Fedín's short novel *Sanatorij Arktur*, his last work before the outbreak of war between the Soviet Union and Germany, was written between 1937 and 1940 and first published in 1940 in the journal *Nový mir*. Unlike the earlier novels, Fedín did not rewrite *Sanatorij Arktur* subsequently, and the only variations between the 1940 text in *Nový mir* and the 1960 edition consist in corrections of obvious misprints and minor verbal alterations.

The novel is relatively short (142 pages in the 1960 edition) and one critic raised the question of genre, finding that the work was a *povest*, rather than a *roman*. I. Oksenov wrote that in view of the brevity of *Sanatorij Arktur* and the fact that the action is concentrated in a short period of time, "... v "Sanatorii Arktur" net i ne možet byt' izobraženiya xarakterov v ix stanovlenii, kak éto vozmožno v romane."\(^2\)

\(^1\)"Sanatorij Arktur. Roman," *Nový mir*, #4-5 (1940), pp. 50-120. Extracts from the novel were published earlier in the journal *Rezek* (#3, 5, 15-16, 1939). The novel was first published in book form by the *Sovetskij pisatel'* publishing house (1940) with illustrations by I. Nikolaevcev.

Fedin himself, writing to N. N. Nikitin in 1939 about the forthcoming publication in Rezec of extracts from the work, refers to the work as a "povest' o Davose," although he had previously referred to it as a "roman" in a letter to M. M. Škapskaja. Two extracts published in Rezec were, in fact, subtitled Iz povesti o Davose. M. Slonim terms it a "novelette", and G. Struve refers to the work as "der ausserordentlichen kurze Roman Sanatorij Arktur... den man eher eine Novelle nennen kann." However, all Soviet critics apart from Oksenov accept the description of Sanatorij Arktur as a novel, and the book invariably has been published as such.

Sanatorij Arktur was the first major work to be published by Fedin since the appearance of the second book of Poxiščenje Evropy in

---


4Fedin, letter of June 22, 1938, to M. M. Škapskaja, addressed from "daca" [Peredelkino], in Tvorchestvo Konstantina Fedina, p. 405.


7Gleb Struve, Geschichte der Sovjetliteratur (Munich, 1958), p. 333.

8With the single exception of the 1941 edition, in which it is termed "malen'kij roman": Malen'kie romany i četyre rasskaza (Moscow, Goslitizdat, 1941).
1935. As in his earlier novels, Fedin here again draws to a very great extent on his own experiences in Western Europe.

In May 1931 Fedin suffered a serious attack of tuberculosis in both lungs, and Gor’kij was instrumental in obtaining the necessary foreign passport and currency for him to undergo treatment in Switzerland and Germany. Fedin spent ten months (September 1931-June 1932) in a sanatorium in Davos (Graubünden), followed by six months (June-December 1932) in a pension in St. Blasien in the Black Forest. By November 1932 Fedin was able to write to Gor’kij that "Rezultat lečenija očen' xorošij... dovolen ne toľ'ko ja, no i vrači." However, the low ethical standards of the owners of sanatoria during the economic depression made a very unpleasant impression on Fedin. Gorkij had warned him not to stay at Prof. Backmeister's sanatorium in St. Blasien, where he himself had undergone treatment in Davos (Graubünden), followed by six months (June-December 1932) in a pension in St. Blasien in the Black Forest.


12 Fedin, letter to M. Gor’kij from St. Blasien, November 24, 1932, in Gor’kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 540.
treatment in 1922: "...eto ves'ma grubyj i zadnyj chelovek...s bol'nymi
on nebren."

Fedin found his own sanatorium to be an "...apparat,
yvdelyvajushchij iz koxovyx bacyll shvejcarskie franki."

Fedin describes the personality of the owner as a clear source of
literary inspiration:

Sdelat' mozno, pozhalуй, tolo'ko odno:
k skandal'noj slave Tomas Manna ("Zauberberg")
pribavit' esli ne slavy, to skandala. Mne v
etom smysle povezlo: vladelc sanatorija, v
kotorom ja lechus', prevsochel po licemeriyu,
xan'jestvu, podlomu stjazhaniem samogo ludi'shu.
Predstav'te sebe etakoe sozdanie na fone
nyneesnogo krizisa - krasota! Ne potomu li
on menja staratel'nno uderzivaet ot raboty, cto
zhдет on nee..."vozmezdija"?

Fedin was, however, impressed by his personal physician,
"prevosxodnyj vrach i tonkij chelovek," and by the fact that the Berlin
doctors had sent him to Davos: "Esli prinjat' v raschet nemeckij
patriotizm, to napravlenie bol'nogo v chu'ju stranu, kogda sanatorii
i vansiony Germanii pustujut, nado priznat' obrazcom bespristrastja."

Nevertheless, later at St. Blasien Fedin found that in the eyes of the
local area administrations profits were more important that the health
of the patients:

13 M. Gor'kij, letter to Fedin from Moscow, May/June 1931, in
Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 523: see also
M. Gor'kij, letter to Fedin from Sorrento, March 29, 1932, in M. Gor'kij,
Sobranie sochinenij v tridcati tomax (Moscow, 1949-55), XXX, 246.

14 Fedin, letter to M. Gor'kij from Davos, March 22, 1932, in
Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 532.

15 Fedin, letter to M. Gor'kij from Davos, October 29, 1931, in
Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 529.
...nemeckie policejskie vzjali na sebja sanitarnej nadzor i provodjat ego tak userdno, čto razognali vsex bol'nyx. Dlja mestnyx samoupravlenij vygodnee, vidite li, zdorovye, čam bol'nye, t.e. turisty, sportsmeny, tak čto vse krugom peredelyvaetsja v paradoksal'nye kurorty dlja zdorovyx.¹⁶

Not only does Fedin in Sanatorij Arktur describe in detail the life of TB patients in a sanatorium in Davos, but also the novel has as one of its principal themes the dishonest financial manipulations of the sanatorium owner, so that the autobiographical basis of much of the material is evident. The year (1932) is that of Fedin's own stay in Davos. Fedin himself wrote of the novel when introducing extracts published in the journal Rezec, "V celom ěto kartina nравov i byta evropejskogo sanatorija v 1931-1932 gg."¹⁷

Curiously, however, Fedin's detestation of fascism - a major theme in Poxiščenie Evropy - which he apparently derived in part from his experiences when visiting Prof. Backmeister's sanatorium in St. Blasien in June 1932 and while in Berlin in December 1932,¹⁸ is not reflected in Sanatorij Arktur. Possibly this is due to the political developments of 1939, which culminated in the Hitler-Stalin pact of August: thus Sanatorij Arktur was published during the period of the

¹⁶Fedin, letter to M. Gor'kij from St. Blasien, June 17, 1932, in Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 538.


Soviet-German alliance.\textsuperscript{19} The action of the novel takes place in 1932 and extends apparently over a period of several weeks in the spring. The date may be determined from a reference to the Russian hero, Levšin, receiving Soviet newspapers in which the ceremonial opening of the Dneprogés (Dneprovskaja gidroélektrostancija) hydroelectric station is reported.\textsuperscript{20} The opening was a major event of 1932 at which M. I. Kalinin, Chairman of the Union Central Executive Committee, and G. K. Ordžonikidze, People's Commissar for Heavy Industry, both made speeches.\textsuperscript{21}

II

Levsin, the Soviet hero of the novel, has been a patient in the "Arktur" sanatorium for about a year.\textsuperscript{22} Before falling ill, he had worked...

\textsuperscript{19} I. G. Erenburg relates in his memoirs the difficulties which he encountered at this time in publishing a book on his Spanish civil war experiences, as well as his novel \textit{Padenie Pariža}. The censor insisted that he remove even the word "fascism", which occurred in Part I of \textit{Padenie Pariža} in a description of demonstrations in Paris between 1935 and 1937. It proved impossible also to make any reference in articles to the "zakljatye druz'ja." (Il'ja Erenburg, \textit{Ljudi, gody, žizn'}, in \textit{Sobranie sočinenij v devjati tomax} (Moscow, 1967), IX, 263-265.

\textsuperscript{20} See \textit{Bol'saja sovetskaja énciklopedija}, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1952), XIV, articles under \textit{Dneprogés imeni V. I. Lenina}, p. 577, and \textit{Dneprostroj}, p. 591.

\textsuperscript{21} See p. 23.
for three years in a Soviet torgpredstvo, apparently designing electrical
equipment for power stations, including the Dneprogés hydroelectric
station.\textsuperscript{23}

It is curious that the designing office should be in a torgpredstvo, since torgpredstva (torgovye predstavitel'stva; usually translated "USSR Trade Delegation") normally operated only abroad, and their functions were restricted to foreign trade.\textsuperscript{24} This is the only reference in the novel to Levšin's work, and the inadequate treatment of Levšin's professional activity became a subject of criticism by Soviet commentators.\textsuperscript{25} Even this sketchy representation, complains an engineer correspondent, writing in Molodaja Gvardija soon after the appearance of the novel, contains a technical inaccuracy: the tracing paper which Fedin describes\textsuperscript{26} as in use by Soviet engineers had not been used in daily work for "30-40 years."\textsuperscript{27}

It is doubtful also whether contemporary Soviet readers would find Levšin's undergoing treatment in a Swiss sanatorium to be a realistic situation. The only comment in the novel on the problem of arranging

\textsuperscript{23}See pp. 70-71.

\textsuperscript{24}See Bol'saja sovetskaja enciklopedija, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1952), XIV, article under Torgovoe predstavitel'stvo, p. 17.


\textsuperscript{26}p. 70.

treatment abroad is the reference to "...druz'ja, osvobodivšie ego ot denežnyx zabol..." Inge Kretschmar interrupts Levšin when apparently he is on the point of telling her about the circumstances of his falling sick (p. 74).

Fedin himself, despite his position as a prominent Soviet writer, coeditor of a major literary journal, and chairman of the board of a publishing house, had the greatest difficulty in obtaining foreign currency for treatment abroad, finally succeeding only thanks to the efforts of Gor'kij. Clearly this success was due to pressure at the highest level, in this case to Gor'kij's influence on A. I. Steckij, who was in charge of the Kul'tpro (Otdel kul'tury i propagandy) of the Party Central Committee. I. A. Gruzdev, in fact, complained bitterly to Gor'kij of the humiliating attitude of the authorities. If a prominent writer who had through Gor'kij the ear of the Central Committee encountered such difficulties, it would scarcely have been realistic for an ordinary engineer to apply for a foreign passport and currency in order to undergo treatment in a sanatorium in Davos. No doubt the unreality of this situation contributed to

28 p. 71.


30 "Xlopoty s ot''ezdom očen' dlitel'ny i žestoki. Segodnja uexal Fedin, soveršenno prevrativšijsja v močalku. Počemu u nas tak malo uvaženija k čeloveku, otčego obsljumivajut i stempeljut tebja so vsex storon, točno poslednego mazarika? Neuželi my tak opasny dlja gosudarstva." (Letter from I. A. Gruzdev to A. M. Gor'kij, Leningrad, August 22, 1931, in Perepiska A. M. Gor'kogo s I. A. Gruzdevym, p. 280.
Soviet critics' doubts of the convincingness of Levšin as a representative of the Soviet Union.

Levšin's condition on his arrival in Davos had clearly been extremely serious, but we are first introduced to Levšin in the context of his recovery, and specifically the heightened perception, "kakoj-to novyj, udivivšij ego instinkt," through which he becomes aware of the improvement in his condition. With enthusiasm he makes sensuous discoveries during his first sleigh outing: the special crackle of snow under the sleigh-runners, the funny smell of petrol exhaust fumes, and the special brightness, "osobaja tajna krasok," of colours in the mountains. This theme of brilliance of colour is to acquire special significance in the novel. Levšin finds that "Ljubopytstvo ko vsemu roslo...s uvlekajuščej, veseljaščej bystrotoj." "Zima byla sladostnym sostojaniem." He realizes that he is indebted to Dr. Stumm, the physician under whose personal care he had been, for his "renewal and his life." His new capacity for observation and his interest in life

31 Dr. Stumm, head doctor at the cantonal sanatorium, had said of him, "Ot Davosa vse ešče čudes - prisylajut takie slučai." (p. 19).


33 p. 12.

34 p. 13.
around him is demonstrated by an episode in which he watches a quarrel between two little girls whose meetings under a poplar clump he has regularly watched. "Čto vživanie v neisčislimyje melodič okruženija, perežde ne zamečaemye ili navodiščie ustalost', prevraščalo nepodvižnost' ležanija, kogda-to pugavšij odnim svoim imenem "režim", vo čto-to dejatel'noe, prijatnoe."35 After a bantering conversation with Dr. Hoffmann, who, as he is aware, is in love with him, he feels - these words end the chapter - "neuderžimo dovol'nyj vsam na svete."36

When he meets Inge Kretschmar in the company of the assembled patients he tells her with assurance, "Popravlja's."37 Apart from brief references to Levšin's going for walks and practising gymnastics,38 and to the changed appearance of the skin of his hands,39 the impression of regained health is created by the gaiety which Levšin displays in his reaction to his environment as well as by the presentation of his heightened perception. Thus while Levšin watches a hockey match, "...v otvet na čto veseloe poboišče sil'nee otzyvalos' v nem čuvstvo zdorov'ja."40

---

36 p. 16.
37 p. 23.
38 p. 70.
39 p. 40.
40 p. 70.
A less attractive aspect of his recovery is the opportunity which it gives him to draw comparisons almost gloatingly between his own improving health and Inge Kretschmar's deteriorating condition. This parallel, repeated on five occasions, becomes a leitmotiv of the novel.  

When Inge asks him to come to her room in order to tell him of the fraud practised by Klebe on Willi Bauer, Levšin goes to her "s oščuščeniem preobladanija, s kakim vrači v xodjat k bol'nym. Peremena v nej byla očen' zametna i probuždala k sebe tosklivoe učastie, no slova, kotorymi čto vyrazilos' v soznanii Levšina, pokazalis' emu strannymi: 'Ja tak i znal, čto ej budet xuže,' podumal on."  

This feeling is mingled with one of resentment at the sympathy which Inge's condition perforce arouses in him:

```
Približenie k Inge stanovilos' emu v tjagost', nadolgo vzyvaja k nej sostradanie. No sostradanie nikogda ne prixodilo čistym, a smešivalos' s trevožaščim uprjanym čuvstvom udovol's-tvija, čto s nim, s Levšinym, ne proisxodilo togo, čto proisxodilo s nej, s Ingoj. Ëta dvojstvennost' kazalas' emu postydnoj. On staralsja podavit' v sebe postojannoe nevelikodušnoe sravnenie nedavno perežitogo s tem, čto pereživala Inga. No v nem jutilos' skrytöe toržestvo...```

When Inge is dying Levšin tells Hoffmann of his shame at his mixed feelings toward her: "Ved' nedavno vas tak tjagotilo, čto Inga vzyvaet sostradanie." - "Da, i mne stydno."
Although both Inge and Hoffmann fall in love with him, he is unable to reciprocate in either case. Levšin first demonstrates a certain interest in Inge by offering to escort her to her room when she bursts into tears after seeing the skijumper fall. There is no suggestion that Levšin finds her especially physically attractive. He is intrigued by her facial tic,\(^{45}\) which seems rather repellent than endearing. In their first conversation he shows a complete lack of sympathy for Inge: when he is asked whether she should agree to painful collapse therapy, of which she is evidently terrified, Levšin tells her, "Poslušajte, ved' éto sušče pustjaki, i tut nešego razdumyvat'."\(^{46}\) Later he tells her when she weeps with anguish and terror of the doctors, "Vyet vse čego-to boites', a ved' bojat'sja nešego!"\(^{47}\) When she asks him about Clavadel, he is pointedly unromantic, ("Četo avtomobil'naja sirena,"\(^{48}\) and after she presses him he is offended at the "volnujuščaja glupost' razgovora."\(^{49}\) However, the reader is left to conclude from the discreet ending of the chapter that he does not reject her advances,\(^{50}\) and on a later occasion he accepts a kiss from her.\(^{51}\)

---

45 See, for example, pp. 23, 40.
46 p. 40.
47 p. 58.
48 p. 40.
49 p. 41.
50 See p. 41.
51 See p. 59.
Although Levšin thus accepts her attentions passively, he objects strongly to Inge's attempts to establish a relationship, or, as he terms it, a "dependence," between them. It seems unjustified to speak of his "boleznennoe vlečenie" for Inge, despite Hoffmann's embittered remark, "Vas tołkaet k Inge vovse ne sostradanie." When she tries to catch him out by inducing him to admit that he is about to leave "Arktur," he is indignant: "Kakuju-to navjazčivuju zavisimost' staralas' ustanovit' Inga meždu nim i svoej sud'boj. A ego ugnetał sostradanie k nej, on ne xotel byt' njan'koj ee bolezni." It is this indignation that drives him to lie to Inge about his intention of leaving and to make the unfeeling remark ("imenno k bezžalostnosti on sebja zval"), "...vot dažε vy ne boites' vesny," although soon after he is ashamed of his lying. Eventually Levšin persuades himself that he has done nothing unjust, and that the well-intentioned lie will do both him and Inge a good service. He rationalizes his behaviour by telling himself, "V samom dele, ne pokušenjem li na ego svobodu byli vse ěti pretenzii Ingi? Ona običalas' na to, čtò on ne daval ej povoda običat'sja. Ukorjala tem, čtò u nego ne bylo pered nej nikakix objazannostej. Nelepeoe, smešnoe položenie!" After this evidence of

52 Goffenšefer, p. 183.
53 p. 118.
54 p. 86.
55 p. 86.
56 pp. 87-88.
his attitude toward Inge, Levšin's missing Inge on his arrival at the hotel in Alp Grüm seems unconvincing: 
"...kakaja žalost', čto ee net poblizosti i čto ona tak užasno bol'na!" On parting from Hoffmann, who has visited him in Alp Grüm, Levšin gauchely asks her to greet Inge from him and is embarrassed when he remembers how he had left "Arktur" without saying goodbye to her. It is not clear, however, to what extent his embarrassment is due to his faux pas toward Hoffmann. When Levšin learns of Inge's return to "Arktur" in an extremely serious condition he seems to be greatly affected. His feeling toward Hoffmann changes, and despite her reproachfulness and subsequent irritation he cannot withstrain himself from asking about Inge. After seeing the degree to which she has been disfigured by the disease, his desperation is expressed in an interior monologue incorporating a reiterated extreme metaphor which is too hyperbolical to be psychologically entirely convincing:

...nado vse vremja, bez pereryvov, dejstvovat', podnimat' vse sily, iskat' samye neobychnye sredstva i spesit', spesit'. U nego vse nylo ot boli, potomu čto ego sbrosili na mostovuju... On byl dostupen liš' odnomu čuvstvu... vse oni, vse, kto byl okolo née, ne mogli ponjat', čto Inga rasstavalas' s edin-stvennoj svoej žiz'nu. Ėto bylo sobytie grandioznoe, takoe, kakogo ne videl mir: ona rasstavalas' s žiz'nu, ona umirala.

57 p. 90.
58 p. 95.
59 p. 117.
Later Levšin's emotion at Inge's death is expressed by his refusal to play bridge on the evening of the same day: "...on xmuro skazal, čto pri podobnych obstojatel'ствах v sledujuščij raz, naverno, budet igrat' v karty, esli emu udast'sja predvaritel'но sojti s uma, a sejčas on xočet guljet'."  

Neither this statement by Levšin nor the earlier interior monologue is completely psychologically convincing and they fail to persuade the reader of Levšin's sudden realization of the depth of his feelings for Inge, which the reader had had no grounds to suspect.

It would be difficult to maintain that Levšin's affection for Hoffmann, with whom he becomes involved during his stay at Alp Grům, is more profound than his feeling for Inge. There is an element of mockery in his first bantering conversation with her, even though he is clearly aware of her liking for him. The conversation ends on a tone of unfeeling smugness: "On videl, kak, otveruvšis' i uxodja, ona zakusila podmazannuju gubu, i on dolgo smejalsja, pomogu nabiraja v grud', morozno-čistogo vozduxa, neuderžimo dovol'nyj vsem na svete."  

When Hoffmann visits him in Alp Grům, they go for a walk up the mountain toward a glacier, and Levšin suddenly begins to experience

---

60 p. 122.
61 p. 16.
62 p. 16.
physical attraction toward her. After dinner Levšin's feelings become overpowering ("Strast' vytesnila soboju vse...") and he kisses her. Hoffmann has been awaiting this ("Kak udivitel'no, čto éto ne slučilos' ran'še....No kažetsja, - čto bylo vsegda...") and she expects that it will be the beginning of a permanent relationship: "Skaži, kak ty dumaeš', čto budet dal'še?....Ved' ty menja..." Levšin is non-committal: "Budet xorošo....Ne znaju. Davaj ne stanem gadat'." Soon after at parting he makes the faux pas of asking her to greet Inge from him. His lack of feeling in continually asking Hoffmann about Inge during her last illness drives her to ask him bitterly: "Začem, začem vy priexali!"

At the end of the novel, however, Levšin finally appears to become conscious again of his affection for her. After Klebe's death Levšin can remember only the good in "Arktur", and the best of that good, he finds, is expressed in one "suščestvo", Hoffmann. He asks her to meet him that evening, presumably to say goodbye. When, however, she shows sadness at his already having packed his books before leaving, he tells her feelinglessly, "Čto že gorenat'? Ved' éto vyvod iz vsego, čto

---

63. "...otkryvaja v nej čto-to neožidanno vlekuščee," "v nem uže vnjatno roslo bespokojnoe vlečenie k nej..." "blizost' vzgljada stanovilas' smutnoj." (p. 93).

64. p. 94.


66. Curiously, the infelicitous word "suščestvo" is repeated four times in a single paragraph (p. 142).
bylo." His emotion during their last meeting is expressed only in the phrases, "emu vdrug stalo s nej xoroșo i prosto," and "...emu s nej bylo po-preznemu xoroșo." In the course of a conversation with Dr. Stumm in the final scene, Levšin plainly hints that Stumm should offer Hoffman a post at his sanatorium, and Stumm consents. The stylistically superb setpiece of the final episode gives the parting of Levšin and Hoffman an artistically convincing romantic aura - an aura, however, not warranted by the previous development of their relationship. His affection is suggested directly only by the phrases, "...on obnjal ee za pleči, i oni pošli dal'še medlennym, slitnym šagom, kak ljudi, kotorym ne xočetsja, čtoby put' končalsja."  

Levšin's feelings toward Dr. Stumm are stronger than toward any other individual. After the sleighride during which he is vividly conscious of his returning health, he becomes convinced that he owes his recovery to the doctor: "Togda Levšin oščutil mgnovennyj i neošidannyj priliv nežnosti k Štumu i totčas понял, что imenno emu objazan svoim obnovleniem, svoej žizn'ju." He acquires a romantically irrational faith in Stumm's omnipotence as a healer. During Inge's last illness

---

67 p. 142.  
68 p. 143.  
69 p. 148.  
70 p. 13.
he demands that Stumm be summoned, and eventually climbs up the mountain road to Stumm's cantonal sanatorium in order to call him to Inge. The sanatorium and its surroundings create on him an irresistible impression of "blagopolučie", and for Levšin "...bylo nesomennomu, čto vsem zdes' upravljaet bog, i on znal, čto bog byl Štum." Soon after, Levšin thinks of Davos as the "...gorod dobroj voli Štuma," and significantly finds Stumm to be the "pravednik, na kotorom deržitsja gorod." Finally it is to Stumm that Levšin proposes a visit to the Soviet Union.

Levšin's attitude toward Klebe is not made explicit. When Klebe unburdens his soul to Levšin, Levšin's participation is limited to ironic comments, from which one infers that Levšin is totally unconvinced of Klebe's altruism or material disinterestedness. As Grinberg points out, however, Levšin has the last word on Klebe: "On byl neploxoj čelovek...potomu čto on ne mog byt' lučše, daže esli by xotel." When Hoffmann comments, "Eto vse rassuždenija," he replies, "Da, éto rassuždenija, ot kotoryx on umer."
Most Soviet criticism of Levšin has been devoted to his inadequacy as a representative of the Soviet Union, but Levšin's relationships with Kretschmar and Hoffmann have also attracted considerable attention.

None of the critics apart from Oksenov draws attention to the somewhat hackneyed plot feature of the "eternal triangle" or expresses an opinion on the psychological convincingness of their mutual love for Levšin. The reader learns nothing of Levšin's physical appearance, and the assumption must be that there exists, as Brajnina expresses it, a "glubokaja, podspudnaja tjaga nesčastnyx obitatelyx Arktura k nemu, k ego duševnomu zdorov'ju, k ego jasnosti i uverennosti." The only entirely positive evaluation of Levšin's relationships with others is expressed by "Obozrevatel" in the journal Literaturnyj sovremennik, who claims that Levšin is "...tesno svjazan s drugimi dejstvujuščimi licami, ego otnošenija s nimi aktivny i naprjaženny." He finds that "dramatizm" is the principal characteristic of these relationships, and that this is expressed particularly in Levšin's relationship with Inge: "[Levšin]...sočuvstvuje devuške i gorjuet o nej, no ne možet otvetit' na ee čuvstvo." 81

---

78 Oksenov refers to the "vnešne nesložnyj, xotja i ne banal'nyj ljubovnyj sjužet," finding that Fedin raises it to a high artistic level by his subtle treatment of the dialectic of human relationships and emotions. (I. Oksenov, "O novom romane Konstantina Fedina," Zvezda, #8-9 (1940), p. 284).

79 This is commented upon by Panov, who, however, curiously remarks that we do not "remember" Levšin's appearance (Panov, p. 226).


81 "Obozrevatel", "Ščastlivaja vstreča," Literaturnyj sovremennik, #5-6 (1940), p. 224.
Even Fedin's normally most indulgent critic, Brajnina, finds that the hero's feeling of biological joy in life "...часто заслоняет от Левшина чувство страданий." Referring to his relationship with Inge, she continues, "Потому так созерцательный и эгоистично его любопытство ...Эгоизм вьзоравливаючего человека делает Левшу холоднолюбопытным и в отношении с фрейлой Гофман..."82 Zagradka finds that Levšin is similar to Rogov in *Poxiščenie Evropy*, and to a degree also to Starcov and Karev in his "непосредовательная нравственная позиция в отношении между людьми..." He wonders, "Почему Levšin приобщился к обману доктора Клейбе? Потому что путем формальной идейной логики сумел оправдатель его поступок. Это нарушает логику образа..."83

Grinberg is the only critic to praise the manner of Levšin's parting with Hoffmann: "Покидая Давос, он стремится устроить жизнь любимому, симпатичному, заинтересованному."84 Nevertheless, he concludes that Levšin cannot be a "полноценный герой" in view of his defects as an individual. Grinberg finds that Levšin is "методическое холодноватый и превеликенно рассудительный." For Inge, Levšin is the last bridge connecting her to life, and although "...нелепо обвинять Levšina в смерти девушки. Он не мог насиливо заставить себя полюбить..."

82 Brajnina, p. 170.


84 Grinberg, p. 28.
Grinberg remarks that Levšin compromises himself even further in the reader's eyes by consciously continuing Klebe's deception of Inge. With little justification, Grinberg comments finally that Fedin "...spokojno i bezžalostno pokazyvaet, kak ţestoko raspladivaetsja Levšin za svoi ošibki, za svoju izlišnuju xolodnost' i rassudital'nost'.

Goffenšefer, who finds Levšin completely unsatisfactory as a Soviet hero, considers his behaviour appropriate for the representatives of the world of Klebe, Pašić, and Rivacs. After describing his interest in Inge as a "bolaznennoe vlečenie," Goffenšefer writes that "Ego svjaz' i obraščenie s ţrejlejn Gofman otdaet izrjadnym duškom buržuaznoj pošlosti," and concludes that the only difference between Levšin and the other characters is that he is more healthy and more indifferent to other people.

Panov also finds that Levšin is basically similar to the negative heroes of the novel. "[Levšin] ...tol'ko ležit, guljaet, nabiraetsja sil, gljadja skvoz' pal'cy na okružajuščie ego podlosti i stradanija." Referring to Hoffmann, Panov objects to Levšin's easily entering upon a chance love affair and breaking it upon his departure just as easily.

85 Grinberg, p. 29.

86 Goffenšefer, p. 183.
The critic compares Levšin with Hemingway's heroes: "...vnešne enerģičnye i bodrye, a vnutrenne opustošennye..." 87

Perhaps appropriately, however, it was a woman critic who excoriated Levšin most severely for his character defects. G. Kalina, writing in Molodaja gvardija, finds Levšin's behaviour completely incomprehensible: his relationship with Inge is "pathological." Levšin is false and insincere in not breaking with Inge after "joining his fate" with Hoffmann, and thus bears part of the blame for Inge's death. A true Soviet man, let alone a Communist, would never have acted in this way. Perhaps somewhat naively, Kalina cannot at all understand what prevented Levšin taking Hoffmann back with him to the Soviet Union, and finds a striking analogy in Tolstoj's Voskresenie to Levšin's role in arranging a post for Hoffmann: "Čem, skažite, otličaetsja éto povedenie 'sovetskogo' čeloveka ot toj 100-rublevoj assignacii, kotoruju pytalsja vsučit' Nexljudov Katjuše Maslovoj?" 88

Whatever view one may hold of Levšin's moral behaviour, unquestionably Fedin's hero is an artistic failure. Not only does his inactivity and indifference to others preclude his becoming a "positive hero", but the consistent impression of passivity and characterlessness which he creates makes him unconvincing as an individual. The inadequacy of Levšin's presentation is emphasized by the contrast between him and the complex personalities and often frenzied activity of Kretschmar and

---

87 Panov, p. 227.

88 G. Kalina, Molodaja gvardija, #10 (1940), p. 159.
Klebe. We know nothing of Levšin's background and professional activities except for what Runin terms the "lakoničnaja spravka" relating to his work in the torgpredstvo. As Soviet critics point out, Levšin's joy in his recovery and his heightened perception are the principal elements in his portrayal, yet it is not the dominance of this theme in itself which makes Levšin un lifelike. The brilliant setpieces in which the theme is developed are inadequately related to the hero's interior monologue, so that the reader perceives them as authorial narration, and consequently they contribute little to the characterization of Levšin.

Levšin's essential passivity in personal relationships is paralleled by his taciturnity in conversation. As Dneprovskij remarks, "Čto my znam o Levšine? My vynuždeny liš' dogadyvat'sja ob otnošenii Levšina k okružajuščemu po korotkim neopredelennym replikam, imejuščim často xarakter oborvannyx i nezakončennyx fraz." 

Fedin writes that Levšin is intended to be the bearer of the theme of recovery and triumphant life, and it is clear that a conversation between Inge and Levšin on the subject of recovery from tuberculosis is intended to have major symbolic significance. Levšin tells Inge that he had been worse than she, but "Ja nemnogo poterpel....Ja byl uveren, čto mne est' smysl vyzdorovet'." Inge then asks him whether

89 B. Runin, Literaturnoe obozrenie, #3 (1941), p. 11.

90 L. Dneprovskij, Literaturnyj Voronež, #1 (1941), p. 264.

anyone is waiting for him at home, and Levšin replies, "Vse ždut." Inge evidently lacks a purpose for recovery, and no doubt it is in reference to this that Levšin remarks, "Vy zakryvаете глаза на правду." After reading the Soviet newspaper reports of the opening of the Dneprogőš power station Levšin is filled with fresh determination: "...togda opjat' s zakalennoj siloj ego Levdina oxvatilo rešenie: vyzdorovet', vyzdorovet', vyzdorovet' i vernut'sja tuda, domoj, k smyslu i cel'i vsego budučeago." Clearly Levšin's remarks to Inge and this interior monologue represent both a presentation of Levšin's worldview and the cause of his recovery: Levšin's worldview, it is suggested, gives him a goal in life, a spiritual purpose for recovery ("smysl vyzdorovet'") which in turn gives him the physiological capacity for recovery. This presentation of Levšin's motherland, the Soviet Union, as the home of the "smysl i cel'i vsego budučeago" is confirmed by Levšin's reply to Stumm's question about the sentence in Klebe's suicide letter, "Gоворят, есть на свете страна, где чудеса случаются с люд'ми, у которых денег нет." Levšin is asked what he makes of this sentence, and replies, "On prav....takaja strana est'." Levšin then

92 p. 74.

93 p. 75.

94 The impact of this interior monologue is weakened by the purely "physiological" content of its continuation one paragraph later: "Takoj чудесный инстинкт, такoj чудесный инстинкт, думал он, жизнь! Видно, мне уже не тридцать лет, не тридцать, а шестьдесят, - так я хочу жить!" (pp. 71-72).

95 p. 143.
tells Stumm (who is presented as the most morally upright character in
the novel), "...vam nado bylo by povidat' etu stranu." A final signifi-
cant reference to the Soviet Union is found in Klebe's remark to Levšin
regarding the "...verolomnaja priroda sobstvennosti": "U menja nojut
kosti ot etix kandalov, i - o! - skol'ko raz ja dumal o Moskve,
isceljajuščej etu strašnuju bolezn'!"96

The attempt to endow the hero's recovery with symbolic signif-
icance is artistically unsuccessful, since the rhetorical declarations97
associated with Levšin are completely alien to his personality as a
"bezdejstvennyj sozercatel'".98 As Runin observes, the rhetoric is
merely a "razrušenje obraza."99

III

Inge Kretschmar plays a significant role in the novel quite apart
from Levšin's relationship with her. As Goffenšefer and Panov point out,
Inge's "agonija" is a subject line which runs throughout the novel, so
that her fate becomes a dark symbol which dominates the entire work.100

96 p. 46.

97 Even the favourable critics Brajnina and Zagradka find these
passages unconvincing: see Brajnina, pp. 170-171, and Zagradka, p. 55.
Phrases such as "polnovesnaja, dorodnaja, zvonko klokočuščaja žizn'"
(p. 71) with their striking metaphors are completely out of character
for Levšin.

98 Kalina, p. 159.

99 Runin, p. 12.

100 See Goffenšefer, p. 183; Panov, p. 226.
Syllectically far more attention is devoted to her than to Levšin. She is repeatedly associated with a nervous tic of the eyebrows and skin of the forehead, which becomes a leitmotiv of the novel. Moreover, her moods are related to the significant leitmotiv of the Clavadel postal horn: notably, the final episode in which she appears describes her suffering on hearing the sound for the last time. Several effective setpieces are devoted to her experiences and actions, and her conversations with Levšin, Hoffman and Stumm represent the most realistic and sensitive dialogue in the novel.

Great attention is devoted to the detailed descriptions of her physical appearance and sufferings, which constitute an apparently clinically exact case history of the death of a tuberculosis patient. Unquestionably here Fedin draws on his own experience of sanatoria. Oksenov praises this "clinical exactness", finding nevertheless that there is some excessive naturalistic detail. Fedin's work is superior to Tolstoj's Smert' Il'i Il'iča or Mann's Zauberberg in that the descriptions do not produce pessimism or cynicism, since Fedin demonstrates "...nastojaščaja, berežnaja ljubov' k čeloveku..." Panov, referring to Fedin's "mračnoe ljubovanie" displayed in these descriptions, finds that they help to endow the "pathological figure" of

101 Referred to on pp. 23, 25, 29, 40 (repeated), 76, 83 and 116.

102 See pp. 32-33, 41, 60, 68 and 117.

103 Oksenov, p. 284.

104 Panov, p. 226.
Inge with symbolic significance. Kalina, however, clearly finds the emphasis excessive: "So skrupuleznost'ju issledovatelja Vy izobražaete vse perepetii smerti ot tuberkuleza."\(^\text{105}\)

The artistic effectiveness of the short but detailed setpieces depicting Inge's experiences greatly heighten the cumulatively morbid impact which they produce. When Inge practises coughing as she has been instructed by Stumm, "Pot bulavočnymi golovkami vysypal skvoz' pudru na lбу i вокруг rта."\(^\text{106}\) The description of Inge's sensations when she gets up to go over to Levšin's room is strikingly vivid: "V glazax ee tronulis', rastvorjajas' v pustote, izorvannye, poxozie na meduz, krasnye kloč'ja. V razryvax i promezhutkax meždu nimi plyla, perevernutaja veršinami vniz, belo-golubaja gornaja cep'."\(^\text{107}\) Again, a successful metaphor enhances the impact of the occasion when Inge first coughs blood: "...na sekundu stalo poxoże, budto u nej gubnaja pomada načala spolzat' na podborodok, no sejčas že podborodok sdelalsja jarče i temnee gub."\(^\text{108}\) Similarly vivid is the description soon afterwards of the deterioration in her condition, in which again a striking metaphor is used to depict colour: "Slovno nalet zoly pal na ee viski i vyroššie skuly, vjalje morščinki povisli ot nozdrey k uglam rta, podnjalsja, vzletel malen'kij podborodok vse ešće legkogo, ženstvennogo,

\(^{105}\) Kalina, p. 158.

\(^{106}\) p. 33.

\(^{107}\) p. 56.

\(^{108}\) p. 68.
The deterioration in her appearance is emphasized by the strong verb "izurodovat'" repeated shortly before her death.  

Fedin is careful to stress Inge's femininity in descriptions and setpieces. The significance of clothes to her is shown in the setpiece where she gets up and goes to Levšin's room: "Vyiskivanie, razgladyvanie čulok i bel'ja - procedura, čut'-čut' vozbuždajuščaja ženščinu, uvlekla Ingu noviznoju...", as well as in her thinking first of what clothes should be put out for her after she is brought back to "Arktur" desperately ill. Inge becomes unused to high heels, which make it difficult for her to walk, as though she were wearing heels for the first time.

Inge's sensations when she regains consciousness after bringing up blood are depicted in one of the most effective interior monologue setpieces in the novel.  

\[109\] pp. 72-73: see also p. 39.

\[110\] pp. 72 and 117.

\[111\] See especially pp. 25 and 75.

\[112\] p. 84.

\[113\] pp. 109 and 110.

\[114\] pp. 84 and 86.

\[115\] pp. 110-112.
that she has been given oxygen, her perplexity and terror are brilliantly rendered. Here a detail emphasizes the femininity of Inge's perception: she sees the oxygen cylinder as a "metalličeskij predmet, napominajuščij ognetušitel', no tol'ko ne tak krasivo raskrašennyj."

From the beginning she takes the initiative in trying to establish a liaison between herself and Levšin. The dominance of the physical element in his attractiveness for her is suggested by the emphasis on her acts. Thus their first scene together (and the chapter) ends with her asking to touch the veins on his hands. In their second conversation Inge proposes that they leave "Arktur" together. She openly shows her jealousy of Hoffmann and asks him, "Malodušničaete vam frejlen doktor?" She tells Levšin, "Vy takoj že obyknovennej, s vašej Moskvoj..." The scene, however, ends gaily with her taking advantage of his inadvertently sitting on her bed to kiss him. After Inge has talked with Willi Bauer, she malignantly provokes Klebe by telling him that Pašić, Hoffmann and she have been trying to induce Bauer to stay at "Arktur," even though he is completely healthy, and by asking Karl to buy her a copy of Zauberberg. When Levšin comes to see her after watching the hockey match, she gives vent to a malicious

---

116 p. 111.
117 p. 41.
118 p. 57.
envy of his health: "'Vy, naverno, zabyli, čto takoe tb,' skazala ona v nastavitel'nom tone. 'On očen' kovaren, ětot nedug. Ėlovec zabolevaet, kogda uveren, čto sovsem popravilsja. Ėsče neizvestno, pojdet li vprok vaša popravka...esli by vy popali pod avtobus, ja skazala by: tak i nado, ne popravljajtja!''¹²⁰ Levšin tries to laugh it off: "'Vinoven v vyzdorovlenii,'" but she rejoins, "'Da. Vinovny. Vy deržites' kak gost'. Ėto oskorbitel'no.'" It is then that she asks the significant question, "'Čto my zdes' - tramplin dlja vašego budušćego?'¹²¹ Inge begins to ask him about what had happened when he fell sick, but then interrupts him peevishly. She tells him that she loves him, and "'Mne nužno skoree požit'." After complaining of his "doktorskoe bezučastie" she speaks frankly of her desires: "Ja nenaviżu xanžej. A vy dumaete, čto ja takaja, kak drugie devuški, kotorye izo vsex sil prjačut svoj želanija, potomu čto bojatsja posledstvij. Ja vse ravno umru skoree, čem mogut byt' kakie-nibud' idiotskie posledstvija."¹²² Levšin makes the curiously inadequate and cryptic remark that she is running away from a wasp, and then tells her that she is closing her eyes to the truth, presumably meaning that she lacks any aim in life.

The scene ends in an outburst of selfpity by Inge ("Ja skoro umru"), who tells Levšin that he is a "rezoner" and "...prosto, naverno, negodnyj

¹²⁰ pp. 73-74.
¹²¹ p. 74.
¹²² p. 75.
and finally shouts at him to go. This scene with its effective contrast between Inge's almost hysterical passion with its overtones of desperation and Levšin's gauche feelinglessness illustrates the dramatic quality which Fedin can achieve in dialogue.  

Later Klebe tells her that Levšin intends to leave, and her reaction indicates the strength of her feelings for Levšin: "...vo vzore ee Klebe uvidel zatočennuju v ostri v nенavist'...Klebe zjabko pereder-nulo. V тот же момент lico Ingi nastol'ko vyrazilo perenesennoe ispytanie bolezn'ju, što on ponjal: ploxo!..." Despite her condition, Inge gets up, dresses, and goes to Levšin's room in order to extort from him an admission of his intentions. Her emotion is not directly stated, but effectively suggested by attention to minor physical details. 

Before leaving "Arktur" she malignantly tells Hoffmann in a striking semihysterical outburst that she is a liar: "Ona ispytala p'janjaščee toržestvo pri vide rasterjannosti frejlen doktor, bespomoščno zakryvšjej lico rukami. Ona trepetala ot radosti, u nee šumei v golove pritok vosxiščajuščix sil, kakix ona v sebe nikogda ne podozrevala, i uže ozorno, vojda vo vkus, ona udarila ešče raz: - Vy - Igun'ja!"

123 P. 76.
124 See "Obozrevatel'," p. 224.
125 P. 83.
126 P. 86.
127 P. 100.
In a conversation with Major Pašić soon afterwards Inge reiterates the theme of the doctors' deception of the patients: "Vy ne boites', net? Ja ne bojus' ni kapel'ki. Ėto vse vydumki doktorov. Dovol'no, dovol'no doktorov!..." Ironically, she exhorts Pašic, "načnite novuju, sovsem novuju žizn'!... nikogda, nikogda ne vozvraščajtes' nazad!"  

Inge's elation at seeing Levšin when he visits her on her deathbed is effectively conveyed without overdramatization: "On zametil, kak drognul svet v glazax Ingi, i ona tjaželo peremestila ix na nego. To, čto on uvidel v nix, on nikogda ne nazval by radost'ju, no ēto bylo bol'še radosti, čto bylo likovanie, na mig prorvavšeesja iz smjatennogo mira straxa... 'Oni vas prjatali,' tjaguče vygovorila Inga."  

After her love for Levšin the second major element in the presentation of Inge in the novel is the theme of escapism. From conversations between her and Dr. Stumm and from an important setpiece on the subject of a novel which she has been reading it becomes clear that she is completely dissatisfied with her life and longs for romance and adventure. The subject is adumbrated in her first conversation with Dr. Stumm, when he offers her wine before attempting to induce her to consent to undergo collapse therapy. Inge complains that the vermouth

128 pp. 57-58.
130 p. 116.
smells of quinine: "Xorošo, čto van ne nravitsja, a to vy priučites'.' "
"Ja xotela by priučit'sja. Ja pila by s utra i na noč', i vsegda byla by v takom tumane. Togda propali by neprijatnye mysli, voobšye vsjake mysli, pravda?....P'janoj ja ni za čto ne xotela by byt'. A tak, čtoby ne dumat'..." 131

Great attention is devoted to the "strange book" which Inge has been reading before Major Pašić comes to play to her his collection of grammophone records. 132 In this novel about South America and a voyage by doomed criminals, as well as a love affair in New Orleans, 133 the author writes about disasters with such passionate contempt that "oni uvlekal i manili k bytu tjajelomu, riskovannomu, zakvašennomu na mučitel'noj pomesi iz priključenij i bor'by." The significance of the passage about the book is underlined by the occurrence in it of the Clavadel leitmotiv, which becomes associated with the name of New Orleans. The novel heightens Inge's dissatisfaction with her life as a sanatorium patient, and in a section of exclamatory interior monologue incorporated in the setpiece she cries, "O kak xotelos' ujti, uexat', ubežat', uplyt' na neizvestnom paroxode v neizvestnuju gavan', obreč' sebja na uničtoženie, na besstrašnuju i besstydnuju ljubov'. Nevedomyj avtor... vozbuždal v Inge prenebreženie k stradaniju, bolezni, slabosti." Inge

131 p. 29.
132 pp. 59-60.
133 Possibly this is a real novel: if so, it has not proved possible to identify it. Soviet critics do not discuss the book.
The exalted manner of this carefully elaborated setpiece, which is curiously inconsonant with the narrative manner of the novel as a whole, prepares the reader for the subsequent mood of desperate determination in which Inge clutches at Levšin's love as a last straw, a "last bridge" connecting her with life, and in which she carries out her resolve to abandon "Arktur." This element is confirmed by Inge's significant words to Pasic following the setpiece on the novel: when Pašić, drawing a military analogy, tells her that the requirement for successful treatment is "...nagibat'sja, vse vremja nagibat'sja," she replies, "Ne xoču! Ne budu nagibat'sja." Pašić interjects, "Togda..." and receives the reply, "Znaju! I vse ravno ne budu..." 

Her bringing up blood for the first time is associated in her interior monologue with the theme of the novel, which again is fused with the Clavadel leitmotiv: "Ona podumala, čto načalis' strašnje nesčast'ja, čto otplyvает v okean otčajannoj korabl' i s nim - ona. V ušax ee zvučali neslyxannyje šumy, točno nadvigalsja so svistom škval. Tolpy slov metalis' v ee voobraženii, otodvigaemye kuda-to v temnotu pevučimi imenami to N'ju-Orleana, to Klavadelja." Inge's determination

134 p. 60.
135 Grinberg, p. 29.
136 p. 61.
137 p. 68.
to experience as much as possible before dying has already been expressed by the effective phrase already quoted in the major dialogue with Levšin in which she tells him that she loves him: "Mne nužno skor'ee požit'."138

Another theme of Inge's interior monologue on the novel is reiterated in her words to Stumm: "Nado vse, vse peremenit'."139 Although at this time Stumm (and the reader) is left with the impression that Inge has consented to stay at "Arktur", it later becomes clear that her determination to leave is unchanged. In the course of the same conversation an element parallel to those already suggested as present in Inge's personality is introduced: she lacks the willpower and perseverance which are needed in order to undergo suffering in the interests of ultimate recovery: "...beda v tom...čto ja verju vam i ne verju sebe. Čto ja podojdu pod vaši pravila, pod vaši merki. Čto mne nado ležat', a ne bežat', ne ustavat' ot kakogo-to truda, riska, opasnostej, ne znaju - čego." Stumm rejoins inadequately: "Vam nado naučit'sja poslušaniju. Ėto vse."140

Grinberg points out that Levšin and Inge Kretschmar, who lacks the will to live, are to be considered as antithetical characters in terms of the novel's thematics: "Levšin i Inga - Ėto dva poljusa sredi obitatelyj sanatorija."141 Brajnina, stressing Inge Kretschmar's

---

138 p. 75. Oksenov objects to this phrase on grammatical grounds. (Oksenov, p. 286).

139 p. 98. This theme recurs for the last time with irony after her death: "...ona ležala poprežnemu, ničem ne pokazyvaja, što xotela by što-nibud' izmenit'!" (p. 117).

140 pp. 98-99.

141 Grinberg, p. 28.
significance as a product of her social environment, writes: "...počemu bolezń tak stremiteln'no razrušaet ee? Potomu, čto u Ingi otsutstvuet volja k žizni i vsem svoim povedeniem ona pomogaet razrušitel'noj rabote bolezni....Dušu ee s"edaeat nedug bezvolija, apatii i ěto rokovym obrazom pribîžaet devušku k smerti." 142 Fedin does not, however, directly suggest that Inge's "nedug bezvolija, apatii" is sociologically determined, although the implication is clear that her reading of such fiction as the novel about New Orleans pandered to her escapist mentality.

The impression is created that she might have been saved, physically and psychologically, had Levšin reciprocated her affection, even though Oksenov is not justified in finding that "...obrečennaja Inga vprave nadejat'sja do poslednej minuty...na tu radost', kotoruju mog ej dat' Levšin." 144 Inge tells Stumm that there was one man - Levšin - whom she might have been able to obey, but he was gone. 145 Less importantly, it is possible that Hoffmann might have been able to influence Inge had it not been for their mutual jealousy over Levšin, which induces the greatly provoked Hoffmann, far from attempting to ensure that Inge remain in "Arktur", virtually to drive her out with the vicious words, "I uezžajte. Skatert'ju doroga. Lučše dlja vsex." 146 Finally, the great emphasis

142 Brajnina, p. 167.
143 See Grinberg, p. 29.
144 Oksenov, p. 284.
145 p. 99.
146 p. 100.
discussed earlier throughout the novel on the clinical details of the deterioration in Inge's physical condition necessarily focuses attention upon the physiological progress of her disease, and consequently creates an impression of the pathological inevitability of her psychological and physical disintegration. This theme dominates the less developed contradictory suggestion that Levšin's love might have saved her.

Dr. Stumm, the "pravednik, na kotorom deržitsja gorod," is the most attractive character in Sanatorij Arktur. Soon after the beginning of the novel, as we have seen, Levšin realizes that he owes his life to Stumm, and feels more affection for him than he is to show for either Inge or Hoffmann.

Stumm, it is implied, is the sole doctor in Davos who puts the interests of his patients before material considerations. At a meeting of doctors at which Stumm presides as head doctor of the cantonal sanatorium where a paper is read on the treatment of tuberculosis of the bone he is content to term the paper "interesting" and does not support the remaining doctors who demand that sections of the paper favourable

---

147 The monosyllabic name itself ("stumm"="dumb") is clearly suggestive of taciturnity and possibly of sterling character traits.

148 p. 120.

149 Curiously, Stumm is totally ignored by Soviet critics.

150 p. 13. The only other occasion on which "nežnost'" is used in reference to Levšin is when he kisses Hoffmann during their stay at Alp Grüm: "Ona kazalas' emu očen' rastrogannoj, i emu xotelos' byt' nežnym." (p. 94).
to Davos be widely publicized with a view to improving business prospects.151 Klebe remembers later Stumm's description of his colleagues as "kopilki v pidžakax i černyx šljapax."152 Significantly, after the reading of the paper the other doctors hastily say goodbye to him and he is left alone.

Stumm becomes associated with the lyrical description of snow at the beginning of the novel and the view down on Davos which follows. This sets the scene for Stumm's interior monologue flashback to his dead wife, of whom Inge reminds him. The parallel between the fates of Inge Kretschmar and of Stumm's wife becomes a theme which runs through the novel, heightening the reader's sympathy for Stumm and the pathos of Inge's fatal illness.153 Stumm's love for his wife is portrayed in one of the most lyrical and stylistically effective passages in the novel:

Potomu, čto ona očen' dorožila každym žiznennym faktom i vo vsjakom javlenii otkryvala čto-nibud' novoe, Šum nikogda ne žil tak nasvyščeno, kak s nej. V čtom čuvstvennom perepolnenii on i probyl do ee gibeli, i ee gibel' byla dlja nego koncom vsjakoj žizni. Tol'ko god spustja Šum ponjal, počemu on živ, kogda vse končilos': ego spas neuderžimyj razbeg navykov, privyček, discipliny togo samogo doktora mediciny, kotorogo oni umyšlenno vyključili iz svoej žizni. I v postojannyaх vospominanijax o žene perežitej s nej čudilos' emu kakoj-to pervoj elkoj detstva,

151 p. 24.

152 p. 25.

153 See pp. 25-27.
Stumm blames himself for his wife's death, since he had been unable to bring himself to force her to undergo treatment for her tuberculosis: "Ее случай оказался вне воздействия, перестал существовать" как "случай"... вместо того чтобы сломить ее счастливое, наивное, пренебрежительное легкомыслие, он покорялся ему." Stumm finds on two occasions that he is similarly unable to force himself to make Inge take her illness seriously, but finally persuades her to undergo collapse therapy.

Stumm clearly falls in love with Inge, and his affection determines the great interest which he takes in her. In the moving conversation in the course of which he tells her that she needs only to learn obedience she asks him about his wife and he replies: "... в случае с моей женой виновен я. Мне не хватило мужества заставить ее слушать. А врач ни в каком случае не имеет права терпеть мужества." It is at this point that Inge says that there is one man whom she might have been able to obey, and Stumm's hurt is effectively conveyed with syntactic subtlety:

"No on uexal?"
"On uexal."
Stumm opustil vezi.
"Xolodno," skazal on, "pojdeste v komnatu."
Stumm’s special relationship to Inge causes his embitterment with Klebe for permitting Inge to leave "Arktur", as a result of which he severs his connection with Klebe’s sanatorium: "Ja ee lečil, ja, vy ponimaete éto?...Ja otvečaju za to, čto u menja proisxodit, gospodin doktor." 158

It is curious that Stumm should have agreed to practise at Klebe’s sanatorium - the only sanatorium in Davos apart from his own cantonal sanatorium to which he is prepared to lend the prestige of his name 159 - in view of his evident awareness of Klebe’s mercenariness and unfeeling frankness toward him. When Klebe reminds Stumm that he too is sick, Stumm tells him, "Vy - bol’noj, odnako ne pacient. Vy sdelali nepravil'noe upotreblenie iz sanatorija: vy ego soderžite, vmesto togo čtoby v nem ležat'. Ėto poročnyj metod lečenija." Klebe rejoins that it is a method of existence, on which Stumm comments succinctly, "Ēto metod samoubijstva v naše vremja." 161 Nevertheless, it is Stumm who displays his fundamental goodness by showing the greatest sympathy for Klebe after his death: "Bednjaga, kak zaputalsja!" 162 He is convinced that he would have acted in the same way had he been in exactly the same position. 163

158 pp. 129 and 130.
159 See p. 130.
160 See p. 96. On one occasion Stumm sends away a perfectly healthy girl whom Klebe had tried to induce to stay in his sanatorium. (See p. 77).
161 p. 97.
162 p. 144.
163 It is curiously out of character for Stumm to refuse to examine Klebe. (See p. 112).
It is not surprising that Stumm is the only Western character to be associated, however remotely, with the Soviet Union. When the doctor asks Levšin about Klebe's suicide letter, Levšin tells him that he ought to "have a look" at the Soviet Union. Stumm replies that he would like to find out "čto u vas tam takoe, v ētoj strane."\(^{164}\)

In Levšin's interior monologue while he climbs the mountain to Stumm's sanatorium Stumm is associated with the character of Davos as a place of healing. Levšin's image of Stumm as a god who rules everything is preceded by the stylistically effective description of the cantonal sanatorium as creating an impression of "blagopolučie" and the description of the tame squirrel which runs after Levšin.\(^{165}\) "Strannoj pokazalas' Levšinu mysl' o pritvornoj ličine goroda. Net, čto byl gorod dobroj voli Štuma. Skol'ko raz nušna byla zdes' ruka pomošči Štuma. I on protjagival ee, - pravednik, na kotorom deržitsja gorod."\(^{166}\)

A significant feature of the presentation of Stumm are the references to his proletarian origin in conjunction with his bluntness and physical awkwardness.\(^{167}\) These form one of the most consistent leitmotivs of the novel. In the first edition (1940), Stumm is made to speak with the "retijskij akcent pastusa,"\(^{168}\) and although the

\(^{164}\) p. 145.

\(^{165}\) See p. 119.

\(^{166}\) p. 120.

\(^{167}\) See especially pp. 97, 129, 146.

\(^{168}\) (1940 ed.) p. 94.
"shepherd" is toned down to a "peasant" ("krest'janin") in later editions, in both the first and later editions Klebe in his fury thinks of Stumm as "...eto egoističeskoe sozdanie Štum, gruboe, kak gornij pastux..." His peasantlike and at the same time honest and straightforward appearance is suggested in one of the few descriptive phrases used of characters apart from Inge Kretschmar in the novel: "bol'šie i sil'nye čerty ego lica." Stumm's qualities of professional competence, honesty and straightforwardness make him undoubtedly the most positive character and, in this sense, the true positive hero of the novel.

The retired army major from Montenegro, Pašić, is the archetype of the permanent sanatorium resident and "simvol vsex obrečennyx." "On byl iz porody bol'nyx, privykšix k strogomu odnoobraziju mnogoletnego režima, i navsegda uverivšix sebja, čto za predelami Davosa ix ožidaet gibel'." The initial authorial presentation of Pašić is not greatly developed in the course of the novel, except for the element

---

169 (1960 ed.) p. 96.
170 (1960 ed.) p. 131.
171 p. 129.
172 He is the only doctor in the novel to speak with assurance of the disease of tuberculosis and its treatment. (See pp. 29-32, 51-52, 98-99, 146).
173 Brajnina, p. 167.
174 p. 8.
175 See p. 8. He is compared to a Wilhelm Busch character; see Note 382.
of his youthful experiences in Russia.\textsuperscript{176} This "večnyj plennik Davosa,"\textsuperscript{177} who has spent ten years in "Arktur,"\textsuperscript{178} is profoundly pessimistic and passive about his disease and its treatment.\textsuperscript{179} Of Levšin he says, "On dumaet, čto vyzdoravlivaet. Osobaja poroda ljuđej, - u nix voobraženie ubito čuvstvom bezopasnosti."	extsuperscript{180}

Clearly Klebe considers that a degree of camaraderie has been established over the years between Pašić and himself, and it is on this that he counts when he appeals movingly to the major not to abandon "Arktur," telling him of himself, "...za desjat' let prebyvanija naverxu priobrel toľko bojanz' perebrat'ija vniz. Vam čto znakomo, ne pravda li."\textsuperscript{181} In an earlier interior monologue, Klebe thinks of him as a "v svoem rode blizkij čelovek, vozdux ďesto goroda poil ego sliškom dolgo, major poslušno šestvoval skvoz' stroj sanatornyx koridorov, komnat i balkonov - napugannyj soldat sud'by. Bunti, kotorye on ustraival, proxodili besslednymi pavodkami. Čto govorit', on obladal serdcom!"\textsuperscript{182}

Nevertheless, Pašić treats Klebe with contemptuous indifference.\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{176}See pp. 61-62.

\textsuperscript{177}Grinberg, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{178}See p. 23.

\textsuperscript{179}See Pašić's conversation with Inge Kretschmar, p. 61.

\textsuperscript{180}p. 61.

\textsuperscript{181}p. 50.

\textsuperscript{182}p. 50.

\textsuperscript{183}See pp. 47-48 and 127-129.
The effective image of Pašić as a "solder of fate" is reiterated toward the end of the novel when Pašić returns to Davos: "Pokojnyj soldat sud'by, on prinadležal Davosu i ne mog nikuda ujti." The association is reinforced by the episode in which he tells Inge of his war experiences, and by his military phraseology when he informs Klebe of his inalterable intention of leaving: "...esli ja teper' ne poedu vniz, ja ostanus' zdes' navsegda. Prišel čas. Ja čelovek voennyj, ja slyšu zorju, nado svertyvat' lager'. He has designs on Inge Kretschmar, but his timidity, he feels bitterly, ruins his prospects of romance. The scene in a snowstorm where Pašić unwillingly takes leave of "Arktur" is extremely effective in its stylistic subtlety, and well prepares the reader for the major's return: "Ja vernulsja, potomu čto mne zdes' spokojnee."

Significantly, the leitmotiv in the novel provided by Thomas Mann's Zauberberg is associated principally with Pašić. He tells Inge that the doctors kept it secret since it was harmful to their interests; he himself, however, had been unable to understand the novel. When he

184 p. 127.
185 p. 62.
186 p. 82.
187 See pp. 35, 63-64, 65 and 101. Pašić's feelings are rendered in some of the most psychologically effective interior monologue in the novel.
188 p. 102.
189 p. 128.
190 p. 63.
later returns to Davos and meets Klebe at Inge's funeral, he tells him maliciously that he had managed to buy a copy of the book, which Klebe had failed to get for Inge, despite his promise. Pašić's association with the novel emphasizes his significance as a "Zauberberg character," for whom the artificial environment of the sanatorium is more real than the world below. To great artistic effect he becomes at the end of the novel the symbol of the world which Levšin is leaving, where decline is the expected: "...v poxodke ego bylo kak budto bol'se ustalosti, chem ran'se, i, požaluj, bol'se grusti." The symbolic significance of Pašić is directly conveyed: "...eto proxodil mimo nix sam Davos, proščajas' s Levšinym, napominaja o sebe, kak večnost'..." The minor characters of the sanatorium, the servants Karl and Liesl, are portrayed with an unappealing degree of depersonalization, so that the reader gains the impression that the writer regards them as scarcely human. The initial presentation of Karl demonstrates the author's manner: "Širokie, bystrye šagi, kurčavost', zelenye glaza, gorevšie podobno pugovicam ego uniformy, rumjanec i ēta neutominaja sijajuščaja ulybka sostavlja suščestvo, nazyvavšeesja Karlom." The phrase "suščestvo, nazyvavšeesja Karlom" emphasizes the element of depersonalization, which is again conspicuous in the following phrase, "Klebe s udovol'stviem posmotrel emu v zdrovju rovnuju spinu." The

---

191 See p. 129.
192 P. 148.
193 P. 21.
194 P. 22.
impression of depersonalization is reinforced later by Levšin's interior monologue on the subject of Karl: Levšin wonders whether his "eternal beaming" is simply a function of "bezoblačnoe zdrav'o" or of "likujuščee toržestvo duxa," and continues, "Prixod Karla mog byt' upodoblen tol'ko samozaženiju planety, vozglavljajuščej roskošnuju nebesnuju sistemu."195 Here the ridiculous extreme simile removes the subject even further from the human plane.

The servant Liesl receives similar treatment. In her portrayal the emphasis is on coarse physical detail and the girl's primitive nature. "Ona byla v fartuke iz rozovoj kleenki, černye kudiри ee rastrepalis', na vernej gube skvoz' temnyj nalet puška prostupili kapel'ki pota..."196 "Ona vyterla guby snačala odnim plečom, potom drugim" Responding to Klebe's banter, she says, "Ja ljublju ital'jancev: vot éto rasa! Ja s odnim gulfija, dumala - na me živogo mjasa ne ostanetsja: on menja vsju isščipal."197 A vivid description of Liesl scrubbing the floor follows: "Lisl' prinjalas' myt' pol. Kudri u nee raskaživalis', gusto zanaveživaja lico. Sinela vybritaja Šeja. Ruki razmašisto perekatyvali trjapku po polu, s čevkam' em ožimaja mutno-zelenju vodu. I tak xorošo byl' viden krepkij tors, gibko povoračivavšijaja iz storony v storonu, sledom za rukami, i sil'no sbitye, tjazelovsnye bedra."198

195 pp. 42-43.
196 p. 80.
197 p. 81.
198 p. 82. "Post-Factum" in Literaturnoe obozrenie refers ironically to this phrase: "Nu, čto é...Éto povreždenie čisto fizičeskoe i ego legko mog by spisat' esli ne sam pisatel' to redaktor 'Novogo mira.'" "Post-Factum's" comments are accompanied by a caricature by A. Radakov,
The stylistic justification of the passage is that Liesl is at this point the object of the lust of both Klebe and Pašič, but the cumulative impact of the gross physical detail in conjunction with the earlier passages describing Liesl is unpleasant. 199

Liesl figures, however, in an artistically highly effective episode with Inge Kretschmar. When Inge wakes up desperately ill after her return to "Arktur," Liesl tries to console her by telling her how she had once had a botched abortion, but had recovered: "Ja v odni sutki, vot kak vy, frejlen Krečmar, sdelalas' ničut' ne xuże vas, strax vzgljanut'! A sejčas posmotrite: ja prjamo ne znaju, so mnoj ēta beda strjaslas' ili ešče s kem." 200 The ironic impact of Liesl's attempting to console Inge by these means, as well as the artistic effectiveness of her characteristic language, greatly heighten the pathos of the scene.

The description incorporating diminutive suffixes of the postman who figures in the final chapter, as well as the references to his actions, create an impression of depersonalization also in regard to this minor character. "...požiloj nizen'kij tolstjačok s usami kol'com..." 201 "...pomusil na nej [telegramme] pal'cem ugolok... Staratel'nymi gotičeskimi bukvami, kak v tetradke čistopisanija, na telegramme bylo vyvedeno.... Počtal'om nadul ščeki i s sopeniem vypustil skvoz' usy vozdux." 202

the famous "Satirikon" caricaturist, showing a workman beating nails into Liesl's wooden hips with a hammer. ("Trebuetsja vrač, libo redaktor...," Literaturnoe obozrenie, #13 (1940), p. 55.)

199 In the scene of Inge Kretschmar's farewell to the sanatorium the same stylistic manner is resumed. (See p. 103).

200 p. 110.

201 p. 135.

202 p. 139.
Curiously, none of the Soviet critics discusses this aspect of Fedin's characterization in *Sanatorij Arktur*.

An English couple, a parson and his wife, are amongst the most interesting inhabitants of "Arktur." Originally the parson came to Davos to take over temporarily the duties of a colleague who had returned to England on vacation, but even after his return the couple remain at the sanatorium, apparently using "Arktur" as a hotel. The parson and his wife are extensively satirized in authorial narration with the result that they emerge as two of the most negative characters in the novel. Their egotism and selfish indifference to others receive considerable attention. It is difficult to agree with Simmons, who finds them "amusing."203

On their arrival the parson assumes automatically that Klebe understands English perfectly.204 Later their conspicuous unsociability is stressed: "...anglijskaja četa, obladavšaja nacional'nym svojstvom: obitaja so vsemi vmeste, žit' soveršenno otdel'no."205 The dislike of the other patients for them and the universal schadenfreude when their car becomes stuck in the snow forms the basis of an entire episode.206 One of the patients observes, "Menja udivljaet ēta nazojlivaja manera angličan

---


204 p. 20.

205 p. 34.

206 pp. 34-35.
vsegda čem-nibud’ vydeljat’sja," to which Klebe responds, "V angličanax
voobšče est’ nečto bezdušnoe."207

The parson mocks Inge Kretschmar cruelly - this episode is one of
the most unpleasant scenes in the novel - when she so far intrudes upon
their privacy as to thank them for the Easter card which they had sent her:
"...xotja v étét prazdnik dopustimo snizojti k kakim ugodno nacijam,
odnako izbavi bog pitat' nadeždy na sbliženie."208 Significant also is
their reaction to the news of Klebe’s suicide: after the first shock "oni
odernulis’, točno pereodevšis’.'"

"On byl očen’ milyj," skazala pastorša, "no,
po pravde govorja, emu bylo trudno spravljat’sja
so svoim delom." "A my kak raz sobralis’ uezžat'
iz Arktura," skazal pastor... "Pokojnik ved’ byl
ljuteranin?" sprosil on, obernuvšis’, i opjat'
stal spuskat’sja.209

In narration regarding the English couple, a satiric tone is maint-
tained throughout: "rodnye ostrova," "ostrye kolenki pastora,"
"nadmennye suprugi,"210 "voobražaemye mociony k korrespondentam im byli
nužny dlja appetita,"211 "...uselis' vse pacienty, krome Levšina i,
konečno, angličan, otpravivšixsja v kurgauz."212 In the first edition

207 p. 35.
208 p. 104.
209 p. 140.
210 p. 34.
211 p. 103.
212 p. 122.
The cumulative emphasis on the character traits of the parson and his wife result in their acquiring symbolic significance, as is indicated by the phrase "nacional'noe svojstvo," quoted above. The image which they convey of the English in the novel is confirmed by the parallel drawn in one passage between Klebe and England:

...pravda, doktor Klebe, v izvestnom smysle, byl pokož na Angliju, u kotoroj motivy vysokogo rycarstva vsegda svpadajut s motivami vygody. U nego toliko nedostavalo anglijskogo jumora, čtoby svoju koryst' vsegda predstavit' blagodejaniem dlja čelovečestva. Kak Anglija, on ljubil svoe blagorodstvo, no nel'zja skazat', čto on byl gotov zaščitit' ego ljuboj cenoj.

This presentation of the English constitutes the only case in the novel of nationality being emphasized as such: no stress is laid on Swiss or German character traits.  

---


214 p. 20.

215 p. 34.

216 p. 78.

217 There is an incidental reference by Inge Kretschmar to the unwarlike character of the Swiss. (See p. 52).
Sanatorij Arktur is dominated not so much by the intended positive hero, Levšin, as by the principal negative character, Dr. Klebe, the owner of the sanatorium. This "naibolee xudožestvenno sil'nyj obraz romana" is by far the most thoroughly developed character in Sanatorij Arktur, and Klebe's fate carries the highly significant theme of economic determination. Klebe is himself sick with tuberculosis after having recovered from two earlier attacks. As an Austrian citizen, he is not permitted under Swiss law to practise in Switzerland, although he may own a sanatorium. Klebe had bought "Arktur" both as a source of income and a means of treatment:

Arktur byl priobreten, чтобы лечить, постепенно лечиться и жить в горах, жить в условиях, обеспечивающих здоровье, в обстановке, уничащающей болезнь. Arktur был задуман как лекарство, как гарантия, как прочность: он должен был лечиться и платить за лечение, он должен был стать вечностью и в это же время ценой, которую приобретает вечность.

218 The name (cf. German "kleben", "stick") is suggestive of weakness and sycophancy.


220 pp. 140-141.

221 p. 46.

222 p. 106.
Although at first the profits had been considerable, the depression years have led to a fall in the number of patients, which results in Klebe's being declared bankrupt and the sanatorium's being put in receivership. Klebe is now prepared to go to any lengths, including deception and fraud, to obtain the eight patients whom he needs in order to cover his overheads. Less seriously, he cheats the patients by charging them for calcium which he obtains gratis from a German company under the pretext of using it for research purposes, and inflates Inge Kretschmar's final bill by overcharging for the fumigation of her room. Klebe has completely lost all professional integrity and treats the patients entirely as a source of income. Klebe's mercenary is demonstrated especially by his repellent remark after the doctors' meeting about patients with tuberculosis of the bone: "...ved' éto samye blagodarnye pacienty - s tuberkulezom kostej: oni ležat s utra do noči ne vstavaja, i ležat god, dva..." His attitude

223 See pp. 7, 46, 79 and 92.
224 pp. 7 and 96.
225 p. 80.
226 pp. 78-79.
227 pp. 124-125.
228 Simons writes of Klebe, "...he approaches them with unfailing kindness..." (Simmons, p. 54), but there is no suggestion of anything better than obsequiousness. Pašić is the only patient with whom Klebe appears to have developed any kind of human relationship.
229 p. 24.
toward Mme Rivacs is clearly determined by her wealth, and his first impressions of Inge Kretschmar are dominated by her apparent financial standing. When the dying Inge asks for more oxygen, he is concerned about the cost: "Ja xoču skazat': éta bednaja osoba vse ravno umret.
No počemu že dolžny stradat' my? Neizvestno, polučim li my po štetu za rasxody, kotorye teper' neses." To Stumm, Klebe is surprisingly candid about his attitudes: "Ja byl by ščastliv, esli by pacienty žili u menja večno!...Ja ne gožus' v svjatye: nel'zja trebovat' ot menja, čtoby ja dumal o drugix sanatorijax." He frankly describes keeping a sanatorium as a method of existence.

He invents relapses and tries to ensure that patients have heavy falls. When Mme Rivacs leaves "Arktur" he malignantly wishes, "Pošla by u starušonki krov', ona uznala by!" Debating means of guaranteeing that either Levšin or Inge Kretschmar remains, he tells himself, "Nado dejstvovat', poka oni ne razbežalis', vse éti kaleki..." He attempts in vain to induce the young Willi Bauer to stay by falsely claiming to have found TB bacilli in his phlegm.

230 p. 20.
231 pp. 18-19.
232 p. 113.
233 p. 96.
234 p. 97.
235 p. 78.
236 p. 77.
237 p. 80.
The fraud which Klebe practises on Inge Kretschmar is, however, the most unprincipled of his manipulations and constitutes a basic event in the development of the plot. Klebe apparently concludes from Levšin's depression at Inge's worsening condition\textsuperscript{238} that Levšin will possibly remain if he can induce Inge to leave. Consequently Klebe writes to Levšin to inform him that he has told Inge that Levšin is leaving, and that he is certain that this will accelerate her departure. "Zato Vaše prebyvanie zdes' nikto ne budet otjagoščat', čto mne dostavit istinnoe udovol'stvie."\textsuperscript{239}

Inge's departure from the sanatorium and the abandonment of treatment and exposure which this involves are evidently the immediate causes of her death, and to this extent Klebe is guilty of her end. Klebe's responsibility is emphasized by Stumm's reaction to Inge's death.\textsuperscript{240}

Nevertheless, the guilt is shared to a degree by Levšin, who deliberately becomes a party to Klebe's deception,\textsuperscript{241} and by Hoffmann, who might possibly have been able to induce Inge to stay, yet, as we have seen, allows herself to be provoked virtually into driving her out of "Arktur" with vicious words.\textsuperscript{242}

Klebe's need to keep his patients in "Arktur" at any price results in his adopting a servile attitude toward them. Dneprovskij describes

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{238}See p. 76.
\item \textsuperscript{239}See p. 87.
\item \textsuperscript{240}See pp. 112 and 129-130.
\item \textsuperscript{241}See pp. 86 and 87-88.
\item \textsuperscript{242}See p. 100.
\end{itemize}
vividly this aspect of the degeneration of Klebe's personality: "...on stanovitsja krivljajuščimaja pajacom svoej žalkoj sobstvennosti." 243 This obsequiousness is shown especially in his attitude toward the rich Mme Rivacs, 244 to appease whom he is prepared to go to almost any lengths. Klebe's manner toward Levšin is evidently similar: "...on□Levšin □ vernulsja domoj i iz Arktura truscoju vyskočil v xalatike doktor Klebe, vysprašivaja, kak prišlas' progulka, i vse li xoroše..." 245 When Levšin returns of his own volition after Inge has been brought back to "Arktur," Klebe is confused, and "...prjamo perelivalsja iz odnogo sostojanija v drugoe, starajas' bezošibočnee ponravit'sja." 246 Klebe's obsequious timidity is conveyed by the description of his manner of entering the room: "...delikatnoe postukivanie v kosjak...□Klebe□vsej svoej figuroj izobražaja polnejšju gotovnost' vyjti za dver'." 247 Klebe's readiness to humiliate himself is seen also in his behaviour toward his long-term patient Pašić. As soon as Pašić complains of a headache the doctor's manner changes: "Doktor znal, čto bez žaloby ne obojdetsja, no novym golosom, mjagkim ot učastija, s gotovnost'ju nepremenno totčas pomoč', sprosil..." 248 The scene in which Klebe begs Pašić not to leave "Arktur"

243 Dneprovskij, p. 261.

244 See p. 39.

245 p. 13.

246 p. 114.

247 p. 66.

248 p. 9.
is one of the most painful episodes in the novel: he feels a sense of
closeness to Pasic ("Čto govorit', on obladal serdcem!") yet
approaches him, "...točno prositel'." After confessing that he also is
sick, he tells him: "Vot otkuda kovčeg, v kotorom my s vami plyvem,
gospodin major. On pojdet ko dnu, esli budut pokinut obitateljami. Ne
brosajte vašej kajuty, gospodin major. Ja govorju s vami kak s
džentl'menom." Klebe's anguish and humiliation are vividly conveyed:
"Veki doktora Klebe pokrasneli, on izvinilsja s vidom nadmennogo čeloveka,
ego rot perekašivala strannaja prezritel'naja užyvka. On vysvobodilsja
iz kresla i stojal s opuščennoj golovoj." Despite his mercenariness, Klebe is extraordinarily persistent
in his hypocritical attempts to convince others and himself that he puts
the interests of the patients above all else. Referring to the obnoxious
supervision by his creditors, he tells Levšin, "...ja imeno - čestnyj
čelovek, ja ne pojdu na sdelki s sovest'ju: reputacija Arktura dlja
menja vyše vsego, ja eju ne postupljus', daže esli pridetsja pitat'sja
odnoj kartoškoj." To Inge Kretschmar he gives vent to his conviction
of others' ingratitude:

Razočarovanie, milaja frejlen Krešmar,
o, nam znakomo razočarovanie. My inogda
žestoko raskaivaemsja v privjazannostjax.
Boj'noj, kotorogo my vozroždаем k žizni,
delaetsja nam blizok i mil. My gordimsja
im, my raduemjsja s nim vmeshe. A te,
kotoryx, nesmotrja na naši usiliya, my ne

249 p. 50.
250 pp. 50-51.
251 p. 51.
252 p. 47.
Klebe goes on to complain of Levšin: "On podozревает в моих договорах
ночто эгоистическое. Эгоизм и я! Боже мой! Вот и еще одно
разочарование!" 253

Selfpity is another of the most prominent elements of Klebe's
personality. In the long episode during which he unburdens his soul
to Levšin, he complains bitterly of Mme Rivacs' arrogant behaviour toward him, "...она позволяет себе говорить насмешливо с лицем-to
доктором Klebe!," and of his humiliating situation: "Ja, so svoim
medicinskим опытом в присутствии любого свежеского юноши, тол'ко что
вывущенного из университета, должен стоять', заткнув себе рот тампоном.
Зато мне предоставлжает право владеть собственностью, когда она
принесет одни убытки." 254 Even more replete with selfpity is the out-
burst to Inge Kretschmar in which he vaunts his altruism.

As Klebe becomes increasingly ill, his misery dominates more and
more his interior monologues. After the first positive analysis of his
phlegm, he realizes bitterly that the sanatorium has failed in its pur-
pose. "Da, доктор Klebe слишком мало думал о себе. Все о drugix, o
drugix!" 255 Stumm's refusal to treat him is followed by another outburst:

253 pp. 82-83: cf. also p. 78.
254 p. 46.
255 p. 106.
In view of Klebe's special relationship with Pašić, it is not surprising that the doctor is deeply hurt by his ingratitude and "treachery":

K neščast'jam, pereživaemym Klebe, major dobavljal oskorblenie: kakim-to obmnanny putem perceexal v drugoj sanatorij. Bliz' pensionera, kotoromu vse ravno gde proživat' den'gi, obrašcena byla protiv čeloveka, tak serdečno k nemu otnosivšegosja i - Klebe vspomnil - posvjativšega ego v svoju bolezn', v svoi stradanija. Takov čelovek, takovy ljudi. I Klebe ne xotel ostanovit' kativšiesja gorčše sleezy.

Klebe's misery becomes even deeper after Stumm tells him of his decision to leave "Arktur." He looks through his depressing x-rays and analyses and then goes to bed:

...Klebe načal dremat', s trepetnym, pugajuščim čuvstvom, čto každyj den' prinosit neščast'e za neščast'em, i počti ne ostalos' ničego obnadeživajuščega, i žizn', ele tepljas', vedet Klebe pod ruku, kak starca, v čužoj, bednyj pension, gde ego iz žalosti kladut na nečistuju kojku v temnom uglu, i on tam vyxarkivajet svoi legkije.

256 pp. 112-113.

257 pp. 127-128.

258 p. 131.
Not surprisingly, the theme of Klebe's selfpity finally recurs in his interior monologue immediately before the scene with Liesl and Karl which precedes his suicide: "Prošlo xlynulo na Klebe s sladkoj i užasajuščej nevozvratnost'ju, i žalost' k sebe, i nenavist' k tomu ničtožestvu, kakoe obstupalo ego so vsex storon i grubo peresilivalo, bralo verx, - vse éto stesnilo ego gorlo do rydanij."259

This theme of Klebe's misery and selfpity which runs throughout the entire presentation of the doctor is paralleled by the theme of Klebe's inferiority feelings and attempts at self-assertion. Stylis-tically, this theme is continually stressed by a combination of Klebe's own remarks in conversation, interior monologue, and authorial narration.260 Thus the doctor boasts to Levšin that he had not apologized to Rivacs, but had rather insisted on her leaving "Arktur." The narration, however, belittles his bold self-assertion and suggests Klebe's deeper feelings of inadequacy: "Vyprjamljajas', on raspaxnul xalat. V ego osanke, kak spičečnaja vspyška, mel'knul vyzov. On vložil ruki v brjučnye karmany. Ego podborodok vypjatilsja."261

Accompanying Klebe's inferiority feelings is a raw sensitivity to humiliation. At one moment he decides against entreating Mme Rivacs

259 pp. 131-132.

260 A suggestion of Klebe's character traits is to be found also in the description of his signature, which shows no variation in his suicide letter: "...rosčerk udalsja, kak vsegda: tonkij, vozdušnyj oval s dvumja xvostikami vnutri (p. 138).

261 p. 45.
Nevertheless, immediately afterward Klebe begs Major Pašić to remain in the passage already quoted, with its powerful depiction of his tortured self esteem.

Klebe's sensitivity is again seen in the episode during which he suffers acutely when Rivac accuses him by innuendo of hypocrisy ("dvoedušie"). When Stumm announces that he is leaving "Arktur," Klebe is at first crushed ("...stojal ponikšij, tixij..."), but then attempts to defend his dignity: "Šagi ego pokrupneli, on vstrjaxnulsja, emu stalo svobodnee idti... 'Ved' u vas, naverxu, ljudi umirajut každuju nedelju, i vy ne uxodite iz svoego sanatorija." Highly significant is Klebe's interior monologue immediately preceding his suicide, when he suddenly feels that he has Parkinson's disease: "U nego javilos' neoborimoe želanie skryt'sja, sprjatat'sja v nedosjagaemuju ščelku, skatat'sja v klubok i tak zaleč', ctoby nikto

262 pp. 49-50.
263 See p. 35.
264 p. 130.
ne našel. Ego terzalo, čto vot sejčas opjat' otvoritsja dver' i snova povlačat ego na kakoe-nibud' uniženie."265

Klebe’s psychological condition at this point, when his feelings of inadequacy become so acute that he longs to vanish into the ground, are reminiscent of Dostoevskij’s underground man. A further parallel between Fedin’s Klebe and Dostoevskij’s underground man can be found in the doctor’s remarkable fantasies. In several visions he entertains megalomaniac delusions of achieving fame in various fields of activity.

Klebe’s main cultural interest lies in music, and in the scene in which we are first introduced to Klebe he listens to a broadcast of Wagner’s *Rienzi*. The music gives rise to a fantasy in which he conducts the Berlin Philharmonic with greater skill than Furtwängler, and Toscanini is driven to confess Klebe’s superiority.266 Similarly, when Klebe watches a skijumping competition, he identifies himself with the skiers and sees himself as a world champion competing in Norway.267

When business prospects improve, he is immediately seized with optimism, and indulges in visions of a more materialistic and "pošlyj" character.268 Such surges of optimism are generally held to be characteristic of TB patients.269 In the first such fantasy Klebe dreams of buying a car

---

265 p. 134.
266 p. 8.
267 p. 37.
268 Klebe’s preoccupation with social standing and prestige is also suggested in the episodes where he reproaches Karl for appearing in public without his uniform: "Vy služite v pervoklassnom sanatoriil," (p. 21) and in his anguished description of a French novel: "Opisyvaetsja vpolne poštennyy, bogatyj gospodin, i - ponimaete - on zivet so svoej prislugoj! Užasno!" (p. 10).
269 Note Klebe’s optimism at resuming for the third time his regimen as a TB patient (p. 107).
of the latest model, meeting women, and travelling around Europe. His genuine intellectual interests are indicated, however, by his also dreaming of hiring a piano tutor, buying books, renewing "Arktur's" equipment and carrying out medical research.

His last "Walter Mitty" fantasy constitutes a major setpiece. On the way to the crematorium for Inge Kretschmar's funeral, Klebe hears the whine and scream of a motor saw, and in his mind the sounds give rise to the music of an imaginary orchestra, which in turn conjures up an extraordinary vision of the future.

Klebe becomes the intimate friend of a Dutch millionaire, who has "Arktur" emptied of all the remaining patients. They leave the sanatorium to live in luxury in a villa on Lago Maggiore, where they are visited by the Duce. Mussolini, on whom Klebe makes a great impression, appoints him Minister of Health, and the doctor gives "Arktur" over as a sanatorium for doctors with tuberculosis. Klebe's bust, crowned with a laurel wreath, is set up in the hall of "Arktur." Here the neurotic quality of Klebe's fantasies is immediately apparent.

Besides these radiantly optimistic fantasies, Klebe also has two fantasies of an abandoned "Arktur." In the first vision, occurring after Pašić tells him of his decision to leave, Klebe sees the sanatorium stripped of furniture, with the paper peeling off the walls: a terrifying silence reigns everywhere. Later, after receiving from Hoffmann the

\[270\]
Klebe's fantasies have received almost no attention from Soviet critics. Runin refers inadequately to Klebe's "bezuderžnaja fantazija, detskaja mečtatel'nost'. (Runin, p. 12).

\[271\] See pp. 48-49.
first positive TB analysis, Klebe in anguish accuses the sanatorium like a "provinivšegosja čeloveka" of deceiving him. Instead of serving as a means for his recovery, "...on stal požiratelem zdrav'ja doktora Klebe, stal paguboj." In this new fantasy the empty "Arktur" has frozen into a frightful immobility suggestive of rigor mortis:

Večno pugavšaja pustota s kakoj-to bezrazsudnoj toržestvennost'ju javilas' pered Klebe: pustye koridory, pustye komnaty, v pustoj kuxne - zastavlaya povarixa, v ljube pod'emnoj mašiny kurit Karl, mortvym glazom podmigivaja Lisl', i gde-to pod Čerdakom, na čemadanax, pril'nula k mikroskopu frejlen doktor.272

These fantasies are clearly a projection of Klebe's terror of losing all his patients and consequently further develop the theme of economic crisis in the novel.

Parallel to Klebe's increasing loss of contact with reality is his desire for distraction from reality, which, he claims, is directly conducive to health. This theme is established in the course of Klebe's conversation with Pašić in the first chapter: "Začem vy sozdaete sebe stol'ko zabot. Ėto ne blagoprijatstvet' vyzdrovleniju. Vy dolžny otvlekat' svoi mysli ot okružajuščej vas dejstvitel'nosti."273 After Klebe discovers that Levšin has watched Inge's body being removed from "Arktur" by the undertakers, he tells him, "Vy očen' mnogo v žizni


273 p. 10. The theme recurs in Inge Kretschmar's conversation with Dr. Stumm on the subject of drinking wine (p. 29). The occurrence in connection with Inge inevitably suggests the perniciousness of this attitude.
zamčaete, milýj drug. Nado men'še videt'...dlja zdorov'ja tak poleznee." 274

Klebe's principal means of distraction are the novels of Edgar Wallace, 275 which he recommends strongly to his patients. In the first conversation between Pašić and Klebe, the doctor extols Wallace: "Ja ne budu čitat' nikogo, krome svogogo milejšega Ėdgara Vollėsa....Možno čitat' noči naprolet! Gde francuzam! Bezumno uvlekaet i vmešte s tem rasseivat..." 276 Later, talking with Levšin, Klebe relates Wallace's work to the needs of the contemporary reader:

Konečno, on - ne Dostoevskij i ne Lev Tolstoj, čtot samyj Edgars. V kakuju golovu pridet voobšče sravnivat'!.... Stoit posmotret' na čtu malointelligent-muju tolstuju fizionomiju a papirosoj! Ja ne stavlu ego ni vo čto! No ja deržu ego dlja pacientov. Kto xočet rasszej'sja i spokojno zasnut' s knigoj, tomu ja ne mogu rekomendovat' Dostoevskogo, soglasites'.... Ser'eznyj pisatel' pišet tak, čto ego knigi trebujut razmyšlenija. A éto utomljat. Čitateli xotjat s knigoju v rukax ėuvstvovat' sebja teatral'nym zritelem, za kotorogo sdelany vse vyvody. 277

Significantly, the theme of Wallace recurs for the last time in the suicide scene, in which Klebe stamps on the covers of his copies of Wallace's novels with their smug portraits of the author:

274 P. 124.

275 There is no indication in Sanatorij Arktur which of the over 150 novels which Wallace wrote were in Klebe's collection.

276 P. 11.

277 pp. 43-44.
Here the occurrence of the Wallace theme evidently has a double significance: the smug self-satisfied face is more than Klebe can stand in his anguish and desperation, and also, on a deeper level, Klebe is now finally obliged to recognize the unbearable reality, and thus Wallace's novels can have no further distractive role to play.

We do not learn until the very end of the novel that Klebe's wife has abandoned him. The combination of authorial irony and the denigratory portrayal of Liesl makes the presentation of Klebe's designs on the servant girl Liesl extremely unattractive, and we gather from Liesl's outburst in the scene immediately preceding Klebe's suicide that he had once pestered her in a storeroom. This treatment of Klebe's sexuality contributes a further negative element to his characterization.

Klebe makes two significant references to the Soviet Union in the context of his financial situation. In his conversation with Levšin

---

278 See p. 134.

279 See p. 139.

280 See pp. 81-82.

281 See p. 133.
he discusses his ownership of "Arktur":

Imet' sanatorij? Bezumie! Éto byl rokovoj čas moej žizni, kogda ja rešilsja kupit' sanatorij!....vladet' tem, čto tebe ne prinadležit! Ved' imeno tak obstoit delo teper'....O, ja ubedilsja v verolomnoj prirodě sobstvennosti!.... U menja nojut kosti ot étix kandalov, i - o! - skol'ko raz ja dumal o Moskve, isceljujuščej ětu strašnuju bolezn'!

To this Levšin retorts, "Ne sami li vy vyzvali u sebja ětu bolezn'?"282

Klebe's second reference to the Soviet Union is in his suicide letter, in which the theme of private property recurs in cruder form:

Ja inogda mečtal o čude, kotoroe menja spasat. No čuda ne slučilos'. I ponjatno: čudo - čto den'gi, a ved' deneg net. Covorjat, est' na svete strana, gde čudesa slučajutsja s ljud'mi, u kotoryx deneg net. Esli by ja byl zdorov, ja pošel by tuda peškom, čtoby ubedit'sja, čto čto - skazka. No doexat' tuda nužny den'gi. Ja sdajus'.283

These isolated statements of Klebe's do not convince the reader that they proceed from any deep intellectual conviction or emotional "tjaga," and are in no way integrated with the remaining presentation of the character. The apparently significant words in the suicide letter about Klebe's loss of hope in a Soviet "marvel" are unconnected with the depiction of Klebe's suicide.284 The impact of these words is reduced

282 p. 46.

283 p. 141.

284 Sec p. 134.
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good (as Levšin himself points out), and by Levšin's statement that there would have been no point in his going to the Soviet Union. A Soviet critic speaks frankly of the "nasil'no pritjanutaja fraza" about the Soviet Union as a "country of marvels." The novel contains clear suggestions that Klebe is to be seen as the product of his environment. After telling Stumm that keeping a sanatorium is a method of existence and receiving the reply, "Metod samoubijstva v naše vremja," Klebe says significantly, "Vinovato naše vremja, a ne ja." Again, Levšin's final words on Klebe are: "On byl neploxoj čelovek, potomu čto ne mog byt' lučše, daže esli by xotel.... čto rassuždenija, ot kotoryx on umer." More directly, Klebe's suicide is attributed to lack of money both in Klebe's own suicide letter and in Karl's words, "On byl xorošij čelovek, no u nego ne xvatalo deneg. Odni dolgi. On poštomu i..."

In one passage of authorial narration Klebe's hypocrisy is related to his education:

V etix nevol'nyx i redko udavavšixsja umyslax ě attempts to keep patients in "Arktur" by chicanery K Klebe ne videl ničego durnogo, potomu čto sčital, čto ljubit svoix pacientov i zabortitsja

285 See p. 46.
286 See p. 145.
287 Kalina, p. 159.
288 p. 97.
289 p. 141.
290 p. 139.
Here an antithesis is established between the basically noble feelings which Klebe derived from his education and the unconscious effect on his actions which material conditions have produced. There is no attempt to demonstrate that Klebe's entire personality is economically determined, but evidently Klebe's acts are to be understood as the consequence of the economic crisis from which Klebe suffers, as is directly implied by the statements about Klebe quoted earlier.

Stumm generalizes from Klebe's experience: "...esli by na ego meste - ja. Sovzem na ego meste. Vo vsex podrobnostjax, pri vsex obstojatel'stvax. To est' absoljutno, kak u nego, ponimaete?" When Levšin says that he does not know how he would have acted, Stumm comments, "No esli my s vami ne znaem, značit my razdeljаем, opravdyvaem, tak? Ved' tak? No esli tak, togda načnut vse kak Klebe..."[292]

Although it is natural for others to identify themselves with Klebe, it is unjustifiable to maintain that his fate demonstrates the
helplessness of the "average man" in capitalist society as Brajnina asserts: "Zdes' obsobennno vyraziteln'no pokazana tragičeskaja bespomozność tak nazvyamego 'srednego čeloveka' v uslovijax kapitalističeskogo obščestva." Irrespective of whether Klebe's fate is shown to be determined by "capitalist society" rather than merely by the "strašnaja sud'ba poslednih let," Klebe is obviously far from being an "average man." We know nothing of Klebe's background, but apparently his financial situation had been such as to enable him to buy a major sanatorium in Davos. Until very recently the profits had made it possible for him to live extremely well.

Klebe's atypicality is not, however, so much material as psychological. His numerous fantasies and generally tenuous contact with reality in conjunction with his acute inferiority feelings suggest strongly that he is psychologically unbalanced. On the evidence of Klebe's neurotic personality the reader naturally infers that Klebe's behaviour would be abnormal even in the absence of the specific economic conditions presented in the novel. Not only is the thesis of the "average man" made untenable by Klebe's psychological condition, but also in the absence of an attempt to show that Klebe's personality traits have

293 Brajnina, pp. 167-168.
294 p. 106.
295 See p. 7.
296 Thus Klebe had possessed a Rolls-Royce (see p. 96). Fedin's plutocratic symbol from Poxiščenie Evropy recurs in the later novel.
297 See especially Klebe's interior monologue before committing suicide (p. 134).
economic causes the theme of economic determinism is seriously undermined.

It would have been possible for Fedin to present Klebe as a tragic figure whose fate would deeply move the reader. Such an interpretation of Klebe is, however, vitiated by the author's portrayal of the doctor as a somewhat ridiculous figure who is incapable of attaining tragic dimensions. This view of Klebe is implicit throughout Klebe's fantasies which in their mingled "pošlost'" and pomposity betray the ironic attitude of the author, as well as in the character of the authorial narration devoted to Klebe.

Klebe speaks contemptuously of Edgar Wallace:

Konečno, on - ne Dostoevskij i ne Lev Tolstoj, čtot samyj Edgar. V kakuju golovu pridet voobšče sravnivat'!
On xvalalsja za golovu, v kotorju ne moglo prijti podobnoe sravnienie.

...doktor sunul nos za peregorodku...

On Ėklebe...v serdečnom tone, počti kak muzikal'nyj jaščik, zapel:...


---

Klebe's timidity due to his inferiority feelings (see especially p. 66) and his obsequiousness naturally contribute to this impression.

298 p. 43.
300 p. 44.
301 p. 49.
302 p. 45.
Even Klebe's pitiful interior monologue on his future fate to die as a pauper loses pathos and acquires ironic overtones as a result of the use of the word "starec" and the emphasis on gruesome detail.

Significant also is the use of diminutives in relation to Klebe:

Klebe podnjal ruki nad golovoj i obernul'sja k krovati. S etim zhestom, slegka napominavshim biblejskij, on postojal neskol'ko mgnovenij slovno obraščajas' v stolp. 303

A final vital element in the author's conspicuously denigratory attitude toward Klebe is the constant association of the doctor with verbs of rapid motion, ("running," "jumping," "rushing"), which inevitably create the cumulative impression of a midget scurrying around the sanatorium. 309

303 P. 83.
304 See p. 131.
305 P. 47.
306 P. 124.
307 P. 126.
308 P. 129.
309 E.g. vskakivaja (p. 11), truscoju vyskočil (p. 13), begom skatilsja...zabežal (p. 18), pobežal...brosil'sja (p. 19), vybežal (p. 21), pobežal (p. 47), begom pustilsja (p. 48), vskočil...pomčalsja
The character of the author's presentation of Klebe results in the lessening of his stature as a figure capable of carrying a major thematic load. Moreover, as we have seen, despite the frequent suggestion and clear implication that Klebe's behaviour and fate are a consequence of the economic crisis, the great emphasis in the novel on Klebe's unbalanced personality detracts from the plausibility of the economic thesis that, in Zagradka's words, Klebe is a "žertva tex denežnyx otnošenij meždu ljud'mi, kotorye on uporno pytalsja ispol'zovat' v svoix celax."310

In the portrayal of Klebe Fedin did not succeed in achieving an artistically convincing synthesis of the double theme of neurotic motivation and economic determinism. Nevertheless, with his psychological complexity and capacity for evil Klebe is far more than "...one of Fedin's blameless drudges of the early stories, a Chaplinesque creature."311 The attention devoted to the economic factors involved in Klebe's situation and, paradoxically, the realistic detail given in the presentation of his alienation from reality, result in his becoming the most lifelike character in the novel. As Runin observes, Klebe is the "naibolee pravdivyj obraz

(p. 49), otskočil (p. 81), vybežal (p. 83), otebega (p. 97), pobežal (p. 102), soskočil...brosilsja (p. 106), ustremilsja (p. 114), ubegaja (p. 124), pospešil (p. 129), metnulsja (p. 134).


311 Simmons, p. 53.
knigi. Doktor Klebe boles, chem kto-libo iz obitalej sanatorija, svjazan s 'izn'ju.\footnote{Runin, p. 12.} Klebe's fate constitutes the principal dramatic element of the novel.\footnote{Dneprovskij, p. 261.}

References to Thomas Mann's novel Der Zauberberg (1924)\footnote{Grinberg, p. 29.} form a leitmotiv of Sanatorij Arktur. Apart from direct references, the presentation of "Arktur" as an independently existing hermetically sealed environment, and yet a microcosm, would seem at first sight to owe a great deal to the German novel.\footnote{Dneprovskij, p. 261.} Not surprisingly, the Zauberberg-like figure of Major Pašić, for whom life in Davos is the only possible existence, serves as the principal bearer of this theme.

Pašić tells Inge Kretschmar, "Éta kniga zdes', naverxu, na volšebnej gore, sekreta. Éta kniga - pro nas s vami. Zdes' delajut vid, čto ee ne suščestvuie." It is harmful to the doctors, although they claim that it is detrimental to the patients. "Medicina obižena 'Volšebnoj goroj' potomu, čto romanist napisal knigu bez blagoslovenija davosskogo obščestva vračej." Pašić evidently interprets the basic thesis of the novel as one of biological determinism, which he completely rejects: "Slučajnost' pravit sud'boj - filosofija, kotoraja otnimaet u bol'nogo

\footnote{Similarly, Dneprovskij observes that Klebe is "...nesomnennno samyj 'iznennyj, pravdivyj i soderžatel'nyj obraz romana." (Dneprovskij, p. 261).}

\footnote{"Osnovnoj dramatičeskij uzel proizvedeniya." (Grinberg, p. 29).}

\footnote{These are the only specific literary references in the novel apart from the references to Wallace and the incidental reference to Willhelm Busch. (See p. 8).}

\footnote{Klebe refers to "Arktur" as a "kovčeg." (See p. 51).}
When Inge asks Karl in Klebe's presence to buy her a copy of *Zauberberg*, Klebe asserts that he has never heard of it, but after Pašić has spoken of Klebe's discussing it with him several times, the doctor himself offers to buy it for Inge. After Inge's funeral, Pašić counters a sarcastic remark of Klebe's by reminding him of his failure to get Inge a copy, and Klebe exclaims, "Kakoe sčast'e, čto ona ne otvadala čtogo morja pessimizma!" Reminiscent of the special world of *Zauberberg* are the expressions "naverxu" ("oben"), described as a "prinjatoe vyraženie zdes'" and "vniz" ("hinunter").

The impression arises also that Inge Kretschmar's heightened sensuality may owe something to similar traits in the Russian Mme Chauchat in Mann's novel, as Stumm's peasant vitality may to Pieter Peeperkorn. The references to *Zauberberg* convey an interpretation of the novel as inducing acceptance and passivity toward tuberculosis, while there is no suggestion of the novel's theses of the secret relationship between sickness and the spirit, or of the atrophy of normal emotions in the special environment of

---

316 p. 63.
317 See pp. 67-68.
318 Possibly also Mann is meant as well as Dostoevskij in Klebe's remark to Levšin, "My sliškom často v žizni javljaemsja svideteljami isporčennoj, amoral'noj psixiki, čtoby vдобвок izučat' urodstva duši po romanan." (p. 44).
319 p. 12.
320 See, for instance, p. 114.
the sanatorium. In writing Sanatori Arktur Fedin clearly viewed the sanatorium far more as an "economic microcosm" which reflected the economic crisis of Western Europe, than a "spiritual microcosm," as Mann saw Zauberberg: in the words of a recent Soviet critic, "dlja izobraženija myslitel'noj žizni, filosofskix iskanij, kak tipičnoj storony sovremennogo čeloveka, E Mannu prišlos' postavit' poslednego v osobye uslovija, vyključit' iz povsednevnnoj žizni." It is clear that the "ideological determinism" of Levšin's recovery has nothing in common with Mann's conception of sickness as a quickener of the spirit.

Several critics, including Fedin's biographer, Brajmina, see the choice of a similar environment with a significant difference in thematics as evidence of a deliberate polemic between Fedin and Thomas Mann. Simmons writes that "It is very likely that the Magic Mountain contributed to the conception of Fedin's novel," and contrasts the theme of the Soviet novel with Mann's "...emphasis on the tragic helplessness of man before the cruel and blind laws of biology." Oksenov finds, "...Fedin vstupil v svoeobraznoe sovremnovanie s Tomasom Mannom...," concluding that "Fedin otvetil na roman T. Manna proizvedeniem, proniknutym duxom podlinnogo i blagorodnogo sovetskogo gumanizma, v kotorom preodolevaetsja i snimaetsja tragizm žiznennyx protivorečij," although Mann's work is superior in its "...širokij razvrot materiala, razvernutoe všir' i vglub' izobraženie geroev i sobytij." Finally, Brajmina states: "Roman Fedina - polemika

---


323 Simmons, p. 57.

324 Oksenov, pp. 283 and 286.
s 'Volšebnoj goroj' Tomasa Manna...,' and finds that in Fedin's work, in contrast to Zauberberg, "...človek, ego sila, ego dostoinstvo pobeždajut, kazalos' by nezyblemye, zakony biologii: tol'ko bol'nye duši, ne sposobnye, ne umejuščie borot'sja, obrejajut sebjja na smert'..."325

Curiously, however, in view of Fedin's connections with Germany and the significance of Mann's novel, Fedin told the G.D.R. writer Hugo Huppert when the latter compared the "Ausgangsstellung" of Sanatorij Arktur and of Zauberberg that at the time of writing his own novel about Davos he had not read Mann's work. As quoted by Huppert, Fedin told him:

Sie sind nicht der erste, der mir diese vermeintliche Parallelführung vorhält...
Aber eine Anlehnung kommt hier gar nicht in Frage...schon darum nicht, weil ich... den "Zauberberg" damals noch gar nicht gelesen hatte....Drum darf ich sagen: die behauptete Analogie stimmt nicht oder nur scheinbar und ganz wesenlos. Denn wie wollen Sie Thomas Manns Berghof=Heilstätte anders nehmen denn als weitläufige Hieroglyphe fur die Krankheit oder Krankhaftigkeit der gesamten bürgerlichen Gesellschaft unseres 20. Jahrhunderts? Währenddessen will mein Sanatorium Arktur kein symbolisches, nur ein simples, aber sehr real überzeugendes Einzeletablissement sein und mein Held Rogow [sic] jedenfalls kein dem Untergang geweihter Patrizierspross Hans Kastorp...326

325Brajnina, p. 167.

Despite Fedin's expressed intention of creating in Sanatorij Arktur "ein real überzeugendes Einzeletablissement" little attempt is made in the novel to enhance realism by the extensive use of description or detail. Curiously, the only external description of the sanatorium is to be found in the lyrical setpiece at the very end of the novel which helps to set the scene for Levšin's departure from "Arktur." Virtually no information is given on the internal appearance of the sanatorium. 327

A major element of local colour is, however, introduced by the fullscale setpieces on the skijumping competition 328 and the icehockey match, 329 as well as by the magnificent descriptions of Swiss mountain scenery. 330 Consciousness of the location is heightened by the leitmotiv of the Clavadel posthorn and by the descriptions of yodelling, 331 both of which have symbolic functions.

Nearly every detail, indeed, possesses a specific function. Thus the reference to the rumba, 332 which at this time was becoming popular, prepares the reader for Willy Bauer's question on seeing Pašić's records, "Rumby u vas net?" 333 which stresses his healthy insouciance. The use of an insignificant local detail - the brand of Hoffmann's cigarettes -

327 There is a brief description of two rooms which Inge Kretschmar sees immediately after her arrival (see p. 17), and a reference to wallpaper is repeated in Klebe's first vision of an abandoned "Arktur." (see p. 49).

328 pp. 35-38.
329 pp. 69-70.
330 See Chapter XI, pp. 88-93. See also p. 7 and p. 69 (description of the "foehn").
331 pp. 84 and 88.
332 p. 24.
333 p. 65.
heightens the suspense and raises the pathos of the news of Inge's death.\footnote{334}{See p. 120.} Klebe's former affluence and ostentatious generosity is suggested by his habit of offering the postman Kirschwasser.\footnote{335}{See p. 135.}

There are no references to Swiss history or culture except for the one ironic reference to Wilhelm Tell in Inge's interior monologue about Stumm.\footnote{336}{See p. 52.}

A convention of the novel is that the German language is not suggested, and the reader is left to assume that the Russian Levšin and the Montenegrin Pašić speak perfect German. Klebe apparently speaks perfect English.\footnote{337}{See p. 20.} However, the English parson's wife speaks a "negodnyj nemeckij."\footnote{338}{See p. 104.}

Davos itself is presented in several setpieces and incidental descriptions as a place of beauty and peace. Initially, the mood of Levšin's joy is continued in the description of the brilliance of the colours which he sees.\footnote{339}{See p. 12.} Later the idyllic description of snow is followed by the scene of Stumm's looking down on Davos, in which the image of the town as an ordered assembly of cubes occurs for the first time. In the major setpiece of Davos in which Levšin goes to the cantonal...
sanatorium, the impression of peace and order is momentarily disturbed
by Levšin's thoughts of Inge, but ultimately the fundamental association
of Davos with beauty and tranquillity dominates.

...nalažennost', vseobščaja vežlivost'
i porjadok mogli by nadelit' ravnovesiem
daže duševnobol'nogo....Otsjuda stal
viden razmax doliny i gorod na ee dne,
kak kristalličeskij osadok, ljubovno
otloživšij kubiki domov. Levšin ne
srazu našol sredi čtich igrušek Arktur,
- vse oni byli na odno lico, i udivitel'noc
skodstvo domov podskazalo emu, čto,
naverno, vezde v nix povtorjaetsja
sud'ba Ingi. S vidu spokojnij, gorod byl
naselen brodom svatok so smert'ju, no
pritvorstvoval, nosja ličinu znamogo
raja, pobediivšego stradaniija...on videl
gorod takim, kakim on kazalsja i kakim
on vsegda byl dlja nego - gorodom nadeždy,
i videl glaza Ingi i gorod, kakim on sejčas
stanovilsja dlja nee - gorodom gibeli. I
ponimal vse...On vzošel v goru, k bol'šomu
belomu domu. Zdes' bylo blagopolučie v
allejax, blagopolučie v dorožkax....belyj
dom razvernulsja pered nim šasadom svoej
sotni balkonov, na kotoryx ležali sotni
bol'nyx, dožidajas', čto im budet dano
zdorove'. I Levšinu bylo nesomennno,
čto vsem zdes' upravljaet bog, i on znal,
čto bog byl Štum....Levšin videl vnizu te
že kubiki osevših kristallov, povtorjaajušchie
drug druga. Svojeju slitnost'ju doma kak
budto poručalis' byt' vernymi obščej celi,
privedšej ix sjuda, v sozvučie s dolinoj,
sečnimi gorami i solncem. Strannoj pokazalas'
Levšinu mysli' o pritvornoj ličine goroda.
Net, čto byl gorod dobroj voli Štuma.340

Here the idyllic nature of the presentation of Davos is heightened
by its being interwoven with the theme of Dr. Stumm, the "pravednik, na
kotorom der'žitsja gorod."341

340 pp. 118-120.
341 p. 120.
In the final chapter Davos continues to be associated with an idyllic mood. To this the description of "Arktur" and its surrounding scenery contributes: "Dom plyl v mire sinego neba, snežnyx gor, svetlo-zelenyx lugov, moxnatyx černyx okajmlenij lesa." There follow the exquisite descriptions of the Clavadel valley, the chalet at the bend in the road, and the Landwasser river, while the mood is maintained to the very end of the novel by the lyrical reference to the symbolic Pašić and the farewell between Levšin and Hoffmann.

On the background of the idyllic presentation of Davos, the theme of the economic crisis of the depression is maintained throughout the novel. Apart from the constant recurrences of this theme in connection with the presentation of Dr. Klebe himself, there are numerous other references to the economic situation.

The novel begins in medias res with this theme: "Doktor Klebe stremitel'no progoral. Po ego delam kreditory naznačili administraciju..." and soon Klebe's situation is linked directly to the depression: "...vot uže vtoroj god padalo čislo priezžajuščix v Davos bol'nyx, i Klebe uverjal, čto nikogda prežde ljudi ne byli takimi skaredami, kak poslednee vremja..." Listening to Wagner's Rienzi on the radio, Klebe realizes that the performance is a recording, and his reaction is that "Oni pomešalis'
432

The theme is carefully maintained throughout the chapter: Klebe remarks, "Portitsja tol'ko to, čto stoit deneg," and soon the reader becomes aware, not only that Klebe is feeding the patients with burdock instead of lettuce, but also that Karl is obliged to do the work of nine men. Klebe has had to pawn a microscope, as well as sell his car, and is in arrears with Hoffmann's salary and the wages of Karl and Liesl. Klebe refers to the "mizera" and the "strašnaja sud'ba poslednix let," and, apart from the suggestions already discussed that Klebe's fate is the result of the economic situation, the English couple's immediate reaction to his suicide is to ask: "Iz-za krizisa, da? Kakoj grex, kakoj grex!"

Finally, the unemployment in the outside world is emphasized in several episodes. Inge Kretschmar's father, an engineer, is obliged because of unemployment to work as an office clerk. Willi Bauer explains his determination to return to work: "Ja služu u venskoj firmy....Mne šceen' zavidujut. Vse moi tovarišči bez raboty. Ja uveren, oni byli by rady, čtoby u nix zavelis' bacilly. Liš' by postupit' na službu." Klebe is amazed that Karl should give notice when there is such heavy unemployment.

---

345 p. 8.
346 p. 9.
347 See pp. 10, 19, 54, 96, 133.
348 pp. 19 and 106.
349 p. 140.
350 See p. 27.
351 p. 65.
352 See p. 133.
The effect of economic pressure on personal integrity is shown in the episode in which Hoffmann justifies to Levšin her becoming an accomplice in Klebe's fraud with the fear of losing her job:

On prosto vygonit menja...Ja ego nenavižu...No pojmite...Čto že mne na ulicu?...

...Možet byt', u vas v Moskve prinimajut na službu iz blagorodstva ili kak-nibud' ešče...Štum - švejcarce, i objajan primimat' po zakonu odnix švejcarcev. A ja - takoj že inostrane, kak Klebe...

Vy dumaete, on ne ponimaet, čto mne nekuda devat'sja...353

The novel suggests that the depression has led to a general preoccupation with money. In the financial straits to which he is reduced Klebe has acquired a reverence for money and its possessors. He is evidently impressed by Inge Kretschmar's sterling cheque,354 and says to Hoffmann of Inge: "Naskol'ko ja ponimaju - ves'ma obespečena, da."355 Even less attractive is his obsequiousness toward the rich Mme Rivacs. Despite his protestations to Levšin, we suspect that Klebe feels that her riches ultimately justify her pretensions:

Čto dast ej pravo tak postupat'? Neuželi den'gi?....Čto podumajut pacienty: U doktora Klebe bogačam možno delat' čto xočeš'. Tak?.... Ona pozvoljaet sebe govorit' nasmešlivoy s kakim-to doktorom Klebe!

...Vy berete s menja samuju vysokuju platu, - govorit madam, - i za éti den'gi ja vprave trebovat' vse,

353 pp. 54-55.

354 See p. 18.

355 p. 19.
Pasic's cynicism illustrates this theme of the power of money. After making a caustic remark directed at Klebe, Mme Rivacs observes, "Ja vsegda govorju pravdu," and the major comments sceptically, "Možete sobe pozvolit', sudarynja." 357

The moral degradation induced by the economic crisis is, of course, exemplified principally by Klebe's unethical acts and ultimate suicide, although, as we have seen, the causal relationship which the author seeks to demonstrate is not artistically convincing.

The ethics of the medical profession in Davos are presented in a very unfavourable light by the doctors' behaviour at the meeting during which the paper on tuberculosis of the bone is read. The doctors are seen to be little interested in medical progress, but highly excited at the possibility of advertising Davos at a time when "...vsem xotelos' čem-nibud' podnovit' delovye perspektivy v takoe trudnoe dlia kurorta vremja." 358 Stumm's isolation is the result of his attitude toward the other doctors, "kopilki v pidžakax i Černyx šljapax." 359

The negative impression of Western Europe is reinforced by cultural references in the novel. S. I. Mašinskij draws attention to

356 pp. 44-45.
357 p. 35.
358 p. 24.
359 p. 25.
the way in which Fedin in *Sanatorij Arktur*, as in his earlier work, constantly "...svjazyaet problemy zizni s problemami tvorchestva." Referring to the literature read by the patients of the sanatorium, he writes, "Čeloveka ubivat bolezn', odnako ešče ran'še ego postepeno ubivat, lišat voli rasslablennaja dekadentskaja literatura, gde odni tomlenija, straxi, mistika, obražennost'".360 Undoubtedly the extended references to Wallace and to the adventure novel read by Inge acquire, even apart from their major role in the characterization of Klebe and Inge Kretschmar, a thematic prominence in the treatment of the sanatorium and suggest an association between mental and physical sickness and escapist literature. Inge Kretschmar's reading heightens her dissatisfaction with her present life and her frantic sensuality, while Klebe's reading tends to reduce even further his contact with reality. Moreover, Mann's *Zauberberg* becomes associated with the loss of will to resist disease.

Although the relationship suggested between "decadent" literature and spiritual illhealth is artistically convincing in *Sanatorij Arktur* because of the integration of the characters' reading with their thorough psychological presentation, yet intellectually the popular literature read by the patients appears more "pošlyj" than pernicious. This is certainly the case with the French novel described by Klebe.361 In a conversation with Levšin


361 See p. 10.
the doctor makes an interesting defence of Wallace. He claims that the contemporary reader does not wish to be made to think, but only to be entertained: "Prežnemu čitatelju bylo očen' interesno uznat' o dejstvitel'nosti pri pomoči romana, potomu čto on o nej ne imel ponjatija. A teper' dejstvitel'nost' pogloščaet nas bez ostatka, i my rady, kogda roman rasskazyvaet nečto malopravdopodobnoe."\(^{362}\)

The literary references in the novel are indicative of the author's views on the type of literature currently popular in Western Europe. Fedin may well have been influenced in his opinions by Gor'kij's views on Western culture, expressed in his correspondence with Fedin,\(^ {363}\) as well as by his own reading and contemporary Soviet publicistics. The atmosphere of cultural "pošlost'" certainly contributes to the generally negative presentation of the life of the sanatorium.

Nevertheless, the portrayal of Europe is not entirely negative. The description of Stumm's cantonal sanatorium, in which "vrači...mogli ne spešit'" creates a very different atmosphere from that of "Arktur."\(^ {364}\) Moreover, the passage devoted to Klebe's betrayal of his deepest feelings suggests the idealism inculcated by European universities.\(^ {365}\) Although the theme of crisis and degeneration constitutes the dominant impression of Europe, the effect on the reader is largely neutralized by the artistic power of the idyllic descriptions of Davos and its surroundings which form such a significant part of the novel.

\(^ {362}\) pp. 43-44.

\(^ {363}\) See especially M. Gor'kij, Sobranie sočinenij v 30 toman (Moscow, 1949-55), XXIX, 430, and XXX, 246-248, also N. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, pp. 470, 534-536, 540-541.

\(^ {364}\) p. 119.

\(^ {365}\) p. 78.
Apart from the references to the Soviet Union in Levšin's interior monologues, the presentation of Soviet reality receives little attention in the novel. Hoffmann asks Levšin whether the song of the Italian bricklayers reminds him of Russian songs: "K revnivomu učastiju, kotoroe uže privyk v ee glazax zamečat' Levšin, slovno dobavilsja ottenok zavisti." 366 The barber is immensely proud of the catfur cap which he had bought in Moscow many years before: "Ėta šapka - tridcat' tri let... ee nel'zja poterjat', ona ot Moskva!" 367 However, the very mention of "Moscow" apparently gives the Greek a fit of ridiculous terror. 368 We learn nothing of what Levšin tells him about Moscow, although "Mnogo bylo tainstvenno-vlekuš'ego v étix rasskazax." 369 Inge interrupts Levšin before he can tell her about what happened after he fell sick. 370 In a quotation from a friend's letter which occurs in Levšin's interior monologue there is an incidental reference to the attitude of Western Europe to the Soviet Union: "Posylaem naši gazety, gde vse - o Dneprogése. Zdešnie 371 ty, konečno, čital, ob ego otkrytii, no im ne xočetsja skasat' bez surdinki, čto éto - zdorovo!" 372 Major Pašić tells Inge about his youth in Russia, where he had been educated

---

366 p. 15. She also refers incidentally to the Soviet Union when discussing with Levšin her fears of unemployment (p. 55).

367 p. 41.

368 pp. 41-42.

369 p. 42.

370 p. 74.

371 presumably "tamošnie" is meant.

372 p. 71. In this letter Levšin's friend incidentally criticizes the quality of Soviet paper: "...izvini, neizlečimaja beda naša - bumaga..."
at a "kadetskij korpus," and his highly romantic memories of Kiev. 373

Finally, the Soviet Union is referred to as an ideal in Klebe's exclamation about Moscow's healing the "terrible disease of property," and in the description of the Soviet Union in Klebe's suicide letter as a "country of marvels." The references to the Soviet Union create an atmosphere of unreality which is well indicated by the words "feerija" and "skazka." 374 The presentation of Soviet Russia in the novel thus depends almost entirely on the convincingness of Levšin as a representative of his homeland. Irrespective of the question of his reality as an individual, however, Levšin's references to the Soviet Union are pale and rhetorical and fail to form an organic part of the novel. The author clearly seeks to show how compared with Western Europe, "...u nas i vozduš-to drugoj! - i kakoe dvizenie vo vsem, kakoj gul!," 375 but the effectiveness of the theme is greatly diminished by the unreal impression of the Soviet Union produced on the reader.

Although Kalina refers to Fedin's detailed description of Inge Kretschmar's final illness, 376 the degree to which Fedin was able to heighten the realism of his depiction of the sanatorium by making use of firsthand knowledge of sanatoria and the disease of tuberculosis has

373 See p. 61.

374 See Klebe's suicide letter (p. 141).

375 Fedin, letter of November 24, 1932 to Gor'kij from St. Blasien. (Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 541).

376 Kalina, p. 159.
received little attention from the critics. "Obozrevatel'," who makes the surprising statement that "...povestvovanie k sčast'ju lišeno kakogo by to ni bylo 'kliničeskogo ottenka',"\textsuperscript{377} is the only critic to refer directly to this aspect of \textit{Sanatorij Arktur}. In fact, Fedin makes extensive use of details of the life of a sanatorium, the pathology of tuberculosis and the treatment of the disease. In the novel there are references to the sanatorium's regular schedule, the method of examining patients, the use of calcium injections and of camphor, phlegm analysis and the appearance of an X-ray of the lungs of a TB patient.\textsuperscript{378} Even more significantly, many of the most effective scenes in the novel rely largely for their impact on insight into the feelings of a TB patient. Both Inge and Klebe suffer from pains in the joints and the unbearable feelings caused by any weight on the body.\textsuperscript{379} The effectiveness of the depiction of Inge's sensations on being given oxygen and on spitting blood,\textsuperscript{380} and, most particularly, the joy of Levšin's recovery, may partly be due to an autobiographical element.\textsuperscript{381} Much attention in the novel is devoted to collapse therapy (pneumothorax) which was widely
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\bibitem{377} "Obozrevatel'", p. 224.

\bibitem{378} pp. 22, 122, 26, 47, 106, 115, 131.

\bibitem{379} pp. 73, 76, 113, 131.

\bibitem{380} pp. 68, 110.

\bibitem{381} See Fedin's description of his feelings during his recovery in a letter to Gor'kij from Davos in March, 1932. (\textit{M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli}. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 532).
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practised at this period in the treatment of tuberculosis. Inge's terror at the prospect of collapse therapy and her sensations afterward on moving are vividly described.

Among the most strikingly vivid descriptions in the novel are those of coughing. The references to the changed appearance of Inge's hands as compared with Levšin's emphasize the deterioration in her condition, and Stumm's comparison of her hands with those of his dying wife adds to the pathos of Stumm's identification of Inge with his wife. After the scene in which Stumm teaches Inge how to use the TB patients' special spittoon, the episode in which Klebe's misery is associated with his relapse gains additional poignancy through the personification of the device: "Podnjavšis', on otyskal v stole davno zabrošennuju karmannuju plevatel'nicu sinego stekla i, vodruziv ee u krovati, kivnul i uvmyl'nulsja ej, kak starому znakomomu, kotorogo bol'še ne dumal vstretit'." The use of the medical term "ex" which contributes to the pathos of Inge's death and, used later unexpectedly by Karl, adds to the effectiveness of the narration of Klebe's suicide, demonstrates the role that minor technical detail can be made to play.

---

382 Fedin himself received pneumothorax treatment in 1932. (See M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perеписка, p. 531).
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No doubt Fedin's own view is expressed by Stumm: "Est' tol'ko
don sposob bor'by s tuberkulezem: pozicionnaja vojna. Bol'noj dolžen
okapyvat'sja i postepенно žimat' tranšei vokrug protivnika. Šag za
šagom." Apart from one passage which stresses the slow insidiousness
of the disease, the image of tuberculosis is that of a cunning animal
awaiting an opportunity to pounce:

...Елевсин прогляль человека, вперьye
vospesnego Čełoveka, kak bolezn' krasivuju,
romantičnuju, i vset', kto poezdizuet ěto
čudovishče, potomu ěto ono neradko izbiraet
sebe v řezetu poētov. 391

...bolezn' pitaivalas' bezdyxannym
sozdaniem gde-to tut že, u nego za poduškoj,
gotovaja sbrosit' ego v jamu, kak tol'ko on
zaževatsja. 392

Xotite poslednj sovet? V vašem sostojanii
s bolezn'ju nado obraščat'sja tak, ětoby ona
ne dogadyvalas', ěto vy o nej помnite: ona
budet sčitat' vas zdorovym i ne posmeet napast'...
S nej nado xitrit'. 393

V

The conciseness and "economy of artistic means" 394 of Sanatorij
Arktur immediately strike the reader. In this short novel Fedin avoids
complicated construction and unnecessary detail. 395 The narration proceeds

389 p. 52.
390... Ingu izurodovala netoroplivaja bolezn', ispodvol' gotovja
k smerti." (p. 117).
391 p. 120.
392 p. 73.
393 p. 146.
394 Oksenov, p. 184.
395 See "Obozrevatel'," p. 224.
chronologically and there are only three flashbacks, all of which are integral parts of the characters' interior monologue. In Chapter II Levšin's recollections of the meetings of two little girls during the winter emphasize the process of his recovery, while in Chapter IV Stumm's memories of his dead wife prepare the reader for his relationship with Inge and heighten the pathos of her fatal illness. Finally, Levšin's memories of his work in the torgpredstvo in Chapter IX form an important part of his characterization. Although the setpieces - especially those devoted to the skijumping competition, the hockey match and Levšin's mountain journey - and the lyrical descriptions at the end of the novel are amongst the most memorable sections of the novel, in fact they account in total only for some 15 pages. In Sanatorij Arktur dialogue plays a vital role in characterization and the development of the plot, and it is not surprising to find that there are over 50 pages of dialogue, in over 80% of which either Levšin or Klebe participates (each accounts for about 20 pages). Klebe's dominance in the novel results largely from the attention given to his interior monologues and fantasies; in all these occupy over 12 pages.

As Kuznecov remarks, contrasting Sanatorij Arktur with the "krupnaja masštabnost'" of Poxiščenie Evropy, "avtor zamykaet vse dejstvie sanatoriem i kurortnym mestečkom." Even within this narrow compass, however, Fedin concentrates on the fates of a very small number

of characters: the only characters who receive extensive treatment are Levšin, Klebe and Inge Kretschmar. Of the remaining characters, Hoffmann, Stumm and Pašić play only secondary roles, and Mme Rivacs, the English couple, Karl Liesl, the Greek barber, Bauer, and the postman appear only episodically.

After the presentation of Klebe's financial situation in Chapter I, Chapter II is devoted principally to the theme of Levšin's recovery. The subsequent chapters are dominated by the characterization of Klebe by dialogue and interior monologue and by the presentation of Inge's worsening condition and passion for Levšin. The setpiece devoted to Levšin and the Soviet Union, followed by his interior monologue (Chapter IX), tends to be overshadowed by the later scenes between Inge and Levšin (the most vehement of which occurs at the end of the same chapter as the setpiece). In these dialogues Inge's passion and the leading role which she plays in the conversation result in her becoming the dominant figure. After Chapter XI, devoted to Levšin's trip, in which, however, the descriptions of mountain scenery overshadow the presentation of Levšin himself, while after Levšin's brief passion Hoffmann dominates the final pages, Inge's actions are the most prominent feature of Chapter XII, in which Levšin does not appear at all.

The following chapter is devoted principally to Inge's death and Levšin's bitter regrets for his previous indifference to her. Chapter XIV is given almost entirely to Klebe's emotional sufferings and reaction to the scene with Karl and Liesl: Levšin appears only briefly in a conversation with Klebe. In the final chapter the principal elements are the
presentation of the discovery of Klebe's death, Klebe's suicide letter, and the lyrical descriptions of the river and the Clavadel valley. Stumm's reactions dominate the conversation between him and Levšin, while Levšin's sudden tenderness for Hoffmann becomes overshadowed by her evident sorrow.

It is clear that the dominant role played in the novel by the subject lines of the fates of Klebe and Inge Kretschmar is due not only to the relative paleness of the characterization of Levšin and his passive relationship with Inge and Hoffmann, but also to constructional features of the novel. The construction inevitably tends to reduce Levšin's role in the novel and thus contributes to his "colourlessness." For Levšin to carry convincingly a heavy thematic load, adjustments in the construction of the novel would be necessary.

Apart from the small number of flashbacks referred to above, the novel is poor in constructional devices. An element of suspense is achieved in the final episode of Chapter XIV, in which Klebe takes out a syringe and begins writing a letter. The reader must suspect that Klebe commits suicide, but his death is not confirmed until a page and a half later. Again, suspense surrounds Inge's preparations for departure: after her conversation with Stumm it appears that she will stay, but Hoffmann's viciousness and the subsequent development of the action make her departure seem more and more certain. When she finally leaves with Klebe, the reader's impression is that her departure had always been inevitable.

397 p. 134.

398 See pp. 98-105.
The only point at which coincidence plays a major role occurs at the end of Chapter XIII, when Levšin happens to leave his room at precisely the same time as Klebe emerges from the lift and also Hoffmann comes out of Inge's room to announce her death. This episode jars on the reader: presumably Klebe needed to be present at this moment in order to justify Hoffmann's use of the term "ex." Entirely unsatisfactory is the constructional nexus which supplies the justification for first Levšin and then Inge leaving the sanatorium. Clearly motivation was required for Levšin's decision to take a trip in the mountains (the principal setpiece in the novel), as well as for Inge's decision to leave the sanatorium, which makes possible the effective scenes connected with her departure and contributes to the pathos of her fate. The solution adopted is that Klebe, desperate to ensure that either Levšin or Inge will remain, decides to induce Levšin to stay by causing Inge's departure.

Klebe therefore tells Inge "incidentally" that Levšin has decided to leave, and also writes Levšin a letter: "...Ja vzjal smelost' skazat' frejlen Krečmar, što Vy jakoby uezžaete. Ne somnevajus', esto uskorit ee ot"ezd, k kotoromu, kstati, ona davno gotovitsja." 402

399 See p. 120.

400 As we have seen, this term is repeated with effect by Karl in relation to Klebe's own death. (See p. 136).

401 There is no indication as to why he should write to a patient in his sanatorium, rather than tell him verbally.

402 p. 87.
Earlier Levšin had said of Inge, "Tjaželo byvat' v ětoj komnate.... kogda smotriš' na nee, zanovo proxodiš' svoju bolezn'," after Klebe had commented on Levšin's tiredness. When Klebe expresses his sympathy, Levšin tells him, "Vpročem, mne skoro učžat'!" Although Klebe is evidently very worried by this news, there is no indication that he deduces that Levšin's decision is determined by the unbearable presence of Inge. Later, in his anguished interior monologue about the need to retain patients at any price, he says of Levšin, "Vot Levšin nepremeno uedet, ego ne uderžiš', on sliškom popravilsja." He thus appears to assume that Levšin will leave in any case, whereas he muses on the subject of Inge, "Nado ostavit' Ingu. Ona nedavno polučila den'gi. A esli ona umret? Net, ona ne umret. Poka u nee est' den'gi, ona protjanet. Takie tjanut dolgo." Consequently it would seem more rational for Klebe to concentrate on inducing Inge to remain, which he apparently finds altogether possible. So far there has been no indication that Klebe believes that Inge will find life at Arktur insupportable without Levšin. The reader is not aware that Klebe has any knowledge of Inge's passion for Levšin. Soon afterwards, however, when he lies to Inge about Levšin's intention of leaving, it is evident that he had a purpose in deliberately breaking the news to Inge: "On podumal: ne otstupit' li, ne obratit' li vse v boltovnju, ili možet byt', rešitel'nee napast' na Levšina, čtoby dokazat' pravdivost' svoix slov o nem?" Thus Klebe behaves irrationally in attempting to induce

403 p. 76.
404 p. 80.
405 p. 83.
Levšin rather than Inge to leave, and acts furthermore on the basis of information which he cannot be supposed to possess.

Moreover, the characterization of Levšin suffers as a result of this feature of the construction. If Levšin's behaviour is convincing when Inge tries to "catch him out," and force him to admit his intentions of leaving "Arktur," the same cannot be said of his subsequent willing acceptance of Klebe's deception. It would have been more natural for a "positive" character - and especially for one who carries such a heavy ideological load - to have reacted with indignation to Klebe's malicious lying and unwarranted interference in Levšin's personal affairs: instead of this, however, Levšin's anger is reserved entirely for Inge. Even if we accept the convincingness of Levšin's behaviour within the context of the episode, his behaviour has the inevitable result of reducing his moral stature. This aspect, as we have seen, has been attacked by Soviet critics who discuss the characterization of Levšin and his thematic role in the novel. Finally, Levšin's later feelings of guilt and regret for his behaviour toward Inge, first presented on the occasion of his farewell to Hoffmann at Alp Grüm and then, greatly intensified, after Inge's return to "Arktur," need to be unconvincingly...

406 See p. 86.

407 This point is made by Dneprovskij. (Dneprovskij, p. 264).

408 p. 95.

409 See pp. 115-122.
extreme in their vehemence after his previous indifference in order to improve his moral standing in the opinion of the reader. Consequently the constructional nexus surrounding Inge's departure and Levšin's and Klebe's role in the event is a failure in the novel which has unfortunate results both for the characterization of Levšin and for the artistic convincingness of an important section of the novel.

Sanatorij Arktur is notable for the frequent changes in pace which result from the alternation of authorial narration, descriptive setpieces, tense dialogue, and frequently highly emotional interior monologue. An examination of almost any chapter demonstrates this effective variation in tempo and degree of emotional charge. In Chapter XIII, for instance, dialogues between the principal characters alternate with an interior monologue setpiece (Inge's being given oxygen), a tension-breaking humorous monologue by Liesl, the anguished interior monologues of Klebe and Levšin, and a lyrically-coloured setpiece devoted to Levšin's interior monologue on the subject of Stumm and the cantonal sanatorium. At the end of the chapter the narration of the news of Inge's death is followed by a short episode involving the Greek barber, which by its repetitive normality heightens the pathos of the situation. Chapter XI, devoted primarily to the scenic descriptions of Levšin's mountain

410 He is also unattractively colder toward Hoffmann than would have been necessary without this revulsion of feeling.

411 Chapter VII, however, apart from a fairly short setpiece devoted to Inge containing elements of interior monologue consists almost entirely of three major conversations.

412 pp. 108-121.

413 pp. 88-95.
journey, comes at a point (about two-thirds through the novel) where a major pause in the development of the plot is appropriate after the detailed presentation of the subject-lines of Klebe's and Inge's fates. After this interval there is no substantial break in the seemingly inexorable disintegration of both characters.

The use of leitmotivs, which will be examined later, is one of the most prominent artistic devices employed by Fedin in *Sanatorij Arktur*, as in his earlier work. However, it is not only the major leitmotivs, such as the Clavadel posthorn or the motif of "silence," which demonstrate the great care devoted to the construction of the novel, but also the recurrence of minor references. When Karl comes to see Klebe for the last time in order to give notice, his voice immediately reminds Klebe (and the reader) of how Karl had brought Inge back from the station not long before her death, for which Klebe had been ultimately responsible.414 The reference to Inge's being taught by Stumm to spit into the special spittoon used by TB patients,415 incidentally repeated later,416 is developed to great effect, as was pointed out earlier, in the description of Klebe's taking out again his long-disused spittoon.417 Again, the repeated references to Dr. Hoffmann's instruments,418 which the reader comes automatically to associate with her, form a vital part of the presentation

---

414 See pp. 132 and 107-108.
415 p. 31.
416 p. 53.
417 p. 131.
418 pp. 15, 92, 98, 100, 137, 142.
of the character. Less significant, but subtly effective, is the repetition of the reference to the notice "Vizity zapreščeny." Klebe himself first fixes it on Inge Kretschmar's door after her death, and later Karl writes out and fastens a similar notice to the door of Klebe's room after his death.  

An examination of the final chapter demonstrates the skill with which all the "loose ends" of the plot are tied by the end of the novel. After Levšin has spoken the final word on Klebe, the reading of Klebe's letter and the discussion between Stumm, Hoffmann and Levšin connects Klebe with the theme of the Soviet Union. Hoffmann's future is assured through Levšin's mediacy, and the lyrical melancholy of the final scene is created by emotionally charged description as well as by the reference to Pašić, who makes his final symbolic appearance. The lyrical descriptions alternate with dialogue and with the episode of the creditors' valuation of "Arktur," which has the character of an appropriately "pošlyj" funeral service for the sanatorium.

Soviet critics praise the conciseness and yet richness of content of Sanatorij Arktur. Smirnova stresses the role played in the novel by contrast, referring especially to the contrasts between the beauty of nature and the sickness of the patients, and between the love of Levšin and Hoffman and Inge's "morbid erotic fantasies." Oksenov speaks of the "...bol'šaja sjužetnaja slažennost' i organizovannost'" of the

419 pp. 122 and 139.
421 Oksenov, p. 286.
work. Serebrov extols Fedin's "blestjašcie kompozicionnye sposobnosti," demonstrated especially by the "Častaja peremena tempov" in the novel, and is impressed by what he terms the "puritanizm izobrazitel'nyx sredstv." He finds that Sanatorij Arktur is "postroen na čeleznom karkase," and that the novel, a "vyverennyj apparat xudožestvennogo vozdejstvija," illustrates the principle of "ékonomija, ékonomija vo vsem."422

In Sanatorij Arktur all the characteristic stylistic features of Fedin's earlier work are present. Fedin uses extensively authorial setpieces, leitmotivs, as well as authorial interior monologue ("nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč") and dialogue.

The setpieces vary, however, somewhat in style from Fedin's previous work. Notably absent are the authorial digressions, extreme similes and metaphors, and the frequent use of repetition and parallelism found in the earlier novels. Moreover, very few archaisms occur. In Sanatorij Arktur the setpieces are devoted in the main either to descriptions of natural scenery (with a minor element of interior monologue) or to presentations of the characters' sensations (with a major element of interior monologue).

Of the first type of setpiece, the finest in the novel is undoubtedly the description of the mountain scenery423 surrounding the

422 N. Serebrov, "Sanatorij, gde ne vyzdoravl'vajut," Literaturnaja gazeta, July 5, 1940, p. 4.

423 Runin writes of the "nezabyvaemye po jarkosti izobraženija al'pijskie pejzaži" (Runin, p. 12), and Grinberg comments, "...gornaja poezdka [Levsina] opisana prevosxodno." (Grinberg, p. 29).
Berninabahn on which Levšin travels. Here the effect is achieved by similes and metaphors contrasting the immensity and grandeur of the mountain range successively with various objects which are tiny in comparison: the coaches of the train, the winding highway, viaducts, and telegraph poles.

The cumulative impact of the series of metaphors and similes ("xvost," "snarjady," "štopor," "tabakerki," "spički") as well as the effective selection of adjectives and verbs is immediately apparent. Unlike those of Fedin's first novels, however, here the descriptions incorporate no grotesquely extreme tropes: there is no impression of a conscious striving for effect. The most "extreme" metaphors are appropriate to the

424 Fedin travelled on this railway in March 1932 and described it in a letter to Gor'kij as "...nečto sumasšedsee po tečničeskomu masterstvu...i živopisnosti (ledniki - kak na ladoni)." (Fedin, letter of March 22, 1932 to Gor'kij from Davos, in Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 531.

425 Serebrov comments briefly on this technique (Serebrov, p. 4).

426 p. 89.
A degree of personification is an important element in Fedin's presentation of nature. Where relatively inconspicuous verbal and adjectival metaphors are used the effect is marginal, although it adds to the total impression. In many cases, however, the degree of personification is considerable. Apart from two instances in the previous paragraph ("prikornul," "xlestanul") we find:

Many authorial descriptions in the novel embody finely observed and rendered detail. Especially is this true of the lyrical descriptions in the final chapter, where the mood of subdued melancholy is brilliantly

427 pp. 88, 90, 93.

428 pp. 88-90.

429 No doubt it is such passages as these which led Pross-Weerth to speak of "Fedins Neigung zu verdeckter Melancholie." (Heddy Pross-Weerth, "Konstantin Fedin," Osteuropa (Stuttgart), #11 (1959), p. 698).
conveyed without the use of authorial comment or the characters' interior monologue.

The description of the chalet standing at the bend of the road to Clavadel demonstrates Fedin's powers at their highest:

U povorota dorogi stojal odinokij krest'janskij dom pod kartuzom staroj kryši, s uzen'kim navesnym balkonom, služivšim perexodom iz ķil'ja na čerdak. Lestnica na vek x balkon byli ograždeny perilami iz tonkix reznix baljasinok, i ten' étix baljasinok obvivala rešetčatym pojasom yes't dom, i on budto skvozil, propuskal čerez sebja zarozovevšij večernij svet, i tol'ko naxlobučennaja kryša pridavala emu veščestvennost'.

Indicative of the care taken by the author is the consonance of the metaphorical noun description "kartuz staroj kryši" with the subsequent verbal metaphor "naxlobučennaja kryša."

Similarly brillianty rendered observation is to be found in the descriptions of the river at the very end of the chapter:

...poverxnost' češuilas' melkoj volnoj, budto voda rvalas' vsegda protiv vetra... V vekh roliš' neisčislimy kraski, voda staralas' poglotit' ix, i ne mogla, i vybrasyvala naružu tol'ko čto isčeznulkie v nej cveta, i opjat' nenasytno glotala ix.

The description of the "Arktur" sanatorium earlier in the chapter incorporates an effective repeated simile:

Pered nim stojal vysokij, legkij, čereščur uzkij dom, k fasadu kotorogo byli igruščeno

---

430 p. 144. This passage should be read in association with the preceding mood-setting passage describing the desk and the Clavadel valley, with its nostalgic restatement of the Clavadel leitmotiv.

431 p. 147.
The care given to the orchestration of these final lyrical descriptions is shown in the repetition of references to the sunset and the light of dusk, as well as to the surrounding silence.

Levšin podošel k perekrestku dorog nezadolgo do zakata, kogda vse vokrug terjalo jarkost' i stanovilos' matovym i tišina prevraščalas' v bezzvučie. Glubokoe klavadel'skoe usčal'e naverxu sleva bylo solnečnym, sprava - zatenennym, i čem niže, tem nasyščennoe byla temnota, i na dne ležal večernij mrak. Na čerte među solnecom i tem'ju...

...zarozovevšij večernij svet...
Ni v nem, ni okolo nego ne bylo nikakogo dvženija, i otogo molčan'ja vsej doliny kazalos' soversšennym.

432 pp. 141-142.
A description of the sanatorium servant Karl cycling into town, which constitutes a minor setpiece, shows to advantage a very different aspect of the writer’s skill, the depiction of motion:

Karl vyvel iz Arktura vidavšij vidy velosiped, ogljadelsja s udovol'stviem, popravil perekinutye na remeške čerez plešo dva pustyx ballona iz-pod kisloroda, vstal na pedal', outolknulisja i, ne sadjas', pokatilisja nod gorku, šurša graviem tropy. Vyexav na mostovu, on peremaxnul nogi čerez sedlo, zavertel ne speša pedaljami i legko vzdoxnuv, stal svistet'.

Here the vivid effect of motion is achieved by the selection of motion verbs with attention paid to their syllabic length (gerunds play a major role) and the orchestration of the length of phrases.

A minor stylistic tour de force is the depiction of the sound made by a motorsaw:

Tišina odnoobrazno, no dovol'no prijatno narušalas' lesopilkoj, - kak morskaja sirena, vyla kruglaja pila i, perepiliv dosku, vzmetal' v vozdux vysokij pevučij zvon, ne uspevavšij rastajat' do novogo basistogo vzvyvanija pily.

The noise of the saw fulfills the vital function of conjuring up in Klebe’s mind the illusion of an orchestra, from which proceeds his major fantasy of a brilliant future.

433 p. 121.

434 p. 125.
Sanatori\j Arktur is notable for the many vivid descriptions of
snow which occur throughout the novel. Thus the scene is set for Stumm's
moving recollections of his dead wife by descriptions of snow:

...zvenel pod nogami sneg. Ego sverkanie
bylo neobyčajno: daleko po doroge, v otkrytx
dvорax i al'pijskich sadikax gorela rossyp'
sijajučix kristallov....legčajšaja poroška
ležala v neprikosnovennoj čistote - Ogronymy -
v nogot' snežinki otrazali beglyj
vspyxvajučij blesk. Štumbral ix na ladon',
- sekundu oni mercali, potom gasli, čudesnyj
uzor ix migom propadal.435

One of Levšin's joyful discoveries during his first sleighride is con-
nected with the qualities of snow:

On otkryl, čto pod poloz'jami xrustit sneg, -
ne prosto, konečno, xrustit (čto on znal s
detstva), a kak-to mnogotočno-pevuče, kako-to
ni na sekundu ne obryvajučejšja prazdničnoj i
daże likujuščej pesn'ju.436

The long setpiece of the mountain scenery seen by Levšin during his
mountain journey begins with a masterly description of snow:

Rjadom pokoilsja sneg, nedavno vypavšij,
ryxlyj, s kruževnoj taloj koročkoj.437

Fedin associates Pašić's mournfulness at leaving "Arktur" with a snow-
storm:

Sneg vse letel i letel. Vjažkij pokrov
ego ležal na dorоžke. Dver' byla zaleplena
xlop'jami, stekla umyvalis' slezami....
Xlop'ja ispjatnali ego Pašića, vokrug
bot na dorоžke obrazovalis' vytainy, s zonta
načalo kapat'....

435 p. 25.
436 p. 12.
437 p. 88.
A snowfall creates the background for Stumm's remarks to Inge:

"Posmotrite na nabo... A ved' vozmožno, čto čerez čas ili dva ono stanet prozračno i jarko. I kak trudno budet voobrazit' ětu svincovju kryšku, kotoroj sejčas zaxlopnuta dolina."

Vesennie tajuščie redkie xlop'ja snega toropilis' na zemlju, skvoz' ix rjab' okrestnost' byla vidna napolovinu.

Finally, Klebe's sensations of illness are associated with the weather in a sentence containing a vivid depiction of melting snow: "V sanjax on ežilsja i vzdragival. Sneg perestal, no vozdux byl neprivyčno vlažen, doroga potemnela, polož'ja s šipienim ožimali iz kolej vodu.

All these descriptions are thus functional elements within the structure of the novel.

Colour likewise constitutes a powerful leitmotiv in the novel. The brilliant colours of Davos are a vital element in the setpiece of Levšin's gaiety and heightened perception resulting from his recovery, and the leitmotiv thus introduced recurs throughout the novel.

---

438 p. 102.

439 p. 98.

440 p. 105.

441 There is an evident association between the environment of snow and the description of Davos as a deposit of crystal cubes (see p. 119), an association which is foreshadowed in the scene in which Stumm picks up snowflakes and looks down upon Davos (see p. 25).
Soon afterwards a description of the sky incorporates one of the few extreme metaphors in the novel:

...Levšin smotral v nebo - gladko-goluboe, uxdovyše v nevesomuju vysotu i vdrug padavšee sinej plitoju na samye glaza, edva oni našinali slezit'sja ot moroza.

Following this, the lyrical interior monologue setpiece of Levšin's recollections of watching the meetings of two little girls throughout the year is introduced by a description of the colours of the poplar trees:

Levšin pomnil vse ix ottenki - ot isstuplennoj zelen'j vesny do osennego gorenija žel'ji.

The use of colour is an important element also in the mountain descriptions in the chapter devoted to Levšin's journey. The description of the glacier and the sky is particularly striking:

---

442 p. 12.

443 p. 13.
Significant element in the scene-setting for the episode in which Levšin is overcome by passion for Hoffmann:

Finally, this leitmotiv recurs to great effect in the lyrical descriptions at the end of Sanatoriij Arktur. We read in the first description of the sanatorium found in the novel:

The bright green of the grass adds to the effectiveness of the later depiction of the colours of the river:

---

444 p. 92.

445 p. 93.

446 pp. 141-142.

447 p. 147.
Apart from the descriptions of snow and the references to the vivid colours of Davos, Fedin's great care in composition is demonstrated by the existence in the novel of several other significant leitmotivs. The role played in the presentation of Inge by the recurrence of references to the skin of her forehead, the vivid descriptions of coughing, and the regular depiction of the deterioration in her physical appearance, has already been discussed.

The association of Davos with quietness and peace so carefully maintained in the final chapter is found throughout the novel. However, while for Levšin - as in the final chapter - the silence is a "spokojstvie" which has contributed to his recovery, for Inge Kretschmar the silence of "Arktur" is associated with her desperation and her ultimate fate, and for Klebe the silence of the sanatorium is symbolic of the complete abandonment of "Arktur" and final ruination.

The tranquil view from "Arktur" helps Levšin to convince himself that his deception of Inge will be a good service to both Inge and himself:

Neizmennaja, nasyščennaja pokojem dal' prostiralas' pored Arkturom....Kak privyčno vseljalo éto v nego spokojstvie i rovnost!!448

Later in an interior monologue Levšin associates Inge's suffering with the "tišina" of "Arktur," whereas Davos itself returns to him his peace of mind:

448 p. 87.
Soon this image of the ambiguous peace of Davos recurs:

Inge's condition is first associated with the "tišina" of "Arktur" immediately after the scene between her and Stumm in which he convinces her of the seriousness of her illness, while this reference is followed by the introduction of the Clavadel leitmotiv in connection with Inge:

The "tišina" of the sanatorium is presented as the background against which Inge makes her decision to get up in order to tell Levšin that she has overheard Hoffmann's story of Klebe's fraud:

---

449 p. 118.
450 p. 119.
451 p. 32.
452 p. 56.
Later Levšin, conscious of the deterioration in Inge's condition, associates "tišina" with the insidiousness of her disease:

...v nastupivšej tišine bolezn'
pritaivalas' bezdyxannym sozdaniem... 453

When Inge gets up after Klebe's revelation to go to Levšin for the second and last time the implied silence of the sanatorium is the background against which the yodelling seemingly impels Inge to act:

Inga dolgo ostavala nepodvižnoj.
S dalekoj dorogi priletel zvon bubencov i tjaželij topot kopyt, slegka ěvakavšix po talomu snegu. Potom voznikla v xrustal'nom vozduxe i stala perelivats'ja, kak struja vody, tirol'skaja fistula... 454

Inge's fatal journey begins with a personification of the "tišina" of Davos as the town takes its farewell of her - an association vastly different from Levšin's image of "spokojstvie":

Šel posleobedennyj mertvyj čas, gorod-
sanatorij byl pustynen: zakrylis' magaziny i kontory, ne begal avtobus. Tišina slovno nabljudala za ot'ezdom Ingi, - doma gljadeli vsled i to primečali pro sebję: von ona poexala vniz, to slovno peregovarivalis': smotrite, smotrite, čto ona delает - ona uezžает iz Davosa! 455

The leitmotiv is conspicuously emphasized when Levšin goes to see Inge on her deathbed:

Bylo očen' tixo - v koridore, vo vsex ětažax doma, i kak budto večnost' nikto

---

453 p. 73.
454 p. 84.
455 p. 105.
After this last meeting silence falls and then the Clavadel motif recurs:

Finally, the association of silence with Inge occurs after the reference in Levšin's interior monologue to Inge's eyes and the "tišina" of the sanatorium corridors in the course of the narration of Levšin's anguished wait during the night:

The dreadful silence of an empty "Arktur" is a theme in both Klebe's visions of ruin. In his first fantasy, the soundlessness appears to give rise to the vision in Klebe's mind, whereas in the second fantasy the impression is no less vivid for being implicit:

---

456 p. 116.
457 p. 117.
458 p. 120.
459 pp. 48-49.
Večno pugavšaja pustota s kakoj-to bezrassudnoj toržestvennost'ju javila:' pered Klebe: pustye koridory, pustye komnaty, v pustoj kuxne - zastyvšaja povarixa ...."Da" - bylo načertano v samom konce koridora, po kotorou razdavali neznakomye šagi, i kto-to prožital vslux: "da", i doktor vzdrognul vo sne. 460

The recurrence of the sound of the Clavadel posthorn 461 is the most significant leitmotiv of the novel, and, unlike that of the silence of the sanatorium, has attracted some critical comment. For Smirnova, the horn is a "'golos sud'by," napominajuščij o vremeni, o prožityx časax i dnjax, o podstupajuščij srokax," 462 while Oksenov finds that the "motiv klavadel'skogo rožka, vyrastajuščij v romantičeskij simvol nadeždy, mečty" gives a"liričeskaja okraska vsemu romanu." 463 Like the leitmotiv of silence, for Levšin the posthorn has very different associations than for Inge Kretschmar. Grinberg writes that "...každyj raz ona Čpesenka Č zvucht po-inomu...Dlja Levšina...eto zov k žizni...Dlja Ingi, lišennoj voli k žizni, ěto simvol beznadežnosti i obrečennosti." 464 This symbolic significance of the horn is made quite explicit in the novel.

When Inge Kretschmar hears the posthorn for the first time, the sound leads her to wonder about her fate and what Clavadel may be like - which she is destined never to learn:


461 In Poxiščenie Evropy Fedin had already written of the sound of a postal horn (Poxiščenie Evropy, p. 13).

462 Smirnova, p. 23.

463 Oksenov, p. 284. See also Runin, p. 12.

464 Grinberg, p. 28.
When she begins coughing the horn continues to sing in her head, so that she coughs in time to the word "Clavadel."

Later the scene in which Inge asks Levšin about Clavadel demonstrates his unromantic nature and indifference to Inge: when Inge continues to talk about Clavadel, he makes a coldly non-committal reply, finding the conversation stupid. Soon afterward Klebe sings the melody, apparently in order to conceal his embarrassment at having been led to say more than he had intended.

The Clavadel leitmotiv recurs in Inge's interior monologue set-piece on the novel about New Orleans: the name of New Orleans, a further refrain in the novel, sings in Inge's head, "pevučee i neponjatnoe," to the tune of the posthorn. When Inge first coughs blood, the melodious names of New Orleans and Clavadel constantly recur to her in her terror.

---

465 pp. 32-33.
466 See p. 40.
467 See p. 41.
468 p. 44.
469 p. 60.
In an explicit statement of the significance of the Clavadel horn at the beginning of Levšin's journey, it is revealed, surprisingly enough after the scene with Inge, that for Levšin the sound is full of romantic significance. As the train passes Clavadel, Levšin hears in his mind the sound of the posthorn, but he is determined never to look at Clavadel, both in order not to disturb his own image, and to preserve Inge's dream, should she ask him about it:

"Každyj, kto otadal časticu bytija balkonam Arktura, vkladyval v naivevnu melodiju svoe osoboe čuvstvo. Dlja Levšina ěto byl zov k žizni. I srazu emu vspomilsja razgovor o Klavadele s Ingoj i to, kak ona slušala ětot napev, byvšij dlja nee tože kakoju-to mečtoju. Čtoby ne pomešat' davno složivšemusja vlekuščemu predstavleniju o Klavadele, ne sledovalo videt' živuju kartinu, naverno prekrasnuju, no nesxodnuju s voobražaemoj."

This unexpected statement of the fascination which the Clavadel horn exercises on Levšin is unconvincing after his earlier attitude demonstrated in his conversation with Inge.

On the dying Inge the horn has a shattering effect:

"...daleko probežala v Klavadele počta, i v komnatu vošel i pozval za soboju znakomyj napev rožka. Možet byt', Inga rasslyšala ego, potomu čto vskore lico ee načalo menjat'sja, toska i tomlenie iskažali ego..."

---

470 p. 88.

471 p. 117.
At the end of the novel the mystery of Clavadel is an element in the creation of the atmosphere of lyrical melancholy. Levšin proposes that Hoffmann and he meet "at the turn to Clavadel." The description of the light of dusk in the Clavadel valley forms part of a passage of lyrical description. Levšin would need to walk further in order to see into the valley, but it is already time for his meeting with Hoffmann:

On povrnul nazad, i v nem ožilo ubeždenie, čto Klavadelju suždeno ostat'sja v pamjati vsegda zovuščim, očen' blizkim, no ni razu ne dostignutym, kak mečta.

A final illustration of Fedin's device of developing characterization by presenting the varying impact of an external phenomenon is found in the two references to yodelling in the novel. The brilliant description of yodelling is followed by the narration of its impact on Inge:

Nesterpimaja toska javilas' v komnatu s ĝtoj večnoj šutlivoj-grustnoj pesnoj gor i vytolknula Ingu iz nepodvižnosti k dejstvijam, kotorye vsego neskol'ko minut nazad pokazalis' by ej udivitel'nymi.

Here the insistent reminder of her environment causes Inge anguish and serves as a stimulus to desperate action, while for the reader the reference to a sound so suggestive of local colour inevitably becomes associated with that of the Clavadel horn.

---

472 See p. 142.

473 p. 144.

474 p. 84.
The same sound serves, however, at the end of the chapter only to confirm Levšin in his smug self-satisfaction and rationalization of his motives in deceiving Inge:

On uslyšal nakativšijsja izdaleka otgolosok ozornogo fal'ceta: "uli-ula-uli-ul" - i soglasno trjaxnul golovoj ego igrivomu prizyvu. 475

The greater subtlety displayed here than in the case of the Clavadel leitmotiv is evident. Irrespective of the varying effect of the sound upon the two people, the two widely differing descriptions convey the essential difference in perception:

Inge: fistula...to zamiraja na vysokoj note, to obryvajas' na kakom-to ptič'jem xoxote. Gory...vežlivo pobul'kali fal'cetom.

Levsin: otgolosok ozornogo fal'ceta... ego igrivomu prizyvu.

The lack of consistency in Levšin's perception of the posthorn, and the fact that its nature and impact tend to be narratively stated, rather than rendered by interior monologue (as on the occasion when Inge first hears the horn) detract from the effectiveness of the Clavadel leitmotiv.

Apart from the setpieces devoted to Alpine scenery which have already been discussed, there are two notable setpieces in Sanatorij Arktur devoted to sport. In Chapter V there is well over a page of description of skijumping and in Chapter IX a page of description of a hockey match.
Fedin describes very effectively three jumps, of which perhaps the second is the most vivid:

S gory nizvergalsja vtoroj. On minoval tramplin, nizko prisedaja, rasprjamilsja na samom ego konce, i, vskinuv ruki, kak kanatoxodec, podderživaja imi ravnovesie, paril nad sklonom, spokoijnij i prjamoj. Ljudi vnizu zaklopali cmu v ladečki, no, prizemljajas', on vdrug kuvyrkom pokatilsja k podešve gory i, nasilu podnajav'sis', ves' v snegu, medlenno pobrel proč' s dorožki.476

Here the careful selection of motion verbs, the varying length of phrases and the use of gerunds all contribute to the vivid impression of motion.

The phrase with its adjectival doublet slowing the tempo ("paril nad sklonom, spokoijnij i prjamoj") is followed by two abrupt changes of pace: "vdrug kuvyrkom pokatilsja k podešve gory," "medlenno pobrel proč' ot dorožki.").

The first jump contains a vivid description of take-off and braking:

Vdrug on podprygnul i, povernuv lyži v dol' dorožki, rinulsja vniz po otvesu. On kannem pročerknul proseku, za naj - krivuju tramplina, otorvalsja ot nego, slegka vzmetnulsja vverx i poletel po vozduku. ... On blizilsja k zemle, a zemlja ubegala iz-pod nego padajuščim sklonom gory ... I vot prygun kosnulsja lyžami dorožki, podognuv koleni, prisedaja, nčas' po snegu, kak po vozduku, i, nakonec, kruto zavoraživaja včok, štoby ostanovit' edva uderžimyj raskat.477

476 pp. 36-37.

477 p. 36.
Perhaps the most striking feature of these descriptions is the virtuosity displayed by Fedin in employing most effectively a great variety of verbs of motion.

Technically, however, the setpiece devoted to the hockey match is of even greater interest. This description derives its effect from the extended development of a metaphor which involves a major element of ostranenie. The initial metaphor of an unravelling ball of wool is succeeded by the presentation of an image of the players' limbs jumping constantly from one man to another, whereby an effect of fantastic speed is achieved. The metonymy of "sweaters" for the "players" contributes an element of depersonification:

Belye i oranžovye svityery, sklubivšis', perekatyvalis' iz konca v konec polja. Klubok raspuskalsja na otdel'nye nitki, budto vetrom rasseivaemye po katku, potem nitki naskoro scepjalis' v svjazki i opjat' komkalis', samatyvalis' v klubok, i klubok snova katalo po polju, iz kraja v kraj. V eti minuty nel'zja bylo usledit' za otdel'nym igrokom, kak budto ruki, nogi, golovy xokkeistov byli obšcie i bystro-bystro peremeščalis' s odnogo svitera na drugoj....

Zatem Levšin opjat' videl ustrašajuščju, slovno kavalerijskiju rubku kljuškami i strannoe, vzyvavšee vostorg i smex, peresakivanie ruk, nog, golov, s oranževykh sviterov na belye, s belyx na oranževye.478

These highly successful setpieces have attracted curiously little attention from the critics, although Serebrov, discussing Fedin's "blestjaššie kompozicionnye sposobnosti," refers to the use of a "priem

478 pp. 69-70.
in the description of the hockey match. This term, however, ignores the principal element of the technique involved. Runin praises the descriptions highly in general terms: "...roman napolnen prevosxodnymi opisanijami, masterskim ispolneniem kotoryx Fedin poražal nas vsegda." Oksenov, referring to these scenes, discusses the general significance of the descriptive setpiece in Fedin's work: "...xarakternaja "...roman napolnen prevosxodnymi opisanijami, masterskim ispolneniem kotoryx Fedin poražal nas vsegda."  

An analysis of the language of Sanatorij Arktur confirms the reader's general impression of the presence of a degree of constraint ("sderžannost'") as compared with Fedin's earlier novels. Grinberg is the only critic to suggest that there is a degree of superfluous ornamentation in the descriptions.  

In Sanatorij Arktur - unlike earlier novels - we find very few descriptions of the environment which include extreme metaphors or similes. Apart from the metaphor used of the brilliantly blue sky, we find only the following:  

Serebrov, p. 4.  
Runin, p. 12.  
Oksenov, p. 285.  
"...opisanija Fedina inogda sliškom ne prosty i vitievaty." (Grinberg, p. 29).  
P. 13.
Less successful is the strained metaphor describing the Dnieper dam:

...titaničeskij greben', rasčesyavuščij bukli Dnepra...486

In general Fedin's comparisons are subtly felicitous ("Bunty, kotorye on ČPašič Justraival, proxodili besslednymi pavodkami"), and very rarely disconcertingly extreme, as perhaps is the gruesome description of Mme Rivacs' skin: "...obvislaja, kak stirannaja xolstinka, koža."488

A rare example of carefully worked out ostranenie occurs in the episode of the undertakers' removal of Inge's body from "Arktur":

...oni vnesli stojkom netjaželyj jaščik, vysotoj nemnogo bol'še ix rosta...oni vošli v kabinu vместе s jaščikom i stali po bokam ego vplotnjuju, tak čto bylo poxože, čto stojat ne dvое, a трое, v seredine, - deravjanny, povyšе...

...oni vynesli iz komnaty jaščik v ležačem položenii i, xotja on stal tjaželyj, tixo i lovko sputilis' s nim po lestnice.489

484 p. 15.
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486 p. 71.
487 p. 50.
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489 pp. 122-123.
Fedin retains in Sanatori Arktur his characteristic devices of the use of doublets, as "tixo i lovko" in the preceding quotation indicates, and of series, with which he frequently achieves successful effects. An analysis of the first ten pages demonstrates the extent to which doublets are used:

zvonkaja, zovuščaja uvertjura (p. 7)
otkašlivajas' i smejas' (p. 9)
razvratnaja i podlaja (p. 10)
s ukorom i vozmuzščeniem (p. 11)
s uvelekajuvene, veseljaše bystrotoj (p. 12)
zaulybalis' i zakivali (p. 13)
toržestvennoe i nemnego smešnoe vysaživanie (p. 13)
mgnovennej i neožidannej priliv nežnosti (p. 13)
svoe obnovlenie, svoja žizn' (p. 13)
minuty razdum'ja i nerčitel'nosti (p. 14)
golosa byli polnye, zalivlye (p. 14)
pesnja byla i dovol'noj i grustnoj (p. 15)
vol'nee i šire delalis' golosa (p. 15)
blagogovejno-tixo (p. 16)
morozno-čistoj vozduh (p. 16)
s tupoj ustalost'ju i daže s neprijazn'ju (p. 17)
privetlivaja i prosten'kaja komnata 490 (p. 17)

The relationship of the epithets to each other varies greatly, but in many cases the second defines either more precisely or in more emotional terms the impression conveyed by the first epithet. The intensification of effect achieved by this means is often considerable, since the absence of additional phrases or subordinate clauses ensures that there is no dilution of the impact. The extensive use of series is also apparent

490Occasionally, however, the device is used so indiscriminately as to suggest only a mannerism. In the narration of Inge's regaining of consciousness (with an extensive interior monologue element) after her return to "Arktur," there are eight doublets on one page (see p. 109).
in Sanatorij Arktur, as in Fedins' earlier work. The setpiece on Inge's novel relies greatly for its effect on series, as well as on a number of doublets:

oniČnesc'ast'jažuvlekalini manili k bytu tjaželomu, riskovannomu, zakvašennomu...
obražennye na smert'ljudi, avantjuristy, prestupniki
0, kak xotelas'ui, uexat', ubežat', uplyt'...
obrěč'sebja na uničtoženie, na besstrašnju i besstydnuju ljubov'
...prenebreženie k stradaniu, bolezni, slabosti
...termometry, špricy, igly.

Series are an important element in Klebe's interior monologue before his suicide:

...neoborimoc'želanie skryt'sja, sprjatat'sja,...
skatat'sja...zaleč'...

The effect on Klebe of the sight of Edgar Wallace's portrait is rendered by this means:

...vyxolennaja, dovol'naja, raskrašennaja fizonomija...492

Occasionally the series have simply a cumulative descriptive effect, as with the descriptions of Karl and the sound of the English couple's car:

Širokie, bystrie šagi, kurčavost', zelenye glaza, gorevšie podobno pugovicam ego uniformy, 493 rumianec i čta neutomimaja sijajuščaja ulybka...
stuk, fyrkan'e, zavyvanie motora.494

---

491 pp. 59-60.
492 p. 134.
493 p. 21.
494 p. 20.
Normally, however, the words are semantically closely related and their conjunction conveys intense emotion:

...ona Gofman ponjala, što nužno, tak že kak Karl, bežat', mšt'sja, nestis'.

naskol'ko xitro, predusmotritel'no, rasčstlivo sdelaloš' ego povedenie...

...nado vse vremja, bez pereryvov,
dejstvovat', podnimat' vse sily, iskat' samye neobyč'nye sredstva i spošit', spošit'.

...sostojanie bylo legkoe, no kakoe-to nevesomoe, postoronnee, sliškom prozračnoe.

...nalažennost', vseobščaja vežlivost' i porjadok...

Occasionally contrasting elements within the epithets introduce an ambiguous atmosphere while heightening the emotion:

...Klavadelju suždeno ostat'sja v pamjati vsega zovuščim, očen' blizkim, no ni razu ne dostignutym, kak mečta.

...ee ščastlivoe, naivnoe, prenebrežitel'noe legkomyšlie...

...ětu junuju, neuravnovešennju, nedostatočno ser'eznuju, no, vpročem, slavnju devušku...

As Smirnova points out, there are no lyrical or contemplative authorial digressions. The absence of this characteristic feature of

495 p. 136.
496 p. 71.
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499 p. 118.
500 p. 144.
501 p. 27.
502 Smirnova, p. 23.
Fedin's earlier work contributes to the impression of conciseness and concentration produced by the novel. Nevertheless, some of the narration and the characters' interior monologue contains a conspicuously authorial element:

In the midst of Levšin's interior monologue about the Soviet Union, we meet with the phrase "étot privedelivyj posluz v gorax," which with its archaic flavour is out of character for Levšin. Inge's interior monologues also occasionally contain an obtrusively authorial element:

Again, the ironically coloured phrase "zolotoj son" used of Klebe's and Pašić's designs on Liesl is immediately obtrusive.

The passages comparing Klebe to England and discussing the gulf between Klebe's education and his behaviour - perhaps the closest
approach in the novel to direct authorial comment - are found in the
midst of Klebe's interior monologue on his frauds, and necessarily de-
tract from the convincingness of Klebe's thoughts. A passage on the fol-
lowing page produces a similar effect:

"...Klebe, čelovek bol'noj, otyskival v sud'be
drugix bol'nyx - svoju, i smerti proizvodili
na nego podavljajuše vpečatlenie, kotoroe
on dolžen byl utaivat' tak že, kak svoju bolezn'."

The authorial element is occasionally high in introductions to interior
monologues:

I vot Klebe vernulsja v Arktur, v novyj Arktur,
o kotorom uže nel'zja bylo skazat': zdes' ležit
doktor Štum, - v Arktur bez Štuma.510

Vse, čto v nem Arktur bylo čuždoe, budto vzjal
s soboyu Klebe, i, točno v vospominanii o detstve,
v Arkture zasvetilos' vse tol'ko xoroše, i on
perestal suščestvovat'.

Togda lučšee iz vsego, čto v nem bylo, vyrazilos'
v odnom suščestve...511

Nevertheless, the "objectivity" of Fedin's style in Sanatoria Arktur is
indicated by the lack of authorial digressions and comment, in conjunction
with the generally low authorial element in the characters' interior
monologues.

Similarly, neutrality of language is characteristic of the novel.
The convention that all the characters speak perfect German has already
been discussed. All use a standard literary language, and there is no

---

509 p. 79.
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attempt to differentiate the speech of the characters (except for Pašić's use of appropriately military metaphors). Even Stumm with his peasant accent uses an uncoloured literary language. The single exception is Liesl's use of prostorečie in telling Inge of her abortion:

...ja stol'ko poterjala krovi, dumala - nu, doguljalas', Lisl', adé! U nas na rodine est' ženščina, k nej vsegda devčonki, esli plošajut...ponimaete, esli vdrug beda slučitsja, sejčas - k nej.513

Considering the location of the novel, the specifically local lexicon is very small. The principal examples are: "prokurist" (p.18), "fen", "kerling" (p. 69), "fajf-o-kloki v kurgauz" (p. 78). Interestingly, Fedin, revising the novel for the first book edition, replaced two German words by Russian terms.514

Moreover, the number of colloquial, or, on the other hand, highly literary obsolescent words, regularly encountered in Fedin's earlier work, is very low. In the entire novel there are no more than a dozen colloquial words and expressions and some five obsolescent words.515 The word "sponadobilos'" (objected to by Oksenov)516 which Fedin had praised in an article517 as being especially expressive, was replaced by the normal

512 See p. 82.
513 p. 110.
515 Skareda (p. 7), nafufyrennyj (p. 18), uvalen' (p. 34), prjamikom (p. 48), vspoloxnulsja (p. 77), zadarom (p. 79), prikornul (p. 90), korotyga (p. 93), sosborit' (p. 104), plošajut (p. 110), xot' kuda (p. 121), uže skol'ko let (p. 135): pol'zovat' (p. 18), amunicija (p. 20), pestovat' (p. 37), kuafjura (p. 42), vračevanie (p. 146).
516 Oksenov, p. 284.
literary word "ponadobilos'." The effective regional expression "zalubenet'," however, remained.

The neutral quality of the language, accentuated by the general objectivity of the style and the conservative use of figurative language compared with Fedin's earlier work, was commented on by contemporary Soviet critics. Oksenov, although objecting to three unliterary expressions used by the author, calls Fedin "odin iz lučših masterov i znatokov russkogo literaturnogo i narodnogo jazyka." He implies that the fact that "jazykovoj stroj Sanatorija Arktura v celom neskolk'o nejtralizovan" is due to the novel's being based on Western European material. Serebrov develops this theme, finding that the language is "un-Russian" in its colourlessness:

Jazyk romana bazukoriznenno korrekten i točen, nastol'ko, k sožaleniju, korrekten, čto poroj kažetsja, budto avtor ne koronnoj russkij čelovek, a kakoj-to čopornij evropeec, xorosto izučivšij po knjžkah naš jazyk i ščegeljuščij svoim "čisto russkim" proiznošenijem. Byt' možet, avtor soznatel'no pošel na ćutu žertvu, čtoby pridat' romanu daže s ětoj storony zakončenno evropejskij oblik? Pust' zak. A vse će obidno za sočnyj samobytnyj russkij jazyk, s ego neprijazn'ju k akademičeskim pravilam, s ego veselym ozorstvom.


519 "...ona Čulybka po-zimnemu zalubenela ot moroza" (p. 14).

520 Oksenov, p. 286.

521 Serebrov, p. 4.
The critics are impressed by the "ekonomija xudožestvennych sredstv" displayed by Fedin in the style as well as in the construction of Sanatorij Arktur. "Obozrevatel'" comments, "My uznaem zdes' prisus'čij Fedinu xudožestvennyj takt, prisus'čee emu umenie, otstranja nenužnye, pobočnye melodi, itti neposredstvenno k predmetu rasskaza, k osnovnomu, k suščestvennejšemu." Goffenšefer claims that the novel "otličaetsja tem lakonizmom, kotorogo tak nedostает proizvedenijam mnogix iz našix pisatelej." 

There is universal praise - except for the critical note sounded by Grinberg - for the descriptions of mountain scenery and the setpieces of the novel. Goffenšefer and Oksenov join Grinberg in praising highly the description of Levšin's trip: Oksenov writes, "Vo vsem tvorčestve Fedina edva možno najti drugie stranicy, pronizannye takoj legkost'ju i polnotoj oščuščenija mira..." 

Several critics comment on the relationship between the scenic descriptions and Levšin's psychological condition, and Oksenov finds that "Veličie al'pijskoj prirody i strast' vozvraščennogo k žizni čeloveka slity zdes' v organičeskoe edinstvo." Serebrov, however, is the only... 

522 Oksenov, p. 284.
523 "Obozrevatel'," p. 224.
524 Goffenšefer, p. 184.
525 See Goffenšefer, p. 183.
526 Oksenov, p. 285.
527 Oksenov, p. 285: see also Panov, p. 226, and Grinberg, p. 29.
critic to state clearly the functional role of such descriptions: "Режи́щ не игра́ет в ро́мане Федина samostojatel'noj роли, он исполняет служебные функции и везде зави́сит от эмоциональной окра́ски соответст вам схе́метной ситуаци́и."

Drozda remarks that Sanatorij Arkur is essentially a "psychological study," and the characterization was the subject of great attention on the part of the critics. Oksenov finds that Fedin is a "master psixologicheskogo romana, xotja on redko pribegaet k priemam tak nazyvaemogo psixologicheskogo analiza. Duševnye dvizhenija ego geroev, dažе samye smutnye i глубокие, raskryvajutsja im в человеческих ре́чах и поступках." Serebrov is struck by the "disciplinedness" of the characters, and comments, "Внашний их облик определяет 2-3-mja xarakternymi чёртами. Fedin izbegaet opuskat'sja v riskovannye psixologicheskie глубины, где mnogo nejasnogo и служащего, on predpočitaet fakty dogadкам и старается показать вну́тренний мир человека через его поступки." "Obozrevatel" likewise finds that "Psixologicheskij rисунок Fedina, kak pravilo, ochen' točen," and is impressed by the combination of conciseness with completeness of presentation.

528 Serebrov, p. 4.


530 Oksenov, p. 284.

531 Serebrov, p. 4.

532 "Obozrevatel," p. 224.
The absence of personal physical description is a typical feature of Fedin's work which is accentuated in the relatively narrow compass of Sanatorij Arktur. Apart from Pašić, whose appearance is briefly described, we know almost nothing of the physical characteristics of the characters. Fedin does, however, as we have seen, refer to secondary characteristics - Levšin's hands or Inge's forehead - to which other characters react, with the result that these features acquire symbolic significance. Zagradka notes this element, but exaggerates in claiming that "...zametno povysilos' značenie portreta, kotoryj est' u vsek personažej i daetsja, xotja poobyknoiveniju postepenno, no vse-taki bolee koncentrirovanno, v bolee podrobnyx zarisovkax, čem v predyduščix romanax." Indeed, except for the reference to his hands, the hero Levšin is not described at all.

The absence of authorial psychological analysis is also characteristic of the novel. The only significant exceptions are to be found in the presentation of Major Pašić and the discussion of Klebe in which he is compared to England and the gulf between his education and his behaviour is explored. The characterization is effected principally by a combination of interior monologue and dialogue, as the discussion of the individual characters and the construction of the novel has shown. Except in the case of Inge, whose physical advances to Levšin and
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departure from the sanatorium are important events in the plot development, such "acts" as are possible to the characters do not play a very significant role in their characterization. On the other hand, interior monologue is a vital part of the presentation of Klebe, Levšin and Inge, and figures prominently in the presentation of Stumm and Pašić.

The effectiveness of many interior monologues, however, tends to overshadow the significance of dialogue in the novel. Inge's attitudes and love for Levšin are conveyed principally in her conversations with Levšin and Stumm, and, although interior monologue is dominant in the presentation of Levšin, his attitude toward Inge and Hoffmann is conveyed mainly through dialogue. Most of the principal elements of Klebe's character - his hypocrisy, self-pity and mercenary - are developed in his conversations with Levšin and Stumm, while his tortured obsequiousness is shown almost exclusively in dialogue. Dr. Hoffmann's love for Levšin is presented entirely through dialogue with Levšin, while the theme of her jealousy of Inge is introduced through a conversation between Inge and herself.

Zagradka exaggerates the role of authorial psychological analysis and physical description in characterization, but correctly stresses the significance of dialogue: "...igrajut bol'šuju rol' dialogi, obyknoveno "čistye," bez avtorskich remarok. Oni otličajutsja vnutrennim dramatizmom i avtor v nix umelo izobrazil tončajšie njuansy vo vzaimnyx otnošenijax geroev." Zagradka refers to authorial interior monologue ("nesobstvenno-prjamaja reč'") as an element in characterization, but clearly underestimates its great importance. Attempting to demonstrate the
"objectivization of Fedin's creative style," he claims that "avtor voobšče predpošitaet sejčas otkrytoj sub"ektivnosti formu nezametnoj, skrytoj ocenki," which ignores the conspicuous element of overt irony in the presentation of Klebe. Zagradka well describes, however, the tenseness of the psychological atmosphere of the novel: "Nebol'sie "postupki," vozmožnye v etoj srede i dostupnye gerojam, vsegda podgotovleny naprjažennoj vnutrennej žizn'ju, dlitel'nym samoanalizom, tonkim psixologičeskim "oščupyvaniem" drug druga i podtekstom razgovornyx "poedinkov."537

VI

Fedin himself defined the thematics of Sanatorij Arktur in the author's note which he wrote to accompany the publication of extracts from the novel in the journal Rezec:

Glavnoj temoj javljaetsja tema vyzdorovlenija, tema toržestvujuščej žizni. Nositel' etoj temy - sovetskij inžener - pokazan v stolknovenii s neskolkimy sud'bami bol'nyx i vračey.538

Almost all the Soviet critics, however, are deeply dissatisfied with the personality of Fedin's hero. Of the contemporary critics, "Obozrevatel'" in Literaturnyi sovremennik, who finds that Levšin is not an "outside observer," and praises his "active relationships" with the remaining characters,539 is the only one not to criticize Levšin. The modern

537 Zagradka, p. 56.


539 "Obozrevatel'," p. 224.
critics Zagradka and Brajnina also emphasize the effect which Levšin exercises on others. For Zagradka, this Soviet hero is not merely an "observer," but a "geroj deistvuyushčij," even if only within a narrow circle of people. Brajnina's appraisal is very positive: she finds that life is shown to have triumphed over death, and that the proud will and bright reason of a Soviet man have been victorious. She explains the cause of what she calls the "tjaga" of the other patients toward him: "Put' k spasenju vsem ětim poterjannym ljudjam ukazyvает svoim primerom, svoim povedeniem sil'nyj i cel'nyj sovetskij челovek...uverennyj...čto жизнь uвлекател'na i prekrasna v svoem nepreryvnom dvиženii k soveršenstvu."  

Contemporary critics, however, condemned Levšin roundly for his inactivity, facelessness, and dubious morality. Panov finds that Levšin lacks concrete characteristics and that there is too much emphasis on Levšin's self-contemplation and joy in his recovery. The single reference to Dneprogés is not enough to convince us that he is eager to return to his homeland and his work. Levšin is not revealed as the carrier of the new Soviet worldview. For Oksenov, Levšin is one of Fedin's standard characters - the "Soviet observer." It is very difficult to imagine him as a person: "Levšin - ne ličnost' v ee svoeobrazii, a sovetskij челovek 'voobšče.'" Kalina, who, as we have seen, excoriates Levšin for his

540 Zagradka, p. 55.
541 Brajnina, p. 170.
542 Brajnina, p. 169.
543 Panov, pp. 226-227.
544 Oksenov, p. 284.
treatment of Inge and Hoffmann, compares him to Rogov in *Poxiščenie*
Evropy: "bezdejstvennyj sozorcatel' - beskonečno dalek ot dejstvitel'nogo
tipa sovetskogo čeloveka." Referring to Fedin's conception that it
was love for his Soviet homeland which helped him to recover, she says
that she could not believe Fedin, despite all his artistic mastery. In
the same number of *Molodaja cvardija* "Ju.R." bitterly attacked the book,
saying of Levšin: "...Levšin mog by, bez uščerba dlja knigi, ne
pojavljat'sja na scene." Brajnina joins other critics in finding that there is an excessive
emphasis on his biological joy in life, which makes him cold and indifferent
to others: "...Levšin živet v egoističeski zamknutom mire nastroenij i
oščuščenij vyzdoravlivajuščego čeloveka." As a result Fedin insuf-

ciently reveals Levšin's social significance, and the hero is somewhat
static and indefinite. Zagradka also remarks on the author's concentration
on the actual process of Levšin's recovery. For him Levšin's moral dubi-

ousness in relations with others affects the value of the novel as a
whole: "Eto narušaet logiku obraza i snižaet nesomnennuju udaču vsego
proizvedenija." Smirnova is similarly critical of the hero, but comes to the con-
clusion that the fundamental cause of Fedin's failure is that Levšin is

545 Kalina, p. 159.
547 Brajnina, p. 171.
548 Zagradka, p. 55.
historically misplaced. Like Zagradka, she finds that Levšin's defects result in the novel's being a "ne vpolne osuščestvivšijsja zamsel." Although she defends him against the charge of being a "superfluous man," she complains that he fuses with his environment and that the only difference between him and the others lies in his recovery. Levšin is impenetrable to the reader, since we know so little about him. Speaking of the "symbolic significance" of the character, she finds that it would be naive and primitive to see his superiority in his recovery alone: what is needed is a far fuller portrayal of his characteristics as a Soviet man. Somewhat contradictorily, she goes on to comment that the trouble with Levšin, like Fedin's earlier heroes, is not that he is un lifelike, palely or incorrectly depicted: "Net, oni EStarcov, Karev, Rogov i Levšin kažutsja takimi, potomu čto oni ne na svoem meste. Oni ne po pravu zanimajut central'noe mesto v knige, ibo ne oni, ne takie, kak oni, ljudi byli v te gody gerojami revoljucionnoj dejstvitel'nosti."

Simmons shares the Soviet critics' dissatisfaction with Fedin's hero. He too comments on Levšin's lack of chivalry: "...a bit of a cad in his lovemaking." Remarking that "Levšhin is the least interesting character in the book," he concludes that "Fedin's art seems to desert him when he is faced with the task of creating a convincing Soviet hero."
Struve joins Oksenov and others in finding that Levšin is a
typical Fedin "observer": "Er gehört zu den "nachdenklichen Beobachtern,
die Fedin mit grosser Vorliebe schildert."  

All the critics agree in stressing the symbolic significance of
Levšin, although not all define it as succinctly as Goffenšefer: "...Fedin
dokazal, čto sovetskому graždaninu tuberkulez ne opasen." Condemning
Levšin, Goffenšefer refers to Fedin's "neudačnyj priem olicetvorenija
sovetskogo mira....vnutrennjaja kollizija romana ne v ětom protivopos-
tavlenii. Ono zdes' uslovno, nominal'no..."  

Panov also concentrates on Levšin's unfitness for his role as the
"positive hero":

Očevidno, po zamyslu avtora, vyzdorovlenie
čto [Levšina] simvolično. Lišennym voli k
pobede predstaviteljam starogo mira - Klebe
i Inge - sovetskij čelovek protivopostavljactsa
kak olicetvorenie aktivnogo i pobeždajuščego
načala. Inžener Levšin vyzdorovel potomu, čto u
egno est' dlja čego žit', - vot ideja, kotoru
v xudožestvennyx obrazax xotel raskryt' avtor.  

Panov claims that the author identifies himself with Levšin:
"...kak by ego glazami avtor smotrit na ostal'nyx personažej."  

Similarly, Serebrov calls Levšin the author's "rupor." Asking himself why
Levšin alone was cured, he finds that Levšin's Soviet homeland, with
which he did not sever his connection even for a minute, was his

551 Struve, p. 333.
552 Goffenšefer, p. 183.
553 Panov, p. 226.
554 Panov, p. 225.
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chief doctor. The other patients had no such medicine, and therefore they perished. Serebrov - of whom Goffensefer commented, "...čem tak xvalit' roman Fedina...lučše bylo i vovse ne pisat' o nem," 556 is the only critic to interpret the themes of the novel so crudely while accepting the portrayal of Levšin, but the critics who strongly criticize the hero all define his function similarly. Grinberg finds fault with him as a "voploščenie sovetskoy točki zrenija," 557 and Smirnova, stressing his symbolic significance, condemns him on the assumption that he is intended to be a "polpred sovetskogo obščestva." 558

Developing her thesis that Levšin shows the lost people of "Arktur" their way to salvation, Brajnina finds that Levšin is aware of the value of his life because it is inseparable from the life of his country. Nevertheless, she comments that, compared with the brilliant descriptions of Levšin's joyful feelings, his recollections of his work are pale and rhetorical: "Zdes' konstatacija fakta, illjustracija k "delovoj" žizni Levšina do bolezni, no onnjud' ne poëtičeskoe vosproizvedenie ětoj žizni." 559 Zagradka agrees that Levšin's dream of returning to life is too general, but finds that Levšin as an "acting hero" is essentially different from the "observer" Rogov in Poxiščenie

556 Goffensefer, p. 182.
557 Grinberg, p. 28.
558 Smirnova, p. 25.
559 Brajnina, pp. 170-171.
Evropy: "Levšin...polemiziruet s dejstvitel'nost'ju kapitalizma, no ego polemika ne nosit deklarativenog xaraktera, kak to bylo u Rogova."560

Brajnina, however, finds that Levšin represents a backward step: "Esli Rogov...govorit o dvizhenii pisatelja vpered v poiskax položitel'nogo geroja, to Levšin - čto otxod v storonu sozercatel'nosti, ob'ektivizma."561

Runin, writing in Literaturnoe obozrenie, provides one of the most penetrating analyses of Levšin given by any Soviet critic. He also draws parallels between Levšin and Rogov, but extends the comparison of Fedin's heroes to include Nikita Karev and Andrej Starcov, concluding that there is a "line of succession" of Fedin's static observer-heroes. Runin claims that there is a psychological unity between the author and his creation. Discussing the hero's illness and the sanatorium environment, he concludes that this situation is ideally suited to Fedin's heroes: "...tvorčeskaja manera pisatelja, ego principy raskrytija čeloveka v ĝtoj knige prišli v sootvetstvie s žiznennym sostojaniem geroja...Zdes' nakonec, najdena ta izolirovannaja sreda, k kotoroj tol'ko i prisposoblono dyxanie geroja Fedina. Zdes' on obrel svoe estestvannoe sostojanie." Like other critics, Runin remains unconvinced by the author's attempt to show that Levšin's cure is due to his determination to recover and return to a purposeful life in the Soviet Union. Essentially, Levšin is no different from the other patients of "Arktur." Referring to Levšin's having worked in a Soviet

560 Zagradka, p. 55.

561 Brajnina, p. 171.
toropredstvo, Runin observes, "Toł'ko do naivnosti doverčivoj čitatel'
poverit čtoj lakonicjoj sprawke..." He quotes Levšin's interior monologue
about the "zvonko klokočuščaja žizn'" of the Soviet Union and his determin-
ation to recover, but objects that these words contradict the entire logic
of the character: "...vse čto ostaetsja toł'ko ritorikoj, k ščast'ju,
nemnogoslovnoj."\textsuperscript{562}

One of the most interesting contemporary detailed reviews is that
by L. Dneprovskij in \textit{Literaturnij Voronež}. While praising highly the art-
tistry displayed by Fedin in the novel, he also condemns the characteri-
zation of Levšin. Further, Dneprovskij finds that the author made a
fundamental error in restricting the framework of the novel in order to
concentrate on the theme of illness, thus giving insufficient attention
to the social background.

Referring to the "vydajuščijsta talant i masterstvo pisatelja,"
Dneprovskij writes that Fedin "prekrasno peredat v svoem romane
čužezemnuju atmosferu neobyčno prekrasnoj prirody, prevosxodno izobražat
byt i obstanovku Davosa..." Dneprovskij praises the characterization of
Klebe, whom he finds the most lifelike character in the novel. "Zdes'
tema bolezni estestvenno svjazivaetsja s voprosami social'noj žizni,
perepletaetsja s nimi nerazryvno..." Fedin shows how the "sobstvennik"
is victorious in the conflict between the "sobstvennik" and the "doctor."
However, Klebe is not only an instrument but simultaneously also a
victim of private property.

\textsuperscript{562}Runin, pp. 10-13.
Stressing the defects of Fedin's artistic "abstraction," the critic wonders how the "social'no-tipičnoe" can be achieved in view of the removal of the patients from their normal connections and interests. "V konce koncov u čitatelja ostaetsja somnenie: stranica li kliničeskoj psixologii pered nami, ili stranica psixologii social'noj." Dneprovskij finds that the theme of illness can properly be treated only in connection with man's social life, while in Sanatorij Arktur Fedin's heroes leave their entire past life on the sanatorium threshold. The relationship of Inge and Levšin demonstrates the unsatisfactoriness of attempting to demonstrate social differences merely in differences of behaviour in sickness and attitudes toward sickness. The relationship examined here between someone who is dying and someone who is recovering becomes one of the principal problems, if not the principal problem, which the Soviet man Levšin resolves in the novel, yet he resolves it by flight. Observing ironically that everything bright and joyful is connected with Levšin, - "dlja nego neizmenno mobilizuetsja samoe sverkajuše solnce, ego progulki okruženy samymi čudesnymi pejzažami" - Dneprovskij writes that the reader awaits with interest to learn the thoughts and feelings evoked in Levšin by his surroundings. All we see, however, is the contrast between the dying Inge and the recovering Levšin, and it cannot be considered that the ability to observe a regimen and concentrate all one's forces on one point for the struggle with the disease563 are the distinguishing features of Soviet man alone: "...eto ešče toľ'ko ton, a muzyka načnetsja pozže. I vdrug čitatel' k izumleniju svoemu vyjašnjaet, čto muzyki nikakoj ne budet."

563 Referring to Dr. Stumm's words to Inge Kretschmar (p. 30).
Dneprovskij criticizes Fedin's hero at length. He finds that the reader is obliged to guess at Levšin's attitude to his environment from brief indefinite comments, and that, while we know all about Levšin's feelings when frosty air fills his lungs, we know nothing about his relations with Hoffmann. Here Dneprovskij adds a new note to the criticism of this relationship: "...možet byt', ýtot roman nužno takže рассматривать" kak odnu iz stadij vyzdorovlenija?" Finding shades of Hemingway in the conversations between Levšin and Hoffmann at Alp Grüm and in the discussion about Klebe at the end of the novel, he objects that in relation to Levšin all this seems strange and misplaced. Complaining that Levšin displays no indignation at Klebe's treatment of Inge, Dneprovskij concludes that he is poor in feelings as well as in thoughts - a "raisonneur" who only explains, but never judges. "...my ne možem postignut' xarakter Levšina po toj prostoj pričine, čto net u nego xaraktera...Obraz, kotoryj dolžen byt' samym interesnym i bogatym po soderžaniju v ýtom romanе, okazalsja, k sožaleniju, dovol'no vjalyim i bednym." It is Levšin who has suffered most from Fedin's "self-limitation," which was an error in the very concept ("xudožestvennyj zamysel") of the novel. "Fedin ne sumel izvleč' bol'sego soderžanija iz interesnejšej temy, potomu čto on i Levšina podčinil svoej izolirujščej xudožestvennoj abstrakcii."564

Dneprovskij is, however, unusual in holding the view that Fedin made little attempt to endow the novel with ideological content. Indeed, the overwhelmingly negative presentation of "Arktur" and its residents,

564 Dneprovskij, pp. 261-265.
as well as the emphasis on the economic crisis and its effect on human behaviour, makes inevitable the conclusion that the novel, in Slonim's words, "...symbolically opposes the illness of the West to the vitality of Russia." Zagradka states the virtually universal Soviet critical opinion: "Obređenost' buržuaznogo stroja zdes' pokazana na primere žizni odnogo sanatorija v Davose, kotoryj, xotja i dalek ot ežednevnoj suety socialno-političeskoj žizni Evropy, vse že javljaetsja čast'ju etogo mira i dolžen podčinjat'sja ego žestokim zakonam."556

Similarly, although Oksenov, one of the first critics to discuss the novel, begins by stating, "Sanatorij Arktur dalek ot politiki...," he concludes that "Sanatorij Arktur s dostoinstvom neset svoju idejnu nagruzku."567 The world in which live Klebe and those like him is doomed, just like the "Arktur" sanatorium. Consequently the picture of "Arktur's" disintegration also acquires a symbolic significance.

Serebrov writes that Fedin could have entitled the novel "Gibel' Evropy." Fedin has succeeded in depicting the grim drama which European society had experienced over the previous decades, the finale of which they were now observing. Fedin's chief merit lies in the fact that he has managed to point to the only "healthy" place in the world, where such a catastrophe is impossible. Serebrov praises him as a writer who


566Zagradka, p. 55.

567Oksenov, pp. 284-286.
has learned to pose great social problems and to solve them correctly. Goffenšefer, referring to the atmosphere of depression and hopelessness which reigns in the sanatorium, claims that the small world of "Arktur" reflects clearly the state of the great European world before the Second Imperialist War, and concludes the article by stressing the significance of the novel as a mirror of contemporary capitalism: "...Sanatorij Arktur zasluzivaet vsjačeskogo vnimania, kak proizvedenie, risujušee izmel'čanice, besperspektivnoe suščestvovanie i gibel' ljudey v sovremennom kapitaličeskom mire." 568 Panov, however, implies that Fedin fails to reveal the social causes of the tragic fates of the bourgeois characters. The impression is created that the author set himself the goal of showing the ruin and death of people from the bourgeois world, but succeeded merely in showing death in general and sickness as such. 569

Grinberg finds that Klebe's story constitutes the "obščij zamysel romana." Agreeing with "Obozrevatel" 570 that it is the social order which is ultimately guilty of Inge's death, he sees Klebe as a man mutilated by capitalism, who is merely a "squirrel in a wheel." Capitalism is the real murderer, he concludes, and Fedin's victory lies precisely in the fact that he has penetrated to the source and uncovered the soil which

568 Goffenšefer, pp. 183 and 184.
569 Panov, p. 227.
570 "Obozrevatel'," pp. 224-225.
produces people like Klebe and others far more terrifying and dangerous. He finishes by praising Fedin for his fearlessness in writing a book "surovju i pravdivuju, knigu o žizni i smerti, knigu o ljudjach, umerščivjaemyx kapitalizmom i dukovno i fizičeski."  

Zagradka and Brajnina similarly comment that Klebe acts under the pressure of the inexorable power of money. Brajnina adds that the financial ruin and suicide of petty entrepreneurs were extremely typical of bourgeois society during the depression. As we have seen, she asserts that the case of Klebe demonstrates most effectively the tragic helplessness of the so-called "average man" in the conditions of capitalist society. Commenting on Klebe's act of making Inge Kretschmar leave "Arktur," she also holds that this is the inexorable law of capitalism - the law of mutual destruction. Brajnina introduces a new element into criticism of Sanatorij Arktur by claiming that "Osnovnaja mysl' Sanatorija Arktura - moral'naja degradacija otorvannoj ot naroda intelligenci - naxodit svoe vyraženie vo vsex sjužetnyx situacijax, podčerknuta v každoj detali." She refers specifically to Klebe's attempts to distract his patients from reality and his recommendation of Edgar Wallace. After discussing the prevalence of indifference, cynicism, and "sumerečnoe, bol'noe,

---
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dekadentskoe soznanie" among the bourgeois intelligentsia of the period, she claims that Fedin saw clearly how the terrible sickness of lack of will, apathy, and egotism gradually yet irresistibly was taking possession of the intelligentsia, and had embodied his observations and knowledge in typical and artistically powerful images. In conclusion she states, "Sanatorij Arktur - obličenje amoral'nosti, antichelovečnosti sobstveničeskogo stroja; kritičeskaja tema romana razverнута široko, poëtično, uvlekatel'no." 

VII

Fedin in his note for Rezec refers directly to the symbolic importance of his hero Levšin, while both then and in his later autobiography - as well as in his remarks to Huppert - he stresses the economic realism of his picture of Western life. Pross-Weerth is unjustified in claiming that "...[Fedin] entzieht sich noch einmal dem sozialen Auftrag..." since the writer clearly attempts to endow the hero of the novel with symbolic significance in terms of Soviet ideology.

575Brajnina, p. 166.
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577Brajnina, p. 171.
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581Pross-Weerth, p. 698. The other reference is to Poxiščenie Evropy.
As "simvolu dvux mirov,"582 however, the characters are not artistically successful. The neurotic elements in Klebe's personality greatly reduce his credibility as a representative of Western society, although Soviet critics are prepared to accept him as such. Again, no real attempt is made to relate Inge Kretschmar to her environment, so that the reader inevitably interprets her psychological characteristics in clinical rather than social terms. Yet, as Goffenšefer points out,583 Fedin is more successful with the "old world" characters than with those representing the "new world." Contemporary critics denied almost unanimously both the hero's reality as an individual and his validity as a Soviet man.

Even if we do not evaluate Levšin in accordance with his convincingness as the type of the "new Soviet man,"584 the artistic failure of Fedin's attempt to identify him with Soviet ideology, his unattractive and colourless personality, as well as the intrinsic staticness of his depiction, greatly diminish the artistic impact of the novel as a whole. The fact that much of the descriptive material of the novel proceeding from Levšin's experiences is only marginally related to Levšin's interior monologue both contributes to his shadowiness as an "observer" and submerges the hero under the personality of the author, since the reader perceives most of the description as authorial narration.

582 Kuznecov, p. 34.
583 Goffenšefer, p. 183.
584 See Istorija russkogo sovetskogo romana, p. 439.
Nor is Fedin successful in *Sanatorij Arktur*, the "most European of all Fedin's novels," in creating the "obraz vremeni" which he sought. The narrowness of the canvas and the "artistic abstraction" to which Dneprovskij refers militate against the perception of "Arktur" and its surroundings as a microcosm of Western society. This unacceptability is increased for the non-Soviet reader by the tendentiousness inherent in the presentation of the economic situation and its effect on Klebe.

Struve stresses the static nature of the novel, implying that the principal quality of the novel lies in its subdued atmosphere. It is, however, difficult to accept his statement, "In dem Roman ereignet sich fast nichts," of a novel in which we find the lingering death of the heroine and the suicide of the principal negative character, as well as the vivid descriptions of sporting events at which the hero is present and the major episode of Levšin's mountain journey.

In defining the essential quality of the novel, Oksenov claims that "Vse,čto možno bylo sdelat' v takom sžatom ob"em, pisatelem sdelano. Nebolšoe prostranstvo Arktura zapolneno čelovečeskimi sud'bami, xarakterami, situacijami, izobražennymi s isčerpyvajuščej polnotoj v postavlennyx sebe avtorom predelax." This effect of concentration,

---
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of "naprjažennost'," attained principally by the cumulative impact of the psychological intensity of the dialogues and much of the characters' interior monologue, constitutes a major artistic success.

The most notable artistic achievement of Sanatorij Arktur lies, however, in the descriptions of nature and human activity. Here Fedin's remarkable power of perception and the development of his verbal technique enable him to reach new heights of artistry. It is these descriptions which, as Runin remarks, form the "poetry of the book." 590

---

590 Runin, p. 12.
CONCLUSIONS

By means of a detailed analysis of Fedin's novels this study has established that elements of both continuity and change are conspicuous in the writer's work. Probably the most striking feature is that several aspects of the writer's style and character creation remained relatively unchanged during the creative period investigated in this study.

The analysis of the construction of Goroda i gody and Brat'ia indicated that Fedin's attempt at innovative structure may not have been so artistically successful as modern Western critics have sought to show. The degree of suspense achieved is limited and there are unfortunate gaps in chronology. It was suggested that the structure of Goroda i gody may reflect the contemporary emphasis on "sjužetnost" and the great interest of the Serapion Brethren and Viktor Sklovskij in the development of plot. In both novels the dependence of the author upon coincidence in the development of the action and the relationships between characters was judged to be a serious artistic defect.
Whereas several episodic figures in *Goroda i gody* were successfully characterized, major figures such as Andrej Starcov, Kurt Wahn, and Marie Urbach remained unconvincing because of incompleteness of presentation or unmotivated psychological transitions. It was noted that in *Goroda i gody* Fedin rarely employed interior monologue in characterization, which contributed to the degree of unreality found in his characters.

In the presentation of Germany a measure of tendentiousness or "plakatnost'" was observable, often associated with authorial intrusions embodying a substantial element of irony. The presentation of revolutionary Russia, on the other hand, was vivid and effective. It was considered that some episodes may indicate the influence of Zamjatin's artistic method.

In characterization, the influence of Dostoevskij was discernible in the presentation of Marie Urbach's childhood, the "double" relationship between Starcov and Wahn, Wahn's personality, and possibly in some elements of Starcov's San'šino experience. A new interpretation of the character of the Markgraf von zur Mühlen-Schönau was proposed. The analysis of the complex personality of Starcov demonstrated that far more was involved than the question of the intellectual's readiness to transgress his moral code in the name of revolutionary ideals. The characterization of Starcov suggested a preoccupation with death as a theme, apart from the emphasis on death to be expected in a work dealing
with the period of War Communism and the Civil War. The correlation of the original version with the revision of the novel carried out by Fedin in connection with the publication of the 1952-1954 collected edition of the author's work indicated that Fedin was concerned to reduce the emphasis on this theme in the new edition. A possible relationship between Starcov's psychological condition and the reaction of some sections of the intelligentsia to the introduction of N E P was suggested.

In both Goroda i gody and Brat'ja Fedin's artistic method was characterized by similar features. The ornamental rhetorical setpieces found in the presentation of Germany in Goroda i gody recur in the presentation of Ural'sk and in the characterization of Varvara Šerstobitova in Brat'ja. Although authorial intrusions in the form of comment on the action and characters are found in Brat'ja, their role in the narrative structure of Brat'ja is far less than in Goroda i gody, where authorial comment is a major element in characterization. In Brat'ja a conspicuously greater element of interior monologue is used in characterization, frequently with a notably low authorial element. Interior monologue was a major feature in the characterization of Nikita Karev and Rodion Čorbčv. While symbolic leitmotivs were employed in both Goroda i gody and Brat'ja in the development of theme and of character, it became clear that Fedin uses the device far more consistently in the later novel.
In *Coroda i gody* considerable artistic effect was achieved by the use of documentary material, whereas in *Brat'ja* such material was limited to the inclusion of Šaporin's article on Karev's symphony. The device was considered unsuccessful, since the article introduced themes not presented artistically in the remainder of the work.

In *Brat'ja* the chronological structure of the novel, examined in detail for the first time, demonstrated the close association between Nikita Karev's career and Soviet political developments, notably the beginning of the NEP period.

The writer's continued interest in Dostoevskij was indicated in *Brat'ja* by the characterization of Varvara Šerstobitova and Vit'ka Čuprykov, who were found to reflect the influence of the Dostoevskian "infernal woman" and of Smersjakov. The resemblance between Professor Bax in the novel and Akim Volynskij was conclusively demonstrated, while it was suggested for the first time that there is also a similarity between Volynskij and the "trench professor" in *Coroda i gody*. Attention was drawn to the character defects of the principal Bolshevik figure, Rodion Čorbov, as well as to unconvincing features of his presentation.

The complex relationship between the artist and his art portrayed in *Brat'ja* was found to be ambiguous, since no solution is adumbrated in the novel to the conflicting theses of the absorption of the artist by his art (the "pylinka" thesis) and the need of the artist for a life-companion in order to create. Moreover, the social function
of the artist and the role of the common people as a source of inspiration was presented with an unconvincing degree of "plakatnost'."

In Poxišćenie Evropy the close connection between the presentation of Holland and the author's own autobiographical experiences was demonstrated. The correspondence between the presentation of the capitalist West in the novel and the themes of contemporary Soviet publicistics was indicated by the emphasis on the growth of National Socialism and on capital concentration, as well as in the similarity between Justus Eldering-Ghyser in the novel and Sir Henri Deterding. The contrasting attitudes towards Soviet Russia of successive generations of the van Rossum family apparently reflected a view of evolving Western capitalist opinion of Soviet developments.

Despite the major defects of the tendentious "plakatnost'" of many episodes set in both the West and in the Soviet Union, and the "lakirovka" involved in the presentation of the Soviet Union, it was suggested that the novel deserves attention for the high quality of many of the setpieces dealing with Western Europe and also the descriptions of the North of Russia. Here Fedin displays great perceptive capacity allied with effective imagery, while generally avoiding the rhetorical ornamentalism prevalent in his earlier work. In Poxišćenie Evropy the author employs interior monologue with great psychological convincingness in the characterization of Philip van Rossum and Ivan Rogov.
The characterization of Philip van Rossum was one of the most successful features of the novel. His profound cultural interests and political attitudes were vividly conveyed. Similarly, Klavdija Andreevna was a convincing figure, despite a degree of tendentious "plakatnost" found in the presentation of her background and attitudes. It was noted that in revising the novel Fedin was concerned to reduce the emphasis on the monotony and boredom of Soviet life. The Soviet hero, Ivan Rogov, was not entirely convincing because of the ambiguity in his characterization and the limited presentation of his relationships with others. The unconvincingness of the "espionage plot" in Poošćenie Evropy was discussed, as well as the question of Rogov's involvement with this plot. A comparison of the revised version of the novel with the original edition showed that Fedin was concerned to reduce the emphasis on Rogov's anguished doubts whether to reveal the plot. The restricted intellectual horizon of a number of the Soviet characters, such as Sergeič and Volodja Gluškov, was pointed out. The result of the relative inactivity of Rogov and the limitations of the other Soviet figures was that the personality of Philip van Rossum tended to dominate the second book of the novel.

In Sanatorij Arktur the characterization of Klebe and the presentation of the economic situation of the sanatorium embodied a high degree of tendentious "plakatnost" and it became evident that Fedin was concerned to present the theme of the "crisis of capitalism" in the West.
The characterization of Levsin was found to be not entirely successful in view of the contrast between his supposed willpower and capacity for work and the passivity displayed in his relationships with other characters. The artistic quality of the presentation of the scenery of Switzerland and the convincingness of the interior monologue of several characters, notably Inge Kretschmar, was judged to be extremely high.

In style Fedin's work has been marked by a progressive reduction in the extent of the rhetorical ornamentalism found in the author's first two novels, Goroda i gody and Brat'ja. Nevertheless, it was noted that ornamental setpieces still recurred in Poxiščenie Evropy. Fedin's language continued to be characterized by an extremely wide vocabulary with a range of linguistic levels, including archaisms, colloquialisms and prostorešie. In Sanatorij Arktur, however, a neutral literary language was employed almost exclusively. An emphasis on the detailed presentation of the physical environment was found in all of Fedin's work, and it was maintained that in Sanatorij Arktur, in which attention is concentrated on the natural surroundings, Fedin achieved new mastery in the suggestion of atmosphere. Although Fedin abandoned earlier attempts to achieve suspense by means of nonchronological construction, he remained dependent upon coincidence for development of the action and this feature must be considered a weakness of Fedin's work. The writer continued to use the device of flashback extensively with varying artistic success, while it undoubtedly contributed to the convincingness of characterization. The extensive use of symbolic leitmotifs in characterization and the development of themes remained a major feature of Fedin's artistic method.
In the presentation of character Fedin's artistic method was notable for the absence of physical description and a growing reliance on interior monologue. Direct authorial comment, frequent in the first two novels, became rare in Poxiščenie Evropy and Sanatorij Arktur. The authorial element in interior monologue was progressively reduced until it became generally inconspicuous, with a corresponding increase in psychological convincingness. Fedin's widespread use of interior monologue in characterization constitutes one of the main achievements of his artistic method.

An interesting element of continuity is observable in the major figures of Fedin's work. In all the novels a principal hero serves as the main link in the plot and as the chief commentator on events.

In every case the principal Soviet character is a Russian intelligent, a contemplative "observer," whose professional activity, with the exception of Nikita Karev, is unimportant within the thematics of the novel. These heroes exemplify an evolving attitude toward the Soviet political environment. Starcov in Goroda i gody has great difficulty in accepting the Bolshevik ideology represented in the novel by Kurt Wahn, and ultimately betrays the Bolshevik cause. Karev in Brat'ja, however, although claiming to be completely apolitical, apparently accepts Bolshevik ideology. Further, Karev's creative work is held to express the revolutionary experience, although this thesis remains artistically unconvincing. Rogov in Poxiščenie Evropy is presented as a dedicated Bolshevik who totally rejects the bourgeois system of Western
Europe. However, Rogov's political beliefs are not successfully integrated with his total personality, so that the hero's identification with Soviet ideology remains unconvincing. Levšin in Senatorij Arktur is likewise a dedicated Bolshevik whose support of Soviet ideology is publicistically stated rather than artistically demonstrated.

Fedin's earlier heroes are preoccupied by the quest for personal happiness, while Levšin is mainly concerned with his recovery from sickness. Thus the presentation of the individual personalities of the heroes and their relationships with others overshadows the question of their identification with Bolshevik ideology. Moreover, the heroes' inactivity results in their ideological views' possessing an abstract character: had they played a more active role in society, their engagement would no doubt have created a more realistic and convincing impression. It is noteworthy that, with the single exception of Fedin's first hero, Starcov, the heroes' ideological attitudes do not lead to severe conflicts or bring suffering upon them. Since they are not obliged to fight for their ideals, the opportunity is lost to demonstrate the significance to the heroes of their ideology and their willingness to make sacrifices for its sake.

On the other hand, the figures of the principal Bolshevik activists in each novel - Wahn and Golosov in Goroda i gody, Čorbov in Brat'ja and Sergeič in Fosiscenie Evropy - are characterized by emotional limitedness and a certain "sxematičnost'". Consequently we do not find
in the writer's work a psychologically convincing presentation of the Bolshevik "new man."

Apart from the desire for love and the longing to find a life-companion, the hero is aware of a consciousness of alienation, "otčuždennost'," from the world. This conception of the hero determines the psychological atmosphere of Fedin's novels.

In Goroda i gody the writer suggests that the intellectual's alienation can be overcome by self-abandonment to a collective revolutionary élan. In Brat'ja, on the other hand, the conclusion appears to be that the creative personality must be prepared to accept complete alienation in order to devote himself utterly to his art.

In Poxiščenie Evropy the romantic longing characteristic of Andrej Starcov and Nikita Karev comes to dominate the entire personality of the hero. Rogov can overcome his consciousness of alienation only through the satisfaction of his desire for love. In addition, Rogov was seen to possess a literarily conditioned sense of history and the continuity of time which contributed to the sense of unity with his environment which he was occasionally able to achieve.

In all the novels the hero's victory, however achieved, over his sense of alienation is presented as a mystic sense of fusion ("slitnost'") with his environment. Thus Starcov's "San'šino feeling" has elements of similarity to the bliss which Karev sometimes experiences within his "pylinka" and to the mystic joy which possesses him during his return to Ural'sk. Rogov's happiness at his feeling of identification
with his environment is paralleled by Levšin's joy at his recovery, marked by the heightened perception of his environment. Again, in all the novels the hero's alienation is partially conveyed by the tendency to present the world as an abandoned desert ("pustynja"), as at the end of Goroda i gody and Brat'ja, during Rogov's journey to Holland, and in aspects of the presentation of the sanatorium and the mountain landscape in Sanatorij Arktur.

The personality traits of passivity in personal relationships and a certain taciturnity were conspicuous in all of Fedin's principal heroes. The episodes in which the heroes apparently overcome this taciturnity tend to appear unconvincing. The heroes' relationships with the women who are so important in their lives demonstrate their passivity. These women tend to have dominant personalities and to be the initiating partner. The submissive element in the heroes' personality is illustrated by the "interchangeability" of the heroines, indicated by the striking parallel between the triangular relationships Starcov - Marie - Rita, Karev - Irina - Varvara, Rogov - Helena - Klavdija, and Levšin - Inge - Dr. Hoffmann, where the second heroine is seen as the successor of the first. In all the novels the predecessor-successor relationship between the heroines constitutes a major theme, while in Brat'ja and Poxiščenie Evropy the perception of the women as "doubles" is an important element in the consciousness of the hero.

Fedin uses the personality of his heroes as a means of conveying the recurrent theme of the complex psychological relationship of man and his environment, in which love is shown to be of paramount significance.
Unfortunately, however, Fedin’s artistic method is such that his heroes fail to become fully convincing figures. Unquestionably Fedin was more successful in the characterization of episodic characters. However, Philip van Rossum in Poxiščenie Evropy must be considered a major artistic success.

Fedin’s work is distinguished by its capacity to project a sense of the vivid immediacy of the environment. The ability to convey this perceptiveness, which the writer himself described as "vživanie v neistislimye meloči okruženija,"¹ in literature is Fedin’s great creative achievement.

APPENDIX

BRAT'J.A

SYNOPSIS

The novel begins with the introduction of the distinguished Petrograd medical professor Matvej Karev, who is tired of his fame and of his exhausting profession and seeks solace in frequent and riotous family celebrations. An ornamental setpiece is devoted to the rebirth of Petrograd after the revolution and civil war; luxuries of all kinds are now again available. At a name-day party in honour of his wife, Sof‘ja Andreevna, Matvej tells his guests that the Russian people has not changed at all, finding that it is impossible to spoil the people, however hard one tries. An old friend of the family, the biologist Arsenij Arsen'evič Bax, declines to speak, and suggests that Sof‘ja Andreevna address the company. Sof‘ja Andreevna formally welcomes the evening's most notable guest, "the pride and glory of young Russian music," - Matvej's brother Nikita. The company gives Nikita, who normally lives an extremely secluded life, an enthusiastic ovation. It becomes clear that Nikita is fond of his niece, Matvej's daughter Irina, and when she resists his attempt to take her hand he leaves the room.

Matvej and Nikita sit smoking in Matvej's study. Nikita tells Matvej that this is not the moment to talk of Rostislav, their third
brother. Matvej takes Nikita to the kitchen to meet his old "djed'ka", Evgraf, who apparently once had saved Nikita's life. Nikita is deeply hurt when Evgraf wishes him a daughter like Irina. Unexpectedly a sailor, Rodion, arrives and tells Matvej he is needed urgently to treat the Party leader Šering. The sailor is irritated at seeing Nikita, whom he evidently knows. Then Bax goes up to Rodion and greets him as an old friend. Finally a mysterious woman, Varvara Mixajlovna Šerstobitova, arrives: she tells the guests that she needs to see Rodion, who, however, ignores her. Varvara Mixajlovna only laughs and asks Rodion about Lenka's health, at which he grimaces. She then recognizes Nikita, whom she evidently knows well, and asks him ironically why he seems so terrified of her. Varvara Mixajlovna asks Nikita to introduce her to Irina. As Rodion is leaving with Matvej, she asks him why he has told her nothing about Irina: he replies with the one word, "drjan'.'

Varvara Mixajlovna introduces herself to Irina with a smile, but Irina, suppressing her tears, turns around and walks back into the drawingroom. Varvara, examining Nikita's face, suddenly explodes into wild laughter and rushes out.

Šering lies, suffering acutely, on an unendurably uncomfortable couch, longing for a "real doctor" to arrive and replace the young man who has been treating him. Karev immediately wins the confidence of Šering, even though he agrees with his predecessor's diagnosis of heart disease. Šering asks Karev to call Rodion to him, and after an interval during which Šering's mind wanders - expressed in an effective passage of authorial interior monologue narration - Šering asks Rodion on his
arrival to summon Karev back. Rodion, who clearly has great admiration and affection for Şering, is terrified by the deterioration in his condition. At the moment that Matvej Karev arrives back at his apartment the telephone is already ringing, calling him again to Şering. Resignedly, Karev looks at the débris of the party and the few remaining guests in the drawingroom, and then goes into Irina's room. He finds her crying, but she is unwilling to tell him the reason. Karev's hired car is appallingly dilapidated, and the exhausted professor is consumed by irritation during his bumpy ride over the bad roads: he tells himself that he will speak to Şering about the neglect and ruin all around him. When he arrives, however, Şering has already died, and Karev is needed only to sign the official announcement of his death.

At the beginning of the final chapter of the first part a long setpiece is devoted to Petrograd, which is presented as a city of chimeras, in which the people are more like apparitions or characters from Dickens' novels than real human beings. Nikita, unable to stand the incomprehensible behaviour of Rodion and Varvara Mixajlovna at his brother's party and anguished by the thought of Irina, is walking aimlessly about the streets in a snowstorm. His strangely smooth, airy walk is unlike that of any of the other Karev brothers, who are all true Cossacks and excellent horsemen. He hears the roar of water in which he distinguishes a wave of sounds which he believes he can stop by repeating the same five sounds himself. However, the wave continues to resound all around him, and Nikita flees, thinking of a nightmare which he has recently had. Nikita had dreamed of a girl, Anna, whom
he had loved while he was living in Germany, studying at the Dresden conservatory. She had died years before, but in the dream Anna shared an apartment with Irina. Nikita discovers that Anna is still alive, but when he returns to see her, he cannot help betraying to her his love for Irina. Clearly Nikita sees in Irina Anna's double and suffers guilt feelings at his unfaithfulness. When Nikita comes to himself, he is standing in front of a huge shop window which has suggested the dream to him, since it had been in such a window that he had watched for Anna to appear in the window of her apartment opposite. In an episode which appears like a continuation of the dream, Nikita visits a gruesome gambling house at which the clients seem all to be violet corpses. Suddenly Varvara Mixajlovna appears in front of him: she had waited for him to leave Natvej's and followed him. She refers to the layer of ice which isolates Nikita and warns him that nothing will come of his romance with Irina. Telling him that she has followed him all her life, she says that he can never be happy without her. Nikita tells her that he is afraid of her and does not love her. Varvara has abandoned Rodion, despite her love for their daughter Lenka: she is bored with him now that he has given her all that she wanted from him - a baby. Varvara tells Nikita that she would have preferred to have a child by him, but she would now like to have a second child - this time by Nikita. Nikita's idea that he is not good enough for her is only stupidity and cowardice on his part. He replies that what she wants is impossible, since man is obliged to act in the way determined by his past. As they part, Varvara insists that she will soon come to see him - and that she will have a child by him. When Nikita comes out on the street, the working
day has already begun, and it seems to him that hundreds of eyes are gazing at him with dislike; for a while he feels ashamed and alienated. On his way home Nikita is greeted by the grotesque figure of Vit'ka Čuprykov, a former servant of the Šerstobitov family, who complains with mixed servility and malice that while he, a disabled Red Army veteran, is reduced to poverty, Nikita enjoys wealth and fame as a composer. Vit'ka refers menacingly to his knowledge of Nikita's past life, implying that Nikita had been on the side of the Whites. Finally, however, Nikita turns the tables on Vit'ka by exploiting a sarcastic remark which betrays Vit'ka's own anti-Soviet attitude.

The second part of the novel, "Inferno", begins with a long presentation of the huge Cossack family of the Karevs, headed by the autocratic, immensely fat Vasil' Leont'ič. Vasil' Leont'ič had amassed considerable wealth in his post as manager of a rich estate, as well as through haymaking, grazing sheep, and growing apples on his own land. The young Nikita is full of admiration for Evgraf, the Karevs' head gardener, with his inexhaustible fund of animal lore. Nikita remembered his last summer of freedom in the Čagan, when he was seven, hunting gophers with Evgraf, his first adventurous horseride, and his visit to a toyshop in Ural'sk, where he fell in love with a toy violin. He is desperate to possess such a violin, but when his father hears of his longing he brings him, to Nikita's grief, not a toy violin, but a real one, on which Vasil' Leont'ič insists that he learn to play. In the autumn Nikita is sent to his aunt's to study in Saratov, and his destiny as a musician, his "inferno" begins.
Much of the next chapter, which includes an abundance of technical detail regarding music, is devoted to Nikita's sufferings during his study of the violin under his teacher, Jakov Gol'dman. Nikita detests the violin and Gol'dman equally. Gol'dman's father, a bookbinder, loves music as passionately as his son. Nikita spends his month's summer vacation in the country not far from the town, but his vacation is ruined by the need to practise for two hours a day, which prevents his going fishing with the local boys. Finally his mother yields to his entreaties and writes to his father, asking him to allow Nikita to give up the violin, but Vasil' Leont'ij refutes. At the same time Nikita's youngest brother, Rostislav, is born. Nikita becomes resigned to his fate: "His childhood is over."

In Saratov there exists an ancient enmity between the coalminers, the "anafemy", and the saddlers, the "potniki", which used to lead to frequent fights, although both apparently had become more peaceable by the time Nikita settled in the city in the Smurskij Pereulok. Nikita now practises for five hours a day under Gol'dman, and although he begins to attract attention and praise, he still lacks faith in himself and is convinced of the pointlessness of his music. However, he practises diligently for a public concert at which he is to play the second violin.

At the same time he has forebodings of an impending catastrophe. Nikita has a vision of houses burning, and when his presentiment is strangely fulfilled, he feels so ill that he is forced to visit a doctor, who finds that he is suffering only from overtiredness. Nikita's forebodings of calamity, however, grow even stronger. Moreover, he is
conscious of the injustice of his isolation within the little world of his music, his "speck of dust", within which his entire existence is confined.

The city appears to be filled with groaning, as antisemitic gangs roam around, starting fires and burning down a synagogue. Early the following morning the groan becomes a frantic howl as the area surrounding the Smurskij Pereulok is crowded with enraged anafemy and potniki. Nikita watches while a man is beaten up, despite his desperate begging for mercy, by a gang of riffraff. In the yard of Nikita's house a locksmith is restrained by his wife and a crowd of neighbours from rushing out into the street with a revolver. Finally an old lady throws a bucket of water over the man lying in the road, and he staggers off, covered in blood.

Nikita learns that the man who had been beaten up was a Pole who had lost his presence of mind when surrounded by a crowd and fled. At first he fought off his pursuers with a revolver, but was defenceless after he had emptied the magazine. Col'dman in disguise takes refuge in Nikita's house and Nikita hides him in a storeroom. The pogrom begins again and Nikita is warned to put an icon in the window. A crowd of ruffians rushes past the house with a roar, but then unexpectedly a silence falls and they run back the way that they had come. A group of darkly dressed armed men appears in the street and fires at the rabble. In one of the men Nikita recognizes a boy, Rodion, with whom he had often gone fishing. The locksmith Petr drags his screaming wife across the pavement, but the leader of the group makes him stop,
and Petr joins the group when it moves off down the road. Nikita, deciding that eventually, at the last moment, justice must inevitably triumph, releases Gol'dman from his hiding-place.

In a lengthy ornamental setpiece the author ironically wonders whether the whole pogrom had not been an illusion - now order has been fully restored and the city is full of elegantly uniformed troops. The governor himself walks down the street, asking the citizens whether they find the pacification measures adequate. It is impossible to prevent oneself from bursting into tears at the sight of such exemplary behaviour and popular unanimity.

Nikita expects retribution to follow the catastrophe, but instead there is only an oppressive quiet. Although seemingly Nikita had been thrown out of his isolation, yet his lonely wandering in hell continues, and he perforce returns to his "little world". Nikita exhausts himself practising bow technique (to which a technical digression is devoted). When the violin concert takes place, Nikita, feeling an organic part of the quartet, for the first time finds happiness in his music. He is elated by the harmony ultimately achieved by the differing personalities in the quartet: the apparition of Mendelssohn himself seems to congratulate the musicians. After the concert Nikita runs out into the street, but Jakov Gol'dman's father stops him in order to congratulate him. The bookbinder tells him that the local police chief had attempted to put an end to the ovation, which gave the impression of being a pro-Jewish demonstration. Gol'dman kisses Nikita, who, he says, has been the "saviour" of his son. Nikita realizes that he loves the Gol'dmans. He now knows that his life is worthwhile.
At the beginning of the next part of the novel, entitled "On the Slopes", Rodion, who is now employed as a seaman on the Volga ferries, leaves the quayside in the evening to go into town. Since he is too early for an appointment, he decides to visit his old friend Nikita. When Rodion looks at Nikita's books, Nikita asks him whether he would like one about the revolution: he implies that he knows Rodion is in the underground and then asks him whether he is a member of a "rabočaja družina". Rodion denies it, and leaves suddenly. Nikita, who had already been hurt when Rodion called him "vy", is offended by his former friend's coldness.

Rodion goes to a grocer's shop and comes out with a big piece of bread wrapped in newspaper. Almost immediately he becomes aware that he is being followed and begins to run, but his pursuers soon catch him. Rodion is hooded and taken by cab to a house where a gendarmerie officer attempts without success to interrogate him. He is then searched while with apparent boredom the officer compares the leaflets containing proclamations, which the "bread" turns out to be, with others already in his files, and then has a policeman seal up the parcel. After being searched Rodion is brought back and although the officer proves to him that he knows his identity, he refuses to give his name or the password which he had given in order to obtain the proclamations. Finally the officer has Rodion taken away into confinement after threatening that he will be exiled while his accomplices get off scotfree.

In his cell, Rodion wonders what could have gone wrong, and begins to suspect Nikita. He curses him, wondering why he should be so insistent on their childhood friendship. Rodion becomes lost in recollections of his childhood, when he used to row out into the river to
meet his father, who served as pilot on a tug. Rodion then remembers his first experiences of the hectic bustle of the wharfs at Saratov, and his father's handing him over to a ship's agent to work in return only for his food. A long setpiece is devoted to a description of the dock-workers in their colourful rags and their cruel mockery of the two blissfully happy half-witted sisters, Katerina and Lizaveta Ivanovna, who imagine themselves to be rich ladies, the objects of constant admiration and flattery. After they undress themselves in public, one of the dockers kicks them both down a slope, and Rodion attacks their tormentor, only to be thrown to the ground, spitting blood. Rodion dreams of revenging himself on this human scum, which had also been responsible for the pogrom.

Rodion then remembers how not long before Cossack troops had fired into a crowd and he had saved himself by throwing himself down a ravine which served as the city rubbish dump. There a man in an astrakhan cap had made him put his revolver away and had invited him to a secret meeting: "on that day everything had begun". Rodion thinks of Nikita with growing hostility, blaming him for his misfortune. Finally he recollects a painful episode: standing in the bows of a steamer approaching the harbour, he was about to throw a mooring line ashore when a young girl on deck laughed at him, telling him that he will throw the line short. The line indeed falls into the water. Rodion has been unable to forget the girl, who turns out to be the daughter of a rich merchant, Mixail Šerstobitov, but persuades himself that the pain he feels is due to the insulting way in which she
had exploited her position to mock him. At dawn the other occupant of the cell wakes up and proves to be the locksmith Petr. When Rodion asks him whether everything is over, Petr tells him with a grin that Rodion's wanderings from prison to prison have only just begun.

In a highly rhetorical passage Varvara Mixajlovna is introduced as the object of the love and admiration of her mother and the entire Šerstobitov household. Then in an ornamental setpiece the colourful annual autumn pickling ceremony is described, in the course of which a mass of local peasant women prepare piles of cabbage in readiness for the winter. Refusing to allow the matchmakers to find a husband for her and ignoring reproaches at her free behaviour with men, Varvara insists on living just as she wishes. Varvara's father, Mixail Gavrilovič, immediately subdues and depresses everyone, except for Varvara and possibly his wife, with whom he comes in contact with his cold gaze and silent indifference to people's behaviour.

To escape the boredom of life in the town, Varvara Mixajlovna visits the market with its Cossacks, camels and frequent dust storms. On this occasion Varvara blushes to see Nikita Karev at the market. She tells him that if she had not caught him, he would never have visited her, despite his promise. When Nikita says that he is going abroad, Varvara rejoins that he will miss everything in life for the sake of his stupid harmony. She invites Nikita into a barn in the grounds of the Šerstobitovs' house. Varvara tells him that his sister had told her what had made him give up the violin. In a flashback, Nikita recollects his first meeting with Varvara - an event of which
he had often thought since - during the summer after he had been heartened by his first musical successes. He had met her by chance at a shop where he had stopped for a glass of lemonade. When Nikita told her that he had been fishing, she replied that she was the fish, and then ran off roaring with laughter. Nikita returned home full of elation, but when he tried to express his emotion by music, his violin failed him completely, and he furiously flung it on the ground. When his sister came into the room he shouted at her to get out and rushed out of the room.

Nikita suddenly notices that Vit'ka Čuprykov is spying on them through the door of the barn, and tells Varvara how he detests him. Varvara in turn tells Nikita that Vit'ka cannot stand him, since he is jealous of Varvara and Nikita. Nikita relates how he had once caught Vit'ka stealing from the Šerstobitovs, and asks Varvara indignantly why she had not got rid of him. Varvara responds by asking Nikita why it should matter to him. Becoming very affectionate, Varvara says to Nikita, "If only you understood......". Nikita, however, is filled with conflicting emotions and cannot decide how to act. When, holding him to her, she tells him in desperation of her agonizing boredom, he asks her sympathetically why she is not as gay as usual. Varvara furiously tells him to go away and never to come back. When he has gone she stamps violently on the floor.

Nikita later studies at the conservatory in Dresden. In a short setpiece Dresden is compared to a monastery in which the thousands of monks in their cells are subject to a cruel rule in which achievement is all-important. Nikita shares with three others an apartment which is
ironically described as a "factory of noise" at war with the other tenants in the house. He has as his neighbour the violinist Werth, by origin half Czech and half German. The powerfully built Werth has organized his life to a fantastic degree: not only does he allocate his time according to an exact schedule, but also keeps and files every piece of paper, from concert programmes to receipts. One day, however, Werth tells Nikita that his professor has recommended that he take up the viola instead: it is difficult even for an excellent violinist like Werth to find work, and his prospects as a violist would be far better. Nikita and Werth speak of the violin as a treacherous and tragic instrument. Werth begins to spend much of his time playing chess with Nikita, gives up his music and neglects his appearance. The others treat him with caution.

One night Nikita is suddenly awakened by a flatmate who has heard a heavy falling sound in Werth’s room. Going into his room, Nikita feels himself split by conflicting emotions: whereas the rational part of his being realizes at once what has happened, telling Nikita that his first concern should be himself, some animal part of him desperately refuses to believe that anything is wrong. They find Werth’s body lying on the veranda: he had hanged himself from a hook in the ceiling. Nikita now indignantly convinces himself that Werth is pretending, only soon to be filled with fear. The police secretary who comes to investigate the suicide remarks when Werth’s situation is explained to him, "But the professor was right: violists earn more than violinists."
Everywhere he goes, Nikita is tortured by recollections of the dead Werth. He wonders agonizingly in his intense loneliness whether Werth's death had not been the final warning that he should give up music before it was too late. Nikita remembers his constant desperation during his years of study at the conservatory in Moscow. Even after studying all the composers of the past, he had begun to understand that he was still only an ignorant apprentice. Finally he believed that he had grasped the essence of music - "absolute music" - only to realize that a new apprenticeship had begun. It was at this point that he had gone to Dresden. Returning home, Nikita is constantly reminded of Werth's suicide. He is indignant that Werth should have addressed his suicide note to him, rather than to his professor. In order to drown out the menacing silence, he begins to play the piano, but suddenly hears a note played on a violin, coming from Werth's room. He recovers from his terror when he finds that the sound is caused by a torn gas mantle. 

Nikita goes into Werth's room and reconstructs agonizingly the circumstances of Werth's suicide. Overcome by a feeling of impending death, to distract himself he begins to solve a chess problem, but is reminded suddenly of his games with Werth and of Werth's hairy hand, and knocking the board over, he jumps up in terror.

Nikita tells his fellow students that he must move - their looks of sympathy make him wonder whether they do not see written in his face the same fate as Werth's. Nikita finds a new room, but returning the first evening after his move, he learns that his landlady has been taken to the hospital. Alone in the empty apartment filled with the stench of
disinfectant, he is overwhelmed by a sense of identity with Werth and expectation of the same fate. When a neighbour knocks the next morning, he tells her that he already knows that his landlady has died, and, without realizing it, laughs in her face. After spending the next day aimlessly wandering around the city, he sits down on the porch of a house, but runs away when he hears a sound like a shot from inside the house. Nikita associates his present mood of desperation and self-doubt with the premonition of fire which had recurred to him several times earlier in similar psychological situations. The following morning he reads in the newspaper of a fatal incident at that very house. Nikita tells himself that he is going mad, and mutters - mysteriously even to himself - "One of two things...".

Nikita meets a girl, Anna, at the studio of a painter friend, Gresse, and falls in love with her at once. Clumsy and awkward in her movements, she yet has a negligent attitude towards all the objects about her, which results in their seeming unimportant and completely subordinate to her. After a party at Gresse's they become lovers, and Anna's constant presence and support enable him to compose again: "Nikita again became convinced of his vocation."

Nikita completes the organ work which he has been composing and is invited by the old organist, a teacher at the conservatory, to whom he has given the music, to be present at a performance of the work by him in the Dresden Frauenkirche. In an effective setpiece, Nikita listens to his music: at first, unable to distinguish the melody in the chaotic conglomeration of sounds, he is overwhelmed by despair, but
then he begins to follow the melody more and more and realizes joyfully that the music being performed is exactly that which he had intended to write. The old organist congratulates him, and filled with self-confidence, Nikita runs off airily to meet Anna. Nikita was to remember forever the bliss of walking with Anna along the bank of the Elbe - his happiness seemed to him a reward for the years of ordeal.

Nikita then returns to Ural'sk during the following winter. In a long and highly ornamental setpiece the traditional Cossack "bagren'e" for sturgeon through iceholes in the Ural River is presented. The charge of the Cossacks down the banks when the signal is given by cannon shot is like the onslaught of an army. Nikita instinctively compares himself to his 15-year-old brother Rostislav, who remains completely alien to him, despite Nikita's admiration of his bravery and Cossack "udal'stvo". In the final scene of this section of the novel, Varvara Mixajlovna comes up to Nikita, commenting sarcastically on his airy walk. Nikita tells her that he is soon leaving, which draws from her the bitter admission that she loves him. When Nikita tells her that he does not love her, she screams that it is not true and runs away from him. The chapter ends with the statement that everyone climbs his own slope (vzvoz), and Varvara Mixajlovna's is - love.

Old Vasilij Leont'iev Karev has aged greatly during the war years, and suffers from anxiety about the fate of his youngest son, Rostislav. He is contemptuous about his other sons - Nikita he calls a "tuning fork" - but is intensely proud of the gay, lively Rostislav, whom he considers the only true Cossack among his sons, saying that Rostislav
alone did duty for all the Karevs. At the age of sixteen Rostislav had enlisted in a Cossack regiment as a scout. In 1917 at first no news at all of him reached home, but then in the autumn Vasil' Leont'îč heard that Rostislav had joined the Bolsheviks and deserted the front. Although the old man asserts that it is impossible, it is clear that to his grief he believes it to be true.

In September 1917 the Karevs' old retainer Evgraf, who had worked for twenty years as a porter in the Petrograd Medical Academy - his work had consisted in delivering corpses to the anatomical theatre - decides to leave starving Petrograd and return home to the steppes where there is still bread. Saying goodbye to Matvej Karev, he tells him that a time is coming when trees will be glad to grow roots uppermost - if they would only be allowed to.

Evgraf manages eventually to reach the Volga and is appalled by the scenes of chaos and brutality resulting from the breakdown of the river transport system and the flood of refugees. He waits patiently for the arrival of Ural Cossack troops and finally learns that a Red Army detachment commanded by the "Red Ataman", Rostislav Karev, has just arrived. On the pretext of delivering a message to Rostislav from his brother, Evgraf makes his way on board the Red commander's tug and meets Rostislav. Rostislav implies that the older Cossacks - "the fathers" - have established a White government in Ural'sk. Evgraf tells him that evidently the time has now come for him to serve Rostislav, just as he had served his father and his brother. Rostislav gaily accepts his offer - Evgraf will be his "Red anatomist".
In a long extended metaphor the older generation of Cossacks - the "fathers" - are compared to the sturgeon confined in a pound created in the Ural River by an iron grille, ready for the annual "bagren'e." Similarly, in 1918 the "grille" of the revolution divides the "sons", who support the Bolsheviks, from the "fathers", who have but one faith - the holy cross, their oath to the Tsar, and their Cossack freedoms.

Rostislav Karev's detachment forms an important mesh in the grille confining the White Cossack forces. The battles are few but savage, and Rostislav tells his orderly Evgraf about a night engagement in which the Red detachment had been initially outwitted but had succeeded in driving back the Whites. At this moment a refugee who had been captured making his way toward White territory is brought in. The man asks about Karev's detachment and finally Rostislav recognizes that he is his brother Nikita, whom he had not seen for five years. Nikita tells Rostislav that he is returning home to his own people, but Rostislav is astounded that he should want to go to an area held by the Whites. When asked what he had been doing in Germany, he tells him that he had been writing a symphony. Rostislav is dumbfounded: "The whole war, four years? Nothing apart from that?" Telling his brother that he had been watching and listening, Nikita feels a bitter superiority over his brother. They laugh at finding each other unchanged, but after asking Rostislav about his father and the whole family, Nikita tells him that he would never have gone against his father. Rostislav retorts that Nikita will have to go against either his father or his brother, or else he will be left hanging in the air, with nowhere to find a drink. Nikita replies that
Rostislav is young - he himself cannot live without his homeland, but he has been unable to find it. Both Rostislav and his father are sure that they are serving a noble cause, but Nikita is unwilling to choose sides, since on his way he had seen the steppe to be littered with corpses. One can serve one's cause only by doing what one is best able to do - in his case, by looking and listening. When Nikita tells him that he knows nothing but war and wants to solve everything by war, Rostislav replies that he is sure that he also will try to solve everything by war. Evgraf tells Nikita that he remembers well how Nikita as a child used to feel pity for the hunted gophers. The next morning Rostislav asks whether he has decided irrevocably to go to the Whites. Nikita replies that he has to go home in order to work - each of them must go his own way. His work is vital to him and he believes in its great importance. Assuring Rostislav that he will be useful neither to the Whites nor to the Reds, Nikita is seen off by Evgraf. Rostislav overcomes his reluctance and sends greetings to his father and the whole family in Ural'sk.

The development of the strange relationship between Varvara Mixajlovna and her father's shopman Vit'ka Cuprykov is presented. Vit'ka, who is desperately in love with Varvara and longs to marry her, is treated by her with contemptuous mockery, displayed in an episode in which Varvara proposes to Vit'ka that they drink "Brüderschaft" together and then roars with laughter at him. Nevertheless, Varvara is clearly attached to Vit'ka, who is closer to her than anyone else. Vit'ka fawns on her with dog-like subservience and is content to amuse
For her favour because of the depth of his love for her and his unique sensibility. When he makes physical advances to her after spying on her bathing, she slaps his face. A long ornamental setpiece is devoted to the grocery trade of Varvara's father, who goes as far as Samarkand and Nižnij Novgorod to buy goods. Despite all this activity, Varvara suffers agonizingly from the excruciating boredom of the Serstobitovs' age-old way of life in Ural'sk. The Karev family and servants as well as Vit'ka are well aware of Varvara's passion for Nikita Karev, and are careful never to mention him in her presence. Vit'ka, however, had seen Varvara run away from Nikita after their last meeting during the "bagren'e" just before the war and was encouraged to pour out his heart to her. He tells her that she is wearing herself out in vain - it is not love which she has for Nikita, but envy, since he is different from all the others. She resents the fact that he could not care less for her, while the others all fawn at her feet. He tells her to give him up - with his music he is not even a real man, but a laughing stock for the true Cossacks. Varvara tells him that she would do anything for Nikita - Vit'ka is not worth his wornout boot. For nearly five years afterwards Varvara grieves her mother by refusing all suitors, but then in 1918 she becomes gayer and gayer, the more critical the situation in besieged Ural'sk becomes. Varvara foresaw that Nikita would return to Ural'sk, and finally meets him by chance in the street. She is wild with joy at the affection which he shows for her when he tells her that he plans to stay in Ural'sk for a long time - even if the town is occupied by the Reds.
Soon the Whites are forced by the Red advance to evacuate Ural'sk and withdraw into the steppes beyond the Ural River, and in an ornamental setpiece the preparations of the Šerstobitovs for departure with a line of carts and camels are described. When Varvara's mother tells her to get dressed to leave, Varvara announces that she is remaining in Ural'sk. Her mother collapses and dies almost immediately, while her father loses all self-control, screaming at his servants to leave nothing to the "dogs", and to tie his dead wife up in a sheet and put her in the cart.

Nikita walks around the garden of the Karev house in Ural'sk, which evokes in him memories of his childhood and especially of his desperation at being unable to express his emotions by playing the violin. He realizes how vitally important to him have been his frequent desperation and misfortunes. In Nikita childhood memories and a growing excitement fuse into an ecstatic new sensation that he possesses the power to express his feelings. The sound of the trees in the wind seems to him an exquisitely harmonious symphony played with overwhelming clarity of sound by hundreds of orchestras. Nikita has a vision of conducting an orchestra in a columned hall: suddenly he cries "Fire!" and the thousands in the audience rush for the exits. He is suddenly brought back to reality when he runs into a branch. Nikita feels that he holds in his hands a "grain" of music which enables him to embrace with joy the entire world. It was in this mood of insane bliss that he had met Varvara Mixajlovna. Nikita is convinced that it is here at home that he will complete his symphony: his homeland is the source of his inspiration, and he feels a duty to reward
it for its generosity. He has an intense consciousness of the continuity through successive generations of human culture, which he believes to originate in such tiny places as Ural'sk. Nikita finds the process of composing to lie in the painstaking selection of accumulated impressions. He has a burst of creative activity, but as winter approaches with its snowstorms, a growing sense of uneasiness makes itself felt in the town, and he gradually loses the keenness of his ear, surrounded by a dull noise in which all other sounds are submerged. Artillery fire can be heard in the distance and the Cossacks hastily prepare to evacuate Ural'sk; at the same time Nikita's deafness worsens and he is overcome by a feeling of sickness. Nikita believes he can hear again the groaning in the Smurskij Pereulok during the pogrom, from which he had taken refuge in his "little world", his "speck of dust." He tries again to escape into his "speck of dust," but the groans deafen him, and he succumbs to a benumbed stupor in which he has a nightmare involving his old music teacher Gol'dman. Nikita wakes up to the sound of nearby artillery fire as the cook comes in to tell him that the family is ready to leave. He decides impulsively that he can no longer remain in his state of "deafness", and departs with the others, leaving a note telling Rostislav that all are well.

Varvara Mixajlovna has sat for days by the window as if paralyzed. After Vit'ka Čuprykov tells her that the Cossacks have withdrawn and the Reds are occupying the town, she orders him to find out whether Nikita has remained in Ural'sk. With restrained frenzy she hears the news of Nikita's departure. Dazed, she watches the Red soldiers enter the
courtyard and begin plundering the storehouses under the direction of Vit'ka. When Vit'ka enters her room, she curses him contemptuously, but to his joy accepts his argument that she must leave at once and go further into the steppes, saying resignedly that there is nothing for it - "I am also with them!" A short setpiece is devoted to the occupation of Ural'sk by the joyful Red troops after the hardships of the campaign: the smoke curling from the chimneys symbolizes the replacement of the machine of war by the machine of peace and repose. Shortly before dawn the town is reconquered by the Cossacks, only to be reoccupied by noon after a counterattack by the Reds. Hearing that the Reds have been decisively defeated, the refugees settle down at a Cossack post not far from the town, but at dusk flee with desperate speed on hearing of the Whites' final rebuff. Trudging through the snow, Nikita reaches the first farmhouse after the post, but there is no news of his father, and he turns back to the post. He is overwhelmed at first by indignant suspicions that his father had deliberately misled and abandoned him, but then succumbs to a mood of complete apathy and indifference. Nikita feels that his flight was senseless and convinces himself that the crowds of refugees, desperately attempting to save their possessions, with whom his own father had fled, were just the same as the ruffians of his childhood pogrom, the dreadful groaning of which had driven him to leave Ural'sk. On arriving back at the post, he finds it full of exhausted Cossack soldiers. His father's name no longer evokes respect, and a Cossack who recognizes him treats him with affectionate contempt. At night Nikita is thrown out of the house by a Cossack and sets off again back to Ural'sk. He is
conscious of having lost all selfpossession and is convinced of his own utter worthlessness. Completely exhausted, he reaches the bank of the Ural river on the outskirts of Ural' sk and goes toward a fishing hut on the ice with the aim of taking refuge. To his amazement he finds Evgraf fishing in the hut. Evgraf reproaches Nikita for leaving Ural' sk with his father and finally brings himself to tell him that Rostislav had been killed by the White Cossacks. On Rostislav's instructions, Evgraf had spent the night in the Karevs' house; when Rostislav had arrived the following morning the Cossacks were already reoccupying the town and he had had to escape from the house at the last minute. White cavalry noticed him riding off and shot him dead, later mutilating his corpse. Despite Evgraf's frantic warnings that he will be killed, Nikita goes back into Ural' sk to his father's house. In Rostislav's room he finds a note written by Rostislav on the back of the message which he had left for him: it concludes with the words "I don't burn in fire and don't drown in water."

Outside the house Nikita notices that the old street sign - Atamanskaja Ulica - had been crudely overpainted with the new name - "Ulica tovarišča Kareva." Suddenly Nikita feels himself filled with new life and strength, and his hearing and ear for music are restored to him. With a secret enthusiasm he experiences "the first desperate bitterness of loss and the first timid gladness of the gaining of loss."

Šering, appointed to command a river flotilla on the Kama, nominates Rodion Čorbov as commissar of the flotilla. Rodion is filled with joy, for it had always been his ambition to serve under Šering. In his
dreams he has a frequent vision of flying with Šering high above docks full of shipping, and often recalls his being interrogated ten years before in exile after helping Šering make a successful escape, and refusing to give information to the investigator. Rodion would gladly die for Šering, who represents for him the ideal of a Bolshevik revolutionary. Now, together in the flagship - a converted tug - Šering tells Rodion of his plans to attack the Whites in the rear and break through their front. Rodion is disconcerted and fascinated by Šering's efficient secretary, who looks at him as if at a void. Šering tells him that Čuprykov, serving in the ship as commissary after service as a volunteer in the Red Army, had introduced him to the secretary, who turns out to be Varvara Mixajlovna Šerstobitova. Šering justifies the employment of the merchant's daughter by her value as a worker and the impossibility of any underhand action in the confined environment of the ship. Varvara Mixajlovna's superb effortless efficiency and untirability despite the night watches and ceaseless danger irritate Rodion - he is exacerbated by what he sees as her constant endeavour to demonstrate her superiority over him, especially in education, about which he is acutely sensitive. Maddened by her ironic references to his unliterary dictation and her correction of his grammatical errors, yet strongly attracted to her, he is finally driven to refer to her relationship with Čuprykov, at which she bursts into laughter. Soon after he sees her laughing at a clowning sailor and immediately remembers that she was the girl in the white dress who had laughed at him many years before when he had worked as a shipping agent's boy. He now realizes that the origins of his hatred for her lay in the insult and pain which she had caused him then.
The river flotilla is forced to withdraw, since the Whites in their retreat have set burning hulks and blazing oil floating downstream. When the Red ships are bombarded by a shore battery lying in ambush a shell hits the bridge and Serling is thrown into the water. Rodion dives and rescues him, while Varvara Mixajlovna shows terror at the danger which he runs. The same day Uprykov is accused of stealing food from the ship's store, and Varvara Mixajlovna begs Rodion not to punish him too severely. When Rodion asks what Uprykov is to her, she implies that he had saved her life. She tells Rodion that she will answer for Uprykov, and then tells him that he - Rodion - will answer for her. Rodion hates her for making use of her physical attraction to win him over and longs to destroy her charms, but when she whispers endearments in his ear he yields to the love which underlies his hatred and seizes her in his arms.

The next section of the novel, "The Concert," begins with a presentation of "half abandoned and dilapidated Petrograd": the city is generous to the unpractical and the eccentric, including those such as Nikita Karev who are possessed by music and for whom music has replaced everything that they have lost. Nikita, who as yet has produced nothing, sometimes feels doomed - he is spoken of as one whom selfdissatisfaction dooms to sterility. Nikita waits for minor unexpected events which he believes to be psychologically vital for him - without such events he is unable to work. For a moment in winter he feels joy at the sight of the gilded lions of the Bank Bridge over the Ekaterininskij Canal gleaming in the sun against the snow, but then the realization that he has no one in the whole world with whom to share his feelings causes him acute pain.
Anna's death, of which he had heard a year before, had deprived him of the one person who had understood him and given him the power to compose. He had been able to return to his "speck of dust" and work on his symphony in Ural'sk after the Reds' victory two years before, when he had felt that his guilt toward Rostislav had been expiated, but Anna's death had destroyed his peace. In spring, Nikita attends a concert given for trade union members and at first is repelled by the indifference of the audience. However, he notices the excitement of two sailors during a performance of Wagner's Rienzi overture, and is deeply moved. Leaving the concert, he runs into Irina, who reproaches him for becoming a mummy in the palace in which he is living.

Irina tells him that everyone is waiting for his symphony: Nikita contests this, but says that he had realized that day that nearly everyone understood music. He must finish his symphony soon, since he has no right to be silent if he has something to say, and is obliged to give all those people what he possesses.

Irina reminds Nikita of Anna, and he tells her that although that day he had again understood that composing was worthwhile, he sometimes wondered who needed it at that moment. Implying that he often lacks faith in himself, he tells Irina that he needs something - perhaps warmth - to arouse his faith to action. Without naming her, he tells Irina about Anna: when he had lost all self-confidence, she had restored to him faith in himself and enabled him to overcome his mistakes and failures. Although he had worked well during the war, which had even helped him greatly, he had always looked forward to her approbation, since music
was the fruit of everything, and yet only a part. When Nikita tells her that this person was a woman, and that Irina is terribly like her, Irina is clearly offended and tells him that he needs not to excite pity, but to be strong. Nikita says that he has learned to value losses, since without them he could not be what he ought to be. Nevertheless, he needs gladness, sympathy and love to give him the conviction that he and his work are necessary. Irina tells him that he ought to demand such affection; suggesting that she loves him herself, she tells him that if he had really been looking for what he needed, he would have found it long before. Nikita is reminded even more vividly of Anna. Irina tells him that achievement is the most pleasant thing in life, and that she can help him, since she is strong. After telling him that she had realized what he lacked, she laughs at him and says that she will wait for him to visit her soon. Nikita feels joyful and rejuvenated. Arriving home, he begins to scrape the putty from the winter window frame.

Matvej Karev returns home depressed and finds that his daughter Irina is out with Nikita and that his wife has guests. He is angry at the intimacy between Nikita and Irina and at his wife's artistic pretensions: it is time that he told his wife the truth - in reality, she has no theatrical talent at all and she is wrong to think that she had ruined her future for his sake. Resenting Irina's absence, Matvej feels miserably lonely, abandoned and dying. He has begun to detest Nikita for possibly arousing new feelings in Irina, when he is her uncle and old enough to be her father, and decides to tell Nikita without mincing words what he thinks of his behaviour. Matvej thinks back to Nikita's
first major concert, when his symphony received its first performance. With malicious pleasure Matvej had originally decided that the symphony would be a failure and was concerned for the good name of the Karev family, but as the performance continues he becomes increasingly enthusiastic and finds the work to be truly Russian music. Deeply moved, he feels that this is the happiest moment of his life, and goes behind the platform to congratulate his brother. Soon after Irina has also come up to Nikita, Varvara Mixajlovna arrives to congratulate him and tells him that she has forgiven him for deceiving her in Ural'sk. For the sake of his music, she says, she is ready to accept any humiliation. Varvara Mixajlovna introduces Nikita to her husband Rodion, and Nikita remembers having seen Rodion in the street. Matvej invites Nikita to celebrate at his apartment, but his tiredness and depression return when Nikita explains that he must meet some colleagues, and Irina tells her father reproachfully that he should understand that Nikita is busy. On his way out of the concert-hall Nikita is filled with joy at seeing his old violin teacher, Jakov Gol'dman, and his bookbinder father, who have come to congratulate him. Jakov Moiseevič plays the piano in a cinema, but, as he tells Nikita, he is completely happy - he has done his work. Old Gol'dman promises to bind the score of the symphony for Nikita. Karev feels how he loves the Gol'dmans, and together with them all people and the whole marvellous world. At home, Matvej tries to console Irina, who is sitting miserably, but Irina refuses to tell him the cause of her grief. After she goes out of the room covering her face, Matvej bitterly regrets having kissed Nikita after the concert
and decides it is high time to have it out with his brother and put him in his place.

In Petrograd, Rodion and Varvara Mixajlovna quarrel over their two-year-old daughter Lenka: Rodion protests at her telling the little girl fairy stories instead of creating healthy natural conditions for her growth, saying that they had not made the revolution in order to tell fairy stories. Varvara Mixajlovna sarcastically asks Rodion what he would advise her to tell Lenka, and when he retorts that it is up to her to think up something since she is more learned, Varvara Mixajlovna calls him a healthy mužik who is just pretending to dislike fairy tales - mocking his ideology, she tells him that he has spoiled himself with all kinds of booklets. Varvara exclaims how bored she is with him: she is tired of his incessant mouthing of Bolshevik catchwords, which does not suit him at all. Rodion locks himself up in his room. He seeks to find order and causality in the world, such as there is with ship repairing in a yard, where Rodion feels himself the master of his environment. Rodion fails agonizingly to understand people in the same way - to him everyone seems like the two halfwits Katerina and Lizaveta Ivanovna, who have come to symbolize for Rodion the way in which everyone is given to illusions and false idols. He remembers how three years before Šering had received the news of his marriage to Varvara Mixajlovna with displeasure, calling her a "foolish woman."

After his move to Petrograd, Rodion becomes increasingly aware of the gulf between him and his wife - she cares nothing for his work, and he sees in her a similarity with Katerina and Lizaveta Ivanovna.
He recollects how, trying to extract from her a confession of her unfaithfulness, he had recently betrayed to her his jealousy over Nikita Karev. She had skilfully mocked his "reactionary" sentiments, and then told him that she loved Nikita: she had lived only with him, Rodion, but loved only Nikita. When Varvara Mixajlovna goes out soon after, he follows her in the hope of catching her with Nikita, and indeed she does meet him in the street. Rodion overhears Varvara asking who the "schoolgirl" had been that she had seen at the concert. Mockingly, she asks whether Nikita is really in love with Irina: his attachment is simply funny, since she herself has a little girl just like Irina - she would like to have another one with Nikita. She convinces herself that Nikita loves Irina, but tells him that she will wait for him, hoping that there will come a time when he realizes that he needs her alone. Nikita says that she ought to be happy with her husband, whom he likes very much. Varvara Mixajlovna suggests that Nikita means that she ought finally to leave him in peace, and then tells him that Rodion hates Nikita because of her love for him. At this moment Rodion comes between them, calls Nikita a "barčuk," and immediately turns and walks off.

Returning home, Rodion deals extremely efficiently with the paperwork which has accumulated and then studies textbooks. Impressed by his own self-control and the clarity of his mind, he goes to bed, but then realizes that he can remember nothing of what he had read and has lost a document which Šering had entrusted to him. The following morning Varvara leaves him, declining to attempt to justify herself. She has made arrangements for Lenka to be boarded out. Varvara tells Rodion
that she is not going to live with Nikita - he does not need her yet - but has simply decided to take a rest.

The biologist Arsenij Arsen'evič Bax is typical of the inhabitants of Vasil'evskij Ostrov after the Civil War - apparently the same as fifty years before and yet strangely changed - the people, like the streets, are majestic and naive. Admitting that they may be out of date, Bax has stopped writing articles, but gives lectures for schoolchildren and workers.

Bax buys shelving for his enormous book collection, but it proves impossible to pull the long supporting boards through the window of his apartment. One of the bystanders, who turns out to be Rodion Čorbov, offers to help, and later Bax rents him one of the rooms of his apartment. Their heated discussions result in the old professor and the former sailor becoming closely attached to each other. Rodion finds that his disputes with Bax distract him from his thoughts of Varvara Mixajlovna.

When Rodion accuses him of idealism, Bax retorts that he needs first to learn about idealism. Rodion replies that others have done this for him - their views are scientifically based. Bax tells Rodion that the vast library of human knowledge is a battlefield on which great thinkers tear one another apart - who is to choose between one philosophy and another? Bax claims that the greatest danger to thought is the habit of basing judgments on readymade conclusions. When Rodion retorts that this means a complete vacuum, Bax tells him that after the battle a certain indisputable extract of thought will remain. Unfortunately, the world does not bother to distil this extract but adopts whatever philosophy is the most convenient and advantageous for it at a given moment.
Although Rodion believes that the Bolsheviks are making a selection, in fact they are creating a new religion by making a fetish of science. Bax illustrates his thesis by citing an anecdotal experience which he had recently: a member of a workers' study circle had called him up to ask if the soul existed. Bax told him there was no soul, at which the man had rung off, completely satisfied. When Rodion expresses approval, Bax tells his friend that for a mass of people science was beginning to take the place of religion. Rodion's task should be to make men search for the truth by arousing in them uneasiness and doubt, which had always been the mainspring of human invention. Rodion retorts that it is not doubt that one needs to inculcate in oneself, but confidence. Bax, however, rejects any earthly paradise founded by assistant professors: even though his knowledge is such that he can construct for himself a completely harmonious corpus of belief, nevertheless there are moments when he crosses himself and tells himself that he understands nothing. Rodion bursts into laughter, calling Bax's attitudes "jurodstvo," and speaking of "Katerina Ivanovna in the Academy of Sciences." He tells Bax that with his knowledge he would feel himself a ruler over everything. Bax, however, holds that the Bolsheviks in undertaking the reconstruction of humanity have left out of consideration the vital factor of human weakness. When Rodion tells him that the Bolsheviks are building life, Bax rejoins that the great question is how to build life.

Later Bax tells Rodion how much he admires people like Rodion for their strength and directness. He himself sometimes would like to be transformed into a Bolshevik in order to feel their "physical faith,"
since he is convinced that they are called to create something vast and unprecedented. Nevertheless, in a long speech he tells Rodion that it is sad that his type of people are being driven out of life by the new man and are doomed to extinction: they had known how to feel and create the beautiful. Whereas they had carefully preserved a feeling for the past, the Bolsheviks are deliberately trying to extirpate it. People such as he are truly universal and eternal. The question is how to preserve and transmit their emotions faithfully to future generations.

As an instance of a successful attempt to achieve this, Bax cites Nikita Karev's symphony, but Rodion, furious at the mention of Karev, retorts that it is not "their music," but bad music.

Nikita Karev, overjoyed at the success of his symphony, goes to see Irina, but she receives him coldly and complains of his coming to see her three days after the concert. In asking him about the meetings which he had had Irina clearly betrays her jealousy of Varvara Mixajlovna. She asks him why he had lied to her in telling her earlier that "she" - his former love - had died - and then, learning that this was a different woman, she is even more deeply offended. Nikita attempts to explain to Irina about Varvara Mixajlovna, telling her that although they are connected by his childhood attachment to her, now she repels him. He speaks of her "pursuing" him because of her strange belief that she is destined for him. Nikita says that he has given her no grounds to act in this way, and when Irina reproaches him for having spoken of his loneliness and making her believe that he needed her support, he tells her that he owes to her all his work and all his success. Irina, however, protests.
at his everlasting harping on his work - she objects to being only a "means," something needed only for his symphonies. Nikita rushes towards her to implore her, but at this moment Matvej Karev enters - it is clear that he is deeply offended by the scene which he has witnessed.

At the beginning of the final section of the novel, entitled "Losses," Rodion Gorbov thinks agonizingly of Šering's death in an attempt to discover a culprit. He remembers Šering's 18-year-old son, whom Šering had called a "blockhead," yet wanted to see just before his death. The boy had told his father that the Bolsheviks of his father's generation were out of date and becoming museum exhibits: whereas they had constantly blabbered about revolutionary ethics and the traditions of the old guard, without having any professional education at all, the new practical generation wanted to become specialists and to learn how to work. It was for them to build the life described in the old Bolsheviks' books.

Rodion decides that if Šering's son was guilty of his death, then he was also guilty, since he had taken no concern in Šering's personal life. Thinking of Matvej Karev, who had failed to save Šering, Rodion is reminded of Varvara Mixajlovna's appearance at the Karevs', and decides that Nikita and Varvara had arranged to meet there. As Rodion thinks confusedly of his enemy Nikita, he hears a knock: it is Irina, who is amazed to see Rodion. She had come to find out from Bax where Rodion lived. In great embarrassment Irina tells him that she wants to talk about his wife, and despite Rodion's retort that that is his personal affair, she asks him whether his wife had left him. At
first Rodion believes that Nikita had sent her, and eventually betrays to Irina that Varvara has left him and that he believes Nikita has deceived him. Rodion and Irina soon become allies in their desire to convince themselves that they have been betrayed by Nikita and Varvara, who had obviously agreed to meet at the Karevs'. When Rodion tells Irina that evidently she must love Nikita very much, she denies it energetically, but goes on to exclaim that she will not let Nikita deceive her by having any women friends. Irina is made happy by Rodion's view that the most repulsive thing is all the deception and lying. Rodion sees Irina off, telling her that he is angry with her father for not saving Šering. Her conversation with Rodion has strengthened her in her decision to break with Nikita, and when returning home she sees him coming out of the Karevs' house, she cuts him dead.

Vit'ka Čuprykov comes to visit Varvara Maxajlovna in the hope of obtaining something from her through Rodion, but he gives up the attempt, noticing how poorly she lives and assuming that Rodion has abandoned her. With his customary selfabasement Vit'ka finds out that she is still in love with the now famous Nikita Karev, and telling her that he will do anything for her he offers to enable her to settle scores with him. He claims that he has Nikita in his power and can bring him to Varvara's feet at once if he wishes. Varvara Maxajlovna drives him out, but in the course of the conversation Vit'ka has given her Nikita's address, and she decides instantly to go to see him. A long setpiece is devoted to Varvara's joyful preparations, "a holy rite," for the visit - she goes to enormous lengths to make herself as
attractive as possible. Nikita has chosen his room in a palace in order to lead as secluded a life as possible, but he feels intensely lonely and depressed. He has been completely unable to work, and realizes that he needs somebody with whom to share his life, but he does not have the strength to undertake the struggle to achieve the right, since all his efforts are expended on his music - the only thing which gives significance to his existence.

Nikita sees Irina clearly as Anna's successor, and is confident that he would be able to win her back, but he lacks the willpower to undertake explanations with Matvej and Irina. Nikita then has a vision of Varvara Mixajlovna and thinks he hears her voice - suddenly he realizes that Varvara herself is standing in the room. Nikita tells her that he had been waiting for her, but goes on to say that he missed Irina. Varvara cannot conceal her malicious pleasure over the quarrel between Nikita and her rival. Nikita tells Varvara that he had been thinking of her during the last few days - every time after meeting her he understands everything differently. He now realized that she was right when she spoke of Nikita's true feelings. When Varvara says "If only you would carry out your feelings in action," Nikita replies that music is feminine and passive. Varvara asks him whether he will ever finally give up his music, by which he is possessed. Varvara's preparations, however, have their effect, and, overcome by her attractiveness, Nikita kneels at her feet and kisses her. Varvara tells him, "Karev! You have never been like this!"
The next chapter is devoted entirely to a highly technical article by a composer, Ju. A. Ṣaporin, on Nikita Karev's symphony. Ṣaporin writes that Karev's symphony was the first major production by a contemporary composer since the revolution. The dramatic collision, possessing a truly tragic quality, in the first part of the symphony showed the impact on the music of the breakup of the social and the personal. He praises the symphony highly, calling it a "symphonic novel" which records everything great that the revolution has brought. Ṣaporin emphasizes the clarity and convincing sincerity of the work, and claims that the composer has perceived the lofty significance of the events taking place and has reflected them creatively. In its combination of Western polyphony with the Russian song element characteristic of his work, Karev's symphony remains deeply national and shows the path which the future development of Russian music must take.

Vasil' Leont'ič Karev, now ill and emaciated, crushed by the loss of his wife and Rostislav, makes his way to Petrograd to live with his son Matvej. Evgraf and he become greatly attached to each other, and in their conversations Vasil' Leont'ič condemns the frantic haste which now possesses everybody, while he himself is oppressed by the deathlike silence surrounding him.

Irina has fallen in love with Rodion Čorbov, and leaving her father she goes with Rodion to his new assignment at Poti on the Black Sea. Irina's new love is presented in a setpiece devoted to a storm at sea which Rodion and she experience on their way. The last few months since she met Rodion seem to Irina to have been like a storm.
Now the only happiness she can imagine is that of being together with Rodion, with whom she feels completely safe. It is precisely his lack of education and his homeliness which attract her.

Matvej can do nothing for Vasil' Leont'iev and the old man dies soon after finally taking to his bed. Just before his death Nikita arrives and Matvej bitterly accuses him of turning Irina's head. Holding him guilty of Irina's disappearance, he calls him a scoundrel. Nikita, conscious of the hideousness of this scene beside their father's deathbed, tells him he is mistaken and that he is ready to forgive him, but Matvej disowns his brother and tells him to leave.

Nikita goes home to Varvara Mixajlovna in his freezing room. Varvara laughs when Nikita tells her of his brother's behaviour, amused that Nikita should pay for Rodion's sins. Nikita is offended by Varvara's indifference to his father's death and her laughter at this moment, and tries to go, but Varvara keeps him, telling him that he had come expecting from her sympathy, which he had begun to regard as his right. Varvara says that he was guilty of her mother's death, since it had been the result of her staying in Ural'sk for Nikita's sake. Varvara objects to Nikita's thinking only of himself - he expects his life to be the most important thing for her and considers her only a servant and a convenience. She finds her secondary importance in his life to be insulting - he lives only for music, which has become a mania with him, leaving nothing for life and life with her. It makes no difference to Nikita who lives with him, the important thing is that his second life should make his first life, his main life, easier - whereas
she has but the one life. Varvara tells him bitterly that she will never forget that Nikita had been a sop thrown to her by Irina - he had come to her only after Irina had rejected him and he had nowhere else to go.

She has now achieved her aim, for she is going to have a baby by Nikita and no longer needs Karev, who has lost all the charm of inaccessibility. Nikita flares up for a moment at her not having told him earlier about her pregnancy, but soon cools in his misery and Varvara disappointedly taunts him with his incapacity for anger - Nikita, she says, is too clever and virtuous for that.

Varvara tells Nikita about a woman with a briefcase under one arm and a baby under the other, whom she had seen near the Smol'nyj Institute. She believes that she could do the same. Telling Nikita that she is sick of virtue, she says that she feels that their relationship cannot continue much longer.

Nikita goes out and walks aimlessly about the city. He feels he is wandering in a desert, enveloped by soundlessness. At dawn, hearing a bird fly overhead, he is reminded of his childhood feeling in the steppe of mystical union with the world and of his last happy summer in Ural'sk. With a bitter smile Nikita counts all the losses he had suffered during the night and realizes that he has not a single living soul in the whole world. Suddenly Nikita catches sight of a poster advertising a performance of his symphony. Nikita accepts that his music may be his lot for the rest of his life. While he feels that the world rejected him in order to accept him, and enriched one of his destinies with the experience of unhappiness and losses in another, his hearing and vitality return to him.
At the beginning of the novel the reader is introduced to the Soviet hero, Ivan Rogov, who is travelling in Norway. Rogov stays at a luxurious hotel in Stalhem where he meets an elegant young Dutch girl, Helena van Rossum. The Russian is greatly struck by this chance encounter, since, as we learn later, Rogov knows Helena's uncle, Frans van Rossum, from Leningrad, and the latter had offered to arrange for Rogov to visit Holland, should he wish it. A significant episode occurs in which a boy nearly falls to his death while retrieving Helena's handbag from a precipice - for which he receives a tip of one dollar.

Chapter III begins with an ornamental setpiece devoted to the fish market at Bergen. The drunken driver Nielsen makes an appearance, during which he displays his characteristic gallows humour. Nielsen meets Rogov, and is amazed and delighted to discover that he is a Soviet Russian and a journalist. A setpiece devoted to the German bridge in Bergen and the bloody history of the Hansa follows. After a vivid presentation of the savage battles between the Hansa employees and the Norwegians over the local women, Rogov's visit to the Hanseatic museum is described. Rogov feels a vivid sensation of the past and is
intensely happy at his new consciousness of unity with the entire world.

In the evening he again meets Nielsen, who tells him at length of his background - by origin he is a German who became a deserter through refusing to serve in the German Navy during the war. He is trying to find his archenemy, a man who had made a profitable business of selling deserters back to the German authorities. Nielsen naively tells Rogov of his interest in coming to the Soviet Union, where he believes he could become a rich man or a government minister.

In Chapter V the principal Western character, Philip van Rossum, is introduced in a scene in his office in Amsterdam, during which he patronizes his chauffeur, Willem. In a series of flashbacks during a car ride from Amsterdam to Harlem Philip recollects his delightful childhood in Harlem, and then a disastrous episode when three of the van Rossums' ships had sunk in the Bay of Biscay during the war. The van Rossums' mercenariness and hypocrisy are suggested by their incidental tribute to the dead seamen after a lengthy discussion of how the firm will gain financially from the insurance payments on the lost ships.

Philip visits his elder brother Lodevijk, the head of the firm, in his home in Harlem: the house impresses with its ordered comfort and traditional elegance. Lodevijk's dovecot and grandfather clock are to become symbols of the continuity and stability of the van Rossum family. In the course of a business discussion with Lodevijk, Philip expresses his fears for the future of the van Rossums' lumbering concession in the Soviet Union: it becomes clear that Lodevijk is strongly
opposed to the Soviet regime, whereas Philip is sympathetic toward the Bolsheviks. Their younger brother Frans, who is managing the Soviet concession, has the impression that the Soviet side desires to put an end to the agreement. Consequently Philip proposes that the van Rossums now undertake surveys in remote regions with the aim of obtaining the right to exploit limited areas, in order to avoid the term "concession". Philip van Rossum travels to the Hague in order to arrange the issue of a visa for Rogov with an official of the ministry of foreign affairs. His love for the Hague is expressed in an interior monologue setpiece in which the city is compared to a museum. This is followed by a set-piece devoted to the stream of cyclists. In an ironic scene, Philip obtains from an unwilling official permission for Rogov to enter Holland. Arriving in Rotterdam, van Rossum is approached by an unemployed seaman, Bryver, who begs him for money. Van Rossum offers him work, and Bryver buys himself a rubber eraser which he uses to repair his worn-out shoe.

Chapter VIII contains the most significant setpiece in the novel, devoted to the Rotterdam Stock Exchange, in which the various types of dealers are seen as reptiles of differing species, distinguished by their physical characteristics and activities.

Philip van Rossum meets Justus Eldering-Ghyser, a director of Royal Dutch Shell - a member of the Exchange's most highly developed species - and they agree to negotiate on the sale of timber for new warehouses. At lunch van Rossum and Eldering-Ghyser discuss the importation of timber from the Soviet Union, which leads to Eldering-Ghyser's attacking van Rossum for his pro-Soviet views. Referring to
the van Rossums' doubtful financial situation as a result of the market's being flooded with timber, Eldering-Ghyser hints threateningly that he will ensure that the van Rossums' bank credit is cut off unless they agree to buy a substantial amount of the stock of Royal Dutch Shell.

Finally Eldering-Ghyser bursts out into an anti-Soviet tirade, calling van Rossum a madman for investing capital in a country which is interested only in wrecking the economic life of Europe by dumping its exports.

The scene then shifts to Germany and the unemployed boilerman, Rudolf Quast. In order to keep himself from starvation, Quast takes a job as a picket, holding a placard calling for a boycott of Soviet goods, in front of a dairy which has been selling cheap Soviet butter and eggs. A column of unemployed demonstrators demanding work passes the store, and the leaders take the placard from Quast and tear it apart. At the same time Maria Krieg - the sister of Philip van Rossum - who is married to the director of an engineering firm in the town, complains of the appalling boredom and the ingratitude of the unemployed.

Philip van Rossum continues his conversation with Eldering-Ghyser. He maintains that Europe is too strong to be endangered by the Soviet Union. Van Rossum rejects the proposal to cooperate with Royal Dutch Shell on the grounds that their widely differing interests dictate their taking different paths.

On his return to Amsterdam Philip finds a telegram from Frans van Rossum in the Soviet Union proposing that the concession contract be annulled by mutual agreement and that the firm continue to operate
only as a broker. Philip, however, wires back insisting that the concession contract be maintained. Then Philip reads a second telegram which had arrived for him - Helena van Rossum had suddenly died of typhoid during a cruise in the Far East. Overcome by the news, van Rossum has the seaman Bryver, who had come to see him in consequence of his promise to give him work, thrown out of his office.

Chapter XI is entirely devoted to the oil king, Eldering-Ghyser. The chapter begins with a hyperbolistic setpiece on the subject of the magnate's Rolls-Royce, one of the contemporary wonders of Europe. While on his way to London, Eldering-Ghyser passes through Brabant, and a passing truck belonging to Royal Dutch Shell throws some mud into his eye. His eye closes up, and Eldering-Ghyser is obliged to spend the night in Vlissingen under the care of a Belgian eye specialist. The oil king decides to summon a business consultant and a secretary, and it becomes clear that Shell is selling the stock of a competitor in the oil business in order to induce it to amalgamate with Shell. Eldering-Ghyser tells the consultant to explain to the company that Shell's purchases of Soviet oil have been effected solely with the aim of removing this oil from the market and thus improving the market position of other companies. This is the only reason for Shell's dealings with Soviet oil, which Shell holds to be stolen oil. Eldering-Ghyser has taken the opportunity of buying up great quantities of the stock of the oil companies with interests in Russian oil, so that in practice he himself is now the owner of the oil. Eldering-Ghyser then takes a decision not to charter any more of the van Rossums' ships, and
immediately afterwards sends a telegram of Christian commiseration to Philip van Rossum on account of Helena's sudden death. Remembering the number of the truck which had splashed the mud in his eye, he gives orders for the driver to be fired for careless driving.

Rogov meanwhile, on his way to Holland, studies the section on Holland in the book by the eighteenth-century Abbé de la Porte on his world travels, "Le voyageur français, ou la connaissance de l'ancien et du nouveau monde": long passages are quoted on Holland's past commercial grandeur. Rogov feels like an eternal wanderer in the infiniteness of space and time. It is evident that his principal purpose in going to Holland is to find Helena, in whom he sees the unknown mistress he constantly seeks. Later Rogov demonstratively leaves the ship's saloon while the passengers are listening reverentially to a broadcast mass.

The degradation of the unemployed Rudolf Quast becomes even more acute. While rowing a young couple on the river, he throws himself on the remains of their food like an animal and slinks off without a tip. Quast then hires himself out for potato salad and beer as a "living example" of the suffering caused through unemployment, but the bar where the meeting takes place is raided by Brownshirts. Quast just manages to make his escape, and after a long terrified flight eventually reaches his room, where he gasses himself more as a result of inertia than a conscious attempt to commit suicide.
In Amsterdam Rogov meets Philip van Rossum, who receives him very cordially and maintains that essentially nothing has changed since the revolution. Philip tells Rogov of his daughter Helena's death, and Rogov realizes that it is she whom he had met in Norway. Later Rogov watches the impressive ceremony of Helena's coffin being brought on shore from the ship and feels certain that there had been no purpose in his coming to Amsterdam.

Philip shows Rogov around the Rijksmuseum, and the Russian turns the conversation from the revolutionary art of El Greco to the effects of the economic crisis on the countries of Western Europe. Whereas Philip maintains that Europe is an infinitely complicated organism within which one country may be able to develop an antidote against another's economic poison, Rogov holds that there is no difference between the big and the small countries, illustrating his thesis by the drive for re-armament which he finds throughout Europe. Philip's remarks to Rogov and his watching her during a conversation with Maria convey his interest in his nephew's Russian wife, Klavdija Andreevna. A major setpiece is devoted to a cruise through the Amsterdam canals by Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna during which they pass through the appalling slums, described in intricate, horrifying detail. After a conversation in a liqueur bar and a visit to the Jewish quarter, the two Russians walk through the Jewish market. The descriptions of children dancing to a barrel-organ and of the desperate cries of the street vendors constitute two minor setpieces.
As they leave the market, Rogov takes Klavdija Andreevna's hand and the contact gives rise to an overpowering sensation that he has at last found the person he has been seeking all his life. Klavdija declines his invitation to come up to his room, but they part jokingly. Philip plans to take Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna on a trip to Leiden in his Mercedes, but Philip's chauffeur Willem suddenly goes on strike without warning in the centre of Amsterdam in solidarity with a cab-drivers' strike, so that Philip beside himself with fury, is forced to drive himself. Klavdija Andreevna laughs at Philip, but, to Rogov's irritation, sympathizes with him, holding Willem's behaviour to be inexcusable. Klavdija defends the van Rossums, but is bitterly offended at being called a "foreigner" by Rogov. Finally she offers to tell him the story of her life.

Philip is jealous of Rogov, who is clearly exploiting the opportunity for a tête-à-tête with Klavdija, but then is elated to find that the two are clearly annoyed with each other. He tells them spiritedly about the history of Leiden, on which he is an expert.

On his arrival home, Philip finds Maria Krieg and is forced to listen to a lecture on the teachings of the philosopher Rudolf Holzapfel. She attacks Bolshevism, accusing Klavdija Andreevna, so that Philip is forced to defend her. Intending to invite Klavdija for an evening walk, for a moment he almost succumbs to the temptation to rush into her room and make love to her. In the evening Philip tells Klavdija enthusiastically about Amsterdam's pre-eminence as a jewel-cutting centre. He takes her into a famous jeweller's and insists that she put on a
diamond ring: she feels increasingly strange, and then, as she gazes at a magnificent necklace, suddenly faints. On coming to herself, she returns the ring. When she goes off to her room on their arrival home, Philip decides to pay a visit to a woman whom he maintains in Amsterdam.

Meanwhile Rogov is suffering agonies from his lame leg. Originally he had been wounded at Pulkovo in 1919, but his recovery had been complete, and he had become a first-rate journalist. Five years later, however, he began to feel the pain in his leg, which still recurred at intervals. Rogov recollects his conversation in Leiden with Klavdija Andreevna. After failing to get into an institute she had taken advantage of her summer home's being near the Finnish border to flee abroad. Klavdija complains of the greyness and boredom of Soviet life, and when Rogov accuses her of becoming a traitor tells him that she finds it impossible to consider herself a criminal. Rogov, saying that their way of life will soon change unrecognizably, calls her the perfect example of an émigrée. After leaving Finland, Klavdija had begun to work as a dancer in a nightclub in Riga, where she met Frans van Rossum. In his hotel, recollecting this conversation, Rogov sees Klavdija as Helena, whom he had hoped to meet again after leaving Norway. The following morning his pain returns and he calls up Klavdija Andreevna, but, as before, she declines to come to his room.

Amsterdam at night is the subject of a major setpiece, divided into two sections: the movements of policemen in pairs about the streets, and the prostitutes in the windows of the brothel quarter. Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna meet by chance as he is about to go into a bar, and
Klavdija tells him how Philip van Rossum had brought her again the diamond ring which they had seen in the jeweller's, and then tried to make advances to her, so that she had thrown him out of her room. Rogov tells her that she could be quite different if she wanted - with the van Rossums she must inevitably feel like an outsider. When Rogov says that it is time that he left Amsterdam, Klavdija exclaims that she will go with him. Nevertheless, she has misgivings that with Rogov happiness would be oppressive, while with Frans she always feels at ease. They kiss, and Rogov believes that he has found the reward of his expectations and searchings: for the second time, this time even more strongly, he feels a consciousness of belonging to the world and of unity with his physical environment.

In Germany, Dr. Krieg, the director of the MBV textile machinery plant, has arranged a meeting at his house between Herr Pieck and Herr Möse, the two largest shareholders, Philip van Rossum, who is staying with the Kriegs, and a Swiss engineer, Casty, who has just returned from Moscow. The textile industry is in a state of severe depression and several MBV customers have been declared bankrupt. In a long episode Krieg's guests, who also include the hunchbacked cripple Beckmann, a retired Army medical officer, reveal their attitudes and political opinions. Pieck is a former social-democrat who had supported the war and since grown fat as a stadtrat, oblivious of his socialist beliefs.

Philip van Rossum, sitting with the womenfolk, thinks of the previous winter, which had been a terrible period for the family
business: the timber market was contracting steadily and costs were rising on the Soviet concession. Moreover, Eldering-Ghyser had revenged himself on the van Rossums for trading with the Soviet Union by restricting credit. Philip thinks miserably of Klavdija Andreevna, who, he was sure, had gone off to the Soviet Union after Rogov. Philip arrives and joins the company of the men at the moment when Casty is telling the story of how in Moscow the horse had broken loose from the harness of the cab in which Casty was riding, to the driver's complete and witless desperation. Casty tells Krieg's guests that before the revolution there had been thousands of luxurious cabs in Moscow, and that this cab-driver is symbolic of modern Russia, since Soviet Russia now is becoming motorized. Casty speaks at length of his impressions of the Soviet Union. He believes that the Bolsheviks will succeed in industrializing their country, although the cost of training an industrial labour force is immense. At this stage, the Soviet Union needs Western technology, and sales prospects are good - he accepts that Western firms will be thrown out when the plan is completed. The fascist Møse finds that the Soviets are industrializing Russia with the aim of destroying the West and consequently the West should think first and foremost of defending itself. Casty maintains that they must make up their minds to trade with the Soviet Union, to which Møse retorts that trade would be a slow poison, since the Soviets will dump their products in Western markets. Møse calls Casty's policy suicidal and implies he is a Soviet agent.
Pieck agrees that the Soviet planned economy gives Russia enormous advantages in external trade, and proposes the creation of a centralized united Western agency for trade with the Soviet Union. Philip van Rossum, rejecting any political approach, finds profitability must be the sole criterion for trade, and looks forward to an economic policy which will return Russia to the family of European peoples. When Beckmann retorts that Europe ends where Poland begins, Philip maintains that trade with Russia is the only means of inducing her to renounce her madness and return to her old economic system. Philip freely discusses the contradictions of capitalism, giving as an example the operations of a London timber export bank - evidently that controlled by Eldering-Ghyser - but remains true to the free enterprise system.

Beckmann then begins to rage against parliamentarianism and its spirit of compromise: calling for a rejection of everything alien, he demands an economically autarkic state in which order can be restored. Tolerance and liberalism must be replaced by a sense of heroic duty toward the desecrated fatherland. The scene ends in uproar when a bankrupt industrialist, Ensait, who has also been present, lets in a huge dog and drives him to overwhelm the discussion with his barking: however, no sooner has Philip van Rossum thrown Ensait out, than Beckmann bursts a blood vessel and starts to cough up blood.

Lodevijk is dying of cancer and Philip goes to see him for the last time before leaving for Russia. He finds Lodevijk's old friend, Captain Mees, cleaning the dovecot and winding up the grandfather clock. A strike has broken out on the Soviet concession and Philip is certain
that Frans is not acting correctly: the Bolsheviks must be reminded firmly of the agreement - infractions on the van Rossums' side can be countered with the Bolsheviks' own infractions. Lodevijk speaks of his wish to leave money to cancer research, and Philip is overcome by terror that he will take capital out of the business: he persuades Lodevijk to abandon his intention, and is afterwards intensely relieved to find that Lodevijk has not altered his will.

Philip sails for Soroka from Bergen on his new ship, renamed the "HELENA". A stowaway, who turns out to be Nielsen, is discovered and taken ashore. Soon afterwards Philip is infuriated by the sight of an officer striking a sailor for idleness, and complains to the master. The sailor turns out to be Bryver, whom Philip himself had added to the ship's crew. Then Bryver himself comes into the cabin, putting his hand into his trouser pocket. For an anguished moment van Rossum believes the sailor is about to shoot him, but Bryver's hand is empty except for a coin with which to pay back the loan van Rossum had made to him. Jokingly he asks Bryver when he will get the interest, and Bryver replies abruptly "Interest later!" The master wonders whether to have him discharged on shore, but Philip finds that he should be turned over to the Bolsheviks.

The action of the second book of the novel is set almost entirely in Soroka in the Pomor'e region. In a violent snowstorm - although it is June - the Soviet hero Sergeï is rowed down the river Vyg past the settlement itself and the lumber storage area, like a city of stacked lumber, to the port, where two huge lighters have run aground on rocks. Sergeï arrives at his office and discusses with the club director the reception
arranged for the visiting seamen. He learns that the ship which has just anchored is the "HELENA".

After a setpiece devoted to the amateur orchestra which greets the foreign crew, Sergeič gives a welcoming speech in which he tells the guests, who of course cannot understand a word, that they have stepped onto land which belongs to the workers and peasants, the motherland of all working people. Despite the severe life of the North and the remaining backwardness, he is sure that the visitors will be impressed by the socialist construction. When the interpreter temporarily disappears, Philip van Rossum offers to interpret. A seaman makes an impassioned speech in reply: the workers in his own country are always with their Soviet comrades in their thoughts and dreams.

The guests arrive at the club for a welcoming meal, and are greeted by the club director with a lengthy speech in which he stresses the educational significance of clubs in the Soviet Union and claims that half the Soviet revolution would never have taken place had they not organized clubs from the very beginning. Philip van Rossum introduces himself to Sergeič, and, judging him to be a hunter, tells him of his love of shooting. In the club an orchestra of balalaikas, mandolins and guitars is playing, and a setpiece is devoted to the perpetual comic struggle of the various instruments for supremacy. During the meal, Bryver makes a speech and Philip van Rossum translates after offering to take over from the official interpreter. Bryver tells the hosts that whereas they had thought all those present to be their class brothers, in fact amongst them there is a capitalist and exploiter who is making profits out of
their labour. They had made a revolution in order to rid themselves of exploiters, but now this predator is sucking them dry - "our enemy is amongst us!" Philip wants to answer him, but Sergeič himself replies, calling for understanding and not emotion. Soviet workers know to whom they are selling, but in order to build a socialist society machines and technology are needed. Philip leaves before the end of Sergeič's speech.

Looking around Soroka, Philip wonders what binds him to Russia, and decides that the Dutch had always been, and would remain, the teachers of the Russians. Nevertheless, he is impressed by the self-assurance of the young Russians. After watching the hosts dancing with their foreign guests, he tours the club building and is surprised to find a room full of chess-players and the most unlikely looking people reading in the library. Meanwhile an indignant Bryver is being interrogated by a GPU officer about his relations with van Rossum.

At a conference in Sergeič's office the serious shortage of labour and the slowness with which the ships are loaded are discussed. The enthusiastic young Komsomol Volodja Gluškov calls for the construction of a proper port with mechanized loading, but Sergeič terms Gluškov's proposal a five-year plan and asks for practical suggestions. The frame-saw operator Ermolaj proposes a voluntary Komsomol subbotnik for loading timber on the lighters, and Sergeič gladly accepts his suggestion, saying that such collective aid is their great advantage over the bourgeois system, under which each thinks only of himself. Ermolaj reproaches Sergeič for snubbing Gluškov, since it is vital to plan projects for the future, such as replacing the obsolete sawmill with
an integrated wood-processing plant. Sergeič, however, stresses that it is impossible to reconstruct every branch of industry simultaneously, and the lumber industry is a well from which the entire Five-Year Plan draws power.

Philip van Rossum is given a room in the house of the old peasant woman Anfisa Petrovna, whose three sons are all Communists. She tells him colourfully about her youthful experiences on a fishing boat and how local women had been attacked by bears. Philip enjoys the humble simplicity of life in the old woman's house and falls asleep, happily thinking of his childhood in Harlem.

The following day Philip Goes to see the biggest sawmill in Soroka. On the way he discusses the subbotnik with Anfisa Petrovna's lively granddaughter Şura: she refuses to accept that the subbotnik is obligatory and refers to the unemployment in Western Europe. Philip thinks of his love for wood - whereas metal forms only shackles for man, everything necessary for human happiness can be made of wood. Looking around the sawmill, Philip is shocked to find that the wood waste is not being removed properly, so that it piles up and hinders the saw operators in their work. In a technical setpiece, the highly skilled work of the two saw operators, Ermolaj and Senja Eršov, is described: they are responsible for correctly positioning the logs in the frame-saw in an unbroken succession. Finally the piled-up wood waste makes it impossible for the saws to continue working, but Philip is struck by the fact that the two saw operators, instead of taking a rest, argue with the tally clerk over a supposed mistake and ask to be put on another job in the meantime. Philip wonders at the
men's keenness, but reacts with cynicism to the foreman's words that they know they are working for themselves and not for a boss - it is a question, Philip believes, not of the production system, but of trousers and stomachs. The lumber yard is like a city built on canals, and reminds Philip of Venice, which he had visited with Helena. He wishes he had been able to show her Soroka, suddenly realizing that in his mind he is confusing Helena with Klavdija Andreevna. Philip goes to the wharf and watches the volunteers enthusiastically but awkwardly loading the lighters. Suddenly, amidst universal alarm, Šura is badly injured when a board falls on her. On his return to his room, Philip is given two telegrams: one is from Lodevijk's wife Elizabeth, announcing Lodevijk's death, the other from Lodevijk himself, sent a few hours before the end. Van Rossum tries to buy black crépe at the only shop in Soroka, but is shocked to find they have none - mourning has died out. Going back on board the "HELENA", Philip thinks with relief of his ship as a little piece of Europe.

Klavdija Andreevna sees Rogov by chance in a barber's shop in Leningrad, and they walk about in the heavy traffic. Because of Frans' evident suspicions, she has not been able to meet Rogov for several months. The palaces of Leningrad remind the blissfully happy Rogov of the time he had spent with Klavdija in Amsterdam. Rogov tells Klavdija about the visit of an English minister to Leningrad: he had convinced himself that the Russians were incapable of learning how to handle machines, yet was lost in admiration at the treasures of the Hermitage. He wondered what the Hermitage could mean to them, and why they should have a city
like Leningrad. Rogov would have replied that the city was that minimum that they were prepared to take over from the past unchanged - the remainder would be tolerated temporarily and then replaced by better. He tells Klavdija glowingly of his faith in the future and the enthusiasm which the new cities under construction arouse in him, and goes on to speak at length of the new face, full of pride, strength and confidence, that he meets everywhere. Criticizing a feuilleton article that Rogov had recently written, she refers to the contemporary phenomenon of arrogance and the "American sickness" - a madness for big numbers. When she tells him of her fear that this will lead also to the American worship of the chequebook he taunts her with her dependence on van Rossum's chequebook. Following Klavdija up the staircase of the dilapidated house in which her father has his flat, Rogov is suddenly vividly reminded of Helena. The chapter ends with their making love.

Looking around Soroka, admiring the carving of the fishermen's huts, Philip van Rossum finds a neglected graveyard. He has begun to remove a fine ikon from one of the crosses when an old woman curses him and he leaves hurriedly. Back in his room Philip falls asleep and has a nightmare in which a militiaman, Lodevijk and Bryver figure. In the evening Philip watches how at high tide, with the aid of three tugs, the two lighters are saved in the teeth of a gale, despite the loss of a boat. The masterful organisation, selflessness and heroism displayed by the Russians impress and trouble him; he wonders what they may yet achieve in the future. Senja Eršov takes Sergei aside and asks his approval for a woman witch-doctor to treat Šura. Sergei, expressing amazement at such superstition
on the part of a Komsomol member, shames him by making him tell all the others what he has just asked.

Philip van Rossum sets off on a shooting expedition with Volodja Gluškov. In the train Volodja denies the stories that there is forced labour in the North, and asserts that there is enough bread except where the kulaks have sabotaged supplies. Philip joins the other two members of the expedition, a professional ornithologist and a hunting inspector, and together they sail among the islands with their incredible richness of undisturbed bird life. The Dutchman shoots gull and geese, and one particular day's shooting becomes for him an uniquely wonderful experience because of the abundance of bird life and the beauty of the natural surroundings. They stay in the house of an Old-Believer, the retired sea-captain Nikodim Nikodimović, and Philip buys from him an ikon in the collection hanging in his private chapel. During the night the Old-Believer goes down into another, secret, chapel and reads a service, recollecting the evil-doing of the Nikonians and the miracles performed by the true-believers, as recounted in the holy books: now, he believes, the priests of Antichrist are being punished for their wickedness.

A significant conversation in a train between Philip van Rossum and Sergeič follows. Noting the general movement and excitement, Philip says that evidently a revolution is in progress, but he has been struck by the shortages; the industrialization plan should not be built on the hunger of the population. Sergeič replies that the plan is not built on hunger, but on extreme economy in everything, and that the search for work
and the search for food amount to the same thing. Despite the kulaks' sabotage, there is enough food, and the abundant supply of workers at the new construction sites ensures that the plan will be successful. Van Rossum points out that the attacking side is responsible for the disorganization and poverty, but Sergei replies that whereas they build and develop, the counter-revolution, employing its sole weapon, only destroys. The revolution is not an "experiment", as Philip terms it, but a new life. Philip then speaks of the technological revolution resulting from the development of decentralized engines, and Sergei comments that this thesis of the replacement of capital concentration by specialized craft skills is a typical fascist view. Philip objects to any reference to his "opinions", since unlike Sergei, he has no systematized ideology, but maintains a practical approach to all questions. Sergei then attacks vehemently the readiness of foreigners to blame the Bolsheviks for every Russian deficiency. Returning to the technological revolution, van Rossum maintains that a hundred years separate the West from Russia - the West already has too many machines and the time has come to destroy them. Sergei interprets in his own way van Rossum's reference to their living in different epochs - the Soviet Union is ahead, but the West will soon catch up, with the aid of its workers - and claims that in the Soviet Union the machine can never become a danger to man. For Philip, Sergei begins to personify the as yet unfamiliar Soviet partner with whom he will have to deal. Philip then reveals his plan for supplying capital for construction of a new port at Soroka in return for lumber rights, but Sergei maintains that the export of unprocessed wood is out of date.
Impressed deeply by Sergeič's knowledge and self-assurance, Philip asks him what his job had been before the revolution. Sergeič replies that he had worked as a moulder in an engineering plant.

Van Rossum arrives at the family concession on the Western bank of the Onega estuary and meets Frans, who explains to his uncle the problems arising from the shortage of labour. Frans complains that the concession agreement will ruin them, which Philip cannot understand, since he himself had signed the agreement: his nephew is evidently not making proper use of its terms. Frans finds that the cause of the constant conflicts lies in the fact that the Soviets have no more need of the van Rossums, and tells Philip that the concession must be wound up at once. The firm should then continue to operate as brokers for the Soviets. Philip rejects this proposal indignantly, and takes his nephew aside for a discussion before reaching the concession office. Here the narrative is interrupted by a setpiece on an idyllic, flower-covered forest glade and an authorial discussion of the background to the conflicts over the concession. Owing to the economic situation and the contraction of markets in the West, the van Rossums had not adhered to the terms of the agreement, which required the construction of a railway within a specific time and also the export of a certain percentage of timber in semi-manufactured form. Moreover, the van Rossums had been guilty of a deliberate infraction of the agreement by selling timber on the Soviet domestic market and transferring the proceeds abroad. The van Rossums held that the essential purpose of the agreement was to enable them to make profits out of the concession, and considered the
Soviet demands merely petty formalism. Conflicts with the Soviet trade unions, culminating in a recent strike of timber floaters, had also become a constant source of trouble.

Philip concludes that it is time to go on the offensive and show firmness, whereas Frans had found that the only possible policy, in view of Philip's insistence that the concession rights must be preserved at all costs, was to make concessions. Agreeing with Frans, who points out that Philip is demanding compensation in a different form, Philip says that he had never protested against the expropriation of their pre-revolutionary property in Russia, and is prepared to respect revolutionary principles if only his business is permitted to operate properly. On his arrival at the office Philip immediately asserts his authority by arranging transport for a timber floater whose foot has been crushed in an accident. Philip and Frans then receive a trade union delegation which makes a series of demands including the construction of a club with a hall seating 300 and a 25-unit apartment house. Philip rejects the ultimatum, stating that it had clearly been composed with the aim of ensuring a refusal, and the delegation tells him that they will call a strike. When Philip asks whether they make similar demands and strike also at Soviet undertakings, a member of the delegation replies that such demands form part of the plan, while to strike would mean that they were devouring themselves, since they themselves were the bosses. Philip is apparently pleased at having brought things to a head, but Frans replies that the unhappy business will soon be over.
In Leningrad Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna walk together down the Litejnýj Prospekt with its many bookshops. Rogov wants her to reveal to Frans the truth about their relationship, but Klavdija is unwilling to cause herself unpleasantness. She is indignant when he calls her a "barynja" and tells her that she ought to be torn out of her comfortable nest. He cannot go on like this any more: unless she tells her husband, he will tell him himself. She then leaves him abruptly, asking why he expects she should want to go and live with him.

Rogov is desperate at the thought that his one aim is to effect a change in their present relationship, whereas Klavdija is perfectly happy at the present situation. From the books which he had read as a child Rogov had acquired a longing for love, which he had always associated with the heroic. In Helena, and then in Klavdija who so closely resembled her, Rogov thought that he had at last found what he had sought so long. He had intended to return Klavdija to the world which she had betrayed, and was revolted to find that she had become his mistress without any thought of sacrificing her life "over on the other side".

Mechanically Rogov goes to the newspaper office where he had worked during the cruel but wonderful days of the Civil War in the hope of regaining his self-control, but he meets an old acquaintance who warns him against his involvement with foreigners. In order to distract his mind, Rogov goes off to the port, which at that moment Frans and Philip van Rossum are touring. They arrive at the lumber port and watch the operation of the new completely mechanized loading system. A technical setpiece is devoted to this Soviet engineering achievement. A second
setpiece follows in which is described the work of a Soviet dispatcher and foreign receiver, responsible jointly under the supervision of the ship's master for the loading of the ship with lumber. The confrontation between two worlds is symbolized by this everyday contest between the two men. Philip and Frans meet Rogov, and Frans invites him to visit him. Rogov openly challenges Frans by telling him that Klavdija had already asked him.

At their house in Leningrad, Frans indulges in spirited horse-play with Klavdija before lunch, at which Philip is also present. Rogov then arrives, and the playful atmosphere soon evaporates in the course of a discussion about Soviet shortages, during which Rogov, referring to unemployment in Europe, warns his hosts against believing appearances, either in the Soviet Union or in the West. Frans observes that the newspapers give a misleading impression; the Soviet Union has done in 15 years what it took Holland 200 years to achieve. Frans and Philip begin to discuss the inability of contemporary parliamentarians to cope with technological developments, and Frans, referring to a proposal to establish an experimental state ruled by scientists, engineers and economists, proposes instead that engineers, scientists and businessmen should take over their own countries, adopting economic planning on the Soviet model. Rogov challenges Philip's belief that man needs to return to nature and manual labour, since technology is the source of man's power over nature. What they are afraid of is that the hand of the worker will seize control of technological progress and become master of the world. No plan will help unless a new man wins power, unless there is a
revolution. Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna are left alone, and he again seeks to induce her to leave Frans. He is embracing her when suddenly Frans enters the room. Klavdija throws herself at Frans' feet, weeping, but he beats her with his fists.

The next chapter consists of an article by Rogov about the Soviet Union, "Rogov's Feuilleton", which has no connection with the action of the novel. Rogov cites various episodes, such as that of a train which was lost completely and then discovered by chance two years later in Eastern Siberia, to show that such anecdotes had created for prerevolutionary Russia the reputation of "the country of great possibilities". Satirizing the Western cult of the "religiousness" of Russia, in particular the enthusiasm for Dostoevskij, Rogov finds that whereas Russia was given a monopoly of "spiritual depth", all possibility of technical progress was denied. Many had seen the revolution in this light, as a senseless search for social justice, but now this view had been decisively repudiated by reality. The replacement of religious superstition by universal literacy and the vast achievements in armaments and industry prove that it is not exotic, ancient Russia which possesses great possibilities, but the triumphant working class revolution. Whereas before the European went to Russia to see what the Russians did not have, now he is involuntarily impressed and worried by what they have: the world knows that they have opened a new volume of human history.

In a sanatorium at a coastal resort near the Finnish border a middle-aged couple meet and exchange impressions about the lack of culture of the young people who undergo without discrimination every
available treatment. They both automatically accept that treatment and leisure are their right. Philip van Rossum has taken Klavdija Andreevna for a drive to the resort and on the way they discuss the depressing sight of some stone breakers working on the road. Klavdija says that it is a terrible thought that there will be just as ragged and dirty people even after her death, and Philip remarks that she had seen nothing like it in Western Europe. Klavdija, however, counters by telling Philip of an inhuman and degrading scene in Lausanne, where she had seen a sick railway workman driven to work to the limit of his endurance. Philip concludes that her sudden patriotism and rebelliousness are the consequence of her belated repentance; her reason and consciousness of self-advantage will eventually make her see sense again. Klavdija feels unbearably humiliated: she hates Rogov for depriving her of everything at one blow, not only of her affair with him, the secrecy of which had held great charm for her, but also of her husband, whom she loves, yet detests as a savage for having beaten her.

Unexpectedly they meet Sergeič and Šura on their arrival at the resort and Sergeič explains to Philip the social security system: accommodation and treatment are free to all the patients at the resort. Philip is offended at the garish way in which many of the patients are dressed, but Sergeič attacks any kind of regimentation as an idiotic form of Americanism. Šura is appalled by the thought that in Klavdija Andreevna she has met a live Whiteguardist.

Philip thinks of his past stays at resorts in Western Europe - at St. Moritz, where he had played curling with Eldering-Ghyser and his
wife, and at a peaceful hotel in Scheveningen. There Philip can tell at once the professions and desires of the people he sees, but at this Soviet resort the people are mysteries; rushing irresistibly into the future, they acquire new knowledge and experience, becoming new people in the process. He is repelled by the self-satisfaction in the faces of a group of laughing young men, whereas Sergeič, judging them to be students, admires the willpower in their expressions. Sergeič asks Philip about the concession: he believes van Rossum will give up the concession and begin selling Soviet lumber. Philip suddenly blames Sergeič for all his troubles and finds that he embodies everything that is repellent and inacceptable.

Rogov catches sight of Klavdija Andreevna entering the Hermitage in Leningrad, and follows her about the galleries until she notices him. Rogov feels a sense of triumph at having caught her, but Klavdija tells him that she does not want to stay and live in the Soviet Union. She would never be able to live with him, since he does not know how to be gay; he is too calm, just like a priest. She rejects the clarity of Rogov, and cries that she will perish without Frans. Rogov tells her that she rejects clarity because she does not like people who know where they stand, and he stands firmly, like a soldier, on one side - the Soviet side. He begins to remind her of her relationship with him, but is overcome by embarrassment, and instead tells Klavdija the story of a young peasant who falls in love with his master's daughter. Despite his being threatened with death, he climbs up an apparently unscalable cliff in order to see her again. Rogov compares his love for Helena to the fate of the peasant
boy, speaking of the feeling of unitedness with the world which he had experienced and his overwhelming desire for love. Everywhere he has had cliffs to climb, but he will never give up his beloved. Rogov defends himself against Klavdija's accusation that Helena, not she, had been his beloved, and insists that she leave Frans for good. At first she tries to laugh off his peremptoriness, but finally yields to his persistence and invites him into her house. Waiting for her, Rogov feels that he must now bring things to a head, since he can stand the uncertainty no longer; either he has now won his personal happiness, or lost it forever. He then overhears a conversation in the next room between Philip van Rossum and a mysterious man in a green suit who makes a proposal to supply his lumber requirements and hints that with the assistance of agents he is in a position to sabotage lumber deliveries at Soroka. As he listens to what he believes to be a foreign plot to wreck the Soviet lumber industry, Rogov has a hideous nightmare of his brain being removed and operated upon while he is still conscious. He is disgusted and humiliated that he should eavesdrop, but understand that he has a duty to reveal the plot. In his indignation he swears that he will never return, and quietly leaves the room before Klavdija comes back.

On the terrace of the Metropole hotel in Moscow, where the Western businessmen normally judge the virtues of socialism by the business possibilities which it offers, Casty tells Philip how he has been impressed by Soviet engineering achievements, concluding that socialism is the result of combining Russian elements with what is best in America and Europe. In order to achieve independence, for the moment the Soviet
Union needs foreign technology, and therefore the hotels for foreigners are temporarily justifiable as a source of foreign currency. Casty persuades Philip and Frans van Rossum to go to see a car plant. Meanwhile Frans can think of nothing but Klavdija's infidelity: he feels that she ought to be eternally grateful for everything that he has done for her, and is aware that she loves him. In his hatred he longs to beat her again.

Casty tells them not to overestimate the extent of foreign help in Soviet construction, relating how the engineers sent by an American firm to redesign the car plant they are about to visit had all proved to be charlatans, so that finally the work had been done by young Soviet engineers. Frans is repelled by Casty's pro-Soviet views and finds him a typical example of the many Western experts who had been enthralled by Soviet industrialization. Arriving at the plant, they watch the assembly line, and Philip wonders how a peasant country has succeeded in moving directly to the highest forms of industrialization. The foreman tells him that he and the shop engineer had set up the flow line without ever having seen one before. Philip asks the foreman how workers decide what kind of plant to work at: the foreman agrees that the workers go where they are best off, adding, however, that in the Soviet Union what is best for the worker and what is best for the State amount to the same thing. The van Rossums then tour the engine assembly shop, where there are many women workers, and see a huge piston-rod press, but suddenly Philip's hatred of metal makes the plant unbearable to him and he rushes out. On the way back Casty tells him that he intends to work in Moscow.
They pass in their car a column of young people with spades, who, to
Philip's irritation, start to sing the "Internationale" and throw their
spades in the air at the sight of the foreigners. Philip is angered by
Frans, who in his preoccupation with his personal life has no interest
in professional obligations. On their arrival at the hotel Frans'
finger is crushed in the revolving door, and Philip brutally curses the
doorman.

The van Rossums have arranged a decisive interview about their
concession in the appropriate Soviet commission, but Philip is offended
to find that they are received not by the chairman himself but by a
young official. When Philip states that he intends to set out his com-
plaints, the official refers to systematic violation of the concession
agreement on the part of the van Rossums. After the Soviet official
cites the illicit sale of lumber on the domestic market, Philip re-
sponds with what he conceives to be his trump card - the government
regulation of lumber prices, which had not been foreseen by the con-
cession agreement - but the official counters by reminding him that the
concession had illicitly sold lumber even earlier, hinting that the price
regulation had been a countermeasure on the part of the government. He
implies that the Soviet government had acted extremely generously to-
ward the concession: it was a marvel that the concession had survived
so long, but this was a mistake which must be corrected without delay.
Whereas the young man cannot forgive the van Rossums the export of cur-
rency, since they had been invited for the purpose of making capital
investments, Philip is possessed by the sole thought that he is in
Russia only in order to extract from the country as much money as possible. The Soviet official reminds Philip of the concession's failure to build the railway line, and then accuses the van Rossums of using predatory felling methods. The accusation infuriates Philip, who speaks of his love of timber and the van Rossums' fifty years of cooperation with Russia, but the official then calls in a technical witness, the jovial Professor Vaškulat. The professor states his findings that the ringing of the aspens had been carried out too late, so that the future stand of coniferous trees would be harmed. Philip at first protests, but then rudely tells Vaškulat that there is no point in his going on with his lecture. He accuses the official of hairsplitting and speaks at length of the valuable support which the van Rossums had given the Soviet Union, in particular by advocating recognition of the Soviet Union by Holland, despite a regrettable lack of Soviet cooperation. When Philip tells him that breaking off relations with the van Rossums will do enormous harm to this great cause, the official replies that he is sure that the Soviet Union will find new forms of cooperation with them. Philip confirms with him that this means that the agreement is dissolved and then walks out in a fury, saying that he will protest to the Kremlin. Later Philip tells the listless Frans to arrange an interview in the Kremlin while he goes away to Leningrad for a few days. Frans is surprised that Philip has not yet realized that everything is over, but Philip, brutally reminding him of his subordinate position, tells him that people in his state get fired.
At Soroka Sergeič watches the old kindergarten janitor Danton take his four children to the kindergarten while he reflects on his life with his wife Olga, who had run away to Moscow with a reserve officer after constantly complaining that her youth was being ruined through her having one baby after another. Sergeič is expecting a visit that evening from Šura, whom he hopes to marry, and he goes to great lengths to clean up the house before her arrival. Rogov, of whom Sergeič had heard during the Civil War, comes to see him, and speaks mysteriously of an affair which he wants to clear up in Soroka. He still has serious doubts about his suppositions, but hopes desperately that the van Rossums and the man in the green suit will be unmasked for the sabotage of which he suspects them. Rogov asks about Philip van Rossum's movements in Soroka, and Sergeič exercises his memory, trying to think of anything suspicious in his actions, although he wonders whether Rogov is not himself involved in some affair. He blames Rogov for not having found out the identity of the man in the green suit, and for not listening to the end of the conversation to learn whether van Rossum agreed or not. Sergeič believes Philip did not agree, since he is dependent on the Soviet Union and will avoid a quarrel if possible. Finally Sergeič tells Rogov that he will report the matter to the appropriate people and Rogov leaves him, enormously relieved at having told someone of the conversation he had overheard. Rogov walks down to the lumber yard, where he sees Volodja and Šura, who are discussing Senja Eršov's being sent to study at the rabčak as a consequence of his conviction for superstition. Volodja, who had been courting Šura, asks her embarrassedly about
Sergei's asking her to marry him, and is miserable at hearing that she had consented.

Frans arrives home in Leningrad unexpectedly in the hope that there will be a reconciliation with Klavdija, and is bitterly disappointed to find that everyone is out. Walking around the luxurious house, he is overcome by a longing for peace and comfort, and his anguish becomes unbearable after he goes to sit in Klavdija's bedroom. Seeking distraction, he begins to examine the mail in the study, but finds that the financial situation has deteriorated ominously - debtors have gone bankrupt and the demand for lumber has fallen catastrophically. At last Philip and Klavdija arrive and Frans reports the final collapse of the negotiations. He convinces himself from Philip's manner and the smell of wine on his breath that Klavdija has now been unfaithful with his uncle. Philip tells Frans that he had always been convinced that the concession was finished, but had wanted to try every possibility before finally abandoning it. Eldering-Ghyser, exploiting the van Rossums' difficulties, was deliberately creating financial problems in order to induce him to break off relations with the Soviets. If he were to join forces with Eldering-Ghyser he would be able to teach them a lesson. Philip has decided to abandon the traditions of the van Rossums and become a broker: a Soviet lumber export trust had guaranteed the firm lumber supplies adequate to carry out its contracts and the van Rossums would act as agents for the sale of Soviet lumber in countries lacking relations with the Soviet Union. Frans, scarcely able to control himself, asks Philip why he had told him to stay in Moscow when he had
already decided to abandon the concession, and convinces himself of the
truth of his suspicions that Philip had wanted to remain alone in
Leningrad. Philip refers condescendingly to his faith in Frans, which
makes Frans scream at him in fury. He appears to calm down, however,
and Philip, mentioning other supply proposals and hinting at the sabo-
tage offer in connection with his rejection of a plan to sever all con-
nections with the Soviet Union, speaks at length of the need to adjust
to the changed situation and derive the maximum benefit from the Soviet
economic monopoly, which had led him to decide to become a broker.
Klavdija, dressed elegantly and made up with enormous care, then enters
the room, and her appearance in conjunction with the smell of wine fin-
ally makes Frans lose the last vestiges of self-control. For a moment
he feels a terrible desire to attack her, but rushes out of the house
and gets into his car. Frenziedly thinking of Klavdija and wondering
how his formerly well-ordered life had become so unbearably confused,
Frans drives repeatedly over a bridge, until at last in an attempt to
avoid a tram he collides with a bus and is killed.

Constantly distracted by a drunken log-trimmer and two old women
complaining how short a time a dead foreman's body had lain in the club,
Senja Eršov writes an awkward letter for the lumber industry newspaper
to explain why he intends to enter the rabfak. Senja writes of the
great desire he has had to study ever since experiencing the ignorance
and drunkenness in the countryside, and concludes by swearing that he
will devote all his strength to the socialist construction of his
country. Sergeič has organized a meeting between a group of Komsomol
members and Rogov, who has been suffering agonies from his leg.
Drinking a supposedly miraculous brew of rowan berries offered him by
Anfisa Petrovna, Rogov thinks bitterly of the series of doctors and treat-
ments he has tried uselessly. When the meeting begins, SergeiČ, refer-
ing to the growing slackness among the workers, speaks at length of
the deliberate sabotage committed by the class enemy, infuriated by
socialist achievements, and calls for watchfulness toward doubtful
workers. Senja Erêov is troubled by Philip van Rossum's visit to the
sawmill, when he claims he saw van Rossum wink to himself at the produc-
tion breakdown, and Ermolaj refers to Bryver, who could do more good at
home than living "all found" in the Soviet Union. Rogov's visitors ask
him to tell them about life abroad, and he relates the story of a
Catholic priest who had held a service on Mont Blanc in order to be as
close as possible to heaven. Rogov, realizing that the Komsomol members
are well informed about the world and want only to add the benefit of his
experience to their own, then tells them that the West, although fright-
ened by the growing economic might of the Soviet Union, has been forced
by its economic troubles to conclude trading agreements with the Soviet
Union; citing the example of the van Rossums' concession, Rogov empha-
sizes that the Soviet Union is determined that all agreements will be on
a basis of equality of advantages for both sides. Senja Erêov shows Rogov
the letter that he has written for the newspaper, and Rogov tells him
laughingly that no correction is needed. Rogov now thinks of Klavdija
as a figure from the past, and he is ready to begin his search anew,
though with less hope than before. Anfisa Petrovna goes to SergeiČ's
house and finds him with Šura, washing the club crockery. They smash
a plate, but Sergej roars with laughter and tells Šura that this is only
appropriate for a wedding.

On his sixtieth birthday Philip prepares to leave Leningrad on
the "HELENA". Although Klavdija and Philip have agreed that his second
youth is now beginning, he is depressed by the mourning for Frans and
repelled by the corpse-like smell of a carnation which Klavdija gives
him. Frans' death seems to crown all Philip's losses in Russia, casting
a shadow over Philip's youthful feelings for Klavdija. When the harbour-
master expresses his commiseration to Philip, he comments to himself
that the Russians have now learned to behave decently. Asking her
whether this time he is parting with her forever, Klavdija's lonely
father says goodbye to her with tears in his eyes, and as the ship moves
away she has a sudden urge to jump into the water. Klavdija begins to
cry, thinking miserably of Rogov, who has not come to see her off.
Philip is filled with hostility toward the Soviet Union and tries to
determine who is guilty of Frans' death. He has forgiven Klavdija, who
he considers has expiated with him her frivolous affair with Rogov.
Looking at the Soviet border resort in the distance, he has a vision
of Sergej's face gazing at him intently, and feels that this face has
followed him everywhere since the moment of his arrival in Soroka. His
ships seem to him to be retreating from the Soviet Union as after a
lost battle: only brute force, he finds, can ensure respect. Philip
tells the master that the Soviets are guilty of Frans' death, since
they had made him lose control over himself. In a black mood he comments "Vae victis", then suddenly goes below and gulps down half a glass of whisky.
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