Chapter Two
Rudin

2.1 Introduction

While describing my model for the analysis of Turgenev’s novels in the previous chapter, I noted that in his first novel, Rudin (Рудин - 1856), the mechanisms of narrative and verbal art, as generators of textual meaning, functioned somewhat differently from what the model suggested. In Rudin, the image of the hero, as provided by the information on the narrative art level and as suggested through verbal art associations, is not a twofold one. As I have explained, it is a characteristic of Turgenev’s novels that, through narrative art, a perspective on the hero is created that connects the course of his life to his personal circumstances (the contemporary milieu, his social and cultural background, his psyche and the like), while the network of associations in the verbal art structure suggests links between the personality and fate of the hero, on the one hand, and those of (arche)types on the other. The verbal art associations hint at the existence of irrational, cosmic forces (presenting themselves in the form of destructive passion, supernatural events and death) that govern the life of the hero. In line with these different perspectives, opinions as to the hero’s superfluity will also differ. The logical-causal orientation of the narrative art structure suggests that the basis of superfluity lies in contemporary (social, cultural) or otherwise concrete features of the specific hero (psychological flaws, for instance). The verbal art associations, by contrast, suggest that superfluity is inherent in man’s life since he is doomed to repeat the fate of other men and faces the inescapable destruction of his individuality.

In Rudin, the archetypal element is hardly developed at all, and there is very little allusion to a cosmic basis for superfluity. Instead, the novel focuses on the presentation of the hero as a typical example of the superfluous man of the forties, and provides an overview of the significance of this type within the contemporary framework of Russian society. In my approach to the novel, I shall argue that its structure as a whole is geared towards the presentation of a complex image of Rudin as superfluous ‘hero of his time’, and that both narrative and verbal art cooperate in this aim. This means that these two separate generators of textual meaning are not differentiated as clearly as will be the case in the later novels. My analysis of Rudin will be adjusted to the novel’s specific structure and will thereby deviate from the analyses of the other novels. As will be clear by now, this will not provide a satisfying illustration of the application of the model I described in Chapter One, but its inclusion should still be of interest because Rudin occupies an important position in the development of Turgenev’s dual world view, as presented in the novels.

Rudin, being the first novel, stands at the beginning of this development. As has been noted before by Bjalyj (Bjalyj 1962: 62-68) among others, the novel’s focus on the portrayal of the superfluous man as contemporary (and temporary) type makes it reminiscent of the character sketches of the superfluous man in Turgenev’s short prose works of the forties and fifties, including “Diary of a superfluous man” (“Дневник лишнего человека” – 1850), “Jakov Pasynkov” (“Яков Пасынков” - 1855) and “A Correspondence” (“Переписка” - 1856). Rudin has the same basic characteristics that the heroes in these stories display. Like them, he was raised in the philosophical milieu of German Romanticism; he lacks a practical view on life, and is unable to love. Moreover, as is also the case in these short prose works, in Rudin the hero’s psychological weakness is revealed through his relation to the heroine. The
hero cultivates his feelings for the heroine, but is unable or unwilling to give his love a serious or tangible form.

Unlike the short prose, however, *Rudin* also provides an overview of the social significance of the superfluous man – of his place within Russian history. This is a major development from the preceding short stories, and *Rudin* considerably exceeds these in the range of its interests. Furthermore, the structure of the plot and the character types accord with the basic schemes for all of Turgenev’s novels that have been identified by Peterson and Gippius (see 1.4).²¹

The social engagement of the novel is enhanced by the final scene in which Rudin dies on the barricades in Paris during the 1848 revolt. Turgenev added this scene for the 1860 edition of his work. It is reasonable to speculate that Turgenev wanted to make the social concerns of the novel more pronounced, thereby confirming its status as a novel, which would also explain why, for this edition, he had *Rudin* and the two ensuing novels, *A Nest of Gentry* and *On the Eve*, bound together in a single volume.

Richard Freeborn has argued that the added scene gives a revolutionary dimension to the hero. He states that Turgenev thus created “the first true Russian revolutionary in Russian literature” and “was also redeeming the reputation of his own older generation” (Freeborn 1982: 14). However, the scene cannot remove all doubts about Rudin’s (positive) nature, nor, so it seems, was it intended to do this. The description of his behavior (appearing on an already deserted barricade with a dull, crooked sabre) underscores its senseless nature. At the same time it hints at the very heart of Rudin’s being. His world is one of symbols and symbolic behavior²² (of which his appearance on the barricade is the ultimate example), just as he is himself a symbol of the generation of the superfluous man. Rudin’s depiction in the scene underscores the senseless character of his actions. Had he really turned into a revolutionary, then he would no longer be a superfluous man. However, it is more in tune with the novel’s overall tone to regard Rudin’s appearance in Paris as a final desperate attempt to move from words to deeds. From his last encounter with Ležnev, we know that there have been earlier attempts, and, far from hinting at a change in Rudin towards the revolutionary, his senseless death simply serves to underline their lack of success.

In my analysis of *Rudin*, I shall explore the idea that the novel gives an assessment of the superfluous man of the forties, both as a psychological type and as a social type. The development of the hero, as the novel progresses, is geared towards the presentation of both these aspects. I shall discuss this in the next paragraph, where I shall examine the image of the hero on the contemporary level of the text. I shall argue that the novel starts from a portrayal of Rudin that is akin to that of Turgenev’s short prose of that period. It draws a picture of the superfluous man as psychological type, whose weakness is illustrated by means of a love story in which he is afraid to take decisive steps. In *Rudin*, the focus then shifts to the question of the social significance of this type: has the superfluous man in any respect contributed to the benefit of future Russia? This question first arises in the form of Rudin’s

²¹ In this connection, it is interesting to note that, in the first instance, Turgenev designated *Rudin* not as ‘novel’ but as ‘povest’ (a term that can be used to designate both short stories and longer prose works such as novelettes). It must be said that Turgenev often referred to his novels as povesti (повесть, большая повесть) while working on the manuscripts (see Batjuto 1972: 244-250 for a possible pattern in Turgenev’s use of different terms), but only in the case of *Rudin* did he hesitate to label it a novel for a long time, even after its publication. In the 1860 edition of Turgenev’s work, *Rudin* appeared in one volume with the ensuing novels *A Nest of Gentry* and *On the Eve*. However, in the three following editions of 1865, 1869 and 1874, he placed in one volume together with the novella’s and short stories of the fifties. Only in the 1880 edition of the novels did Turgenev definitely include *Rudin* as the first of the novels.

²² The role of symbols will be examined in detail during the course of my analysis.
personal account of the activities he has tried to develop, and second in the form of his friend Ležnev’s more general remarks about the strong and weak sides of people like him.

My approach to the novel is based on the idea that the theme (that is, the assessment of the superfluous man) is stressed through the textual composition as a whole, including elements of the plot structure, the narrative perspective and the means of characterization through the mechanisms of narrative and verbal art. Before discussing aspects of the narrative perspective and characterization, I shall consider those elements of the plot structure that are relevant in this respect.

As far as plot structure is concerned, the introduction of the hero is of special interest. Rudin first appears as a stranger when nearly all the other characters have gathered and are awaiting the arrival of a baron, who fails to appear. Only Ležnev is missing. As he happens to be the only one who has met Rudin before, it seems that his absence in this scene is designed to ensure that Rudin appears as a sort of mystery guest. Everybody wants to know who he is. This question – “Who is he?” – becomes the main focus of the novel. Almost every scene in the novel comprises either a discussion between Rudin and another character about his views concerning life, or a discussion among the other characters about the personality of Rudin. There are very few events. Of those that there are, the most important is the development and outcome of the relationship between Rudin and Natal’ja. Conversation takes up most of the content of this novel, and so character is revealed, not through events but through words. In none of the later novels does assessment of the hero depend to such an extent upon discussion about him, nor does any other hero speak so elaborately about his own ideas about the significance of his life. Only in Virgin Soil, where the hero, Neždanov, continually ponders the discrepancy between the person he longs to be and the person he is, do we find anything remotely similar.

The stress on dialogue as the main instrument in the assessment of Rudin accounts for the limited importance of more indirect means of rendering character, particularly verbal art. The characterization of Rudin depends for the most part upon narrative art mechanisms, and verbal art associations, where they occur, do not provide a substantially different or more complete image. This agreement is fairly uncharacteristic of Turgenev’s method of rendering character. As was noted by Sander Brouwer in his survey of the depiction of character in Turgenev’s short prose, an important characteristic of that method is that “explicit psychology is subordinated to the psychology suggested by the artistic texture” (Brouwer 1996: 263). This is as true of the novels as it is of the short prose, which is why, in my model of analysis, I have formulated that the image of the hero is twofold, based on both explicit psychology through narrative art and more implicit means of characterization through verbal art.

Rudin thus presents an exception to the usual schemes of presentation of character in Turgenev’s novels. In Rudin it is ‘explicit psychology’ that plays the major role, but this should not be taken to mean that the reader is presented with an unequivocal portrait of Rudin. The point is that the narrator’s statements about the hero are very concise. He describes Rudin’s outward appearance upon his introduction in Chapter III, and on several occasions speaks about Rudin’s gift of speech, but even on these occasions his position remains close to that of an observer. The portrait of Rudin depends almost entirely on the information provided by his own words (about life in general and the meaning of his own life in particular) and by what the other characters say about him. This latter information is clearly colored by the personal views of these characters, whose opinions are widely

---
23 The narrative perspective and characterization on the contemporary level are dealt with in paragraph 2.2. The paragraphs that follow that deal with verbal art associations.
divergent. Some think he is a genius; others think he is merely a gifted speaker, but with little real content; some think he misleads people; others are convinced of his candor, and so on.

Furthermore, a number of characters change their opinions of Rudin during the course of the novel. Natal'ja is completely disillusioned when she discovers that his poetic words about love do not reflect real love in him. Her reason for changing her opinion of Rudin is clear; not so Ležnev’s change of opinion. Ležnev at first declares that Rudin is a play actor who cares far more about himself than about others. Since Ležnev is Rudin’s old friend, and knows a lot about his background, his account at first seems to provide reliable information about Rudin. However, in the novel’s last chapter, before the epilogue, Ležnev states that he has done Rudin wrong in his earlier statements, and he then gives a far more sympathetic judgment. In effect, everything he has said (both negative and the positive) is now stigmatised as a personal judgment. Since Ležnev’s account is the only source of information regarding Rudin’s background – including where he was raised, his student years, and his behavior in the philosophical circle of which he and Ležnev were both part – all this information is now similarly tainted and misses the objective tone that usually characterizes the Turgenevan narrator.

I would argue that this method of characterization is a device that Turgenev uses to make Rudin’s portrait complex. What the novel communicates is that the superfluous man, of whom Rudin is a representative, cannot easily be assessed or judged. Owing to the remote position of the narrator, and the varied and unreliable views of the characters, the reader is never presented with a complete portrait of him, let alone enabled to make a final judgment. Even at the end of the novel, he is left only with a multifaceted image of this superfluous man. Returning to the role of verbal art, I would suggest that its associations in Rudin function in support of this notion of multifaceted characterization. In my analysis of the novel, I shall identify two motifs whose functions can be described in these terms – ‘ice and fire’, and ‘fruitfulness’ versus ‘fruitlessness’. Through his own words and those of others, Rudin is associated with each of these opposite traits.

Apart from these associations, there are also some that have a different effect, linking Rudin’s personality and fate to those of (archetypal types. These associations suggest a possible archetypal basis for Rudin’s superfluity. First, Rudin is associated with Don Quixote, the archetypal enthusiast who lacks the rational gift to act purposefully. Turgenev’s description of Don Quixote as a basic human type in his essay “Hamlet and Don Quixote” (see also 1.1) is of much interest in this respect.24 I will deal with this association in paragraph 2.5. Second, there is the motif of fierce and/or predatory animals versus meek animals. Like the previous motif, it hints at possible inherent, features, not contemporarily defined, that determine a person’s fate. These images will be dealt with in paragraph 2.6.

Before moving on to a discussion of the verbal art associations in the novel, I will outline the contemporary image of Rudin’s character, and look in closer detail at the specifics of characterization in this novel that I have touched upon above.

2.2 The contemporary level

Lev Pumpjanskij has described Rudin as a cultural-heroic novel ("культурно-героический роман" - Pumpjanskij 2000: 390), a term which implies that the “main actions of the hero are determined by the cultural environment of which he is part” ("обусловленность сюжетных

24 The essay was published in 1860, some years after the appearance of Rudin, but Turgenev had been considering writing it since at least 1850, as becomes clear from his correspondence (see the commentary in PSS VIII, 553).
действий героя типом культуры, которой он принадлежит” – idem, 391). This environment is indicated by means of detailed information about the intellectual horizon of the hero, the books he reads and the ideas that have influenced him. In Rudin, the reader is indeed provided with such information about the hero. He grew up during the heyday of Romanticism. He spent a year in Heidelberg and, as his long-time friend Ležnev later declares, he used to attend nightly philosophical meetings of students at the house of the Romantic pur-sang Pokorskij. Whereas Ležnev looks upon these meetings as a beautiful memory, but one that is no longer real, Rudin is still full of the ideas and terminology that he gained during this period. His words betray his idealism, and his speech is full of comparisons. The reader is told that he is fully engrossed in German Romantic literature and philosophy. He reads Novalis, Hoffman and Goethe’s Faust with Natal’ja (VI, 290).

As Pumpljanskij remarks, this form of characterization distinguishes Rudin from the later novels of Turgenev (ibid.). Only in Fathers and Sons are elements of this cultural characterization again found. Bazarov’s materialist ideas are highly determinative for his image. He advises Nikolaj Petrovič to read Büchner instead of Puškin. Puškin and Büchner become icons of the two generations in the novel, Puškin standing for the romanticism of the elder brothers Kirsanov while Büchner stands for the materialism of the younger generation.

This cultural portrait explains Rudin’s behaviour, but only up to a certain point in the novel. It can account for the impression Rudin makes on the other characters, and it motivates his behaviour towards Natal’ja. This part of the novel, leading up to Rudin’s departure from the house of Dar’ja Lasunskaja, is strongly reminiscent of Turgenev’s short stories concerning superfluous types, and demonstrates the hero’s psychological deficiencies in his confrontation with the wholehearted character of the heroine. However, Rudin’s image becomes more complex as a result of the ensuing developments. After Rudin has left the estate, he is characterised no longer as a gifted man of words (a typical Romantic idealist), but rather as an unsuccessful man of deeds. In an interpretation of Rudin’s character that fits the general image of the superfluous man, Ležnev declares that Rudin “is a genius”, but “will never achieve anything” (“Гениальность в нем, пожалуй, есть (...) Он не сделает сам ничего” - 348). However, in Rudin is depicted in the epilogue as a man who does act, but not purposefully, and so he remains sadly unsuccessful. Rudin and Ležnev meet at a post station, and Rudin tells Ležnev of several attempts he has made to achieve practical results, including a project to make a river navigable (360). The final scene of the novel, in which Rudin dies on the barricades in Paris, adds still further to the complexity of Rudin’s image. It portrays him as someone who is prepared to die for an ideal, which is a long way from the general image of the superfluous man. Rudin’s earlier verbal defense of ideals has now developed into a physical defense of an ideal that has materialized in the form of revolution. What began as a generalised image of the superfluous man has developed into a more complex psychological image of a type of man who feels a basic need for some higher cause in life. That need underlies both his verbal defense of ideals, a prominent aspect of his early image, as well as a somewhat more positive type than the earlier superfluous heroes. In a reaction to the novel in Library for Reading A.I. Ryžov stated that Rudin was a step away from “those who are affected by the moral illness of the age” (“нравственно больных недугом века личностей”– quoted from PSS 573), presumably regarding Rudin as less superfluous than his predecessors. Černyševskij, though maintaining that the type that Rudin represented was one of the past, nevertheless argued that these men had played an important role as they “prepared the road” for the next generation (“проложивших ему [новому поколению – МО] дорогу” - idem, 575).

These reactions bear witness to the fact that Rudin was initially seen more as a forerunner of the new generation, even though his superfluity was, for all parties, beyond dispute.
and his attempts to materialize such ideals. With the addition of features that are new and unexpected, the static and unified 'cultural' image of Rudin is supplanted with one that is increasingly complex.

Interestingly, this development is accompanied by a change in Ležnev’s evaluation of Rudin’s personality. Ležnev’s assessment of Rudin carries considerable weight throughout the novel. First, he gives an interpretation of Rudin’s character on the basis of his experiences of Rudin’s behavior in the past. His verdict at this point is very negative. He describes him as a cold and unnatural person who needlessly hurts peoples’ feelings. In the final chapter of the novel (the events of which take place two years after Rudin has left the estate), he once more discusses Rudin’s character. By this time, his attitude has undergone a remarkable change. He defends Rudin against the cynical remarks of Pigasov, praising his sincere enthusiasm for the inspiration that it had given to others (348-349). In the epilogue, where he meets Rudin again and hears about his unsuccessful projects, he feels sorry for him and tries to convince him that his life is not as useless as he thinks it is.

The complexity of Rudin’s character is further supported by the diversity of opinions of him that are expressed by the other characters. There is a chorus of differing and changing opinions of the hero, with no final word from the narrator. There is no telling which opinion is ‘right’. It is not only the character of Rudin that is affected by this difficulty, however. He is not the only character who is ultimately more complex than initial characterization might lead us to expect. The seemingly timid Natal’ja, for example, proves to be full of determination when she is confronted with Rudin’s lack of backbone; the shy and ever silent Volyncev becomes agitated in confrontation with Rudin, and the phlegmatic Ležnev reveals a more passionate side to his nature in his desire to win Aleksandra Pavlovna’s hand (see also 2.3).

Moreover, on several occasions in the novel, people appear to be mistaken in their judgments about others. Natal’ja’s mother, for instance, sees no harm in allowing her daughter to spend a great deal of time with Rudin because she thinks that Natal’ja’s fondness for him is simply that of a little girl. The narrator informs us that she is mistaken in this and points out that Natal’ja is falling in love with Rudin (289). Natal’ja is herself mistaken about Rudin, as is Ležnev, though in his case it is because he judges him too negatively. There are several other instances that I shall deal with in the paragraph about ice and fire associations, but all these mistaken judgments of character combine to show how little value such judgment may have. Rudin presents us with more than an assessment of the superfluous man; it also presents an assessment of the process of assessment itself, in other words, a judgment of judgment.

We see this most obviously in the scene in which Rudin sits with Dar’ja Lasunskaja and is asked to judge some of the other characters. She is delighted by Rudin’s quick analyses, but her appraisals contain expressions that suggest a negative view of judgment. When Rudin has given her his view on Pigasov’s character, for example, she exclaims: “Voilà, m-r Pigassoff enterré” (273). Somewhat later, Ležnev arrives to see Dar’ja Lasunskaja, and she insists that Rudin remain in the room to form a judgment on Ležnev as well: “I want you to judge him too, as you did with Pigasov. When you speak, vous gravez comme avec un burin” (‘я желаю, чтобы вы и его определили, как Пигасова. Когда вы говорите, vous gravez comme avec un burin’ - 275). Later still, Ležnev observes to Aleksandra Pavlovna that Rudin has the “habit of pinning down every phenomenon of life with a word, as one pins down a butterfly” (“привычки каждое движение жизни […] пришпиливать словом, как бабочку булавкой” - 302). The first and last of these comparisons certainly indicate a destructive aspect of judgment. The criticism does not only help to characterize Rudin; in the light of the
overall assessment theme of the novel, it also makes a negative judgment of the very activity of judging people.

Before we conclude this discussion of the presentation of character on the contemporary level in relation to the idea of assessment and judgment, there are some points that need to be made with regard to the position of the narrator. In general, he refrains from making direct judgments. It is only when the flat characters Pigasov and Dar’ja Lasunskaja are introduced that the narrator provides an assessment, and then it is from an omniscient perspective. His portrait of Natal’ja at the beginning of Chapter V, by contrast, comprises little more than a description of her outward appearance and a summary of the opinions that her teacher and her mother have of her. Although the narrator tells us that Dar’ja Lasunskaja is mistaken about her daughter, he never offers an alternative analysis of Natal’ja’s character or feelings. After the last meeting of Rudin and Natal’ja at the Avduchin pond, the narrator appears to provide a description of Natal’ja’s state of mind, but he continually lapses into general remarks regarding first experiences of disappointment in love, and what actually takes place within Natal’ja’s consciousness remains a secret.

In general the narrator seems very reluctant to comment on the characters’ inner life. Although he sometimes apparently has access to the characters’ thoughts (he tells us, for instance that Rudin felt ashamed about his visit to Volyncev – 318), his usual perspective is that of a remote observer. His reluctance to analyze character, or to judge people, contrasts with the frequent attempts of the characters in the novel to do so. As far as the psychology of the characters is concerned, his reticence hints at the ultimate impossibility of looking into the depths of the soul. In this light, the readiness to judge that is shown by the characters themselves appears as misplaced. It is telling that the narrator does not provide a final evaluation of who Rudin actually is. As I have said, his portrait is characterized by its very complexity. The same is true, though to a more limited extent, of the portrayal of the other characters. Indeed, it is an inherent feature of the portrayal of human character in Rudin. The assessment of the superfluous man thus becomes the springboard for a discussion of the question as to whether one can really obtain insight into another’s psyche.27

The respective positions of both the characters and the narrator regarding assessment, together with the ambivalence of the portraits of a number of the characters themselves, can be read as devices of characterization that hint at the essentially enigmatic nature of man’s psychology. All of this highlights one of Turgenev’s basic convictions about man. It is this conviction that has prompted his artistic choices for the rendering of the human psyche. His use of verbal art mechanisms, allowing for the subtle interweaving and association of phenomena, fits such a deliberately remote approach to character. In the novels following Rudin, explicit characterization is often reduced in favor of an elaborate associative network.

In On the Eve, this device develops into a near-collapse of the motivational structure of the novel. The reader is confronted with motivational lacunae in the hero’s personality and fate that are due to a lack of direct information as to who he is. In Rudin, the verbal art associations function in an essentially different way in that they support the complexity that arises as a consequence of the dual function of character-opinion and narrative voice by associating individual characters with their opposing images. In the next two paragraphs, I explore two such associations.

27 This question also plays an important part in “First Love” (“Первая любовь” – 1860). The first-person narrator’s love for Zinaida, and his discovery of his father’s relationship with her, confront him not only with the power of emotion and the cruel aspects of love but also with the enigma of the human psyche. In many later love stories, the theme is revisited in the form of the enigmatic woman whose advent changes the hero’s life.
2.3 Ice and Fire

In the first chapter of the novel, Aleksandra Pavlovna and Ležnev discuss fire. Having met Ležnev in the fields, Aleksandra accuses him of addressing her “with a cold expression” (“с холодной миной” - 240), and their conversation continues as follows:

“A cold expression… You always want fire; but fire is no good. It flames up, smokes and goes out.”
“And gives warmth” – added Aleksandra Pavlovna.
“Yes… and burns.”
“Well, and what if it burns, that is not a disaster. Anyway it is better than…”
“Let us see if you would still be of that opinion if you were even once to thoroughly burn yourself” – Michajlo Michajlyč interrupted her fretfully.

This argument introduces ice (coldness) and fire as symbols of human characteristics, and begins a discussion as to which of the two is preferable. During the course of the novel, some characters are identified as “cold” and others as “ardent”, but it is interesting that, in all these cases, where one character ascribes coldness or aridity to another either there is a third who disagrees or the narrator observes that he or she is mistaken. Thus, Aleksandra Pavlovna maintains that Natal’ja has a cold nature, but Ležnev sees her as passionate and capable of irrational deeds, including trying to poison herself (303). Natal’ja’s mother is also mistaken about the character of her daughter: “Fortunately my Nataša has a cold nature, nothing like me” (“Наташа, у меня, к счастью, холодна, не в меня” - 280), but the narrator immediately informs us that she is wrong.

Ležnev even corrects Aleksandra Pavlovna on the subject of her own character. When she remarks: “To such a phlegmatic person as you are, even I must appear to be a volcano”, Ležnev answers: “Not really, and as far as character is concerned, fortunately you do not have character at all” (“Такому флегматику, как вы, пожалуй, и я покажусь вулканом”. – ‘Ну нет (…) А что до характера – у вас, слава богу, характера нет вовсе”’ - 303).

The same sort of ambivalence arises with regard to Rudin’s character. Ležnev declares that Rudin is “cold as ice” (“он холоден, как лед” – 293), at which Aleksandra Pavlovna expresses surprise: “He, such an ardent soul, cold as ice?” (“Он, эта пламенная душа, холоден!” – ibid.), to which Ležnev responds by claiming that Rudin only pretends to be ardent (“прикидывается пламенным” – ibid.) but is in fact as cold as ice.

These disagreements and misjudgments among the characters hint at two different things. First, their capacities to judge others, and therefore the value of their judgments, are limited. Second, human character is by nature enigmatic. An observer apparently cannot know what goes on inside another person when even such fundamentally different elements as ice and fire are difficult to distinguish in a single character.

In Rudin’s case, the ambivalence of character that arises in discussions among other characters is represented in his outward appearance. His “tanned face” (“смуглый” – 258) and dark hair, for example, in combination with his eyes that are “dark blue” with a “watery gleam” (“с жидким блеском в темно-синих глазах” – ibid.) suggests a mixture of the warm and the cold, and his other contradictory features include the fact that he is tall but walks with a stoop (“высокого роста, несколько сулутоватый” – ibid.) and has a “high pitched voice”
which is said to be “in disharmony with his height and broad chest” (“Тонкий звук голоса (...) не соответствовал его росту и его широкой груди” – ibid.).

Rudin’s outward appearance contrasts with that of Ležnev, who has a rather pale face with “pale gray, small eyes” and “a whitish moustache” (“Широкое [лицо – МО], без румянца, с небольшими бледно-серыми глазками и белесоватыми усами” - 239). Together with his grayish suit and “yellow” hair (“косицы жёлтых волос” – 241) sticking out from under his hat, he resembles, in the narrator’s words, a “large flour sack” (“большой мучной мешок” - ibid.). Ležnev’s character is in congruence with his looks: phlegmatic and unadorned. His name even suggests laziness (deriving from лентяй).28

Ležnev’s outward appearance communicates colorlessness. Although there is no ambivalence in his character traits, he does prove to have a more ardent side as the novel progresses. Ležnev tells Aleksandra Pavlovna that in his younger years he belonged to the same philosophical circle as Rudin, and was engaged in the romantic sphere that Rudin has never left. His account of the nights at Pokorskij’s, his attempts to write a play in the style of “Manfred” and his love for a young girl combine to give his personality more color. This is underlined by the narrator’s remark that, by the end of the story, “his colorless face had turned red” (“бесцветное его лицо раскраснелось” - 300). Ležnev’s literally gaining color symbolizes his figuratively doing so. As Aleksandra Pavlovna’s suitor, he also shows a more ardent side. Once he has heard of Rudin’s plans to marry Natal’ja, he suggests that Volyncev, Aleksandra Pavlovna and he go traveling together, and he promises Aleksandra Pavlovna that he will court her by organizing serenades and strewn flowers on the road (328). When Rudin has disappeared from the scene, Ležnev immediately proposes to Aleksandra Pavlovna. Admittedly, his proposal is somewhat prosaic, and he does not even kneel (despite his earlier claim that he would stand on his knees for days, if necessary), but when Aleksandra Pavlovna agrees, he kisses her maid out of pure joy (332).

Like Ležnev, Volyncev also gains color during the course of the novel. He does not easily express himself, and usually remains somewhat in the background, but the confrontation with Rudin forces him to take a stand, thereby bringing out a more active, even ardent side of his personality. His apparently-perpetual calm and restraint crumble as he observes Rudin’s increasing influence over Natal’ja, culminating in his sudden outburst against Rudin at the dinner table when he accuses him of denying others their own way of expressing themselves (309). When he subsequently challenges Rudin to a duel after hearing Rudin’s declaration of love for Natal’ja, Ležnev drops his pipe, and reacts: “My fellow, how colourful you are today!” (“Экой ты, брат, сегодня с колером!” – 328). Thus, Volyncev has figuratively gained color through his confrontation with Rudin. For both Volyncev and Ležnev, the appearance of Rudin is a more-or-less direct stimulation to reveal their feelings for the women they love. Although they seem rather pale in comparison to Rudin, they both show spirit in the end – but it is spirit of a different, more pragmatic kind.

We have already observed that ice and fire symbolically characterize Rudin’s outward appearance, but the same symbolism recurs in connection with the same of his words when, after Rudin has left the household of Dar’ja Lasunskaja, Basistov declares that “he changed you to the core and set you on fire” (“он до основания переворачивал, зажигал тебя” - 349). Fieriness of speech is also a characteristic of the Romantic Pokorskij, at whose house Rudin and Ležnev first met and whom Ležnev describes as the true example of a great idealist. He recalls that, when Pokorskij spoke, “he ignited all of us” (“он вздыхал нас всех огонь” - 298).

Rudin’s fiery words are seen as having both positive and negative effects by Aleksandra Pavlovna and Ležnev respectively. For her, Rudin’s enthusiasm warms and incites others, but he modifies her view by adding, “But it also burns”, and it is this effect that Natal’ja experiences.

Rudin himself uses the image of fire as a metaphor for his life, comparing himself to a lamp that has run out of paraffin and is broken (“масла в лампаде нет, и сама лампада разбита” - 365). Peter Thiergen has shown that a candle or a lamp often appears in emblem books as an image of sacrifice, with accompanying texts such as “Aliis in serviendo consumer” – I perish for the benefit of others (Thiergen 1978: 513). Rudin’s use of the image would therefore seem to be suggesting that he has enlightened and inspired others at the expense of burning himself out.

The effect of Rudin’s “fire” remains limited, however. This is symbolically expressed in Natal’ja’s reaction to Rudin’s farewell letter, which is to burn it and throw the ashes out of the window. Once it has become clear to her that Rudin’s words will never develop into deeds, they are no longer of any value to Natal’ja. Symbolically she sets fire to them, and they go up in smoke.

Taking into account all these aspects of the ice and fire symbolism, it can be said to have two effects. First, it hints at the general unfathomability of human character. All characters that are associated with ‘ice’ or ‘fire’ (that is, ‘coldness’ or ‘ardency’) appear at some point to possess the opposite trait as well. Second, in specific connection with the assessment of Rudin’s personality, it hints at the inherent ambiguity of his character and, consequently, at the difficulty of assessing it.

2.4 Fruit bearing similes

Contrary to the ice and fire imagery discussed above, the fruit bearing similes apply only to Rudin, and it is he who mainly uses them as characterizations of his life. Thus, Rudin points at an apple tree in the garden of the house and says: “do you see that apple tree: it has broken down under the weight and abundance of its fruit. A true emblem of a genius” (“видите вы эту яблоню: она сломилась от тяжести и множества своих собственных плодов” - 290). Peter Thiergen has pointed out that a picture of a tree breaking down under the abundance of its fruit commonly appeared in emblem books at that time, with texts such as “Timenda nimia foecunditas” (A fruitfulness that is too big, is harmful) (Thiergen 1978: 515).

Thiergen has also discussed two related images that appear in Rudin – those of a fruitless tree, and of a seed that has yet to sprout, the corresponding texts in Rudin being: “An egoistic person withers away like a lonely, fruitless tree” (Rudin’s words to Pigasov - “Себялюбивый человек засыхает словно одинокое, бесплодное дерево” - 267), and “I will see no fruit from my seed” (Rudin’s words in his valedictory letter to Natal’ja “я не увижу плодов от семян своих” - 337). Thiergen argues that these images, together with that of the oil lamp mentioned above, provide insight into the question of who the hero is (“einen Schüssel zum

29 In this connection Thiergen notes that one such book of emblems, Symbola et Emblemata in the edition by Maksimović-Ambodik, was part of Turgenev’s personal library. Interestingly, the emblem of the oil lamp does not occur in this book (according to its reproduction of 1989, edited by Anthony Hippisley). Instead, the image of a bridge accompanies the text “Aliis in serviendo consumer” (picture no. 604).

30 As was the case with the image of the oil lamp (see the previous note), the picture of the tree breaking down under the weight of its own fruit is not found in Ambodik’s collection. Instead, a tree is featured that sheds its leaves, with the accompanying text (in the Russian reading): “множество мне вредить. Великое изобилие меня погубляет” (picture no. 379).
Verständnis der Romanhelden” – Thiergen 1978: 516). For him, the image of the tree that breaks down under the weight of its own fruit has “apologetic power” (“apologetische Kraft” – ibid.) and puts Rudin’s superfluity in a different perspective. He does not see an opposition between this image and that of the lonely fruitless tree, but suggests instead that Rudin turns into such a fruitless tree after he has turned down Natal’ja, who was prepared to give him the support he needed because of his excessive fruitfulness (idem, 515-16). Thiergen thus interprets the fruitless tree as one that has lost its fruit owing to its abundance. I do not think that such an interpretation is very logical; it seems much more likely that the fruitless tree has never produced any fruit than that it has become fruitless by the loss of its fruit.

Apart from considerations of what seems likely, though, the association of Rudin with a fruitless tree that withers away is indeed suggested at another point in the novel by more indirect means. The image is called to mind by the setting of Rudin’s meeting with Natal’ja at the Avdjuchin pond. Near the pond, that has itself long since dried out, stands an oak forest that has “dried out and died” (“дубового леса, давно вымершего и засохшего” – 320). The trees that make up this forest are described as resembling “sad ghosts” (“высиялись какими-то унылыми призраками”) and “evil old men” (“злые старики” - ibid.). They call to mind the image of the fruitless tree in Rudin’s earlier comparison, and his egoistic behavior in turning down Natal’ja at this location associates him with the egoistic man who, in his own words, resembles such a tree.

The rest of the setting is similarly suggestive of deathliness. The place is described as “empty and bare, but nevertheless wild and gloomy, even on a sunny day” (“пустое и глохое, но глухое и мрачное даже в солнечный день” - 320). When Rudin has turned Natal’ja down, he is left alone in this deserted place. The scene symbolises what is missing, not solely in the relationship between Rudin and Natal’ja, but in Rudin’s life generally. He is left alone to wither away like the lonely tree that he has already described. In this connection, it is worth remembering that Rudin’s speech has previously been compared to a river: “His words began to flow like a river” (“слова его полились рекою” - 283). When it comes to action, Rudin more closely resembles the landscape of the Advjuchin pond, of which only the name remains to remind visitors of the water that was once found there.

The debacle of the relationship between Rudin and Natal’ja contrasts with those that develop among several of the other characters. By the end of the novel, Ležnev and Volyncev are each happily married (to Anna Pavlovna and Natal’ja respectively), while Rudin remains alone. These contrasting situations also hint at Rudin’s ultimate fruitlessness. A similar contrast between the hero and a number of the other characters is also found in two of Turgenev’s other novels. In Fathers and Sons, the two generations of Kirsanovs are depicted in marital bliss while Bazarov’s possible relationship with Odincova has been annulled, and he himself has died. In Virgin Soil, Neždanov goes so far as to renounce all claims to the heroine, Marianna, so that she can marry Solomin.

There are several other fruit-bearing and related images that have not been mentioned by Thiergen. I shall first list them and then discuss them in the light of the complexity of Rudin’s character. First, in his ‘rehabilitation speech’ in chapter XII, Ležnev says of Rudin: “Who has the right to say that his words did not drop many good seeds in the souls of young people?” (“кто вправе сказать (...) что его слова не заронили много добрых семян в молодые души” - 348). Second, in his description of Rudin at a post station, in a scene that immediately follows the speech of Ležnev, the narrator tells us how Rudin’s traits have changed: “His blossoming time had passed; as gardeners say: he had run to seed.” (“Пора его цветения прошла: он как выражаются садовники, пошёл в семя” - 353). Third, in the epilogue, Rudin appears to have busied himself with agronomy, trying to cultivate the poor and fruitless grounds of a landlord in the Smolensk area (357-8). And finally, Ležnev
concludes that Rudin never “took root”, no matter how rich the soil he encountered (“не пускал корней” – 366), to which Rudin adds: “I was born a tumbleweed” (“Я родился перекати-полем” - ibid.). This last image carries the notion of homelessness, which is also sustained by the associations with wandering which I will discuss in paragraph 2.5.

When one takes all these references together, the composite image appears to be quite complex. On the one hand Rudin associates himself with a fruit-bearing tree, while on the other he complains that he will not see his seeds come to fruition. The last expression echoes the images of Rudin as one who is full of seed, and as a sower. The two groups of images suggest contrasting valuations of Rudin’s activities and the meaning of his life for society. The images of fruitbearing suggest both success that is visible during his life, and his own destruction as a result of that success. The associations of Rudin with a plant that has run to seed suggest that that result still lies ahead, in the future, which can itself be interpreted as an expression of the idea that the men of the forties did the intellectual groundwork for the revolutionary spirit of the sixties. Such an interpretation is further enhanced by the scene on the barricades that was added by Turgenev and clearly associates Rudin with revolutionary activity. I should add, however, that the text does not justify stretching these conclusions too far. The novel’s focus remains on the tragic side of Rudin – on his inability to lead a satisfying and meaningful life.

2.5 Traveling prince or wandering Don Quixote

When Rudin arrives at the house of Lasunskaja, he makes a deep impression on all present. On several occasions Rudin’s position is associated with that of an authority, and Ležnev uses a number of expressions that depict him as such. For example, he compares Rudin’s position in the house of Lasunskaja with that of a “grand vizier” (“он у неё теперь великим визирём” – 285); he calls him “a despot” (“деспот” - 293), an “idol” and “an oracle” (“что за роль его (…)? Быть идолом, оракулом” – 294), and he declares: “He reigns right now” (“теперь он царь” - 285). The reader is informed that, for Lasunskaja, daily conversations with Rudin have become a must: “She could not dispense with him anymore” (“Она не могла обойтись без него” - 287).

Rudin takes on a special role for Natal’ja too. She shares her thoughts with him and relies on his advice; he becomes “her teacher and her guide” (“он был ее наставником, ее вождем” - 290) and conducts her through the German romantic writers and philosophers in a sort of magical excursion: “Rudin was all engrossed in German poetry, in the world of German Romanticism and philosophy, and enticed her after him to these mysterious lands” (“Рудин был весь погружен в германскую поэзию, в германский романтический и философический мир и увлекал ее за собой в те заповедные страны” - 290).

Once Lasunskaja has heard of his relationship with Natal’ja, Rudin’s position in the house radically changes. He ceases to be referred to in terms of an authority or ruler. He exchanges his position as “almost the master of the house” for that of “a guest” (“Он сел, но уже не как прежний Рудин, почти хозяин в доме, (…) а как гость” - 333). This indicates not only his loss of authority, but also his loss of a home. Whereas the master of a house has the right of permanent residence there, a guest will sooner or later be expected to leave.

The image of Rudin as wanderer is sustained by a number of associations throughout the novel. In the first place, he describes himself as a homeless wanderer. Even when his position in the Lasunskaja household is still promising, he tells Natal’ja that “all that is left for me now is to drag myself along the hot and dusty road from one post station to another in a jolty carriage” (“Мне остается теперь тащиться по энной и пыльной дороге, со станций до
станици, в тряской телеге” - 306). Later, when he is forced to leave the estate, he associates himself with Don Quixote. He quotes the words about the importance of freedom that Don Quixote utters upon leaving the palace of countess, and then adds: “What Don Quixote experienced back then, I am experiencing now” (“Что Дон-Кихот чувствовал тогда, я чувствую теперь” - 335-6). In the epilogue Rudin further associates himself with the “Wandering Jew” (“Вечным Жидом” - 367).

These images of Don Quixote and the Wandering Jew, who are condemned to wander from one place to another, suggest a sharp contrast with Rudin’s position at the beginning of the novel when he is introduced as “a travelling prince” (“путешествующий принц” - 267). The image of the prince is that of a dignified traveler and is fully in accordance with associations of Rudin as an authority. The image of Don Quixote has the opposite implications: it associates Rudin with a somewhat ridiculous figure who has no dignity whatsoever. Whereas the “traveling prince” may be presumed to have a clear goal towards which he is heading, Don Quixote and the Wandering Jew have no such goal but travel aimlessly, needed by nobody. This change of image, from travelling prince to wandering Don Quixote, reflects the development of Rudin’s position in the course of the novel: at first sight he seemed a promising personality (a prince who might take the heroine with him to a better life), but in the end he appears as a ridiculous Don Quixote, sacrificing himself for vain purposes.

Rudin’s Quixotic features are further underlined by the slightly ridiculous nature of the projects about which he tells Ležnev in the epilogue. For instance, he tries to make a river navigable with no funds and the help of only one man. The senselessness of Rudin’s death on the barricades again calls to mind Don Quixote: the barricade is already deserted, and the crooked sabre he is waving could never have been an effective weapon against the guns of his adversaries.31

His being associated with Don Quixote throws a different light on Rudin’s fate. Don Quixote is the archetype of the non-rational enthusiast battling for his ideals. The link with this figure suggests a typicality that takes us beyond the embedding of Rudin’s personality in the culture of his time and place, in accordance with his narrative art portrait. On the basis of what we know of his background, Rudin’s lack of success could be read as a flaw that was endemic in his Romanticism, in which case his tragedy would simply reflect the inevitable fate of his ‘superfluous’ generation. However, the association with Don Quixote matches Rudin’s fate to that of the timeless type that Don Quixote represents. The implications of the association are all the more interesting in the light of Turgenev’s essay on Hamlet and Don Quixote, in which he presents Don Quixote as one of two basic human types. Rudin’s personality and fate thus take on a significance that stretches far beyond the tragedy of a superfluous generation, and points instead to the intrinsic tragedy of man’s intrinsically superfluous life.

Of added interest is the fact that critics have also discovered in Rudin features reminiscent of Hamlet. We might include among the relevant features his eloquence, self-knowledge and cold heart (Woodward 1989A: 60). It has even been suggested that the Rudin/Hamlet features are associated with the superfluous ‘men of the forties’, as opposed to the Quixotic ‘men of the sixties’ (Bjalyj 1962: 143). Nevertheless, it is Rudin’s affinity with Don Quixote that is

31 In the essay “Hamlet and Don Quixote”, Turgenev speaks of modern Don Quixotes whom he has seen “sacrificing their lives for equally unreal Dulcineas” (“умирающих за столь же мало существующую Дульцинею” - VIII, 181). In the commentary on the essay in PSS, it is suggested that Turgenev aims at those who sacrificed themselves for the revolutionary cause in 1848 (VIII, 553). In that light, the scene of Rudin’s death on the barricades (which Turgenev added in the year of the essay’s publication) may be read as a reinforcement of Rudin’s Quixotic character.
beyond dispute. I would prefer to see the combination of Hamlet and Don Quixote in Rudin’s portrait as yet another point of ambivalence in his characterization.

In addition to that, the combination also hints at a feature that Hamlet and Don Quixote have in common – their idealism. Both value what is good, and want to battle against all that threatens it. However, Hamlet’s reflectiveness leads him to doubt the usefulness of action, since evil is so omnipresent while goodness seems more like a mirage than a reality. Don Quixote battles against every apparent evil that he comes across, without ever questioning the usefulness of his deeds. Rudin lives by the idea lism that Hamlet and Don Quixote share, but he lacks both the cynicism of the one and the enthusiasm of the other. He is assured of the existence of both good and evil, and he dreams of doing good. He is convinced of his own powers, but lacks the drive to use them. As a consequence, he is melancholic throughout. His attempts finally to take action, that are not made until the end of the novel and lead ultimately to his death, have little to do with Don Quixote’s heedless actions. Rather, they are conscious attempts to turn idealism into tenable results, and they can achieve nothing but failure owing to the incompatibility of the elements that make up the complex character of Rudin himself.

2.6 Animal associations

The associations of Rudin with Don Quixote hint at a link between Rudin’s fate and that of an archetype. A similar effect arises from the network of animal associations in Rudin. Some characters are associated with predators, others with meek animals. Again, Rudin’s image is ambivalenent: he is associated with both. The associations suggest that Rudin, despite his own fieriness, is unable to defend himself against the attacks of other characters who are linked to predatory animals.

On the evening of his arrival at the estate of Lasunskaja, Rudin is associated with fierce animals on the basis of both his appearance and his behavior. His hair is compared to the mane of a lion (“встряхнув своей львиной гривой” - 282), and when he successfully outmanoeuvres the cynical Pigasov in a discussion, one of the spectators, Pandalevskij, encourages Rudin in silence: “Bite, bite, bite” (“кусь, кусь, кусь” – 261), invoking the image of an attacking dog.

Two other characters in the novel are also associated with predators. The first, Pigasov, resembles a wild animal through his tousled appearance (“взъерошенный” – 248) and “fox-like face” (“лисьё личи́ко” - 260). He is further associated with one through the words of Dar’ja Lasunskaja when, attempting to bring to an end to his openly patronizing remarks about women, she asks Pandalevskij to play the piano and adds: “Maybe, musical sounds will bring Afrikan Semjonyč to calm. After all Orpheus calmed wild animals” (“Ансьє, звуки музыки укротят Африкан Семечыч. Орфей укроцял же диких зверей” - 252). Pigasov’s first name, Afrikan, further underlines his association with something wild and untamed. Towards the end of the novel, when we meet some of the characters two years after Rudin has left, the narrator relates how Pigasov now hisses while speaking, thus “giving his speech an even more venomous tone” (“шипение придавало еще более ядовитости его речам” - 342). The association with a snake is clear.

As James Woodward has noted, the second of these two characters, Pandalevskij, also has snake-like qualities. He has the habit of staring at the person he is talking to (“вплівя́ться в нього глазами” - 242, Woodward 1990: 27), for example, and his speech has a hissing effect that is brought about by his constant use of the polite postfix –s, which he sometimes pronounces “like the English –th” (“да-с, присла-с – отвечал он, выговаривая букву ‘с’, как английское ‘th’ - 243). Unlike Rudin, however, he has additional associations with a cat.
Upon seeing a peasant girl in the fields, he approaches her “cautiously, like a cat” (“осторожно, как кот” - 245), and his fingernails, trimmed as they are in triangular form (“ногтями, остриженными треугольником” - 250), are reminiscent of a cat’s claws.

Both of these characters function as enemies to Rudin. A third character, Volyncev, appears at first as a meek animal, but as he becomes more hostile to Rudin, he too becomes associated with an aggressor. The situation develops as follows. As Rudin and Natal’ja become closer to one another, Volyncev retreats and is described as walking around “with the face of a sad hare” (“глядел грустным зайцем” - 303). When Rudin declares his love for Natal’ja, however, Volyncev is outraged and threatens to kill Rudin in a duel: “I will shoot him, that accursed philosopher, like a partridge” (“Я его, проклятого философа, как куропатку застрелю” - 328)."32

It seems, however, that Rudin’s defeat at the hands of Volyncev has already taken place. We are told that, after the dinner at Lasunskaja’s, during which Volyncev’s outburst against Rudin took place, “Rudin looked at him, but could not bear his look, turned away, smiled and did not say a word” (“Рудин посмотрел было на него, но не выдержал его взора, отворотился, улыбнулся и рта не разинул.” – 310). Volyncev is already the moral victor, and his change in position in relation to Rudin is underlined by the change in animal imagery from that of hunted animal – the hare – to that of the hunter who swears that he will hunt down Rudin.

During that same dinner scene, Pигasov concludes that Rudin is the weaker party, and does so in terms of animal categories. He has already compared people to dogs, dividing them into two categories: dogs with tails are self-confident, whereas bobtailed dogs lack confidence and will never be successful (309). After Volyncev’s outburst has reduced Rudin to silence, Pигasov concludes: “Aha! You are bobtailed as well!” (“Эге, да и ты куц!” – 310). By the end of the evening, Pигasov is also seen as having been victorious over Rudin: “Pигasov was the hero of the evening. Rudin left the battlefield to him.” (“Героем вечера был Пигасов. Рудин уступил ему поле сражения” – ibid.).

The third aggressor is Pandalevskij, but his position as confidant on the estate is in danger, and so he attacks in a much more subtle way. Of his behavior towards Rudin, we are told that he “carefully moved about him” (“осторожно за ним ухаживал” - 288). He displays the same careful behavior here as he did towards the peasant girl – that of a cat stealing up on its prey. There is also something cat-like about the way he hides in the lilacs when Rudin and Natal’ja declare their love in the arboretum, before telling Dar’ja Lasunskaja all about it and thus making Rudin’s position in the house impossible.

---

32 There are several other bird associations in connection with Rudin. On the evening of his arrival at Lasunskaja’s house, he relates what he calls a Scandinavian legend [as is noted in the commentary to the novel, Rudin is mistaken as to its origin: the legend is actually Anglo-Saxon – 579] about a bird flying into a hall where a king and his warriors have gathered round a fire. The bird flies out at the other end of the hall, and the king remarks that the bird is a symbol of man’s life, referring to the shortness of the time that the bird was in the light and warmth of the hall. One of the men, however, answers that the bird will find its nest in the darkness outside. It is not difficult to identify the symbolic overtones of this story in the context of the novel. Rudin himself is like the bird, flying into the warmth of the Lasunskaja household. He finds no nest there and is forced to move into the ‘darkness’ of the world outside (the inhospitable nature of which is suggested by the storm in the epilogue). Rudin’s entire life presents itself as a vain search for a nest. His restlessness contrasts to the settled life of Ležnev. During their last meeting, Ležnev offers Rudin his house as a place to go to, symbolically referring to it as a nest: “You always have a place, a nest, to flee to: my house”. (“У тебя всегда есть место, есть гнездо, куда ты можешь укрыться. Это мой дом.” – 367). In addition, Ležnev compares Rudin to a swallow for his light-hearted behavior: “Amidst of all sorts of misunderstandings and confusion, Rudin used to float like a swallow over a pond” (“носится, бывало, среди всякого рода недоразумений и путаницы, как ласточка над прудом” - 302).
The animal associations in *Rudin* link several characters, including Rudin himself, to predators. In the conflicts that arise during the course of the novel, Rudin loses his ascendancy when confronted by the aggression of the others. Pigasov’s differentiation between dogs with tails and bobtailed dogs, which eventually places Rudin in the second category, suggests that the degree of man’s success in life is predetermined by his nature. Rudin, because he is ‘bobtailed’, will never achieve anything. Indeed, in the conflicts that arise between him and the other predatory characters, it is always the others who win, and their predatory associations imply that these victories are due to their inherently aggressive natures. This division of the characters into the inherently successful and the inherently unsuccessful itself suggests that factors other than those that are contemporarily defined help to determine the lives of the characters.

### 2.7 Conclusions

*Rudin* primarily presents an assessment of the superfluous man as a historical phenomenon. The focus of the novel is on the question of who Rudin actually is and how his type is to be qualified. This constitutes the main theme of the novel. On the contemporary level, a complex image of the sources and implications of Rudin’s superfluity is created. Rudin’s portrait first resembles those of the psychological sketches of the superfluous man in Turgenev’s short stories, but during the course of the novel the focus shifts to the social implications of his superfluity. The judgments of Rudin’s personality by the other characters change accordingly. Ležnev, through whose eyes Rudin’s past and character are discussed, changes his opinion radically. He consistently judges Rudin as cold and selfish up to the point where he meets Rudin again and hears of his unsuccessful attempts at contributing actively towards Russia’s future, after which he reassesses Rudin as a limitedly useful type.

The associations of the verbal art level mainly emphasise the ambiguity of Rudin’s image. The development from negative to positive that arises in the contemporary image as a consequence of Ležnev’s changing attitude towards him is not reflected in the image of the verbal art level. The associations create a multifaceted image of Rudin’s personality, suggesting fiery as well as cold qualities, immense fruitfulness as well as utter fruitlessness, and the air of a prince as well as the pathetic life of a wandering Don Quixote.

The associations of Rudin with Don Quixote imply that he is a representative of this archetype of the enthusiast who is doomed to see his efforts go up in smoke. The associations of Rudin as the victim of predatory types suggest that his unsuccessful life is due to his inherent weakness. Both these groups of associations present a view of superfluity as a trait that is determined by causes that lie outside the specific cultural portrait of the characters and the socio-political circumstances they live in.

In the novels that follow, the depiction of the heroes on the contemporary and verbal art levels will more systematically highlight different views of the significance of their lives and the factors that influence them. The reader will also be confronted with a lack of motivation for the hero’s fate on the basis of the logical-causal development of the plot and the hero’s contemporary profile. This is not the case in *Rudin*. Rudin’s superfluity is beyond doubt even on the contemporary level. It is not a question of whether Rudin will prove to be a new active type of hero, but why he could not possibly have been one. In these novels, even though *A Nest of Gentry* still resembles *Rudin* in some respects, the hero is promising. He is no longer a representative of the superfluous type of the forties, and his contemporary characterization even presents features which are the opposite of those usually associated with the superfluous man. Insarov and Litvinov, for example, are non-contemplative and practical, as is Lavreckij,
who is struggling against what he sees as the deficiencies of his upbringing. Bazarov is rational, anti-idealistic. Thus there arises a discrepancy between the hero’s profile and his fate. In these cases, the verbal art associations suggest an explanation in the form of a more universally defined superfluity.

The notion of conflict between the individual’s ideas and expectations on the one hand and the laws of nature on the other, as well as the deeply tragic interpretation of the significance of man’s life that this entails, are not yet articulated in Rudin. The tragedy of Rudin’s life is presented as flowing mainly from his inability to move from words to deeds, either through psychological limitations or as a consequence of his circumstances. We can thus conclude that the roles of narrative and verbal art in creating two different views of the hero’s superfluity are not significant in the theme presented in Rudin. The tragic conflict between the individual and the cosmos will become thematic only in the later novels.