status as if simply naming something can change its underlying reality, and which in the last analysis, serve to create artificial barriers between men. With this in mind, he doesn't consider it worth the effort even to stop them from using it, much less worry about defining it.

For some strange reason, most critics have adopted Arkadij's view of Nihilism and disregarded Bazarov's unconcern for it. However, in adopting Arkadij's, they have not been able to resist the temptation to shape Arkadij's vague
conception into something finite. Consequently, we encounter the interpretation which chooses to emphasize the literal meaning of the term based on its etymology, so that it is said of Bazarov "that he has reached the point where he can recognize the futility of striving and struggling, and has the courage to be a nihilist—a philosophical nihilist—and can sincerely deny the value of everything, science, civilization, life itself." This is not at all true. Bazarov does have values, as we hope to prove, and characterizing him as a philosophical nihilist, whatever that is, is much too confining.

Another narrow approach to Bazarov is to dwell too heavily on the scientific nature of Bazarov. It may be true that "Turgeneff intended to embody [in Bazarov] the scientific spirit itself in relation to mediaeval survivals" engaged in a "conflict between ideals of life and conduct inspired by modern science and social speculation, and the traditional usages of Russia." Still, isn't Bazarov's devotion to science lip-service? Dissecting frogs does not suggest very much concrete achievement and Bazarov can scarcely be counted as a great scientist. He reflects the spirit of science in service to mankind, but he is too human ever to sacrifice human values for science's sake.

Some critics, recognizing that Bazarov is far from being a philosophical Nihilist, have attempted to label him something else, for example, a realist, as in the following:

Bazarov permits the name, but he is not a nihilist so truly as a realist. It is not
for the nothing that he strives, but for the real. Rid yourselves of empty abstractions, of futile forms, to make room to see things as they really are. Tear away conventional rules so as to penetrate to actual laws. The work he means to do is straightforward enough. Better roads, increase of trade, trustworthy savings-banks, honest administration, free and convenient justice,—these are the objects he will strive for.19

Such a judgment is acceptable as far as it goes, but once again it imparts a social bias to Bazarov which his behavior does not quite justify.

Bazarov has also been called a Positivist, such as in this somewhat enigmatic evaluation of him:

"Voobšče Bazarov" predstavljaetsja mne kak"—by neskol'ko drapirjuščimsja togoj pozitivizma, podobno Pečorinu, vildimo ščegoljavšemu svoim razočarovanijem". A četo dokazatel'stvo, čto Bazarov"—tip" perexodnoj epoxi; čelověk" prošnych" uběždenij, kotoryja blizki emu, č" kotorymi on" srodnilsja vpolně, postupajt" prošče i ne podčerktivaet" slov". 20

and

Bazaroff, to be a nihilist in Tourgenieff's signification of the word, should profess exclusively negational and abolitionary doctrines, whereas he is represented in the novel as endowed with positive qualities and as advocating positive principles. Call him a Positivist, and he is intelligible; baptise him a Nihilist, and he is inconsistent and contradictory; for his nihilism is confined to criticising the institutions of his country.21

This latter commentary completely misses the point that Turgenev did not use the word as a philosophical code but simply as a synonym for "revolutionary." Arkadij's definition is the unattainable ideal of a youthful admirer which Bazarov does not even bother to repudiate. Consequently, there is nothing contradictory in calling Bazarov
a Nihilist because Turgenev applied it without any definite philosophical or active political connotations.

What happened is that the word caught the public imagination and acquired a wide range of meanings, all at various times applied to Bazarov and the upshot of which has been diverse evaluations such as the ones we have quoted. When Otctv i Deti was published, both the reactionaries and the liberals, not to mention the general public, were guilty of supplying their own connotations for the Nihilism which Bazarov supposedly practiced. The results were horrifying to Turgenev. "Every author expects bouquets and brickbats; what hurts is to have the bouquets come from your lifelong foes and the brickbats from those you had considered your friends."22 This is what happened to Turgenev. Many of his friends detected only the destructive revolutionary element in Bazarov (and we should bear in mind that Bazarov does not destroy anything!):

"Turgenev returned to Petersburg at the beginning of June 1862 during the mysterious fires which the authorities accused the 'revolutionaries' of starting, and the first words that escaped the lips of the first acquaintance he met on Nevsky Avenue were: 'Look, what your nihilists are doing! They are setting Petersburg on fire!' Turgenev was appalled; he noticed a coldness amounting almost to indignation in many people he liked and with whose views he sympathised."23

Many of his enemies detected this element, also; however, they interpreted it in a favorable light, with the result that "he received congratulations and almost kisses from people whom he regarded as his political enemies."24 These
were reactionists, one might say the "Fathers," who hailed Bazarov as a "portrait of the insidious revolutionary ideas current in Young Russia."25

On the other hand, "the Younger Generation, irritated by the public capital made out of Bazarov and his M nihilism by the "Fathers," flew into the other extreme, and refused to see in Bazarov anything other than a caricature of itself."26 Turgenev was accused of "having written his novel with the sole purpose of expressing his personal hatred of the younger generation and of exposing his enemies as scoundrels;"27 Černysevskij was convinced that Bazarov was a caricature of the recently deceased Dobroljubov and that Turgenev had expressed his personal hatred of Dobroljubov in this manner.28

It was inevitable that in the midst of such a heated and passionate controversy that Bazarov's M nihilism should become a central issue:

'Many people who were only waiting for an excuse to put an end to a movement, which had taken hold of Russian society,' Turgenev wrote, 'availed themselves of the word "nihilist."'29

Avraham Yarmolinsky appropriately comments on the popularity of the term:

Turgenev had not invented the term—it was first used by St. Augustine to denote unbelievers—any more than he had invented the type, but his employment of the word and his projection of the character made for the vogue of both....The word was also used loosely by the general public. A girl wanting a new frock was likely to face her parents with the threat of turning M nihilist if they didn't come round.30
Perceptive critics were fully aware of what had happened with respect to Bazarov's Mihilism.

[Bazarov] called himself, and is called by his friends, a Nihilist. The name has unfortunately acquired a terrible and evil meaning since Tourgenieff's novel was written. But we should be doing a manifest injustice to Bazaroff, were we for a moment to confound him with those who during the last few years have usurped the title to themselves, and by rendering it a synonym for assassin have made it an offence to every honest man. 31

And the whole affair proved to be very regretful for Turgenev:

In a letter to Saltykov-Shchedrin fourteen years later [than the novel's publication], he expressed his regret at having ever used the unfortunate word. 'I am ready to confess,' he wrote on 3 January 1876, 'that I had no right to give our reactionary rabble an opportunity of getting hold of a mere word. The writer in me should have made that sacrifice to the citizen, and that is why I consider the alienation of the young people and all the reproaches hurled at me as justified. The problem it gave rise to was more important than artistic truth—and I should have realized that in advance....32

It is not surprising that this new, perverted conception of Mihilism, born of a very dubious association with Bazarov in the first place, bloated into generalization by overuse and distorted by misuse through many decades, has often been applied to Bazarov without considering its true relevance to Turgenev's original creation. Consequently, a mythical Bazarov has arisen who bears little relation to the original. This is the Bazarov who has inspired naive statements such as "[Bazarov is] a colder kind of Mephistopheles, incapable of admiration or respect,...In short, Bazarof is as
detestable as, for the protection of society, he is bound
to be"33 and who has lent his name to an "ism:" "'If,' as
M. Paesareff has well said, 'Bazaroffism be a malady, it is
the malady of our days, so widely spread that in spite of
all our palliative or amputations we must learn to endure
it as best we can.'"34

Modern critics have attempted to focus attention once
again on Turgenev's original creation and thereby reassert
a point which has become clouded by undue emphasis on
Bazarov's role as an activist: essentially Bazarov was power-
less to destroy anything or to pose any real threat to soci-
ety.

"Even as Bazarov wants to 'smash other people' he senses
his own helplessness: he has no weapons for smashing any-
thing. 'A harmless person,' he calls himself, and a little
later, 'a tame cat.'35 He fails to accomplish anything at
all, a point which statements such as the following com-
pletely fail to grasp:

We never find Bazaroff neglecting the
business of the moment, but he ploddingly
devotes himself to the modest task of amel-
iorating, as best he can the miseries of
those around him. The sphere of his labours
may be humbler than would have suited the
wide-reaching grasp of a Roudine, but it
gains in completeness by being thus re-
stricted.36

In the course of this study, we should hope to prove
that the character of Bazarov, in the final analysis, is
just as "superflous" as Turgenev's other "superflous men."
In order to accomplish this, we shall examine the motivation
for Bazarov's relationships and resultant behavior with the other characters of the novel on the grounds of personal interaction exclusive of social, class, generation, age, educational, intellectual, or moral considerations imposed by external society. In fact, to Bazarov, these considerations represent mythological barriers which tend to impede communication between individuals and arbitrarily divide mankind thereby encouraging dissension. Bazarov's entire mission in Otcv i Deti might be reduced to his confrontation with these mythological barriers, and the core of this thesis to an evaluation of his relative success in tearing them down and the consequences thereof. This re-examination of the original Bazarov should isolate him from the well-meaning but inaccurate myth which has grown up about him, and it will be accomplished by means of a running commentary on the consecutive stages in the development of the character of Bazarov as the result of his movement from confrontation to confrontation with the various characters of the novel.
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CHAPTER I

One of the most striking features of Turgenev's great novel is the overwhelming predominance of Bazarov's role and the dependence of the other characters upon it. This domination by Bazarov is the result of Turgenev's art of characterization accomplished within a structure which incorporates Bazarov as its principal unifying member. Richard Freeborn sums up this process thus:

In structural terms, the main feature of Fathers and Children is the figure of Bazarov. The action of the novel hinges upon him almost exclusively. He is present in practically every scene of the novel, and it is his movement within the fiction that serves to link together the different 'places' or foci of interest which comprise the setting of the novel. Simultaneously, these 'places' and their occupants contribute, stage by stage, to the process of his characterization. A natural unity of form and content is thus achieved, which is the most striking development in Turgenev's exploration of the novel-form. The portrait of Bazarov that finally emerges from the novel is one that transcends all other issues in the fiction.

Our purpose in this chapter is to explore Turgenev's process of characterization in achieving the portrait of Bazarov which has emerged by the time of his first visit to Madame Odincova's. This first half of the novel has produced the majority of the evaluations—and misevaluations—of the character of Bazarov. Friends of social progress have evaluated him as "the epitome of the depths of a great movement" while unsympathetic observers have labeled him "a rude and powerful figure, full of disdainful science and
a frankness all but brutal,—a young materialist who believes in nothing."³ Such judgments are politically influenced, of course, and are closely related to the discussion of Nihilism found in the introduction to this thesis; our concern here will not be the character of Bazarov as a representative of some vaguely defined political philosophy called "Nihilism," but with the illumination of Bazarov's personality as a human being with emotions and prejudices. This illumination is achieved by Turgenev's process of characterization, an objective, almost dramatic, process in which the reader's impressions are a result of the observation of the characters themselves and their interrelations among themselves.

Bazarov's first appearance on the scene is much like that of an actor stepping onto a set. Like the spectator at the theatre, the reader has had no advance preparation: "Bazarov is not introduced to the reader by means of any biographical excerpt which might set his character in perspective."⁴ Starting with no information, we gradually gather impressions of him from his actions, from his behavior, and, most importantly, from the remarks made about him by the other characters. Our initial glimpse of him is very brief. He utters only two words: his name and patronymic. From Arkadij, we learn that his family name is "Bazarov." At this point, we have only a name to which the author adds a sketchy physical description:
Our initial impression of Bazarov is rounded out by his hesitancy at holding out his hand to Nikolaj and his non-committal silence to Nikolaj's hope that he will not be bored at Maryino. Summing up this impression of Bazarov, we observe a rather awkward young man who is reserved, confident, and extremely quiet.

To this first impression, Arkadij adds details concerning Bazarov. Not only do these details add to our knowledge of Bazarov; more importantly, they serve to establish the relationship between Arkadij and Bazarov. Arkadij remarks that he met Bazarov "nedavno," which lets us know that he cannot know Bazarov very intimately. To Nikolaj's question as to what Bazarov is studying, Arkadij replies: "Glavni predmet ego-- estestvenyje nauki. Da on vse znaet." This indicates to us that Arkadij is certainly not impartial in his evaluation of his friend, and indeed looks up to him. Arkadij also suggests the "emancipated" attitudes which he and Bazarov share when he tells Nikolaj not to worry about Fenicka: "On Bazarov vyše vsego etogo." 

After supper, when we finally hear Bazarov express himself from his own mouth, we find that the reserved, shy young man is not reserved at all. He is quick to criticize his host's family in the most personal ways. Having noted
earlier that Arkadij looks up to Bazarov, we learn now that Bazarov entertains this admiration and is condescending with Arkadij. He expresses ridicule for Pavel's "ščegol'stvo" and Nikolaj's tendencies to be a "staren'kij romantik". A popular tendency has been to attribute to Bazarov an indictment of Nikolaj and Pavel in political terms:

These men have outlived their age; neither in sympathies, feelings, nor ideas do they belong to the present; and in their unwilling concessions to the spirit of progress, tacitly acknowledge that they have neither interest nor part in the work of the new generation.

This interpretation is difficult to accept since both Nikolaj and Pavel represent the same political philosophy, yet Bazarov likes Nikolaj and dislikes Pavel. This should suggest that perhaps Bazarov is more interested in personalities than in politics.

But before we consider this problem, we should take a closer look at the relationship between Arkadij and Bazarov. We have already detected a master/disciple tone in their attitudes toward one another. It should be noted that they represent two different social classes. Bazarov is of lowly origin and is purportedly a raznočinec, a member of the new intelligentsia whereas Arkadij is a member of the gentry, the dvorjanstvo, the class which stood to lose the most as the result of social reform. Arkadij represents an intermediary between the country gentry world of Pavel and Nikolaj, the "fathers," and the intellectual, scientifically oriented world of the new intelligentsia, the men of the sixties, the
"children." Bazarov is an intruder on the scene at Maryino just as Pavel would be an intruder in the theoretical world of the raznočince.

Since Arkadij belongs to some extent to both classes, it is not surprising that he attempts to interpret the world of the raznočince for his relatives. But, as so often happens in religion where the convert is more knowledgeable and pious than the born devotee, so in this case Arkadij is more the raznočinec than the raznočinec. Consequently, he is not at all reluctant to formulate a working code of Nihilism and to ascribe it to Bazarov; however, we must bear in mind that the code which Arkadij explains to the brothers is only his own conception of what Nihilism means and not at all binding on Bazarov, even though Arkadij may feel that Bazarov is obligated to live up to it. We can also forgive Arkadij for formulating a particularly strict definition because of the intense admiration he feels for his ideal. And, Bazarov, conscious that he represents an ideal to Arkadij, cannot but feel some compunction not to let Arkadij down.

As a result of this relationship, we must remember that much of what Bazarov says to Arkadij must be examined carefully because Bazarov, in spite of himself, desires to maintain his image as a freethinker with Arkadij. And this will be particularly true later on when Arkadij begins slipping back into the camp of the dvorjanstvo after he begins realizing that he is not at all like Bazarov. As this realization grows, the free and natural relationship becomes strained.
Arkadij's presence as an environment for Bazarov becomes more and more hostile as he gradually assumes the myths of the Dvorianstvo, myths which alienate Bazarov. But this is jumping ahead a bit. At this point in the novel, Bazarov still represents Arkadij's ideal of what a Mihilist should be, even though he does not understand exactly what "Mihilism" connotates or exactly what constitutes a "Mihilist."

With the foregoing in mind, we come to the scene where Arkadij is called upon to explain "what" Bazarov is. By this point in the novel, we have been able to draw some tentative conclusions concerning Bazarov. Here, "at the opening of the book, he is thoroughly sophisticated, calm, self-confident and clever." We know several things of which Bazarov approves, among them: Nikolaj, conditionally; dissecting frogs; and progress. We also know a number of things which he dislikes: the estate of Maryino ("Ege, mestečko-to ne kazisto." ); Pavel and what he represents; and Romantic Idealism. We have observed that Bazarov gets along well with the peasant boys whom he asks to help find some frogs for dissecting, and, in fact, this observation is confirmed by the author himself: "Bazarov... vladel osobennym umen'em vozbuždat' k sebe doverie v ljudjah nizšix, xotja on nikogda ne potakal im i obxodilajà s nimi nebrežno." 

With these impressions fresh in the brothers' minds, Arkadij, who had cited Bazarov's lack of ceremony as one of Bazarov's positive qualities, finds that Pavel interprets such behavior in quite a different light. Unwittingly,
Arkadij hastens to justify Bazarov by categorizing him as a "Mihilist," almost as if such an explanation would absolve Bazarov of any responsibility for his actions. As one might expect, the introduction of this new term does not assuage Pavel in the least. On the defensive now, Arkadij attempts to explain nihilism. He voices a working definition: "Nihilist, eto chelovek, kotoryj ne sklonjaetsja ni pered kakimi avtoritetami, kotoryj ne prinimaet ni odnogo principa na veru, kakim by uvaženiem ni byl okružen etot princip."  

Arkadij is interrupted before he can elaborate further. It is artistically significant that Bazarov is not present in this scene to contradict, affirm, or amend this definition. He would definitely have found his protegé's definition much too theoretical.

In practice, we find that Bazarov fails to make any commitment at all or establish any theoretical tenets. We mentioned earlier that Bazarov is intruding on the dvorjanstvo's territory by being at Maryino. Consequently, he senses a hostile environment and his state of mind is reflected in the tone of his first discussion with Pavel and Nikolaj. This tone is one of nonchalance, tempered with defiance. Turgenev states that Bazarov answers Pavel "nebrezno," and that with respect to Pavel: "On [Pavel] nashilam čuvstvovat' tajnoe razdraženie. Ego aristokraticeskuju naturu vozmušchala soveršennaja razvzajnost' Bazarova. Ėtот lekarskij syn ne tol'ko ne robel, on dažhe otvečal otryvisto i neoxotno, i v zvuke ego golosa bylo što-to.
Bazarov yawns and does not even want to prolong the discussion.

So what has Bazarov, the man whom Arkadij calls a "Nihilist," actually asserted? He has not even used the term. He has defended truth, at least to the point of saying he will agree with it, but he has also stated that he does not believe in anything, and why should he? He has simply expressed a desire to view life scientifically without sham or myth, without useless social convention or tradition with nothing to justify them except their own time-honored existence. He has fired back quips at Pavel several times, but they seem to be designed more to antagonize and deflate Pavel in his eloquence and pomposity than for anything else. True, Bazarov does not accept art, but this seems to be due more to his own insensitivity than any malice, and, as he indicates, even it would be acceptable if it reflected truth and not myth.  

Using this desire to adopt a demythologized view of life as a starting point, we can deduce a number of other qualities of Bazarov's personality: disdain for pointless argumentation about trivialities which stem from myths in the first place, a lack of concern for personal dignity since rank and station are products of myth, too, and a coolness to derision since derision is almost always the result of wounded dignity. One must assume that emotional detachment is also essential to a scientific view of life. We get these impressions not from what Bazarov says, but
from his attitudes. It is indeed difficult to find any traces of a "frustrated political passion" in him from these attitudes.

Bazarov's attitude towards Fenička and the peasants reveals that he extends his yearning for demythologized relations to personal relationships as well as society and institutions. After all, the gentry, peasantry, and nobility are all artificial terms which are applied to beings with common human traits. True, birth and rearing in a particular class produce obvious effects on a person and determine his economic and social status, but, in the last analysis, a stupid and superstitious nobleman is no different from a stupid and superstitious peasant, and Bazarov would not distinguish between the two. Consequently, he can accept both Fenička, the unwed mother, and Nikolaj because they are not affected or insincere, and for similar reasons he rejects Pavel.

Bazarov's relationship with Arkadij is also meaningful and natural, within the confines of the teacher/disciple relationship, so that what might be mistaken for invective is actually candor. During the course of the evening conversation with Arkadij, a wider area of Bazarov's outlook is illuminated. To some extent, his criticism is contrived for Arkadij's benefit, but generally, we can conclude that he is sincere in it. First of all, Bazarov admonishes Pavel for having staked his life on a single card—a woman. He states that anyone who would do that is not really a man.
Another assertion is that one's concept of what is useful does not justify itself. Just because Pavel imagines himself useful when he saves a peasant from being flogged does not make him so. To Bazarov, the criterion for usefulness must be based on something more than personal conjecture. It would never occur to a Pavel to question the institution of the peasantry; obviously, to him the system is proper; it simply needs the quirks worked out of it. Nonetheless, it never occurs to Bazarov that Pavel's concept of what is useful is just as valid for him as Bazarov's is for Bazarov. Bazarov is also extremely bold in his assertion that the age should depend on him and that the age in which one lives is no excuse for shortcomings.

Finally, Bazarov states his famous attitude toward women:

"I čto za tainstvennye otnošeniya meždu mužčinoj i ženščinoj? My, fiziologi, znaem, kakie čto otnošeniya. Ty proššudiruj-ka anatomiju glaza: otkyda tut vzjat's'ja, kak ty govoriš', zagadočnomu vzgljadu. Ėto vse romantizm, čepuxa, gnil', xudožestvo."20

How do these statements fit in with the personality of Bazarov which we have seen evolving? The first statement about staking one's life on a woman seems reasonable, especially in the context of Pavel's love affair. Society love has long been based on coquetry, deceit, sham, and infidelity, and such love would violate both the conception of a demythologized society and that of natural and candid relations between human beings. The second statement
coincides with Bazarov's belief that only that which represents truth is useful. The last two statements on the influence of the age in which one lives and on love can also be reconciled with the scientific view of life. The first erroneously excludes the interplay of fate, a factor which Bazarov must concede very painfully later, and the second excludes emotion, something which is not completely voluntary, as Bazarov also realizes later. In any case, these are statements and attitudes which Arkadij would expect Bazarov to express, and in the freedom of his relationship with Arkadij, it is natural that Bazarov should express them.

When Bazarov becomes personally acquainted with Fenička, we are firmly convinced that he is sincere in his conviction for meaningful and natural relations between people. Fenička's position as Nikolaj's mistress is no bar to Bazarov's acceptance of her as a human being. This is apparent in his attitudes toward her. He had scarcely acknowledged Nikolaj and Pavel when he was introduced to them whereas he bows politely to Fenička. He even introduces himself as a "smirnyj" person, and his behavior towards Fenička would indicate that he has correctly described himself. He also says that he has a way with children; this also proves to be correct because the child is not frightened when he examines him. One should note the softness in Bazarov's behavior. He expresses genuine concern for Fenička's health and even calls the baby a "young hero." Furthermore, he respects a folk belief when he states that
his praises have never brought the evil eye. Of course, this doesn't mean that he believes the superstition; as a man of science, he obviously does not. The important thing is that he recognizes that Fenicka probably does, and therefore is considerate enough to take her beliefs into account. The "evil eye" is a myth, but a myth can often have the power of truth if it is believed in strongly enough. In this instance, Bazarov weighs the case for a meaningful relationship against the need to demythologize and realizes that in practical terms, some myth, and some faith in unseen and unproven things is a necessity in life, and he possesses the ability to distinguish this myth from the myth which degrades and retards mankind. His scientific view does not demand blind adherence.

This same perspicaciousness permits Bazarov to penetrate to the core of things, to ferret out deceit and insincerity. He properly evaluates conditions on the Kirsanov estate; its rundown condition, loafing workers, corrupt bailiff, cheating peasants. In his conversations with Arkadij he restates his conception of truth: that opinions are irrelevant when it comes to truth, consequently, opinions are worthless. We should note that for this very reason Bazarov has stated no opinions of himself.

It was noted earlier that Bazarov was insensitive to art. This innate trait coupled with his scientific outlook yields the not surprising statement to the effect that art is worthless unless it has some usefulness other than purely
aesthetic value. In like manner, nature is also worthless from the aesthetic point of view; it is valuable only in that it provides a workshop in which man can operate. "The aesthetic side of his nature is lacking, as he thinks, although it is, in reality, only crushed by the scientific," writes one critic. 21 Perhaps the scientific outlook does blind one to art at some degree, but many men have successfully combined the two, e.g., Leonardo da Vinci.

One begins to doubt the sincerity of Arkadij's conversion to the intelligentsia when he becomes annoyed at Bazarov's ridiculing of Nikolaj's violincello playing. Of course, to Bazarov such activity represents the epitome of uselessness and is another example of Nikolaj's romanticism.

In the second discussion with Pavel, Bazarov soon realizes that Pavel is so wrapped in his myths that it is useless to even talk to him. Pavel wants Bazarov to pin himself down to specifics which Bazarov absolutely refuses to do. He almost lets himself slip down to the level of Pavel's argument by letting Pavel anger him: "On načinal zlit'zja, i lico ego prinjalo kakoj-to mednyj i grubyj cvet." 22 But he quickly realizes that he is becoming too expansive, and he regains his composure. Bazarov has allowed himself to use the word "Mihilism" but with the most passive connotation possible: "I rešilis' ni za cto ne prininmat'sja." 23 This is a great victory for Bazarov because it cuts off Pavel's argument completely. Bazarov absolutely refuses to be defined or limited in any way as
far as Pavel is concerned because he realizes there can be
no natural and meaningful relationship with someone as prej-
udiced and hostile as Pavel. Even the limited expression
Bazarov permits is the result of words put in his mouth by
Pavel. This is another manifestation of Bazarov's reluc-
tance which we shall see spills over into all aspects of his
life. He is willing to condemn superficial liberalism,
abstract logic, and shallow reforms which do not come to
grips with real issues, but he admits that he will do nothing
more than condemn.

One of Bazarov's last retorts to Pavel is a deprecation
of the family. But the family he has in mind is the peasant
family characterized by forced marriage, cruelty, incest,
and unhappiness. His family is quite different; Bazarov
loves his old doting parents, but somehow, he cannot commu-
nicate with them. He cannot accept from them the simple love
which they so desperately want to give him. His love for
them is concealed under the guise of brutality, his sense of
duty is stifled by his feelings of boredom. "The perpetual
anxious fears of the poor parents, their wistful watch of
his every look, the tears of the mother, the father's cease-
less nervous attempt to make himself agreeable, are so
clearly set before the reader that, though his sympathies
are entirely with the old people, he cannot but perceive
the likelihood that all this may prove too much for human
endurance."24 And it does; however, we are mildly surprised
that Bazarov expresses a desire to go to town. After all,
Bazarov has often stated his contempt of society and impa-
tience with social convention. The significance of this des-
ire is not that it represents any compromise of his anti-so-
cial tendencies; rather, the significance lies in the fact
that Bazarov is seeking an alternative to the boredom he
feels at home. One will note in the novel that "each charac-
ter, with the exception of Bazarov, has his or her own 'place'
or situation in the fiction,"\(^25\) but Bazarov does not seem to
be satisfied no matter where he finds himself. He is always
willing to exchange the real and gnawing boredom of "now"
for the potential boredom of another place and a future day.
"Town" represents potential boredom but at least it will give
relief from doting parents. Bazarov's feeling of isolation,
his inability to adjust to the world about him, and his con-
stant boredom suggest that, in spite of his self-confidence
and eloquence, he is still in the process of seeking purpose
for his life; the Pavalos of the world have scarcely retreated
in the face of his quest for scientific order in the world;
neither has the quest for natural and meaningful relation-
ships with other people proven to be very successful. Per-
haps his purpose could be defined in another sphere. Perhaps
there could exist some singular, perfect personal relation-
ship which in its purity and completeness could transcend all
the deceit and sham of the existing social order. Or perhaps
his discontent with this social order could be translated
into a purposeful campaign of action. In any case, the town
simply represents another waystation in Bazarov's flight from
boredom and pursuit of the unknown.

By the time the young men arrive at Kukšina's, the potential boredom of town has turned into actual boredom, and Bazarov reacts accordingly. He dutifully tries to avoid calling on the governor, with Arkadij and displays a manifest lack of interest in anything to do with society. During these town sequences, Bazarov's attitudes toward social convention are confirmed. He mumbles Arkadij's introduction to Sitnikov. He is not only reluctant to meet Kukšina; when he gets to her place, he pays more attention to the champagne than to her (the champagne was the reason for his original agreement to go there). "Bazarov's brief meeting with the radicals is a fine bit of horseplay; their empty-headed chatter being matched only by his declaration, as preposterous as it is pathetic: "I don't adopt anyone's ideas; I have my own.' At which one of them, in a transport of defiance, shouts: 'Down with all authorities!' and Bazarov realizes that "among a pack of fools it is hard not to be a fool."25 Bazarov, who had felt like an intruder at Maryino and even with his own family, realizes that he had rather not be accepted into the world of the intelligentsia, supposedly his world, but that it is difficult to keep from it. He realizes that these pseudo-intellectuals like Sitnikov and Kukšina are just as much surrounded by sham as is Pavel. He reverts to his usual defense mechanism: he simply refuses to take them seriously, Bazarov yawns loudly, scarcely replies to Kukšina's superficial chattering,
and, upon departing, does not even take leave of the hostess. Similarly, as we would expect, he does not dance at the ball (he probably does not know how) and we quickly discern that Bazarov, indeed, is quite out of place in society.

We have seen earlier that Bazarov appreciates a nice-looking woman. Consequently, we are not surprised when he inquires as to whether Kukšina is pretty, nor when he asks Sitaikov if there are any pretty women in the town. His conversation with Kukšina cannot be taken as representing his true attitudes towards women since much of what he says to her is contrived simply to antagonize her. Examples are his remark that "meat is better than bread, even from the point of view of chemistry" and his comments on judicious use of the whip. However, we should take seriously his contention that his appreciation of women does not extend beyond their physical function and the companion statement that there is no need for pretty women to understand serious ideas. At this point, we can agree with Sarah Radoff that "romantic love was to him mere folly."27 However, Bazarov has yet to be put to the test to see if his conviction can stand up. Fenicka was not a suitable test because of her relationship with Nikolaj, a relationship which Bazarov would honor much ahead of legal marriage. And Kukšina is personally repulsive to Bazarov (for different but similar reasons that Pavel is repulsive to him). It is apparent why he refuses to discuss "love" with her. "Love" would mean completely different things to Bazarov and Kukšina. We cannot fail to note,
however, that Bazarov is quite agreeable to switching the conversation to the subject of Madame Odincova. At the ball, Bazarov had noticed that Odincova stood out from the rest of the women. But his initial attraction to her is physical in nature: as a medical man he is attracted by her excellence as a physiological specimen and as a normal man he is attracted to her in sexual terms. Such attraction in no way compromises his earlier comments on "romantic love" even though he may feel a premonition that his feelings cannot be reduced to animal desire alone.

At this point, it would be well to pause and consider the portrait of Bazarov that has emerged so far as the result of Turgenev's process of characterization. In the running commentary, there has been an effort made to evaluate the significance of each of Bazarov's confrontations with the occupants of the "places" which he has visited. The portrait of Bazarov's personality that we can now display is the result of the cumulative effect of the stage by stage process which we have observed: a confident and intelligent young man with normal drives and instincts who yearns to achieve a scientific view of life which would enable him to live free from the myths generally associated with civilized society, who also yearns to achieve free and natural personal relationships with other people, relationships likewise uninfluenced by the myths of social status, birth, or education, who scorns active political commitment, and who seeks to maintain a mastery over himself and his emotions in consonance with the above
mentioned scientific view. He has made an admirable start
towards achieving all of these goals, and in Chapter II, we
shall continue to follow his progress as he passes to yet an-
other confrontation: that with Madame Odincova.
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CHAPTER II

In the preceding chapter we have sought to trace the characterization of Bazarov up to the point of his and Arkadij's initial visit to Madame Odincova's estate of Nikolskoe. The portrait which we have seen emerge is the one which has inspired his description as "student, genius, skeptic, raisonneur, dreamer and scientist, aristocrat and plebian, all in one; with a philosophical calm, a deep resignation."¹ This is an exaggeration, of course, but there are elements of truth in it. Now we should like to turn our attention to the continuing process of Bazarov's characterization, a process which, seemingly unknown to socially and politically oriented critics, does not end when a love interest crops up. The process has been continuous, of course; interrupting our commentary at the point of Bazarov's first visit to Nikolskoe was wholly arbitrary. But this point does seem to represent a natural division in the novel because Bazarov's convictions about the relations between man and woman are completely altered by his acquaintance with Odincova; indeed, the entire confrontation with Odincova is of vital importance to the ultimate destiny of Bazarov.

This new stage in the characterization of Bazarov is marked by the addition of a new goal to the ones we summarized before: a yearning to achieve a complete personal relationship unlike any other he has ever experienced, for the confrontation with Odincova opens an entirely new horizon to
him. And, as the process continues, we shall be witness to Bazarov's relative success or failure in achieving all these goals. In addition, it is hoped that this chapter will help us to comprehend to a greater degree the marvelous complexity and paradox inherent in the character of Bazarov.

It is obvious from the very beginning of Bazarov's visit that there will be something special about his acquaintance with Odincova. For purposes of comparison we should review Bazarov's demeanor on first meeting each of the main characters in the novel. With Nikolaj, Bazarov hesitated in extending his hand and did not even answer when Nikolaj expressed the hope that he would not find his stay at Maryino boring. Likewise, getting acquainted with Pavel was accomplished with only a bow and scant acknowledgment. He had mumbled on meeting Sitnikov and simply frowned at Kukšina. And, although the introduction to Feniška was somewhat warmer, Bazarov still remained composed and confident.

Bazarov's initial encounter with Odincova is quite a different matter. He is actually embarrassed; he actually experiences an involuntary breach of self-control. In Odincova's presence, we encounter a Bazarov, or at least a facet of Bazarov's personality, hitherto unknown to us. The so-called M nihilist is upset in the presence of a woman. We can have no doubts that this is an important point because the author reinforces the details of the situation in four different ways. First, the narrator relates that Bazarov is embarrassed, and then, the omniscient author discerns that
Bazarov is conscious of his own embarrassment and, indeed, annoyed because of his inability to prevent it. Then, the embarrassment is reflected in Arkadij's surprise and, lastly, in Odincova's displeasure with Bazarov's embarrassment.

Bazarov's manner also reveals his discomfiture. He finds himself lolling about in an armchair just as the pseudo-intellectual, Sitnikov, had done. He converses in an exaggeratedly casual manner, and, in contrast to the taciturnity he had displayed with Pavel, he is expansive with Madame Odincova. And we should bear in mind that Pavel and Madame Odincova are in some ways very much alike—poised, beautiful, refined, and socially superior to Bazarov.

What is the significance of Bazarov's unprecedented behavior in the presence of Odincova? Well, to Odincova, accustomed to the manners and decorum of drawing-room dandies, Bazarov's behavior cannot but displease her initially, but when she realizes that it is sincere, she is even flattered by it. To Arkadij, Bazarov's behavior is surprising because it is not in accordance with the image and ideal of Bazarov Arkadij has formulated in his mind. Such behavior in the presence of a mere woman does not fit in with this image. Finally, the reader is also surprised, but not as much as Arkadij. After all, this is Bazarov's first encounter with an eligible woman in the fiction (we must remember Fenička's relationship with Nikolaj), and the reader has no prior encounters by which to judge Bazarov; however, the reader cannot but bring to mind Bazarov's prior statements about the physiological
nature of love, the lack of necessity for pretty women to understand serious ideas, and the monster-like nature of "free-thinking" women.

But before we consider these statements, we should examine the significance of Bazarov's discomfiture in the context of his earlier personal encounters. We observe that Bazarov has permitted himself to enter into Odincova's environment, which, at least at this point, is essentially the same as Pavel's environment, i.e., it is the comfortable, well-ordered existence of upper-class society with its attendant myths and observance of these myths. Yet, Bazarov had refused to enter into Pavel's environment at all. This means that there must be some key element missing in Pavel's environment, yet present in Odincova's, which tends to neutralize Bazarov's innate hostility. The key element is, of course, that very mysterious relationship between man and woman which Bazarov has so vehemently denied: sexual attraction which transcends animal desire, emotional involvement which refuses to be guided by the intellect, circumstance beyond the mastery of the will; in short, the whole inexplicable bundle we try to suggest with the word "love." Potentially, this relationship could develop in any man/woman encounter, but in practice it does not for any number of reasons: personal tastes, personality clashes, fear of social sanctions, family ties, respect for already existing relationships, and so on. Consequently, the potential for falling in love with Fenicka exists within Bazarov, but this potential is not exploited to a very high
degree because of her existing relationship with Nikolaj. And as the affair of Dunjasà illustrates, the potential of love can be unrealized because only one partner contributes to its development.

So where does this leave Bazarov's statements concerning the non-emotional nature of love and the physiological role of sex? We should bear in mind the circumstances under which these statements were made. The statements on the physiological nature of love were made to Arkadij, a fact which in itself should tell us something about the nature of the statement. In the first place, Bazarov, in spite of his intense desire to dispel the myths of the world, has unknowingly surrounded himself with myth in his relationship with Arkadij. This is the myth that Bazarov represents some sort of Nihilistic ideal who plays a teaching role with his pupil. And both Bazarov and Arkadij pay homage to this myth: Arkadij, by expressing surprise and displeasure when Bazarov does not live up to the ideal which Arkadij has set up, and Bazarov, by talking down to and lecturing Arkadij. Theirs is certainly not a free and natural relationship on the whole, and the teacher/disciple myth is largely responsible for this in the early stages of the novel. This myth gradually gives way to a new myth as Arkadij slips back into the gentry. But to return to Bazarov's statement, we cannot accept it as any deeply thought out commitment because Bazarov knows that this is what Arkadij expects from him, and Bazarov is concerned with maintaining his image with Arkadij, if for no other reason than
the fact that Arkadij is his only convert, so to speak.

We have already stated that one cannot take seriously anything that Bazarov said to Kukšina because he enjoyed antagonizing her in her ridiculous liberalism. With this in mind, we can establish the pattern that Bazarov's innermost and sincerest thoughts come to the fore at moments of the greatest natural contact with others, at moments when the myth in his relationships has been dispelled, if only for the moment. So, his most telling moments with Arkadij are when the teacher/pupil myth has been disregarded, his most telling moments with Fenička result when the relationship is man to woman and not doctor to patient, and his most telling moments with Odinčova come after Bazarov feels that their relationship has become completely free and natural. Needless to say, there are practically no telling moments with Pavel, except perhaps after the duel, and absolutely none in Bazarov's encounters with the pseudo-intellectuals.

Simply stated, Bazarov's own sincerity is determined by the sincerity inherent in the particular relationship. There are always underlying kernels of truth in what he says, but with people like Pavel and the pseudo-intellectuals, they are often obscured by careless and even contrived irrelevancies; in relationships inflexibly predisposed by the myths which structure them, Bazarov senses the futility of trying to achieve meaningful communication.

When Bazarov and Arkadij arrive at Nikolskoe for a visit, it is obvious that the mysterious element we had observed in
him earlier is still operating. To emphasize Bazarov's awareness of his own embarrassment, Turgenev has him overcompensate by ordering vodka. But Bazarov still resists entering into Odincova's environment. He is aware that the class difference myth is still working between them. He realizes that his inexperience and Odincova's experience preclude anything approximating a free and natural relationship with her. Consequently, he reacts to the artificiality present in the environment in his usual manner, which at the same time enhances his image with Arkadij. Bazarov's mildly bantering tone is preserved by the wit he displays when he spies Odincova's late husband's picture. His long dialogue with her with its variation on the theme of the uselessness of art and its assertion that the reform of society would cure mankind's ills is reminiscent of his conversation with Pavel, and one suspects that his remarks are more for Arkadij's sake than Odincova's. Bazarov suggests that man holds some degree of control over his destiny, that it is environment and not heredity which determines the course of human destiny, that there is a historicism at work which is at least to some degree predictable, and, more important, capable of being influenced. But one suspects that such sentiments are the products of an effort to impress Arkadij, and, to some extent, Odincova, and do not stem from an honest commitment to influence the historical process.

Having described the initial interview with Odincova, the author informs us that two weeks have passed. Bazarov,
the keen judge of human nature who had appreciated Nikolaj and Fenicha, had also rightly evaluated the situation at Nikolaskoe upon arrival. He had immediately discerned Odincova's intelligence, experience, and self-indulgence. Likewise, he had appreciated the merits of Katja—fresh, untouched, shy, silent, impressionable. But now, after two weeks, we detect a change in Bazarov. His praise of Katja has become petfunc-tory, and he has stopped deprecating Odincova in Arkadij's presence.

We have not been witness to the process, but Bazarov, during the last two weeks at Nikolaskoe, has yielded to the mysterious element which he had publicly discounted previ-ously. He has fallen in love and thereby committed himself to the development of his relationship with Odincova to the highest degree of its potential. This represents a new goal for Bazarov. Here is an opportunity to achieve the most com-plete personal relationship known to man, and in so doing to ignore the artificial myths imposed by tradition and soci-eity: the myths of the distinctions between peasant and gen-try, between wealth and poverty, between intellectual activ-ity and the stifling boredom of a gentry life of ease and luxury. If these myths could be overcome and ignored, it would amount to destroying them, at least as far as Bazarov's view of the world is concerned. Regardless of how it comes about, we cannot fault Bazarov for falling in love. The love which he falls prey to is beyond his control; it does not demand motivation, and none is presented to justify it.
Although Turgenev obviously had no such parallel in mind, it can serve a useful purpose to view Bazarov's love for Odincova, irrespective of its motivation, as a type of love which follows the rules of courtly love of medieval times. In order to do this, we must regard his love as an infection which is beyond human control, in fact, as if fated "by a higher power." It is as if the lover "is compelled to do so by the power of love." Bazarov even experiences many of the symptoms of courtly love: "Every lover is wont to turn pale at the sight of his beloved" and "a lover's heart trembles at the sudden sight of his beloved." While we cannot see if Bazarov's heart is trembling, we do know that his hands trembled just as the courtly lover's "trembling hands betray him." When Odincova states the formula for love in the only terms which Bazarov could accept, unconditional surrender, we strike another parallel with the language of courtly love: "Love can refuse nothing to love." Bazarov's decline in health and his poor eating habits might be explained by the rule, "He eats and sleeps less whom the thought of love distresses." In courtly terms, the whole affair might be summed up by the rule: "Love seldom lasts after it is divulged." The rules of courtly love are only of incidental interest, of course, because the medieval lady was supposed to be a paragon of virtue and purity, which Odincova definitely is not, and Bazarov would have detested anything as wrapped in myth and arbitrary rules as courtly love.

Even though the reader is fully conscious of what is
happening to Bazarov, neither the author nor Bazarov employs the word "love" in the early stages of the acquaintance. Bazarov may have an inkling of what is happening to him, but he remains true to himself in that he never becomes involved in the game of love. He remains candid and forthright. He utilizes no verbal ploys, as it were, to "feel out" Odincova. In fact, he disapproves of any interpretation of his remarks as "courting" words. He frowns when Odincova interprets his matter-of-fact statement on her beauty as flattery. There is no reason to believe that his remarks on not being missed and his self-appraisal as an uninteresting and straightforward person are not absolutely sincere. And the author even intercedes to state that Bazarov never fabricated stories.

As Bazarov's acquaintance with Odincova grows warmer, he permits himself to discuss "love," but only on an abstract and somewhat pessimistic level. He characterizes "falling in love" as a pitiable condition. It is pitiable to Bazarov because he senses that the condition is involuntary and non-intellectual. Even in his inexperience, he realizes that love cannot be reasoned, that "Glavnoe, nado umet' otdat'sja." Bazarov does not specifically admit that he could give himself unreservedly; however, inherent in his yearning to achieve a complete natural relationship is the requirement that nothing can be held back. All barriers must be destroyed.

Within the framework of Bazarov's increasing attention to Odincova, there runs the counter-theme of Bazarov's gradual alienation of Arkadij. This progression unifies the novel
and enhances continuity. It is documented in Bazarov's growing feeling of alienation and being ill at ease in Arkadij's presence. The deterioration in the relationship is further evidenced in the breakdown in communication between the two, and it is finally verified by commentary by the author. While jealousy is a partial motive for their drifting apart, Arkadij, too, takes note of Bazarov's divergence from the ideal which Arkadij had formulated in his mind.

In the course of our acquaintance with Bazarov, we have noted that his main attitude towards life has been essentially fatalistic: "qué será, será." And in spite of his statements about reform during his first meeting with Odincova (and we have already commented on the nature of these statements), he has resolved that he personally will do nothing as far as active progressive measures are concerned. Consequently, if our theory that Bazarov's statements will become more indicative of his true nature as his intimacy with Odincova increases is true, then we would expect that at the climax of the development of a relationship which is of vital importance to Bazarov, at the time when he is prepared to give himself completely, we might achieve the deepest penetration into Bazarov's personality we have yet experienced. And, in fact, just such a revelation of Bazarov's essentially fatalistic nature takes place: "Da i krome togo, čto za oxota govorit' i dumat' o buduščem, kotoroe bol'šeju čast'ju ne ot vas zavisit?"4

That Odincova will draw a confession of love out of
Bazarov is a foregone conclusion since he is grossly over-matched as far as the intricacies of the "game" of love are concerned. This fact has caused Odincova to receive more credit as a *femme fatale* than she is due. Note the following which takes her much too seriously and fails to perceive that Odincova's treatment is satirical: she who is painted as the literal victor is actually the loser:

Madame Odintsof in this book is a typical personage, and one with whom we are too well acquainted. The beautiful young widow who, in perfect armour of her own purity and fundamental self-containedness (if we may be allowed so awkward a word), throws even such a direct and positive nature as that of Bazarof entirely off its balance, and sets his life all wrong for him without herself yielding to more than a pleasurable vibration of feeling—even though she rises for a moment to a semi-tragic height of remorseful generosity when he is on his deathbed—is infinitely less interesting, as she is less natural, than the simpler beings around her. The bad and impassioned siren who leads the young men altogether away from their duty, and ruins, or just fails to ruin them, is scarcely more distasteful than this elegant conversationalist, and gentle freethinker. That it is almost impossible to enter into society, in any at least of its Continental centres, without encountering her, is scarcely a justification of the great artist who suffers himself to be led astray like his own hero by this purely artificial personage. Falseness is nowhere more entirely embodied than in fact. To be sure, it was poetic justice that the rude scoffer at all poetry, beauty, and sentiment should make shipwreck upon the first piece of smooth loveliness and fictitious feeling that came in his way.5

And to say that Bazarov "is tempted, finally, by Madame Odintzov, the country-house Delilah. ...he is rejected, and humiliated too, almost like a servant who has been used by his mistress and then sent packing,"6 represents a gross
misinterpretation by an otherwise very perceptive critic. The fact of the matter is that Bazarov rejects Odincova. In her conversations with him she stated a formula of love which embraced the complete union which Bazarov was seeking:

Možet byt'. Po-moemu, ili vse, ili ničega. Žizn' za žizn'. Vzal moju, otdaj svoju, i togda uže bez sožaljenija i bez vozvrata. A to lučše i ne nado.7

It is Odincova who cannot meet the terms of her own formula. Like Natalja in Rudin, Bazarov offers his all on the altar of love; however, Odincova is not willing to give her all. She is not willing to give up her life of ease, her upper class privileges, her delusions of liberalism and lack of prejudice; in short, she is unwilling to destroy her own myth. To accept Bazarov on his terms would have required more than she is willing to give. And we must remember that Bazarov's goal of the perfect natural union could be achieved only on his terms. In all probability, he could have become Odincova's lover, but only as a pet dog, a favorite flunky at her beck and call, or even her husband, but then only as a typical gentry husband destined to be dominated by her as Arkadij will be by Katja. But, no; acceptance of Odincova on those terms would be shallow victory. It is not important that it would violate Arkadij's image of Nihilism—that was fast slipping away anyway; what is important is that such an action would amount to "selling out" to those artificial standards he had so long opposed. Bazarov has preserved his yearnings, but at great cost to his personal happiness.
Ironically, during a talk with Odincova, Bazarov had himself unwittingly foretold the outcome of events with the words: "Vam xočetsja poljubit', a poljubit' vy ne možete: vot v čem vaše nesčastie" (and the nesčastie of Bazarov as it turns out).

The conversation with Arkadij on the eve of departure from Nikolskoe is marked by an interesting turn. The rupture with Odincova naturally having signaled an upturn in the outward relationship between Bazarov and Arkadij, Bazarov attempts to rebuild his image with Arkadij by dismissing Sitnikov as a blockhead and commenting: "Ne bogam že, v samom dele, gorski obžigat'!..." For Bazarov, this is just another of his flippant statements so similar to others we have heard him make, just another indication of the front he puts up with Arkadij, but even it contains a kernel of truth since Bazarov in comparison with them is some sort of a god; however, on this occasion, Arkadij takes it differently than he has in the past. Turgenev writes: "'Ège, ge!...' podumal pro sebja Arkadij, i tut tol'ko otkrylas' emu na mig vsja bezdonnaja propast' bazarovskogo samoljubija." Arkadij suddenly realizes that he is looking at Bazarov and his reckless statements in the same light as Pavel and Nikolaj who had both seen Bazarov as a conceited egoist. He realizes that he inwardly belongs, not to some vaguely defined world governed by a Bazarovian code of Nihilism (the Odincova affair has fully confirmed that no such code exists), but to the same world as Pavel and Nikolaj, and he suspects that
his destiny lies therein. Such a statement about the Gods is meaningless in Bazarov's makeup, but in the gentry world where rank is strictly assigned, calling one's self a god can only amount to "samoljubie." A complete break with Bazarov is inevitable now.

The change noted above has occurred in Arkadij; there has been a change in Bazarov, too, but Arkadij cannot detect it and, if he did, he would not understand it. This change involves Bazarov's conception of himself as an individual. To this point, we could agree that "to the extent that he had been indifferent to the importance of individuality, Bazarov had never really imputed an importance to himself as an individual, despite the fact that he had clearly felt himself superior to other representatives of the younger generation, such as Sitnikov and Kukshina."11 Consequently, we can conclude that Bazarov was sincere when he told Odincova that it was not his affair to investigate his own value. An appreciation of his value as an individual was latent in his personality; however, it was veiled from his own perception until Odincova removed the veil. Her words echo: "Kak že soboju ne dorozhit'?"12 Such words could not but stir Bazarov's latent and suppressed emotional potential. Freeborn states the case as follows:

The process of self-realization begins in Bazarov's case after his meeting with Odintsova. Previously his dislike of romanticism and sentimentality had led him to dismiss any suggestion that there could be anything mysterious about the relationship between a man and a woman, or that any special importance should
be attached to differences between individuals. Yet he is soon to realize that his relationship with Odintsova has revealed to him the romantic in his own nature. In fact, it is this aspect of the relationship which is most important: it is not mutual self-fulfilment, but self-realization that his relationship with Odintsova has to offer him.\textsuperscript{13}

Perhaps, before the encounter with Odincova, Bazarov was firmly convinced that he could eliminate his own interests as a factor in the equation of human relations. He had not, however, taken into consideration the involuntary, the fated, if you like, demands leveled by love and its accompanying emotional involvement. In a Zamjatinian society, the coldly scientific view of life might be possible, and one could destroy social institutions and manipulate causes and effects at will. But Bazarov, as a human being susceptible to all the weaknesses and complexities thereof, cannot achieve a scientific view of life despite his best efforts.

The entire question of Bazarov's value, or significance, in his own estimation is a key element in the understanding of his character. Prior to his encounter with Odincova, we were able to say with impunity, "Bazarov thought his great thoughts, and serenely continued dissecting frogs and curing babies of the colic. He [was] able to recognize his own uselessness."\textsuperscript{14} As far as we can judge from the fiction Bazarov had never experienced a similar situation; in other words, he had never before fallen in love. His conversations with Odincova disturbed his objective view of life. She had asked: If I have no value, then who needs my
devotion? Bazarov discovers that his devotion is a real and disturbing factor in his make-up which he is fully capable of bestowing (even if it is not accepted); if his devotion is needed (and Bazarov thinks it is or he would not have confessed his love), then it must follow that he has a value. Bazarov has involved himself in the human equation, and we can no longer characterize him as the embodiment of "simple self-forgetfulness." Some would say that Odincova has eliminated the self-forgetfulness necessary for the true revolutionary, such as the ardent Communist who is willing to sacrifice everything, including himself, for the advancement of an idea; this is not true, because Bazarov never possessed that kind of self-forgetfulness in the first place. Such political self-forgetfulness implies acknowledgement of a commitment worthy of the sacrifice of one's life. What happens is that Odincova makes Bazarov aware that he has a value because he perceives a commitment which he thinks is worthy of it; when she fails to be, a vacuum is created. Bazarov's quest to fill this vacuum provides much of the motivation for his characterization in the remainder of the novel.

It is understandable that on the trip to his parents' home, we find a Bazarov who has been frustrated in his yearnings and convicted of his own sensitivity to hurt; still, he tries, perhaps for these very reasons, to preserve his old image with Arkadij by shrugging off his experience with Odincova and loudly voicing his anti-feminist attitudes
again. But his sensitivity about his experience shows through. He starts to use his old saw about Romanticism, but since the word seems to suggest his recent experience, he uses "vzdor" instead. Bazarov has undergone an illness which he claims he will recover from, but the sixteen miles of silence leave some doubts in the reader's mind.

However, before he lapses into silence, Bazarov gives us another insight into his attitudes toward the peasants. He is ironic in his reference to the driver as "mudrec" since he already knows that he will get a banal answer to his question. The same is true of his question: "Nu, a ona tebja b'et?" but this question is completely outside the peasant's sphere of understanding. Such a question does not even exist as far as he is concerned, much less have an answer. This behavior points up the fact that Bazarov, unconsciously or otherwise, does acknowledge a distance between him and the peasantry which is out of line with his democratic sentiments expressed earlier. As a human body for dissection, as a living organism to be studied, as a scientific phenomenon to be evaluated, Bazarov can detect no differences among men, as he stated in his discussion with Odincova. But in the realm of interpersonal relationships, be he nobleman, peasant, or gentry, Bazarov always feels decidedly superior or at least isolated, a situation which, as we shall see later, often produces a feeling akin to hatred. He senses that he has failed in his attempt to form a free and natural relationship with the peasants with whom he has come in contact. As we shall
confirm later, he is correct; the myth is too deeply im-
planted to be affected in any appreciable way.

Bazarov's parents, two of the most splendidly sketched
figures in Turgenevian literature, also present case studies
in Bazarov's inability to cultivate free and natural rela-
tionships, even with respect to his own flesh and blood.
One journal comments on them thus:

The anxious joy with which the son and his
companion are received, the eager and tremulous
solicitude of the father to foresee and arrange
everything, his wistful deference to all the
young man's wayward ways, his anxiety to con-
ceal his own emotion and attribute all the tears
and thanksgivings to his wife,—make a most pa-
thetic picture—one of those which go to the
heart. The mother is passive, doing little but
weep and gaze at the son whom she has not seen
in three years; but the anxious babble of the
father, his fussy and nervous cares for every-
thing, the adoration which he does his best to
cover under an air of light-hearted hospitality
and full understanding that a man will naturally
be bored by too much demonstration of love, is
in the highest degree natural and affecting.

It is obvious from this brief commentary that there would
be less likelihood of a natural relationship between Bazarov
and his parents than between Bazarov and practically anyone
else. Bazarov's father cannot truly see his son because he
is blinded by his love, and cherished hope and belief, that
Bazarov will be a great man. And his mother is still trying
to hold on to the little boy who is gone forever. These are
both cherished myths which Bazarov knows he can never over-
come. In truth, he loves his parents and he confides his
fondness for them in Arkadij. And his heart is touched by
the groaning and sighing of his mother, and his father's
persistent efforts to please him in every respect. But he knows that these myths isolate him from his parents, and his rudeness and impatience are manifestations of his frustration at the hopelessness and tragedy inherent in being unable truly to communicate with his parents.

At this point it would be well to summarize some of the observations on Bazarov we can formulate by now. First of all, we should adduce from his general behavior that, particularly with respect to Pavel and the pseudo-intellectuals, Bazarov has a yearning to view the world from a scientific point of view without regard for long-cherished myths which have only tradition to justify them. Most of these myths appear under the guise of time-honored law and custom, but this does not excuse them in any way. Secondly, this scientific view must presuppose the equality of men beneath the myths of social status, economic condition, and education, in short, the entire myth which constitutes "civilization."

Therefore, Bazarov would like to achieve meaningful, natural relationships with those about him, relationships free of sham, pretense, or affectation. He tries to cultivate just such relationships with Feniška and the peasants. Thirdly, when the involuntary rule of love imposes its iron hand, Bazarov recognizes the possibility of achieving a complete personal relationship which would represent the culmination of his yearnings through its defiance of social structures and fulfillment of his belief in the essential equality of human beings. And, lastly, Bazarov would like to achieve
these yearnings without subconsciously imposing any myths of his own on his own personality. So far we observe that Bazarov has had difficulty in all these areas because he has not been able to eliminate the myths honored by others, or, for that matter, sub-conscious myth-making within himself.

However, Bazarov does come close to myth-free relationships at times. And one of the most important times in terms of penetrating into his real character is the scene at the haystack. Bazarov lays aside the teacher/disciple myth and opens up to Arkadij in a true exchange of ideas. Whether it is the drowsy atmosphere of noonday and the peaceful surroundings, or the fact that he realizes that he is losing his influence with Arkadij, which prompts Bazarov's mood of candor (he even brings himself to argue with Arkadij, which emphasizes their equality), we do not know; however, we do know that we can attach great weight to his words, because, as he states, "da i ja v drugoj raz tebe etogo ne skažu." 17

Bazarov states:

Da tak že. Naprimer, ja: ja priderživa-
juš' otricatel'nogo napravlenija—v silu ošču-
ščenija. Mne prijatno otricit', moj mozg tak
ustroen—i basta! Otčego mne nravitsja ximiya?
Otčego ty ljubis' jabloki? tože v silu oščušče-
nija. Eto vse edino. Glubže etogo ljudi nikogda
ne proniknut. 18

This statement indicates once again that Bazarov is basically quite fatalistic. This explains why he can remain so passive in the face of so many pressing issues and avoid responsibility in his own mind for his inactivity. Yet, the yearnings we have mentioned often run counter to the attitude.
of simply taking things as they come. After all, Bazarov has no more control over his inherent nature (as he states above) which fosters these yearnings than he has over external events. Consequently, the situation is reduced once again to the apparent paradox of fatalism versus free will so aptly summed up by Dr. Samuel Johnson with the words: "All theory is against free will; all practice is for it." Bazarov continually asserts his free will in an attempt to realize the yearnings we have noted, yet he meekly submits to external circumstances in most other areas—social, political, etc. And so the paradox exists within Bazarov as in every human being, and his behavior in its complexity reflects his attempts at resolution of the paradox.

But we can have no doubt of Bazarov's determination to pursue his yearnings at all costs. The affair with Odincova confirmed that he is willing to accept unhappiness and failure rather than compromise them. And, indeed, it would destroy him to compromise them because they are all that he has. His role is only to strive and to advocate, not to realize and accomplish, but he knows that he must cling to it to the end. But he senses that such a stance is untenable and doomed to failure, and he foresees its consequences in a statement symbolic of his position as a man out of tune with his time and symbolic of his eventual premature death: "Net, brat! Rešil'sja vse kosit'—valjaj i sebja po nogam!..."  

The scene at the haystack brings out a point which we have already suspected: the individual yearnings which we
have noted earlier are all manifestations of a larger, more all-encompassing yearning, as one critic puts it, "a romantic yearning in his soul, a great melancholy yearning for the unattainable." 21 Bazarov tells Arkadij:

---A ja dumaju: ja vot ležu zdes' pod stogom...Uzen'koe mestečko, kotoroe ja zanimaju, do togo kroxočno v sravnenii s ostal'nym prostran-
stvom, gde menja net i gde dela do menja net; i čast' vremenii, kotoroiu mne udastsja prožit', tak ničtožna pered večnostju, gde menja ne bylo i ne budet...A v etom atome, v etoj matemati-
českoj točke, krov' obraščaetsja, mozg rjabotaet, cego-to xožet tože...Čto za bezobrazie! Čto za
pustjakii! 22

Bazarov senses the futility of his yearning.

Bazarov also senses the differences between him and Arkadij, indeed, his isolation from both the gentry and the pseudo-intellectuals: El' da ty, ja vižu, Arkadij Nikolaevič, po-
nimaeš' ljubov', kak vse novejsie molodye ljudi, cyp, cyp, cyp, kuroška, a kak tol'ko kuroška načinaet približaetsja, davaj bog nogi! --Ja ne takov." 23

We mentioned earlier that Bazarov displays unprecedented candor in the haystack scene. It is obvious that he is not worried about his Nihilistic image with Arkadij when he tells him he does not want him to look at his face while he is sleeping because it will look stupid, nor when he admits that a "real man," a doer, a positive personality, would not worry about what people think of him. As Bazarov says:"Nastojaščij čelovek tot, o kotorom dumat' nečego, a kotorogo nadobno slu-
šat'sja ili nenavidet'." 24 He knows that he is not such a
"real man," but also that Arkadij is much less of a "real man"
than even he is.

Why does Bazarov say "A ja [nenavižu] tak mnogix" when Arkadij admits that he does not hate anyone? He says it because he recognizes the myth, the sham, the pretense all about him, and Arkadij does not; he realizes that he is isolated from and even superior to most of his contemporaries and he cannot help but hate them, not as biological specimens of human kind, but because they have trapped themselves in myth and ignorance, refusing to give up the former or remedy the latter. Bazarov admits his superiority: "Kogda ja vstreču čeloveka, kotoryj ne spasoval by peredo mnoju togda ja izmenju svoje mnienie o samom sebe." Bazarov does not attempt to explain why he hates other people. In fact, he accepts it as a factor inherent in his nature.

Bazarov's readiness to argue with Arkadij, even to fight with him, indicates that Bazarov realizes that he is losing Arkadij and that it is only a matter of time till Arkadij makes a complete break with him. Still, at this point, Arkadij can still help the old father's feelings by sincerely complimenting Bazarov—in the most general of terms, though.

Having arrived once again at Maryino, Bazarov makes a statement to Pavel which once again points up the frustration he feels at the petty, artificial barriers man has set up which hamper real communication: "Čelovek vsë v sostojanii ponjat'—i kak trepeščet æfir, i čto na solnce proisvodit; a kák drugoj čelovek možet inače smorkat'sja, čem
on sam smorkaetsja, ètogo on ponjat' ne v sostojanii."27
It is significant that Bazarov says "ètogo on ponjat' ne v sostojanii" rather than "on ne möžet ponjat' ètogo" or "emu nel'zja ètogo ponjat'," because he feels that this is not something which could not be changed if man were really serious about it. Bazarov seems to suggest that man is capable of understanding other men, at least on occasion, but he chooses not to understand or tolerate differences among men for any number of reasons, most of them involving some element of selfishness. We know that man is capable of greater understanding, but it often takes great stress to precipitate it: a white man on the battlefield forgets that his fellow soldier is a Negro, a mining town draws closer within itself as the result of a mining disaster, a family forgoes its petty quarreling in the face of the loss of a loved one. Even Bazarov and Pavel will experience one of these rare instances after the duel while Pëtr runs for the drosky: "Oboim bylo nexorošo. Každyj iz nix soznaval, čto drugoj ego ponimaet."28

As Bazarov comes to know Fenička, he is presented with another opportunity to try to realize his yearning for a free and natural relationship. In so doing, he would be able to regain confidence in the probity of his outlook as well as partially fill the vacuum in his life created by the Odincova affair. He admits that his life is incomplete: "Da vy sami posudite, Fedos'ja Nikolaevna, na čto mne moja molodost'? Živu ja odin, bobylem..."29 And do we detect a
note of desperation in his answer to Fenička when she says
to Bazarov with respect to his solitary life: "(ona) ot vas
vsegda zavisit?" Bazarov replies: "To-to čto ne ot menja!" 30.
Once again here is a power beyond himself directing Bazarov’s
fate and he senses his helplessness to overcome it. This
feeling of helplessness and frustration becomes unmistakably
evident in his plea: "Xot' by kto-nibud' nado mnoju ša-
lilsja." 31

Bazarov has found it increasingly easy to enter into
Fenička’s environment because much of the myth which impeded
communication between them has been dispelled. The doctor/
patient relationship no longer has its customary aweing
effect. Turgenev writes of Fenička:

Ona ne tol'ko doverjalas' emu [Bazarovu],
ne tol'ko ego ne bojalas', ona pri nem deržalas' vol'nee i razvijaznee, čem pri samom Nikolae
Petroviče. Trudno skazat', otčego ěto prois-
xodilo; možet byt', ottoqo, čto ona bessozna-
tel'no čuvствоvala v Bazarove otsustvие vsego
dvorjanskogo, vsego togo vysšego, čto i privle-
kaet i pugaet. V eš glazax on i doktor byl
otličnyj, i čelovek prostoj. 32

At last, Bazarov has found someone who will reciprocate his
ingenuousness! Fenička realizes that Bazarov is an intel-
lectual, but she dismisses this difference and does not
interpret his studying as any sort of "intellectual snobbery"
as a Pavel would. Aware of this, Bazarov permits himself
behavior in her presence which is unthinkable in the pre-
sense of others. Here we encounter the "courting language"
which Bazarov would never use with Odincova. (We must
remember that because of Fenička’s role with respect to
Nikolaj, Bazarov cannot hope to achieve the complete personal relationship that he might have with Odincova.) Still, Fenićka is an attractive woman and that their communion might be climaxed with a kiss is quite understandable; however, Turgenev is careful not to give the impression that Bazarov is "in love" with Fenićka, certainly not "in love" in the same sense as he was with Odincova. Turgenev writes: "Fenische nravilsja Bazarov; no i ona emu nravilas'." So, in the free and natural environment of Fenićka, Bazarov plays guessing games, he chooses roses, he uses similes like the comparison of Fenićka's voice to the babbling of a brook. Without the impediment of love, without its tension and consequences, Bazarov is free to enjoy Fenićka's company. He is required to play no other role than that of a human being, which is fully in accordance with his scientific view of life.

However, Bazarov's triumph is short-lived. Fenićka can be natural when she is alone with Bazarov, but once Nikolaj or Pavel appear on the scene the barriers go right back up. Fenićka becomes aware once again of the class distinction between her and Bazarov and of the role she is supposed to play. And so this free and natural relationship, in spite of its promise, also fails.

We have observed that in previous encounters with Pavel Bazarov has absolutely refused to enter into Pavel's environment. He has realized that Pavel would not pay any attention to what he was saying, that Pavel was too steeped in
myth even to understand what he was talking about, and consequently, Bazarov responded in kind by being rude and also by not taking Bazarov seriously:

No wonder Bazarov feels so desperate a need to be rude. There are times when society is so impervious to the kicks of criticism, when intellectual life softens so completely into the blur of gentility, that the rebellious man, who can tolerate everything but not being taken seriously, has no alternative to rudeness.34

However, when Pavel comes to challenge Bazarov to a duel, Bazarov, after registering the initial surprise, does take Pavel seriously, and submits to the ultimate irony of a duel, the antithesis of the scientific view of resolving conflicts. Then what is it that motivates Bazarov to fight the duel? This is best answered by Bazarov himself in the author's commentary after Pavel has left Bazarov's quarters. Bazarov has just been exclaiming about the stupidity of dueling and the impossibility of refusing to duel under the circumstances: "Bazarov pobledjel pri odnoj 'etoj mysli; vsja ego gordost' tak i podnjelas' na dyby."35 The Nihilist of Arkadij's original image would have killed Pavel on the spot; he would have wanted "zadušit' ego, kak kotenka," for the sake of clearing away an outmoded and superfluous quantity; however, such a Nihilist would not consider the personal insult involved at all. On the other hand, a true humanitarian would have tried to avoid a fight at all costs. Bazarov reacts in neither of these extreme fashions; rather, he reacts like the complex human being he is. Bazarov has also failed to
conquer himself. The myth of pride is also ingrained in him. It has been said of Turgenev that he "embodied in himself certain of the fundamental Slavic traits with which his own teachings were at war. The seeds of the ailment which was devastating the life of his people were planted in him also, but he at least saw it as an ailment."³⁶ By changing "Slavic traits" to "traits of human nature," we can apply this to Bazarov: he is also susceptible to the myth inherent in human nature, and he falls victim to a fundamental manifestation of it: pride. He recognizes that he has done so in the sarcasm and irony with which he regards his particular "ailment." His keen sense of humor remains, and it cannot help but be contrasted with Pavel's utter seriousness.

To the suggestion that the distance be set at ten paces, Bazarov quips: "V desjati šagax? Èto tak; my na èto rasstojanie nenavidim drug druga."³⁷ The proposal of a valet as a witness is a point of irony which Pavel catches, but Bazarov smooths it over with even more sarcasm. And when Pavel is departing, Bazarov adds the final sarcasm by imitating a true Romantic: "Do prijatnogo svidaniya, milostivij gosudar' moj;"³⁸ however, he does balk at the absurd implications of a letter in the pocket explaining the reasons for the duel.

Bazarov could have provoked Pavel to use the stick he brought with him and reduced the duel to brawl status. If he had done so, this would have represented a victory for his scientific view. But, Bazarov's pride had slammed the door, and his fatalistic nature had locked it and rendered
participation in the duel irrevocable. It all seems beyond his power once he has made his decision: "Ja by mog otkazat' vam v etom udovol'stvii, da už kuda ni šlo!"39 His resignation to the manipulation of the powers beyond him is also apparent in his behavior before the barrier. It is significant that Bazarov does not aim when he returns Pavel's shot. He does not try to kill Pavel; however, he also does not try to miss Pavel. Simply, he just fires and allows the bullet to find its own mark. Obviously, Bazarov does not feel that Pavel is worth committing what amounts to murder over; still, to fire to miss deliberately would just add more sham to an already absurd situation. Consequently, Bazarov leaves it up to Fate to determine the duel's outcome.

We stated earlier that Bazarov's self-realization as a result of the affair with Odincova resulted in a recognition of his own value. But it also faced Bazarov with the problem of finding a cause worthy of the expending of this value, of translating his new-found significance into some positive commitment. The duel presented an opportunity for making such a commitment, in this case, avenging his wounded pride, but as we observed at the barrier, he failed to make this commitment. This failure adds to the ignominy of the duel, but it also tells us something about Bazarov. He has recognized that he has a value as a human being and indeed was reluctant to expend himself in something as ridiculous as a duel (He fully recognized the possibility that he might have been killed): "nado budet podstavljat' lob,"40 he had
remarked; however, even though he realizes that he has some value (we should remember the discussion about Odincova), he has not been able to measure it in specific terms. In other words, he still has not balanced his own value against some commitment worthy of it, and the rest of his brief life is spent continuing the quest for this commitment.

Before leaving the duel, we should note that it also plays an extremely important role in the framework of the novel as a whole. Richard Freeborn suggests that the duel with Pavel functions as a vehicle to illuminate the intermingling of personal and ideological issues. Both Bazarov and Pavel are interested in Fenička personally, Bazarov because he is attracted by feminine beauty, but Pavel, emotionally, because of the resemblance of Fenička to his lost love of long ago. Here is Pavel, the aristocrat, defending the honor of a peasant just as if she were the highest of nobles. And Bazarov, the ridiculer of the absurdity of dueling, accepts the challenge, which, to Freeborn, is a reflection of his readiness to devote his life to the peasantry and his decision to reject the dvorjanstvo altogether.

A more plausible explanation is that Fenička is a symbol of both Pavel's and Bazarov's greatest happiness. To Pavel, she is a symbol of the love of his life which he lost, and never understood. To Bazarov, she is the symbol of his great yearning for the unattainable—the scientific view, the natural relationships, the one complete personal relationship, the victory over himself—which is definitely unattain-
able now, lost forever as a result of his failures. He also never really understood it. But each man recognizes that Feniška represents for him the closest approach to his lost dream that he has encountered: Feniška as a mental substitute for Pavel's lost love and Feniška as the best example in Bazarov's attempts to achieve a relationship completely free of myth. One finds it difficult to find any indication that Bazarov views the duel as a last brave gesture before he devotes his life to the peasants and rejects the dvorjanstvo altogether. After all, he hates the peasants and he has long since rejected the dvorjanstvo.

Bazarov's trip to Nikolskoe after circumstances have forced him to leave the Kirsanov estate reveals to us that Bazarov, even in the face of so many failures, still clings to the hope of attaining happiness with Odincova. Perhaps he still harbors the hope of convincing her to accept him on his terms.

And we are informed in various ways that he does. He himself admits that he didn't turn in at Nikolskoe just to tell Arkadij about the duel. Even though he dismisses his particular reason with a "čort znaet," the author tells us that "bolee opytnyj glaz, verojatno, otkryl by v ènergičeskoy poprežnem...priznaki vnutrennego volnenija;" and, to cap it all, Bazarov has "conveniently" packed his good suit in such a way that he can get at it easily, and he admits that it might even be true that he came there to see Odincova. Consequently, we cannot be absolutely sure of the sincerity
of Bazarov's contention that Odincova would not want to see him.

In fact, we cannot be very sure of the sincerity of anything Bazarov says to Arkadij because he has adopted his bantering image again. He is willing to admit that he has strayed from the path, but he also maintains that he has properly diagnosed his condition and has taken steps to correct it:
"čelovek inogda polezno vzjat' sebja za xoxol da vydernut' sebja von, kak reb'ku iz grjady; èto ja soveršil na-dnja x." 42

It turns out that Odincova does want to see him, but not on the terms which Bazarov might have wished. He senses this immediately, and he recognizes that this particular door is indeed closed to him. The hope of achieving a complete personal relationship has been dashed, as it turns out, forever. Bazarov has not been able to describe his situation in words but he finds that this makes no difference. Later, on his deathbed, Bazarov marvels at the power of words, but notes that naming something does not change its underlying reality, the "true" state of things. Thus, whether his feelings for Odincova are termed "ljubov'" or "napusknoe čuvstvo," the underlying reality does not change. Turgenev emphasizes this disparity between "truth" expressed in words and their referent. Whatever this feeling is, it was strong enough to prompt Bazarov to call Odincova as witness to his dying words, indeed, to color his imagination in the final moments of his rationality to conceive of her as "kakaja molodaja, svežaja, čistaja," 43 none of which apply except in Bazarov's tortured
mind. It is understandable that this failure should deal a significant blow to Bazarov, but it is not the singular factor in his downfall, as the following might suggest: Bazarov "reached for the alluring Rheingold, the power and independence of knowledge, as confident as Alberich that he could pay the price, the renunciation of love. But Alberich was a sexless dwarf, while... Bazarov... [was] human." "The irresistible life-force symbolized by love and woman" crushed Bazarov "in vengeance" because he "would not submit."\(^{44}\) Granted, the affair with Odincova is important, but it represents only one factor among a number of others.

One of these other factors is the final break with Arkadij, who has gradually slipped back to the "fathers." Bazarov had already sensed the progressive alienation of Arkadij from him and even stated it: "Мне сдаётся, что ты уже расстался со мною;"\(^{45}\) however, this realization does not finally strike Arkadij until he has succeeded in fully replacing Bazarov with Katja in his scheme of things.

That Bazarov still loves Odincova is revealed in their walk past the "temple" where Arkadij is proposing to Katja. He probes Odincova's feelings for Arkadij, and there is even a hint of bitterness prompted by jealousy. And when he reads Arkadij's proposal letter and discovers that his suspicions were correct—Odincova did have designs on Arkadij—his bitterness turns to a malicious impulse. Even if it were possible, Bazarov's pride prevents him from stepping into the place just vacated by Arkadij. Too, at this point, he also
believes that he can regain his old composure, "flop back into his natural element," as he puts it. The problem is, however, that Bazarov no longer has a natural element, if he ever did. With his statement, "Nynešnjaja molodež' bol'no xita stala," Bazarov unknowingly acknowledges his shift from the "children" to the "fathers," and his salvation as a father lies in the one path which has been closed to him, the very path which Arkadij has chosen.

Bazarov is painfully aware of the need to fill the vacuum in his life: "Vidiš', čto ja delaju: v čemodane oka-
 zale's' pustoe mesto, i ja kladu tuda seno; tak i v žiznennom
 našem čemodane; čem by ego ni nabili liš' by pustoty ne
 bylo." Perhaps this is the reason that he still clings so tenaciously to his illusions with Arkadij, so that he can still single himself out and isolate himself from the Arkadi-
 ijs of the world:

--A teper' povtorjaju tebę na proščan'e
...potomu čto obmanyvat'sja nečego:--my pro-
ščaemsja nasvsegda, i ty sam eto čuvstvues'...

ty postupil umno; dlja našej gor'koj, terpkoj,
bobyl'noj žizni ty ne sozdan. V tebe net ni

derzosti, ni zlosti, a est' molodaja smelost'
da molodoj zador; dlja našego dela eto ne goď-
itsa. Vaš brat, dvorjanin, dal'še blagorod-
nogo smirenija ili blagorodnogo kipenija dojti
ne možet, a čto pustjaki. Vy, naprimer, ne
deretes'--i už voobražaete sebja molodcamy,--a
y drat'sja xotim. Da čto! Naša pyl' tebe
glaza vyst, naša gržaz' tebja zamarajt, da
ty i ne doros do nas, ty nevol'no ljubues'sja
soboju, tebe prijatno samogo sebja branit'; a
nam drugix lomat' nado! Ty slavnjej malyj; no
ty vse-taki mjaken'kij, liberal'nyj barič, --
e volatu, kak vyražaetsja moj roditel'.

Bazarov has made the final break with Arkadij; any "hay"
for his life's suitcase as a result of his relationship with Arkadij is now a thing of the past. Arkadij has completely rejoined the "fathers," and he will live out his life dominated by Katja as Bazarov would have been if he had married Odincova on her terms.

With Nikolskoe and Maryino closed to him, the only physical environment remaining for Bazarov is his old home. "Nothing remains but to go home, to his good sweet uncomprehending mother and father, those remnants of old Russia, and to die."49 He returns to his old parents as a frustrated man. And, just as before, he finds only painful boredom and vague restlessness at home. He moves as one who has aged. No longer hampered by illusions, Bazarov is free to act more naturally with his parents and even take an interest in their world. Instead of spurning company, he seeks company, and he even inquires about the priest. In short, Bazarov begins to adapt himself to his parents' world, which probably explains why Freeborn feels that he was dedicating himself to the peasants.

But Bazarov is also a failure with respect to the peasants. On the way home from the duel, Bazarov had suggested as much. He had remarked: "Kto ego [russkogo mužika] pojmet? On sam sebja ne ponimaet."50 Now we see what the peasants think of him. Rather than speaking naturally as they do with one another, the peasants speak to him "s patriarchal'nomodrobužnoju pervačest'ju." They persist in the myth of the world being divided into a peasants' "mir" and the masters'
domain. One peasant explains to Bazarov: "protiv našego, to est', miru, izvestno, gospodskaja volja; potomu vy naši otcy. A čem strože barin vzyščet, tem milee mužiku."51 Yes, the peasant is unshakable in his belief in the myth. And Bazarov, for all his trouble, gets only the following consideration from the peasants after he has turned away and the peasant is walking homeward addressing a fellow peasant:

--- čem tolikoval?---sprosil u nego drugoj mužik...0 nedoimke, čto l'?---Kakoe o nedoimke, bratec ty moj!---otvel- čal peryvь mužij, i v golose ego ưže ne bylo sleda patriarxal'noj pevučesti, a naprotiv, slyšal's kakaja-to nebreźnaja surovost';---tak, boltal koe-čto; jazyk počesat' zaxotelos'. Izvestno, barin; razve on čто ponimaet?---Gde ponjat'!--otvelal drugoj muzik...52

It is true that "fundamentally the means of touching 'the people'... are a mystery to Bazarov."53

There remains one area in which Bazarov has not failed, however, and he turns to it as an alternative to the overpowering stagnation and boredom he is experiencing: his profession. We cannot, however, accept medicine as straw which would have filled Bazarov's life. He performs his medical functions competently but not out of devotion; they occupy his hours, but they do not justify them. Science and medicine are useful, but Bazarov has already rejected them as a raison d'être.

It is ironic that the peasantry and the primitive conditions inherent in a backward society combine to do in Bazarov. He had preached reform of both of these elements, the individual and his environment; however, he failed in
reforming either. His infection while performing the autopsy on the peasant is a tragic act of fate. Bazarov acknowledges it as such: "Esli ja zarazilsja, tak už teper' pozdo." Still, he continues to resist this Fate even to his last ounce of strength. Here is the full realization that to deny something does not change its underlying reality. As Bazarov puts it: "Da, podi, poprobuj otricat' smert'. Ona tebja otricat, i basta!" Here is the full realization that even the Mihilist who denies everything is only carrying out a verbal exercise. Real change is the result of action, not denial. Bazarov is angry at death, and battles it, but he knows that he must succumb to it. As he says, "So mnoj končeno. Popal pod koleso." And there is rare beauty in this struggle:

It is at the end of Fathers and Sons that Turgenev reaches his highest point as an artist. The last twenty-five pages are of an incomparable elevation and intensity, worthy of Tolsto and Dostoevsky, and in some respects, particularly in their blend of tragic power and a mute underlying sweetness, superior to them. When Bazarov, writhing in delirium, cries out, "Take ten from eight, what's left over?" we are close to the mad lucidity of Lear in the night. It is the lucidity of final self-confrontation, Bazarov's lament over his lost, his unused powers: "I was needed by Russia....No, it's clear, I wasn't needed...."

Yet this ending too had failed to satisfy many critics, even one so perceptive as Prince Mirsky complaining that there is something arbitrary in Bazarov's death. But given Russia, given Bazarov, how else could the novel end? Too strong to survive in Russia, what else is possible to Bazarov but death? The accident of fate that kills him comes only after he has been defeated in every possible social and personal encounter; it is the summation of those encounters.
And, "although his life was hard and unlovely, such is Fate's irony that in his death, Bazarov, who was stricken in the pursuit of that science which he served, achieved the greatness for which he had longed, the beauty that he had never before experienced. There is something awe-inspiring in this master's candid recognition that he was being overcome by the most powerful master of all." 58 "Bazaroff dies, imperfectly grasping...the true nature of the work required of her children by Russia—failing to comprehend it in its full and wide significance," 59 for his is a personal tragedy, not a political tragedy. But he remains true to Turgenev's moral creed:

The lot of man is not enjoyment but heavy toil, not self-indulgence but renunciation, not the attainment of cherished ideas but the fulfillment of duty. The sentence that completely expressed the noble sadness of Turgenev's moral creed is that 'not happiness but human dignity is the chief goal of life.' 60

Even in the death struggle, Bazarov maintains his dignity and fulfills his duty as he interprets it. But, ironically, mythology has the last word after all; even in his coma he manages an involuntary shudder of horror on his face as he is annointed in the last rites, at his parents' request, of course.
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CONCLUSION

Our final evaluation of Bazarov based on this study of his behavior and interrelations with the other characters must be that he does not represent any sort of political activist wreaking havoc in civilized society, that he is not "a specimen of Russian boorishness"1 insensitive to his environment, and that he is not a M nihilist in any systematic philosophical sense of the word. Rather, as we noted at the end of Chapter II, Bazarov represents a man who has encountered failure and frustration at every turn in his efforts to fulfill his yearnings.

His mastery over himself was a failure because he could not keep himself from falling in love and he could not conquer his pride. And as a result of the latter, he was forced to compromise his concept of a life free of myth by participating in the duel, and even on his deathbed the mythology which he sought to dispel exerts its awesome power. In his efforts to achieve free and natural relations, he is also a failure. In the final analysis, Fenička, too, cannot accept him on terms free from myth and sham because of the presence of Pavel and Nikolaj in her world view. And Bazarov, as we have seen, fails in his attempts to communicate with the peasants. The myth of their social status is so ingrained in them that they would convince the "master" that the stricter they are dealt with, the better they like it, but in their freer relationships among themselves they would admit the
absurdity of this statement. What disgusts Bazarov is that most of the masters accept the former, contrived statement as the gospel truth. And finally, Bazarov failed to achieve his yearning for a complete personal relationship as a result of the confrontation with Odincova.

So, when Bazarov returns home to his parents, we observe a man who has failed to find any "hay" with which to fill the void in his suitcase of life. In many respects, he is like the disenchanted youth of today who, too, would like to dispel the myths connected with the "establishment," prejudice based on race, and economic status, and the political and military stature of society. This modern youth, too, invariably seeks a commitment which he feels is worthy of the value he places on his life.

This commitment may take the form of political activity, either through the approved channels or as a part of an underground movement. We observe that this alternative was closed to Bazarov from the very beginning because of his "superfluous" nature. The youth of today may very easily make his political concern seem irrelevant or at least secondary by taking on the responsibility of a family. This, of course, is what happens to Arkadij: "Bazarov's young disciple Arkady will marry, have a houseful of children and remember to be decent to his peasants."² This alternative is also closed to Bazarov. In today's society, an occupation or a profession can also be converted into a full-time commitment, so a disenchanted youth often becomes an overwrought
executive or business man whose politics become conservative by his very political inactivity. But Bazarov's void was too vast to be filled by his profession as a doctor, since his predilection for natural science represented only a small portion of a much greater philosophical yearning. Then, why could not Bazarov really have dedicated himself to working among the peasantry, as Freeborn suggests, much in the way that a contemporary youth can join the Peace Corps or Volunteers in Service to America in order to find commitment in his life? The answer lies in Bazarov's failure to achieve a natural working relationship with the peasants. His frustration with their ignorance and indolence, corruptibility and dishonesty; in short with the whole interconnected myth pervading them, inspires hatred in him. He can treat them medically as a physiological entity no different from any other human being, but he cannot bring himself to embrace a humanitarian commitment to something which would go unappreciated and more than likely be squandered anyway. Also, Bazarov painfully recognizes that the peasantry does contain within itself that strength of fibre necessary for perpetrating a meaningful program of reform. The clarity of his perception is borne out in the failure of subsequent movements based on this erroneous belief, e.g., "the naive and romantic crusade v narod" of the narodnik idealists in 1874, the revolutionary Zemlia i Volia of 1877, and the Cherny Peredel and Narodnaya Volia of 1879.

Bazarov as a literary creation is both the continuation
and the culmination of efforts to create a hero worthy of
the strong heroines found in his four greatest novels. This
effort began with the character of Rudin (Rudin, 1856) and
continued with Lavretsky (A Nest of the Gentry, 1859),
Insarov (On the Eve, 1860), and, finally, Bazarov. All four
of these characters fail, at least outwardly in the context
of the novel; all four are victims of fate in that each sac-
rifices his individual happiness to the dictates of a higher
will, "a greater law of humanity," and in all four cases, a
love affair plays the key role as far as personal failure is
concerned, as if fulfilling the Turgenevian belief that "love
is an illness that upsets the balance of health in man's
organism." We must concede that all four represent "super-
fluous men" in the tradition of Eugene Onegin in that each
caracter's aspirations, borne of an intellect fully capable
of analyzing the conditions surrounding him, are stifled by
society and disillusionment gives way to indifference, action
to impotence. But in spite of the fact that none of these
four really accomplish anything in the larger scheme of
things, they still preserve the purity of the ideas which
they champion. As Freeborn puts it: "Rudin, Lavretsky,
Insarov, and Bazarov all aspire to put their ideas to the
service of ideals that transcend the personal and all of
them appear to fall short of their ideals while succeeding
in justifying by their personal example the worth of their
ideas."

The fact that Rudin is all word and no deed, that he
possesses the gift of poetic eloquence for propagating new ideas but no capability to put them into practice, does not alter the validity of those ideas. And we can never doubt the sincerity of his words about love, even though he does not possess the instinct for love (interestingly, Bazarov possesses the instinct but not the words). He remains faithful to his principles, even though he is too weak to propagate them; "in nineteenth-century Russia he was simply superfluous, a social phenomenon for which Russian society could offer no place."6

Lavretsky is also as superfluous as Rudin; the difference is that Rudin was not capable of doing anything, whereas Lavretsky, whether due to his unbalanced education or otherwise, cannot figure out what needs to be done. His idea of a rapprochement with the soil, with Mother Russia, is above reproach, but Lavretsky does not know how to effect this rapprochement. He is doomed to stand by as a spectator, to stand aside for another generation, to gaze whimsically at the young people.

Insarov's conception as a revolutionary patriotically coming to the rescue of his native land is a sound idea in theory, but in execution Insarov is also superfluous, both as an individual and as a revolutionary. As an individual, he is greatly overshadowed by the strength of character of Yelena and as a revolutionary, he is never effectual and his revolutionary activities are scarcely more than a sideline. Still, the idea of freeing one's country from foreign
domination, or as applied to Russia, from the economic and political exploitation of the autocracy and its associated mechanism, remains a worthy idea.

All of these characters are compromised personally and the villains are their inherent weakness, susceptibility to emotional entanglements, and their inability to cope with the circumstances which they, as strangers, encounter in the environment into which they enter. But even if they were capable of overcoming these obstacles, it would still seem that there are inevitable laws at work which tend to prevent the achievement of personal happiness. And it seems that even the voluntary renunciation of personal happiness, as in Bazarov's case, is not enough to placate the Fates and permit implementation of "the greater law of humanity," even though its ideal remains intact. Rudin can only yearn for the achievement of some vague ideals of "Religion, progress, humanity," Lavretsky can only yearn for an enlightened Russia of which he could truly become a son, and Insarov can only yearn for the heady success of revolution.

And, so, Bazarov, too goes to his death having failed in his efforts to fulfill his yearnings, yet his failures have not dimmed the purity of purpose of his yearnings. And his yearnings hold more significance than those of the other three characters we have mentioned because they transcend topical Westernist and Slavophile issues, vague idealism, and political agitation. Bazarov's yearnings embrace universal issues like the essential isolation of the human being and
his efforts to effect true communication with his fellows. And once again we must conclude that absolute truth is unattainable, and, indeed, even undesirable, although Turgenev's great hero makes a strong case for such an ideal society in which candor, straightforwardness, and greater equality would hold sway. But Bazarov, like all the Catskij and Alcestes of this world, was doomed to failure from the very beginning, but we must also give him credit for refusing to yield the strength of his convictions, even though he was forced to yield to the consequences of them. There is no doubt that "Bazarov is quite as superfluous as Rudin" and all of Turgenev's other superfluous men, in the last analysis, but he still remains "the truest and most significant creation of Turgenev's genius," because he represents that rare man who strives to be all that he possibly can, even though he senses his ultimate failure, and realizes that everyone about him is content to settle for much less.
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