



Neither *Burgher*
nor *Barin*: An
Imagological and
Intercultural Reading
of Andrey Stoltz in
Ivan Goncharov's
Oblomov (1859)*

Ни бюргер, ни барин:
Имагологическая
интерпретация
Андрея Штольца
в романе
И. А. Гончарова
"Обломов" (1859)

Joshua S. Walker

Buckingham Browne & Nichols School
Cambridge, Mass.

Джошуа С. Уокер

Школа Букингем Браун и Николс
Кембридж, Массачусетс

Abstract

This article presents a reevaluation of Andrey Stolz as more than either a "weak point" in the novel or a "plot device" and "simple foil" to Oblomov (as D. Senese represents Dobrolyubov's position). I investigate the problematic nature of "Germaness" in the novel according to the Imagological methodology, and this allows me to explore how Andrey's intercultural identity is mediated through a myriad of different perspectives in the novel. Andrey accesses two politically-loaded symbolic sets of the German character in mid-nineteenth-century Russian literature: as an outsider, an Other, who is a negatively-valued opposite by which the positive Russian Self can be defined; and as an aspect of the internalized German in Russian culture, where the Other functions as a symbol of the westerniz-

* I would like to thank my former doctoral advisor, Sarah Smyth (Dublin), for providing invaluable insights into Andrey Stolz and also the general topic of literary stereotypes. I am also indebted to my doctoral readers, Justin Doherty (Dublin) and Joe Andrew (Keele), and to my anonymous reviewers at Slověne for their valuable critiques and the additional sources they suggested for the final draft of this article.

ing process within Russian society. Andrey's unstable Germanness thus exposes the paradox of expressing the Russian Self in the 19th century, where the Russian is constructed in contrast to—yet also in terms of—the imagined Western Other. I therefore challenge the prevailing assumption that Andrey is meant only to be the “antidote” to Oblomov, and suggest that his character elucidates the instability of the Russian Self Image.

Keywords

Oblomov, Goncharov, Dobrolyubov, Imagology, literary stereotypes, Germans in Russian literature, 19th-century Russian Literature, the literary construction of the Self and the Other, the image of Andrey Stolz, identity construction

Резюме

В настоящей статье идёт речь о “немецкости” Андрея Штольца и о том, как она связана с образом немцев в русской литературе XIX века. Штолец не является ни “противоядием” для Обломова, ни “просто противоположностью” ему, а выражает кризис личности, характерный для образа “русского” и “русскости” в XIX веке. Автор использует имагологическую методику, чтобы исследовать оба аспекта стереотипа немца в русской литературе XIX века: это и диаметрально противоположность образу “русского”, конструирующая положительные черты последнего, и часть собственно “русского”, демонстрирующая присущую русской личности той эпохи нестабильность.

Ключевые слова

Обломов, Гончаров, Добролюбов, имагология, литературные стереотипы, немцы в русской литературе, русская литература XIX века, литературное конструирование образа “своего” и “чужого”, образ Андрея Штольца, конструирование идентичности

Introduction and Methodology

Ivan Goncharov's Andrey Stolz, from the novel *Obломov* (1859), is the product of two worlds: his German father's, a domain of strictness and burgher values, and his Russian mother's, one of tenderness and gentry [*барин*] bearings. He is a character who travels west on business, yet who believes that work will ultimately benefit his homeland, Russia [180].¹ Andrey is difficult to define on the spectrum of foreignness in relation to his upbringing [Холкин 2003: 40], his activities, and even his name. To his detractors, such as Tarant'ev and Mukhoyarov, he is a German, “Stolz.” To his family and friends, such as Oblomov, Zakhar, and his own mother, his name is resoundingly Russian, “Andrey,” “Andrey Ivanych” or “Andryusha,” respectively. It is curious, then, that the majority opinion in scholarship holds that “Andryusha” is a symbol of the West, while Oblomov—who was raised with a pseudo-German educa-

¹ Textual citations to *Obломov* refer to the authoritative version from the 1998 RAN collected works, vol. 4 [ГОНЧАРОВ 1998, IV].

tion, who wears a Germanic (yet “Eastern”) *shlafrok/шлафрок* gown, and who lives in the Westernized imperial capital Petersburg [РЕАСЕ 1991: 13]—is a symbol of the East. Frank summarizes the received formulation as follows: “Some critics have interpreted it as a reference to an ‘Asiatic’ tendency in the Russian character; and Oblomov’s efficient and successful friend Stoltz, whose father is German, certainly forms a ‘Western’ contrast to Oblomov’s indolence and practical helplessness” [FRANK 2007]. This is not to say that Oblomov is unique among nineteenth-century Russian literary characters for his display of Western symbols and Westernization. Rather, he and Andrey bear contradictory and paradoxical symbolic currency that was inherent to the cultural milieu. Instead of emerging as diametric opposites, as Ehre has argued [ЕХРЕ 1973: 196], a close reading of the stereotypes in the novel demonstrates that both characters exist on a continuum between images of Russianness and Germanness. Once Andrey has been removed from his usual role of a cultural stereotype and/or foil to Oblomov and from the configuration of “Stolzism/Штольцевщина,” which was imbued with negative valuation by the critics of the 1860s immediately following the publication of the novel [НЕДЗВЕЦКИЙ 1992: 43–44], the symbolic currency can be evaluated on its own terms.

To address the role of the images of the Other and how they apply to Andrey, I utilize the Imagological methodology, a relatively new school of criticism that took shape in France in the 1950s and gained a scholarly following in the following decades in Germany [LEERSSEN 2007: 17–32]. This is a productive lens to analyse Andrey’s simultaneously Domestic/Foreign character because Imagology investigates how the construction of the Other affects and constructs the Self. There are two particular Imagological assumptions that underpin this assertion. First, identity only comes into being when it is conceptualized and verbalized: the Self is an articulation, and not a stable idealized abstraction, meaning there only exists that which emerges through discourse, deployed to meet the changing demands of the situation. Therefore, it is necessary to identify the context surrounding the German stereotype and how it includes, excludes, or ignores Andrey. Secondly, because the Self emerges in contrast to the Other, the image of the Other represents a constitutive aspect of the Self. Representations of the Other in literary discourse do not exist in a separate universe from the articulations of the Self—the “You” is constructed and imagined precisely to give shape and meaning to the image of the “I.” Because of this, the two terms “Russian” and “German” function in a symbiotic symbolic relationship in Russian literary discourse.

Andrey’s character accesses—yet never fully commits to—two politically-loaded symbolic sets of the German character in mid-nineteenth-century Russian literature: as an outsider, an Other, and as a negatively-valued opposite by which the positive Russian Self can be defined; and as an aspect of the inter-

nalized German in Russian culture, where the Other functions as a symbol of the westernizing process within Russian society. I argue that the paradoxical synthesis at play in Andrey's character goes well beyond the limited role it has been ascribed in scholarship, such as a "prototype" for the future who is "too schematic" [DIMENT 1998: 30], as a "plot device and foil" [SENESE 2003: 88], as a "theoretical abstraction" [MCLEAN 1998: 50], and as a "topos" of the "German element" in Russia [MUZA 200: 186]—though caution against interpretations limited to diametric opposition between the two characters has been advised [SETCHKAREV 1967: 1799–1805; ЕНРЕ 1973: 197; PEACE 1991: 13]. I therefore challenge the classically received assumption first pronounced by Dobrolyubov that Andrey is meant only to be the "antidote" [*противоядие*] [ДОБРОЛЮБОВ 1948: 71] or "antipode" [SHISHKIN 2008: 547–549; ГОНЧАРОВ 2004, VI: 186–187, 386]² to Oblomov, as well as the discursive current established by Goncharov's contemporaries who, according to Krasnoshchekova, "made absolute the social aspect of the character and ignored all the rest" [*Они абсолютизировали социальный аспект образа и игнорировали все другое*] [КРАСНОЩЕКОВА 1997: 275]. I assert that his character expresses the conflicted interplay of cultural stereotypes in mid-nineteenth-century Russian discourse. In this sense, I agree with the Nedzvetskii, who argues that Andrey is an "interestingly and deeply thought-out figure" [*интересно и глубоко задуманная фигура*] [НЕДЗВЕТСКИЙ 1992: 38].³ While critics such as Kholkin and Setchkarev have illuminated the complexity of Andrey's character and the depth of his role in the success of the novel as a whole, I utilize the Imagological methodology to demonstrate how this complexity emerges in relation to the character's paradoxical Germanness.

The German and Russian as Diametric Opposites

I begin with an analysis of the Hetero Image of the German as Other to determine how it constructs the Russian Self Image and how this applies to Andrey. In this school, the term "Hetero Image" is used for a stereotype from Group A regarding Group B (here: the Russians regarding the Germans). It is also possible to speak of a "Self Image," the stereotype from Group A about Group A (here: the Russians about themselves) [LEERSSEN 2007: 342–344]. The German emerges in terms of mutual exclusivity to the Russian from four perspectives in the novel, and in this essay I provide a close reading of three of them (while the fourth perspective emerges from Mukhoyarov, whose limited contribution is not discussed in detail here): Oblomov's manservant Zakhar regarding their German neighbors; Andrey's mother regarding her husband

² See also [КРАСНОЩЕКОВА 1997: 328].

³ See also Kholkin, who views Andrey as indicative of the "fearlessly natural/genuine" [*бесстрашно естественны*] characters in the novel [ХОЛКИН 2003: 38].

and the general category of “burghers”; and Tarantjev regarding Andrey and Andrey’s father. I organize the traits that compose the German stereotype in the following chart, which demonstrates how the negative stereotype can be a constructive element in the positive Russian Self Image—or, as Leerssen contextualizes the work of Ricoeur and Levinas, “one becomes I by way of encountering You” [LEERSSEN 2007: 339]. To facilitate internal referencing in the following sections, I use the letters from the left-hand column of Figure 1.

	Russian Self Image	German Hetero Image
	<i>Positive Traits</i>	<i>Negative Traits</i>
A	Open	Hemmed-in (M)
B	Free	Uncontrolled (T)
C	Spontaneous	Predictable (M)
D	Full of Life	Dull (M)
E	Honest	Deceitful (T)
F	Future-Oriented	Past-Oriented (M)
G	Simple	Condescending (T)
H	Noble	Crude, Everyday (M)
I	Dirty	Exceedingly Clean (Z)
J	Spiritual	Demonic, Heathen (T) (M)
K	Disorderly	Obsessively Orderly (M) (Z)
L	Spiritual	Material (T) (M)
M	Mysterious	Knowable (M) (Z)
N	Generous	Money-Grubbing (T) (M) (Z)

Figure 1: Mutual Opposition in Oblomov; Source Key:
(Z)=Zakhar, (M)=Mother, (T)=Tarantjev

Zakhar’s Cheap and Cruel German

Zakhar’s contributions to the list (**I, K, M, N**) emerge from one exchange in the novel: when Oblomov confronts him regarding the messy state of their apartment, Zakhar defends himself with a comparison to the negatively-valued cleanliness of their neighbor, a German piano tuner. Zakhar argues that he

could not possibly keep the flat as tidy as they do, because the Germans live in a spare and cheap manner, as opposed to the abundance of Oblomov's flat. While this hyperbole is both humorous and expedient to his defense, Zakhar's following assertion demonstrates how he deploys and reinforces the cultural stereotype:

And where are the Germans to get rubbish from? Just take a look at how they live! The entire family has just one bone to gnaw on for the whole week. And the coat gets passed from the father's back to the son, and then back to the father. And the wife and the daughters have these short little dresses... So where are they supposed to get rubbish from? [13]⁴

This passage accesses four aspects of the German Hetero Image: as clean (**I**), because their flat lacks sufficient items to create disorder; as orderly (**K**), because they can institute such a structured frugality; as money-grubbing (**M**), because they share a single bone for sustenance, even though the father's occupation allows them to live otherwise; and as knowable (**N**), because the extent of their material life is defined, whereas Oblomov's residence is characterized by its clutter and the innumerability of its objects (typified by the "множество красивых мелочей" [*multitude of beautiful knick-knacks*] in Oblomov's room) [7]. These depictions access the stereotype of Germanness as imminently knowable and comprehensible from its surface, a trait that has been identified by Dolinin as characteristic of how Russian writer constructed German space in the 1920s [DOLININ 2000: 230–236], while the Russian remains a mystery, full of latent and hidden potential—traits that have been identified as characteristic of Russian space by Ely (as "outer gloom" belying "inner glory") [ELY 2002: 134–164] and Widdis (where unlimited potential emerges through "unboundable space") [WIDDIS 1998: 30–49].

Zakhar depicts the neighbor to be a typical German, raising the specific situation to the general level with the exclamation "Where are the Germans to get rubbish from?" Zakhar attributes these characteristics to the neighbor and not to Andrey; because the latter is a close family friend and links to the patriarchal gentry authority structure, he is not subjected to the German stereotype. The manner of address reflects this relationship: Zakhar, like Stolz's future wife, Olga, refers to him by first name and patronymic, "Andrey Ivanych"—and Zakhar often adds the term for patriarchal respect, *batiushka*. An example of this is when Zakhar meets Andrey at the end of the novel after falling on hard times: "Oh, father [Ах, ах, батюшка] Andrey Ivanych!" [490–491]. Zakhar defers to Andrey as he would to other Russian gentlemen, he

⁴ "— А где немцы сору возьмут, — вдруг возразил Захар. — Вы поглядите-ко, как они живут! Вся семья целую неделю кость гложет. Сюртук с плеч отца переходит на сына, а с сына опять на отца. На жене и дочерях платьишки коротенькие <...> Где им сору взять?"

follows Russian social conventions and excludes Andrey from the category of the money-grubbing, cruel, orderly, and obsessively clean Other. Indeed, from Zakhar's perspective, Andrey is not even a half-German, because he bears no traits of the German piano tuner.

The Labyrinth of Burgher Life: Germans According to Andrey's Mother
 Andrey's Russian mother also refers to Andrey with a non-German version of his name: when the narrator adopts her perspective, he uses the diminutive form of Andrey, "Andriusha," such as how "His mother always worriedly watched when Andriusha disappeared from home" [*Мать всегда с беспокойством смотрела, как Андрияша исчезал из дома*] [152]. As with Zakhar, Andrey does not represent a typical German for her—though, in his youth, she worried that he would become a typical German burgher like his father. She feared this outcome because, for her, German nature is tied to money, materialism, arrogance, and boredom, and the principle that each German follows the same pattern as his father and his father's father, *ad infinitum* [154–155]. The repeatability of the German archetype was a frequent motif in literature of the nineteenth century. Herzen had deployed this image in the 1840s to characterize travel in the West, while Gogol applied this trope to the German Rhineland scenery in the 1830s. For Herzen, Western space emerges as an excruciatingly boring space where the poetry "vanishes" from travel and where you feel as through you were in a "machine":

Riding through France on post horses is boring. It's the way you're in a machine; there are no conversations, no arguments, no postmasters or their *samovars*, no books, and no travel documents. The postmen drive rapidly; they set everything up in an instant. And since the roads are like tablecloths, and there are horses everywhere, all the poetry has vanished [ГЕРЦЕН 1956: 246].⁵

For Gogol, the Rhine inculcated more annoyance than awe precisely because of its numerous attractive scenes: "I finally grew tired of all the incessant views. Your eyes get completely worn out, as in a panorama or a picture. Before the windows of your cabin there pass, one after another, towns, crags, hills, and old ruined knights' castles" [MAGUIRE 1994: 115]. Prefiguring Andrey's mother's inversion of the value of acquiring wealth, Gogol flips the valuation of the picturesque and non-picturesque—Russia's possible liabilities, such as its empty expanses, are repositioned as advantages compared to the boring repetition of the German space. As Widdis argues, the "unboundable expanse" [*необъятный простор*] acts as a "cypher for a more generalized

⁵ "Ездить во Францию на почтовых лошадях скучно: точно машина, ни разговоров, ни спора, ни станционных зрителей, ни их самоваров, ни книг, ни подорожных. Почтальоны ездят скоро, закладывают в один миг, дорога — как скатерть, лошади везде есть, вся поэзия исчезла".

mystery of Russianness itself” and it “becomes a symbol for the impossibility of self-definition” [WIDDIS 1998: 48–49]. Epstein has also noted how Gogol transforms the depths of Russian space [*глубь российского пространства*] into a figure that represents Russia as a whole [ЭПШТЕЙН 1996].⁶ Andrey's mother, in her turn, prefigures the repetitive nature of German space that Alexander Dolinin has identified in the work of Bely, Shklovsky, Ehrenburg, and Antsiferov regarding 1920s Berlin [DOLININ 2000: 231]. The bounded and constricted nature of German space becomes necessary to establish Russian space as boundless and impossible to fully grasp by rational means.

In addition to these traits, Andrey's mother deploys other aspects of a restrictive, labyrinthine German space—including cruelty and restrictiveness—to characterize the German essence that she fears for her son:

[Andrey's mother] didn't entirely like this work-intensive, practical upbringing. She was afraid that her son would become the same kind of German burgher as his father's antecedents... (S)he did not like the crudeness, self-reliance, or arrogance with which the whole German mass showed off their burgher rights that they had fashioned over the last thousand years... She could not detect any softness, delicateness, or leniency in the German character. There wasn't anything... that could bypass a rule, break with a custom, or not comply with a statute [154].⁷

The section in which this passage emerges [ch. II, 152–156] accesses ten of the traits under discussion. I include examples from nineteenth-century creators of culture to demonstrate the broader discursive currency of the German stereotype that Andrey's mother employs.

A. As Hemmed-in: Andrey's mother refers to the German nation [*нация*] as a crowd [*толпа*] and as a mass [*масса*]. These terms access the German stereotype as hemmed-in and constricted—and as part of an imaginary, conflated “nation” of heterogeneous Germans. This aspect of the Hetero Image is dramatized in her imagination by the narrow life allowed to the German bur-

⁶ For Epstein, Russian space—as a figure—is connected to the demonic, and it engages in “mystic copulation” [*мистическое соитие*] with both Chichikov and with itself: “композиционно должно увенчаться мистическим соитием героя не с какой-то определенной женщиной, а с самой Россией. Отсюда мгновенная смена диспозиции, от биографического плана — в географический: стремительное движение героя в глубь российского пространства”; “Ландшафтно-космическая эротика <...> перерастает в автоэротизм, — отсюда и уместность формулы, предложенной Белинским: «гремящие, поющие дифирамбы блаженствующего в себе национального самосознания»” [Эпштейн 1996].

⁷ “Ей не совсем нравилось это трудовое, практическое воспитание. Она боялась, что сын ее делается таким же немецким бюргером, из каких вышел отец <...> (Н)е любила грубости, самостоятельности и кичливости, с какими немецкая масса предьявляет везде свои тысячелетием выработанные бюргерские права <...> Она в немецком характере не замечала никакой мягкости, деликатности, снисхождения, ничего того <...> с чем можно обойти какое-нибудь правило, нарушить общий обычай, не подчиниться уставу”.

gher, as opposed to the assumed expansive and limitless potential of the Russian, a common image identified by Widdis and Ely [WIDDIS 1998: 40–41; ELY 2002: 94–96]. The traits of the German as hemmed-in and restrictive resonate with the depiction of von Biron’s labyrinthine house in Lazhechnikov’s 1835 *Ice Palace* [Ледяной дом] [ЛАЖЕЧКИКОВ 1858: 48–49], and they also prefigure the prison-like German house encountered by Gurov in Chekhov’s *Lady with a Lapdog* [Дама с собачкой], where Chekhov’s narrative draws particular attention to the imposing fence that surrounds the house of Gurov’s lover: “Gurov walked down Staro-Goncharnaya Street without rushing, searching for the house. Just outside the house stretched a long, grey spiked fence. ‘You’d run away from a fence like that,’ thought Gurov, alternately looking at the windows and the fence” [ЧЕХОВ 1977, X: 138].⁸

C. As Predictable: For Andrey’s mother, the German burgher has no choice in the path of his life, and he is incapable of breaking the rules, customs, and statutes of his “nation”. There is no leeway for deviation from their pre-determined trajectory, which progresses “as though along a ruler” [как по линейке] [158]. This aspect emphasizes the linear aspect of the labyrinthine life of the German, which represents a progression from one point to another along the surface of things, with no concern for the deeper aspects of life. The aspect of this image resonates with a German from Gogol’s story *Nevsky Prospect*, the *akkuratnyi*/аккуратный [thorough, orderly] Schiller, who plans his life to absurd lengths, such as in his vow not to kiss his wife more than twice a day. The narrator of Gogol’s story contrasts Schiller’s behavior with that of the typical Russian, and describes the character in terms of his national character: “Schiller was a perfect German in the full sense of the word. When he was only 20, that happy age when a Russian lives carelessly, Schiller had already measured out his entire life, and he never made an exception, no matter the circumstances” [ГОГОЛЬ 1938, III: 41].⁹ As with Andrey’s mother’s German burghers, Gogol’s Schiller does not allow for deviation from his planned course, and this is cast as a diametric opposite to the Russian Self Image. This image of the German as overly planned and the Russian as gloriously irrational participates in a discursive pattern that includes the Slavophiles’ descriptions of the Russian language, which Gasparov has characterized as a rejection of rationalist orderings of events [GASPAROV 2004: 133]. It also connects to Tyutchev’s poetic lines that cast Russia as incapable of being measured by any standardized metric, where “One cannot measure [Russia] in

⁸ “Гуров не спеша пошел на Старо-Гончарную, отыскал дом. Как раз против дома тянулся забор, серый, длинный, с гвоздями. От такого забора убежишь, — думал Гуров, поглядывая то на окна, то на забор”.

⁹ “Еще с двадцатилетнего возраста, с того счастливого времени, в которое русской живет на фуфу, уже Шиллер размерил всю свою жизнь и никакого, ни в каком случае, не делал исключения”.

terms of general arsheen”) [*Аршином общим не измерить*], because Russia is accessible through faith and emotion: “In Russia one can only believe”) [*В Россию можно только верить*] [Тютчев 2003: 165]. Tyutchev’s lines connect to a spiritual and metaphysical belief in Russia, but they also undermine an attempted rational measurement, because the reader is invited to imagine a country and people that *can* be measured in terms of a general standard and that *can* be comprehended by means of logic [*умом*]. The German image is *Oblomov* is thus connected to commonplace images of measurement, such as the ruler [*линейка*] and Schiller’s “measuring out” [*измерить*], while the Russian Self Image defies rational quantification.

D. As Dull: Without any allowance for deviation from the progress “along a ruler,” there is nothing to make life pleasant for the Germans; thus, they maintain a “boring correctness of life” [*скучная правильность жизни*] [155]. For Andrey’s mother, the dullness of German life is connected to the harshness of their upbringing, and she despises the practical education and the German work ethic that Andrey receives from his father. For her, these aspects of German life are characterized by the image of the Germans going through life “with their hands turning the millstone [*ворочающими жернова*]” [156].

F. As Past-Oriented: According to Andrey’s mother, the German future is chained to its past. This emerges in the invocation of the repetitious generations and the 1,000 year-old traditions. From this perspective, the Germans lack the potential and imagination found in the Russian character. This aspect of the German Hetero Image thus reinforces the spontaneity and the improvisational aspects of the Russian Self Image, because the German is cast as incapable of deviation. She imagines the ideal Russian gentleman [*барин*] to be typified by, “a clean face and a bright, lively gaze [*бойкий взгляд*],” whereas the German burghers are typified by their “everyday faces” [*будничные лица*] [155]. While Andrey’s mother fears that his education will turn her child into a dull and unimaginative burgher, Andrey would actually “speak with so much energy and liveliness that it would move her to laughter” [*рассказывать так бойко, так живо, что рассмешит и ее*] [153]. Andrey’s education instills him with the very characteristic (being lively/*бойкий*) that her mother cherishes in the Russian *barin*/gentry.¹⁰

H. As Crude and Everyday: Just as the stereotypical Germans display everyday features rather than liveliness, Andrey’s mother believes that the

¹⁰ The narrator echoes the trait of “liveliness” in his depiction of young Andrey’s “lively mind” (“Андрюша детскими зелененькими глазками своими смотрел вдруг в три или четыре разные сферы, бойким умом жадно и бессознательно наблюдал типы этой разнородной толпы, как пестрые явления маскарада”) [157], and also in the description of the “wide, lively footsteps” made by the imagined “Stolzes with Russian names” (“Но вот глаза очнулись от дремоты, послышались бойкие, широкие шаги, живые голоса...”) [164].

Germans cannot become gentlemen, nor can they possess the refinement of the Russian *barin*/gentry. Rather, for her the Germans have “big rough hands” [*большие грубые руки*], and they use “rude speech” [*грубая речь*] [155]. Through the repetition of the word “*grubyi/grubyy*” [rude/coarse], the lack of refinement and “softness” [*мягкость*] applies to the structures of German appearance, character, and spatiality. This provides a counterpoint to the immaculate softness described in Oblomov’s features, dress, mannerisms, his small hands, and even his “whole soul” [*вся душа*] [5]. Indeed, if one takes Oblomov’s robe as “an essential part of Oblomov’s attitude towards life” [PEACE 1991: 72], his corpulence becomes more salient as the robe degrades around his body during the course of the novel.

J. As Demonic: Andrey’s mother refers to her husband as an “old heathen” [*старый-то нехристь*] [160], which accesses her husband’s Protestantism as opposed to her own Orthodoxy. In Russian cultural history, the “heathen German” represents a foreign intrusion and threat to Orthodoxy, with roots in the Don Cossack revolt of 1705, when their leader, Kondraty Bulavin, called upon all Cossacks “to defend the house of God’s Holy Mother and the Christian Church against the heathen and Hellenic teachings which the boyars and Germans wish to introduce” [MASSIE 1986: 409]. The imagined threat to Orthodoxy and the Russian center by the heathen at the periphery translated to rumor’s that Peter the Great was the Antichrist, and that the solution to his defeat lay in burning the German Suburb [*немецкая слобода*] to the ground [MASSIE 1986: 406–407]. Andrey’s mother characterization of her husband thus loosely connects to the demonic aspect of the German Hetero Image in the history of representation, which appears in the German-Devil in Gogol’s *Night Before Christmas* [*Ночь перед рождеством*] [ГОГОЛЬ 1940, I: 202]; in the doctor Werner—nicknamed “Mephistopheles”—in Lermontov’s *Hero of Our Time* [*Герой нашего времени*] [LEATHERBARROW 2004: 999, 1006]; in the doctor Krestyan Ivanovich in Dostoevsky’s *The Double* [*Двойник*]; in depictions of the demonic metropolis in 1920s Berlin [DOLININ 2000: 232–4]; and in the devil Woland (according to Berlioz’s initial estimation) in Bulgakov’s *Master and Margarita* [БУЛГАКОВ 2004: 97–107].

K. As Obsessively Orderly: For Andrey’s mother, the German lifestyle does not allow for the slightest deviation from the pattern of burgher life; thus, their lives and characters are determined by “cheap and commonplace orderliness” [*пошлый порядок*] [155], a characteristic that Vladimir Nabokov ties to Germans in his critical work regarding Gogol [НАВОКОВ 1961: 64–66].

L. As Materialistic: Because the Germans base their lives upon burgher values without deviation, their only interest lies in accruing material wealth, rather than in developing the spiritual side of their existence. This aspect is also established by the “ruler” [*линейка*] metaphor, as the German burgher

only cares about quantifying the surface of things. This aspect prefigures the negative attitude towards the excessive rationality and methodical manner in the German accumulation of wealth that emerges in chapter four of Dostoevsky's *The Gambler* [Игрок], where the narrator asserts that he “shall not worship the German method of accumulation of riches [*немецкий способ накопления богатств*]” [ДОСТОЕВСКИЙ 1994: 528], a detail that Gerschenkron has identified as indicative of the novel's negative approach to the imagined German way of life [GERSCHENKRON 1975: 697]. The image of the German as materialist thus further reinforces the spiritual and mystical aspect of the Russian Self Image—as being anti-rational and anti-materialist, and guided by the intuitive rather than the systematic. Dostoevsky's characterization of the German method as a “German idol” [*немецкий идол*] [ДОСТОЕВСКИЙ 1994: 528] further establishes the Russian Self Image as properly spiritual and the German Hetero Image as blasphemous—and perilous to the Russian soul.

M. As Knowable: For Andrey's mother, German arrogance and crudeness are as plain as are “horns on cows”—they are prominently visible and cannot be hidden. The German thus lacks key aspects of the Russian Self Image: mystery, humility, and hidden potential. As with Zakhar's condemnation of the German neighbor, to observe the outside of the German is to understand the inside. This aspect is diametrically opposed to the indeterminate and expansive traits associated with Russian identity (as identified by [WIDDIS 1998] and [ELY 2002]), and even Oblomov. In the first passage of the novel—and thus the keynote description of the—Oblomov's facial expression and his mental state are depicted as indefinite. His eyes are cast as “dark-gray, but with the absence of any kind of definite ideas [*с отсутствием всякой определенной идеи*]” [5]. The ideas that do occur to him wander “across his face like a free bird” [*Мысль гуляла вольной птицей по лицу*] [IBID.]. While this may seem to be an incidental description, this image sets the tone for the remaining novel; this “absence of any kind of definite ideas” encompasses Oblomov's inactivity, his spiritual purity, his incompetence in practical affairs, and his unusual trajectory as the hero of a novel who does not end up with the heroine, but rather with his landlady.

N. As Money-Grubbing: The Germans' concern for money is so pervasive that the only goal of their lives is “the labor-intensive acquisition of money [*труженическое добывание денег*]” [155]. This emphasizes the material aspect of their character, because they only value what can be quantified, and they are willing to sacrifice comfort to increase their accumulation of wealth.

Andrey's mother fears that her son will turn into the apotheosis of the German stereotype (a role she ascribes to her husband), which is diametrically opposed to the positive Russian image. In this oppositional relationship, the negative traits associated with the Other construct a positive image of the

Self: the burgher denigrated to create the idealized *barin*/барин. Fortunately for Andrey's mother, her son "was raised on Russian soil" [*вырос на русской почве*] and not in the "everyday crowd, with the burgher cow horns" [156]. As with Zakhar's deployment of the stereotypical German, Andrey's mother does not apply the category of "German" to Andrey. Instead, the dimensions of the stereotype create a counterpoint of Germanness against which Andrey's character and behavior are contrasted through the course of the novel. While many critics have bristled at the supposition that Goncharov intended for Andrey the German (or half-German) to save Russia from Oblomovism [DIMENT 1998: 30], this passage elucidates how Russia saves Andrey from becoming a German.

Tarant'ev's Scheming and Conflated German

Oblomov's acquaintance Tarant'ev, however, casts Andrey as a typical condescending German in an effort to gain influence over Oblomov and his finances.¹¹ Tarant'ev exploits the negative stereotypical currency of the German image in a conversation where he attempts to turn Oblomov against Andrey, asserting that the German cannot be trusted for the following reasons: Andrey is uncontrollable, because he is "always knocking about foreign lands [*шатается по чужим землям*] and as he travels "everywhere" [*Пострел везде поспел!*] (**B**) [52]; Andrey is aligned with the demonic as a "немец проклятый" [accursed German] whose whole set of affairs is "нечисто" [unclean] [IBID.], which aligns with and compounds Andrey's mother's characterization of the father as a "heathen" (**J**); and Andrey is deceitful because he supposedly plans to "swindle" Oblomov [*немец твой облупит тебя*] (**E**) [51]. Tarant'ev's argument regarding Andrey's father elucidates his position, and it also clarifies how stereotypical German traits of materialism (**L**) and greed (**N**) construct a positive Russian Self Image:

A fine lad indeed! Suddenly from his father's forty rubles he's made capital of 300,000, and then he becomes a Court Councilor, and he's even educated — And now he's always traveling off somewhere! The little scamp really gets around! Are you telling me a genuine, good Russian person would ever do that? A Russian person would choose something and then go through with it, without rushing. He'd do it nice and easy, but he'd go off and get it done! [52]¹²

¹¹ See also Krasnoshchekova's treatment of the German as the opposite to the Russian according to Tarant'ev [КРАСНОЩЕКОВА 1997: 205].

¹² "Хорош мальчик! Вдруг из отцовских сорока сделал тысячу триста капитала, и в службе за надворного перевалился, и ученый... теперь вон еще путешествует! Пострел везде поспел! Разве настоящий-то хороший русский человек станет все это делать? Русский человек выберет что-нибудь одно, да и то еще не спеша, потихоньку да полегоньку, кое-как, а то на-ко, поди!"

Tarantyeu argues that an Orthodox Christian Russian should be trusted and not a “cursed/damned” [*проклятый*] [50] and educated [*ученый*] [52] German. Tarantyeu’s argument, while mercenary and self-serving in its aims, does highlight the demonic aspect of Andrey’s character. Krasnoshchekova has indicated how critics such as Ashkarumov and Loshits have linked Andrey to Mephistopheles and even (in the case of Loshits) the Anti-Christ [КРАСНОЩЕКОВА 1997: 471 сн. 64].¹³ Further, Andrey’s development emerges as a product of ruptured and displaced spatial borders, wherein his “narrow little German alleyway was widened into such a wide road” [*обратят узенькую немецкую колею в такую широкую дорогу*] by Russian spatial and cultural forces [158]. Epstein has characterized the displacement of such boundaries as demonic in 19th-century Russian spatial discourse, established by Pushkin and Gogol [ЭПШТЕЙН 1996].

Tarantyeu hopes that his deployment of the Hetero and Self Images will create an insular In Group based on ethnic and religious lines that include himself and Oblomov while excluding Andrey. This strategy fails because, as with Zakhar, Oblomov does not view Andrey as an Other; rather, he is “closer than any relation,” because the two grew up and attended school together. Tarantyeu’s mercenary usage of the German stereotype proves to be hypocritical in two respects that demonstrate the paradox of defining the Russian as the diametric opposite of the German or “the West” in nineteenth-century Russian discourse. First, Tarantyeu does not differentiate among foreigners. The English, French, and Germans are all the same to him—crooks [*мошенники*] and bandits [*обманищики*] [50]. Tarantyeu, however, scolds Oblomov for not providing him with a foreign cigar, and he prefers French snuff and imported wine purchased from a German in an English shop to their domestic equivalent, which once again demonstrates a conflation of nationalities: “Is this this same stuff as before, from the German? You should let me get some from the English shop” [*Это прежняя-то, от немца? Нет, изволь в английском магазине купить*] [44]. This irony anticipates Turgenev’s mocking depiction of Slavophile Pavel Kirsanov who reads nothing in Russian while living in Dresden: “[Pavel Petrovich] holds Slavophile views: it is well known that this is *très distingué* in high society. He doesn’t read anything in Russian, but he does have a silver ashtray in the form of a peasant’s [*мужик*] bast sandal on his desk” [ТУРГЕНЕВ 1964: 228]. Both depictions lay bare the impossibility of the Westernized Russian nationalist maintaining non-Western habits. Secondly, while Tarantyeu warns Oblomov regarding Andrey, he himself desires to swindle Oblomov; Tarantyeu constantly asks for money, and he steals from Oblomov when he can (and yet it is Andrey who has been labeled as negatively materialistic! [SAZONOVA 1945: 65–69]). This demonstrates that Tarantyeu’s

¹³ See also [ОТРАДИН 1994: 156].

deployment of the German stereotype is ultimately mediated through hypocrisy, and that it represents what he picks and chooses based upon utility rather than a coherent worldview. He is the only character in the novel, though, who explicitly contrasts Andrey as a German with Oblomov as a Russian and who posits the two characters as diametric opposites.

Andrey and Oblomov: Russian Identity as Mediated through the West
 Mutual Exclusivity between the Russian and the German represents an aspect of four characters' perspectives, though Andrey is included in this category by only Tarantjev and Mukhoyarov—that latter of whom disparages Andrey to the former by asserting: “You never told me what kind of a German he was!” [*He сказал, что это за немец такой!*] [440]. It is therefore surprising to note that many scholars consider Andrey and Oblomov to be diametric opposites of each other. To be sure, there are many aspects where Andrey and Oblomov differ, particularly in their approaches to work and their relationships with Olga. Andrey has a keen grasp of financial systems, while Oblomov is mystified by monetary transactions. Andrey's financial vision also extends into the future, while Oblomov prays that the next day will be the same as the previous [GERSCHENKRON 1975: 699; BOROWEC 1994: 562]—though this oppositional structure does not align with the stereotypical currency of German as past-oriented and Russian as future-oriented, as deployed by Andrey's mother. There are also a number of similarities between the two: both are good-natured, friendly, and honest—and capable of loving Olga. Setchkarev adds that the two share the same pessimistic worldview, where they only differ in their reaction to a shared existential premise [СЕТЧКАРЕВ 1805]. Both characters are also capable of complete immobility: Oblomov through his sloth, and Andrey through the calm [*покойно*] manner in which he sits, where he uses “only those gestures that were necessary” [*употреблял столько мимики, сколько было нужно*] [161]. The two characters are also portrayed as similar in their childhood, because both enjoy running through Oblomovka—Andrey to the encouragement of his father, and Oblomov to the horror of his mother and nurses. The characters' respective childhoods also demonstrate how, despite the fact that the two ultimately reacted in different manners to their education [ОТРАДИН 1994: 78; ХОЛКИН 2003: 40; НЕДЗВЕЦКИЙ 1992: 38], Andrey's formation is principally mediated through Russian space, and his roots, Kholkin has argued, “were reinforced by the essence of Russian life, Russian speech, and Russian customs” [*корни... укрепленными в существе русской жизни, русской речи и русского обычая*] [Холкин 2003: 39].

Oblomov and Andrey also had similar plans in their youth to implement academic study for self-improvement: both committed to work hard, to live poetically, and to develop Russia's “inexhaustible resources” [*неистощимые*

источники] [180]. In the passage that describes this period, Oblomov and Andrey are compared in similar terms rather than as opposites, where “Stolz’s youthful ardor infected Oblomov” [*юношеский жар Штольца заразил Обломова*], and the latter longed for work and for “a distant yet fascinating goal” [*далекой, но обаятельной цели*] [62]. Even though this mental state would prove to be temporary for Oblomov, this does not diminish the fact that they shared a common vision of the future. Andrey alludes to this when he exhorts Oblomov “to work in order to rest more sweetly” [*работать, чтоб слаще отдыхать*], reminding Oblomov that it was the latter who wished to develop Russia’s resources [179–180]. And, though he produces no tangible results, Oblomov does spend his time planning reforms “along western lines” [PEACE 1991: 13]. Further, Krasnoshchekova has argued that, while Andrey and Oblomov differ in how they had been shaped by their education, they are similar in that their two characters “[unite] within themselves the mind and the heart” [*соединивший в себе “ум” с “сердцем”*] [КРАШОЩЕКОВА 1997: 275].¹⁴ It is also possible to conceive of Oblomov and Andrey as complementary rather than mutually-exclusive in terms of their narrative functions. Otradin argues that Andrey and Oblomov represent two different points of view from which the action of the novel is apprehended—the Stolz/analytical and the Oblomov/poetic—and that the two were necessary to “provide the fullness of the artistic representation” [*обеспечивает объемность изображения*] [ОТРАДИН 1994: 73, 114]. The two can be considered literary doubles, but this does not extend to diametric opposition, especially along Russian/German or Eastern/Western lines—indeed, in this passage it is Andrey who aligns himself with the Russian Self Image of inexhaustible space and resources. In this regard, Tarantyevo emerges as a more suitable diametric opposite to Oblomov—he is scheming, dishonest, active, and his mercenary materialism is in diametric opposition to Oblomov’s unconcerned passivity.

Many commentators ascribe oppositional roles to the characters by citing the “Persian” dressing gown as the proof of Oblomov’s Easternness and Andrey’s surname and father as proof of his Westernness [DIMENT 2001: 100]. This reading, however, disregards the German associations of the dressing gown [*shlafrok/шлафрок*], which is first introduced in the second paragraph of the novel as an extension of Oblomov’s body, where his “lack of concern passed from his face into the posture of his entire body, even into the folds of his *shlafrok*” [*С лица беспечность переходила в позы всего тела, даже в складки шлафрока*] [5]. Instead of using the more common term “*khalat*,” the narrator here chooses the barbarism *shlafrok / шлафрок*, from the German “Schlafrock.” This word is rare enough for it to be listed in the 1984 *Словарь русского языка* [*Dictionary of the Russian Language*] as obsolete [МАС, 4,

¹⁴ For other parallels between Andrey and Oblomov, see [КРАШОЩЕКОВА 1997: 323].

722], and the term required an explanatory note in the 1959 *Библиотека школьника* [*Schoolchild's Library*] publication of the novel [ГОНЧАРОВ 1959: 3, note 2]. Two factors establish the ambiguity of the item's symbolic structure: the *shlafrok*/*шлафрок* is later recast as a “genuine Eastern *khalat*/*халат*” that bears “no mark of the West whatsoever” [*настоящий восточный халат, без малейшего намека на Европу*] [6], and Oblomov maintains that his robe is a *khalat* and not a *shlafrok* to Volkov [17], despite the narrator's usage of the term. On one hand, as a *khalat*, the dressing gown emerges as the opposite of the West; this dovetails with the mutual opposition that Andrey's mother identifies between the values of the burgher and *barin*, and it appears to align Oblomov with the East and to separate him ideologically from the negative German Hetero Image. On the other hand, as a *shlafrok*, it emerges as a style of behavior that is mediated through the German; Oblomov does not wear his dressing gown as a “genuine” Easterner, but rather as a Russian who participates in a Western display of exoticism. Peace has also noted that the *khalat*, made of “Persian” material, could itself be viewed as pseudo-Russian because it recalls Chaadayev's withering remark that the peasants mistook Slavophile Konstantin Aksakov's Russian outfit to be “Persian” [PEACE 1991: 13].

From this perspective, the *shlafrok* represents an imitated Western model— analogous to the passage in Lermontov's *A Hero of Our Time* where Pechorin depicts Rayevich's hairstyle in Franco-Russian terms, as a “*прическа* [haircut] à la moujik” as opposed to a “*прическа мужика*” [peasant / *muzhik* haircut] [ЛЕРМОНТОВ 1957: 265]. In the same passage, Pechorin invokes Crusoe in exotic peripheral space to forge a parallel to the imagined French gaze at the “*moujik*” in the colonial space of the Caucasus Mountains—just as Oblomov's *shlafrok* invites the German gaze upon the Russian Orient, a scenario that will be fulfilled upon Andrey's arrival. Both images—Pechorin's Francophone “*moujik*” haircut and Oblomov's non-Western *shlafrok*/*khalat*—emerge as symbols of the paradox of nineteenth-century Russian identity because they represent how the anti-Western (i.e., the *khalat* and the peasant style) is mediated through the Western perspective (i.e., as a *shlafrok* and as à la *moujik*). In cultural terms, the *shlafrok*/*khalat* demonstrates the paradox involved in attempting to articulate the Russian as the opposite of the German given the westernized perspective of the generators of Russian culture in the nineteenth century. As Otradin argues, “the appearance of the ‘German’ Stolz element [in the world of the novel] is a natural result of the internal development of Russian life” [Поэтому появление “германского”, штольцевского элемента — закономерный результат внутреннего развития русской жизни] [ОТРАДИН 1994: 85]. Indeed, the novel itself engages in this paradox, as an articulation of Russian identity and “Russian provincial stagnation” [ЕНРЕ 1973: 178] that is written in the Western medium of the nineteenth-century

novel—and that was even related to the implied author by Andrey Stolz. This aspect is revealed at the novel's conclusion, as Andrey and a writer strolling through town. When the writer demonstrates interest in Oblomov's life, Andrey decides to relate everything he can remember about his deceased friend: «I will tell you in one second, let me just collect my thoughts and memories. You write it down: maybe someone will find it useful». And he told him what is written here” [*И он рассказал ему, что здесь написано*] [493]. This revelation is unnecessary from the point of view of the plot: the reader does not require an explanation of the narrative structure, and there is no reason why an omniscient, third-person narrator is insufficient. While the author's claim may be explained as providing an air of authenticity to the text, it nonetheless establishes Andrey as the narrator of Oblomov's life.¹⁵

Not only does the *shlafrok/khalat* demonstrate how Russian identity is articulated simultaneously as anti-German and in terms of the German, it also reinforces the impossibility of dividing Andrey and Oblomov along the lines of diametric opposites. Thiergen further complicates the stability of ascribing a diametrically opposed relationship to two characters by arguing that Oblomov demonstrates aspects of the philistine [THIERGEN 2006: 362], a trait that has been ascribed to Andrey [SHISHKIN 2008: 549].

The Paradoxical Layers of Andrey Stolz

I have indicated how Andrey's paradoxical character—as both Insider and Outsider to Russian culture—emerge on the familial level: Andrey has a Russian mother, and he is “closer than any relative” to Oblomov. This familial level extends to the linguistic level: Oblomov refers to his close friend most often as “Andrey,” a Russian name that does not introduce the distance of Otherness between the characters, and which reflects their brotherly relationship. Indeed, Oblomov refers to him as “Brother Andrey” twice in the novel in II:3. Overall, Oblomov refers to or addresses his friend 72 times; of those, Oblomov uses the name “Stolz” nine times and the name “Andrey” 63 times—which includes the formal “Andrey Ivanych,” used in the presence of Olga and Zakhar.

Complicating questions of Andrey's Germanness—while demonstrating the inherent instability of national identity in the world of the novel—the narrator refers to Andrey as “Stolz,” and he depicts Andrey as a German with qualification three times. The first instance appears when the narrator describes Andrey's background: “Stolz was only a German by half, from his father's side” [89]. Despite its awkward ring, I translate “*немец только вполовину*” as “only German by half” in an attempt to render the colloquial nature of “*вполовину*” [OXRUSDIC 57]. In fact, the final version of the novel omitted reference to his

¹⁵ See also Otradin's treatment of Stolz as the narrator of the text, who attempts to impose a linear timeline upon Oblomov's circular mode of time [ОТРАДИН 1994: 96].

“German half” [*немецкая половина*], which appeared in earlier manuscripts of the novel [ГОНЧАРОВ 2004, VI: 76], and which would have cast Andrey’s Germanness in more essentialist and deterministic terms. Andrey’s identity appears in the final version of the novel, rather, as the product of cultural interaction, where his Germanness is qualified through a Russian colloquialism, rather than as the composite of two different identities. As Kholkin has noted, Andrey’s Russianness emerges as a process in his “search for understanding” [*поиск понимания*] of others [Холкин 38]—and not as an essentialist trait, nor as a static and deterministic fact of his being. This depiction runs parallel to how characters tend to view Andrey as either a member of the In Group (i.e., as “Brother Andrey”) or as a member of the Out Group (i.e., the “accursed German”)—and never as a “half German.” The second qualified depiction is of Andrey as a “German boy” [*немецкий мальчик*], which also appears during the description of his childhood [165]. While this initially seems to cast Andrey as a German, the context of the utterance undermines the stability of the categorization: the narrator deploys this term during a discussion of how Andrey was influenced by Russian factors such as the “kind, greasy, Russian caresses” [*русские, добрые ласки*] [165]. These two traits—the greasiness (“жирный,” which also connotes thickness and richness) and kindness—oppose the image of the German Hetero Image in the novel, such as the cruelty and meanness of the German piano tuner. Therefore, Andrey’s status as a “German boy” is one of the factors in his developing personality, but not his essential nature. The label can also be read ironically: the narrator refers to him as a “German boy” just as he explains the factors that prohibit the boy from becoming a German.

The third instance appears when the narrator offers the following explanation for Andrey’s proclivity towards rationality: “Either because of his German nature or because of some other reason, he was not able to hold back from conclusions” [*по немецкой своей натуре или по чему-нибудь другому, не мог удержаться от вывода*] [448]. While the image of a “German nature” is introduced for Andrey, it is undermined by the narrator’s indeterminacy: Andrey’s behavior can be explained by his German instincts, or it could be “because of some other reason.” An essential reading is offered, but not endorsed—just as multiple perspectives emerge in the depiction of Andrey’s character in the novel. Therefore, the narrator does not once refer to Andrey as a “German” in an unqualified manner. Rather, Andrey emerges as a product of a Russian mother and German father and the dialogue between these two cultural forces. Andrey has been immersed in Russian folk stories and the traditions of Russian Orthodoxy, and yet he also emerges from certain perspectives as a hostile and alien Other.

The familial and linguistic paradoxes of being simultaneously Foreign and Domestic run parallel to Andrey’s education: his instruction from his father

consists of geographical maps, grammatical lessons, Biblical verses, Herder, and Wieland. His instruction from his mother consists of reading the Saints' lives, Krylov's fables, and Fénelon's *The Adventures of Telemachus* [152]. Regarding his lifestyle, his father educates him in the German tradition of strict burgher values, while his mother educates him in the Russian gentry tradition of tenderness. It is important to add that even the "Russian" side of Andrey's upbringing includes a Western element, in Fénelon—and his "German" side includes the spirituality and anti-materialism of biblical verses. Further, the forces that widened the narrow German scope of his life, embodied by the "narrow little German rut," included the music of Vienna-born Heinrich (Henri) Herz on equal plane with the Russian forces, such as his mother's dreams and stories, and also the happenings at Oblomovka [158]. Therefore, even the ostensibly pure Russian maternal influence includes foreign mediation and the process of cultural translation; Andrey has a Franco/Viennese element to his Russian cultural formation, just as Oblomov has a German element in his Eastern *khalat*. Goncharov thus calls into question the very stability of the Russian Self—a stability that has been ironically reified in the novel's critical reception. Andrey's character demonstrates how Russian culture viewed itself from the perspective of the imagined Western *nemets* [German foreigner], and thus his character reflects the structure of Russian literary discourse about the Russian Self as defined in terms of—yet opposite to—the imagined West. Far from Dobrolyubov's impossible ideal, Andrey's character emerges as an apt symbol for the mid-nineteenth-century educated Russian gentry: one foot is grounded in idealized Russian cultural roots with the other in idealized German education and comportment—though both sides bear their respective structural instabilities.

The key metaphors for Andrey's intercultural development are tactile (i.e., through the soft Russian caresses and the rough German hands), and they are also spatial. First, during the description of Andrey's childhood, the narrator articulates how the Russian elements—mixed with Herz—widened the possibilities of Andrey's life from the narrow path of the crude and limited German burgher: they "turned the narrow little German rut into such a wide road" [*обратят узенькую немецкую колею в такую широкую дорогу*] [158]. Andrey overcomes the restrictive space due to his interaction with the expansiveness of Russia, a commonplace image in Russian discourse that Widdis relates to the "open field" chronotope [WIDDIS 1998: 41–42]. The narrator thus continues the pattern set by Andrey's mother by invoking the labyrinthine nature of German life—a space from which Andrey escapes. A second spatial metaphor appears when the narrator asserts that Andrey did not become a dull and crude burgher because he was born on the "Russian soil" and that nearby there was Oblomovka, which is depicted as an "eternal holiday" [*вечный праздник*] [156]. The botanical metaphor—where the soil augments the development of a

plant—marks the effect of Russian space upon Andrey: it prevents his German traits from taking root.

The third spatial metaphor functions on two levels: as an articulation of Andrey's abstract influences, and as a concrete space that Andrey encounters during his upbringing. The influence of the “wide-open freedom of grand gentry life” combines with the indolence of Oblomovka, and these Russian forces counterbalance the primness of his German house: “On one hand, there was Oblomovka, and on the other was the prince's manor [княжеский замок] with the wide-open freedom of grand gentry life [с широким раздольем барской жизни], and these met with the German element [с немецким элементом], and from this Andrey became neither a good *Bursch*, nor even a philistine” [157]. As Oblomovka exerts a greater influence over Andrey than the Oblomov family, he emerges as a product of his environment in a literal sense—in addition to the layers of metaphors.

Andrey embodies cultural fusion (“an emblem of synthesis” according to [ЕНРЕ 1973: 197], or a product of duality [“двуославнось и двупланность”] according to [Холкин 2003: 39]) on a number of different levels: familial, as he has a German father and Russian mother; educational, as he receives sentimental poetry and logic from his father and fairy tales and Orthodox readings from his mother; biological, as he bears aspects of a German nature but was raised on the Russian soil; and spatial, as he is a product of interaction between two opposing environments. His professional life reflects this cultural interaction, because he spends part of his time in Russia, and part of it conducting business in Europe. This aspect elucidates the relationship between Oblomov and Andrey in the novel: Andrey is a product of dialogue between Oblomov's world (of which his mother is a part), and his father's world. This model also shows the futility of attempting to ascribe a valuation system to these characters, because they exist in a system of reciprocal influence. According to this interpretation, Oblomov's son, Andrey Oblomov—who is to be raised by Andrey Stolz—represents the continuation of the intercultural process as opposed to its establishment in Russian culture, as Borowec has argued [BOROWEC 1994: 571]. Further, if we grant that Andrey can represent the paradoxes of Russian culture and intellectual life, it is only fitting that the next generation of Russians should bear his name. Andrey can thus be interpreted as one who transcends the opposes the invoked German stereotype and who exposes a number of the paradoxes inherent in a culture where a dressing gown that “bears no mark of the West whatsoever” can be labeled a *shlafrok*.

The Critical Tradition Regarding Andrey Stolz

While Dobrolyubov's criticism devalues the importance of Andrey in the narrative, it does not dismiss entirely the notion of a character such as Andrey

existing in Russia, and the critic invokes the “author’s acknowledgement” that Andreys would arrive “with Russian names” [*под русскими именами*] in the future [ДОБРОЛЮБОВ 1948: 71]. Dobrolyubov therefore takes issue not with the substance of the character (as subsequent critics would), but rather with the timeframe [SEELEY 2003: 336]. Indeed, if Dobrolyubov were to take this character as possible in the present tense his argument would collapse, because he reads the novel as a social document, similar to Belinsky’s literary criticism [СТАЦУ 1985: 101]. This has led Kuhn to argue that Dobrolyubov’s essay had many goals, such as an attack upon Herzen’s interpretation of “superfluous man,” but that “none of [them] were strictly literary” [КУHN 1971: 97]. Had Dobrolyubov admitted the possibility of Andrey’s existence in Russia, there would be no foundations to portray Oblomovism as a general social ill pervasive across Russia and as an inevitable result of serfdom. Dobrolyubov’s criticism of Andrey as an unrealistic character was therefore grounded in the critic’s goal to use literary works of art as a springboard to broader social critique [СЕТЧКАРЕВ 1967: 1799–1800]. It is curious, then, that his loaded aesthetic judgment of Andrey has remained entrenched in literary discourse and in scholarship [ОТРАДИН 1994: 149]; he has been depicted as “implausible” [*неправдоподобен*] by Kushelev-Bezborodko [НЕДЗВЕЦКИЙ 1992: 137, note 143], a “crafty rogue” who is only “half composed” by Chekhov [ЧЕХОВ 1976, XXI (п. III): 201–2; СНЕКHOV 1964: 235], as “hopelessly uninteresting and flat” [МИРСКИЙ 1999: 192], as sketched in a “declarative and superficial [*декларативно*] manner” [СКВОЗНИКОВ 1963: 5], as “wooden and unconvincing” and one of the “two weak points” in the novel [ЕHPE 1985: 178–179], as artistically “infinitely inferior” to Oblomov and as an example of the failure to depict “saints, or even simple affirmative characters” in Russian literature [СЛОНИМ 1953: 393], and as less “alive” than Oblomov [СТИЛМАН 1948: 59–60]. Under the assumption of Andrey as a simple stereotype and/or foil, he remains frozen as an idealized “antidote” to the social ills of 1859 Russia, only relevant to inquiries of what Oblomov is not—and so it is no surprise that his character has been roundly condemned as schematic and unsuccessful. This also accounts for the fact that critics such as Nedzvetskii—who provide otherwise sensitive interpretations of Andrey’s complex character—still take Goncharov’s pronouncement that Andrey was “simply an idea” [*просто идея*] at face value [НЕДЗВЕЦКИЙ 1992: 59].¹⁶ Labeling Stolz a “typical German” or even “half-German” limits his character’s complexity and obscures the intercultural dynamic of the novel, and the critical tradition itself reifies Andrey Stolz’s status as a stereotype.

¹⁶ See also Krasnoshchekova’s treatment of the critical tradition [КРАСНОЩЕКОВА 1997: 275].

Bibliography

BOROWEC 1994

BOROWEC C., "Time after Time: The Temporal Ideology of Oblomov," *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 38.4, 1994, 561–573.

CHEKHOV 1964

CHEKHOV A., *Letters on the Short Story, the Drama, and Other Literary Topics*, E. SIMMONS (trans., ed.), New York, 1964.

DIMENT 1998

DIMENT G., "The Precocious Talent of Ivan Goncharov," in: G. DIMENT (ed.), *Goncharov's Oblomov: A Critical Companion*, Evanston, 1998.

DIMENT 2001

DIMENT G., "Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov," in: J. OGDEN and J. KALB (eds.), *Russian Novelists in the Age of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky*, Detroit, 2001, 90–106.

DOLININ 2000

DOLININ A., "«The Stepmother of Russian Cities»: Berlin of the 1920s through the Eyes of Russian Writers," in: G. BARABTARLO (ed.), *Cold Fusion: Aspects of the German Cultural Presence in Russia*, New York, 2000, 225–240.

EHRE 1985

EHRE M., "Goncharov, Ivan Aleksandrovich," in: V. TERRAS (ed.), *The Handbook of Russian Literature*, New Haven, 1985, 178–179.

EHRE 1973

EHRE M., *Oblomov and His Creator*, Princeton, 1973.

ELY 2002

ELY C., *This Meager Nature: Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia*, DeKalb, 2002.

FRANK 2007

FRANK J., "Being and Laziness," *The New Republic*, The New Republic Mag. (web), <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/being-and-laziness>, 29.1.2007, 25.1.2014 (acc.).

GASPAROV 2004

GASPAROV B., "Identity in Language?" in: S. FRANKLIN, E. WIDDIS (eds.), *National Identity in Russian Culture: An Introduction*, Cambridge (UK), 2004, 132–148.

GERSCHENKRON 1975

GERSCHENKRON A., "Time Horizon in Russian Literature," *The Slavic Review*, 34.4, 1975, 692–715.

KUHN 1971

KUHN A., "Dobroliubov's Critique of *Oblomov*: Polemics and Psychology," *Slavic Review* 30.1, 1971, 93–109.

LEATHERBARROW 2004

LEATHERBARROW W., "Pechorin's Demons: Representations of the Demonic in Lermontov's «A Hero of Our Time»," *The Modern Language Review*, 99.4, 2004, 999–1013.

LEERSSEN 2007

LEERSSEN J., "Imagology: History and Method," "Image," "Identity/Alterity/Hybridity," in: M. BELLER, J. LEERSSEN (eds.), *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters*, Amsterdam, 2007, 17–32, 335–44.

MAGUIRE 1994

MAGUIRE R., *Exploring Gogol*, Stanford, 1994.

MASSIE 1986

MASSIE R., *Peter the Great: His Life and World*, New York, 1986.

MCLEAN 1998

MCLEAN H., "The Countryside," in: M. JONES, R. MILLER (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Classic Russian Novel*, Cambridge (UK), 1998, 41–62.

MIRSKY 1999

MIRSKY D., *A History of Russian Literature: From Its Beginnings to 1900*, Evanston, 1999.

MUZA 2000

MUZA A., "Science, Philosophy, Music: Chekhov's Three Germans," in: *Cold Fusion*, 2000, 185–196.

NABOKOV 1961

NABOKOV V., *Nikolai Gogol*, New York, 1961.

OXFENGRUSDICT 1991

Oxford English-Russian Dictionary, 3rd ed., 2000.

PEACE 1991

PEACE R., *Oblomov: A Critical Examination of Goncharov's Novel*, Birmingham (UK), 1991.

SAZONOVA 1945

SAZONOVA J., "The German in Russian Literature," *American Slavic and East European Review*, 4.1/2, 1945, 51–79.

SEELEY 1976

SEELEY F., "Oblomov," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 54.3, 1976, 335–354.

SENESE 2003

SENESE D., "Nikolai Aleksandrovich Dobroliubov," in: A. GILLESPIE (ed.), *Russian Literature in the Age of Realism* (= Dictionary of Literary Biography, 277), Gale, Detroit, 2003, 80–93.

SETCHKAREV 1967

SETCHKAREV V., "Andrej Štol'c in Gončarov's Oblomov: An Attempted Reinterpretation," in: *To Honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, 3, The Hague, Paris, 1967, 1799–1805.

SHISHKIN 2008

SHISHKIN M., "Afterward," in: I. GONCHAROV, M. SCHWARTZ (trans.), *Oblomov*, New York, 2008, 545–552.

SLONIM 1953

SLONIM M., *Modern Russian Literature: From Chekhov to the Present*, Oxford (UK), 1953.

STACY 1985

STACY R., "Dobrolyubov, Nikolai Aleksandrovich," *The Handbook of Russian Literature*, 1985, 101.

STILMAN 1948

STILMAN L., "Oblomovka Revisited," *American Slavic and East European Review*, 7.1, 1948, 45–77.

THIERGEN 2006

THIERGEN P., "Deutsche und Halbdeutsche bei Ivan Gončarov. Eine Skizze," in: D. HERMANN (ed.), *Deutsche und Deutschland aus russischer Sicht. 19. / 20. Jahrhundert: Von den Reformen Alexanders II. bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, München, 2006, 350–365.

WIDDIS 1998

WIDDIS E., "Russia as Space," in: *National Identity in Russian Culture*, 1998, 30–49.

Булгаков 2004

Булгаков М., "Мастер и Маргарита", в: Он же, *Собрание сочинений в 8 тт.*, 5, С.-Петербург, 2004, 97–544.

Герцен 1956

Герцен А., *Собрание сочинений в 30 тт.*, 5, Москва, 1956.

Гоголь 1937–1952

Гоголь Н., *Полное собрание сочинений: В 14 т.*, Москва, Ленинград, 1937–1952.

- ГОНЧАРОВ 1959
ГОНЧАРОВ И., *Обломов: роман в четырех частях*, Москва, 1959.
- ГОНЧАРОВ 1997
ГОНЧАРОВ И., *Полное собрание сочинений и писем: В 20 т.*, С.-Петербург, 1997–.
- ДОСТОЕВСКИЙ 1994
ДОСТОЕВСКИЙ Ф., *Полное собрание сочинений в семи томах*, 2, Москва, 1994.
- ДОБРОЛЮБОВ 1948
ДОБРОЛЮБОВ Н., “Что такое обломовщина?”, в: Он же, *Избранные статьи*, 1948, 29–76.
- КРАСНОЩЕКОВА 1997
КРАСНОЩЕКОВА Е., *Иван Александрович Гончаров: Мир творчества*, С.-Петербург, 1997.
- ЛЕРМОНТОВ 1957
ЛЕРМОНТОВ М., “Княжна Мери”, в: Он же, *Сочинения: В 6 т.*, 6, Москва, 1957.
- ЛАЖЕЧНИКОВ 1858
ЛАЖЕЧНИКОВ И., *Собрание сочинений*, 3, С.-Петербург, 1858.
- МАС
ЕВГЕНЬЕВА А. П. (ред.), *Словарь русского языка*, 1–4, 4-е изд., стер., Москва, 1999.
- НЕДЗВЕЦКИЙ 1992
НЕДЗВЕЦКИЙ В., *И. А. Гончаров – романист и художник*, Москва, 1992.
- ОТРАДИН 1994
ОТРАДИН М., *Проза И. А. Гончарова в литературном контексте*, С.-Петербург, 1994.
- СКВОЗНИКОВ 1963
СКВОЗНИКОВ В., “Предисловие”, в: И. ГОНЧАРОВ, *Обломов*, Москва, 1963, 3–22.
- ТУРГЕНЕВ 1964
ТУРГЕНЕВ И., *Отцы и дети*, Москва, 1964.
- ТЮТЧЕВ 2003
ТЮТЧЕВ Ф., *Полное собрание сочинений и писем: В 6 т.*, 2, Москва, 2003.
- ХОЛКИН 2003
ХОЛКИН В., “Андрей Штольц: Поиск понимания”, в: М. ЖДАНОВА, А. ЛОБКАРЁВА, И. СМИРНОВА (сост.), *Гончаров И. А.: Материалы Международной конференции, посвященной 190-летию со дня рождения И. А. Гончарова*, Ульяновск, 2003, 38–48.
- ЧЕХОВ 1974–1983
ЧЕХОВ А., *Полное собрание сочинений и писем: В 30 т.*, Москва, 1974–1983.
- ЭПШТЕЙН 1996
ЭПШТЕЙН М., “Ирония стиля: демоническое в образе России у Гоголя”, *Новое литературное обозрение*, 19, 1996, 129–147.

References

- Borowec C., “Time after Time: The Temporal Ideology of Oblomov,” *The Slavic and East European Journal*, 38.4, 1994, 561–573.
- Diment G., “The Precocious Talent of Ivan Goncharov,” in: G. Diment (ed.), *Goncharov’s Oblomov: A Critical Companion*, Evanston, 1998.
- Diment G., “Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov,” in: J. Ogden and J. Kalb (eds.), *Russian Novelists in the Age of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky*, Detroit, 2001, 90–106.
- Dolinin A., “«The Stepmother of Russian Cities»: Berlin of the 1920s through the Eyes of Russian Writers,” in: G. Barabtarlo (ed.), *Cold Fusion: Aspects of the German Cultural Presence in Russia*, New York, 2000, 225–240.
- Ehre M., “Goncharov, Ivan Aleksandrovich,” in: V. Terras (ed.), *The Handbook of Russian Literature*, New Haven, 1985, 178–179.
- Ehre M., *Oblomov and His Creator*, Princeton, 1973.
- Ely C., *This Meager Nature: Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia*, DeKalb, 2002.
- Epstein M., “Ironiia stilia: demonicheskoe v obraze Rossii u Gogolia,” *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 19, 1996, 129–147.

- Frank J., "Being and Laziness," *The New Republic*, The New Republic Mag. (web), <http://www.newrepublic.com/article/being-and-laziness>, 29.1.2007, 25.1.2014 (acc.).
- Gasparov B., "Identity in Language?" in: S. Franklin, E. Widdis (eds.), *National Identity in Russian Culture: An Introduction*, Cambridge (UK), 2004, 132–148.
- Gerschenkron A., "Time Horizon in Russian Literature," *The Slavic Review*, 34.4, 1975, 692–715.
- Kholkin V., "Andrei Shtol'ts: Poisk ponimaniia," in: M. Zhdanova, A. Lobkareva, I. Smirnova (eds.), *Goncharov I. A.: Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii, posviashchennoi 190-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia I. A. Goncharova*, Ulyanovsk, 2003, 38–48.
- Krasnoshechekova E., *Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov: Mir tvorchestva*, St. Petersburg, 1997.
- Kuhn A., "Dobroliubov's Critique of *Oblomov*: Polemics and Psychology," *Slavic Review* 30.1, 1971, 93–109.
- Leatherbarrow W., "Pechorin's Demons: Representations of the Demonic in Lermontov's «A Hero of Our Time»," *The Modern Language Review*, 99.4, 2004, 999–1013.
- Leerssen J., "Imagology: History and Method," "Image," "Identity/Alterity/Hybridity," in: M. Beller, J. Leerssen (eds.), *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters*, Amsterdam, 2007, 17–32, 335–44.
- Maguire R., *Exploring Gogol*, Stanford, 1994.
- Massie R., *Peter the Great: His Life and World*, New York, 1986.
- McLean H., "The Countryside," in: M. Jones, R. Miller (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Classic Russian Novel*, Cambridge (UK), 1998, 41–62.
- Mirsky D., *A History of Russian Literature: From Its Beginnings to 1900*, Evanston, 1999.
- Muza A., "Science, Philosophy, Music: Chekhov's Three Germans," in: *Cold Fusion*, 2000, 185–196.
- Nabokov V., *Nikolai Gogol*, New York, 1961.
- Nedzvetskii V., *I. A. Goncharov — romanist i khudozhnik*, Moscow, 1992.
- Otradin M., *Proza I. A. Goncharova v literaturnom kontekste*, St. Petersburg, 1994.
- Peace R., *Oblomov: A Critical Examination of Goncharov's Novel*, Birmingham (UK), 1991.
- Sazonova J., "The German in Russian Literature," *American Slavic and East European Review*, 4.1/2, 1945, 51–79.
- Seeley F., "Oblomov," *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 54.3, 1976, 335–354.
- Senese D., "Nikolai Aleksandrovich Dobroliubov," in: A. Gillespie (ed.), *Russian Literature in the Age of Realism* (= Dictionary of Literary Biography, 277), Gale, Detroit, 2003, 80–93.
- Setchkarev V., "Andrej Štol'c in Gončarov's *Oblomov*: An Attempted Reinterpretation," in: *To Honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, 3, The Hague, Paris, 1967, 1799–1805.
- Shishkin M., "Afterward," in: I. Goncharov, M. Schwartz (trans.), *Oblomov*, New York, 2008, 545–552.
- Skvoznikov V., "Predislovie," in: I. Goncharov, *Oblomov*, Moscow, 1963, 3–22.
- Slonim M., *Modern Russian Literature: From Chekhov to the Present*, Oxford (UK), 1953.
- Stacy R., "Dobroliubov, Nikolai Aleksandrovich," *The Handbook of Russian Literature*, 1985, 101.
- Stilman L., "Oblomovka Revisited," *American Slavic and East European Review*, 7.1, 1948, 45–77.
- Thiergen P., "Deutsche und Halbdeutsche bei Ivan Gončarov. Eine Skizze," in: D. Hermann (ed.), *Deutsche und Deutschland aus russischer Sicht. 19. / 20. Jahrhundert: Von den Reformen Alexanders II. bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, München, 2006, 350–365.
- Widdis E., "Russia as Space," in: *National Identity in Russian Culture*, 1998, 30–49.

DR. JOSHUA S. WALKER

Buckingham Browne & Nichols School
80 Gerry's Landing
Cambridge, Massachusetts
USA
jwalker@bbns.org