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INTRODUCTION

An attempt has been made in this study to examine in depth the early novels of Konstantin Fedin. The novels discussed are Goroda i gody, Brat'ja, Poxiščenie Evropy, and Sanatorij Arktur, so that the period covered is from 1924 to 1940.

Attention was paid primarily to Fedin's artistic method in an endeavour to establish the narrative techniques and literary devices characteristic of the author's work. The problem of characterization is also discussed in detail and the personalities of the principal figures are analyzed in the case of each novel.

The question of chronology in Fedin's work has attracted considerable interest, and an analysis of the construction of the novels is provided with a view to establishing the time relationships within each novel. In addition, this study attempts to determine the actual period presented in each case, and it is claimed that new conclusions have been reached in this respect.

A great amount of critical attention has been devoted to Fedin's work in the Soviet Union. A virtually complete bibliography is to be found in the symposium, Tvorčestvo Konstantina.
This bibliography does not, however, include, except for a few exceptions, critical material on Fedin published outside the Soviet Union, whether in Russian or in other languages. For the present study a number of contemporary critical articles published in Russian emigre journals were found to be of particular interest.

Although the emphasis in most Soviet critical discussion is on "normative" criticism of the ideological aspects of the work, many critics, especially during the 1920s and early 1930s, devoted considerable attention to artistic analysis. The first book to appear on Fedin's work was that by D. E. Tamarchenko, 
Put' k realizmu, whose strongly sociological approach does not exclude analysis of literary technique. Tamarchenko discusses in detail Goroda i gody, Brat'ja, and Book I of Poxichenie Evropy.

In 1951 B. Ja. Brajnina's biography of Fedin appeared. Brajnina's analysis is almost exclusively sociological, from the viewpoint of Fedin's evolution toward "socialist realism", but she included previously unpublished correspondence by Fedin, notably quotations from Fedin's letters to Gor'kij, most of which, however, subsequently became available in the Literaturnoe

________


nasedstvo edition of Go\'rkij's correspondence with Soviet writers.\footnote{M. Go\'rkij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, ed. I. I. Anisimov et al. (Moscow, 1963).}


The Czech critic M. Zagradka published a study in 1962, O xudožestvennom stile romanov Konstantina Fedina,\footnote{Miroslav Zagradka, O xudožestvennom stile romanov Konstantina Fedina (Prague, 1962).} in which, although adopting a standard "Marxist-Leninist" approach in discussion of Fedin's ideology as reflected in his works, he devotes considerable attention to questions of construction and style, as well as methods of characterization. Zagradka contributes a valuable analysis of a number of contrasting aspects of Fedin's artistic method, while his treatment often remains impressionistic owing to
his selection of individual features for detailed discussion. Concentrating on Goroda i gody and Pervye radosti and Neobyknovennoe leto, Zagradka devotes far less space to Brat'ja, Pomiščenie Evropy and Sanatorij Arktur, which he does not attempt to analyze in depth. A selective bibliography, including exclusively Soviet articles on Fedin's work, was added. Earlier Zagradka had published an article on Fedin's style in Brat'ja, which embodied the same approach as his later monograph.  

In the West, Professor E. J. Simmons' book on Fedin, Leonov and Sholokhov, Russian Fiction and Soviet Ideology, provided the first study of Fedin's work to appear outside the Soviet Union. As the title indicates, Simmons concentrates attention on the political ideology reflected in Fedin's work and on discussion of the extent to which this reflects the author's own beliefs. There is little analysis of Fedin's artistic method in his early novels.

Recently J. M. Blum's monograph on Fedin, Konstantin Fedin: A Descriptive and Analytic Study, appeared, based upon a doctoral

---


dissertation written for Vanderbilt University. Blum concentrates attention on Fedin's first two novels, Goroda i gody and Brat'ja, and on Fedin's postwar works, Pervye radosti and Neobyknovennoe leto. The treatment of the novels Poxiscenie Evropy and Sanatorij Arktur, which the critic terms "minor works," is extremely brief. In his discussion of the first two novels Blum is primarily concerned with the analysis of the principal characters and with the evidence which they supply for the writer's own political attitudes. Blum does not discuss in detail Fedin's style or methods of characterization, and does not attempt to draw upon the work of contemporary Soviet and Russian emigre critics.

I owe a considerable debt to Professor Oulanoff's work, The Serapion Brothers. Theory and Practice, with its valuable analysis of the Serapions' artistic method. Although Oulanoff does not study Fedin's novels, except for an interesting discussion of the plot and structure of Goroda i gody, his investigation of the Serapions' early writing and his development of analytic terminology proved highly stimulating and useful.

10 Julius M. Blum, Konstantin Fedin. A Descriptive and Analytic Study (The Hague and Paris, 1967).

11 Blum, p. 12.


13 See Oulanoff, pp. 137-142.
No English translation of the novels Brat'ja and Poxisčenie Evropy exists. A translation of Goroda i gody, however, appeared recently. A translation of Goroda i gody, however, appeared recently. A translation of Goroda i gody, however, appeared recently. Content synopses for Brat'ja and Poxisčenie Evropy will be found at the end of this study. In the cases of Goroda i gody and Brat'ja, the volume of Soviet criticism makes a survey impossible. For Poxisčenie Evropy, a survey of the major Soviet contemporary articles has been included, and the more limited amount of critical attention devoted to Sanatorij Arktur made it possible to discuss critical opinion within the body of the relevant chapter.

Throughout this study, quotations from Fedin's work are taken, unless otherwise stated, from the standard Soviet collected edition in nine volumes, published in Moscow by the State Publishing House for Artistic Literature between 1959 and 1962. For the six-volume collected edition published between 1952 and 1954, however, Fedin made substantial revisions in the text of the early novels. In the present study attention has been paid for the first time to textual changes which appear significant. In these cases the original edition is taken as the basis for discussion while a reference to the revised version is given.

14 See chapter on Goroda i gody.

15 Konstantin Fedin, Sobranie sočinenij v devjati tomax, Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo xudožestvennoj Literatury, Moscow, 1959-62.

16 Konstantin Fedin, Sobranie sočinenij v šesti tomax, Goslitizdat, Moscow, 1952-54.
CHAPTER I

GORODA I GODY

I

Fedin's first novel Goroda i gody, was written between May, 1922 and September, 1924, when the writer was aged between 30 and 32, and published in 1924 by the Leningrad section of the State Publishing House, (Gosizdat). During this period Fedin worked in Petrograd, occupying a responsible post in the Petrograd section of the State Publishing House and editing the journal Kniga i revoljucija. These were the years of Fedin's close association with the Serapion Brethren and regular attendance at their meetings, originally in Mixail Slonimskij's room at the House of Arts (Dom iskusstv) on the Mojka. Later Fedin was to write that


2Goroda i gody. roman, Leningrad, Gosizdat, 1924. Extracts from the novel, notably the section on "Djadja Kisel,' and the chapter "Devjet'sot četynyadcatyj," had been published earlier in journals and newspapers. (For details, see Fedin, Sobranie sočinenij, II, 433).
"Gody živoj družby "Serapionovykh brat'ev" (1921-1924) byli moej literaturnoj akademiej." Fedin was not only exposed to the exciting atmosphere of creative élan of the period but also to the ferment of ideas within the group of his fellow Serapions, and to the influence of Viktor Šklovskij and the Opojez group of literary scholars with their profound interest in questions of literary technique.

The young writer must also have been influenced by the work of the literary studio conducted by Evgenij Zamjatin in the House of Arts. Zamjatin, wrote Nel'dixen in his obituary of Lune, was the "first literary leader of the Serapions," and his concepts of literary structure and imagery and generally highly intellectual attitude toward literature are clearly reflected in their work. However, it was clear even at this time that Fedin was not only the oldest of the Serapions, but also the most "conservative" writer of the Brethren. Already in 1922 Zamjatin wrote:

Fedin ... stotit kak-to osobnjakom vo vsej gruppe .... On samyj pročnyj iz nix:
poka on vse ešše deržit v rukax putevoditel'

---


in his discussion of the disintegration of the Serapions illustrates the way in which Fedin maintained his reputation throughout the 1920s as the most "classical" member of the group. Nevertheless, during this period of literary upheaval Fedin's "traditionalism" was a highly relative concept, and the writer's first novel abundantly reflects what Mirsky termed "the "formal," technical attitude towards literature of the younger literary generation."7

Apart from his literary activity, Fedin was able to observe events in Moscow and Petrograd during War Communism and the beginning of N E P. After experiencing the hunger of 1918 and early 1919 in Moscow, he edited a local newspaper in Syzran' on the Volga, as well as working as secretary of the City Executive Council. In

---

5 E. Zamjatin, "Serapionovy Brat'ja," Literaturnye zapiski, #1, 1922, pp. 7-8. Similarly, M. Gor'kij wrote in 1923, "Constantin Fedine est un écrivain sérieux, concentré, travaillant avec prudence. Il est de ceux qui ne se hâtent pas de dire leur mot, mais qui savent parler bien." ("Le groupe des 'Frères Sérapi'on." Lettre inédite de Maxime Gorki," Le Disque Vert (Brussels), #4-6, 1923, p. 64.


the autumn he was drafted to the front, arriving in Petrograd - like his hero, Andrej Starcov in Goroda i gody - at the climax of the Judenych offensive. At first he was in charge of the office of the Bashkir Special Cavalry Division responsible for supplying the men at the front with newspapers and literature. This period he described as his second "sxvatka s golodom." Soon he joined the editorial board of Boevaja pravda, the newspaper of the 7th Army, as assistant editor, where he remained until Gor'kij succeeded in finding him posts, first on the "Expert Commission" of the Commissariat of Trade and Industry, and then in the State Publishing House.  

It is not surprising that the episodes in Goroda i gody in which the privations and "razruxa" of Petrograd under War Communism are portrayed strike the reader forcefully with their vivid immediacy. Here the writer successfully conveys his personal experience of the years 1919 and 1920, of which Gor'kij wrote in his

---

obituary of Lunc,

... Serapionovy Brat'ja - kak vse v blokirovannoj Rossii - golodali i nekotorye iz nix celymi dniami steralis' nepodvižno lezat', 'stoby xot' etim priglušit' sžigajuščuju bol' goloda ... 9

Fedin's autobiographical experiences play an even greater role, however, in the portrayal of Germany in the novel. Intending to stay in Nuremberg only four months in order to improve his German, he was interned as an enemy alien at the outbreak of war and obliged to remain in Germany until August, 1918. Fedin spent nearly all of the four years in the small town of Zittau in Saxony, 10 where he was active as a teacher of Russian and as an actor and opera singer with the Zittau town theatre. He read Dostoevskij, Björnson, Strindberg, Goethe, and Kellermann, and became interested in the work of the German Expressionist school, published in the magazine Die Aktion. 11

The town of Zittau, under the name of Bischofsberg, provides the background for the majority of the German episodes in Goroda i gody, and the parallel between the author's situation as

---


10 On the Neisse, 48 miles from Dresden.

an internee and that of Andrej Starcov is clear. Many of Starcov's experiences must reflect Fedin's own, and belief in the degree of correspondence is supported by episodes such as that in which Starcov is seen to make his daily report to the police, giving his number as an internee - 52 - Fedin's own number during his internment. Later Fedin was to write a humorous autobiographical account of his years in Germany, *Ja byl akterom*, in which the majority of the characters may be supposed to have real-life prototypes. The writer described the background as "tot že Bišofsberg (Cittau), uvidennyj smějuščimisja glazami." Many of the characters of *Goroda i gody*, however, are probably based on German prototypes known to Fedin. The G.D.R. critic Wolf Düwel identifies Marie Urbach with a woman colleague at the Zittau theatre, Hanni Mrwa, "mit der Fedin eine herzliche Freundschaft verband und der er in drei Werken - mit aller schöpferischen Freiheit - ein Denkmal gesetzt hat: Die Erinnerung an sie klingt an in den Gestalten der Marie Urbach im Roman "Städte und Jahre," der Anna

---


14 Fedin, *Sobranie sočinenij*, VI, 505.
im Roman "Die Brüder" und der Hulda in "Ich war Schauspieler." If Düwel's identification is correct, it seems likely that Hanni Mrwa supplied the model for the creation of a whole range of feminine characters in Fedin's work, including also Helena in Poxiščenie Evropy.

II

The non-chronological structure of the novel has attracted much attention from critics. Although it is not true to claim, as does Brajnina, that "sjužet načinaetsja s konca," the events presented at the beginning of the novel immediately precede the final dénouement, and cannot be understood without knowledge of the events occurring just before the end of the book as printed.

The order of the chapters in the novel is as follows:

Glava o gode, kotorym zaveršen roman.
Glava pervaja o devjat'sot devjatnadcatom.
Glava o devjat'sot ětyrnadcatom.
Glava otstuplenij.
Glava o devjat'sot šestnadcatom.
Glava o devjat'sot semnadcatom.


16 B. Brajnina, Konstantin Fedin, 4th ed. (Moscow, 1956), p. 82.
Glava o devjat'sot vosemnadcatom.

Glava vtoraja o devjat'sot devjatnadcatom, kotoraja predšestvuet pervoj.

Glava o devjat'sot dvadcatom.

In chronological sequence the order is as follows:

Glava otstuplenij.

Glava o devjat'sot štyrnadcatom.

Glava o devjat'sot šestnadcatom.

Glava o devjat'sot semnadcatom.

Glava o devjat'sot vosemnadcatom.

Glava vtoraja o devjat'sot devjatnadcatom.

Glava pervaja o devjat'sot devjatnadcatom.

Glava o devjat'sot dvadcatom.

Glava o gode, kotorym zaveršen roman.

The chronology is especially complex at the beginning of the novel. The actual dénouement is found in the third section of the first chapter ("formula perexoda"),¹⁷ in which Kurt Wahn reports his murder of Andrej Starcov. We then move backward in time to Starcov’s arrival in Petrograd from Semidol in 1919 at the beginning of the Judenyč offensive. Events develop rapidly, although the speed is not apparent owing to the setpieces on the preparations for Judenyč’s reception and the gravediggers’ artel’ and the presentation of Ščepov and the "trench professor." Starcov’s trench-digging in Petrograd takes place on the same day as Stein’s

¹⁷ Goroda i gody, pp. 14-16.
(Mühlen-Schönaus's) appearance at the German Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies, and probably it is again on this same day that Starcov reports to the Army Staff H.Q. in the Winter Palace. Starcov's work as an army writer, Rita's arrival in Petrograd, and the death of the "trench professor" are all crowded into a very short space of time. Stein's last visit to Starcov takes place on the evening of the professor's funeral.

The novel ends in the summer of 1922, if we assume that Starcov is killed by Wahn soon after his mad speech (made during the summer), and his letters to Marie Urbach, the second of which is dated 13th June. The last events before these of which the reader learns are those which occur at the very end of the novel. Here Mühlen-Schönaus's meeting with Marie in his schloss at Bischofsberg, Marie's arrival in Petrograd, and Starcov's receipt of the Markgraf's letter seem, to judge by internal evidence, to suggest a sequence of seasons: winter, summer or early autumn, and early autumn. The time interval between Marie's arrival and flight, and Starcov's reading the letter and crazed running around Petrograd, cannot be great in view of Rita's going into labour on the one occasion and giving birth to Starcov's child on the other. This leaves an awkward time gap between the autumn of 1920 and the summer of 1922,18 of which we learn only that "Tak pustyri

18 Starcov himself in his letter to Marie speaks of the "two years" since he had last seen her. (Goroda i gody, p. 11).
okružali Andreja do goda, kotoromu suždeno bi jalo zaveršiti naš roman."19

Starcov himself says of this time "V poslednih sobytijax (tojest' do togo, kak ty priexala sjudu i potom isčežla, - dal'še ved' ne bi jalo nikakix sobytij) ja ne naxožu svjazi. Možet byt', ona i est'. Što kakoj-to klubok, vse ěti gody."20 Starcov's insanity is already apparent at the end of the novel (as printed) - " ... on metalsja, kak bezummyj, - bezummyj, možet byt' ..." so that we can speak only of a worsening of his mental derangement during the two years. The implication of Wahn's report to the Committee of Seven is that he had no suspicion of his friend's guilt until his confession, 21 so that it cannot be assumed that Wahn's investigations and search for Starcov account for the interval, despite Mühlen-Schönau's conclusion that Wahn would have to be stupid not to realize who had abstracted Stein's documents from the office of the German Soldiers' Soviet in Semidol.22

19 p. 413.

20 p. 13.


22 See p. 410.
It may, however, be significant that Starcov's final mad speech from his window \(^23\) is directly associated with N E P, which had been in force for well over a year. The ironic tone of the references to the material progress of N E P is new for Starcov:

Poštennyye grazdane! Respublika v konce konca koncov ne ploxaia štuka .... Soveršenno očevidno, čto obraz pravljenija gosudarstva nikak ne otrazajetsja na dobrotnosti grammo-fonnyx plasinok .... Ėto verno, čto na dvore dvadcat' vtoroj god. Ėto verno, potomu čto my kušaem smetanu i prostokvašu, učimsja igrat' na domre i provetrivaem periny. Ėto verno, potomu čto protiv perečislennyx zanjatij, kak ni malo oni, revoljucionnyy, respublika ne vozražaet. \(^{24}\)

Fedin probably intends to convey that Starcov's "nravstvennyj upadok" and "rasšatannost' ... umstvennyx sil" are connected with the developments of N E P, as well as with the catastrophe in his personal life, which Wahn holds to be the cause, \(^{25}\) and Starcov's consciousness of his guilt in allowing Mühlen-Schönau to escape. The introduction of N E P had a traumatic effect on many previously utterly convinced Bolsheviks, and Starcov's consciousness of the "betrayal of the Revolution," allied to the


\(^{24}\) p. 10.

\(^{25}\) See Wahn's report to the Committee (p. 14).
consciousness of his own betrayal of the cause, may be supposed to be the ultimate cause of his complete mental disintegration. We have here a possible reason for the author's postponement of the final episodes until the summer of 1922, by which time NEP had already made a conspicuous impact on Soviet life.

With the exception of this gap in chronology, all the sundered threats are successfully tied by the end of the novel, and the reader has complete insight into the relationships and experiences of the principal characters from the period immediately preceding the outbreak of war in 1914 until Starcov's death in 1922. In addition, the reader learns of various episodes in the childhood of Marie Urbach and Maximilian-Johann von zur Mühlen-Schönau.

Surprisingly, however, whereas the reader gains much information on the background of Marie Urbach and Mühlen-Schönau, nothing is said of the background and education of Andrej Starcov and Kurt Wahn. Although Wahn is at least seen to be a successful painter, Starcov has no profession or definite activity whatever. This lack of information inevitably contributes to the perplexity of the reader.

The deliberate infraction of chronology can be evaluated from several points of view. The beginning of the novel with the catastrophic dénouement may be considered to introduce a major element of suspense, since the relationships between the shadowy

26 Born in 1897. (See p. 145).
characters presented at the beginning of the book and Starcov's previous acts remain a complete mystery. Thus the reader may be supposed to follow the subsequent development of the plot of the novel with greatly heightened interest, in order to discover the key to Starcov's catastrophe. The sequence of events cannot be fully understood until the presentation of Marie Urbach's arrival and disappearance from Petrograd, ten pages before the end of the novel as printed.  

Again, it can be maintained that the treatment of Starcov's death and his experiences in Petrograd in 1919 at the beginning of the novel enables the author to concentrate attention on the psychological development of the hero and the motivation of his betrayal of the Bolshevik cause and the women who love him. Whether the author is successful in intensifying situational or psychological suspense as a result of the distorted chronology must remain a matter of subjective appraisal. With regard to psychological suspense, the sketchiness of the portrayal of Starcov's background and the impressionistic presentation of his psychological evolution inevitably detract from the interest in the hero's psychological development which is aroused by his mental disintegration.

---

27 pp. 403-404.

Suspense can only be preserved if the reader's awareness of the initial situation, however dramatic, is maintained, so that he perceives it constantly as a reference point for analysis of the subsequent action and as a problem which is gradually resolved to the artistic and intellectual satisfaction of the reader. Here the question arises whether a device which may be effective within the compass of a short story may not be invalidated by its use in a full length novel.\(^{29}\) In the case of Goroda i gody, whether or not the initial situation is forgotten in the wealth of descriptive and situational material which follows, the dramatic impact of the catastrophe with which the novel begins must inevitably be lost. The presentation of the experiences of Starcov and Wahn in Germany which follows the chapter on 1922 has on a first reading no clear relationship to the events of 1922. The development of the plot perplexes the reader who seeks a key to earlier events and leads to the abandonment of any attempt to relate the chronologically earlier events to the dramatic situation of 1922. Consequently the suspense is lost.

H. Oulanoff emphasizes the significance of the position of the climactic meeting between Marie, Rita and Starcov at the end of the novel. By placing this "moment of the highest tension" at the end, "the author interrupts the narrative structure at the moment of its most impellingly modulated impact on the reader ... \(^{29}\)

\(^{29}\)404 pages in the 1959 edition.
throughout the whole subsequent development, tension subsides. Starcov's physical death does not, in fact, present any dramatic interest, because as character he ceases to be of further dramatic importance at the preceding climax.\textsuperscript{30} However, the novel ends, not with this episode, but with the authorial conclusions on Starcov's personality, Mühlen-Schönau's long letter, Starcov's frantic running about Petrograd, and with the author's self-consciously mysterious final comment on Starcov's fate, which refers the reader back to Starcov's fate as presented at the beginning of the novel:

Kogda ýe nastupil ýot god, Kurt sdelal dlja Andreja vse, čto dolžen sdelat' tovarišč, drug, xudožnik.\textsuperscript{31}

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the novel does not in fact end at "its most dramatic point," but rather "tapers off in an "epilogue" or a "Nachgeschichte".\textsuperscript{32}

The structure of \textit{Goroda i gody} may be considered, however, from another point of view which does not depend upon the reader's recollection of situation during the presentation of large amounts

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{30}H. Oulanoff, \textit{The Serapion Brothers}. \textit{Theory and Practice}, p. 140. See also J. M. Blum, \textit{Konstantin Fedin, A Descriptive and Analytic Study}, pp. 57-58.

\textsuperscript{31}p. 413.

\textsuperscript{32}H. Oulanoff, \textit{The Serapion Brothers}. \textit{Theory and Practice}, p. 139.
\end{flushright}
of later material. The structure of Goroda i gody represents a technical achievement which, in Oulanoff's view, may so impress the reader as to induce him to re-read the beginning of the novel in order to attain complete understanding of the plot. Oulanoff writes that "the dislocation of time sequences ... stirs our sense of time in the novel to the effect that we conceive of the development not as a straight line with a beginning and an end but as a circle without either beginning or end .... the impression of the end in the novel vanishes." 33

Here perhaps lies Fedin's structural achievement in Goroda i gody. Instead of the sense of the presentation in a novel of a segment of time ("otrezok vremeni") with a definite beginning and end, the reader gains a vivid consciousness of the continuity of time. This feeling is associated psychologically with the human tendency to conjure up "flashbacks" of past experiences and with the sensation of "déjà-vu." Moreover, the impression of the continuity of time heightens the "panoramic" effect produced by the novel as a whole with its elaborate genre pictures of different countries and periods.

In his structural experimentation Fedin was no doubt influenced by the contemporary fascination with literary technique; as he was to write delicately in his 1952 "Autobiography," "forma romana (osobennno-ego kompozija) javlas' otrazeniem

33 H. Oulanoff, p. 141. Italics in the original.
One may speculate that both Zamjatin with his "mathematical" approach to literary technique and emphasis on the need for the subjective distortion of material, and Lunc with his all-pervading interest in the "maxanizm sjužeta" directed Fedin's attention toward structural innovation. Could it be that the structure of *Goroda i sady* represents Fedin's attempt to disprove Lunc's contention in his speech at the meeting of the Serapions on 2nd December, 1922, when Fedin was already at work on his first novel?


36 L. Lunc, "Na zapad!" Beseda, #3, 1923, pp. 260-261. Later in his speech Lunc criticized Fedin, as well as Vs. Ivanov and Nikitin, for his lack of "sjužetnost'." "Esli éti dobrye narodniki nazyvajutsja fabul'nymi prozaikami, to gde Že, o Spravedlivyj Razum, nessjužetnaja literatura?" ("Na zapad!," p.269).
As Lune himself perceived, Fedin, the 'narodnik', was far more sociologically oriented that he, yet Lune's older comrade may have wished to introduce "sjuzatnost'" to the Russian novel in the same way that Lune aimed to lend fable interest to the Russian drama.

The novel itself supplies evidence that the novel of adventure advocated by Lune 37 as a model for Russian fiction did indeed leave traces on Fedin's work. Several episodes, in fact, verge on the melodramatic, notably the confrontation between Marie, Rita and Andrej and Marie's flight, the episode in which Andrej and Mühlen-Schönau think they see Marie in a Semidol street, Andrej's theft of the Stein document, and Andrej's final rushing around deserted Petrograd. The impression is heightened by the "dostoevskina" inherent in a number of episodes, such as that in which Marie hangs her brother's cat. Most of these episodes are acceptable in themselves, but the cumulative impression produced is one of a conscious striving for situtional effect.

The dependence of the author in Goroda i gody, as in later novels, upon coincidence for the development of the plot is unquestionably a structural defect of the novel. Notable coincidences, most of which are required for the later relationships

37 Lune praises Cooper, Dumas, Haggard, Stevenson and Conan Doyle, remarking of Dostoevskij, "Tradicija avantjurnogo romana skrylas' v podpol'e. Blestjačaja popytka Dostoevskogo izvliec' ottuda bul'varnuju povest' ostalas' edinicnoj." ("Na Zapad!") pp. 260,262.)
between the characters, include the following:

Mühlenschönau meets Marie Urbach for the first time on the beach at a North Sea resort.

Starcov is found in the grounds of Mühlenschönaus's schloss after his unsuccessful attempt to escape to Austria.

Marie Urbach's offering a cigarette to Fedor Lependin leads to her excoriation by the Stadtrat.

Starcov sees Wahn taking down the Reich flag from the German Embassy in Petrograd.

Wahn is sent (with Starcov) to Semidol, in the neighborhood of the camp where Mühlenschönau is interned.

Starcov sees Lependin's corpse outside Starye Ruži.

Ščepov arrives just in time to save Klavdija Vasil'evna after her suicide attempt.

Mühlenschönau and Starcov believe they see Marie Urbach at the same moment in Semidol.

Starcov sees Ščepov senior in a Petrograd church.

Rita finds Starcov in a Petrograd street.

Mühlenschönau sees Starcov in a Petrograd street.

Rita goes into labour at the moment of Marie's arrival at Starcov's Petrograd apartment: the baby is born at the moment of Starcov's rushing out immediately after reading Mühlenschönau's letter.
Wahn overhears Starcov's mad speech in Petrograd.

The structural engineering is perhaps most conspicuous in the series of coincidences that requires Wahn, accompanied by Starcov, to be sent to the remote town of Semidol, near where Mühlen-Schöna is interned. Subsequently it is against Semidol that Mühlen-Schöna directs the first attack of the rebellious Mordvinians. Further, a village near Semidol is the home of the peasant Lependin, whose hanged torso Starcov sees after having first met him fleetingly at a transit camp on the Polish border.

Although a certain amount of coincidence does not strain the reader's credulity, the complete dependence of the author on chance encounters results in the unfortunate impression that the writer is unable to devise natural and convincing situations.

III

The style of Goroda i gody reveals a similar preoccupation with literary technique as was displayed in the intricate structure of the novel. The stylistic trend which is most characteristic of the book as a whole may be termed "rhetorical ornamentalism." The authorial digressions occurring throughout the novel which embody this style are also notable for the prevalence of irony and apostrophization of the reader. Such a stylistic trend, of course, runs directly counter to the demands of "sjužetnost," and an alternation between ornamental "setpieces" and dialogues significant for the development of character and situation is observable throughout the novel.
If the structure can best be examined in relation to the ideas of Lev Lune current amongst the Serapions, the style may be related to the literary concepts of Viktor Šklovskij, who was extremely close to the Brethren. Vl. Pozner, indeed, included Šklovskij in his list of the Serapions, while Šklovskij himself wrote in 1921 "Ja byl by trinadcatym. No ja ne belletrist." The trend of "Sternianism" ("sternianstvo") noticeable in the Serapions' work was no doubt largely the consequence of Šklovskij's fascination with the English writer.

In his book, O teorii prozy, Šklovskij uses Sterne's Tristram Shandy (1760), which he terms "samýj tipičnyj roman mirovoj literatury" as a basis for much of his discussion of the nature of literary creation and for his analysis of specific literary devices. Although Fedin disagreed with the formalists' exclusively technical approach to literature, attacking Šklovskij and other members of the Opojaz group as early as 1921 in his


39 See H. Oulanoff, The Serapion Brothers. Theory and Practice, pp. 149-152, for a discussion of Sterne's influence on V. Kaverin.

it seems probable that at least the "Sternianism," which was an important constituent of the contemporary literary climate, was not without influence on him. Evidence for this is to be found in the prevalence of digressions and the extensive use of irony. "Sternianism" may have encouraged Fedin in his infractions of chronology, but it is even more likely that the unabashed introduction of digressions reflects Sterne's artistic method. Fedin even entitles one of the chapters of Goroda i gody "Glava ostuplenij."

Very significantly, Fedin deliberately draws attention to his digressions in a way which suggests the Sternian feature which Sklovskij termed "baring the device" ("obnaženie priema"), a technique which attracted much attention from the Formalist school. Thus Sterne justifies the later insertion of an omitted chapter as follows:

Why then was it left so? And here without staying for my reply, shall I be called as many blockheads, numsculs, doddypoles, dunderheads, ninny-hammers, goosecaps, jolheads, nincompoops, and sh--t-a-beds - and other unsavoury appellations, as ever

---

41 Fedin, "Melok na Ŷube. (Fel'eton o knige fel'etonov)," Žizn' iskusstva, #792-797, 1921; Sobranie sočinenij, IX, 538-544.

42 In Tristram Shandy, the "Preface" occurs in Chapter XX of Book III and Chapter XVIII of Book IX in the middle of Chapter XXV.
the cake-bakers of Lorne cast in the teeth of King Garangantan's shepherds - And I'll let them do it, as Bridget said, as much as they please; for how was it possible they should foresee the necessity I was under of writing the 25th chapter of my book, before the 18th, etc.?

-------- So I don't take it amiss - All I wish is, that it may be a lesson to the world, "to let people tell their stories their own way."43

In Goroda i gody, Fedin deliberately "bare the device" in his repeated references to the ironic significance of his presentation of flowers in the sections of the novel which deal with Bischofsberg. The author entitles a subchapter "Vse ešče cvety," and then introduces his theme as follows after an ironic discussion of the Battle of Jutland:

No čto - celaja glava v istorii goroda Bischofsberga; glava že, kotoru my pišem, posvjaščena cvetam. Ix malo v našem romane, ix ljubjat devuški, negodujuščie na pisatelej, kotorye rasskazyvajut o landšturme i vojne, zabastovkax i koroljax, vmesto togo ětoby govorit' ob izmenax i ob'javijax, o ljubvi i cvetax. Grustno dumaj, čto do ětix sočuvstvennyx slov ne dočitaet romana ni odna devuška. No esli nežnaja duša, vkonec izmučennaja soldatskimi čašlonami, revoljucionerami, social-demokratami i koroljami, slučajno raskroet knigu na ětoj stranice, ona najdet zdes' naše kljatvennoe obeščanie govorit' na protjaženii glavy toliko o cvetax, ob odnix cvetax, dušistyx, okroplennyx ķistoju rosoju, celomudrennyx, živyx cvetax!44


44 Goroda i gody, p. 173.
After two reiterations of the theme in connection with the flowers given to German soldiers, the author returns to spell out ironically the significance of flowers as a symbol of love:

Much later, at the beginning of the subchapter, "Jagody," in the "Chapter on 1918" Fedin reverts to the leitmotiv of flowers, explaining frankly that the titles and apparent content of chapters may have no relation to the material which follows:

Similarly, the author draws attention to a quotation from a Bischofsberg newspaper about a doctor's being dismissed from her post

---

45 pp. 186-187.

46 p. 287. Quoted from the 1924 edition.
as a result of her serving Russian officer prisoners with coffee as a digression, but justifies it as an illustration of the main theme of war:

Konečno, ob ētoj zametke voennoplennye lagernogo gospitalja ničego ne podozrevali, i vsja ona - cilikom - očevidnoe otstuplenie ot povesti o Fedore Lependine. No ved' i Fedor Lependin - tol'ko otstuplenie ot drugoj povesti, - bolee strašnoj i žestokoj, neželi ego.47

One of the longest digressions is the author’s solemn farewell to Bischofsberg, in which the writer expresses his own attitude toward the town and its citizens:

Nastalo vremja skazat' poslednee prosti gorodu Bičofsbergu ....
My rasstaemsja s nim polnye grusti - s ētim edinstvennym videniem rozvoy devuški, poutru okunuvšejsja v rečku ....
V Bičeofsberge, konečno, vse ešče gromyxaet i rokočet bas kaznaceja Obščestva druzej xorovogo penija Paulja Genniga. My ne znaem, vyšel li on iz social-demokratičeskoj partii, i potomu govorim o nem očen' sderžanno, xotja pitaem k nemu simpatiju za ego nežnost' k heroja romana ....
Nakonec tol'ko iz odnix egoističeskix soobraženij, kasajuščixsja kompozicii romana, my vozvrashćaemsja k Frau Urbax, uroždennoj fon Frejleben. Ona ne umerala, ee razbil paralič; i ona ležala v spal'noj komnate, kogda v dome Urbax proizošel slučaj, pripasennyj k koncu ētoj glavy.

Mimo ētix ljudej, vpered, vpered! No gorod!
Prosti, esli nelovkoe slovo zastavilo stratat' tvoe samoljubie. Prosti!

47 p. 241.
This passage illustrates the extent to which the author appears in the novel as an independent commentator who assumes the role of a major character within his own novel. Authorial intrusions occur throughout, both as the earlier quotations indicate in the form of remarks on the author's own narrative method in developing themes, and of comments on the personality and actions of the characters.

Vot počemu my ne toropimsja zabegat' vpered ... kto znaet, možhet byt' ěta progulka - poslednj otdyx, polnej kotorogo - odna smert'?49

No ne pora li lišit' slova bišofsbergskix bjurgerov i rasskazat' obo vsem s prisuščim nam besstrastiem?50

Počemu nel'zja govorit' o ĉuvstax trogatel'ných i naivnych, kak detskij lepet? ... Kto osmelit'ja skazat'; ěto ĉuvstvitel'nost' pošlee žestokosti, v to vremja kak vļublennyj šepot my slyšim reže, čem ston ubitogo? ...51

---

48 pp. 304-306. Quoted from the 1924 edition. Notably, in the 1952 revision "Moskva" was replaced by "Afiny."

49 p. 76.

50 p. 149.

51 p. 255.
Particularly frequent is exclamatory comment on the hero, Andrej Starcov:

Otkuda mog on znat', čto ego poputnyj vetver duet s berega, k kotoromu on staralsja pričalit'?52

Pozdno, Andrej! Na nado bylo slušat' ětogo vzdora, ne dopuskat' ni odnogo slova, ne terjet' ni odnoj sekundy.53

At the end of the novel the author pronounces an "epitaph" on Starcov:

Vot my končaem povest' o ěloveke, s toskoju ždvšem, čtoby žizn' prinjala ego ... 0, esli by on prinjal na sebja xot' odno pjatno i zatoptal by xot' odin cvetok! .... No steklo ne svarivaetsja s železom, i my ne v silax izmenit' čto-nibud' v sud'be Andreja.54

The authorial comment on Starcov, while apparently "distancing" the author from the hero, in fact has the contradictory effect of creating a degree of identification between the author and Starcov.

Many of the rhetorical digressions in the novel are more to be appreciated as ornamental essays than as descriptive pieces deepening the atmosphere and assisting the action. Such an interpretation seems particularly applicable to such setpieces as the sections on the gravediggers' artel' in the subchapter "Klubok,"55 the noises of

52 p. 39.
53 p. 382.
54 pp. 407-408.
55 pp. 59-61.
the Erlangen fair and the roundabout in "Centrifuga amura," the stained-glass window and the table in the Stadtrat's office, and the description of Kadaši suburb in Moscow.

The setpiece devoted to the roundabout may be quoted as an example of Fedin's recurrent highly coloured, hyperbolic digressions, notable for their rhetorical nammer and extensive use of extreme tropes:

Ax, strast'! Ax, junaja, Ėstokaja, stremitel'naja strast'!
Sidet' v kolijske, zalitoj pozumentami karuseli, sidet', prižavšis', vpišvis'
vsem telom v kruževnuju, žarkuju,
pyšnogruđuju, podkrăšenuju, čut'-čut'
vspotevšju devušku, s kotoroj
vstretėlsja, stolknulsja, sbлизilsja
minutu namad v tolpe, gde každyj
Čelovek, kak pyž v patronе, sidet',
- ax, ax, net! - letet', nestis',
krush't'sja, točno v oblakax. Vot
temnyj polukrug - tunnel', ni zgi ne
vidno - nikto ne vidit - sekunda, ešče,
ešče; vot den', splejaščij, jarkij; pod
nogami - ljudi gljadjat, pokazyvajut
pal'cami, smejutsja; vot snova t'ma -
net nikogo, tol'ko ona - kakaja?
-neizvedannaja, zakružennaja karusel'ju,
- sekunda, ešče, ešče - svet, den',
ljudi; i opjat' v tunnel'!
Pridumalo li Ėlovest' druguju mašinu,
kotoraja pererabatyvala by serdca, duši,
vzgljady, ob'jatija, pocelui - vse éto
ljubovnoe syr'e v takoj kristal'nyj i
kondensirovannyj fabrikat ščast'ja, kakoj

56 pp. 76,78-79.
57 pp. 248-249.
58 pp. 279-280.
Fedin's architectonic technique of accumulation is best seen in the description of the noises and attractions of the fair in the same chapter:

Gora, uvjazannaja - kak golova platkom - lipovoj, berezovoj, klenovoj čaščej, kružilas' v živoj voronke zvukov. Zvuki toklis' na meste, metalis' iz storony v storonu, izvivalis' zmejami vokrug derev'ev, stlalis'pod nogami. Zdes' byli vse instrumenty, pridumannye Vostokom i Zapadom, sdelannye kustarem i fabrikoj, avtomatičeskie, duxovye, strunnye i udarnye. I oni svisteli, bubnili, gudeli, treščali, peli, vopili vse srazu i ni na minutu ne perestavaja. Vse operetki i opery, mazurki i val'sy, marši i galopy, sočinennye kogda-nibud' na svete, ne šitaja toržestvennych oratorij, pečal'nyx kantat, rapsodij, menuétov, polonezov i pesen, - vse ěti klassy, vidy i rody muzikal'nyx sočinenij, vo vsex tonax i vsex tempax, izvestnych životnomu miru i organnym fabrikam, - vse oni s veličajšim staraniem i nepravdopodobnym fortissimo pyžilis' zajavit' o sebe zdes', na ětoj gore, pokrytoj, kak platkom, lipovoj klenovoj čaščej.

59 pp. 78-79.
When war breaks out Fedin uses the reiteration of the single word "vojna" as a refrain in order to convey the way in which warfare immediately begins to dominate every human activity.

The connection of many ornamental sections with the thematics of the novel is, however, more tenuous. Apart from the setpiece on the roundabout at the Erlangen fair, the repeated attempts to evoke a sensation of speed, frequently with echoes of Gogol's trojka from Mertvye duši, become wearisome: we find at the end of the subchapter "Okopnyj professor" an episode in which a car is driven at immense speed.
speed, as well as Andrej Starcov's sledride down the Lausche with Marie Urbach, and Golosov's breakneck cartridge in "Subbota v Semidole."  

The description of Semidol is strikingly Gogolian in its use of hyperbole and extreme simile:

— Na rossijskom prostore bylo raskidano takix Semidolov velikoe množestvo. Vse oni byli pokozi drug na druga, kak kury, i žizn' v nix šla po-kurinomu - ot zari do zari, s nasesta na nasest. Semidol'cy brodili po pyl'nym, mjagkim, kak periny, ulicam i progrinivšim paneljam, kormilis', kloxtali, vyvodili cypljat, s opaskoj posmatrivali naverx, otkuda valjatsja vse bedy, i bežali bez ogljadki, kak tol'ko razdavalsja voinsidevnyj trepet petušinogo kryla. Petuxi, kak položeno, toptali semidol'cev, bljuli ix nравstvennost', bilis' smertnym boem za svoi prihody. Čtoby otličit' v Semidole nastupavšie novye vremena ot davno prošedšix, nado, byvalo, prožit' v nem ne men'she Čelovečeskoj žizni. V etom slučae nabljudatel'nyj glaz zamečal, čto na Monastyrskoj ulice postavлен novyj fonarnyj stolb, da razvalil'sja palisadnik protiv zemskoj upravy, da vykrašena zanovo požarnaja kalança.

There are even verbal similarities, e.g. in the similes used to describe the softness of the road, with the beginning of Gogol's story, "Koljaska." Fedin heightens the Gogolian atmosphere by "realizing the metaphor" in the passage which follows, and by

64 pp. 34, 167-168, 324-325.

65 pp. 319-320.
introducing a specifically literary reference.

Nam trudno ustojat' pered soblaznom retrospektivnogo opisanija goroda, v byloe vremja poxožego na ptičij dvor. Čto možet by' umilitel'nej kloxtan'ja nasedki, trogatel'nej piska želtoperogo vyvodka ili vdoxnovennej petušinogo prizyva? No my tverdo pomnim, čto etot idilličeskij kurjatnik pogubil nemalo russkix romanistov.

Vot počemu my načinaem svoe povestovanie prjamo s togo dnja, kogda nad ptičim dvorom prokasil' pervye raskaty vspolona i v vyšinu, otkuda valjatsja vse bedy, vzletelo vydrannoe iz xvosta pero. Vskore takie per'ja zaklubilis' nad Semidolom neprogljadnymi tučami, a čerez pjet' dnej - vsego čerez pjet' dnej - vozdux stal snova prozračen.66

The impression of the age-old stagnation of the Russian "gluši" is intensified by the detailed description of the Starye Ruč'ı orchards which soon follows.67 Although the unaffectedness of Semidol by the Revolution is an important theme in this section of the novel, the impression of Gogolian pastiche created by the setpiece on the town necessarily detracts from the realism of the presentation of the background for the Mordvinian uprising and the significant discussion between Golosov, Starcov and Ščepov.

The Tolstoyan device of "ostranenie" is reflected in several passages in the novel, notably in the symbolic reference

66 p. 320.

67 pp. 326-327.
to the director's fingers in the interview between the company
director and Meier at the Faber factory, the description of the
firing during the San'sino battle scene, and the description of the
cavalry detachment which rides past Andrej's house in Bischofsberg.
In the last example the dehumanization inherent in the "ostranenie"
conveys the inhumanity of war and the subordination of the individual
to the military machine:

V svečem poslegrozovom rassvete po
mostovoj cokali besčislenneye podkovy.
V vozduxe, na ostrijax kavalerijskix
pik, razvevalis' dvuxcvetnye flažki.
Vyloščennye temno-zelenyye uniformy,
nabitye xorošimi širokogrudymi telami,
čoporilis' i podprygivali v sedlax.
Po černolakovym kvadratam, zaveršavšim
kaski, begali neverennye teni
utrennego neba.68

The "animation" of the smells of Lependin's hut is curiously
reminiscent of Leonov's similar, though much more sustained, set-
piece on the smells of the Zarjad'e district in Moscow in his novel
Barsuki, which appeared in the following year:

Ot sosnovoj krovati, ot ljul'ki svisavšej
s potolka, i ot sten paxlo prijano, slovno
ot malinnyx kustov. Potoik byl nizkij,
černyj, i sidet' pod nim bylo nadežno -
krepko prixloplnil izbjanye zapaxi, nikuda
ne utj im, nekuda šeloxnut'sja, stojat
gusto, plotno, umjato - klopopve, xlebnye,
tarakani, pečnye, fatanaftel'nye.69

68 pp. 107, 375, 99.
69 p. 236.
On the first page of the novel Andrej's reference to his heart - "serdce moe soxlos' i svernulos' stoporom, kak limonnaja korka na raskalennoj solncem mostovoj" — sets the tone for the author's extensive use of striking tropes.

The subchapter "Son", of 14 pages, in which all the following tropes, amongst others, occur, illustrates the extent to which metaphors pervade the novel:

Plen - grob. Dno i stenki ego - sneg, kryška - nebo, zatknutoe snežnymi tučami.

... Sudorožno trepeščut ščepčeščie guby ober-lejtenanta:...

Gromadnaja ten' rasprjamljajet na potolke ruki i kidaetsja iz ugla v ugol.

Andrey smotrit na nego zastylym, kak steklo, vzgljadom ...

Bezzvučie skovyvaet polumrak komnaty, sveča gorit poprežnemu bojazlivo, i medlenno gusteet prjanyj medovyj dux rastoplennoi voska.

Golova zakinulas' nazad, i na rastjanutoj šee skol'znul čelnokom vypjativšija ostryj kadyk.

V ego rukax podlomilas' i povislo meškom otjazelevšee telo ober-lejtenanta.

Kosogory s ugnešhžimisja na nix lačugami čut' različnymi gorbami podymalis' k bezglazomu nebu.

... ego golos upal, kak ptica, izbivšajasja v kletke ...
The prevalence of highly figurative language reflects the literary climate of the time, determined in large measure by the futurist school, and Fedin's special penchant for the animation of the inanimate by means of "personifying" verbs and adjectives is reminiscent of Vsevolod Ivanov's artistic method. In this connection the metaphorical use of the instrumental is an especially common technique in the novel. The effect of "ostranenie" produced by extreme tropes, and especially by the "animation" device, is one of the most conspicuous elements of Fedin's style in Goroda i gody.

Fedin presents starving Petrograd during the razruxa of War Communism as follows:

71 pp. 384-398.
S severo-zapada gnal t'mu so svistom i gulom mokryj, kosoplečij veter.

Peterburg šeljšilsja železnjoj šeluxoj, i šeluxa so zvonom bilas' po kryšam i pedala, skrežčka, na kamennyje dnišča ulic.

Vnizu bylo temno, kak v tunneljax.

Doma vymerli, doma provalilis', domov ne bylo. Peresekalis', tjanulis' vo t'ne bezglazye, mokrye boka tunnelej.

I po mokrym, bezglazym bokam tunnelej i po kamennym dniščam ix s vizgom i zvonom neslas' železnaja šeluxa. Kosymi plečami mjal veter kamennyj gorod, švyrjal eju v promozglju t'nu.

Belye bez'jan'i lapy avtomobilja capali omertvevšie, sočivšiesja xolodom boka tunnelej, propadali tak že stremitel'no, kak pojavljalis'. I tol'ko okolavajuščim šakalom vyla avtomobil'naja sirena.72

In the images used by Fedin in the presentation of Petrograd in "Glava pervaja o devjat'sot devjatnadcatom" there is a clear resemblance to the imagery of Zamjatin's stories of Petrograd during the Civil War, Peščera and Mamaj. As in Zamjatin's work, the environment is one of savage inhumanity, in which man is reduced to a primitive troglodytic condition,73 although Fedin strikes a note of optimism in his portrayal of the "trench professor."

72 pp. 17-18.

73 The setpiece on "fat" is significant in this connection (pp. 55-56).
Fedin remarks in his article on Goroda i gody, published in 1952, that if he had been writing the novel thirty years later he would have strengthened the leitmotivs of the novel. Although there are clear attempts throughout the work to achieve artistic effect by means of leitmotivs, Fedin makes no systematic use of this device. There is, for example, no consistent attempt in the manner of Lev Tolstoj or Thomas Mann to associate any character with a specific physical or mental trait. Such themes as recur do so only two or three times and are too fragmentarily applied to be really effective.

An example of the limited use made of leitmotivs are the references to flags as symbol of German militarism. Thus the social-democrat Paul Hennig's ability to reconcile jingoistic patriotism with socialism is shown in the episode in which he helps his apprentice to put out a flag to celebrate a German victory over the Russians, while continuing to expound to Starcov his views on the "creeping socialism" induced by the war. Soon afterwards an ironic setpiece describes the statistical analysis carried out in Bischofsberg of the number of flags per house put out in celebration of German victories in Poland. Finally, Marie Urbach's conversion to opposition to the war is first indicated by her indifference to

74 Fedin, "K romanu "Goroda i gody," Sobranie sočinenij, II, 430.

75 pp. 155-156.

76 p. 159.
The time interval between the first use of a phrase and its recurrence is sometimes too great for the device to be effective, although such reiteration illustrates the care taken in the construction of the novel. The phrase "Эх, хорошие девушки в Саксонии," used first of Marie when serving coffee to soldiers en route for the front at a time of patriotic enthusiasm and high morale at the beginning of the war recurs as a soldier's exclamation 150 pages later when Marie takes the lead in forming a Soldiers' Soviet in Bischofsberg. Again, it is doubtful whether the reader recollects the circumstances in which the striking simile applied to the ripping of canvas when Mühlen-Schönau slashes Wahn's painting with a penknife — "Звук был також, как будто на железную крышу бросили горсть гороха и он посыпались по скату в зелёба" — was originally used of Wahn's cutting up the Imperial flag over the German Embassy in Petrograd.

The re-evocation of Fedor Lependin's ecstatic words on the richness of his native orchards of Starye Руч'ї, of which he boasts at the POW transit camp on the Polish border, after his execution at

77 pp. 174-175.
78 pp. 161, 308.
79 pp. 402, 280.
the orders of Mühlen-Schönaus is an example of the effective and moving use of reiteration:

—— Ex, parja! Kakaja u nas sila jagody!
Višnjaka u nas - prijamo tuča! Slivy tam, torona - svin' i ne žrut! A na grjadkax, na grjadkax, parja, krasno vse ot zemljanigi, a zemljaniga - vo, v kulak! Vixtorija tam vsjakaja, skorospelka — i-i-i-i! A jablok štix samyx - vsju zimu lopaem, — i močim, i solim, i sušim, nikak ne spravit'sja, do čego mnogo!80

In this way Lependin's own characteristic words constitute his epitaph.

Wahn's words to Starcov after asking his friend whether he would be able to kill Mühlen-Schönaus, when Starcov replies that he would not be able to kill anybody if he were to know who it was that he had killed, "Ty boiš'sja straxa, Andrej, boiš'sja straxa! Ėto užasno. Nado perestupit' čerez strax, perešagnut' čerez nego," recur significantly at the very end of the novel. As Andrej watches the rats run over his feet during his frenzied flight he hears Wahn's voice telling him to "step over" them, and soon afterwards the voice repeats Wahn's earlier words, "Ty boiš'sja straxa, Andrej. Perešagni čerez nego. Perešagni ..."81 Here the device is strikingly effective in conveying Starcov's state of mind and intensifying the general presentation of his personality.

80 pp. 262, 352.

81 pp. 370, 413.
In his article on _Goroda i gody_ Fedin refers specifically to the leitmotiv of the head of the executed murderer Karl Ebersocks as one which he would have wished to strengthen. Ebersocks' gruesome head, which Wahn and Starcov first see preserved in a jar at the Erlangen Anatomical Museum and then as a target at a shy at the annual fair which the two friends visit, is the most consistently sustained and yet the least successful of the leitmotivs which occur in the novel. At the outbreak of war Starcov has a nightmare in which the head falls down a staircase, striking each step with "chronometric regularity." He wakes up and realizes that the sound of the head striking the steps is the beating of a drum accompanying a detachment of cavalry.

Finally, Andrej sees the head of a blind Italian prisoner of war, one of a long column of blinded men, as the weeping head of Ebersocks. Andrej then continues to see the face of one of the guards as Ebersocks' head. The impact on the reader is partially vitiated by the heavy emphasis on the significance of the symbol and Andrej's reaction:

_Lica desjatkov i soten ljudej pokazalis' emu odnim licom. I kogda on vsmotrelsja v nego, on zakrižal. Ĉto bylo lico Karla Ėbersokska, kakim on uznal ego v Ėrlangenskom muzee i potom vo sne, kogda bagrovaja golova razdumyvala - upast' ej ili ostat'sja na lestnice. No - užas, užas! - po licu ubijcy, kotoryj s otkrytymi glazami vzokeł na ĸafot, Ĉtoby posle smerti beszystno smotreć' na ljudej iz spirtovoj muzejnoj banki, po ĸtomu licu tekli slesyi! Andrej uža ne videl tolpy. Pered nim, gde-to sovsem vblizi, v_
Unfortunately the image of Ebersochs' head is too artificially conceived and too ill-integrated with the action of the novel to become an effective symbol of German bestiality. Whereas the significance of the head is spelled out with unsubtle transparency, other leitmotivs suffer from not being sufficiently consistently developed.

Fedin makes extensive use of documentary material in the novel, and the quotation from contemporary newspapers and other sources is one of the most striking features of the author's artistic method. Fedin wrote of his repatriation in 1918 that "Записки о более чем четырехлетнем пребывании в тылу у немцев и кипа газетных вырезок лежали в моем Kemodane," and it is clear that he had made a systematic collection of newspaper articles with the aim of using them later in his own work.

---

82 pp. 73-74, 80-81, 98-100, 170-171.

The theme of the jingoistic patriotism and inhumanity of wartime Germany is illustrated by the citation of newspaper cuttings supposedly collected by the Belgian clown, Percy, for the scrapbook which he compiled as an internee. Thus Fedin quotes an article in the "Volkserzieher" to the effect that if Christ were to return to earth he would be found fighting in the ranks of the German Army, and another by a doctor in a medical journal on the need to inculcate brutality and hatred. The author's method is similar to the device of the "novel within a novel," in that a character in the book is presented as gathering the author's collection of quotations. The device is developed consistently, so that finally Percy is imprisoned for his action in compiling the scrapbook. A feuilleton article from a German newspaper on coin peepshows featuring battle scenes is also apparently genuine. The article from the "Utrennjaja gazeta Biśofsberga" about the trial arising from the dismissal of a woman doctor for serving coffee to Russian officer prisoners is from the local newspaper in Zittau. The atmosphere of military crisis during the Judenyč offensive on Petrograd presented in the subchapter

---

84 pp. 152-153.
85 p. 154.
87 pp. 240-241.
A similar effect is achieved by Fedin's use of fictional material which produces the impression of genuine documentation. The author uses the device of the "found manuscript" which Šklovskij analyzed in his study O teorii prozy with relation to Cervantes and Sterne, "baring" it in his introduction to the subchapter, "Narodnost' finskogo plemenî," which consists entirely of extracts from Mühlen-Schönaus's diary: "Vot otryvki zapisej ober-lejtenanta sakonskoj armii fon cur Mjulen-Ŝenau, kotorye on vel v russkom plenu. Razroznennaja tetradd' s ětimi zapisjami byla najdena spustja mnogo vremenî posle semidol'skix sobytij .... Soxranivšiesja stranicy udalos' vosstanovit' i perevesti počti polnost'ju." The stamp of authenticity possessed by the language of Mühlen-Schönaus's Proclamation to the Mordvinians contributes to the realism of the anti-Bolshevik uprising. The very different style of the letter written to a German soldier and quoted by Starcov in his speech to the German prisoners at Semidol produces a similar effect.

88 pp. 42-43.

89 p. 311.

90 pp. 363-364. The original version of 1924 reads "moskovskie činovniki" instead of "činovniki" and "ugnetateljami - bol'ševikami" instead of "ugnetateljami."

91 pp. 355-356.
In his presentation of Germany Fedin successfully uses much pseudodocumentary material apart from the genuine cuttings from newspapers. The theme of the horrible suffering of war is developed by the inclusion of a programme for a "performance" by amputees with artificial limbs.\(^2\) The programme serves the additional function in the novel of emphasizing the contrast between the sufferings of the ordinary soldiers and the continuing luxury of the members of the German upper class, such as Frau Urbach, who looks down upon the common people as a different order of beings.

Thus the use of documentary material forms a major integral part of the presentation of Germany in the novel, and may be considered one of its most interesting stylistic features. Such material is also used to assist in the presentation of Starcov's experiences in Germany, as when the text of the police authorization for Starcov to take a walk outside Bischofsberg and Mühlen-Schönau's certificate for the authorities on the circumstances of his finding the Russian in the grounds of his schloss are quoted.\(^3\)

Fedin achieves considerable ironic impact by his use of the signs on the Bismarck-Allee in Bischofsberg in the setpiece devoted to the City Hospital, the pleasant and prosperous façade of which conceals the multitude of cripples and amputees within.\(^4\) In his

\(^2\) pp. 230-231.

\(^3\) pp. 212-213.

\(^4\) pp. 215-218. Düwel suggests that the descriptions of the citizens' promenades in the novel are based upon Fedin's own
description of the hospital and the Sunday promenades of the Bischofsberg citizenry Fedin includes over ten such signs, for instance:

"Zapreščaetsja sorit' bumagoj i kožuroj fruktov."

"Vospreščaetsja njan'kam s det'mi sidet' na lavkax."

"Ne raskovyrivat' dorožek zontami i palkami."

By this device Fedin brings out effectively the contrast between external order and wellbeing and internal inhumanity and disintegration.

IV

The presentation of prewar and wartime Germany in Goroda i gody is more extensive than that of revolutionary Russia. This detailed treatment of Germany suggests that a similar psychological process was operating as in the case of the collection of short stories, Pustyr', based mainly on the prerevolutionary Russian countryside, which Fedin published in 1923. Explaining his choice of theme, Fedin wrote later:

Ja dolžen byl razrodit'sja, inače plod uner by vo mne i ostravil by menja ... ja dolžen byl uvidet' svoe prošloe v knige ... moja proza ostavala ot vsego moego razvitija, ot moego sostojanija. Ėto


95 Approximately 220 pages are devoted to Germany as compared with 180 devoted to Russia.
Fedin goes on to say that he "vykarabkivalsja iz podavljajuščego menja materiala." Clearly the writer was intensely conscious of a psychological need to "overcome" the past by a literary transformation of his experiences. In a letter to Gor'kij Fedin vividly expressed his profound psychological involvement with Germany:

Na tri četverti roman germanskij:
dejstvie razvivaetsja v nemeckom
gorodiške, na žona obyvatel'skogo
tyla. Ja do takoj stepeni vlež v
Germaniju, čto sploš' i rjadom ne
pišu, a "perevožu" s nemeckogo, dumaju
po - nemecki i čuvstvuju. Kogda
perevožu na russkuju zemlju, k
russkim ljudjam, k russkoj reči -
ispytuyu nepreoborimye trudnosti:
čužoj material!97

The rhetorical, ornamental setpieces characteristic of Fedin's presentation of Germany convey an atmosphere of natural beauty and material prosperity, combined with regimentation, "pošlost'," and philistinism. As the setpiece devoted to the Bischofsberg City Hospital discussed earlier indicates, Fedin is concerned to demonstrate that beneath the congenial and orderly appearances lie the fearful forces of inhumanity and brutality which are released by the war. Fedin

---


97 Fedin, letter to M. Gor'kij, July 16, 1924 (Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli, neizdannaja perepiska (Moscow, 1963), pp. 474-475).
suggests, indeed, that the savage repressed energies below the surface demand war for their explosive release.

Starcov is repelled by the ghastly severed head of Ebersoehs, which is to become the principal symbol of German cruelty and militarism, during his visit with Wahn to the Erlangen Anatomical Museum with its pedantically ordered collection of human organs and foeti. Later a Russian student points out the moral of the shy at which the head forms the principal target:

Sport, kak izvestno, - fizičeskoe vospitanie. No skol'ko mudrosti projavil balaganščik, soodiniv poleznoe s vozvyšennym. Vosxititel'no! Takim sposobom vy ne tol'ko razminaete muskulaturu zastojavšemusja landšturm, no i otkrivate ego moral'noe čuvstvo, ukrepljaete pravosoznanie i pročee .... Glavnoe - vsja ëta istorija proniknuta patriotičeskoj ideej, ideej vospitanija graždan v duxe gosudarstvennosti.98

Later the student, suggesting that such sport is designed to exercise the atrophying human desire for vengeance, spells out his thesis:

Takoj rascvet, takaja pyšnost', takoj dostatok, takoe dovol'stvo. Nesterpimo. Ja čuvstvuju, čto pod počvoy vsej strany, pod soznaniem vsego naroda ležat celye plasty naprježennogo neterpenija. Vse krugom tak nasyšeno, nalito, napolneno, čto nužna, neobxodima, naizbežna razrjadka. Vo vsem krugom sebja ja slyšu dyxanie kacock-to strašnoj potencii. I ja vižu, kak ëta potencija rastet, kak ona neprestanno pitaetsja izvne, slovno akkumuljator,
Watching the lustful persistence of a student pursuing a girl, their Russian colleague goes on to tell them that they are sitting on a volcano - one fine day they will be blown up "like a bottle of soda water in the sun." He then makes a vague excuse and disappears, never to appear again in the novel. However justified the thesis of German militarism may be, its introduction in philosophic terms by an episodic figure who is seen only in this one conversation seems unconvincingly artificial.

Fedin does not return to direct analysis of the aggressive and violent forces within the German character, but contents himself with presenting the chauvinism which is aroused by the war. In this regard the most significant episodes are those in which Wahn treats his former friend Starcov as a hated enemy after the outbreak of war and in which the jingoism of the social-democrat Hennig is presented. Further, Fedin introduces at the beginning of the "Chapter on 1916" an ironic setpiece on "patriotic packaging," illustrating the degree

---

99 p. 84.

100 pp. 146-147.
to which even the most innocent household products are modelled after military materiel.

Several of the episodes in which German aggressiveness and chauvinism are presented, such as the conversation of Starcov and Wahn with the Russian student and the symbol of Ebersochs' head, have an artificial quality of "plakatnost" which detracts from their artistic impact. Fedin is initially successful, however, in creating an atmosphere of ominous tension before introducing Ebersochs' head by the contrast between the congenial and aesthetic order of the University Garden and the gruesome and pedantic order of the Anatomical Museum:

Within these grounds stands the Museum, in the entrance hall of which Starcov and Wahn inspect a chest filled with human remains.

The description of the Museum follows:

Oдин за другим тjanulis' стеклянnyе 
škaty. V škatax na stekljannyx polkax stroilis' po vysote i diametru stekljannyе 
banki s zaspirtovannymi preparatami, 
čelovečeskix organov. Steklo, spir i 
sinie, sизye, krasnye kuski, niti,volokna, 
komki čelovečeskogo tela - vse, čto 
napolnlalo prostornye, wysokie zaly. 
Solnce bezuderžno lilos' v čistye okna, i 
po stenam, potolku, polu, na plat'jax,
This episode introduces effectively the theme of the conflict between appearances and reality in Germany. Much later the presentation of the pension in Weimar to which Marie Urbach is sent fulfils a similar function. The pension is a tour-de-force of concise presentation of soulless regimentation:

Pansion zanimal prostornyyj dom, obnesennyj vysokoj çugunnoj ogradoj v zoloçenyx ostrijax i s kamennymi šarami na vorotax. Ot vxoda çerez sad k dverjam veli dorožki iz betonnych plitok, pročno uložennyx, blestjaščix ot gorjačej vody i ščatok. Allei sada rovno usypalis' graviem; utykannyje vperemežku želitye i sinie železnye dužki kruževnymi pojaskami obnimali klumby i gazony; na vystrugannyx palkax, votknutyx v klumby, raznocvetnymi solncami sijali glazirovannye šary; gnom s tačkoju v rukax lukavo smejalsja, zadrav golovu i pročno vryvšis' glinjanymi bašmakami v podstrižennyyj dern. Dom stojal statno, razglazenno i zastegnuto, blestja na solnce, kak šucman - pugovicami, med'ju i nikelem okonnych ruček, zamkov, načiščennoj čaškoj zvonka i massivoj doskoju na dveri:

P A N S I O N  M I S S  R O N I dlja blagorodnychyj devic

Here the reference to the policeman foreshadows the introduction of Miss Ronnie's mirror and the inhumanly rigid timetable to which she subjects her pupils and her servants alike. The adjective "blagopolučnyj", which evokes ironically the general presentation of

102 p. 73.

103 p. 138.
German life in the novel, will acquire far greater significance much later in connection with the description of the Bischofsberg hospital:

Miss Roni naxodila, što pansion blagopolučen toliko, toga, kogda vse' ego stroj otrazat do polnogo sxodstva ee obraz žizni.104

A setpiece on the cleaning of roads precedes the presentation of the consequences of the war, which results in individual privations and the fearful suffering symbolized by the City Hospital. The evocation of normality, order and "blagopolučie" provides a similar contrast to the horrors which follow as the University Garden provides for the gruesome contents of the Anatomical Museum. H. Oulanoff quotes the passage on road-cleaning as an example of successful "ostranenie," 105 but the artistic impact is vitiated by the authorial rhetoricism, which blunts the effect by conveying to the reader the artificiality of the situation:

O, tak mojut dorogi i v malen'kom, nebogatom Bišofsberge .... O tak mojut i čistjat dorožki, doma i šiščki rešetok i v malen'kom, nebogatom Bišofsberge!106

A similar overemphasis reduces the impact of the description of the Bischofsberg Hospital, in which an atmosphere of pervasive irony is created by the repeated references to "blagopolučie,"

---

104 p. 139.


After the presentation of the hospital and the conversation of the citizens’ wives during their promenade follows the moving episode of the visit to the quadruple amputee Albert Biermann by his 

107 pp. 215-216.
wife. The horror is conveyed with great effectiveness both by means of the contrast between the congenial and hygenic hospital and the appallingly maimed inmates and by the Babesque factuality of the descriptions:

Here the stylistic features contribute greatly to the horror of the situation: The deaf cripple repeatedly screams to his visitor in the same words to have his wife called to him, unable, since he is also blind, to see that the visitor is his wife. Only as a result of his asking her to pinch him as a sign of having understood does she pull off the blanket and realize her husband's condition. This masterly episode is an even more memorable symbol of the atrocity of war than the mutilated horse in E. M. Remarque's Im Westen Nichts Neues.

The association of war with amputation, in conjunction with the theme of German complacency and pedantic love of order, is developed further in the episode which follows: a hospital consultant...
buys two cigars and settles down comfortably at home in order to write up an experiment in communication with invalids who had lost their sight and hearing, as well as all four limbs. The inhumanity which the author sees as lying beneath the surface of the selfsatisfied philistinism of the German bourgeois is exposed in such scenes, as well as those in which Frau Urbach figures. The use of the documentary material discussed earlier, exemplified by the programme of the amputees' "performance," effectively illustrates this theme.

The motive of the horrors concealed by the pleasant façade of the hospital recurs later when German morale has fallen catastrophically. Frau Biermann leads a crowd of women in mourning who bring out the cripples from the hospital in order to show them in the town and reveal to all the atrocities of war. In this episode the leitmotifs of the "blagopolučie" and agreeable appearance of the hospital are repeated effectively. The description of the procession of maimed soldiers which follows contributes a further moving indictment of war:

Ženščiny vykattyvali na ulicu kresla, koljaski, stul'ja, usaživali v nix ranenyx, i ranenye razmaxivali kostyljami i čto-to vykrikivali neslyšnymi xripami. Molodoj soldat, skinuv s odnogo pleča mundir, podnjal pobleskivavšju nikelem i lakom ruku, i sledom za nim ranenye, deržavšiesja bez pomošči ženščin, zagolili stal'nye, kartonnye, kožanye ruki, i patenty zatorkali, zaskripeli, zanyli svoimi pružinami i ryčagami. I toga tolpa vzvyla neistovym raznogolosym voem i podnjav na pleči kalek, s kreslami, stul'jami, nosilkami i protezami v rukax, tronulas' po allee Bismarka i dal'še - po
The scene of the hideous procession is immediately followed by the episodes in which the revolution in Bischofsberg is presented. Unfortunately, the rebellion and overthrow of the Imperial administration in Bischofsberg have an unconvincing element of "plakatnost" which is even more conspicuous than in the earlier sections of the novel which deal with Germany. Fedin himself stressed in a later article that the depiction in the novel of the revolutionary events in Germany after 9th November, 1918, is not based upon the author's own experiences. 110

The authorial irony in the presentation of the contrast between Germanic love of order and the outbreak of revolution is expressed completely transparently:

V komnatu vbežala gorničnaja i ispuranno protjanula Frau Urbax pomjatyj listok.


Černym po belomu, daža ne prosto černym, a issinja - černym, na listke stojalo slovo:

revoljucija

I ne gde-nibud' v Rossii ili v Kitae - v čem ne bylo by ničego neobyčnogo, a

v Germanii,

čto bylo užě ne toľko neobyčno, no daža

sverx"estestvenno

Listok byl ékstrenno vypuščen social-demokratičeskoj gazetkoj.111

The same note of laboured irony is maintained later:

Kakoj - to bjurger, vse ešče verja v silu ustanovlenných veščej, kak otec ešče verit v svoju vlast', kogda syn vpervy bezbojazennno vykažet neposlušanie, - kakoj-to bjurger, zaperev svoju tabačnuju lavočku, vyvesil na dveri kartonku s ob"javleniem:

ZDES' ZAPREŠČAETSJA DELAT' REVOLJUCIJU

V samom dele, ne mogli že ljudi, prosnuvšis' utrom 10 nojabrja, sojti s uma! I esli oni neslis' po doroge i trotuarom bez vidimogo smysla, to, konečno, toľko potomu, čto ni na doroge, ni na trotuarax ne bylo napisano:

ZAPREŠČAETSJA NARUŠAT'

NORMAL'NOE TEČENIE ŽIZNI112

111 p. 296. Italics in original.

112 p. 299. Italics in original.
The revolutionary events are accompanied by major coincidences:

Frau Urbach learns for the first time of her husband's political activities from the same number of the newspaper as that in which the proclamation of the republic is announced, and immediately afterwards a telegram arrives informing the Urbachs of their son's death in battle. These coincidences heighten the atmosphere of unreality which surrounds Hennig's political conversion, the assault on the citadel, and Marie Urbach's assumption of leadership of the Soldiers' Soviet.

The stereotypically heroic presentation of Marie Urbach at this moment and the authorial intrusion which follows contribute to this unconvincingness:

Moreover, the impact of the artistically successful episode of the now humbled Stadtrat's application for a pass into the Rathaus, with its implications of German subservience to authority, however

113 pp. 307-308.
constituted, is diminished by Marie Urbach's unlikely use of her library stamp for the document and the Stadtrat's acceptance of the artifice.

V

The presentation of revolutionary Moscow and Petrograd in Goroda i gody is strikingly vivid, and constitutes one of the most impressive features of the novel. In connection with Andrej Starcov's and Kurt Wahn's experiences Fedin provides extensive genre pictures of both capitals during the period of War Communism. Wahn is first struck by the "savage beauty" of dilapidated Moscow, deserted after the evening curfew:

Obluplennye kolonki domikov, dobrodušnye polul'vy-polusobaki u zanesennyx pyl'ju dverej, izvitye vos'merkami rešetki davno opustošennyx podvalov bezzlobno smotreli na vysivšiesja ambarami korobki, protykanne besčislennymi oknami ....
V étot čas zatopljal pereulki kolokol'nyj zvon, i bezmolvie domov uglubjalos' im do tišiny podvodnogo jara. I, kak v jaru, vse načinalo kazat'sja smertnym, stojačim, točno sominyj vzor, i bagrovye ot zakata cerkvi čudilis' utonuvšim carstvom.
Togda Kurt vybiralsja iz pereulkov i šel tuda, ockuda vidny byli kremlevskie bašni. Oni vyplyvali pered nim sumerečnye, kakim-to pevučim vencem isčeznuvšego pod zemlej goroda, i za ix nerezgadannoj osankoj emu mereščilis'ja poizabytyj burg, obeliskom večov ležaččij nad Njurnbergom.114

114 pp. 275-276. The 1952 revision is superior in its romantic evocativeness to the original version, which has "nadgrobiem" in place of "pevučim vencom," "čuždoj osankoj" in place of "nerazgadannoj osankoj," and "koronoj večov" in place of "obeliskom večov."
Following his usual method, Fedin contrasts Moscow of the "forty times forty" churches with the new Moscow under War Communism, characterized by the use of every possible space as storerooms for food, and the conversion of the former lycée on the Ostoženka into a centre for popular education. Here Fedin is concerned to present the further contrast between the poverty and ignorance of the people and the new enthusiasm for education:

... Čerez Teatral'nuju pol'čad', po Mosavoj i dal'še - po Volxonke, po Ostoženke - toročilis' vspugnutye slonami pogorel'cy neizvestnoy planety - s maškami na plečax, beskonečnoj vereniecej - po toj časti ulic, kotoruyu gorod ustupil tramvajam. Na Ostoženke, bliz Krymskogo mosta, verenica vlivalas' v belyj dom, i vokrug étogo doma odinokie figury pogorel'cev kopošilis' pered vitrinami i ščitami dlja plakatov. Na buľ'vare, podle budki, torgovavšej poddel'nym mylom i uksusnoy essencij, torčal stekljannyj jaščik s modeljami čelovečeskix vnutrennostej i nad melkimi bukvami, ob'jasnivšimi čelovečestvu naznačenie poček i selezenki, krupno vystupala nadpis': Proletarii vsex stran, soedinijajtes!

The author goes on to describe the "pogorel'cy" as "New Russia," pouring into the house where a "treaty" is being signed between Russia and Science ("Nauka").

This presentation of Moscow precedes the episode in which Wahn is seen painting an immense poster stretched over the floor of a large room - the only occasion on which Wahn works at his original

115 p. 277. The "elephants" are the innumerable food trucks described in the previous passage. In the 1952 revision Fedin removed the reference to the slogan of the unity of the proletariat.
profession after the Revolution. It is after the woman interpreter tells Wahn how spoons are stolen from the canteen and how two portions of soup can be obtained for one meal ticket that he remarks laughingly:

Neobyknovennyj narod! Izumitel'nyj!
Nasčet ložak - ēto smešno. A voobšče.
Kak on posmel vse ēto sdelať?116

The introduction of the setpiece on the Kadaši slobodka117 which follows is motivated only by the fact of Starcov's having settled there on his arrival in Moscow. The extent of the dilapidation and privation in the city is conveyed by the parallel which is drawn between Kadaši in former times after fires and present-day Kadaši - then as now the rooks gathered on the roofs above the dead horses lying in the street.118

The presentation of "razruxa" in Petrograd during "the third year of the new chronology"119 has already been discussed in connection with Fedin's stylistic setpieces. The impression is intensified by the presentation of Ščepov's return home through Petrograd at the beginning of the subchapter "Peterburg," with its association

116 P. 278. In the 1952 revision the reference to the theft of spoons disappeared, and Wahn remarks, "Nasčet supa smešno."

117 P. 279.

118 The theme of dead animals ("padal'") is reminiscent of that of Fedin's early story Pes' i duši (1922) clearly set during the War Communism period. Pes' i duši was not reprinted after 1933.

119 P. 17.
of Petrograd with a forest and the reference to Ščepov's gathering wood for fuel from abandoned buildings under construction.

Čeloveku, kotoromu gorod - kak lesoviku les, ne nado sveta .... Čelovek, edva otličnyj ot kamnja, iz kotorogo byli vyloženy tunnely, naščupyvaja ugly i vystupy, podgonjaemyj vetrom, legko i bystro skol'žil po lužam. Vot on slil'sja s černoj stenoj, točno vojdja v vorota. Vot oščup'ju vzobralsja na slizkij xolmik. Spustilsja v jamu. Prolez v koridor, užkij, kak mogila. Nad golovoj ego merno bilsja o kamen' tresnutyj list krovel'nogo železa.120

The leitmotiv of the knocking of the iron roof sheeting and the image of the city's "iron shell" peeling off recur throughout the subchapter, renewed in the following subchapter, "Okopnyj professor," by the sound of the iron shovels striking the roadway, effectively reinforce the atmosphere of empty desolation. The "documentary" nature of the advertisement which Scepov finds, as well as his bitter comment "Do čego doveli intelligenciju, a?"121 contribute to the evocation of the atmosphere of the period.

Scepov's hoarding of food and complaints about the distribution system convey vividly the economic situation:


120 p. 18.
121 p. 19.
The theme of privation is developed in the setpiece on fat, introduced in connection with Rita's pregnancy, and Starcov's subsequent furtive theft of butter from Šćepov. The circumstances of the death of the "trench professor" are movingly related to the universal hunger:

... tak kak nikto ne govoril i nečego bylo skazat', Andrej proiznes čut' slyšno:  
— Nyši-to čto nadelal...  
Togda vse povernuli golovy i stali živo rassmatrивat' nučnoj meščok, prislonennyj k kničnomu škafu. On byl progryzen so vsex storon, razdergannyе loskuty xolsta svisali na pol, i po parketu k plintusam tjanulis' uzen'kie belye sledy.  
— Čto nado pribrat', - skazal predsedatel', i srazu troe brosilis' k mašku i potaščili ego von.123

A more humorous treatment of shortages is represented by the setpiece on the gravediggers' artel' for the sale of crosses as fuel. The author is ironical at the expense of the new social order:

V tečenje goda, možet byt' dvux, proisxodili stolknovenija, ssory, draki, slučilos' даže ubijstvo, xotja nikto iz vinovnikov ne xotel prinjat' grexa na sebja. Nakonec do soznania etix ljudej došlo, čto oni život v epoxу social'ного sodružestva, i mir prinimает s sego čisla tol'co idei kollektivizma, otvergaja vse ličnoe, egoističeskoe.

122 p. 21.
123 p. 59.
For the 1952 edition Fedin considerably revised the presentation of the refugees and the starvation and misery in the subchapter "Vrag u vorot!" with the evident aim of minimizing the depiction of anti-Bolshevik sentiment and of toning down the horror. In the original version the description of the anti-Bolshevik citizens who flee Petrograd despite the proclamation "Za delo! Vse v rjadu! Bejте trevogu, vrag u vorot!" conveys the despair and destitution of the refugees much more vividly:

V vjazkuju temnotu prospekta neslis' ogoltelye šineli. Pripljusnye tumanom ljudi voločili za soboj meški, uzly, korziny, po zaxarkannym i oslízlym trotuaram .... Perexvatyvali polovčej meški, podbirali xlopavšie po grjazi poly, rassypalis' cep'ju vdol' tramvajnogo polotna - bili trevogu razodrannym oklikom, pribitym vzorom, vsem vidom zstravlennyx, prikrytxy vetoš'ju svoix ubogix tel. 125 Originally, as Starcov leaves the church he identifies himself with this crowd of refugees:

Von otsjuda, von! Na prospekt! Na prospekt! V kotlovinu seryx šinelej, v poxod, v večnyj poxod, - da budet četot poxod večnym! Tol'ko i možno dyšat' v tolpe smjetennxy ljudej, v

124 pp. 59-60. Quoted from the 1924 edition. The 1952 revision reads simply, "Nakonec do soznaniya étix ljudej došlo, što oni živut v novuju époxu i mir s sego čisla otvergaet vse prošloe i perežitoe."

125 p. 44. Soon after "v otčajanii bredivšego pogibel'ju prospekta" is replaced by "sredi étix bredivšix pogibel'ju beglekov."
Again, in the original version the significant words "gljajda na krasnoarmajca," omitted in the 1952 version, make it appear that soon after Starcov joins the "lico s rastjanutymi v provoloku gubami" in threatening the Red Army soldier: "My ešče posmotrim!"

After Starcov believes he smells bread there follows the moving presentation of the starvation of Petrograd's population:

Zapax byl edva ulovim, no ot nego zabilos' serdce, kak ot narkoza. Andrej osmotreisja, čtoby rešit', kuda idti. Ljudi neslis' poredevšimi nadorvannymi vstrečnymi lentami. Lica byli zemlisty i ploski. Andrej perexvatal vzor č'ix-to bezcветnyx glaz. Za otupelym, nadvižnym bleškom ix on uvidal zverinju bol' goloda. I točas č'co-to gruznnoe potjanulo ego za pleči k zemle, i on kačnuilsja. Golod, golod dvigal vsem prospektom! Vse čto smjatjenie, ves' ětot beg ubogix čelovečeskix tel, ves' ětot neskončaemyj poxod naroda v seryx Žineljax - beg na meste, poxod vokrug Černogo ostova golodnoj smerti! Golod, golod!
Služit' emu - bezglazomu, oskalennomu, smerdjaščemu gnil'ju kostej, služit'emu - zaprijatavšis' v samyj tajnyj ugol nikem nerazyskannoj konury, - služit' skripom krovotočaščix zubov, držju skrjučennyx pal'cev s sorvannymi nogtjami, - služit' emu sobač'ej vernoj služboj do izdyxanija! Skoree v tajnyj ugol konury, domoj, domoj! No dom u čeloveka, kak u sobaki, tam, gde

126 p. 46.
After this presentation of man's humiliation by hunger and degradation to the level of a beast, in a later episode Fedin evokes the animal pleasure which a morsel of food gives to a starving man. The writer ends by speaking movingly of the "paños goloda" experienced at this fearful time:

A dni taščilis' tabunom iznurennyx kobyl po vyžžennoj stepi. I byla v nix zverinaya radost' - ot zolotnika xlebnoj truki i ot ěrvivoj kambaly. I bylo strašno smotret', kak zolotniki zverinoj radosti zaslonjali neob"jatnoe čelovečeskoe ščast'ě.


---

127 Quoted in the original version. In the 1952 revision the force of the exclamation "Golod, golod dvigal vsem prospektom!" is diminished by the following phrase, "pokazal's! Andreju," and the entire passage on "serving hunger" is omitted. The comparison of man with a dog is reduced to a reference to man's "konura."

128 pp. 42-43, 1924 edition. This entire passage is omitted in the 1952 revision.
Starcov's meeting with Rita after being nearly run over by a tram is preceded by an effective episode involving the groaning of a little girl in rags and Starcov's being begged for bread by a starving man. Here the degradation of the people is conveyed by the animal nature of their actions and by the "dehumanization" of the little girl, whose groaning is presented as a gruesome, disembodied sound:

Kakaja-to devočka, v otrep'jax na golove, v korotkom plat'ě, sžav čto-to za pazuxoj, pereminalas' na dlinnyx, očen' tonkix nogax podie zakoločennoj čveri. Lica ee ne byio vidno.

Gnusavyj ston otryvalsja ot nee i prilipal k stena, slovno prikleennyj kosym tjažělym snagom ....

Vysokij Čalovek pribilizilsja vplotnuju k licu Andreja i osmotrel ego vnimatel'no.

— Čraždanin, podajte na kusok xleba, — vdrug probrrjuzžal on, i rot ego otkrylsja ešče bol'še.

— Xleba? — sprosil Andrej. Čalovek postojal nekotoroe vremja molča, s zastyvšim licom, s vytaračennymi glazami, potom povernulsja i bystro pobežal za ugoł. Gnusavyj ston u zakoločennoj dveri razmerennno povtorjilsja.

Prošel starik s tuloviščem, naklonennym vpered, i nogami, ostavavšimi ot tulovišča na polšaga. Stupni ego byli obernuty promokšim, tjažělym trijap'ém, i na trotuare pozadi nego ostavalis' sledy, kak ot švabry. On ostanovilsja protiv devočki i o čem-to sprosil. Potom nagnulsja k nej i opjat' čto-to skazal. Togda ona pronziteln'no vskriknula i brosilas' v storčnu čarez dorogu. Tonkie, dlinnye nogi ee zamel'kali pered Andreem golymi, blestevšimi ot vody kolenkami. Andrej sdelal neskol'ko šagov sledom za devočkoj. Ona kuda-to propala. 129

129 pp. 50-51, quoted from the 1924 edition.
On this background of starving Petrograd Fedin evokes the military defence of the city against the Judenyč offensive. Fedin uses the device of having his hero, Starcov, drafted to the Army Staff as a writer. In this post he copies out the orders for the defence of Petrograd which contribute to the reality of this section of the novel. For the 1952 edition Fedin toned down the striking characteristics of the army commander, the "skulastuj černyj čelovek" who refuses to send Starcov to the front. In the revision the commander's mutilated Russian - "Xorošij poxorona - xorošo dija krasnoj armejskoj dux" becomes merely a "kačkij vostočnyj akcent." The commander's enthusiastic naivetė remains, however, together with his significant remark to Starcov, "Tovarišč dorogoj, počemu ty dumaeš', čto každyj čelovek v revoljucii dolžen streljat' iz ruž'ja? Možet, vsja tvoja revoljucija bumažnaja?n131

The atmosphere of crisis and improvisation in the palace on the Francuzskaja naberežnaja requisitioned by the Army Staff is well maintained by the use of evocative detail:

Po stenam, zaboram i stolbam bilis' podvešennyje na tesemkax i špagate telefonnye provoda. Na nix pozvjakivali derevjannyje jarlyki Zimnego, Smol'nogo, divizionnych štabov, Petropavlovskoj kreposti.132

---

130 p. 41. Quoted from the 1924 edition.

131 p. 49.

132 p. 42.
Unfortunately, however, the presentation of Starcov's work at the staff headquarters has an abstract quality:

The progress of Judenyč's advance is accompanied not only by the flight of starving refugees vividly presented in the 1924 edition, but also by an outbreak of anti-Bolshevik whispering, which again is more extensively depicted in the original version:

Na svete est' prestuplen'e, ne nakazuemoe nikakim zakonom, svoboda, ne narušennaja ni odnoj tiraniej. Kto pojmet slova, na mgnoven'e iskazivsee zažatyj rot? Kto doneset na ugrozu, pozoronennuju za pazuxoj? Kakoj put' i kakoe besputstvo zakazano voobražen'ju? .... Vot po ětim lestnicam, v ětix sarajax, na ětix ěrdakax guby šepčut otčetlivej i kulaki čut'-čut' pokazyvajutsja iz-za pazux. Zabrošennost' karetnika, bezmolvie saraja, pustota koridora, gde samyj opasnyj svidetel' - pauk, okružennyj pyl'nymi pustobrjuximi trupami mux, - preispolnjajut otvagoj duši, udel kotoryx - trepet.134

133. pp. 41-42.

134 p. 43. Not surprisingly, in view of the phrase "svoboda, ne narušennaja ni odnoj tiraniej," the entire first paragraph was omitted from the 1952 revision.
This presentation of the furtiveness of the anti-Bolshevik opposition foreshadows the ornamental setpiece beginning "Peterburg gotovilsja k vstreče vysokogo gostja" in which the armed preparations for repelling Judenyč are compared in an extended metaphor to the joyful reception of a great personage. Thus shrapnel is likened to confetti and the popping of champagne corks to the rattle of machine guns. The rhetorical style and strong irony, as well as the extreme imagery, prevent the reader from relating the passage to the actual political situation, so that the section is seen as an independent authorial setpiece:


A kak dosadno! Kakuju žarkuju vstrechu prigotovil amu Peterburg!136

By contrast the episode in which Starcov and the "trench professor" dig trenches in Petrograd during the night is strikingly realistic. The atmosphere of desolate, nocturnal Petrograd at this time of desperate crisis is brilliantly conveyed by a variety of images, including those of the city's "iron shell" and the striking

135 pp. 47-49.

136 pp. 48-49.
of the spades against the roadway already discussed. Further imagery includes the presentation of the crowd of unwilling diggers as a "drove of horses" ("tabun") and then as "blind men" when they stumble into an obstacle. Particularly effective is the image of the stopped clock with its dial still mysteriously illuminated, which leads to the significant conversation between the "trench professor" and Starcov. The looming figure of the detachment leader, whose voice is like an axe striking an empty barrel, contributes to the atmosphere of ominous tension.

The conversation between the conscripted diggers is strikingly frank. After the professor speaks of the joy of touching the manure and mud of the street, others openly express anti-Bolshevik sentiments.

— Ja ponjal by, esli by - pafoz, - razdalos' proryvisto, s odyshkoj. Tuoshaja, nelovkaja spoxvatilas':
— Vot imennno! V fevrale barrikady stroilos' sami. A sejchas - kazarma. Odyshka dobavila:
— Glavnoe, zaščiščam čto? Pravo na razrušenie.
— Razrušenie, - otdalos' czadi.
— Razrušenie, - kolynuloš' speredi. 137

The voices ask the professor why it is necessary to fight and speak of their fear for the future of culture. The professor's optimism is countered by the retort:

— Idei možno myslit' toli'ko v čelovečestve. A čelovečestvo obrečeno na vzaimnoe istreblenie.
— Istreblenie, - otdalos' szadi.
— Istreblenie, - kolynuloš' speredi. 138

137 pp. 29-30.

138 p. 30.
Irrespective of the characterization of the "trench professor," whose personality and views play a major part in this scene, the night trench-digging in Petrograd constitutes one of the most effective episodes of the novel. Here Fedin uses striking metaphors and leit-motifs to build up a vivid impression of atmosphere and human situation.

The presentation of the ageold stagnation of the remote provincial town of Semidol has already been discussed in connection with the author's use of narrative setpieces. This picture of the Russian "глуши" is intensified by Mühlen-Schönau's diary, in which the German officer writes of the primitiveness of the Mordvinians. Although, as Fedin pointed out to Gor'kij, who praised the realism of the depiction of the Mordva, the author did not know the region personally, the Mordvinian episodes convey a convincing impression of the unchanging, half-heathen way of life of a people almost untouched by modern civilization. Mühlen-Schönau's description of the religious rite ("moljan") as a foreign observer is particularly effective.

The reader naturally associates Mühlen-Schönau's description of the Mordvinian "7th Century" with the presentation of Semidol in the subchapter "Subbota v Semidle" which immediately follows the German officer's diary. For the 1952 revision, Fedin toned down

---

139 See Gor'kij's letter to Fedin, December 13, 1924, and Fedin's letter to Gor'kij, December 28, 1924 (M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, pp. 481,484).

140 pp. 313-315.
somewhat Mühlen-Schönau's comments on the primitiveness and lethargy of the Mordvinians, as well as the Mordvinians' attitude toward the Revolution and the question of the independence of the non-Russian nationalities. Mühlen-Schönau writes in the original version:


In the revised version Fedin muted the Mordvinians' rejection of the Bolsheviks' nationality policy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1924</th>
<th>1952</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mordva, po svoej dikosti, ponjala vsju tak nažyvaemju revoljuciju kak nacional'noe osvoboždenije.</td>
<td>Mordva xočet istolkovat' dlja sebja vsju tak nažyvaemju revoljuciju kak nacional'noe osvoboždenije.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikakogo osvoboždenija, konečno, ne proizošio.</td>
<td>Nikakogo osvoboždenija ožidat', konečno, nel'zja.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpatii mordvy, estestvenno, na storone nerusskich narodnostej.</td>
<td>No simpatii mordvy na storone nerusskich narodnostej.142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

141 pp. 315-316. In the revision Fedin omitted the identification of Russia with the Mordva, and the reference to "černaja sila." The adjective "ubogie" was removed, and "žalkogo" replaced by "pervobytnogo."

142 pp. 316-317.
Even in the revised version, the vivid impression of the individual character and desire for national independence of the Mordvinian people remains. Despite the emphasis on the richness of the orchards of Lependin's Starye Ruč'ı, the cumulative image which the reader gains of the remote Russian provinces is one of cultural isolation and bleak poverty. The political views of the peasantry appear to be subsumed in the characterization of Lependin, who dominates the episodes in which the peasants' attitudes toward their land and toward the authorities are presented.

VI

The Markgraf von zur Mühlen-Schönau is a complex and interesting figure who plays a vital role in the action of the novel. He has usually been seen primarily as a "representative of German militarism," and as a precursor of Nazi chauvinism. Fedin himself was to claim later that he had foreseen in Mühlen-Schönau the type of the future Nazi fanatic. It is not, however, militarism as such which dominates the characterization of Muhlen-Schonau in the novel. Muhlen-Schonau sees himself as the last member of a noble family which will die out entirely unless he has offspring by Marie Urbach, to whom he is utterly devoted. His personality is dominated by his pride in his aristocratic birth and in his family - "rod," "Geschlecht" - not by his belief in blood as the determining element of a race in


Thus Mühlen-Schönau writes of the Mordva in his diary:

"O, čti ljudi do six por ne poterjali instinkta voinstvennyx varvarov. Možet bit', v ix legendax vse ešće vicaet priznak ugorskogo povelitelja, gromivšego russkix knjaz'kov? Ėtot instinkt možno potrebožit'. V konce koncov odin rod markgrafov fon cur Mjulen-Šenau stoit vsej knjažeskoj istorii mordvy!145

Mühlen-Schönau develops his belief in the significance of noble blood during his first meeting with Starcov, when he explains the cause of Wahn's instinctive distrust of his patron:

"My raznoj krovi .... Ja inogda zaviduju takim ljudjam, kak Van, ili, možet bit', kak vy. Oni ne znajut nikogo dal'še svoego otca. Odnoski. Im dolžno bit' ochen' legko. Oni rešajut vsegda za sebja, za odnix sebja A za takix, kak ja, uže davno vse rešeno dedami, pražčurami, istoriej.146

Earlier Mühlen-Schönau had noted in his diary his mystical belief in the power of the past. Fate had determined that he should be the last of his line, while the wound which he had received in France would result in his eventually becoming an idiot:


145 p. 318.

146 pp. 211-212.
In Russian captivity, however, Mühlen-Schönau comes to consider that a union with Marie Urbach will enable him to ensure the continuation of his line ("rod") and will return to it the desire for life that he himself had lost:


147 pp. 205-206. The attention which is given to the mediaeval past of the Mühlen-Schönau family in the subchapter "Legendy-spletni-bylo" (see pp. 114-116) serves as an indirect illustration of Mühlen-Schönau's thesis. The author writes of the peasants, "... kogda smotriš', vsled krest'janinu, po-lošadinomu raštavljajuščemu svoj nogi, kažetsja, čto na ego spine pokoitsja tjaželyj gruz vekov s ix rycarjami, gosudarjami, kardinalami i monaxami." (p. 116).
Mühlen-Schönau finally emphasizes the profound significance of love:

Fedin makes it clear that Mühlen-Schönau's pride in his aristocratic ancestry is a complex emotion which determines his entire personality. Thus he is not the antiintellectual Junker which his treatment of the Landsturm private or Wahn's bitter criticism would indicate. The author's presentation of the German officer is in fact ambiguous, and this duality results in the unconvincingness of his characterization.

The word which Wahn uses of him - "vyrodok" - is significant. It seems likely that Fedin portrays in Mühlen-Schönau the last representative of a noble family which has become progressively less active and determined to assert its power and more cerebral and artistic. To this extent Mühlen-Schönau is a figure reminiscent of Thomas Mann's presentation of the direction of the gradual evolution of families.

148 pp. 311-312. Quoted from the 1924 edition.

149 p. 312.

150 p. 371.
through generations. When he speaks of his profound love for Marie Urbach, Mühlen-Schönau sounds curiously like Andrej Starcov, who claims that "love was the main thing in his life." Mühlen-Schönau's sincere devotion to art, despite his patriotic prejudices, emerges clearly in the episode in which he discusses art with Starcov, nor does his support of Wahn appear completely egotistic and predatory. Throughout much of the novel we gain the impression of a highly sensitive individual who combines the arrogance of status with a consciousness of the responsibilities which privilege should entail. His release of Starcov in Bischofsberg is not the act of a callous martinet. The almost despairing lack of willpower and misery at his separation from Marie indicated in his diary could explain his subjection to Frei and participation in the hopeless rebellion. Indeed, his self-abasement and servility toward Starcov in Semidol can only be interpreted as the behaviour of a man who is desperate to return to Bischofsberg at any price in order to be reunited with Marie Urbach. His readiness to humiliate himself is difficult to reconcile with the stereotype of the Prussian Junker who humiliates the elderly Landsturm private or slashes and burns Wahn's paintings. The reader is driven to the conclusion that in Mühlen-Schönau there are present two characters who are never successfully integrated: the "representative of German militarism" who is needed to illustrate chauvinism in

151 See pp. 210-211.

Bischofsberg, lead the Mordvinian rebellion and wreak vengeance on Wahn and Starcov, and the sensitive aristocrat, the devotee of art and lover who embodies an interesting, if not novel, thesis on the evolution of noble families.

Fedin indicated in a letter to Gor'kij that the character of Marie Urbach was based on a real person, and a German critic, as we have seen, was able to identify the prototype. Nevertheless, the presentation of Marie's childhood has the decidedly literary atmosphere of "Dostoevščina." Her early exploits convince the peasants that she has the evil eye. Fedin consistently builds up Marie's demonic image:

Ne inače, kak sidel v devčonke kakoj-to bes, i rodilas' ona ne v dobryj čas .... ... net nuždy i v splenja x o Mari, potomu što rasskaz o detstve ee ispolnen slučajnostej i tažn, razgadka kotoryx, byt' možet, neozidanee i strašnee vseh splen.

The episodes of her amazing recovery from an almost fatal illness and her learning to walk confirm the impression of an individual who is singled out for a special fate. Subsequently, the stories of her creating the terrible echo on the mountain and of her leadership when she is not yet thirteen of the expedition to discover the treasures of the Markgräfin's tomb develop further the theme of her

---

153 See Fedin's letter to Gor'kij, December 28, 1924, in M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 484.

154 pp. 117-118.
demonic powers:

Xoroško že znal on svoju dočku, esli snzu rešil, čto ej negde byt', krome kak v gostjáx u d'javola! ....
Ona stala molčalivoj, medlitel'noj, v divžen'jax ee isčezla razkost', ona vse ešče ostavalas' rebenkom, no čerty vzroslogo gotovy byli poglotit' v naj vse detskoe. Ona ottalkivala ot sëbja vsex, kto s nej vstrečalsja. Osobennno v glazax ee pugalo kakoe-to nedobroe uprjamstvo, i odna mysl' - ţestkaja i nespokojnaja - postojanno xolodila ee vzor.

S tex por i pošla pro Mari molva, čto ot nee nedaleko do samogo d'javola i čto lučše ne popadat'sja ej na doroge.

The impression of "Dostoevščina" is heightened by the episodes which follow, in which her attempt to kill a goose with an axe and her hanging her brother's cat in order to watch him die result in her being sent away to a pension in Weimar as a "degeneratka."

This "early" characterization of Marie Urbach is so fancifully extreme that it is impossible to accept her as a realistic individual. However, the reader soon becomes aware that she has suffered a change of personality. If her behaviour at the pension and subsequent disappearance with Mühlen-Schönau at the age of sixteen, although unaccompanied by "prodelki ... krovožadnye, otvratitel'nuye,' 156 seem in character, her liaison with Starcov and conversion to revolutionary socialism are so unconvincing that "Mari, kak xudožestvennyj obraz, perestaet sušchestvovat'".157 Marie's growing "boredom" as her

155 pp. 121, 127.

156 See p. 130.

157 A. Lešnev, review of "Goroda i gody", Pešat' i revoljucija, #2, 1925, p. 272.
charitable work becomes more and more depressing, the blind Italian soldiers whom she sees in the park, her revulsion from her mother's class-conscious chauvinism, her love for Starcov and the influence on her of Starcov's inchoate and far from revolutionary political opinions are seen as the only transitional stages in Marie's transformation into the leader of the popular revolution in Bischofsberg.

Marie takes the initiative in writing to Starcov and in visiting the enemy alien in his room, but their conversation is that of two lovers equally horrified by the atrocities of war:

— Nesjacami ja dumala o tom, čto pridu. Vy nesčastlivy, vy prinesli mne nesčaste.'
— Ja?
— S tex por kak my vstretili's', menja presladuet nesčaste'. Po pjetam. Stoit mne vyjti iz domu, kak ja čto-nibud' vižu, ot čega potom nst pokoju. Kak togda, v parke. Ėti slepye na davali mne spat' ....
... ja prislusjavus' s tex por, točno oslepla, točno mne podmenili glaza i ja ne umaju smotreť' imi, ėužimi glazami. Žnaete, čto ja dumaju?
Mari ostanovilas'.
— Ėužye glaza? - paresprosil Andrej.
— Vaši glaza, - skazala ona, pristal'no vgljadyvajas' v nego, kak budto proverjavaja svoju mysľ'.
— Noi? Možet byť'.
— Ja uverena. Ėto naverno tak. Ja čto-to potjerjala. Ran'ševse vse bylo presto ... i nužno ...
Poslé vstreči v gorax ... odinočestvo ... I ni minuty pokoja. Na každom šagu! Sejčas ja matalas' po gorodu, po ulicam, ne znaju gde. Na vokzale ja uvidela, kak uezžajut na front. Sto raz ja provožala soldat i ni razu ne dogadašas', čto Ėto - provody prigovor-ennyx! Kogda soldaty zanosili nogi na podnožki vagonov, mne pokazalas', čto oni vxodjat na Ėšafot.158

158 pp. 185-186.
The unreality inherent in the presentation of Marie's assumption of the leadership of the Bischofsberg Soldiers' Soviet after the storm of the citadel has already been discussed. Here the stylistic elements discussed earlier contribute to the unconvincingness of Marie's role as a revolutionary. An authorial intrusion draws attention to Marie's appearance as an heroic suffragette, while the reference to "illustrated magazines" inevitably underlines the unrealistically literary character of the scene.\footnote{pp. 307-308.}

At the end of this episode, however, Marie reverts to her old personality of "degeneratka" when her father tells her of her mother's stroke and her brother's death:

\begin{quote}
— Ty  što? - sprosila Mari.  
— I tvoj brat ubit v boju ...  
— Da, - otvetila Mari, - mne govorila ob etom gorničnaja. One postojala sekundu nepodvižno, potom povrnulas', vošla v gostinuju i plotno prikryla za soboju dver'.\footnote{p. 311.}
\end{quote}

A similar alternation prevails at the end of the novel, when after marrying a Russian private soldier in order to enter Russia and reunite Starcov she flees on seeing the pregnant Rita, finally to vanish in a crowd of children.\footnote{Contemporary critics assumed that this episode indicated that Marie took up work in a "detdom." Ležnev wondered whether this} The characterization of Marie fails
because of the lack of continuity between the "original" Marie, the Dostoevskian "infernal woman," Marie, Starcov's mistress, and Marie the charismatic revolutionary.

Of the German characters in the novel, apart from Mühlen-Schönau and Marie Urbach, the most thoroughly drawn is the barber, Paul Hennig. In Goroda i gody the transformation of the convinced social-democrat into a chauvinistic "social-predatel'," which has since become a hackneyed topic of Soviet publicistics, is presented convincingly through Hennig's discussions with Starcov and episodes which demonstrate his militaristic nationalism after the outbreak of war. In the course of the artistically successful scene during which Hennig helps his apprentice to put out a flag in celebration of a German victory, Hennig convinces himself that the war assists the cause of socialism:

V Obščestve druzej xorovogo penija,
gde ja - kaznanej, ja prjamo skazal: my
idej k socializmu!
— Čerez vojnu?
— O-o! Čerez vojnu! Andreas, vy
načinaete myslit' disciplinirovanno,
eto - moja zasluga! Xa-xa-xa, ne serdites',
Andreas! Imennom - Čerez vojnu. Kakim
obrazom? Vojna naučaet nas raspredeljat'
-o! - rrasprredeljat' produkt pomimo - o! -
pomimo kapitalističeskogo apparata!
— Xlebnye kartočki?
— O-o!
— A drugie strany?
— Drugie strany?....
— Drugie strany my naučim rrasprredeljat'

was a "variacija tradicionnogo uxoda razočarovannoj geroini v monastyr'." (A. Ležnev, review of "Goroda i gody," Pečat' i revoljucija, #2, 1925, p. 272).
A later conversation brings out the humour inherent in Hennig's making a speech during the visit of the King of Saxony to Bischofsberg and in his subsequent introduction to the King:

— On sprosil: ot parikmaxerskogo ceza?
— I on ničego? - voskliknula frejlejn Lisi.
— On bez vsjakix predrassudkov, naš korol', - snisxoditel'no zametil gerr Gennig. - On poklonilsja i otošel. Ja emu tože poklonilsja. Potom ja otpriwilja vypit' s našimi rebjatami, i oni odobrili, čto ja tak prjamo zajavil korolju, kto ja.163

In this conversation Fedin successfully captures the atmosphere of such royal occasions, as well as conveying simultaneously the personality of Hennig, who is intensely flattered, despite his socialist opinions, by the condescension of the royal personage.

162 pp. 155-156.
163 pp. 182-183.
Soon afterward, however, Hennig speaks less convincingly in character of the "tactical requirement" of hate, using language which is more reminiscent of Kurt Wahn than the barber:


In the farewell scene with Starcov, Hennig speaks a second time of the human need to hate, but it becomes clear that he is less convinced of the essential nobility of patriotism now that German morale has fallen. At this point Hennig's personality is again well conveyed by the conflict which he sees to exist between "politika" and "čelovečeskoe":

Ja čelovek s serdцем, Andreas, ja ponimaju tonkie čuvstva. Ja ni razu ne govoril vam, čto iz moej pamjati ne vyxodit monsieur Persi. On byl bezvrednyj čelovek i igral na garnonike, a ego vzjali i zaperli v citadel'. Éto trogatel'no. Politika - ja liščkom xorošo ponimaju. No, krome politiki, est' čelovečeskoe-možno i čelovečeskoe - nel'zja. My načali xnykat', značit my došli do čelovečeskogo - nel'zja ...165

---

164 pp. 183-184.

165 p. 259.
Unfortunately, on November 10, 1918, Hennig undergoes a transformation which is even more ill-motivated and extreme than that of Marie Urbach. As in the case of Marie, the description of Hennig at this moment contributes to the impression of unreality:

— Soldaty! Zdes' sidjat vaši druz'ja! Paul' Gennig, podnjav nad golovami zont, gnevno ukazal im na rešetčatye okna, vyrvalja iz tolpy i pobežal čerez ploščad', ne opuskaja zonta. Togda kakoj-to molodoj soldatik, obernuvšis' k tolpe, veselo skomandoval:
— Ro-ta! Vpered, za kapitanom! V zonty citadel'! Soldaty oblepili žužžaščim roem komandira i kinulis' k vorotam citadeli, sledom za veličestvennym, toržestvennym Paulem Gennigom .... Glaza Paulja Genniga metali iskry, grud' často i wysoko podymalas', - na golovu vyše soldat, on oziral ix počti vdoxnovenno i razmereno bil zontom po vorotam. On byl poxož na učitelja, okružennyj ozornymi škol'nikami, - v černom odejanii, volosatyj i gnevnyj sredi seryx kurtok bezusyx veselyx soldat.166

Here the "late" Paul Hennig is metamorphosed into a charismatic hero, as the epic language indicates: "veličestvennyj," "toržestvennyj," "glaza ... metali iskry," "vdoxnovenno."

The "early" Hennig is a successful characterization and remains a sympathetic figure throughout the conversations in which he figures, despite his hypocritical chauvinism. However, the authorial attitude toward Hennig and the Social-democratic Party is made abundantly clear, both in the heavily ironic introduction given to Hennig

166 pp. 299-300.
and in the author's solemn farewell to Bischofsberg:

Vместо того чтобы посмотреть, за своим галком и старую виньют в его истинные намерения (должны быть у него какие-нибудь намерения!), Паул' Генниг, пол'зуясь снисходительностью властей, сделал, как мы видели, в народе смуту и сомнения. Нет, положительно не должно быть, настороже на тол'ко с иностранными, но и с некоторой частью соотечественников. Может быть, штутгартская полиция без оснообразия вынесла за скобки всю социал-демократическую партию? Вот точно' бы тот парикмахер, Паул' Генниг ...

V Biśofsberge, konečno, vse ešče gromyxaet i rokočet bas kaznačjaja Obščestva druzej xorovogo penija Paulja Genniga. My ne znaem, vyšel li on iz social-demokraticheskoj partii, i potomu govorim o nem ochen' sderžanno, xotja pitaem k nemu simpatiju za ego nežnost' k geroyam romana ...

My s oblegčeniem dumaem, što o tajnom socialiste Urbaxe nam pridetsja skazat' vsego odin raz. My ne sočuvstvuem emu, potomu što on ženilsja na xromoj aristokrate s nezakonnym synom, stoby pomogat' somnitel'noj političeskoj partii.167

VII

Amongst the Russian characters in the novel the elder Ščepov deserves attention as an embodiment, bordering on caricature, of the philistine petty official so familiar in Russian fiction from Gogol' onwards. Ščepov is, however, directly related to the economic and

167 pp. 148-149, 305. Quoted from the 1924 edition. In the latter passage the 1952 revision has "vnimanie" instead of "nežnost'," and "drjannoj političeskoj partii " instead of "somnitel'noj političeskoj partii ."
political situation during the period of War Communism, and probably reflects the influence of Zamjatin's vivid presentation of the "caveman existence" ("peščernyj byt") prevailing in Petrograd at this time of terrible privation.

There is more than a suggestion, in fact, of Zamjatin's terse style with its short sentences and omission of verbs, as well as the evocation of situation by the accumulation of detail, in the presentation of Sergej Ščepov:

Čelovek našel vorota, dver', lestnicu, ešče dver'. Tam skinul nošu s pleša, dostal odin ključ, drugoj - francuzskij, tretij - očen' dlinnyj, s šarniriom posredine, patent inženera Tubkisa, - po očeredi otkryl zamki. V kuxne zažeg lamočku "Ekonomija" (četvert' funta kerosina v nedelju), razdelsja. Primeril pal'cam: brevno možno raspiljet' na četvre časti po vosem' verškov, každyj kusok raskolot' na raz, dva, tri ... - vosem' polen. Dva vos'miverškovyx polena - kipjatok dlja kofeja. "Sestnadcat' raz. Ėto xorošo ...."

Rastopil železnuju pečku. Vkipjatil vodu, postavil na skovorode pšenicu - varit'. Kipjatkom myl kastrjulu iz-pod supa i tarelku. Potom myl rakovinu vodoprovoda močalkoj i tertym kirpičom. Frenč snjal. Rukavu rubaxi zasučil po lokot'. Kogda zavonjalo gar'ju, brosil myt' rakovinu, sxvatilsja za nož, otskabliva ot skovorodki prigorelye zerna, raz pjať skazal:
— Kofej. Svoloči.
Potom smotrel v škaf. V bankax byla pšenica, rož', krupa jačnevaja, pšennaja i grečnevaja, seledki. V butylkax - maslo l'njane i podsolnečnoe. V meške xolščovom - vobla. V meškax bumážnyx - sol', lavrovyj list, želatin. Želatinu bylo funta tri. Skazal:
— Želatin, a? 168

168 pp. 18-20.
Fedin heightens the identification of Şćepov as a man of the ancien régime by Şćepov's use of the word "kofej", the references to his age, and to his Civil Service rank as "dejstvitel'nyj statskij sovetnik" (the fourth class). Şćepov's bitter words in his conversations with Starcov intensify the vivid impression of the grim reality of contemporary Petrograd produced by the general presentation of the city. Şćepov is completely candid toward the fellow-intelligent Starcov in his total rejection of Bolshevik power:

For Şćepov his son's thieving is a demonstration of the dis-integration of society:

— Nedostoin, negodjaj, upominanija, ne to što slez. Vot počemu govorju ja, što vse teper' poletelo k Čertu. Deti stali predateljami, i otcy počerstveli. Bez sožalenija, bez slez, bez serdca, čerstvy i xolodny, vot kak eta plita .... U menja syna L'va net. Otbolel, kak parš. Vmeste s ljud'mi otbolel, ljudi dlja menja teper' - vory, predateli, svoloč'!171

Şćepov expresses vividly in Zamjatin-like imagery the sensation of elemental chaos and the total collapse of his world:

169 pp. 19, 21, 25, 47.
170 p. 25.
171 p. 23.
... teper' vse poletelo k čertu v puzo.
Vse! My teper' s vami - kašica v utrobë
kakogo-to d'javola. Obrabatyvast nas
želudočnyj sok, potom popolzem my po
kiškam, po dvenadcati-perstnoj, po tonkim,
tolstym, po prjamoj. Vot čto my takoe.172

The terror underlying Šćepov's excoriation of the new regime
is clearly conveyed by his reaction to the knocking on the door at
night by the commander of the trench-digging detachment.173 When
Starcov offers to go in his place, relieved, he expresses his
schadenfreude: "Vidno, tam ploxo!"174 Although Fedin in his pre-
sentation of Šćepov strongly emphasizes the selfishness and
"škurničestvo" of his character, the official's reaction to his new
and incomprehensible environment provides a vivid picture of the
plight of the "little men", stripped of their livelihood and pre-
carious status by the revolution.

The "trench professor" who accompanies Starcov in the night
trench digging episode is presented as an almost arithmetical contrast
and foil to Šćepov. The physical appearance of the professor,
especially the description of his face - "lico ego ... podergivalos',
izrezannoe na kubiki perekrestnymi glubokimi čertami: vdrug on ves'
zaševelilsja - ot malen'kix korotkix nog do mel'čajšix želvačkov i

172 p. 22.


kubikov lica"\textsuperscript{175} - suggest a strong resemblance to Akim Volynskij, whom Fedin knew well in Petrograd.\textsuperscript{176}

The "trench professor"\textsuperscript{177} is fully aware of the privations to which the intelligentsia is subjected - "životu, mamonu, zverju sejčas tjažko"\textsuperscript{178} - but selflessly offers Starcov flour, probably from his "učenyj paek," for the pregnant Rita. In terms reminiscent of Bax's speeches to Rodion Korbov in \textit{Brat'ja},\textsuperscript{179} he speaks of his consciousness that his generation of the intelligentsia is doomed:

\begin{quote}
Ja, konečno, ne vyživu, ne gožus'....
Kto ţe budet otricat', čto nam bol'no smotret' na sobstvennuj smert'?!\textsuperscript{180}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{175} pp. 54, 55. Note also "Siluétik rostom emu po pleču ... skorye, korotkie šažki . . ." "Professor živo povernulsja ne kablukax, kak-to po-ptrić'į, vperil glaza-ugol'ki v Starcova . . ." "... dvižen'jam golovy - korotkim, vzdragivajuščim i častym." "... morgajuščie, blestkie, kak fol'ga, glaza étogo malen'kogo čeloveka, kotoryj nepreryvno cžimalisja i razžimalisja, točno pruzinka..." "opjat' gorjačo i toroplivo voskliknul." "morsčiny na lice ego izgladilis', želvački i kubiki, takie podvižnye i očerěnnye pri žizni, propali." (pp. 31, 53-54, 59).

\textsuperscript{176} See the discussion of the possibility of Volynskij's having served as the model for Professor Bax in \textit{Brat'ja}. (Chapter on \textit{Brat'ja}).

\textsuperscript{177} He is known in the novel only as "okopnyj professor" and "professor."

\textsuperscript{178} p. 32.

\textsuperscript{179} See the analysis of Bax's discussions with Rodion in the Chapter on \textit{Brat'ja}.

\textsuperscript{180} pp. 32, 30.
Nevertheless, human culture, he believes, will survive:

Ja, znaete li, izučaja istoriju, ne mog obnaružit', čtoby kakaja-nibud' ideja bessledno isčezala pod razvalinami akademii, goroda ili gosudarstva. Ne mog. I ja soveršenno spokoen: biologii, istorii, iskusstvu, fizike, vopšče znaniju, nakoplennomu 'celovečestvom sejčas ničto ne ugrožaet.181

The "trench professor" expresses in an emotional speech his mystical sense of identification with the pathos of the revolution and of the exalted significance of the time in which he is living.182

Ešče odin raz rodit'sja, ešče odin raz, bože moj! Čerez sto let. 'Čtoby uvidet', kak ljudi plačut pri odnom upomnenii ob etix godax, čtoby gde-nibud' poklonit'sja istievšemu kusku znamenii, počitat' operativnuju svodku žtaba raboče-krest'janskoj Krasnoj Armii! Ved' vot - smotrite! Smotrite! - veter rvet, polosčet doždem otlipšuju ot zabora obmazannuju testom gazetu. A ved' čerez sto let kusoczek, častičku etogo lista 'celovečestvo v antimins zaš'et, kak mošči, kak svjataya svjatyx! .. Čerez sto let rodit'sja i vdrug skazat': a ja žil togda, žil v te gody!183

Later the professor in a conversation with Starcov speaks more explicitly of his political support of the Bolsheviks:

---

181  p. 30.

182 There is a curious analogy between the intense consciousness of the "holiness" of the moment expressed here and the theme of Henry V's famous St. Crispian's Day speech before Agincourt in Shakespeare's King Henry the Fifth (Act IV, Scene iii).

183  p. 32.
The antithesis between the anti-Bolshevik "obyvatel" Ščepov and the idealistic pro-Bolshevik professor unfortunately has a mechanistic character which contributes to the somewhat schematic impression produced by both figures. Nevertheless, the professor, like Ščepov, represents a valid type. The revolutionary romanticism which the professor poignantly expresses unquestionably existed amongst some sections of the intelligentsia at this time.

The Bolshevik activist Semen Golosov, the chairman of the Party Executive Committee (ispolkom) in Semidol, has been viewed surprisingly favourably by both contemporary and modern critics. N. Tereščenko wrote that "Golosov - obraz žiznennoj-jarkij i tipičnyj dlja provincial'nyx dejatelej iz rzadov revoljucionnogo avangarda

184 p. 54.
Fedin presents him as a bucolic, "prosteckij" character who is completely lacking in intellectual pretensions. The character leitmotifs which accompany Golosov throughout heighten this impression: his "brisk little laugh" ("bojkij smešok"), and mannerism of covering his mouth with his "round palm" ("kruglaja ladon'ka") and pulling at his upper lip. The initial presentation of Golosov, with its heavily ironic tone, immediately following the Gogolian description of Semidol already discussed, automatically associates Golosov with the patriarchal primitiveness of Semidol:


The following passage conveys the adolescent selfimportance with which he acts the role of a superlatively efficient administrator:

---


186 p. 320.
Golosov's failure in his rivalry with Starcov for the possession of Rita - an affair which is in itself politically highly prejudicial in view of Rita's "lišenec" class origins - makes him appear ridiculous. This view of Golosov receives further confirmation in the episode in which Rita seduces Starcov, leaving Golosov to empty the magazine of his rifle into the air in a fit of pique.

The note of authorial irony is so conspicuous in the presentation of Golosov that the reader wonders whether Fedin is satirizing a type of selfimportant, yet immature, young Bolshevik official with whom the author was familiar from his work in the provinces. Nevertheless, it falls to Golosov, in a voluble outburst which seems completely out of character except for its note of adolescent arrogance, to rebut Ščepov's argument that the revolution is non-existent.

187 See p. 335. Rita's claim that Golosov has Starcov sent to the front as an act of vengeance remains uncontested. (See p. 390).
in Semidol. The younger Ščepov spells out wittily Semidol's backwardness:

Vot vy - čto ni na est' otvetstvennye bol'ševiki - uoxali v subbotu iz goroda. Znate, čto tam ostalos'? Esli ne ščitat' voenkoma, ostalsja v neprikosnovennom celomudrii Semidol carja Goroxa. 189

In the course of this significant conversation Golosov, stung by Ščepov's taunt that he and his Bolshevik colleague Pokisen are just like the "men of the '80s" ("vos'midesjatniki"), opposes his faith in action and the ruthless suppression of opposition to the intellectuals' cerebrations and qualms of conscience:

Vot takie, kak ty, da vot kak Starcov, čto vy razvodite principial'nuju boltovnju, potomu čto vy roxli, tjužjaki. Dlja nas vse jasno, my znaem, čego xotim, i v ljubom bolote najdem čto delat'. Daj nam samyx nastojaščix ljagušek, my iz nix sdelаем to, čto nam nado. A esli iz nix ničego delat' nel'zja - uničtožim, da, uničtožim ix .... Ėto vy - Ščepovy, Starcovy - krutites' večno v mmimoj principial'noj bestoloči, vse xotite primirit' ideal'noe s dejstvitel'nym. My znaem, čto primirit' nel'zja, možno tol'ko podčinit' .... Ja že po nosu tvoeu vižu, čto ty dumaeš': nam-de očevidny protivorečija, v kotoryx pogruzili bol'ševiki, i naše ryl'ce čisten'koe. Plevat' my xoteli v vaše ryl'ce! ... Obojdemsja bez intelligencii s ee patentom na neporočnoe myšlenie. 190

189 p. 329.

190 p. 330. Quoted from the 1924 edition. In the 1952 revision Fedin omitted Golosov's reference to the intellectuals' acting on "principle": "principial'nuju boltovnju" became simply "boltovnju," and "principial'noj bestoloči" was replaced by "mnimoj principial'nosti." "Samyx nastojaščix ljagušek" was replaced by "samyx sonnyx ljagušek."
Golosov's words on the need to "annihilate" opposition, and notably the wellturned phrase "intelligencija s ee patentom na neporočnoe myšlenie," would have been far more natural in Wahn's mouth than in Golosov's.

Fedin's characterization of Rita Tvereckaja is one of the most successful features of the novel. In the course of a few brief episodes a vivid impression is given of her entire personality. Her unhappiness, passion for Starcov, and longing to leave the desolation of Semidol are all suggested in her words and actions in the episode in which she seduces Starcov:

---

The scene in which Rita meets Starcov in Petrograd and tells him that she is pregnant is equally successful. After the vivid presentations of her pregnancy in starving Petrograd we see her for the
last time at the poignant moment after Marie's arrival and flight when she asks Starcov, "Skazhi pravdu ... ty ee ... vse e'she ljubi?'" Rita becomes a so much more real figure in the novel than Marie that Starcov's abandonment of her is ultimately more moving than his betrayal of Marie.

The characterization of the peasant Fedor Lependin is one of the most memorable features of the novel. Lependin at once attracted universal critical praise as a completely convincing and typical figure. The attention paid to the presentation of Lependin as a major figure in the novel is emphasized by the independent publication of the episodes involving Lependin before and after the publication of the novel as a whole in book form.

Indeed, the failure to integrate the characterization of Lependin successfully with the action constitutes one of the constructional weaknesses of the novel. Although he figures as the leader of the peasant uprising against local Soviet power in Semidol, most of the episodes in which he appears depend upon the unlikely coincidences which were discussed earlier in connection with the construction of Goroda i gody.

---


194 For details, see Fedin, Sobranie sochinenij, II, 433:
The irony of the situation in which Lependin loses his feet while writing his name on the boots of a dead German soldier which he has removed emerges naturally without authorial emphasis. Lependin's experiences in the hospital are presented initially in skaz form:

Očrulsla potom v hospitale. Po telu plavala ustalost', no bylo xorošo, xotelos' est'. Vybral lico, kotorce ponravilos', sprosil:
— Dozvol' te uznat', vaše blagorodie.
Odežža u menja byla, sapogi tože, sovsem novye, na gvozdjax. Tak čto v soxrannosti ili kak?

Tolstogubij - doktor, fel'dšer li, v zameznom krovjanim razvodami xalate - soščurilja i, slovno zadevaja za čto-to jazykom, otvetil:
— Počemu Ifan nado šapka, esli Ifan ne imeet golofa?\(^{195}\)

Leppentin's reactions continue to convey vividly his peasant mentality:

Nexorošo pokazalos' Lependinu, čto rjadom nazodilis' oficery, - pravda, bez soznanija, ščuplye i v takom že bol'niknom sel'e, kakoe bylo na nem. Oni stonali ne po-nastojaščemu - s pereryvami i bezvučnym pridyxaniem, i Lependinu bylo prijatno, čto on stonal lučše ix.\(^{196}\)

Lependin's love for his homeland dominates his personality. After the setpiece with its evocation of insects and smells in which Lependin dreams of his hut,\(^{197}\) his nostalgic memories of Starye Ruč'ı

\(^{195}\) p. 239.
\(^{196}\) p. 239.
\(^{197}\) p. 236.
are movingly presented in the episode in which he meets Marie Urbach. Fedin is equally successful in conveying Lependin's courage and cheerfulness, displayed in his making the tub and crutches which enable him to move and work as a vegetable gardener. The presentation of Lependin's gaiety as he works, however, has a certain "plakatnost," as Lependin is seen as the brave and indomitable Russian peasant overcoming adversity. There is here an element of the "susal'ničanie" for which Gor'kij reproached Fedin in criticizing Fedin's early stories of the "Pustyr'" collection.

Lukoško, v kotorom sidel Lependin, poskripvalo, remeški xrusteli, pojas treščal ot natugi. No ruki i život stali krepkie, sbitye, i upirat'sja uključinami v zemlju, vybryasyvat' vpered i nazad tulovišče bylo legko.

Ottogo, čto zemlja vsegda blizka k licu, ottogo, čto ščupal ee pominutno rukami - tepljuju, kak telo, - veselel Lependin, natekal siloj. Prigljanulsja Lependin ogrodniku - veselost'ju, uveč'em li, - vzjal ogrodnik kaleku k sebe grjadočnikom. Postavil xodit' za ovoščami, perestilat' parnikovye ščity i okonca. Polol Lependin, okupoval, erzal v svoem lukoške maž grjadoč s utra do noći - v zeleni, v sladkom duxe perepreloj zemli, pel pesnju:

Nalovili nemčiki eger'kov
Posadili eger'kov v lager'ki.
   Aj, eger' - meger' -
Russkij snegir'
   V lager'ke.

---

198 p. 246.

199 M. Gor'kij, letter to Fedin, March 3, 1926 (M. Gor'kij, Sobranie sočinenij, XXIX (Moscow, 1959), pp. 456-457). Gor'kij, however, praised Fedin's characterization of Lependin, finding Lependin's song "prevosxodna." (M. Gor'kij, letter to Fedin, December 13, 1924, in M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perepiska, p. 480.
In the vivid episode on the Polish-Russian border Lependin, optimistic as ever, interprets the revolution as peasant freedom, "volja vol'naja, krest'janskaja."  

Soon after, Lependin speaks movingly of the richness of his native district in the speech already discussed which forms a character leitmotiv in his presentation.

The propaganda conducted by the mysterious Bolshevik agitator, "skulastyj," evidently turns Lependin against his fellow-peasant, "Djadja Kisel'," who is dying of tuberculosis. "Skulastyj" professes sympathy for "Kisel'," but uses him feelinglessly as an example for the purpose of his agitation:

Po dobroj vole nanjalsja k nemcu, čtoby
den'žonok podkopit', laty na portki postavit'.
A u nas v Rossii portki darom razdajut - vsem

---

200 pp. 245-246.
201 p. 263.
202 p. 262.
xvatit! Emu by podat'sja tuda, gde ljudi po-novomu žit' načali, a on v kabalu ušel, kopečku skolotit'. Ne verit, čto u nas teper' vse krest'janskoe dobro zadarna razdaetsja.\textsuperscript{203}

Lependin's ultimate cruelty to "Kisel'" clearly reflects the influence of the Bolshevik propagandist's words:

\begin{quote}
Žaleete vy ego, rebjatki, naprasno. Žalost'ju ne pomožeš', ne takoe teper' vremja. Vas tože požalet' nadо - kto bol'noj, kto bezruкij, u kogo nog netu. My dolžny sami sebja požalet'.\textsuperscript{204}
\end{quote}

The scene in which the dying "Kisel'" returns to the camp is one of the most moving in the novel. Fedin presents the situation effectively through the simple presentation of movements and speech without authorial comment or emotional analysis. Lependin replies when "Kisel'" asks his hutmates where he should go,

\begin{quote}
— Ja, bratec, smotrel za toboj, poka exali. Žit' tebe ostalos' nedolgo, vse ravno gde pomirat'. A po železke ty mesto zanimaš', ležiš'. V éto vremje kotorou narodu domoj nado - možet iz-za tebja v poezd ne popast' ....
— Nas tebe sovet takoj, - skazal Lependin. - Ostavajšja tut, potomu xorošej smerti Ėloveku nynče nigde netu.\textsuperscript{205}
\end{quote}

"Djadja Kisel'" makes his decision. As he leaves he seems suddenly to acquire an almost heroic stature as a symbol of

\textsuperscript{203} p. 265. The agitator is referring to "Kisel's" having worked for the German military government after his land had been ruined.

\textsuperscript{204} p. 266.

\textsuperscript{205} p. 270.
Lependin figures as the leader of the peasant delegation which goes to the Semidol Ispolkom office in order to demand the ending of the grain requisitions ("razverstka") and the abolition of the "prodotrijady." In a convincing episode Fedin presents the dialogue between the Bolshevik official Pokisen and the peasants, who claim that the local Committee is concealing a supposed new Soviet edict

206 p. 271. Quoted from the 1924 edition.
abolishing grain requisitions and taxes in kind from the peasantry. The contrast between Lependin's somewhat substandard and incoherent peasant speech and the literary speech of Pokisen, expressing his growing awareness of the danger of the situation, contributes a further element of drama to the episode.

Apart from the irony of Lependin's ultimate fate, there is irony in Lependin's peasantlike plea of poverty, which contrasts effectively with his earlier words on the wealth of Starye Ruč'i:

— Po-stoj, po-sto-øj, tovarišč! - provopil Lependin. - Tuta vse v svoem ume i v razume. 'S mirom nado govorit' sur'ezno, mir - tebe ne spolkom. Ty poslušaj, kakoe delo. Mestnost' u nas na xlebnaja, zanjatie bol'še ogorodnoe, sadovoe tože. Lixa v našem xozjajstve xoš' obavljaj; bednost', morkov' odna da kartoška. Xleba my sami ne vidim. A s nas trabujut xlebom. Kak byt' teper'? Zemlja, vyxodit, vol'naja, xrest'janskaja, a meždu pročim xrest'janin ...

Fedin achieves a strikingly effective ironic reversal of situation in the episode in which Lependin is given up to the mercy of Mühlen-Schönaü's Mordvinians by his fellow-peasants as their ring-leader: Lependin's fate mirrors the fate of "Djadja Kisel'," for which he himself bore the responsibility. The peasants' refusal to look at Lependin suggests the peasants' guilty avoidance of one another's eyes as "Kisel'" leaves the hut. Moreover, the fundamental situation of the reprisals taken by the Mordvinians as a result of which Lependin dies as a scapegoat is of course itself ironic, in that

---

207 p. 338.
the peasants take the "karateli" to be Bolsheviks angered by the peasants' protest to the Ispolkom.

— Skryvat' začinčika? Sopročivljajt'sja?
Vdrug mužiki zavolnovalis', zakašljali,
neskol'ko ruk motnul's k soldatu, koe-kto
snjal i opjac' naxlobučil kartuz.
— Čto mnetes'? Onemel'i? - krikнул soldat.
Togda srazu iz desjatka glotok vyvalilos'
na soldata naukljužee slovo:
— Lependin ...
— Lependin vse ...
— Fedor, on ob"jasnit, stalo, kak ...
— Lependin ...
Soldat pritix i sprosil:
— Kotoryj?
Golovy i ruki družno pokazali na Lependina.
Ego vytaraščennyje glaza ispuganno pereskočili
s soldata na tolpu. Mužiki ne gljadeli na
nego, i lica ix byli odinakovy, kak struganye
doski.208

Here the matter-of-fact narration combines with the extreme
simile ("lica ... kak struganye doski"), as in Babel's characteristic
style, to convey the underlying horror of the situation.

Lependin's execution is given a vivid immediacy by the accumu-
lation of descriptive detail:

— Bra - tuš - ki - i!
Lukoško, kotoroe služilo Lependinu pročym,
udobnym bašmakom, otdrajos' ot ego korotkix
kul'tej i taščilos' na remne, sledom za
tuloviščem, ostavljaja na kustax trjapičnuju
trebušu.
— Bratuš - ki - i! ...!
Potom nad ix golovami zakolyxalsja nesuražnyj
obrubok, i dlinnye ruki, pritknutye k nemu,
darnuvšis' raz-drugoj v storony, vdrug
vyprjamilis' vdol' tulovišča i sžalis v kulaki,
kak budto Lependin v poslednij raz zaxotel

The heartless phrase of one of the peasants which follows directly suggests the parallel with Lependin's own treatment of "Djadja Kisel":

— Pronesi, gospodi ... A Fedor vse odno kalečnyj ...

The section ends with the reiteration of the character leit-motiv of Lependin's lyrical words on the orchards of Starye Ruč'í, re-evoking his joy at his return to his homeland. The dead Lependin appears again, however, later in the novel, when Starcov's spiritual élan is briefly interrupted by the ghastly sight of the mutilated corpse hanging from the tree. The effectiveness of the situation is enhanced by the degree of ostranenie introduced by Andrej's seeing Lependin's body with completely fresh eyes, as if Lependin were now appearing in the novel for the first time. In the presentation of Fedor Lependin Fedin combines a complex construction of ironic situations with varying stylistic elements to create a completely realistic peasant who is perhaps the most convincing character in the novel. The characterization of Lependin is unquestionably one of the greatest artistic successes of Goroda i gody.

VIII

The beginning of the section on Germany, "Centrifuga amura" introduces us also to the relationship between the two friends,

---

209 p. 352.
Andrej Starcov and Kurt Wahn. Although they are seemingly inseparable, the reader soon becomes conscious of a difference in attitudes between them which is as ominous as the atmosphere of apparent wellbeing and "blagopolučie" which surrounds them. Kurt's first words to Starcov indirectly emphasize their varying origins:

— Est' li u vas četo čuvstvo, — sprosil Kurt, — pokojnoe, mirotnorjaščee — čuvstvo rodnogo? My dovol'stvuemaja pustjakami, potomu čto čto naši pustjaki. 210

The presentation of the fearful contents of the Anatomical Museum and of Ebersochs' head is accompanied by the significant difference in reaction between the two: whereas Kurt seems to remain unmoved, Andrej is repelled by the museum and terrified by the sight of the head's being used as a target at the fair. Later the mediaeval visions which the two friends experience also differ significantly. Kurt dreams of the Pied Piper of Hamelin, who exerts uncanny power over a multitude of rats, whereas Andrej dreams of a little boy, who is spiritual and holy, but utterly weak and powerless:

On bleden, kak bumaga, koža ego prozračna, on xud i nastol'ko slab, čto ne možet sdelat' i pjati šagov. U nago prekrasnye sinie glaza, očen' dlinnye volosy, verojatno nikogda ne strižennye i mjagkie, kak pux. Sudja po rostu, emu možet byt' let pjanjadcat' no on bespomoščen, kak mladenec. Ot ego vzgliada stanovitsja strašno — takoj čto čistij, nevinnyj vzgliad. Naverno, tak smotrijat velikomučeniki i angely.211

210 p. 72.
211 pp. 89-90.
In this episode we find foreshadowed the essential difference in personality between the two men. The active, wilful ("volevoj") nature of Wahn is symbolically opposed to the passive, spiritual nature of Starcov. We are reminded later of this scene both in Wahn's description of his friend in Moscow - "Ja Často vsominal tebja vot takim - s étoj dobroj, rasterejannoj ulybkoj"\textsuperscript{212} - and at the end of the novel when Starcov seems to hear his friend telling him to step over the rats.\textsuperscript{213} Wahn's words to Starcov on their mystic attachment to Nuremberg have an ironic significance which will become clear only much later, since it is Starcov, the Russian, who will remain "faithful" to Germany, whereas Wahn will "betray" it: "udary tvoego serdca sovpali s udarami serdca goroda, ty vovlečen v ego žizn' i živeš' eju tak, točno rodilsja i vyros zdes' \ldots \textsuperscript{214}

Already, however, the suspicion has been sown that the friends' vow of eternal friendship is doomed never to be fulfilled.

In these early episodes the theme of Wahn's "hatred" is already introduced. Wahn's interview with his patron ends with the single word "Ne-navi-iž-žu!" and similarly his chauvinism when war breaks out is expressed in his sudden hatred of his friend:

\textsuperscript{212} p. 284.

\textsuperscript{213} p. 413.

\textsuperscript{214} p. 90.
The presentation of Kurt Wahn in Germany gives us greater insight into his personality than is at first apparent. The capacity for the abrupt transition from love to hate as well as a desire for vengeance are strongly suggested in the scenes with Starcov and with Meier. Moreover, the interview with Mühlen-Schönau conveys his vivid sense of the injustice of his position and, by implication, the consciousness of the invidiousness of a social system that dooms him to dependence on an autocratic Maecenas.

The author fails, however, to present Wahn's professional work convincingly. Mühlen-Schönau's words, "vy lučšij iz xudožnikov vašego pokolenija," have an empty ring in view of the lack of attention paid to Wahn's art. When we find Wahn in Moscow at work on an immense propaganda poster, his activity has an abstract quality which is intensified by his curious words, "Izumitel'nyj narod! .... Za vsem tem ja vižu bol'šoj smysl. Očen' bol'šoj, zdrovyj smysl." The

215 pp. 11-112.
216 p. 94.
217 pp. 278-279.
vague comment is out of character with the positive and articulate Wahn whom we see elsewhere in the novel, and throws an air of unreality on his "conversion," for which the reader, as we have seen, is not entirely unprepared.

In his conversation with Starcov in Moscow, Wahn expresses vividly his consciousness that the world as they had known it had been destroyed. Indirectly comparing the world with a box, he claims that even the boards which are still left in place will need to be taken apart in order to build a new society:

— Esli by ja prosidel éto vremja gde-nibud' v masterskoj, možet byt' mir kazalsja by mne po-prežnemu čem-to cel'nym, kak my govorili i ponimali ran'že - čelovečestvo, mir, - gljadja scerxu. A ja sidel vнизu, pod polom, videl, kak vse éto ustroeno. V obščem - teatr. Ničego cel'nogo. Čelovečestvo - Fikcija ....
— Ran'že vse bylo ukomplektovano, kak marševaja rota. Čelovek prignan k čeloveku, kak doska k doske v dveri. Teper' vse raspolzjos'. Meždu dosok - ščeli. Slepomu vidno, čto vse vroz' .... Te doski, kakie ešče deržatsja, nado raz"edinit', možet byt' razbit', potomu čto oni iskusstvenno skleeny i potomu čto takim kleem nel'zja skleit' ljudej v čelovečestvo. A v konce koncov v ētom naša cel'.

Wahn finds that it was the war that had brought mankind to its senses:

Čerez koljučju provoloku okopov, kak čerez lupu, čto jasno vidno. Vojnu kogda-nibud' blagoslovjat. Vsja éta muzyka, o kotoroj ty dumaeš' s sodroganiem, - bomby, trexlinejki

218 pp. 282-283.
Wahn goes on to tell Starcov, who says that the very word "war" is repulsive to him, that war is the only means of achieving the Bolsheviks' aims. A just society, he evidently holds, can be built only by violence:

So far Wahn has spoken as a Bolshevik of the political requirement of violence, but his assertion at the end of his discussion with Starcov after hearing of his friend's love affair in Germany that the main thing in his life had been hate appears to refer to his individual

---

219 p. 283. Most of this passage, including the reference to the "blessing of war" and the reverence for guns as "saviours," was omitted in the 1952 revision.

220 p. 284. Wahn's contention that "there are different types of wars" before his claim that "there is no other way" was added only in the 1952 revision.
personality. Wahn is aware of his emotional limitations, as he tells

Starcov in the same conversation:

Pomniš' Nürnberg, s xolma? Je togaš
ispytal sčas'tu. "Ty nasač', je nikogda
na žil s žančinoj, to este podolja i xorošo.
Čto ećto za čuvstvo? Esli tako, kak togaš,
a xolme, - i vsage takce, postojanne -
užno, naverno, rodit'sja s osobym darom, čtoby
vyceržat'. Je govorju o tom vostorge,
pomniš'? Čto dojno izznajat' ... Ty dopoljaješ'
menja. Mne xorošć, kogaž ja znaju, čto ty vot
takoj, milij drug, s tvoej razterjannoj
ulybkoj.221

Later, in their conversation at Semidol, Wahn's criticism of
Starcov for his inability to kill an enemy follows Starcov's admission
that he would be unable to kill Mühlen-Schönau if he fall into his
hands. Wahn tells Starcov bitterly, "Ty boiš'sja straxa, Andrej,
boiš'sja straxa! Čto užasno. Nedo perestupit' čerez strax,
peresagnut' čerez nego,"222 but when Starcov refers again to Mühlen-
Schönau, speaking of his inability to kill someone in the full aware-
ness of whom it was that he was killing, Wahn talks at length of his
hatred for Mühlen-Schönau:

Kak ja nenavižu etogo vyrodka! Slušaj,
Andrej. Ja Čuvstvoval sebja - net, čto
tami ja selaalse vešč'ju v rukex etogo
blagodetelja. Ja zasypal i prosyplja
s mysl'ju o tom, čto on kupil menja, čto
ja ne prinadleže sèbe. Emu bi izvjesten
každyj moj šag, cn śpionil za moimi
zamyslam, on ne vypuskai iz moej komnaty
ni odnogo klošča polotna .... Čne vse
krugom napominalo o moem uniženii, kak
čaxotočnomu vse napominaet čaxotku.
Hahn's detestation of Muhlen-Schonau leads him grossly to overestimate his political significance:

This outburst makes it clear that Wahn's personality is dominated by his hatred of Mühlen-Schönau. Believing that his human dignity had been deeply humiliated by his subjection by Mühlen-Schönau, Wahn has built up the German officer into a symbol of evil, and has come to believe that Mühlen-Schönau is the representative of a world in which "me vse krugom napominalo o moem uniženii, kak češtočnomu vse napominaet čenotku." Together with Mühlen-Schönau he rejects his homeland which he had earlier loved so intensely.

223 p. 371. Quoted from the 1924 edition. In the 1952 revision the two sentences beginning, "U nego ne ruki, a lapy" were omitted, and the word "čestokost'ju" replaced by "rasčetlivost'ju."
In all his attitudes there is a "maximalism," found in the "exaltedness" (эксал'tirovannost') of his love for Germany, his hatred for Mühlen-Schönau, his conversion to Bolshevism, as well as his final killing of Starcov after twice swearing external friendship for his comrade. On the artistic plane this maximalism is signalised by the contrast between the last and finest painting on which he had worked in Germany, a picture of the courtyard ("dvorik") of the Deutsches Museum in Nuremberg, and his work on an enormous propaganda poster in revolutionary Moscow. As in the case of Marie Urbach, the presentation of Wahn has distinct literary antecedents. The imagery of Wahn's impassioned indictment of Muhlen-Schonau is directly reminiscent of Dostoevskij: "uniżenie," "Ęaxotka," "Żestokost'" "otrod'e," "lępy," as well as the significant "pauk."

Moreover, the author, to whom German was a second language, could not have chosen the name "Wahn" otherwise than in full awareness of its implications. The name, meaning "false belief", "product of the imagination," "self-deception," suggests that it is misleading to attempt to apply logical criteria to Wahn's rejection of his patron and his homeland, or to his metamorphosis into a Bolshevik. It seems more helpful to see his "conversion" in the light of the abrupt psychological transitions of the "uniżennye i oskorblennye" than to complain of the absence of motivation for his

---

Although we see very little of Wahn's political activity in the novel, except for his agreement to assist in the recruitment of volunteers to fight against the Nerdvinians and the paperwork connected with the repatriation of the German prisoners of war, Starcov's opinion of his capacity as a political leader remains uncontested in the novel. It is curious that Wahn does not himself address the prisoners in order to induce them to fight for the Bolsheviks, but delegates the task to Starcov, in whose polemical persuasiveness he can scarcely have much confidence.

At the beginning of the novel Starcov in his letter to Marie Urbach describes Wahn as an excellent administrator whose every effort is directed toward his goal:


226 The reason is no doubt constructional, in that an opportunity is needed for Starcov to demonstrate his capacity at this time to experience a surge of revolutionary élan.
Starcov's later words in the same letter must clearly be taken to relate to men such as Wahn:

Эти люди, в су́щности, делают не боля́ше того, что они должны делат' по природе.
Они ничего не замечают под ногами, они
ве́чно - впере́д и вверх. И с таким
напряже́нием, то́чно они не люди́, а
какие-то катушку, румко́рфовы катушку ....
Они в круге; наверно, в центре круга.228

Starcov is intensely conscious that such men are essentially different from him - "Moja вина в том, что я не прово́лочни́й" - and also that theirs is an easier fate, since they have no choice but to act as they do - as he himself vividly expresses it, "Чтобы есть и пить, не нужно ни доброй воли, ни любви." Clearly, however, the implication is that they lack important elements of humanity, as Starcov's term, "Rumkørff coils" makes clear. The image was used by the proletarian poets of the kuznica group in their paens to the machine and to factory life. It occurs, for instance, in M. P. Gerasimov's poem "Elektro-пoэмá,"229 in which the poet's beloved

227 p. 12. The suggestion of the well-organized and rational man's power over "things" ("ве́шчи") has an interesting parallel in the "rationalists"' envied domination of their environment in Ju. Oléša's work, e.g. the attitude of Kavalе́rov to Andrej Babíčev in Zavist'.


229 This poem will be found in S. V. Šuvalov, Sem' poètov. Ryleev, Puškin, Lermontov, Nekrasov, Blok, Brjusov, Gerasimov. Istoriko-literaturnye i kritičeskie stat'i (Moscow, 1927), pp. 190-191.
is a dynamo. The extent of dehumanization suggested by the term is complemented by Wahn's own reference to his inability to love or have a relationship with a woman.

In his conversation with Starcov in Moscow Wahn seems half-ashamed of his attachment to his friend:

Škol'níčeskoe ili ne znaju kakoe v čuvstve k tebe u menja. Družba, mystičeskoe čto-to. No mne ne xočetsja borot'sja c nežnost'ju k tebe. Xotja podsoznatel'noe - smešno .... Ja sčitatju, čto ne dolžno byt' čuvstv, nedostupnych ponimanju. I, konačno, vse čuvstva sleduet podčinit' raz navsegda rassudku. Tol'ko v etom slučае za bessmисленност'ju vidiš' mysł i za stradaniem - radost'.

In his speech to the Committee of Seven Wahn again states his belief that reason should be the only basis for human behaviour: "... ja pruičil sebja myslit' ob'ektivno i dejstvovat' soobrazno vyvodom razuma." In this episode Wahn comes closest to the model of the "Rumkorff coil":

Kurt stojal prjamo protiv predsedatelja, utknuv kulaki v stol i korotko potrjajivaja golovoj v konce každoj frazy. Govoril on bez zapinki, budto čitat po knige; i reč' ego byla knižnoj .... Kurt končil, točno zaxlопnul pročитannuyu knigu.

The impression is indirectly intensified by the presentation of the committee chairman, "Čelovek so stekljaľnym licom v tolstyx očkax, fokus kotoryx ni razu ne peremestilsja, poka Kurt govoril."

231 p. 15.
Later the chairman is completely dehumanized: "Kurt stojal prjamo protiv stekljannogo lica."\(^{233}\)

Wahn does not attempt to justify Starcov's murder juridically, explaining it merely as the psychologically indispensable execution of a traitor:

\[\ldots\text{ po ličnym motivam on spas ţizn', našemu vragu i predal delo, kotoromu my vse služim. Kak čelovek on mne stal nenavisten, kak drug, - ja byl ego drugom, - otvratitelen. Ja ubil ego.}^{234}\]

In the political environment of the time, this act of a fanatical Bolshevik is entirely credible, but Starcov's execution necessarily adds an additional element to the impression of "dehumanization" which Wahn creates. Fedin's method of characterization contributes to the unconvincingness of Wahn as a living character. As in the case of Starcov, the author gives us no physical description of Wahn, and he is presented far more in ideologically-oriented dialogues with Starcov than in action or in relationships with others.

Wahn's "maximalism," displayed both in his conversion to Bolshevism and his murder of his friend Starcov, can best be seen within the context of the Russian literary tradition of characterization.

---

\(^{233}\) p. 14. Quoted from the 1924 edition. The references to the "glass face" disappeared in the 1952 revision.

If we adopt this view, Wahn's homage to "reason" may be interpreted as not so much the reflection of contemporary ideology as the psychological overcompensation of a man who is afraid of his subconscious: "podsoznatel'noe - smešno ..." The author does not present Wahn sufficiently fully for him to become completely comprehensible and his characterization remains ambiguous. Contemporary as well as modern Soviet critics have objected to the "schematism" and lack of humanity of Wahn, the principal Bolshevik figure in the novel. Fedin himself in a recent article referred to Wahn as a portrait of one of the "leather jackets," the "kožanye kurtki" made famous by Pil'njak, who did in fact exist during this period.

IX

Wahn remarks to Starcov, "Ty dopolniaes' menja." This significant comment illustrates the relationship between the two men, which reveals similar literary antecedents to those found in the characterization of Wahn. As A. Zonin wrote, "po suščestvu my imeem


237. p. 284.
Wahn's advocacy of hate is opposed to Starcov's belief in love and Wahn's support for war is opposed to Starcov's detestation of war. It has already become clear that Starcov's reactions at Erlangen are consistently contrasted with Wahn's, while the two visions at Nuremberg have also the nature of an antithesis.

Similarity of presentation emphasizes the "inverted correspondence" between the two characters. We are given absolutely no information on Starcov's background, or even on the reasons for his coming to Germany. When Starcov and Wahn appear in the novel, they are already close friends. As we have seen, Wahn is very sketchily presented "in action," so that the fact of Wahn's professional activity as an artist and then as a Bolshevik, while Starcov has no profession at all, does not contrast them as much as might appear at first sight. Throughout much of the novel the views and attitudes of Starcov and Wahn are presented primarily by means of their conversations with each other.

In the German section of the novel, however, Starcov remains strangely silent. He persuades Wahn that they should leave the Anatomical Museum at Erlangen and visit the fair, but when they arrive Starcov makes no significant observations, even in reply to the

\[238\] A. Zonin, "O sub"ekte tvorčestva K. Fedina," Pevst' i revoljucija, #5, 1929, p. 74.
provocative remarks of the Russian student who condemns German barbarity and militarism. Starcov's sensitivity and detestation of cruelty and violence are conveyed by his reactions to the Museum and the fair, as well as by the hideous nightmare of Ebersochs' head. Then, after Starcov's repudiation by Wahn, the principal character leitmotiv associated with Starcov is introduced:

Andréj idet tiko - okrainingi, pritaivšimisja pareukami, v nerovnom, kryom stree staryx kamennyx žilišč. Spešit' ne nado. Spešit' nukuda. Pozadi - gočy, kotoryx ne verneš; i kotorye ne nuzny; ljudi, kotorye nikogda ne stanut prežnimi, nikogda. Ne vse li ravno, kuda idti? Ne vse li ravno, kuda prideš!? I dojdeš! li kuda-nibud'? 239

Here Andréj's resignation in the face of the loss of his best friend and the outbreak of war, with the ominous change of status that it involves for him, foreshadows the theme of his passivity presented in the character setpieces which follow. Starcov's state of mind during his internment in Bischofsberg is described in detail:

On žil obessilennyj, pritupivšijsja, ustalyj. Mir, kotoryj okružal ego, byl nepokolebimoj toščej. Ona omyvala Andeja, kak voda. On mog peredvigat'sja v tošče, no plotnost' ce byla povsjedu odinakovoj. Emu razrešeno bylo dyšat'. No on ne mog dvinut' plečami, čtoby raspravit' ix i vzdoxnut' glubče. On dyšal čerez trostnikovuju trubočku, vyvedennju skvož tošču na vozdųx,

239 p. 112.
In the course of the scene with the social-democrat Hennig during which Hennig expounds his views on the relationship between the war and socialism, Starcov says nothing, except to query Hennig's remarks and to observe, "Ja vižu, čto my živom za sčet nakoplennogo ran'še."241

During the first chance encounter with Marie Urbach on Mount Lausche, Marie takes the initiative in proposing a sled-ride down the mountain. Starcov is provoked by Marie's question, "Čto van dalo pravo sčitat' nas vsex donoščikami? Vam ploxo u nas, van, našemu vragu?" into making a plea for simplicity and human decency. His words on the transitoriness of their relationship have an ironic significance in view of their subsequent love affair:

— Grustno, čto my razužilis' žit' prosto ... za pereborkami i pristrojkami ničego ne vidno. Začem vam ponadobilos' rassprašivat' menja, kto ja? Razve bez čtogo nel'zja idti rjadom, kak my idem...
This suggestion of Starcov's humanist attitudes remains, however, undeveloped in the novel. Marie takes the initiative again in proposing a further meeting, but this second meeting lasts only a few seconds, since Marie flees at the sight of the detachment of blind Italian soldiers. Soon afterwards Starcov is involved in the discussion at his landlord's, Hennig's house, after the visit of the King of Saxony to Bischofsberg. Hennig's remarks make it clear that Starcov had objected to the social-democrat's allowing himself to be presented to the King. Hennig accuses him of not recognizing tactics, and of being unable to hate, while Starcov's own words are not given. Starcov cannot bring himself to argue with his German friends:

Temnym koridorom on šel, sgorbivšis' i nagnuv golovu. Ešli by kto-nibud' vstretil ego zdes', on pokazalsja by starikom, voločaščim za soboju gruz mnogoletnih mučenij.243

Going back to his room, he unexpectedly finds Marie: again the initiative has been hers. Marie tells him that he has made her aware

242 p. 166.

243 p. 184.
of the horrors of war, and he speaks of his detestation of the carnage:

— Vot uže tretij god, kak ja smotrju na kazni. Každuju sekundu umiraju ljudi. My vse stoim v očeredi k šafovot. I ja dumaju vse čašće o palače.244

The scene ends in their making love, in which Marie seems to take the lead. Later Marie is again the active partner in their plans for Starcov's flight. Their conversation vividly expresses his fear and hesitancy compared with her determination now that the decision has been taken:

— Mne trudno rasstat'sja. Vpervye na étoj zemle - rodnoj čelovek. Mari, slyšiš', - rodnoj, ljubimyj! Ja bojus', čto, esli ja ostavlju tebja, ty budes' dumat'...
— Molči!
— No ja ne mogu bol'še v étoj citadeli! Menja davjat ljudi, golosa ljudej, daže dobro ljudej ...
— Rešeno, Andrej. Rešeno! My ved' vstrejimja potom.
— Da, da.245

After escaping from the customs warehouse in Austria, Starcov meekly returns to the German border, and during the conversation with Mühlen-Schönau after his second capture it becomes clear that his actions are dictated by his longing to be reunited with Marie:

Andrej vdrug vspomnil poslednj čas s Mari, v komnate, pritaivšajsja v mjagkoj,
This detailed analysis demonstrates how a sketchy, indefinite impression of Starcov is conveyed to the reader. The basic passivity of his personality is made clear, while his humanity and hatred of war are suggested. Nevertheless he remains in every scene where he is present a "statist" rather than a participant, and consequently an unreal, shadowy figure. The vagueness of his presentation is increased by the fact that we see him most frequently in conversations in which he takes little part, while his interior monologue is very rarely given. Starcov's interior monologue is presented during his flight, but it relates only to his fear of capture, while the authorial element is so high as to reduce credibility:

...oni dejstvitel'no režut, ći glaza, oni, požaluj, strašny, oni ottalkivajut ot sebach! Kakoj nadmennyj i zloveščij vzgljad! Ėtot Ėcelovek drugoj porody, drugix kostej, on nedostupen i Žestok. Opasnost', Andrej, opasnost'! Andrej gotov ko vsjakoj neožidannosti každuju sekundu, on znaet zarane, kak vstretit neožidannost', kogo ona stanet pered nim licom k licu. Odnako neuželi tak skoro, tak bespoščadno skoro i prosto? ....

246 pp. 212-213.
O net! Andrej ne perebegal granicy!
Krugom nego te že ljudi, č'ix golosov
i smexa on bežal: plotnaja,
omvajuščaja každuju častičku tela
tolšča. On možet vytjanut' ruki,
povernut' golovu ili privalit'sja
k stene. No raspravit' pleši, čtoby
vzdoxnut' vsej grud'ju, emu nel'sja.
Trubočka, skvoz' kotoruju emu razrešeno
dyšat', stala ešče dlinnee, vozdux
tjanetsja po nej ešče medlennee, i grud'
rabotaet iz poslednix sil. Net, éto vse
te že ljudi, vse ta že strana, gde vse
neizmenno i pročno, kak vkopannaja v
zemlju i zalitaja cementom šeleznaja stanga -
Germanija!247

The limited use made of interior monologue does not enable us
to gain insight into Starcov's attitudes or his relationships with
others. He remains a pale figure whose unconvincingness casts doubt
upon the credibility of Marie's love for him and upon Marie herself.

After Starcov's repatriation to Russia and reunion with Wahn
he continues to appear as a foil for others and a catalyst for the
expression of opinions by more active personalities rather than as
an independent character. In the important conversation which ensues
after the meeting of Starcov and Wahn in Moscow, Starcov emphasizes
his detestation of war and thus induces his friend to make his
significant declaration on the need for war and for evil. Starcov
confesses the truth of this, commenting only, "Èto strašno i ...
unizitel'no."248 Wahn's references to Starcov's "dobraja,

247 pp. 202-203.
248 p. 284.
rasterjannaja ulybka" confirm further our passive impression of
Starcov.

Gazing at the rooks outside the window, Starcov speaks of
hunger:

— Užasno. Ëtots prizrak zaslonjaet
soboju vse. Golod! Čtoby perestupit'
čerez nego, nužno byt' očen' smelym. I
čto za nim?

Wahn protests:

— Éx, ty, revoljucioner! Stydno, Andrej.
— Ja - revoljucioner? Mne do six por
sovestno projiti mimo kaleki, ne podav emu
milostyni.249

In the course of the conversation it becomes clear that Andrej
wants to return to Germany and Marie, but he indifferently agrees to
join Kurt in going on an assignment to Semidol: "S toboj - da." The
scene ends with Andrej's relating the story of his love for Marie and
agreeing in reply to Kurt's question that the main thing in his life
has been love.

Later at Pokisen's dača in Semidol, where a second most im-
portant episode for the representation of revolutionary attitudes
takes place, Starcov is present, but takes almost no part in the
heated discussion, despite Golosov's provocative remarks about the
intelligentsia. At the end of this scene Starcov's indifference as
to whether to go away with Rita and Golosov or not precedes a further
setpiece describing Starcov's mental state in detail:

249 p. 285. In the 1952 revision "kaleki" was replaced by
"niščego."
As in the case of the earlier passage quoted above dealing with Starcov's emotional condition, the treatment is descriptive rather than analytical. When Rita seduces him, it becomes clear that the "edinstvennaja, neperedavaemaja mysli" is his longing for Marie, but he lacks the willpower to resist Rita's physical advances:

On otorval'sja ot edinstvennoj, neperedavaemoj svoej mysli, on otolknul ee ot sebja, on zanovo vidit to, čto pered nim, vblizi nego, vmoste s nim. Da i byla li u nego kakaja-nibud' mysli? Ne plylo li pered ego gubami gorjačee, vlažnoe, mjagkoe kol'co, uskol'zavšee vot uže celyj god - bol'še goda! - v tot samyj moment, kogda on gotov byl prikosnut'sja k nemu suxim, vospalennym rtom? Najavu i vo sne čto mjagkoe, vlažnoe kol'co majačit gde-to v prostranstve malen'koj krasnoj mišen'ju, i teper' - daže teper', v neprogljadnoj temeni noči - Andrej razl'čaat žarkuju egl krasnotu.

— Xolod ... Mari ... celyj god ... Rita!251

Unfortunately, after this episode the author does not attempt to present Starcov's reactions or possible guilt feelings at his

250 p. 332.

251 p. 334.
betrayal of Marie. The two episodes then follow in which Andrej is overcome by his brief burst of revolutionary élan. In the first, Andrej is suddenly inspired by the letter which he reads out to the German prisoners of war to deliver an apparently impassioned speech, under the influence of which the German soldiers decide to support the Bolsheviks. The abrupt transformation of Starcov's temperament is baldly presented:

I togda čto-to xolodnoe polyxnilo
Andreju v spinu - ot zatylka do pjat,
- i on vspomnil zaučennuju svoju reč',
vspomnil po-novomu, takoj, kakoj ona
emu nikogda ne prirodila na um ... okunajas' v polyxavi̇j otkuda-to
neob''jasnîmyj xolod, Andrej s
ožestočennoj zloboj k slovam, kotorye
mešali mysli, kričal ...252

Soon afterwards Starcov confesses to Wahn his inability to kill an enemy in words which foreshadow his failure later to surrender Mühien-Schönau to the mercy of the Bolsheviks:

Ja, verojatno, ne mog by ubit' nikogo. To est' tak, odnogo
kakogo-nibud' čeloveka. Čtoby potom
znat', čto ja ubil. Čto imenno ja.
Imenno takogo-to čeloveka ....
Možet byt', kak raz ja i ub'ju
markgraфа. No ... toli'ko, Čtoby ne
znat' ětogo naverno. Ne videt'.253

The climactic San'šino episode follows. Already during the march to the battlefield Starcov is conscious of a sense of identity, of "slitnost'" with the German soldiers who surround him, while his

252 p. 357.

thoughts are filled with memories of Marie - "on veril, čto Mari -
-buduščee, čto ona - tot vtoroj šag, kotoryj on sdelaet sledom za
pervym." When the engagement begins, Starcov is seized with a
strange elation, overcome by which he takes part in the infantry
attack:

Strannoe spokojstvie razlilos' po ego
telu. Vpervye za ěti gody, možet byt'
vpervye za vsju žizn', on ispytyval
neobyčajnuju legkost' kakogo-to bezdum'ja.
U nego bylo takoe čuvstvo, kak budto on
ničem ne byl svjazan s nirom, kotoryj
neešdanno i udivitel'no prosto raskrylsja
pered nim i prinjal ego. On oščuščal v
mire odnogo sebja, i vremja vdrug prekratilo
svoe tečen'e, tak čto ono stalо ni buduščego,
s neotstupnoj mysliju o Mari, ni nastojasčego,
s ego toskoj i straxom za izurodovannogo,
kazennogo čeloveka [Lependin].255

Starcov's mystical sense of disassociation from the world,
soon to be vividly expressed as "čuvstvo kakov-to bestelesnosti,
neopošutimo nesšee ego vverx," is a complex emotion with which is
combined a Tolstoyan sensation of fusion with his environment as he
watches an ant fight off a tiny insect:

Možet byt' ottojо, čto zemlja byla
blizka k licu, ničtožnoe pjaatnysko
ee, istočennoe xodami červej i žukov,
vyraoto v celyj mir, i ětot mir
napolnjal Andreja vse uglubljavšejsja
nepokolebimoj tišinoj.256

It seems that for the first time Starcov is able to cope with
reality - but only through experiencing a total disassociation from

254 p. 373.
255 p. 376.
256 pp. 376-377.
The unexpected encounter with Mühlen-Schönau demonstrates Starcov's return to his normal state of passivity and indecision: though conscious of his duty, he is unable to bring himself to give Schönau up to the Bolsheviks. Instead of using the medium of Starcov's own words, physical description or interior monologue, Fedin presents Starcov's failure to act initially through an authorial intrusion:

Pozdno, Andrej! Ne nado bylo slušat' etogo vzdora, ne dopuskat' ni odnogo slova, ne terjat' ni odnoj sekundy.257

The extraordinary coincidence of this encounter of Starcov and Schönau in Semidol after both stop in amazement at seeing in the street a girl whom they believe to be their mutual beloved, Marie Urbach, contributes to the atmosphere of unreality which pervades the scene. When Schönau mentions Bischofsberg, Starcov, overwhelmed by thoughts of Marie, whispers to him that he should come to see him that evening: we are to understand later that Andrej has realized that Schönau will be able to deliver a letter to Marie.

In the remainder of the novel, scenes indicative of Starcov's weakness and indecision alternate with moments when he vividly remembers his experience at San’šino and believes that it has led to his spiritual rebirth. He passively accepts his mobilization to the front 258

257 p. 382.

258 See p. 390. In the 1952 revision Starcov's reaction became more enthusiastic: "Éto xoroso. Éto otlično!"
and then speaks at length to Wahn of the significance of his experience:

Ja soveržennop erorodilsja posle San'šina ... Ja ponjal teper', počemu do six por ja postojanno čuvstvoval sebja ugnetennym. Kakoj-to mrak okutyval manja, ja zadyxalsja ot nego, u menja ne bylo ni minuty peredyskii. Znaeš', čto čto bylo? Čto bylo ložnoe soznanie, budo by ja ne nesu otvetstvennosti za užas, kotoryj soveršaetsja v mire. Budo by ja ne vinoven v ětom užase. No sovest' ne davala pokoja ... Ja vinoven v tom, čto posylal ljudej na smert', i ne šel s nimi sam. Ved' pravda? Vse, kto ne šel na vojnu, vse, kto ne idet na vojnu, - vse vinovaty v vojne. Nel'zja posylat' ljudej na smert'. Esli smert' nužna, esli ona neizbežna, nado samomu ... umeret', a ne posylat' drugix na smert' ....


As E. J. Simmons points out,260 Starcov's revulsion from his former pacifism is allied to a Dostoevskian desire to assume the guilt of others. The belief in collective responsibility which irresistibly

259 p. 392. In the 1952 revision the sentence "Nel'zja posylat' ljudej na smert'" was omitted, and the sentence "Ja vinoven v tom, čto posylal ljudej na smert', i ne šel s nimi sam" was replaced by "Ja vinoven v tom, čto ljudi šli na smert', a ja ne šel s nimi."

reminds the reader of Zosima's words in Brat'ja Karamazovy is fore-
shadowed by Starcov's earlier sense of identity with his fellow
volunteers and his readiness to fight at their side. No attempt
is made to reconcile this consciousness with the ambiguous second
constituent of the "San'yo feeling" - the mystical sensation of
disembodied disassociation from the world. Starcov's words, indeed,
suggest that for him the most significant element has been his tran-
sitory ability in a burst of collective élan to rid himself of the
anguished self-awareness and overpowering incubus of cerebration and
self-doubt suggested by his psychological state before his seduction
by Rita.

Starcov's resolution and eagerness to die for the cause are
of short duration. Wahn himself seems to doubt the sincerity of his
transformation. From this moment an ineluctable fate takes charge
of Starcov's destiny, and his flight after stealing the document from
Wahn's files and frenzied running away from Mühlen-Schönau after his
second meeting with him foreshadow his crazed flight from his room
and running around the city after receiving Mühlen-Schönau's letter in
the final scene of the book.

Starcov becomes an increasingly unreal figure as the novel
draws to a close. The violent and rapid movements, - "beg Andreja
byl poletom kamnja, brošennogo v propast" - which begin to

261 See p. 393.

262 p. 395.
characterize his activities after his first encounter in Semidol with Mühlen-Schönau, 263 are associated with his unconvincingly extreme psychological condition after the theft of the documents, due to which he trembles, staggers, sobs, chokes and hiccups. The atmosphere of "Dostoevskina" is further intensified by Starcov's terrible thirst and his dream of an empty chair standing alone in an endless blue expanse.

On leaving Semidol Starcov is again overwhelmed by the blissful feeling experienced at San'yino - "ego volja otdat' sebja lučšemu, što on uznal v Vizni, byla neotstupna i zaslonjala soboju vse." 264 - but Rita's farewell destroys his spiritual élan, and it is clear that his "rebirth" is transitory. When he arrives in Petrograd and endeavours to abandon himself to the cause by insisting on his transfer to the front - "On toropilsja navstreču delu i veril, što vse v mire stanet prostym i jasnym, esli on prikosnet'sja k nemu" - an authorial intrusion makes it clear that his hopes are illusory:

Emu kazalos', što čuvstvo, podnjavše ego nad zemljé, kak vater klok bumagi, xoronitsja gde-to sovsem blizko i vot-vot vorvetsja v nego, stoby opjat' zakružit' v svoej voronke. Otkuda mog on znat', što ego poputnjy veter duet s berega, k kotoromu on staralsja pričalit'? Otkuda mog znat', što s tego časa, kak on perestupit porog oslepšego ot doždej doma, každyj ego den' ljažet gorju meždu nim i ego prostoj, oščútimoj cel'ju? 265

---

263 See p. 383.

264 p. 397.

The author makes it clear that Starcov's behaviour at this time is determined more by his growing consciousness of alienation ("otšuždennost'") than by guilt feelings induced by his treachery. The environment of starving Petrograd becomes increasingly alien to him:

... každyj den' podbival ego, kak veter - pticu, i vse krugom nego stanovilos' strannym i edva ulovimym. I odnajdy, v snežnyj večer, vozvraščajas' domoj, on ostanovilsja na uglu i vzgljamul vokrug sebja udiviennno, točno ego peraneslo na dši ulicy iz drugogo mira. Tekryj sneg bil po burym obliupiennym stenam s ostervcen'em. Ljudi bezali, kazalos', bez vsjakoj celi, i vo vsam, čto obstupalo Andreja, nel'zja bylo pojmat'smysla, obyčnogo i prostogo v živom gorode.266

For a brief moment the "trench professor" seems to infect Starcov with his idealism, but the professor's death plunges him back into his state of will-less apathy:

... emu kazalos', čto professor, tak nečajanno pojavivšijsja v ego žizni, unes iz nee kakuju-to poslednjuju vozmožnost' skazat' o samom važnom .... On pokinul kladbišče posle vsex, sutulyj, tupoj, pronizannyj sumerečnym tumanom. On ne šel, a taščilsja, počti polz po bezljučnym, neskončaemym ulicam prigorodov. On byl pokož na bol'nogo, kotorogo vykinuli iz lazareta, edva on uspel perelomiti' bolezni.267

This description develops the impression created by Starcov's phantom-like behaviour in Semidol; as the phrase "pronizannyj sumerečnym tumanom" indicates, Starcov has become a spectral figure

266 p. 50.
267 p. 63.
whose real life is already over. His despairing regrets are those of a dying man:

\[\text{Esli by možno bylo načat' žit', snačala ... Raskatat' klubok, dojti po nitke do prokljatogo časa i postupit' po-drugomu. Sovsem po-drugomu ...} 268\]

When Starcov has not presence of mind enough to prevent Marie's fleeing, his ultimate degradation is conveyed by the suggestion that he is less animate than the objects on the wall:

\[\text{Andrei xočet dvinit'sja, emu mešajut šinel'ı, pal'to, zonty, razvešennye na stenke, on sam stanovitsia mjagkim i beskostnym, kak šineli.} 269\]

We find in the novel three epitaphs for Starcov: one provided by Wahn, and those written by the author himself and by Starcov himself. Wahn, as we have seen, calls him a traitor who deserved to die for his treachery to the cause. The author's judgment is more merciful:

\[\text{Vot my končaem povest' o čeloveke, s toskoju žadavšem, čtoby žizn' prinjala ego. My ogljadvyvaemja na dorogu, po kotoroj stupal on sledom za žestokost'ju i ljubov'ju, na dorogu v krovi i cvetax. On prošel ee, i na nem ne ostalos' ni odnogo pjatna krovi, i on ne razdavil ni odnogo cvetka.}

\[\text{O, esli by on prinjal na sebja xot' odno pjatno i zatoptal by xot' odin cvetok! Možet byt', togda naša žalost' k nemu vyrosla by do ljubvi, i my ne dali by} \]

268 p. 70.

269 p. 404.
Although the author justifies his sympathy for Starcov, he condemns him for his passivity and for his pacifism. He implies that there is no place in the world for a man who is not prepared to commit violence and to shed blood. The verdict is ambiguous, since it begs the question of the cause in the name of which the acts are committed. The reader, however, inevitably interprets the verdict in the terms of the discussion in Moscow between Starcov and Wahn: the good which can come only out of evil is the "good" that Wahn represents, the Bolshevik cause. The author then goes on to make a further significant claim:

No steklo ne svarivaetsja s železom, i my ne v silax izmenit' što-nibud' v sud'be Andreja.271

Again, there is ambiguity, in this case as to whether the statement of "personality determination" relates only to the individual personality of Starcov or to a whole class of intellectuals represented by Starcov. It is inevitable that the reader takes Starcov to be the representative of a whole generation of intellectuals attempting to come to terms with the Revolution. Fedin himself lends credence to this

270 p. 407.

271 p. 408.
belief in his 1952 Autobiography and in his article, "K romanu "Goroda i gody." A. M. van der Eng-Liedmeier relates Starcov to a whole class of "vacillating intellectuals," in early Soviet literature who become Communists "out of disgust with the existing world" and because they want to be freed of their "sterile individualism." Starcov, van der Eng-Liedmeier points out, possesses the characteristics of the Russian literary type of "lišnj čelovek," in that Starcov has been unable to find an ideal which would enable him to make decisions and choices.

Starcov's own epitaph shows that he regrets, not his betrayal of the Bolshevik cause, but his inability to find a cause to which he could devote himself. Comparing himself to a little dog scratching at a door, he writes in his last letter to Marie:

Ona ne mogla ponjat', što vovse ne nužna na etom svete.
Ja eto ponimaju. To est' pro sebja ...

Starcov explains movingly that he had failed to achieve his ambition of playing a prominent role in human society:


275 p. 12.
Significantly, Starcov goes on to express his envy of the Bolsheviks such as Kurt Wahn, the "Rumkorff coils," who, unabashed by adversity, work untiringly to realize their ideals. These are the men, Starcov claims, who occupy the position which he had wished for himself: "Oni v krug; naverno, v centre kruga." He ends his letter by confirming the author's final judgment on him:

Moja vina v tom, čto ja ne provoločnyj. Ty dolžna ponjet' menja, Mari.277

Starcov is unable to adopt an ideology such as Wahn's which demands the infliction of suffering, even in the name of an ideal which in the abstract he supports. In this respect he is a readily recognizable intellectual type: in the words of Mirskij, "sintetičeskij obraz russkogo intelligenta - passivnogo, čutkogo i poslušnogo ko vsjakomu toľku izvne, lišennogo initiativy, stremjačegosja sobljusti svoju moral'nuju neporočnost' (ne prolit' krovi!) i absolvutno

276 p. 13.

Starcov, however, has the additional dimension of wishing to become a man of action. The mystical feeling of disassociation from the world and yet identification with his environment which he experiences at San'Yino is the closest that he succeeds in coming to the "circle" which he wishes to enter.

It is clear that Starcov's inchoate support for Communism is the reflection of his psychological need to adopt an ideology which will give him a function in life and an opportunity of entering the "circle." By the end of the novel he has "given up scratching," as he says in despair, because he realizes that he can never be like Wahn. There is the suggestion also that he sees N E P as a betrayal of Communism - if even the ideals in the name of which sacrifices are demanded are now diluted, the price seems to him now perhaps even more unjustifiable.

But even the "circle" of power is for Starcov a secondary goal. Starcov betrays the Revolution not in the name of his ideology, but in the name of Marie Urbach. Even though he was too weak to be faithful to her, the main thing in his life, as he tells Wahn, had been love. Starcov's last act is his attempt to return to Marie:

Ja edu k tebe. Ja rešil. Ja ne mogu bol'še. Vse ravno. Ja zatknu uši i

---

His last words were, as we saw, "Ty dolžna ponjal' menja, Mari."

Starcov's final mental derangement appears to be the consequence of his abandonment by Marie and his learning so cruelly from Mühlen-Schönau's letter of the sacrifices which she made in order to join him in Russia, acting upon a mind exacerbated by the guilt of his treachery to Wahn. Starcov's weakness and indecisiveness are characteristics of a personality to which human relationships are all-important. If Starcov seems feeble and unmanly - a "roxlja," as Golosov describes him, this is largely because his whole life is a "search for personal happiness." Starcov is not the typical "lišnij čelovek" for a further reason. We associate the "lišnie ljudi" on the model of Turgenev's Rudin with articulateness and a rhetorical gift. Their tragedy lies in their inability to convert their words into action. Starcov, however, as an analysis of the novel shows, is a strikingly inarticulate individual whose views, except on the subjects of his rejection of war and the doctrine that the end can justify the means, remain vague and inchoate. His tragedy lies, not in his being a "repentant intellectual," but in his being a "repentant individualist." He cannot give himself up to a collective élan, however, more than momentarily since he is unable to bring himself to make sacrifices in the personal life which is vital to him.

279 p. 12.
280 p. 346.
281 A. Kolesnikova, "Goroda i gody," "Na postu", #1, 1925, p. 208.
Starcov's conflict, however, lies not only in the inability to reconcile the personal with the social, "podčinit' ličnuju žizn' surovym, no i velikim zadacam vremeni." Starcov's inability to assert himself in life is one side of a personality for which death has a strange attractiveness. Toward the end of the novel, the suspicion grows that Starcov is being drawn irresistibly toward a fate which is not completely unwelcome. The urge to dissolution is suggested, indeed, in the "Nirvanic philosophy" inherent in Starcov's "San'šino feeling," and his consciousness of "disembodiment," "incorporeality" ("bestelesnost'"), and "complete freedom".  

Ja vsqgda videl sebja so storony. Pod San'šinom ja perestal ne tó'ko videt' sebja, no úaše oščuščar'. Esli éto smert', to ona prekrasna ...

Andrej's name, with its associations "staryj" and "starec" already suggests his tenuous connection with life. The cult of the "pafos smerti" has, of course, its literary antecedents. One of its most prominent exponents was Fedor Sologub, whom Fedin knew well in Petrograd during this period. Much later he was to discuss him extensively in his literary memoirs, "Gor'kij sredi nas." M. Slonimskij writes of the cult of death amongst the lycée students in Petrograd at the beginning of...
the century and its connection with the "decadent" movement in literature.  

In *Goroda i gody* the repeated evocations of death form a sombre theme which recurs throughout the novel.

We have not only the murder of Starcov himself and the hanging of Lependin, but also the death of the "trench professor" and the fearful picture of starvation in Petrograd. The first sight that meets Starcov's eyes at staff headquarters at Petrograd is a coffin, while the "black general" remarks "Xorošëj poxorona - xorošo dlja krasnoj armejskoj dux." Starcov's own predisposition towards death fuses with the fearful atmosphere of annihilation. The readiness to kill exemplified in the characterization of Wahn is paralleled by the readiness to die emphasized by the younger Ščepov. As his mistress Klavdija Vasil'evna waits to be led out to be shot in a ravine, in her agony she remembers his words:

> On zagovorit v desjatyj raz o tom, čto s revoljuciei ljudi porestali žit' obyčnoj žizn'ju, čto oni každuju minutu gotovjatsja k smerti i čto edinstvennyj smysl revoljucii - v ītoj postojannoj gotovnosti umeret'. Čto ljudjam nečego zadumyvat'sja nač sud'bam revoljucii, a nužno tol'ko umirat', potomu čto na mesto umeršix pridut živye, i togda revoljucija soveršitsja sama soboj.  

---


288 Quoted from the 1924 edition. In the 1952 revision the sentence was amended to "Nado xorošie poxorony, - ėto xorošij krasnyj komandir!" (p. 41).

289 Quoted from the 1924 edition. In the 1952 revised version the passage reads, "...edinstvennoe trebovanie revoljucii - v ītoj postojannoj gotovnosti umeret' radi pobedy. Čto nečego zadumyvat'sja
In the vision of breakneck speed which Starcov has in Petrograd after being kissed by the doomed professor, the theme of death is directly related to Starcov and to the "San'šino feeling":

— Goni, goni, goni!290

It is evident that Starcov's will-lessness and passivity result not only from his inability to find a function in society and from the apathy of the "superfluous man." As N. Tereščenko observed, "Dialektika psixišeskogo razvitija Andreja Starcova naxodit svoj razrešajuščij sintez liš' v smerti."291

Although Starcov is by far the most extensively portrayed character in the novel, it is difficult to agree with J. Blum that he is the "most credible and most convincing"292 character of Goroda i gody.

The lack of information on his background, professional and intellectual

nad sud'bam revoljucii, a nužno tol'ko ne bojet'sja umeret', potomu što na mesto umeršix pridut živye, radi kotoryx revoljucija pobėždaet." (pp. 367-368).

290 p. 34.

291 N. Tereščenko, "Filosofija črotizma i dijelektika živogopyta ("Ljubov' Žanny Nej" Erenburga i "Goroda i gody" Fedina)," Zvezda, #3, 1925, p. 289.

interests, and the shadowy presentation of his relationships with others, especially with Kurt Wahn and Marie Uroch, contribute to his remaining an insubstantial figure. Even more significant causes of his unconvincingness are the frequent authorial intrusions connected with his characterization, combined with the extremely limited presentation of Starcov's own interior monologue. In episodes where his personality and views might have been presented, he regularly appears only as a foil for others. Other characters, such as Fedor Lependin and Mühlen-Schönauf, are considerably more convincingly portrayed.

X

As E. J. Simmons remarks, "Basically Cities and Years is not a novel of characters." The most striking feature of the novel is Fedin's success in conveying the atmosphere of the period by means of what a contemporary critic termed the "kinematografičeskaja smena scen i kartin." Here the striving for "sjužetnost" and the abrupt stylistic transitions both play a role in the attempt to convey the human experience of prewar and wartime Germany and revolutionary Russia. It is clear that Fedin endeavours to project in his art the sensation of the disintegration of the old world and the breathtaking speed of events. In an authorial setpiece in the novel the writer himself expresses this feeling vividly, associating it with the consciousness of death which we find to be so prominent in the personality of his hero:


In *Goroda i gody* Kurt Wahn makes the claim that a "new glue" is needed for the new, postwar novel, and it is tempting to interpret this as a programmatic statement by the author himself. Fedin was aware, however, that he had not yet found the new artistic method he sought. To Gor'kij he wrote of his tendency towards "manernost', izyskannaja narо'citost'," and of the problem of construction: "Ja poproboval v etom romane sдvinut' plasty ob'chestvennogo materiala mexanikoj avantjurno-romaničeskogo sjužeta. No ... - verojatno - rasčety moi očen' často neveryny: to čereščur mnogo ob'chestvennosti i malо avantjury, to naoborot."297

295 1924 edition, pp. 331-332. This passage was omitted in its entirety from the 1952 revision.

296 See p. 283.

297 Letters to Gor'kij, April 7, 1923; July 16, 1924, in *Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perепiska*, ed. I.I. Anisimov et al. (Moscow, 1963), pp. 470,475.
Certainly his attempt at innovation in his first novel led him to experimentation in structure and language which frequently destroys the harmony between content and form and gives the reader unwelcome glimpses into the writer's workshop. Nevertheless, Fedin's preoccupation with literary technique resulted in a number of superb genre pictures, which, despite the "plakatnost'" of which the author himself was conscious, are often memorable for their vividness and intensity. Fedin's greatest achievement, however, lies in the ability to create a sense of the dynamic immediacy of atmosphere in his presentation of revolutionary Russia. Mirskij wrote that "po interesnosti Goroda i gody prevosxodjat vse, čto bylo napisano s Revoljucii." With this, his first major work, Fedin reintroduced the fullscale realistic novel to Russian literature.

---

298 See Fedin's letter to Gor'kij, December 28, 1924, in M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli. Neizdannaja perapiska, p. 484.


CHAPTER II

BRAT'JA

Fedin's second novel, Brat'ja, was written between October, 1926 and March, 1928, while Fedin was resident in Leningrad. The novel initially appeared in serialized form in the journal Zvezda, the principal contemporary literary journal in Leningrad. Fedin commented to Gor'kij that he had begun to print the novel before finishing it, and some of the structural implausibilities of the novel examined later may possibly have originated as a result.

As in Goroda i rody, Fedin chooses as his themes the psychological situation of a member of the intelligentsia in postrevolutionary Russia and the personality of a Bolshevik leader. Again, he selects a period a few years earlier than the time of writing: a chronological analysis makes clear that the latter parts of the novel can be dated as taking place in 1921 and 1922, the transitional epoch of the end of War Communism and the introduction of N E P.

---

1 No English translation of the novel exists.

2 Zvezda, #3-9, 11-12, 1927, #2-3, 1928. At this time Fedin, as well as his fellow Serapions N. S. Tixonov and M. L. Slonimskij, was a member of the editorial board.

3 "Samoe strašnoe: načinaju pečatat' ego, ne dopisav, i raboty ež'ce očen' mnogo." Letter of March 4, 1927 in M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli, p. 516.
Apart from the difference in period separating the two novels, the significant contrast in type which is immediately discernible between the hero-intellectuals who figure as the principal characters in both Goroda i gody and Brat'ja emphasizes the different use made of autobiographical material. Whereas Andrej Starcov's professional background is almost nonexistent, Nikita Karev's musical education and work as a composer are vital to the thematics of the novel, and Fedin draws widely upon his personal experiences in presenting Karev's background in great detail. Fedin himself speaks of his seven years' study of the violin in Saratov and his "love and hatred" for the instrument in connection with his characterization of Nikita Karev. The technical aspects of violin technique are discussed extensively in the novel in the section devoted to Nikita's studies with Jakov Gol'dman, whose prototype was Fedin's own violin teacher in Saratov.

Fedin also drew on his acquaintanceship with the Leningrad composer Ju. A. Saporin for information helpful in the characterization of Karev, even prevailing upon Saporin to contribute a section to the novel in the form of a critical review of Karev's symphony.

---


5 See especially pp. 74-80, 110-111.

6 Saporin is further discussed later in connection with the article in the novel.
A notable parallel between Fedin's own experiences and the biographies of both Andrej Starcov and Nikita Karev lies in their internment in Germany as enemy aliens during the First World War. It seems probable that Karev spends over six years in Dresden. However, Karev's experiences in Germany are presented almost exclusively from the point of view of his musical evolution, so that the extensive treatment of the German environment, which occupies such a significant place in Goroda i gody, is totally lacking in the later novel.

In the sections of Brat'ja devoted to the Soviet Union we find descriptions of Fedin's own Petrograd during the periods of War Communism and the beginning of N E P, as well as evocations of Saratov and the Volga region. The presentation of the traditional way of life (byt) of the Ural Cossacks plays a major role in Brat'ja, but it is evidently not justified to assume that Fedin was personally familiar with every aspect described in the novel. In an article much later Fedin expressed contrition at his use of incorrect terminology in the episode of the "bagren'e" for fish in the frozen Ural river, mentioning that he had not himself observed this traditional scene.

The most "autobiographical" section in the novel is unquestionably that devoted to young Nikita's experiences during a pogrom in Saratov.

---

7 The chronology of the novel is discussed later.

8 My pervyj izdanijax romana "Brat'ja" led na reke Urale, čtoby bagrit' osatra (sam ja bagrenija osatrov ne videl), u menja probivali lomom. Odin iz ural'cev prislal mne na ētot sčet delikatnejšee pis'mecu, posle kotorogo ja pokrasnel i smenil lom na "pešnju." Fedin, "Raspaxnutye okna," Znamja, #8, 1965, p. 84.
The "Smurskij pereulok" on which Nikita lives is the actual name of the street on which Fedin himself lived as a boy. The pogrom depicted in the novel closely resembles the pogrom which the author saw and later described in the autobiography written in 1922. The prominent place which it occupies in this autobiography reflects the profound and lasting impression made on the boy:

... pogromy s mater'ju v pogrebe otsižival ... strašno bylo. Požarov, stona i togo, kak s ikonami v rukax u vorot stojali, čtoby otvesti pogrom; i togo, kak na glazax poljaka razorvali, a ja topali nogami i plakal; i togo, kak svoego učitelja - skripača (Gol'dmana) v kuxne pod lestnicu sprjatal i lukom prikryl - nikogda ne zabudu.10

Both the savage treatment of the Pole and the concealment of the violin teacher appear in the pogrom episode in the novel.11

Certain of Fedin's experiences at the time of writing Brat'ja are also reflected in the sections dealing with Petrograd. As Fedin's biographer, B. Ja. Brajnina, points out,12 there are resemblances between Professor Karev's family in the novel and the family of Professor Grekov, from 1904-1908 Fedin's family lived at #13, Smurskij pereulok. For a detailed discussion of the autobiographical background of Brat'ja, see P. Bugaenko, "Saratov v proizvedenijax K. A. Fedina" in Literaturnyj Saratov. Al'manax saratovskogo otdeleniya sojuza sovetskix pisatelej, XIV (Saratov, 1951), pp. 188-191.

Fedin, Pisateli - o sebe. Konst. Fedin, p. 35. Bugaenko confirms that Fedin's description of the pogrom in Brat'ja is based on his own childhood experience of the pogrom in Saratov on October 18-20, 1905. (Bugaenko, pp. 190-191).

10Fedin, Pisateli - o sebe. Konst. Fedin, p. 35. Bugaenko confirms that Fedin's description of the pogrom in Brat'ja is based on his own childhood experience of the pogrom in Saratov on October 18-20, 1905. (Bugaenko, pp. 190-191).

11pp. 94-98, 100.

whose "salon" on the Jamskaja Fedin frequented.\textsuperscript{13} The family celebrations at the Karevs' remind one of the Grekovs' literary and musical evenings, which were visited by Zamjatin, Remizov and A. Tolstoj, as well as by Glazunov and Šostakovič.

Of the Grekovs' vast apartment Fedin was to write later in \textit{Gor'kij sredi nas}:

Doktorskaja, professorskaja slava provela dom v neprikosnovennosti čerez vojnu i revoljuciju, i, nemnogo obvetšav, on vplyl, kak v gavan', so svoimi kartinami i lampami, so svoimi divanami i s koncertnym rojalem, vplyl v novye vremena, čut'-čut' pokačivajas' na volne domašnik sobytij .... v stolovoj ... xlebosol'stvo masštabov istinno dorevoljucionnyx buševalo v sxvatke s gostjami, medlenno otstupavšimi pod ego naporom. "Lejtmotivom xozjaina byla ljubov' k nastojaščim, bol'šim v svoem dele ljudjam." \textsuperscript{14}

There is an interesting parallel between the literary pretensions of Mme Grekova, who had bathed ever since in the radiance cast by a word of praise from Mixajlovskij, and the musical pretensions of Sof'ja Andreevna Kareva, whose head had been turned by insincere praise from Savina:\textsuperscript{15}

xozjajka ... vsju žizn' pisavšej povesti v čeresčur domašnej manere. Ona očen' tjažko pereživala svoi rokovye neudači .... Literaturnaja slabost' ili dažje bolezn' xozjajki ... byla, konečno, obremenitel'noj. No ja naxožu, čto slabost' čta vozmeščala' ee vostoržennym prekleniemi pered literaturoj.

\textsuperscript{13} Reference to the Grekovs' role in the contemporary literary life of Petrograd will be found in Robert A. Maguire, \textit{Red Virgin Soil. Soviet Literature in the 1920's} (Princeton, 1968), p. 149.

\textsuperscript{14} Fedin, "Gor'kij sredi nas," \textit{Sobranie sočinenij}, IX, 244.

\textsuperscript{15} See \textit{Brat'ja}, p. 317.
As with Mme Kareva at the Karevs', Mme Grekova's exalted attitude to art set the tone of the house:

Lejtmotivom xozjajki bylo ee obozanie iskusstva i slavy .... (iz kabineta xozjajki) ne to chtoby razdavalas' melodiya doma, no zvučal javstvennyj, postojannyj oberton.16

Fedin, however, in discussing at length Professor Grekov, whose patient he had been in 1921, makes it clear that his personality is significantly different from that of Professor Matvej Karev:

On byl lekarem pirogovskoj skladki, v suščnosti xudožnikom, pridavavšim bol'šuju važnost' tomu svoeobraziju nauki mediciny, kotoroe dalo ej pravo nažvat'sja iskusstvom. I, konečno, u nego byla očen' razvita dogadka, intuicija, čut'e.17

The degree to which the biologist Arsenij Arsen'evič Bax in Brat'ja is modelled on A. L. Volynskij, a "permanent guest" of the Grekovs', is beyond conjecture. The resemblance in physical appearance, mannerisms, and speech between Volynskij as portrayed by Fedin in Part II of Gor'kij sredni nas (1944) and Bax in the novel is strikingly close.

16 Fedin, "Gor'kij sredni nas," pp. 244-245.

... torčit iz-za stola ...

Bax

kakim-to smorožnym
oplenkom ... (Lico)
razbito u nego prodol'nymi
i poperečnymi morščinkami
na mel',čajše učastočki.
Rombiki, kvadratiki,
prijamogol'nički tonkoj
želtoj koži ševeljatsja
na lice i v složnejšej
mašinnoj posledovatel'nosti.

Ne povoračivajas',
privyčno-prjamo vzmetnuv
svoj profil', Arsenij
Arsen'evič blagodarit za
vetčinu veličavo i
toržestvenno, slovno
prinjav diplom kakoj-
nibud' zagrančnoj
akkademii ......

...gorbinka na ego nosu,
vypjačennoj glaz,
okruglaja, vysockaja
lebnaja kost', mjajklj
podborodok i linečka
podžatyx gub ....

... Baxa nikto ne znal
inače, kak v profil' ...
vzmetnuv svoj profil', on
proiznes lakonično, v
duxe klassičeskoj
drewnosti, kak esli by
skazal: "Deus ex
machina"....
suxovataja, morščinistaja
ruka, protjanutaja
veličavo i dobro (ne žest,
a manje), kolynxulas'
pered matrosom.

Volynskiij

On byl malen'kogo rosta,
očen' nudoj, s licem
istoščennym, pererazannym
vdol' i poporeč morščinami,
naštol'ko podvižnymi i
sborčatymi, čto kazalos',
kak budto koža ego lica
zagotovlena na čerep
značitel'no bol'sega
razmera.

... slovno v svete molnii,
ja uvidel Akima L'voviča
na paradnom vozvyšenii,
pered licem zataivšix
dyhanje akademikov:
toržestvenno on podnosil
svitok pergamenta
gosudarstvennomu sanovniku
v ordenax, i uze mercali
nad ego otkinutoj golovoj
slovno oživavšie list'ja
lavrovoj vanka ..... 

... i ego čerep byl na
mal - s vysoko vskinutym
lbom, s glaznicami veličinoj
v starinnyj pjatak i s
nadmennoj gorbinoj nosa.

On govoril lakonično, i
dže ne govoril, a kak by
oglašal nevidime zapovedi
skrižali ....

On xodil kak budto na
koturnax, povoračivaisja
medlenno vsem uzen'kim
korpusom, žestikuoval
pripodnjatoj i otočivutoj
ot korpusa rukoj, vrašaja
kist'ju i ottopyrivaja
izognute pal'cy.
On vsegda byval razitelen
svoim žestom - teatral'nym,
Volynskij

no takim estestvennym, čto
nikomu by ne prišlo i v
golovu skazat', čto etot čelovek risuet'sja ....18

Bax's rhetorical speech also suggests Volynskij's manner -
"on mog liš' deržat' reč', emu bylo dostupno tol'ko oratorstvo" - of
which Fedin gives us an example in Gor'kij sredi nas in the form of an
amusing verbal duel between Volynskij and F. Sologub.19

The parallels between the author's own experiences in Petrograd
and the milieux and characters portrayed in Brat'ja suggest the close re-
lationship which one may expect prima facie to exist between Soviet reality
and the contemporary environment and ideological climate as presented in
the novel. From this point of view the discussion of possible proto-
types for Fedin's characters acquires particular interest.

II

As in the case of Goroda i gody, the structure of Brat'ja is
extremely complex, and it is very doubtful whether the chronological se-
quence of the individual episodes can be completely understood on a first
reading. While critical attention has been focussed on the non-chrono-
logical structure of Goroda i gody, the sequence of events is in fact
easier to grasp in the earlier novel than in Brat'ja, where the course of
Nikita Karev's biography becomes entirely clear only after close analysis

18 Brat'ja, pp. 15, 26: Gor'kij sredi nas, pp. 249-251. Later Fedin describes Bax gesticulating with his hand like Pilate in Ge's
painting "What is truth?" (p. 349).

19 Gor'kij sredi nas, pp. 250, 258-260. For Bax's speeches, see especially Brat'ja, pp. 349-353, 356-357.
of the text. Notably, the initial episodes of *Goroda i gody* (Andrei Starcov's madness and Kurt Wahn's appearance before the committee) are easier to place in their correct chronological position than is the initial episode of *Brat'ja* (the name-day party of Matvej Karev's wife), in which almost all the principal characters of the novel make a mystifying appearance.

The text of *Brat'ja* does, however, contain all the clues required to reconstruct with only minor gaps the details of Nikita Karev's biography. In this a major difference between *Goroda i gody* and the later novel is immediately apparent. Whereas almost nothing is known of Starcov's family background, studies, or professional interests, Karev's origins and professional development as a musician are chronicled with great care. It is evident that Fedin's approach to the presentation of the principal hero of a novel had changed significantly since the period of his writing *Goroda i gody*, which he had completed only just over two years before beginning work on *Brat'ja*.

The key to Nikita Karev's biography lies in references in the novel on pages 195, 235, and 86, in which we learn that Rostislav was aged 15 in 1913, and that Nikita was aged 9 when Rostislav was born. Consequently Nikita must have been born in 1889, and this date agrees well with all the later events of his biography. Nikita is seven when he enjoys his "last summer of freedom," the "green cloud," which acquires considerable symbolic significance in the novel, before being given his "real" violin.

---

20 Nikita Karev is thus only 2-3 years older than the author.
and sent to Saratov,\textsuperscript{21} and nine by the end of the following summer's vacation in Ural'sk, when his brother Rostislav is born.\textsuperscript{22} It is during this summer that Nikita fishes with Rodion, who is apparently about the same age.

The pogrom of the "anafemy" and the "potniki" described in the novel is, as we have seen, based on the pogrom experienced by Fedin himself in Saratov in October, 1905 at a similar age to that of Nikita Karev in the novel. This is also the year of Nikita's first musical success - his performance with the Gol'dmans in the Mendelssohn quartet. It seems likely that the beginning of Nikita's relationship with Varvara Serstobitova, presented in the episode in which Nikita's buying lemonade leads to their meeting, dates from the following summer.\textsuperscript{23}

Nikita then studies first in Moscow for four years and then in St. Petersburg until he decides to go to Germany to study at the Dresden conservatory.\textsuperscript{24} He leaves Russia in 1912, telling Varvara that he is going abroad for "about one and a half years" after completing his studies in Russia, and he is back in Ural'sk for the "bagren'e" in the early winter of 1913.\textsuperscript{25} Certainly he is in Dresden at the time of the outbreak of war (August, 1914),\textsuperscript{26} and remains in Germany as an enemy alien until 1918. He

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{21}pp. 65, 74.
  \item \textsuperscript{22}pp. 80, 86.
  \item \textsuperscript{23}See p. 151.
  \item \textsuperscript{24}pp. 169-171.
  \item \textsuperscript{25}See pp. 393, 156, 235, 191.
  \item \textsuperscript{26}p. 198.
\end{itemize}
does not reappear in Russia until his unexpected arrival at Rostislav's camp in the late autumn of 1918.\textsuperscript{27} The similarity with the experiences of Andrej Starcov and of Fedin himself is clear, but, unlike Starcov, we know nothing of his wartime experiences except that he was working on his symphony.\textsuperscript{28}

Soon afterwards Nikita arrives in Ural'sk, leaving again with his father at the time of the Whites' evacuation of the city, apparently in December, 1918.\textsuperscript{29} After his return it seems that he left for Petrograd in the spring of 1919.\textsuperscript{30}

The concert at which Nikita has his significant meeting with Irina demonstrably takes place in the spring of 1921,\textsuperscript{31} and it is clear that Fedin gives an additional dimension to the renewal of Nikita's vitality by associating it with the proclamation of N E P (March, 1921). The theme is developed in the implicit contrast between the presentation of Petrograd under War Communism, immediately preceding the "Bankovskij most" episode which deepens Nikita's misery,\textsuperscript{32} and the setpiece at the beginning of the novel on the regeneration of Petrograd under N E P.\textsuperscript{33} A minor but

\textsuperscript{27} pp. 213, 216.

\textsuperscript{28} p. 219. The delay between the conclusion of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk (March, 1918) and Nikita's repatriation is not explained: at the time of his arrival at Rostislav's camp he had been travelling less than a month (p. 217).

\textsuperscript{29} pp. 238, 249.

\textsuperscript{30} p. 305.

\textsuperscript{31} p. 308.

\textsuperscript{32} pp. 302-304.

\textsuperscript{33} pp. 11-13.
significant detail is added by the reference to the fact that, for the first time since the Civil War, four of the six chandeliers in the concert hall were lit for the first performance of Nikita's symphony. A curious evocation of the atmosphere of the N E P period is found in the description of the gaming house which Nikita visits after leaving his brother's party at the beginning of the novel. This "gambling hell" is very reminiscent of the film scenario salon in which the heroes of V. P. Kataev's N E P novel *Rastratēki* (1927) are fleeced by criminals posing as members of prerevolutionary "high society."

The climatic event of the novel, the successful performance of the symphony, thus takes place in the spring of 1922. One or two days after the concert the meeting in the street between Nikita and Varvara which Rodion interrupts takes place, and on the same evening Varvara leaves Rodion.

Presumably Šaporin's article on Karev's symphony and the composer's career appears soon after the first performance of the symphony.

Most probably, Matvej Karev's party, with which the novel begins, takes place the following autumn. Nikita's reception at the party is in part a celebration in honour of his newly gained reputation as the "gordost' i slava molodoj russkoj muzyki."

---

34 p. 319.
35 pp. 48-49.
36 p. 319.
37 pp. 358, 343.
38 p. 17.
the irruption by Rodion and Varvara, Nikita meets Varvara at the gaming house, and then on his way home is accosted by Vit'ka Čuprykov.

Very soon after this (Šering has just died) Irina takes the decision to go to see Rodion in order to inquire about the relationship between Nikita and Varvara Šerstobitova. Her visit leads to her cutting Nikita dead when she reaches home.

Apparently during the same autumn Čuprykov visits Varvara, telling her that Nikita is in his hands, and immediately afterwards Varvara goes to see Nikita in the episode which begins their love affair.

During the winter that follows Irina elopes with Rodion to Poti.

Nikita's catastrophic visit to his father's deathbed and the argument between Nikita and Varvara which precedes his regeneration in the final scene take place in deep winter three months after the party at Matvej Karev's.

The action of the novel consequently extends over a period from 1897 to the end of 1922. At the end of the novel Nikita is aged 32 - far younger than his conception of himself as virtually a coeval of his brother Matvej (aged 54) would indicate. In eloping with Rodion, Irina is beginning a new love affair with a man of about the same age as Nikita.

39 pp. 366, 370.
40 p. 401.
42 p. 10.
43 pp. 386-387.
The chronological transpositions and the complexity of the action are such that even an immediate second reading will probably not resolve all the problems arising from the intricate relationships between Nikita, Varvara Mixajlovna, Vit'ka Čuprykov, Rodion and Irina. It is likely that the impact of episodes involving Nikita, Varvara, and Vit'ka Čuprykov at the beginning of the novel will be lost by the time (over 300 pages later) that the reader encounters the episodes which chronologically follow.

A further element of complexity is introduced by the author's use of flashback technique, which is psychologically effective in character presentation, but adds to the reader's difficulties in following the development of the subject lines in the novel.

Initially, Anna is introduced in a mysterious section of Nikita's interior monologue as he wanders about Petrograd after leaving Matvej's party. The episode in which Nikita's relationship with Varvara began is introduced in the form of Nikita's flashback in the course of his conversation with Varvara during his stay in Ural'sk before leaving for Germany five or six years later, and his studies in Moscow are first described during Nikita's desperate interior monologue after Werth's suicide in Dresden. The first performance of Nikita's symphony is

---

44 A. de Roubetz comments that the confused composition makes it difficult to follow the development of the action, which both irritates and tires the reader. (A. de Roubetz, Rysslands Nuvarande Litteratur (Stockholm, 1929), p. 77).

45 pp. 46-47.

46 pp. 151-153.

47 p. 169.
The role of flashbacks is particularly significant in the presentation of Rodion Gorbov. We learn of Rodion's work as a boy sailor on the ferry, Rodion's initiation into underground work, and the symbolic episode involving the dockworkers and the halfwitted sisters Katerina and Lizaveta Ivanovna, as well as the significant first appearance in his life of Varvara Serstobitova, through Rodion's reminiscences as he sits in his cell after his arrest for possession of subversive literature. Later an authorial flashback gives the reader the knowledge of Rodion's interrogation about Šering's escape during his exile ten years earlier and his refusal to give information which provides insight into Rodion's adoration of Šering.

Finally, it is through a flashback that we learn of Šering's attitude to Rodion's marriage to Varvara Mixajlovna, which Rodion recollects belatedly after he realizes the failure of their relationship.

This extensive use of the technique of the flashback to convey significant information adds inevitably to the reader's difficulties in relating episodes chronologically, even though each case, psychologically justified in itself, intensifies the artistic effect of the episode.

48 pp. 319-326.
49 pp. 129-140.
50 pp. 283-284.
51 pp. 334-335.
The artistic value of the chronological transposition in Brat'ja must remain questionable. Whereas in the case of Goroda i gody it can be held that this device both contributes suspense and concentrates attention on psychological motivation, the same arguments apply only marginally to the later novel. In Goroda i gody the reader is confronted with situations of human catastrophe which rivet his attention and ensure his interest in the presentation of the characters' background and the retrospective development of the subject lines which follow. In Brat'ja, on the other hand, during the first episode attention is focussed primarily on the figure of Matvej Karev, who, as it turns out, plays a secondary role in the action of the novel. Again, the element of suspense is largely destroyed by the large gaps between the creation of the mysterious situation and its even partial resolution, as in the case of the references to Nikita Karev's relationships with Anna and Vit'ka Čuprykov: when awareness is lost, the effect is inevitably vitiated.

The appearance of Varvara Mixajlovna toward the end of the episode is too redolent of "Dostoevščina" not to produce a disconcerting effect on the reader. Moreover, the introduction of almost all the principal characters into the initial episode suggests a mechanistic striving for effect rather than structural expertness. The explanation is perhaps to be found in the desire to achieve "sjužetnost'," a concept much discussed by the Serapions, by introducing the maximum degree of

---

52 For a favourable evaluation, see E. Severin, "Brat'ja" Fedina," Pečat' i revoliucija, #7, 1928, p. 99. Z. Ėl'sberg and D. Tal'nikov, however, were highly critical. (See Z. Ėl'sberg, "Brat'ja" K. Fedina i nastroenija sovremennoj intelligencii," Na literaturnom postu, #13/14, 1928, p. 39; D. Tal'nikov, "Literaturnye zametki," Krasnaja nov', #9, 1928, p. 250).
mystification at the beginning of the novel. Further, the novel thus begins in Tolstoyan manner in medias res rather than with the "traditional" background introduction of the Karev patriarchate. The "тогдашняя борьба за новшества" with respect to structure, to which Fedin refers in his 1952 autobiography, is more transparently reflected in the later novel than in Города и годы, of which Fedin is writing.

The structure of Братья reveals Fedin's dependence upon coincidence as a method of developing the subject lines of the novel. This tendency, already apparent in the first episode, continues throughout the novel, adding to the atmosphere of "Достоевщина." Unquestionably the repeated use of coincidence as a means of relating characters or of creating dramatic confrontations has the cumulative effect of reducing the credibility of the novel's situations.

After the suicide of his friend, Werth, Nikita's new landlady dies three days later, and then on the evening of the same day a man shoots himself in the house on the steps of which Nikita happens to be sitting. Later, returning to Russia, the exhausted Nikita is fortunate in the chaos of the Civil War to stumble upon his brother Rostislav's encampment (where, it will be remembered, he also finds Evgraf, who had met Rostislav earlier on the Volga).

53 "Inferno," p. 60.
54 Fedin, "Автобиография," Собрание сочинений, I, 16.
55 pp. 179-180.
56 pp. 216-217, 208-209. This encounter results in one of the most significant "ideological" conversations of the novel.
A question which remains unresolved is the mystery of Nikita's losing his father Vasilij Leont'iv after the ideological opposition of the son and his father. Nikita leaves with his father and spends the first night after the flight with his family, but is left behind when Vasilij Leont'iv hurriedly abandons the Cossack post in the evening.\textsuperscript{57} When Nikita returns to Ural'sk he has the good fortune to discover Evgrač fishing in a hut built on the ice of the river. This encounter enables Nikita to learn of Rostislav's death, find his brother's note, and experience for the first time the "joy of loss."\textsuperscript{58}

Similarly, chance plays a major role in the presence of Šering, Rodion, Varvara Maxajlovna and Víťka Čuprykov together on Šering's gun-boat on the Kama, resulting in the meeting of Rodion and Varvara for the first time after Rodion's fleeting, but psychologically significant, encounter with her many years before.\textsuperscript{59}

Varvara Maxajlovna's meeting with Nikita in the street in Petrograd soon after the performance of his symphony is yet another striking coincidence. Although Rodion before interrupting them convinces himself that the meeting had been arranged, the reader has no grounds for supposing this: Varvara does not yet know Nikita's address, and she is "overjoyed and surprised" to see him.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{57} pp. 254, 262.

\textsuperscript{58} pp. 272-273, 277-280.

\textsuperscript{59} pp. 281, 287, 294-295.

\textsuperscript{60} p. 338.
Rodion's friendship with Bax, which results in some of the most significant ideological controversy in the novel, originates from Rodion's being offered by Bax a room in his flat. The reason for Rodion's move from the roomy accommodation he had occupied with Varvara Mixajlovna is flimsy. The ostensible cause is Rodion's wish to keep his daughter Lenka away from his wife, but however convincing this pretext may be in itself, structurally it is unlikely that the reader will recollect the passing reference to this in Nikita's conversation with Varvara in the gaming house at the beginning of the novel in order for Rodion's move not to appear unmotivated.\(^61\) The resourceful Varvara Mixajlovna is strangely unable to find out Rodion's new address, just as she proves unable to discover Nikita's address in Petrograd without the assistance of Čuprykov. When Varvara Mixajlovna goes to see Nikita, the reader is disconcerted to find that his "dogkennel" in which rags had been kept is transformed into a room with a "colossal" door, large enough to hold a grand piano.\(^62\)

Far more unsatisfactory than such a minor lapse is the sketchy and unconvincing presentation of Irina's romance with Rodion, which provides the grounds for Irina's disappearance from Petrograd and for Matvej's embittered repudiation of Nikita at their father's deathbed. Irina's new love is presented perfunctorily by means of a setpiece devoted to the voyage of Rodion and Irina in a storm to Poti, where Rodion is to take up a new

\(^{61}\) pp. 347-348, 52.

\(^{62}\) pp. 307-308, 384.
No answer is given to the question of why Irina did not tell her father of her intention to go away with Rodion, after not having concealed from her father her relationship with Nikita. The reader assumes that the mêsalliance involved in Irina's union with a plebeian Party activist would inevitably so infuriate Matvej that Irina prefers to elope with Rodion.

Irina's failure to tell her father of her new love affair is paralleled in its unexplained lack of motivation by Nikita's failure to tell his brother the secret of Irina's disappearance. He is aware of what has happened, and by telling Matvej of Irina's disappearance with Rodion he would not only have relieved somewhat her father's anguish, but also avoided his brother's curse at this fearful moment. The novel suffers artistically both from psychological improbabilities which have a signigicant effect on the action and from the excessive role played by coincidence in the development of the action.

An interesting feature of the structure of the novel is the author's use of a technical article by a musical critic to develop the theme of the significance of Karev's symphony. Here Fedin uses the documentary device employed extensively in Goroda i gody, but the difference in method between the two novels is illustrated by the far more limited use of documentation made in the later novel. The article was written at

---

63 pp. 401-402. The only previous reference to their developing relationship consists in Irina's sudden wish to tell Rodion of the malicious pleasure she had found in ignoring Nikita on the street (p. 376).

64 p. 408.
Fedin's request by the distinguished Leningrad composer Ju. A. Šaporin (1887-1966), with whom the author was on very friendly terms for many years. Šaporin's article is disproportionately long for the function which it fulfils in the novel, but such a review should contribute an element of realism by adding an additional point of view on Karev's work apart from the authorial and those of the novel's characters. The additional realism contributed by "documentary" material should be heightened in this case by the identity of the article's author as a figure known to many readers. Nevertheless, the content of the article is such that it is inevitably interpreted as an authorial statement on the significance of Nikita's work.

III

Except for the relative absence from Brat'ja of documentary material, the style of the novel resembles that of Goroda i gody. Again Fedin uses extensively the ornamental setpieces with frequent authorial intrusions which dominated the artistic method of Goroda i gody.  


66 For a highly favourable discussion of Fedin's style in Brat'ja, see E. Severin, pp. 95-97, I. Oksenov, ""Brat'ja" Konst. Fedina," Zvezda, #7, 1928, pp. 131-132. While also praising Fedin's style highly, Z. Šl'sberg finds "nekorotaja dolja iskusstvennosti" in the work, and D. Tal'nikov objects to the writer's fascination with "magija slov": "Samoe stroenie frazy, izoščrennoe, cvetisto, otjazhajuše smysl nenužnymi podrobnostjami, izobilujuše "krasivost'ju' ili peregruzenne obraznost'ju, perexodjaše v frazistost', zatjagivaet temp rasskaza, uvodit vnimanie v kakie-to rassčitanne zakouločki slovesnye..." (Z. Šl'sberg, p. 58; D. Tal'nikov, p. 247).
The evocation of Petrograd at the beginning of the NEP period is stylistically very similar to the presentation of Imperial Germany in the earlier novel. The highly literary and rhetorical atmosphere created by the use of extreme imagery, word series, authorial questions and exclamations, as well as irony, is immediately apparent. Apart from a reference to the renewed working of the cranes in the port, emphasis in the "resurrection" of Petrograd is entirely on the reintroduction of luxuries, which serves as the loose thematic connection between the set-piece and the portrayal of the party at Professor Karev's.

Davno li poterjali my v pereulkax našej pamjati - tak leg:oo, slovno obronili na prospekta perevjazannuji špagatikom pokupočku, - okamenelo - vozvyšennyj oblik Peterburga? Groznye, zmaježne
i smjatennye gody sčasali s Peterburga zavitushki, pugovicy, papil'otki, bantiki, i gorod predstal pereč nami v surovoy svojej nagote ..... 

.... vot uže izo vseh ščelocok, skvažin i treščin, s vasilestrovskix zadvorok, veličestvennyx svoimi fasadami, lopuxami i krapivoj, s možno-bidonnoj, syrovornoj Okti, iz čerevjarnogo Lesnogo, iz podvorote: dvorcov i razbityx okušek Rot, - otovsvjudo polez, povpolz, posočilsja staromodnyj, nedavno uprazdnennoj Peterburg. Gde xoronilis' zavitushki, bantiki, papil'otki, pugovicy? V kakix sundukax byli poprjaty, kakim naftalinom peresypany šaviotovye sek-pal'to, ubrannye kruževcami nakoločki, čeartamentskie sjurtuki, putejskie diagonalеvye brjučki? Kto izvernul'sja v syno-tifożnye, zastužennye v'jugami, izmjatye gołodom i sanitarnoj karetoj dni i noci, kto izvernul'sja ubereč' vsju čutu nafujynennuju vetoš', ot umilennija pereč kotoroj razorvalos' by serdce bessmertnoj kalužskoj prosvirni?

No uže nastupajut falangi modistok, zakrojščikov, portnyx, uže vygarcavala snežno-polotnjanaja kaval'kada parikmaxerov, naslyšno prosemenili, podergivaja vostikami salfečok, polki oficiantov, i rossyp'ju otmarsirowali muzykantskie komandy prikazčikov: tak-s, net-s, da-s! tak-s, net-s da-s!....
In the original edition of 1928 the contrast is intensified by an extended simile comparing pre-N E P Petrograd to a corpse: instead of the phrase "gorod predstal pered nami v surovoj svoej nagote" we read "gorod protjanulsja, kak bol'soj golyj pokojnik, uper'sis' čumazymi pštatkami v Markizovu lužu."

In a chapter which soon follows Nikita's wanderings about the city and his mysterious visit to the gambling house where he meets Varvara Mixajlovna are presented. This chapter begins with the setpiece in which Petrograd is compared to a Dickensian city in which the inhabitants seem like phantoms of Dickens' characters. The structural and thematic connection of this section to the remainder of the chapter is so nebulous as to be virtually nonexistent, and the impression that the writer aims to create a stylistic tour de force is necessarily heightened by the specifically literary association, which goes so far as to present the passers-by at one point as not merely Dickensian "phantoms" ("prizraki"), but actual Dickens' heroes escaping from the bookshelves, "rustling like
Here Fedin develops the extreme metaphor to a degree which in its explicitness amounts to a "baring of the device":

At the end of this setpiece the degree of ostranenie is deliberately intensified by the authorial statement that the deception lies, not in the presentation of fictional characters as human beings, but in the pretence of the characters themselves to be human beings - when the observer realizes this, he himself becomes a phantom:
In the original edition this phantasmagorical Petrograd is associated with the motive of suffering and privation introduced in connection with Matvej Karev's second visit to String in the preceding episode. The author exclaims about the city, "Nikakimi brandspoitami, iz kotoryx četvert' stoletija xlyščet čelovečeskaja krov', ne smyt' s tebja prekrasnogo tvoego obol'ščenija!"

In the later edition this reference to blood is removed, as well as the adjective "golodnye" applied to the "aspiranty" a few lines later. Finally, the beggars standing by the church railings who had been "writers" ("pisateli") become the far less concrete "otživšie vitii."

It seems likely that this passage on "phantom Petrograd" was suggested by the description of London in fog at the beginning of Dickens' *Bleak House* (1853). The reference by Fedin to "women, bent over the railings of bridges, looking into the water" may reflect Dickens' sentence, "Chance people on the bridges peeping over the parapets into a nether sky of fog, with fog all round them, as if they were up in a balloon, and hanging in the misty clouds." Similarly, Fedin's reference "lampy vnov' zagorajutsja, ne uspev ostynut'" is paralleled by Dickens' "Most of the shops lighted two hours before their time - as the gas seems to know, for it has a haggard and unwilling look."

---

68 pp. 42-44.
The spectral appearance of London under the blanket of fog is strongly suggested in Chapter I, and occasionally the association becomes explicit, as at the end of Chapter IV, when Ester actually sees Peepy as a "spectra." The evocation of Dickens in Fedin's novel is not surprising in view of the Serapions' interest in Dickens' work.

The type of declamatory setpiece found so frequently in Goroda i gody is paralleled in Brat'ja by the setpiece introducing Varvara Mixajlovna's background as the idolized daughter of a rich merchant's family.

Varja, Varen'ka, Varvaruška, - s zasučennymi po lokotki rukavčikami, - Varjušen'ka, Varečka - v šelkovom plat'ice, v lis'ej dušegrejke! Tol'ko by i ljubovat'sja toboju prikazčić ej rodne, ugoždat' tvoemu naru šerstobitovskim priživaločkam, smotreť' ne nasmotret'sja na tebja kupečeskoj dvorne! A už mamaša-to ne naraduet'sja, što ni slovo, to - zolotko, što ni vzdox, to - ljubuška, krasota, svet duši Varbaruška, Varja, Varen'ka, Varjušečka! ....

Varvara's mother, "Šerstobitixa," tells the family's "tetuški-babuški" not to forget to come to the great annual ceremony of cabbage-pickling on Holy Cross Day:

Gde tut zapamjatovat'! Ne uspela otojti rannejaja obednja, kak k Šerstobitovym tjanutsja bab'ij polčišča: vsjakie Nasten'ki da Sašen'ki Ivanovny, Seliverstovny, kosobokie, krivye, s gorbami da gryžami, v temnyx

69 "The purblind day was feebly struggling with the fog, when I opened my eyes to encounter those of a dirty-faced little spectre fixed upon me." Most probably the Russian translation in which Fedin presumably read Dickens would employ here the term "prizrak."

70 See Fedin, Gor'kij sredi nas, p. 199.
Fedin's full use of the resources of the Russian language is illustrated by the six variants of diminutives of "Varvara" used in this passage with its evocation of popular "skaz." As the final section indicates, the author employs series extensively, as in Goroda i gody, in order to create a cumulative impact. The passage which follows is particularly striking for its repeated use of this device: amongst other examples, Fedin uses a succession of terms for various types of containers, as well as ringing the changes on the noun "voz" in its diminutive, augmentative, and base forms.

Further series follow: "po kučam, po buntam, po ščepotkam," "na vse bolty, zasovy, ščekoldočki," "v ogorodnoj, sadovoj, lesnoj sentjabr'skoj istome," "pro kapustu, pro saxarnyj vilok, pro zelenyj kočan."

A major element in the rhetorical ornamentalism of this section is contributed by the parallelism of series of verbs and adjectives introducing clauses of similar structure:

"Ek ved' lovko letjat kočany iz tolga v bab'i fartuki, is' rastut, navoračivajutsja u koryt listvennyje zelenye voroxa, skripjat,"
Further examples of parallelism follow throughout this setpiece on Varvara and the "cabbage festival":

Vystroilis' ... zasučili ....
pošli skripet' ... pošli barabanit' ...
poneslas', pobežala ......
Sladok dux ... krepko dyxan'e ... sverbit 
v nosu ... tuman i prjanost' ...
... Varja, Varen'ka, Varvaruška, s zasučennymi 
po lokotki rukavčikami, u koryta s kapustoj, - 
na plečinu dušegrejkı, za spinoj kosa, v 
ruke tjapka!
Plat'ce na Varen'ke osennee ... i dušegrejka -
bezrukavočka tože kak onen' ....
Smeetsja Varen'ka, ljubo ej rubit' ....
xorošo slyšat' ... sladko pokušivat' ....
šuščaja potexa.gljadet' ...
Čto ni baba u Šerstobitovyx, čto ni 
prizivalka - to svaxe: kosjatsja krivoglaze,
slepye na kupečeskju dočku, - vot krasota, 
vot pisanaja, vot uđačljivoj svaxe po gob 
žizni obespečen'e!
No potešaetsja Varen'ka ... vysmeivaet ...
otvaživaet ....

The archaic atmosphere created by the use of literary devices 
associated with mediaeval prose, heightened by obsolescent expressions 
such as "ljubo", "pisanaja krasota", "prizivalka", adds to the impression 
of the patriarchal quality of the Šerstobitovs' way of life. In turn the 
reader automatically associates this colourful, though inflexible,
tradition with Vasilij Leont'ič Karev and the significance of Nikita Karev's own background, which is a vital motive of the novel.

Fedin's artistic method in such passages is rendered even more complex by the interior monologue element which is deliberately introduced in order to associate the episode presented with a specific character or characters. In this instance the section begins as a purely authorial setpiece, but ends primarily as a presentation of the interior monologue of the "priživalki" and "tetuški-babuški" on the subject of Varvara's shameless behaviour. Although this development is suggested by the phrase "Gde tut zapamjatovat'" it becomes explicit only later in the paragraph already quoted with the definitely popular ("prostorečie") words "ěk" and "iš'," which can only relate to the speech of the old women. Later we find the prostorečie word "sverbit (v nosu)," contrasting with the hyperliterary style of the passage as a whole. Soon afterwards Fedin presents Varvara's character through the interior monologue of the women, after referring to their being mocked by Varvara: "V kogo urodilas' šerstobitovskaja dočka - ne razobrat' tolikom. Ne to ġtoby ona byla ...."

At yet a third level of reported speech, Varvara's own assertion of her independence is reported through the old women's interior monologue. The section ends with the powerful impression produced on the old women by Varvara's attitudes:

Skažet čto bez zla i ne zanosčivo, a rassmeetsja - nu, čto govorit'! - potom celyj den' na pamjati ee rot, tak by i gljadet' v nego, ne svodja glaz ...
I tak u nee čto "sku-učno" polučaetsja, čto toli'ko maxnut' rukoj: takoe už vesel'e, v samom dele ....
The writer's virtuosity in combining to great effect a variety of artistic devices and linguistic levels compels the reader's admiration, even if it must be conceded that the "hyperliterary" quality of such set-pieces detracts from the reality of the presentation of the environment. Here, however, this element contributes to the "exaltedness" ("ekzal'tirovannost'") which is basic to the portrayal of Varvara Šerstobitova.

Very reminiscent of Fedin's treatment of Germany in Goroda i gody is the setpiece on the restoration of order in Saratov after the pogrom of the "potniki" and "anafemy." The sharply satiric effect is achieved by the contrast between the author's ironic descriptions of the idyllic tranquillity created by the police, the highflown questions, and the brutal reality, which is borne in mind by the reader throughout after the preceding presentation of the pogrom and re-evoked at the end in unvarnished terms.

Na ploščadjaj rasstavleny celomudrennye pulemety, vnestitel'nye dvory kazennyx zdaniy druželjubno prijutili spešivšíxsja ural'cev i astraxancev, malinovye razvody galunov, okolyšej i lampasov vostoženno sošetals' s jaično-želtymi kantami, otoročkami, pogonami, i vše ěto blestit, blistaet, bleščet, vše ěto umileno veruet v neiskoreněnost' blagonravija, vše ěto bezoblačno, solnečno upoveta na vysokuju ideju spravedlivosti i božestvennyj porjadok. Čto možet byt' trogatel'nee takogo bratskogo dušespasitel'nego vostorga, kogda sam gospodin načal'nik gubernii, v polozhenoj četvertomu klassu treugolke, ne ščadja svoego vysokoprevosxoditel'nego zodor'ja, soputstvuyemiy koljaskoj, proxodit iz konca v konec ulicy i, vstrečaja blagovospitannoe naselenie vverennoj emu gubernii, laskovo sprašivaet: - Kak vy naxodite mery, prinjatye
vlast'ju dlja ograždenija bezopasnosti? ...
... posramlerno neverie, uničžen razvat i
blagonravie vodorilos' v mire.
Strjajivait mizincek xrustal'nuju slezu
gubernskij prokuror, i puxloj aromatnoj
ladoškoj utiraet ščeku preosvjaščennyj
episkop, i, prixlobyvaja izjummyj kvas,
plačet navzryd kažčij esaul ....

No v Činnom, blagoustroennom gorode vse
ešče popaxivait gar'ju, uprjamo vzdymanjutsja
k nebu pečnye truby požarišč, avisajut iz
razbityx okon etažnej zastrjavšie krovati i
škašy, xrustit pod nogami istolčennoe v
krupu steklo.
I čemu že bylo verit' - blistajuščim galunam,
našivka, okolyška, smirennoj besede o šestoj
zapovedi ili goloveška, steklu, gari,
pridorožnym tumbam, obryzgannym čelovečeskim
mozgom?72

Here Fedin is successful in creating a major cumulative ironic
impact by the series of epithets expressing elegance, tranquillity and
wellbeing.

Towards the end of the novel we find a setpiece devoted to
Varvara Mixajlovna's preparations for her visit to Nikita Karev. The
loving attention given to each detail of the procedure indicates the
deepth of her passion for Karev, as well as the pleasure which she takes
as a woman in making herself as beautiful as possible - "Bol'šoe ščast'e
drobilos' v rukax Varvary Mixajlovny na malen'kie dol'ki i kazalos'
beskonečnym." Here again the effect aimed at is based partially upon
an explicit contrast:

V ubogoj, nevzračnoj komnatuške, obezobrazivšej
žizn' Varvary Mixajlovny, ej zaxotelos' sejčas
že i so vsemi podrobnostjami soveršit' samee

72 pp. 108, 110.
Every detail of her toilet is described:

"... skrutit' v tugoj žgut volosy, namotat' ego na pal'cy levoj ruki i pridavit' uzel k zatylku. I vot - dolgo, odnu za drugoj, - podcepljat' c farforovoj tarelčki około zerkala skol'zkie, xolodnye špil'ki; zatuplennye v šariki koncy špilek krepko vtykat' v volosjanoj uzel, oščuščaja ix xolodjašče carapan'e po zatylku ..."

Inevitably, the reader becomes conscious of the disparity between the means employed and the function of the setpiece in developing the subject line of the relationship between Varvara and Nikita, and sees the repeated detail and emphasis on Varvara's activity as a "svjaščennodejstvie" simply as an attempt as a technical tour de force without justification within the narrative structure of the novel.

Fedin's use of technical setpieces in the presentation of Nikita Karev's music studies is a most successful aspect of the novel. Apart from their stamp of technical authenticity, they contribute substantially to the novel's theme of the sacrifices imposed on Nikita by his career as a musician. Initially, Nikita's study of the basic violin positions is presented in detail in the chapter which immediately follows the statement: "Zavjazyvalas' sud'ba muzikanta, ego - Nikitina - sud'ba, ego

---

73. p. 382.
Consequently, the torture which he undergoes is associated directly from the beginning with the fundamental theme of sacrifice.

Later, when Nikita returns to his "little world" after the pogrom, a setpiece on bow technique precedes his first true "contact with music" - his performance in the Mendelssohn quartet. Here Nikita's desperation and exhaustion before the performance are conveyed to the reader effectively by means of the vivid evocation of the significance of bow technique.

Understandably, the author was not able to convey the process of composition of the symphony, the source of so much anguish and labour for Nikita, by means of technical setpieces, and Nikita's actual work on the symphony is only suggested in somewhat abstract terms. This abstract quality, which detracts from the reader's awareness of the significance of Nikita's symphony and consequently mutes one of the fundamental themes, is particularly apparent in the episode of Nikita's creative burst in Ural'sk, during which he works intensively on the symphony.

Indicative of Fedin's ability to build up a setpiece without ornamentalism is the short presentation of Dresden as a monastery in which the monk-musicians in their cells know only one inexorable law - the law of success.

---

74 pp. 74-76.

75 pp. 110-111.

76 p. 249.
The religious atmosphere is heightened by the manner in which the passage, and especially the third sentence in the section quoted, evokes the style of the Bible. Its effectiveness is increased by the use of leitmotivs significant in the characterization of Nikita and Varvara Mixajlovna: "poslux" ("skorbnij poslux Nikity"), "vzvoz" ("vzvozom Varvary Mixajlovny byla ljubov"). This initial presentation of Dresden is more successful than the later rhetorical and somewhat abstract setpiece devoted to Nikita's studies at the Moscow Conservatory. 78

As in Goroda i gody, Fedin uses the method of interior monologue extensively to present the thought processes of his characters. Normally

---

77 p. 157.

78 pp. 169-170.
there is no authorial introduction, and an abrupt transition follows to authorial narration:

Pust' Gjubner polučil by predsmertnuju zapisku samoubijcy! ... No ěta zapiska prinadležit Nikite. Pust' pomnit Nikita, čto pered tem, kak vydernut' remen' iz portpledja, samoubijca dumal o nem, o Nikite. On povoračivaetsja k stolu, beret zapisku i vnezapno rvet ee na mel'čajšie kusočki.79

In such passages the only overt authorial element is the identification of the character: "... ěta zapiska prinadležit Nikite. Pust' pomnit Nikita ..." The reader is only marginally conscious, if at all, of the problem of selection involved which, as well as language, differentiates interior monologue from stream of consciousness narration. Since most of Fedin's heroes are intelligenty who can be presumed to formulate their thoughts literately, the use of literary language is not a major barrier to the reader's perception of the interior monologue as an accurate reflection of the character's thought processes. Sometimes, indeed, Fedin approaches stream of consciousness narration closely, as in the lengthy presentation of Nikita's anguished thoughts after Werth's suicide.80 Here the vivid impression of Nikita's mental condition is intensified by the short exclamatory phrases and the lack of coherence. Only after some forty lines is the character identified by a transparent authorial question-comment: "Čto zapolnjalo Nikitu, kogda on skitalsja po unylo-čistomu gorodu?"

79 p. 172.

80 pp. 167-168.
Typical of Fedin's ability to express strong emotion through highly colloquial language and abrupt transitions in thought is Rodion's interior monologue when the sailor suddenly realizes that Varvara Mixajlovna is the girl who had mocked him at the quayside many years before:

Here Fedin is undoubtedly successful in his use of interior monologue to present Rodion's love-hate relationship with Varvara Mixajlovna. The reader's awareness of Rodion's personality is not muted by any overt authorial element.

Fedin's presentation of the first performance of Nikita's symphony through Matvej Karev's interior monologue is similarly effective. The episode is introduced by an authorial comment after Matvej's conclusion that the symphony will be a failure - "Provalitsja," - rešil pro Nikitu

\[81\] pp. 294-295.
Matvej Vasil'ič, i emu stalo počemu-to prijatno. No koncert okazalsja neožidannost'ju ne tol'ko dlja Matveja Vasil'iča." Fedin then brings out vividly the way in which Matvej is torn between schadenfreude at the prospect of Nikita's failure and fear of the disgrace that this would bring upon the whole family.

Kogda ispolnjalas' vtoraja čast' simfonii, Matvej Vasil'ič nezametno dlja sebja vpal v tixuju primirennost'. Nikita deržalsja lučše, spokojnej, uverennjej. Muzyka predstavljalas' Matveju Vasil'iču rodnoj, očen' teploj i ponjatnoj (on nikogda ne ponimal muzyki). Zakryv glaza, starajas' vslušivat'sja v odni skripki, on dumal, kak xorošo bylo by, esli by koncert udalsja, esli by imja brata niskol'ko ne umalilo proslavlennogo imeni professora, doktora Kareva. A to načnut vse krugom sprašivat': "Ax, čto vaš brat, kotoryj ... nu, muzykant?" I nado budet vsjakiij raz ulybat'sja, priznavaja, čto, mol, v sem'e ne bez uroda. Vrjad li, odnako, proval možet byt' očen' konfuznym. Ved' vypuskali Nikitu muzykanty, gramotnye ljudi, slušali podi, ponimali, čto delajut. Da i Nikita tože ne durak, - ne polezet že on sramit'sja pered publikoj. Von kak tonen'ko vyvodjat skripki, i skladno vse tak - odno k odnomu, i kak budto - novo, svežo. Čert ix, konečno, razberet, muzykantov. Najdut étakuju zakovyku, priderutsja, razdjužut - slyxali, mol, u togo i u drugogo. Da i publika tože! Ne vsjakiij podi razberetsja, kak razbiraetsja Matvej Vasil'ič, čto vot xorošo, slavno pojut skripki. Ax, kak slavno, spokojno! Tak by i slušal Matvej Vasil'ič, tak by i slušal ....

Here the closeness to stream of consciousness narration is heightened by Matvej's visualizing future conversations with others as well as by the

82 p. 319.
strikingly colloquial language: "mol" (twice), "podi" (twice), "ne polezet že on sramit'sja," "von kak tonen'ko," "slyxali," "čert ix ... razberet," "najdut ětakuju zakovyku." Unfortunately, the superfluous authorial intrusion at the beginning, "(on nikogda ne ponimal muzyki)", reduces the effect by distracting the reader from his awareness of Matvej's personality.

Generally the authorial element in Fedin's presentation of the interior monologue of his characters is substantially greater. The degree of analysis of the characters' emotions and the literary form which the analysis assumes, often involving figurative language, draws the reader's attention from the character to the author. Thus Nikita meditates before Varvara's arrival in his room on his broken relationship with Irina:

Konečno, Irinu netrudno bylo ubedit', čto Nikita ni v čem i nikogda ne provinil'sja pered nej (o, on byl prav i čist, on mog dejstvitel'no pokazat' na ladoni svoju žizn'!), no možno li bylo i dal'še molčat' o tom, čto uže podkradivalis' novye čuvstva, izvedano stalo nove bespokoystvo, čto ustalye vzdoxi Matveja byli ne men'še blizki, čem blizok byl rebjačij smex Iriny?
Ona byla devočkoj! - kakim nesčast'jem teper' kazaloš' ěto Nikite!
On ponimal, čto možno rasputat' uzly, zatjanutye pустym spletением slučajnostej. No želanie sdelat' ěto vse bol'še bleklo i lomalos', kak suxaja kuga. I, čtoby ne priznat'sja v slabosti, on uverjal sebja, čto vo vsem prav, i, stalo byt', dlja nego unizitel'no čto-to ob"jasnjat', dokazyvat', o čem-to prosit'. Nado bylo by načinat' s brata, kotoj čuždalsja Nikity, bezmolvno vinil ego v čem-to, ne xotel ili ne mog ponjat', kak sam Nikita ne ponimal kogda-to Rostislava. I razve Rostislav mog by dobit'sja ot Nikity
Occasionally the authorial element completely dominates the presentation of a character's thoughts and contributes to the unconvincingness of an episode:

I nikogda, konečno, nikogda ne dumala Irina, čto sčast’e - samoe vysokoe i samoe prosto čelovečesko sčast’e - čto vot tak: stojat’ rjadom s etim sil’nym i nemnogo neuklužim čelovekom, krepko obxvativ ego spinu, oščušćaja tjaželju ego ruku na svoix plečax, stojat’ tak v vetrenom, vodnom, penistom reve, kogda štorm gotov poglotit’ korabl’, kogda štorm bezopasen, kak na muzejnoj kartine, kogda vokrug net ni odnoj krupicy, kotoraja ne zvenela by, ne sodrogalas’ ot smertnogo voplja razrušenija, i kogda tak legko, kak bezvetrynnym rosnym utrom v sadu.84

Generally, however, Fedin's use of interior monologue to present the thoughts of his characters is a highly successful means of characterization, especially in the cases of Nikita, Matvej, and Rodion. Fedin uses interior monologue very little in the characterization of Varvara Mixajlovna.

As in Goroda i gody, Fedin uses dreams in order to focus attention on themes which are of major importance in the novel. Nikita's relationship with Anna and the significance of Irina as her "double" and successor is introduced mysteriously as Nikita's "recollection of a dream" which he had had shortly before.85

83 pp. 386-387.
84 p. 401.
85 pp. 46-47.
During his period of ecstatic frenzy in Ural'sk Nikita has a dream-like vision of conducting in a columned hall when a fire breaks out. Presumably this episode is introduced in order to convey symbolically Nikita's ability to overcome with his music the dark inhuman forces represented by the pogrom in Saratov. It is after the end of Nikita's creative burst, when he hears the symbolic groaning and believes he sees the fires of the Saratov pogrom as the Karev family prepares to flee with the Whites, that Nikita has the dream vision of himself as a boy studying with Jakov Moiseevič. Here Jakov's beating Nikita on the head with his violin because he has forgotten an elementary musical sign is intended to convey Nikita's betrayal of his music through the decision which he makes immediately afterwards to flee with his family. The paper cutting machine used by Jakov's bookbinder father pursues Nikita in a manner curiously reminiscent of the way in which the machine "Ophelia" chases its inventor in Ju. Oleša's Zavist: 


Surprisingly, the down-to-earth Rodion Čorbov is associated with romantic dreams involving his hero, the Bolshevik leader Šering. In

86 pp. 246-247.
87 pp. 251-253.
88 pp. 282-283.
the first, Rodion flies with Šering over some repair docks, remarking to Šering, "bol'šoj remont." However inconsonant with the general characterization of Rodion this episode may seem, it introduces the motive of Rodion's ability to understand how ships are repaired, but not how the "bol'šoj remont" of humanity can be carried out, which figures prominently later in Rodion's thoughts after his rupture with Varvara Mixajlovna. 89 This dream merges into another in which Rodion is driving Šering in a sledge to safety - a reflection of Rodion's role in Šering's escape from exile ten years before. Although these dreams do relate to motives of the novel, they scarcely seem artistically justified, and add little to the characterization of Rodion.

Brat'ja is notable for a number of highly convincing and effective conversations which are significant in the plot as well as in the development of the characterization. In this respect the novel is more successful than Goroda i gody, in which many of the conversations create the impression of "ideological setpieces," constructed to develop the views of the participants.

One of the most effective is the first conversation between Nikita and Vit'ka Čuprykov, in which Vit'ka expresses his envy of Nikita's success and makes obscure threats on the basis of his secret knowledge of Nikita's past. Vit'ka's combination of boastfulness and selfabasement, as well as bitter envy of Nikita's wealth while he receives only a pittance on account

89 p. 333.
of his war injury, comes out vividly in the course of his ungrammatical speech. Vit'ka's characteristic blending of substandard language with Soviet officialese and highflown literary expressions is reminiscent of the speech of Zoščenko's narrators:

... vposledstvii služil po prizvaniju v gerojskoj Krasnoj Armii. Zamet'te: po prizvaniju, a ne po prizyvu. Soveršil bol'še poxody, kontužen i v demobilizaciju uvolen invalidom na sorok procentov. Stradal soznatel'no i ne kajus': po prizvaniju borot'sja za pravdu ...

Izkal mesta, no ničego ne dostig, xotja, konečno i objazatel'no, vezde priznajut, čto Čuprykov zaslužil ves'ma bezzavetnoj bor'boj v rabočix-krest'janskix rjadax. Vpročem, skazat' pravdu, dostig: v Saratove platili šest' s poltinoj v mecjac za sorok procentov kontuzii, zdes' platjat desjat'. Na takoj balans, izvinjajuš', daže umeret' prilično nevozmožno.90

Čuprykov's habitual expression "konečno i objazatel'no" serves as a leitmotiv in his characterization.

Vit'ka's manner of threatening Nikita is extremely effective both as a device for exciting the reader's curiosity as to the nature of Nikita's past association with the Whites and within the context of the development of Vit'ka's characterization:

Vot kak xodit. Xe-xe! Deskat', na to my vam znamenitost', poljubi nas belen'kimi, a krasnen'kimi nas vsjakij poljubit! .... Poljubi nas belen'kimi!... I, izvinjajuš', ljubjat! Ljubjat, konečno i objazatel'no, vyrat'ajut počet! A krasnen'kix to, skazat' pravdu, ne vsjakij ljubit, ne-e-et, šališ'!

90 pp. 56-57.
Nikita evidently understands Vit'ka's allusions, but tries to dismiss the conversation as of no importance. Nikita tells him "Perestan'te popustu boltat'," but winces when he sees the insolent malice in Vit'ka's eyes. Vit'ka is immediately conscious of the effect which he has created: "Popustu, izvolili skazat'? ... A sami požimaetes' ...

The effectiveness of the conversation is enhanced by the localization of the episode in a way immediately familiar to many readers: the dialogue takes place by the gates of the Šeremetev palace in Petrograd, and the scene which gives rise to the successful dénouement takes place across the Fontanka canal.

Vit'ka watches workmen collecting bricks from a demolished house, and "prosmakoval jazvitel'no: Proizvodstvo kirpiča po zavetam Il'iča." The next words vividly convey Vit'ka's appearance at this moment and the complexity of his emotions at having let his tongue run away with him:

No v tot že moment on drognul. V ego podvižnom lice, vo vsem ego tele proizšla mgnovennaja sxvatka kakix-to protivorečivyx dvizhenij. On gljadel na Nikitu podozritel'no, pytlivo, nenavistno, i v to že vremja guby ego krivilis' v l'istvoy i ponimajuščej ulybke. On vnov' poter svoi ruki, na ětot raz uničišitel'no, i raskrył bylo rot.

---

91 p. 58.

92 The last three words were omitted from the 1952 and subsequent editions of the novel.

93 p. 59.
Vit'ka has lost his hold on Nikita, and the latter turns away, laughing: "Krasnen'kie, govorite?.... A sami zabespoikoilos'?

The dialogue is doubly effective because of the unexpected turns and its exposure of the personalities of both participants. It moreover heightens the suspense by not only referring to a mysterious and politically dangerous episode in the past, but also awakening the reader's curiosity about the cause of Vit'ka's hatred of Nikita: at this point in the novel the reader knows nothing of the relationship between Čuprykov and Varvara Mixajlovna. The episode clearly reveals the influence of Dostoevskij, both in the characterization of Vit'ka Čuprykov and the highly charged emotional atmosphere, but the effectiveness of this dialogue at the beginning of the novel reveals clearly Fedin's evolution since Goroda i vol'sh. Fedin is highly successful in many conversations in Brat'ja in using dialogue as a means of presenting characters' views and their impact upon each other, as well as the method of developing significantly the relationships between characters. The conversations between Nikita and Varvara Mixajlovna, and between Nikita and Irina vividly reflect the personalities of the characters, whatever misgivings one may have about the convincingness of the characters themselves. Particularly successful are the dialogues between Rodion and Varvara, in which abundant opportunity is given to Varvara to display her cruel irony at Rodion's expense.

and Rodion's reaction to their unequal relationship. Fedin demonstrates also in the dialogues in which Vasilij Leont'ivič and Evgraf participate that he is able to present successfully the language of "non-intellectual" characters, and the conversations between Evgraf and Rostislav and between Evgraf and Vasilij Leont'ivič are amongst the most vivid in the novel. In every case the characters' language convincingly reflects their background and personality.

IV

The characterization of Vit'ka Čuprykov suggests the influence of Dostoevskij on Fedin at the time of writing the novel. 95 Čuprykov is, as Zagradka maintains, 96 a "superfluous character" in the plot of the novel, although he does perform the function of a foil to Varvara Mixajlovna, enabling her to give full vent to her emotions. Vit'ka's Dostoevskian combination of selfassertiveness with morbid inferiority feelings is indicated already in the initial episode of his meeting with Nikita Karev, and is presented extensively later in the scenes with Varvara Mixajlovna, whom he loves to desperation, although he is very conscious of the promptings of selfinterest in his relationship with her.

Zagradka analyzes the resemblances between the conversation of Nikita Karev and Čuprykov at the beginning of the novel and the meeting of

---


96 Zagradka, p. 50.
Smerdjakov and Ivan Karamazov in Chapter 6 of the fifth book of the second part of Brat'ja Karamazovy. Initially, like Ivan Karamazov, Nikita has no desire to listen, but is impelled by an indefinable curiosity. Both Smerdjakov and Čuprykov display mixed familiarity and politeness and speak in obscure hints. Both authors refer to the character's "glazok" and his manner of staring into another's eyes. Finally, Fedin's references to Čuprykov's rubbing his hands are paralleled by Dostoevskij's references to Smerdjakov's moving his feet.97

In the conversations between Varvara Mixajlovna and Čuprykov later the atmosphere of "Dostoevščina" is intensified by Čuprykov's alternately fawning upon Varvara and insisting on his qualities. Essentially, Čuprykov retains Varvara's favour because of his ability as a buffoon:

On žil v dolgoletnej i bezosibočnoj uverennosti, što glavnoe v ego otnošenijax s Varvaroj Mixajlovnoj - veselost'. S rebjač'ej pocy on izoščrjalsja v prokazax, šтовskix pridumkax i zatejax, čtoby ukreplit', svjazat' potuže svoj neobyčnyj sojuž s Varen'koj.

Fedin makes clear that Vit'ka's love for Varvara is a complex emotion, based not simply upon physical desire and mercenary advantage, but upon the same "toska" as attracts Varvara to him:

Toska, toščiča bez konca, bez kraeška, otčajanie ozorstva, vysmejannaja strast', nelepaja Čuvstvitel'naja mečta i skrytyj zavetnyj rasčet - vse pereputalos' v čtom sojuze.98

98 p. 227.
The element of "otčajanje ozorstva" relates Čuprykov to the character of the Ural Cossacks as presented by Fedin.

In the episode which follows Čuprykov produces the impression of being a combination of Smerdjakov and Marmeladov:

Ja vas očen' obožaju, Varjuša ... ne v sravnen'e bol'še drugix. Drugie, možet, podlaživajutsja, a ja čuvstvuju. I vy ěto zamečaete i vydeljaete menja iz tolypy, a ja opjat' že ěto čuvstvuju, potomu što ne kak vse, a ne v sravnen'e ton'še ..... Ja vas ponimaju, potomu što ne kak vse ...
Ja s detskix let, Varjuša, byl rebenok beda kakov smekalistyj, i um moj byl osobennyj ....
Ja čelovek ne kak vse ... poëtomu ja vas ponimaju, kak vy vretes' ot tosiki i v poiskax scastlivoj žizni. Ja vas očen' obožaju, no ne vsegda smeju skazat' o svoem serdce. Esli by vy zaxoteli, Varjuša, ja by vam ne to što vse svoe scast'e, kotorym vy menja možete udelit' i kotoroe ja sam, svoimi silami, raspolagaju otrodu ...

Čuprykov's morbid desire to assert his human dignity is expressed in his superstitious possession of the filthy piece of leather in which he has cut his name.

Soon afterwards, however, Čuprykov is made to appear completely dehumanized by the reference to Varvara's calling him a "coward" as if "topča kablukom gada," and by Vit'ka's calling himself a "predannyj pes" and "sobaka".

Later Vit'ka in his desire for Varvara suggests Ivan Karamazov's devil:

99 pp. 228-229.
The image of dehumanization is intensified by Vit'ka's timorousness with Varvara: his fear of her is so strong that he flees as soon as she even moves toward him. His movements suggest those of a small animal: "Vzgljad jurknul," "gotovyj vyskočit,'" "vyšmygnul iz komnaty," "sil'no otkačnulsja ... popjatilsja k dveri, zažav obeimi rukami rot," "glazki ... snovali," "iskrivilsja ... zašipel," "šmygnul von iz komnaty.""102

The presentation of Vit'ka, who completely lacks the intellectual pretensions which distinguish Smerdjakov, is even more negative than Smerdjakov. Vit'ka in fact makes the impression of being a pastiche of various Dostoevskian traits rather than a direct reflection of a particular Dostoevskian hero, with the result that he becomes more unconvincing than if he were simply the embodiment of a literary prototype.

Apart from his role as foil to Varvara Mixajlovna, Čuprykov fulfills the function toward the end of the novel of giving Varvara Nikita's address in what we have seen to be one of the most unconvincing episodes

100 p. 232.
101 p. 380.
in *Brat'ja*. Čuprykov also acquires political significance because of his decision to join the Bolshevik camp and his subsequent service in the Red Army. In view of the general presentation of Čuprykov in his relationship with Varvara Mixajlovna as almost subhuman, his role as the politically perceptive mercenary supporter of the Bolsheviks because he perceives that the future is theirs again fails to convince.

Ty s nimi? - rezko sprosila ona.
Kak skazat' ... za nimi vsja Rossija,
a tut pojdet zaviruixa - nog ne ubereš'! ....
.... znaščit, ty s krasnymi?
A kak žë? - živo otozvalesja Vit'ka. - Kuda
ze ujdeš'? Kuda podaš'sja, a?\(^\text{103}\)

More serious, however, within the overall context of the novel is the element of unconvincingness which her relationship with Čuprykov gives to the characterization of Varvara Mixajlovna. Even in view of the boredom and "toska" of Ural'sk it seems unlikely that Varvara would develop a friendship with Čuprykov and eventually arrange for him his post in Šering's flotilla.

Varvara Mixajlovna's Dostoevskian characteristics are less generalized than those of Vit'ka Čuprykov, and she can be seen as a direct descendant of the prototypes of the "infernal women," especially Nastas'ja Filippovna in *Idiot*. Her first appearance at the party at Professor Karev's is characteristic:

\[V \text{ dverjax stojala ženščina, strjajivaja s pal'to rastajavšie xlop'ja rannego, krupnogo snaga. Mokrye sledy ego zalepili vual', i ženščina ostorožno, starajas' ne zamočit' lica, stjagivala vual' s podborodka kverxu.}\]

\(^{103}\)p. 259.
No lico ee vse že zaporosilos' mal'čajšimi blestkami kapel', i, možet byt', potomu, rjadom s komnatno-želtymi licami gostej, namučennyx užinom, kazalas' ona osobenno svežej. Kraski lica ee byli čeressčur jarki slovno nenatural'ny, i zdorov'e ee, brosavšesja v glaza, moglo, požaluj, i ottolknut'.

Throughout the novel Varvara is associated with "brightness" ("jarkost'"), as her most prominent physical characteristic. Even more striking, however, is her wild laugh ("xoxot") which recurs in the majority of the most significant episodes involving Varvara, Nikita, and Rodion Čorbov. This character leitmotiv occurs already in the episode of the party at Matvey Karev's:

... togda Varvara Mixajlovna vnimateln'no, v podrobnostjax rassmotrela zastyvšee lico Nikity i vdrug gromko, oglušajuščim vzryvom rasxoxotalas' i brosilas' von, k dverjam.105

The significance of Varvara's laugh is accentuated by the minor setpiece devoted to it when she mocks Vit'ka Čuprykov after their "bratan'e":

Togda Varen'ka, vsplesnuv rukami, povalilas' v eževičnu časču, podjav uprugju ee putanju ryže-zelenju postei', i xoxot, režuščij dal'no-zvučnym svoim zvonom, xoxot, povtorjaemyj zarosljami luki, vyrvalsja iz eževiki, vzmył kverxu i pošel katit'ja po Čaganu. Vit'ka videl toľko ladoni Varen'ki da drožaščie oborki ee


105. p. 29.
In the ornamental setpiece devoted to the age-old way of life of the Šerstobitov family, the presentation of Varvara's ebullient personality and her domination of her family endows her with almost demonic characteristics:

Nu, xorošo, xorošo, mamen'ka! Pojdet tvoja dočka Varen'ka, poest balyčku jantarnogo, ikorki solen'koj, kajmačku xolodnen'kogo, utešit tvojo miluju dušen'ku!
Ona celuet mat', gromko čmoknuv gubami, smex ee bojkimi kolencami bežit naverkx, vdogonku za tjapočnoj drob'ju, i vot mel'knula ee krasnaja dušegrejka, vot zagorelas' zeltkom na solnce jubka, i propal smex, isčezla so dvora Varvaruška, netu Varen'ki, Varjušečki ...

The secret of Rodion's appeal for Varvara Mixajlovna remains unclear. Varvara does not marry the Bolshevik entirely for mercenary reasons, since it is clear that she has affection for him, at least at the beginning, as the episode - with its overtones of the race episode in Anna Karenina - in which Rodion dives into the river to save Šering demonstrates:

Varvara Mixajlovna brosilas' na kraj mostika. Ona vcepilas' v perila, sžav brovi, naprjaženo razgljadvaja gladkuyu poverxnost' vody. Varvara Mixajlovna byla bledna. Ona

106 p. 231.
107 pp. 146-147.
During their argument before Varvara leaves Rodion, she calls him a "healthy peasant" and suggests that it was physical domination which she had mistakenly expected from him:

-- A na menja nužno kričat'. Menja nužno deržat' vot tak. Ja, možet, ětogo i xotela, kogda s toboj sošlas'. A ty ...109

That Varvara should have expected to be dominated by a man such as Rodion is surprising in view of her experience on the gunboat, where Varvara's psychological superiority over Rodion is seen to be the principal element in their relationship. She tells Nikita after leaving Rodion that "... Rodion mne nadoel. On sdelal svoe delo.... U menja ot nego rebenok.110 Her leaving Lenka in order to escape from her boredom with Rodion is, however, unconvincing, if we are to believe that her desire for

108 p. 298. Gasiorowska refers to Varvara Mixajlovna in connection with the frequent portrayal in early Soviet fiction of "typing misses," representing the "class enemy," who "type decrees and orders, often helping their illiterate bosses to sign them.... Usually, the camp followers ensnare good men in whose lives women had meant, so far, but little." (Gasiorowska, p. 182).

109 p. 332.

110 p. 52.
a child had been so powerful. These inconsistencies throw a shadow of unreality on the characterization of Varvara Mixajlovna as an "infernal woman" after the Dostoevskian prototype.

Varvara Mixajlovna's passion for Nikita Karev is, of course, one of the principal motives of the novel. There is nothing ambiguous about her pursuit of Nikita, whom she sees as destined to be hers, or, as Nikita tells Irina, "U nee strannaja, ochen' nastojashaja mysli', cto ona kak-to sozdana dlja menja, prednaznachena mne, ponimae'te?"

Both in her conversation with Nikita in Ural'sk after the "bagren'e" and during her meeting with him much later in the gambling club in Petrograd she tells him that he loves her. In the second conversation she chooses to refute Nikita's supposed belief - which she cannot herself seriously believe - that "he is unworthy of her," and tells him that he cannot be happy without her. Before they finally come together in Nikita's room, he is brought to think that she is right: "Ja teper' dumaju, cto vy pravy, kogda za menja govorite o nastojašchem moem čuvstve." Varvara demonstrates the depth of her passion for Nikita by remaining in Ural'sk when her family leaves with the Whites. The

---

111 The relationship between Nikita and Varvara Mixajlovna is reminiscent of that between her namesake Varvara and her husband in A. Ostrovskij's Groza, in which the woman is the dominant personality.

112 p. 361.

113 pp. 196, 51, 53.

114 p. 391.
disconcertingly Dostoevskian episode of her mother's collapse and death when Varvara tells her that she has decided to stay becomes one of her weapons against Nikita in her final conversation with him.

The dramatic effectiveness of this conversation, however, reduces the reader's awareness of the degree to which Varvara's change in attitude toward Nikita contradicts our previous image of her personality. Previously she had told Nikita that she would never abandon him as she had abandoned Rodion, and the reader inevitably believes on the basis of the presentation of Varvara's personality and her "grande passion" for Nikita that she will be happy with even a part of Nikita's life after having pursued him for many years without any prospect of eventually living with him. However, in the final episode the reader is to believe that Varvara cannot endure her role of making easier Nikita's "second life":

She implies that she is bored with him, as with Rodion, now that she will have a child by him: after everyday life together with him Nikita is no longer the unattainable hero who drew her on from afar.

Znaëš', Nikita, kažetsja, so mnoj slučilos', kak byvaet s očen' uprjanymi ljud'mi, oni b'jutsja, b'jutsja, a kogda dostignut celi - okazyvaetsja, čto ona uže vovse ne tak nužna. Kogda ja dobilas' svoego ....
- Dobilas'? - prerval ee Nikita.
- Kogda dobilas' tebja, dobilas' togo, čto

115 p. 412.
Suddenly Varvara seems to realize that the revolution has created other roles for a woman such as herself apart from love. Earlier, Varvara's entire life had been seen in terms of love: "V konce koncov - každyj podnimalsja po svoemu vzvozu, i vzvozom Varvary Mixajlovny byla ljubov'." Now she too can consider living a "second life":


It is Varvara's final remark immediately after this speech that their relationship can scarcely last much longer which drives Nikita out on the streets.

Varvara's revulsion of feeling against Nikita seems ill-motivated in view of the presentation of her personality throughout the novel. Artistically, however, the episode is successful because of the dramatic tension created by her passionate criticism of Nikita. Within the

116 pp. 412-413.

117 p. 196.

context of the plot Varvara's changed attitude provides the motivation for Nikita's desperation and ultimate acceptance of his fate.

Amongst the episodic characters Evgraf continues the line of Fedin's peasants such as the gardener in Sad and Fedor Lependin in Goroda i gody. Evgraf's knowledge of country lore and skill at catching gophers become associated with Nikita's happy memories of his childhood in Ural'sk, and consequently form an important element in the presentation of the significance which Ural'sk has for Nikita's creative work. During his return to Ural'sk during the Civil War Nikita's memories of Evgraf, aroused by the sight of his crumbling hut, contribute to the mood of ecstasy which ultimately overcomes him. Unlike his peasant predecessors in Fedin's work, however, Evgraf leaves the countryside in order to work in the city, from which he is driven after twenty years by the hunger of the Civil War, but then returns to Petrograd later at the beginning of N.E.P.

Matvej Karev spells out Evgraf's significance at the beginning of the novel: "- Ved' čto osobennno xorošo: russkaja, nastojaščaja russkaja duša étot Evgraf!" Characteristically, Evgraf makes aphoristic statements of popular wisdom: "Nikto nikogo spasti ne možet ... každyj sam sebe spasitel'." Evgraf makes his pro-Bolshevik sentiments clear to Nikita in their conversation in the icehut. He is happy

\[119\] p. 23.

\[120\] p. 23. Characteristic also is Evgraf's use of proverbs. (See pp. 276, 278, 400).
at the Whites' evacuation of the town, and criticizes Nikita for his decision to flee with his father:

Sidet' by na odnom meste nado, i tebe lučše i drugim. O drugix tože nado podumat'. A to kuda igolka - tuda i nitka. Putešestvennik! Tebe s Vasil'em Leont'ičem ne ravnjat'sja: emu kapital spasat', a tebe čto?121

Here Evgraf's political sympathies fuse with his love of his homeland. In the successful conversation with Vasilij Leont'ič at the end of the novel, Evgraf replies to his old master's complaints about the giddy haste of the times by remarking that "Nynče narod bol'še naprjamki" and "Ja ot naroda ne ostatčik,"122 which clearly indicates the generic significance of Evgraf. Although the reader is given no grounds for Evgraf's siding with the Bolsheviks, he constitutes a convincing embodiment of "narodnost'" in the novel, and the very inarticulateness of his ideology is of course consistent with his apparent role as an example of the instinctive sympathies of the common people.

In Arsenij Arsen'evič Bax Fedin portrays a member of the old intelligentsia who is given the opportunity in his discussions with Rodion Čorbov to develop at length his complex attitude toward the revolution.123 Bax attacks in strong terms Rodion's assumption that the official ideology of materialism is unquestionably correct and that all other views must be rejected out of hand.

---

121 p. 273.
122 pp. 399, 400.
123 Fedin made no changes for the 1952 edition.
Bax goes on to attack, again in very strong terms, the contemporary worship of science ("nauka").

... mir ne skladyvaet i ne vy'citaet, ne sistematiziruuet znaniij, a smotrit, ęto udobnej i vygodnej dlja nego v dannyj moment .... vy tvorite novuju religiju, vy sozdaete ęctiizm ... Nauka dlja massy ljudej načinaet zamenjat' religiju.125

In support of his thesis Bax tells Rodion an anecdote of how a member of a workers' study circle had called him up to ask whether there was a soul or not, to be put completely at rest by Bax's denial.

The biologist goes on to tell Rodion that his task should be to arouse curiosity and doubt, and to make men seek the truth. Bax rejects any "... zemnoj raj, učreždennyj po edinodušnomu rešeniju privat-docentov."126

124 pp. 349, 350.
125 pp. 351, 352.
126 p. 352. A. Luther in a contemporary review of Brat'ja finds that Bax's reply "nicht nur in ihrem Gedankeninhalt, sondern auch in der Form, in der Wahl der Bilder wie ein "echter Dostojewski" wirkt," going on to remark of Bax's anecdote, "... sicher nicht von Fedin erfunden, sondern aus dem Leben selbst gegriffen ist." Luther comments on the discussion that "... der naive - man möchte sagen: religiöse - Positivismus, der sich hier ausspricht, ist keineswegs eine Errungenschaft der letzten Jahre; er war vielmehr die "Weltanschauung" eines groszen Teils der alten "Intelligenz." (A. Luther, Review of Brat'ja, Osteuropa, #9, 1928, pp. 650-653).
Although Bax is intellectually convinced of materialism, he still experiences moments "when the clarity of my thoughts attains maximum purity" during which he makes the sign of the cross and confesses that he understands nothing. Bax explains later that he has in mind human weakness - a colossal hidden force which is working against the Bolsheviks. Referring to Rodion's claim that the Bolsheviks are building life, Bax ends by telling Rodion that the question is how to build life.

In a way highly reminiscent of the "trench professor" in Goroda i gody, Bax tells Rodion later how much he admires his "ustojčivost', ... prjamota ... i sila."

O, ja glubočajšće ubeđen, što takie ljudi prizvany sozdat' nečto nevidanne i gromadnoe ...
... I ja so žgučej žaždoj želal by inogda perevoplit'sja, čtoby oščutit' v sebe vašu fizičeskuju veru. Da, razve vaša vera ne razlita u vas po vsemu telu?127

Here Bax's "vy" clearly refers to the Bolsheviks in general.

Finally, Bax tells Rodion lyrically of his own significance as a representative of a dying race, by which he evidently means the old intelligentsia. With the disappearance of the old intelligentsia will be lost also their aesthetic perception and their vivid sense of the past:

... my umeli čuvstvovat', Rodion, my umeli sozdat' prekrasnoe i obol'ščat'aja im!
I mne grustno, Rodion, što novoе čelovečestvo bezžalostno vybrasyvaet nas iz žizni. Grustno, potomu što besslednoe isčeznovenie našego tipa ljudej naneset uron buduščemu, podobnyj tomu, kakoj nauka ispytyvaet v isčeznuvšix zoologičeskix vidax .... My berežno xramim
In his last remark, inspired by the architectural experimentation of the period, Bax comes very close to Andrej Starcov's image of the Bolsheviks as "Rumkorff coils." Immediately afterwards, however, Bax inverts curiously Starcov's recollection of the radio station, waves from which reach the whole world. It was the Bolsheviks' achievement in the construction of the radio mast that had led Starcov to think of the Bolsheviks as "Rumkorff coils," but Bax praises the universality and immortality of the old intelligentsia as one of its great qualities.

Bax concludes by wondering how the intelligentsia can transmit to future generations the true nature of their experiences, "the great movements of their souls." In this connection Bax claims that Nikita Karev's symphony is an attempt to combine contemporary heroism with, he implies, the expression of the emotions of the intelligentsia.

Irrespective of the degree to which Bax's views possibly reflect those of Akim Volynskij, they are highly interesting in themselves. Bax expresses vividly the awareness that the old intelligentsia and "specy" were being supplanted by the "new men", and the belief that the cultural values represented by the prerevolutionary intelligentsia must be preserved.

128 p. 356.
130 Ellisberg holds that Bax's views are representative of "certain groups of the intelligentsia," who see the revolution essentially as a "dramatic collision" between the culture of the past and the present and future, which threaten this culture (Ell'sberg, p. 56).
Surprisingly frank is Bax's rejection of unquestioning faith in science, ("nauka") and, by implication, the corpus of Soviet ideology, which had acquired the status of a new religion. Bax refuses to accept the control of thought, expressing his view clearly in the formulation, "... the greatest danger to thought is the habit of basing judgments (opinions) on ready-made conclusions." In terms which Oleșa's hero, Ivan Babičev, might have employed, Bax rejects "the earthly paradise founded by the unanimous decision of assistant professors," and the implication with regard to the contemporary reader's own society is transparent. Despite the ironic presentation of Bax's rhetorical manner and appearance, his arguments inevitably gain additional weight in consequence of the weakness of Rodion's retorts. The Bolshevik's inarticulateness does not detract from his generic significance as a "new man," but it is Bax who clearly emerges the superior from this discussion. Bax's admiration of Rodion's "strength" and "faith" suggests more the envy of age for youth than ideological conviction on the part of the old biologist.

V

The portrayal of the Bolsheviks in the novel is of particular interest in view of the controversy aroused by the characters of Kurt Wahn

---

131 V. Polonskij, quoting Bax's views on the value of his doomed generation, refers to the "pereklička obrazov" between Bax and Babičev. (V. P. Polonskij, Очерки литературного движения революционной эпохи (1917-1927) (Moscow-Leningrad, 1928), pp. 26-27. D. Tal'nikov also refers to this similarity. (Tal'nikov, p. 262). For a detailed discussion of parallels between the characters of Brat'ja and Oleșa's Zavist', see Šl'sberg, pp. 57-58.
and Golosov in Goroda i gody. In Brat'ja we find similarly the figures of two Bolsheviks, one an "intellectual", the other a "non-intellectual." Unlike Goroda i gody, however, where Wahn was by far the more important figure, in Brat'ja Rodion Čorbov plays a much greater role than the old Bolshevik Šering.

Šering remains a shadowy figure throughout the novel, in which he is seen more extensively during his final illness than in action. The circumstances of his death - the communiqué is signed by a commission of five - suggests that he occupies a prominent post. When we see him in action as commander of the river flotilla to which he appoints Rodion as commissar, he is presented almost entirely through Rodion's interior monologue as an ideal hero, so that an aura of unreality surrounds him. Rodion has no doubts about his readiness to give up his life in order to save Šering:

O da! Radi Šeringa - da! Dve žizni, desjat' žiznej! On gotov byl vnov' i vnov' rodit'sja, čtoby snova i snova umeret' dlja spasenija edinstvennej - nezamenimoj, kazalos' emu - žizni Šeringa, Šeringa - učastnika vosstanija na Presně, Šeringa - vdoxmovitelja konspirativnoj raboty, Šeringa - revoljucionnyx del mastera, učenogo, agitatora, neustrašimogo, bezukorizennogo Šeringa, - o, skol'ko obrazcovyx kačestv pripisyvalos' étomu imeni, étomu Ėloveku!... 135

132 Apart from Nikita's brother Rostislav, killed during the Whites' recapture of Ural'sk, whose conversation with Nikita on the need for war is his only significant appearance as a Bolshevik in the novel before his death.

133 "...Šering ne razvernut, ostalsja sxemoj." (Severin, p. 96).

134 p. 42. See also pp. 33, 35, 37.

135 p. 284.
The most interesting aspect of the characterization of Šering is the relationship between the old-guard Bolshevik and his 18-year-old son. Šering and his son have nothing in common - "Otec byl revoljucionerom, a syn budet ostolop" - but, to Rodion's perplexity, Šering wants to see the boy before he dies. The son exposes the gulf in attitudes between the two generations in condemning the unprofessionalism of the "fathers":

Tovarišč, vy ustareli! - nastupaet on na otca. Ni odnogo žitejskogo fakta vy ne možete razrešit' bez susal'ničan'ja: revoljucionnaja écika v tradicijax staroj gvardii i pročaja! My - ljudi novogo, praktičeskogo veka, a vy stanovites' muzejnym ěksponatom. My prinjali ot vas vaše zaveščanije i pristupaem k rabote. Pozvol'te nam znat', kak lučšie stroy' opisannuju v vašix knižkax žizn'. My prežde vsego xotim umet' rabotat', to est' byt' specialistami! Iz vos že nikakogo toliko ne vyjdet, vy ni odnogo dela ne znaete. Čto, ja ne prav, ne prav? .... - Pošlјut vas v bank - vy v banke. Pošlјut v tjur'mu - vy v tjur'me. Potom - v sorabise, potom - ne znaju gde. Vy dumaete, pri pomoči politiki možno vse sdelat'? Detskaja bolezn' levizny!137

In this argument we find a vivid reflection of the much-discussed contemporary conflict between the lack of professional qualifications of the older Bolsheviks on the one hand in conjunction with their belief that the correct ideology is all-important, and the frequently pilloried "narrow practicality" ("uzkij prakticism") and "utilitarianism" characteristic of many of the "new men." Earlier the unprofessionalism of

136 "Sojuz rabotnikov iskusstv."

137 p. 365. Polonskij finds a similarity between Šering's son and Volodja Makarov in Ju. Oleša's Zavist'. (V. Polonskij, Očerki ..., p. 27). See also El'sberg, p. 57.
Soviet administration had been referred to more favourably in connection with Rodion's appointment as commissar to the river flotilla:

Efrejtory vodili divizii, poštal'ony
upravljali finansami, tokari po metallu
i portnye izdavali zakony, i armija, banki,
justicia byli neobyčajny, no ne tak
ploxi, - revoljucija dovol'stvovalas'
im, i ponemnogu oni spravljalish so
vsem, što ej mešalo.¹³⁸

The same accusation of non-professionalism could be levelled against Rodion Čorbov, the principal Bolshevik figure in the novel. The son of a tug pilot, he had worked for a shipping agent before being exiled for distributing revolutionary leaflets. As in the case of Šering, little attention is devoted to his activity in his appointments on the Kama and in Petrograd. No details are given of his post under Šering in Petrograd after leaving the flotilla. Rodion's efforts to improve his education are suggested by the episode of his studying textbooks after his final argument with Varvara Mixajlovna.¹³⁹ The ornamental quality and imagery of the brief setpiece devoted to Rodion's work gives it an atmosphere of abstract unreality:

Rodion uselsja za rabotu. Kažetsja, nikogda
v žizni ona ne šla u nego tak gladko i sporo.
Ni odnogo lišnego povorota ruki, ni kolebanij,
i razdum'ja: bumaga pročitana, karandaš
delaet na nej pometku, ona poslušno ložitsja
v storonu, na ee mesto pojavljaetsja drugaja.
Portfel' opustošen do samyx sokrovennyx glubin,
iz vedra on delaetsja trjapkoj, potom, našinennyj
otobrannymi bumagami, prinimaet vid vpolne

¹³⁸p. 281.
¹³⁹pp. 341-342.
Rodion is associated repeatedly with the character leitmotivs of his awkward appearance - his big round head with two large bumps on the forehead - and his incoherent inarticulateness, which he displays most conspicuously in the scenes with Varvara Mixajlovnava, but also in his dispute with Bax. Rodion is acutely conscious of his lack of education compared with Varvara Mixajlovnava.

In view of this characterization of Rodion, it is surprising that he is associated with the strange symbol of the half-witted sisters Katerina and Lizaveta Ivanovna, who are subjected to bestial indignities by the port riff-raff, the "velikoe galaš'e carstvo." For Rodion this scum is identified with the "pogromščiki" whom he had fought off with his comrades from the revolutionary underground. Rodion sees his being beaten up by a docker after attempting to defend the sisters as his first "acquaintance with man" ("pervoe znakomstvo s čelovekom"), and this experience had impelled him to search for justice.

In his anguish after his final argument with Varvara Mixajlovnava, Rodion concludes that while he understands "things", which are subject

---

140 pp. 340-341.
141 See pp. 289, 292-293, 331.
142 pp. 135-136.
143 p. 333.
to man's control, human beings remain for him a frustrating irrational mystery:

... počemu Rodionu mereščitsja vo vsex ljudjax sxodstvo s gorodskimi durami? Počemu počti vse ljudi očarovany kakim-to bredom, počemu oni dorožat kakimi-to prizrakami, gotovy verit' svoim idolam i umiljať'sja imi, kak Katerina Ivanova - cvetnym loskutom? Počemu oni ne otkažutsja ot svoix zabluždenij?  

Rodion associates Varvara's mocking indifference to his affairs with the two sisters in his mental agony over the absence of order and causality in the world. Later the image recurs when Rodion laughs at Bax's confession that sometimes he crosses himself, overcome by a sense of the ultimate mystery of the universe, and calls Bax's attitude "jurodstvo":

Jurod ... jurodstvo! Jurod-stvo! Gorodskie ... dury ... jurodivye ... vse to že, xa-xa-xa! Odno i to že ... dury! Katerina Ivanovna ... v Akademii nauk ... xa-xa-xa!  

The artificiality of Rodion's relationships with Varvara Mixajlovoļna, Bax and Irina has already been examined. When he speaks of his ideological views he does little to refute Varvara's taunt that he has "spoiled himself with brochures." In an effective speech Varvara implies that he does not understand the ideology he mouths at second-hand:

- Kak mne s toboj skučno!
- Davno li? - burknul Rodion.
- Čem dal'še - tem skučnej. Nadoelo mne slyšat', kak ty čužye slova povtorjaš'.

144 p. 334.
145 p. 353.
Here Varvara is evidently attacking, not merely Rodion alone, but, as the "vy" indicates, a whole class of Party activists.

Rodion’s conception of the role of the Party is lofty - "proizvesti samyj čto ni na est' bol’šoj remont vsemu čelovečestvu" - but his inarticulateness in formulating his views is as apparent in his dispute with Bax as in his objections to Varvara’s fairytales. Bax effectively attacks Rodion’s unquestioning faith in the accuracy of the "scientific" party line. The Bolshevik convicts himself further of a subservient mentality in approving Bax’s anecdote about the workers’ study circle and in agreeing that science should replace the old religion. Rodion’s helplessness is revealed most clearly in his reply to Bax’s significant question after the former had stressed the Bolsheviks’ campaign against human weakness:

- .... Čalost’ju ničego ne dobroš’sja, tol’ko tak, jurodstvo, a my žizn’ stroim, da.
- Ves’ vopros, Rodion, v ýtom, - poryválsja

146 p. 332.

147 p. 335.
Rodion then displays his own human weakness in his inability to see Nikita Karev's symphony on any but a purely personal plane. Bax claims to find in the symphony an example of the dying intelligentsia's attempt to convey its emotions to future generations, but Rodion retorts only, "Prokljatyj koncert.....eto ne nasa muzyka. Ploxa muzyka. Ploxa muzyka."\(^{149}\)

It is evident that the portrayal of Rodion in the novel as the principal Bolshevik character must be significant for the author's attitudes at this period. Rodion Čorbov is the type of intellectually limited administrator who will automatically defer to authority. For him the Party leaders are the priests of a new religion who alone are able to formulate and interpret the "scientific" doctrines on the basis of which a new society can be constructed. But Čorbov's "physical faith", which Bax professes to admire, is only one side of his personality. The other, as the author makes completely explicit, is a total inability to understand human beings, who are to him merely the incomprehensible objects of the "bol'soj remont vsemu čelovečestvu." Čorbov is potentially a far more menacing figure in the novel than his failure in personal relationships and incompetence at argument indicate. In this Bolshevik Fedin presents a strikingly negative picture of the "new man."\(^{150}\)

---

\(^{148}\) p. 355.

\(^{149}\) pp. 357-358.

\(^{150}\) Contemporary critics strongly attacked Čorbov's intellectual limitations and minor role in the novel. E. Severin wrote, "... on uzok, prjamolineen do ograničennosti i javno ostupaeit na zadnij plan pered
VI

In the characterization of Nikita Karev, by far the most complex figure in the novel, Fedin develops a highly interesting artistic analysis of the nature of art. Within this analysis two interacting elements can be discerned: the impact of art on the artist's personality and life and the political significance of art. The problem of the relationship between the artist and his art provides the principal theme of the novel.

The belief in what Soviet critics term the "tragedijnost' iskusstva" or the "žertvennost' iskusstva" is basic to the author's conception of artistic creation. Nikita's sufferings on behalf of his art are inseparable from his career as a musician from the very beginning of his studies until the last scene of the novel after his bitter dispute with Varvara Mixajlovna. Fedin spells out this theme when Nikita is first sent to study in Saratov by the use of the Dantesque word "inferno":

Odna tropa otkryvalas' Nikite, i stupit' na nee on ne xotel. Kak zarodilos' v nem tomitel'noe predčuvstvie neblagopolučija, kakan-to tajajoty, oživavšej ego vpered? On ne mog ni znat', ni dumat' ob štom. Emu stalo tosklivno, trevožno i nemnogo bojazno.

Zavjazyvalas' sud'ba muzykanta, ego - Nikitina - sud'ba, ego inferno.152

---


152. p. 74. The word "inferno" is in the Latin alphabet in the Russian text.
Nikita constantly succumbs to desperation during his years of study in Saratov, Moscow, and Dresden, and his toil is made even more agonizing by the fact that in music each new stage of achievement seems to result in one's having to begin anew. For the first time Nikita experiences happiness in his music at the final rehearsal, and then at the performance, of the Mendelssohn string quartet. At this moment Nikita feels a sense of mystical fusion with music:

... suščestvo ego ... rastvorilos' v novom načale. Tak Nikita Karev prikonsulsja k muzike. Tak, esli by oduševit' neživuju prirodu, prigretaja solncem kaplja vody dolžna byla by čuvstvovat' sebja, isparjajas'. 154

The chapter ends with Nikita's consciousness of his love for the Gol'dmans: "On znal, čto na svete stoilo žit'." 155

Almost a year later, however, Nikita, desperate at his failure to express in music his newly awakened feelings for Varen'ka, gives up the violin. 156

The cycle of desperation and blissful fulfilment continues in Moscow and Dresden. Werth's fate fills him with fear and horror, and he recovers his ability to work only as a result of his love for Anna. Thanks to her he "regains faith in his vocation" 157 and is able to complete his organ concerto, his first creative success. The joy he feels

153 pp. 80, 170.
154 p. 113.
155 p. 115.
156 pp. 149, 153.
157 p. 187.
afterwards as he walks with Anna along the bank of the Elbe becomes symbolic for the happiness he is capable of achieving:

... vot чувствство, с которым он идя против ветра, в молчании, и трепыханье на его колене синее плат'е, и ощущаемая сквозь материю тонкая округлая рука, прижатая к боку, — это огромнейшее счастье, вдруг увенчавшее долголетний испуск, Никита запомнил на всю жизнь.158

Nikita's need for a life-companion is a vital aspect of his personality. Without feminine inspiration, except for his brief period of creative activity in Ural’sk before and after the siege, he is unable to compose. The news of Anna's death destroys his capacity to work, and his mood of bitter isolation is effectively conveyed by the episode in which he sees the lions of the Bank Bridge (Bankovskij most) in Petrograd shining in the winter sun:

Teper' Nikita byl odin, i nikogda es'ce on ne ponimal neumolimosti odinochestva tak jasno, tak chrestoko, kak v minuto mimoletnoj radosti pri vide zalitogo solnca veselogo sochetania zolota, snega i vozdu^noj sinevy. I esli by on obratilsja teper' k muzyke, — popytka vyrazit' etu radost' okazalas' by besplodnoj.159

Nikita's love for Irina is based upon her resemblance to Anna.160

He seeks and finds in his niece the successor to Anna. In his dreamlike

158 p. 191.
159 p. 304.
160 pp. 309, 312.
vision after leaving Matvej's party Nikita thinks explicitly of Anna and Irina as "doubles." To Irina Nikita expounds the significance of Anna in giving him faith in himself:

"Est' takie ključi, kotorye zamerdajut na zimu, perestajut bit'". Gde to v glubine voda nakopljaetsja, a na vidu issjakla. Prixodit teplo - ključ opjat' b'et. Veru nado pobuzdat' k dejstviju, inache ona - kak takoj rodnik.....

U menja byl odin čelovek, blizkij drug. Polnyj, nastojaščij .... samoe sučestvovanje četogo čeloveka davalo mne vse - i veru, i sily ....

U menja byla uverennost', čto mne nečego bojat'sja, potomu čto ošibki, ili provaly, katastrofy - čto xotite - ja vsedge peresilju s étim čelovekom. Čto i bylo nužno ..... (Ja) vse rassčityval na proverku moix del étim čelovekom, na otčet. To est' ne po muzyke, a po vsemu. Muzyka ved' - plod vsego, i vse-taki - čast'. Vse ždal, čto vot vstrečus', pogljažu tolo'ko, obmenjajus' vzgljadom i - vse xoroše. Ty veril? - vot smotri, kak ja žil.

I kakoe ščast'e! A vyšlo ne tak ...162

In his lonely misery in his room before Varvara Mixajlovna's arrival Nikita finally spells out for himself Irina's role as Anna's double:

Togda Nikite prixodilo na um, čto vsja ego toska po Anne živet v nem tol'ko potomu, čto blizost' ušedšego druga byla legko dostignuta, i nikakix usilij ne nužno bylo delat', čtoby podderživat' v pamjati étu blizost'. Ne potomu li Nikita s takoj

---

161 "Možet byt', čto ne Irina, možet byt' - dvojnik Anny kradetsja po bol'šomu domu, gde živet ta - drugaja, to est' Anna .... I ne v étom li dvoenii Iriny i Anny 'mertvlaščaja sladost' snoviden'ja?" (p. 47).

Nikita's relationships with women indicate that he is unable to sustain an association on a basis of equality. In Anna and then Irina he finds women who do not make excessive demands upon his "private" life, so that he can devote all his powers to his music. It is Irina's childlike personality that he finds especially appealing:

As he tells Varvara Mixajlovna during their conversation in the gambling club, he is afraid of her, and it is only at a moment of extreme spiritual depression that he convinces himself that in his soul

---

163 p. 386.
164 pp. 309, 313.
he has always loved her and succumbs to her charms:

... vsja nežnost' i vse vosxiščen'e, 
čas nazad vložennye Varvaroj Mixajlovnuyoj 
v radostnoe toržestvennoe koldovanie nad 
svoim telom, načali izlivat'sja na 
Nikitu .... on otvel ee ruki, privstal na 
odno koleno, obxvatil ee lico ladonjami 
i, nagibajas' nad nim, - srazu vsem telom 
oščutil tepluju vlažnost' ee zubov.165

To Varvara Nikita seeks intellectually to justify his passivity
by telling her that music is essentially feminine:

- Ne znaju, muzyka, čto li, sdelala menja 
takim? ... Ved' čto - iskusstvo ženstvennoe .... 
Muzyka vyxodit iz stroja, iz soglasija, v 
suščnosti značit - iz podčinenija, 
bezvolija.166

Nikita's will-lessness and inability to take decisive action is
highly reminiscent of aspects of Andrej Starcov's personality in Goroda
i gody. Indeed, Varvara Mixajlovnuy's criticism of Nikita during their
final conversation is paralleled by the authorial criticism of Andrej
at the end of the earlier novel. Telling Nikita that she had not be-
lieved him capable of anger, she continues after he lapses into anguished
misery:

- Vot, ty uše i ostyl. Milyj moj, esli by 
ty razgnevalsja, vozmutilsja! A ty i umen 
dlia'étogo, i dobrodetelen ...167

For Nikita, however, personal relationships and all everyday life
are subordinated to his "first life" - music - compared to which all

165 p. 392.
166 p. 391.
167 p. 413.
other activity is of secondary importance. Irina and Varvara complain bitterly in virtually the same terms of their minor role in Nikita's life. Irina tells him when he sees her for the first time after the performance of his symphony,

Mne stanovitsja tjaželo s vami. Vse odno i to že: trud, trud, trud! Skažite mne, a ja, čto že ja? Neužali vy ne vidite, čto byt' tol'ko sredstvom ... čto ja .... nu, ja ne znaju, kak skazat'! ..168

Varvara formulates vividly her consciousness of being only a "means" in Nikita's career:

V suščnosti, tebe bezrazlično, kakoj čelovek živet s toboj rjadom. Važno toliko, čtoby žili, čtoby ėta vtoraja žizn' oblegčala tvoju pervuju, glavnuju ... kak éto skazat? - čtoby tebja zdes' zarjažali, a tam ty streļjal by. A u menja net ni pervoj, ni vtoroj žizni, u menja - edinstvennaja, vot ėta, v kotoroj ja živu i čuvstvuju, što načinaju ispolnjat' dlja tebja kakuju-to služebnuju rol'.169

Nikita himself realizes that whether or not he possesses the faith in himself which love is able to give him, his only real life lies in his music. He tells Irina:

.... надо верить в себя.
- А вы?
Nikita pomolčal.
- Я, konečno, верю. Esli by ne veril ili u menja otnjali by veru, mnie by nečem stalo žít'.170

168 p. 362.
169 p. 412.
170 p. 309.
With ultimate clarity Nikita considers his situation in the scene before Varvara's arrival in his room. He has no life apart from his profession, but his work leaves him no energy to devote to the search for the life-companion whose encouragement he needs in order to create:

To, čto on ne mog ni za čto vzjat'sja, čto ego delo kazalos' emu nenužnym i skuchnym, a on sam sebe - bezdarnym i tupidym, vse éto počti ne bespokoilo Nikitu ....... esli by v pripadke otčajanja Nikita ne našel v sebe daže ostatkov very, to i togda on ne mog by brosit' svoego rukomesla il' svoego iskusstva - ne bezrazlično li, kak budet nazvana bolezn', kotoroj on stradal?

On mog časami smotret' na rojal', bez straxa, bez opasenij za svoju sud'bu, za ětu svoju sud'bu, i v to že vremja drugaja sud'ba napoln-jala ego toskoju. Ėtu druguju sud'bu nado bylo tak že delat', kak pervuju. I zdes', kak v muzyke, nado bylo odolet' prepjatstvija, projti skorbnyj poslux, i zdes' každaja krupica udovletvoreniya okupalas' vse tem že otreššnym metaniem po adu .... No esli ustrojstvo prostyx ělovеčeskix del neslo s sobou novyj iskus, to otkuda bylo vzjat' novye sily? Ved' vse oni bezradel'no uxođili na glavnoe, edinstvennoe delo, nadeljavše smyslom sušchestvovanie Nikity.171

Nikita is "possessed" by music, Varvara Mixajlovna exclaims.172

The significance of the word "oderžimyj" is heightened by its application earlier in the novel to the "tribe" of musicians who ignored the privations of starving Petrograd in order to devote themselves utterly to their art. At this point the author makes clear the musician's voluntary renunciation of the real world:

---

171 p. 385.

172 p. 392.
Long ago in Ural’sk, Varvara Mixajlovna had warned Nikita of the sacrifices he would have to make for his art - "Zapomnite, Nikita: s vašej glupoj garmonej vy prozevaete vse na svete!" and in her last conversation with him she calls his music a "mania" which left nothing for life or for life with her.

In his significant conversation with Rostislav at the Bolshevik camp Nikita agrees with his brother that during the four years of the war he had done nothing but write his symphony, "Esli ne škitat', što ja mučilsja, padal duxom i podnimalsja, što ja smotrel i slušal." Rejecting Rostislav's demand that he take sides, he justifies his profoundly apolitical attitude by referring to the "prekrasnoe delo" which his brother had been serving:

Ja služu emu postojanno. Potomu što služit' emu možno toliko delom, toliko tem, što умееš' delat' ... Ja emu služu tem, što smotruj i slušaju.

Nikita's belief in the need for complete devotion to his art gives him a sense of "bitter superiority" over his brother. Later

---

173 pp. 303.
174 p. 149.
175 p. 411.
177 pp. 221-222.
Nikita speaks of the importance of his vocation more positively in connection with his intention of going to Ural'sk to work:

Davaj pojdem každyj svoeju dorogoj. Uverjaju tebja, ja ničego ne xoču i ne mogu delat', krome svoego dela. Ja ne mogu otkazat'sja ot nego. Inače vsja moja prošlaja žizn' stanet bessmyslennoj dur'ju! A mne sejčas kažetsja, čto ona napolnena takim značeniem!178

The theme of Nikita's alienation from ordinary, working people and the guilt feelings to which this gives rise is introduced at the beginning of the novel, but remains undeveloped. At dawn Nikita watches workmen welding tram-rails and crowds of people hurrying to work:

Emu predstavilos', čto desjatki, sotni glaz s ukoriznoj i neljubov'ju, daje s nenavist'ju osmatrivajut ego lico, zatylok, pomjatuju, promokšuju šljapu, ego zabryzgannoe grijaz'ju pal'to. Emu stalo merzko videt' sebja, točno grijaz' zapačkala ne odeždu ego, a vse telo .... Nikita poproboval vgljadet'sja v mel'kavšie mimo nego lica. Oni byli sosredotočeny na odnoj kakoj-to dume, delavšej ix odinakovymi, tosklivymi, kak upakovka odnogo fabrikata. No v morščinax ix ležala sderžannaja surovost', točno ěti ljudi, sžav svoe serdce, navsegda priznali uprjamuju neizbežnost' vot takix gorodskix rassvetov - s toroplivo beguščimi, odnotonnymi figurami, s železnym zvonom udarov po rel'sam, s drožaščim molčnym ognom svarki. Ėto byl dolg, čelovečeskij dolg - takie rassvety, kogda ljudi zavodili sebja, kak meniazm, a bežali, bežali, čtoby skoree, kak možno skoree dobežav, vključit' sebja v kakuju-nibud' ničtožnuju část' ozabočennoj mašiny.

178 p. 224.
This vivid evocation of the intellectual's alienation from ordinary mankind stands alone in the novel, and in general the highly figurative presentation of Nikita's isolation within his own world has an abstract quality. Nikita's alienation from the "real world" because of his almost total absorption by his profession is similar to Andrej Starcov's consciousness of alienation, with the essential difference that Starcov lacks any professional activity. One phrase, indeed, used by Nikita in his anguished thoughts when in Dresden he tries to decide whether to abandon his music, parallels Andrej's words on his failure to "stat' v krug":

Kak beskonečno mnogo upušćeno bylo slučajev ujti, bežat', brosit'! Glupec! on uveličival stavki, vместо того ćtoby сojti s kruga.180

Nikita's isolation is symbolized throughout the novel by the twin images of the "speck of dust" ("pylinka") and the "little world" ("mirok"), which represent his confinement within the tiny universe of his musical career. These images first occur just before the pogrom in Saratov:

... svjaz' ego so vsem tem, čto ležalo dal'še skripki, byla ničtožna. On často dumal o tom,

179 pp. 54-55. Quoted from the original version. In the revised edition the presentation of the "collective mass" of the proletariat - a significant theme in early Soviet literature - is toned down considerably by the removal of the references to "upakovka odnogo fabrikata" and "zavodili sebja, kak mekanizm." "Ničtožnaja ćast'" is replaced by "krošečnaja ćast'.'"

180 p. 168. The author's italics.
Nikita's isolation is associated with the theme of his suffering on behalf of his art by means of the recurrent phrases "skorbnuy poslay" and "xozdenie (metanie) po adu." The use of these leitmotifs throughout the novel in conjunction with the failure of Nikita's personal relationships convey effectively the theme of the artist's unhappy fate of alienation from everything except his art.

Only briefly, during his return to Ural'sk during the civil war, does he seem to feel that the tiny world of his music can replace the real world about him. As Nikita relives his childhood experiences, he is overcome by a sensation of ecstasy in which the sound of the wind in the trees is transformed into the triumphant music of Nikita's symphony:

Iz kakogo-to ničtožnogo zerna vnutri grudi
roslo želanie podčinit' vse smutnye vpečatlenija
odnomu stroju: bol' i bespokojstvo serdca,
This is the only occasion on which Nikita experiences a creative ecstasy associated with a mystical fusion of both the senses of isolation and of unity with the world. Nikita's brief period of happiness is the result of his return to his homeland, which is presented in this section of the novel as one of the principal sources of artistic

---

183 pp. 245, 247.

184 Nikita's complex emotions are reminiscent of Starcov's feelings at San'šino analyzed in Chapter I.
This theme is already suggested in Nikita's words to Rostislav:

Ja prišel na rodinu i ne nasel rodiny.
A ja xoču najti ee, potomu ěto bez nee nel’zja žit’, ponjal? Mne nečem sebja napolnit' bez rodiny ....
- Ja idu domoj ... Esli by tam stojal ty so svoim štabom, ja vse ravno pošel by tuda. Mne nužno rabotat'.

Nikita's love for his homeland is conveyed in the episode of his last happy summer in Ural'sk - the "green cloud" which he experiences again in the final episode of the novel - and in the memories of his musical ordeals which he evokes in Dresden. However, in the episode of his creative success in Ural'sk during the White occupation Fedin's presentation of the role of the artist's homeland in his creative formation amounts to a programmatic statement:

... on nikuda ne sobiraisja uxodit', emu nekuda bylo idti, on dostič nakonec vozmožnosti zavershit' svoe delo, i s radostnym neterpeniem on spešil za nego vzjat'sja. On ne ošibsa: istočnik, pitavšij ego voobražen'e, neissjakaemo bil na rodine, tam, gde on vpervye uvidel mir, gde voznikali i zabyvalis' pervye protivorečija ljubvi i žestokosti. I on mučitel’no xotel voznagradit' ěti kamni, derev'ja, doma, ves' ētot ubogij i milyj kločok zemli, voznagradit' sozdaniem, dostojnym ix raščitel'nosti. On nadeljal besslovesnyj, žalkij steponoj oazis volej i velikodušiem, on ěkvstvoval sebja dolžnikom jablonevyx sadov, tixogo, stojajšegu ěgana, sgnivšego kryl'ca u izby Evgrafa, putanyx zaroslej luki.
On dumal o rodnom, o povelevajuščej sile rodnogo, o tom, ěto sozdannoe čelovekom sozdano preemstvom,

185 Tal’nikov associates this concept with the ideology of "smenovexovstvo." (Tal’nikov, pp. 259-260).
186 pp. 221, 224.
Nikita concludes by deciding to have the place - Nižnij Ural'sk - and the date of completion of his symphony printed at the end of the score.

In the original version Fedin expands the presentation of the role of tiny places in the creation of a nation's culture by evoking Nikita's admiration for German culture. 188 Nikita completes his symphony in Petrograd, however, and the evocation of Ural'sk at the very end of the novel is more an association of Nikita's new mood with past bliss rather than a fresh stimulus for his art.

In the gambling club Nikita tells Varvara of his belief that man is conditioned by his past - words of which Varvara is to remind him effectively in their final conversation before she accuses him of causing the death of her mother:

187  p. 248.

188 "Tak tvorilas' kul'tura strany, kotoruju bral v primer Nikita - kul'tura Germanii, iz stolet'ja v stolet'ja osvjaščavšej pamjatnymi datami ugolki i ščelki rodnoj zemli, sotni svoix Djussel'dorfov, Bajrejtov, Vajmarov i Magdeburgov. Tysjači kantorov, muzikdirektorov, kapel'majsterov i muzykantov rabotali, uporstvovali, umirali v zabytyx bogom i ljud'mi Djussel'dorfax, i kul'tura rastekalas' po strane, kak kapli masla po tarelke. I vot počti ne stalo ni odnogo kamnja, kotoryj ne govoril by golosom otcoj, i každaja pjad' zemli obratilas' dlja detej v dragocennost', v rodinu."
Čelovek, k nesčast'ju, svjazen prošle. My ne postupaem sejčas, a neizbežne dolžnosti postupati tak, kak opredeleno našim prošljem. Každyj želi naš ostavljač sled, ne toliko nastrojaščega, no i prošloga. Prošloe i nastrojaše - odno. V četrtom smysle vremeni net, po krajinj mere ego net dlja odnogo čeloveka.189

Nikita, it seems, is a man who is proud of his origins, and ashamed that he has abandoned the ancestral way of life of his people, so that he no longer "belongs." His conception of the significance of the homeland is abstract, as the reference to German culture indicates, despite his devotion to his childhood memories which is seen to play a significant part in his brief creative elan. Indeed, in the gambling club Varvara tells him with her customary incisiveness to stop dispensing nonsense as philosophy. Nikita's betrayal of his origins is illustrated by his father's rejection of him as a "tuning-fork" and Čuprykov's mocking him as a "čistopljuj" who is laughed at by the Cossacks. Nikita's role as a spectator at the "bagren'e," admiring his brother Rostislav's Cossack "udal'stvo," demonstrates his alienation:

Emu byla prijatna otvažnost' pjatnadcatiletneho brata. On meril po nemu, kak po merke, svoju žizn'. No žizn' brata i ves' on, s otvagoj, udal'ju, stremitel'nost'ju i vesel'em, byli neob'jasnimo strannyemu, kak stranno bylo to, čto on teper' pered soboju videl.190

Nikita's awareness of the significance of his Cossack origin contributes to his feelings of isolation and alienation. With the death

189 p. 53.
190 p. 195.
of Vasilij Leont'ič at the end of the novel, Matvej's aging, and Evgraf's return to Petrograd, the Cossack line of the Karevs is evidentely coming to an end, leaving Nikita even more rootless than before.

Nikita's airy walk ("vozdušnaja poxodka") is a character leit-motiv with a double function: it symbolizes both Nikita's joy at the successes in his career and his alienation from his Cossack background. He alone in the family has this non-Cossack gait. Varvara Mixajlovna interprets Nikita's walk as the expression of his spiritual remoteness from the "real world":

- Pravo že, pravo, Karev, vy ved' ne xodite, a plavaete. Ili net, net! Vy esli i xodite, to ne po ulicam i, konečno, už ne po paneljam, kak u nas vyražajutsja, a po épo-xe, po sovre - men - nosti ili kak čto? Miry, miry! Verno?

VII

The problem of the political significance of art and Nikita Karev's political attitudes presented in the novel is so complex and ambiguous as to suggest the uncertainty of the writer's own concepts. In addition, the presentation of the effect of the political environment on the artist is ambiguous. Nikita himself proclaims his fundamentally apolitical attitudes. As he makes clear to Rostislav in their conversation at Rostislav's camp, he rejects the need for political commitment. His attitude is reminiscent of Andrej Starcov's pacifism:

Ja ne xoču vas sudit', ni tebja, ni otca, ptomu čto, poka ja šel po stepl, na moem


192 p. 50.
The episode in which Nikita is struck by the enthusiasm of two sailors listening to Wagner's "Rienzi" overture is much stressed by recent Soviet critics. At first Nikita feels "irritation and enmity" towards the noisy crowd, but soon the sailors' emotions during the performance moves him deeply:

... vam' s nimi Nikita počuvstvoval sčastlivu legkost' i posle konca uvertjurs xlopal s uvelčenien v ladoši, zaonjo s matrosami, vo vaju glotku kričavšimi "bravo!", zaonjo so vsej tolpoj, podstupivšej k ěstrade. On doslušal koncert s ětim čuvstvom legkosti, počti v umilenii; emu davno uže ne bylo tak xorošo.

Later Nikita tells Irina that he had realized that music is not needed only by musicians, but is understood by nearly everybody.

---

193 pp. 221-222.


The enthusiasm of the audience, he claims, had given him fresh inspiration:

-Woga ja podumal, čto nepremenno dolžen pisat', skoree končit' i - pust' slušajut; čto ja ne imeju prava molčat', esli u menja est' čto skazat', i ja objazan vsem čtim ljudjam otdat' vse, čto imeju. I mne sejčas tak xočetsja skoree končit'!!196

Watching the two ordinary men had convinced him once again that composing music was worthwhile. Nikita goes on to tell Irina of his need for human support to give him faith in his work, and the earlier theme of the artist's obligation to create in order to satisfy a popular need does not recur in the novel. It is difficult to agree with Brajnina that this is the principal theme of the book.197 After the performance of his symphony, Nikita again loses his inspiration and his capacity to compose.198 For him successful creation does not depend upon his awareness of the "narodnost' iskusstva," but upon the emotional climate about him and his personal relationships.

The influence upon Nikita of his political environment is complex. If we include the episode of the pogrom in Saratov, which is presented in political terms, the political situation is seen to have a decisive impact on Nikita's state of mind and capacity to work. Nikita's forebodings of evil caused by the fire in Saratov make him ill, and he is terrified by the hideous groaning which symbolizes the antisemitic atrocities of the "potniki" and "anafemy." Nikita has no doubt on which side the right

196 p. 308.

197 Brajnina, p. 121.

198 See pp. 384-385.
lies, and, significantly, Rodion, already active in the Bolshevik underground, is a member of the group of men, evidently Bolsheviks, who crush the pogromščiki. Nikita decides after the end of the pogrom:

Net, v mire dolžna byla sučestovat' spravedlivost'! Vsegda, povsjedu, v kakoj-to poslednij čas, v poslednjemu minutku ona javljalaš', štoby vdoxnut' iskupljajuščij pokoj ustalosti, javljalaš' neozhidanno, vot kak teper' javilis' ljudi s berežlivymi, skupymi dviženijami, kak javilsja Rodion, kak javitsja gde-nibud' neskladno-sil'nyj, gromadnyj i uprijamyj Petr.199

Nikita is thrown out of his "speck of dust" by the pogrom, and is able to work again only when peace is restored in the town:

Iz krošechnogo dušnogo mirka Nikitu vybrošila na prostor žestokaja, neumolimaja sila, i duxota prostora sdavila ego neščadnoj goreč'ju. I tut, kak vnutri pylinki, tut, v štom putanom prostore mira, kružilis' besplošnye kol'ca Nikitinoj dorogi, i tut prodolžalos' dlja Nikity otrešennoe xoždenie po adu. Togda on, sžav serdce, vernulsja v svoj mirok ... 200

The political implications of Nikita's state of mind during his return to Ural'sk in the Civil War demonstrate the complexity of the relationship between Nikita's moods and the political situation. Nikita returns to Ural'sk during the White occupation, and, as we have seen, his return to his home fills him with creative elan. Nothing is said of the circumstances of the White occupation, but with the arrival of the winter snowstorms the atmosphere changes, and Nikita loses his hearing as a mysterious growing noise increasingly deafens him. When the roar of

199 p. 106.

200 p. 110.
artillery fire is heard it becomes clear that the source of the increasing unease and tension in the town lies in the advance of the Red forces. The political parallel is clear, since Nikita is reminded vividly of the groaning of the "potniki" and "anafe"m", and the horrors of the pogrom.

Smurskij, smurygij mir raskrylsja pered Nikitoj, i on uvidel zarnicy požara, obgorelye svai domov, gvozd'ri i dub'e nad golovoju čeloveka, kluduščego bystrya, strašnye kresty. Stony i volčij voj sililis' teper' snova vyrvat' Nikitu iz ego pylinsky, uže davno stavšej celym nirom, ne ograničennym ni nebom, ni zemlej. Ot užasa smurygogo carstva, ot zarnic požarov Nikita bežal togda v svoju pylinku, i ona spasla ego, vozna građiv napovtorjačem vos- torgom pervogo prikosnovenija k nastojaščemu delu, k radosti dela. Razve mog by teper' Nikita otkazat'sja ot svoego puti, pokinut' pylinku, vzrastivšju ego s materinskoy ljubov'ju? Nikita v zlobe, v uprjamstve opjat' i opjat' bralsja za rabotu. No stony glušili ego, stony navodnjali komnatu, točno kakoe-to čudovišče otdiralo gorod ot počvy.201

Nikita's nightmare of the Gol'dmans symbolizes his terror at his inability to compose, and the crash as the paper-cutting machine attacks him is the roar of gunfire. Now that "Vojna šla za oknom" Nikita's deafness becomes complete. In this condition Nikita makes his sudden decision to join the evacuation with his family. Thus, while his residence in Ural'sk under White occupation is beneficial to his art, the White defence of the town from the Reds and the alarm which it arouses remind Nikita of the Saratov atrocities and tear him again from the "pylinka," destroying all possibility of creation.

201 p. 251.
Subsequently, Nikita's relationship with the political environment becomes unambiguous. His bitter apathy during his lonely wandering in the steppe after losing his father develops into an identification of the fleeing refugees with the "potniki" and "anafemy" of the Saratov pogrom:

... teper', v ravnodušnoj vlasti uedinjenija, odin na odin s puscynej, Nikita priljadelesja k ljudjam, s kotorymi on bežal. Slopec! Kak mog on ran'še ne priznat' étix smurygix masok?! Potniki i anafemy neslis' mimo nego, voloča za soboju grudy, voroxa i kući skarba, oskalivaja zuby, ogryzajas', v stadnom besserdečii, v zverinom stone: spasaj, spasaj! spasaj grudy sundukov, voroxa trjap'ja, kući gorškov - samoe dorogoe, edinstvenno dragocennoe, krovno ljubimoe v anafemskoj étoj žizni! No ved' sredi stada, spasajuščego dragocennyj skarb, nazodilsja otec Nikity, rodnoj papaša Karev;202

After his contemptuous treatment at the Cossack post Nikita completely rejects his previous acts:

On točno otdelil'sja od sobja i v étu minutu mog vynesti sebe ljuboj prigovor. On uvidel tupoe bessmyslie vsego, čto s nim slučilos'. On ne znal, kogda i gde utračeno im samoobladanje. On ne priznaval svoix postupkov ... On bol'še ne dorozhil soboju i sxvatiłsja za poslednjuju naděždu vovse ne potomu, čto xotel spastis', no tol'ko po uprjamoj prirode naděždy ...203

Despite the fact that Nikita does not allude in his later conversation with Matvej to the political significance of Rostislav's death in Ural'sk, in view of Nikita's attitudes during his return from the steppe his spiritual recovery on seeing the new street sign, "Ulica tovarišča Kareva," cannot fail to be seen in political terms:

---

202 p. 266.

203 p. 271.
Later, when Nikita has already been in Petrograd for some time, we learn from a flashback that he had been able to return to his "pylinka" and compose when the Whites' siege of Ural'sk had been broken by the Red forces. Nikita feels that this victory had been a retribution for all the injustice ("nepravda"), and that Rostislav had been avenged, removing some "elusive, ghostly guilt" of Nikita's toward his brother.\footnote{205} At this point Nikita unambiguously associates himself with Rostislav's cause.

Far more strongly developed in the presentation of Nikita than the political theme are the themes of his isolation within his "speck of dust," which has already been discussed, and the significance of his "losses" ("utraty"), after which the last section of the novel is named. Nikita's mystical awareness of the importance to him of "losses" first arises during the spiritual renewal which he experiences on seeing the street sign with his brother's name. At this moment, as we have seen, Nikita's emotion appears to have a political element which does not recur in the treatment of Nikita's "losses."

\footnote{204} p. 280. 
\footnote{205} p. 305.
Nikita's sudden joy at this, his first "acquisition of loss" is associated with the return of his airy walk, which symbolizes his periods of creative success:

On slyšal, kakoju goreč'ju očajanja byl napolnen krugom nego mir, kakuju goreč' utraty zaključalo v sebe ego serdce - serdce Nikity, i tajnyj, bojazlivyj vostorg gluboko sodrognul ego. On pošel po ulice, gde pogib ego brat, prežnej svoej poxodkoj - čut'-čut' kasajas' zemli, - nesja v sebe pervuju očajannuju goreč' utraty i pervuju robusku radost' - radost' priobresteniya utraty.206

In his conversation with Irina after the concert Nikita speaks of the significance to him of his "losses," but seems to maintain that his need for a "life-companion" is more important in his life and creative work:

- No ved' čto malo - odni utraty. I nužno imet' ešče čto-nibud'. Vse ravno, kak nazvat' čto, - radost', učastie, ljubov'. Ja ob čtom i govoril. Takoe čuvstvo, čtoby postojanno byl uveren, čto ty neobxodim i tvos delo, tvoj trud tak že neobxodimy, kak tvoja žizn'.207

Earlier, at the beginning of his happiness during his return to Ural'sk, Nikita had considered on a more general plane the ineluctable role of misfortune and misery in man's life:

206 p. 280.
207 p. 311.
Skol'ko nužno bylo projti, kak často i gluboko očkaivat'sja, čtoby legko, bezbol'no i dobro smejat'sja nad svoim gorem? No esli by teper' Nikite skazali, xočet li on načat žizn' syznova, žizn' bez očkaiani, bez gorja, bez obid i potrjasenij, on otvetil by - net! On dorožil svoimi nečast'jami, on znal, čto nezbyblemo prixodit vremja, kogda veličajše gore prorastaet dobroj, bezbol'noj, ponimajušej ulybkoj.208

Here Nikita's musings are aroused, not by a "loss," but by his memories of his anger and desperation at being unable to express in music his adolescent emotions for Varvara Mixajlovna.

The theme of Nikita's "losses" gains great importance through the "programmatic" thoughts of Nikita in the closing scene of the novel, when he seems to elevate the need for "losses" into a philosophy of life. The significance of the scene is further heightened by the artistic quality of the presentation of Nikita's state of mind on the background of the bitter cold of the winter dawn, and by the evocation of the "last happy summer" of Nikita's childhood, which heightens the lyricism of the scene, as well as subtly reintroducing the theme of Nikita's Cossack origin.

The reference reminds the reader of Nikita's childhood terror at his loneliness within the vast, unfeeling world, while complete silence reigns all around.209 Throughout the scene the repeated references to silence, lifelessness, and Nikita's loneliness intensify the effect.

208 p. 243.
209 See pp. 64-65.
Again, the reference to Nikita's return to Ural'sk after his wandering in the steppe reminds the reader of his mood of hopeless desperation, succeeded by creative élan when the White siege is raised. As then, Nikita is surrounded by a "desert."\textsuperscript{210}

Nikita feels utterly abandoned and isolated:

\... on perebral v pamjati vse utraty, ponesenny za no\"y'. I tak \(\ldots\) kak na \(\ldots\) etom unylom ostrovke, Nikita ne uvidel vokrug sebja ni živoj duši.\textsuperscript{211}

At this moment Nikita catches sight of the poster advertising the third performance of his symphony and realizes that he must accept that he must live for his music alone.

Da, možet' byt', toľ'ko opusy stanovjatsja ego udelom na vsju žizn'. Mir otvergal Nikitu Kareva, čtoby prinjat'. Obogaščal odnu ego sud'bu opytom nesčast'ja i utrat v drugoj.\textsuperscript{212}

Nikita's hearing returns to him, and the implication is clear that he is again able to compose. Just as the earlier reference to Nikita's childhood experience re-evokes the presentation of Nikita's childhood at the beginning of the novel, Nikita's seeing the poster reminds us of the episode of his noticing the new streetsign in Ural'sk in his brother's honour. It was then that he had first experienced the "joy of the acquisition of loss" and, then as now, his creative powers had been restored to him.

\textsuperscript{210} pp. 266, 415.

\textsuperscript{211} p. 415.

\textsuperscript{212} p. 415.
Finally, Nikita's thoughts recall Varvara's words about his "two lives" - his main, "musical" life, and his secondary, "personal" life. In this context his conclusions imply that he is now resigned to the absence of a personal life and to living without the support of the "life-companion" whom he thought he had found in Irina and then in Varvara.

There is clearly a parallel between Nikita Karev's situation at the end of the novel and Andrej Starcov's plight at the end of Goroda i gody. Nikita's lonely wanderings about Petrograd are similar to those of Andrej: Andrej's "pustyri" correspond to Nikita's "pustynja":

Ne gorod, a pustynja razvertyvalas' po zemle, i pustynej, povsjudu odinakovo prinimajuščej čeloveka, šel Nikita.213

Both intellectuals suffer the complete failure of their personal lives, which leaves them alone and isolated. Andrej loses Marie because of Rita, whom he does not love. Similarly, Nikita loses both Irina and Varvara. For Andrej, who has no profession, the collapse of his personal life, in which love is all-important, means madness. Nikita's profession, on the other hand, confines him within a "little world" in which personal relationships have no place. At the end of the novel he comes to realize that the artist has no right to personal relationships. However much the artist may desire love and find that love gives him the selfconfidence needed for creation, his art must inevitably consume all his energies, leaving him incapable of a "second life."

213 P. 415. See Goroda i gody, pp. 411-413.
Although this is the clear conclusion which emerges at the end of the novel, we find earlier in the novel a variety of situations which favour creative work. Nikita's relationships with women - with Anna (the organ concerto), with Irina (completion of the symphony), and, presumably, with Varvara at the end of the novel - enable him to work after periods of severe psychological depression. On the other hand, Nikita's inability to express his adolescent feelings for Varvara through the violin drives him to give up the instrument. Nikita himself seems to believe until the end of the novel that he needs the stimulus of loving companionship.

A second theme in Brat'ja, examined earlier, as extensively developed as the first, is the absorption of the artist by his art, the artist's confinement to his "little world" or "speck of dust." In the cases of the Mendelssohn concerto and Nikita's work on his symphony during the White occupation of Ural'sk the musician's isolation within the "pylinka" is presented as the condition of his artistic creativity. As soon as Nikita is torn out of his little world by external political events he loses his ability to work.

Consequently the presentation of the conditions of artistic creation in Brat'ja is ambiguous. The contradiction inherent in the joint theses of the "second life" and the "speck of dust" is never resolved. The relationship between the artist and the environment presented in the novel gives us no assurance that the composer will be able to remain for ever within his "little world," which excludes completely
the possibility of a "second life." Although at the end of the novel the "speck of dust" appears to prevail, the possibility remains that Nikita will again succumb to a feeling of loneliness and longing for human support and will endeavour to begin another "second life." One may imagine that Nikita's previous relationships failed in view of the particular personalities of Irina Kareva and Varvara Šerstobitova, and that a new relationship may be more successful, if the woman involved is prepared to suffer greater selfabnegation for the sake of Nikita's art. The two successful works which Nikita creates - the organ concerto and the great symphony - originate not in the "pylinka", but in Nikita's "second life." The reader wonders whether the "pylinka" to which Nikita subscribes at the end of the novel will in reality prove to be the secret of Nikita's continued artistic success.

The ambiguity in the presentation of the conditions of artistic creation is paralleled by ambiguity in the presentation of the relationship between Nikita and the political environment. As far as the creative process of composing is concerned, the political situation is seen to have only the direct effect of throwing Nikita out of the "pylinka" and preventing him from working, although his consciousness of the removal of his guilt after the Reds' raising of the Ural'sk blockade restores his ability to compose. Other political references relate to Nikita's infection by new moods, rather than to the direct presentation of the restoration of his creative ability. Despite Nikita's dependence,

214 In his povest' Anna Timofevna (1923) Fedin had created the image of just such a woman, capable of infinite selfsacrifice.
however, at various times upon the "pylinka" and the "second life", his work is endowed with great political significance, as Šaporin's article on his symphony makes clear.

Šaporin mentions in his article "other major works" by the composer, including a fine piano concerto written in 1920, but the only work presented in the text of the novel itself is Karev's symphony, which acquires enormous significance both as the culmination of his creative anguish over many years and as the expression of his musical talent and personality. The reader is dependent upon Šaporin's article for an evaluation of the symphony, since the presentation of the first performance contains no assessment of the artistic qualities of the work, apart from the fact of its success in musical circles. Consequently it is inevitable that Šaporin's article is interpreted by the reader as a final authorial judgment on Karev's work.

Although Šaporin never uses the term, his assessment of the symphony amounts to a description of the work virtually as one of genius. Šaporin finds one "major fault" - neglect of the loss of the psychological sense of unity caused by the need to provide a break in the concert-hall performance - but otherwise has nothing but unqualified praise for the symphony.

Šaporin's article praises in particular two significant aspects of the work. After discussing Karev's studies both in Russia and in Germany, the critic-composer finds that the symphony represents a synthesis of Russian classical music and the innovations of modern Russian and foreign composers, finally making by implication the striking claim
that Karev's work shows the future direction of Russian music. Here Fedin gives an additional dimension to the significance of Nikita's studies in Germany, so that the attention devoted to the composer's years in Germany is further justified within the thematics of the novel. Šaporin, however, also stresses the profoundly national characteristics of Karev's music:

Lišennaja kakix-nibud' mestnyx čert, melodika Kareva v osnove svoej gluboko nacional'na .... Vozrođiv v svoem tvorčestve russkiju pesennju stixiju na osnove glubokogo i vsestoronnegho izučenija stilja zapadnyx polifonistov, on kak by osuščestvil prognoz S. I. Taneeva, vsegda utveržдавšego, čto tol'ko takim putem možet pojti razvitie russkoj muzyki. Imenno ētim Karev gluboko otličen ot krupnych svoix sovremennikov, odnix - rešavšix preimyščestvenno formal'nye zadachi, drugix - otorvavšixsja v svoem tvorčestve ot rodnoj počivy i načavšix govorit' čujdyom nam jazykom.215

An even more important aspect of Karev's work, in Šaporin's view, is its emotional significance as a reflection of the Revolution and the Civil War.

S pervyx źe ee Ėsimfonii]taktov oščutilas' tesnaja svjaz' muzyki s tjaželyami godami lomki obščestvennogo i ličnogo. Dramatičeskaja kollizija, naskvoz' pronizyvajuščaja pervuju čast' simfonii, v razrabotke dostigla vysot podlinnogo tragizma.216

Šaporin goes on to claim that Karev's symphony not only reflects individual suffering, but also the composer's own political ideology.

215 pp. 394, 396. In the original edition Šaporin refers to the influence on Karev of the "great discoveries and acquisitions" made by the "genius Stravinskij."

216 p. 394.
Speaking of the privations suffered by Karev during the Revolution and Civil War, the critic concludes:

V obstanovke, počti isključavšej vozmožnost' 
zanjati na rojale, Karev sozdal etu 
"simfoniju-roman," zapečatlevšuju na sebe vse 
to veliko, čto prinesla nam revoljucija. 
Nužno imet' samoobladanje nastojashčego 
xudožnika, čtoby, otrešivšis' ot obyvatel'skogo 
prijatija žizni, v takix uslovijax uvidet' 
vysokij smysl soveršajuščixsja sobytij i 
tvorčeski ix otrazit'. 
Est' proizvedenija, ktoré, nesmotrja na 
složnost' ix jazyka, sraz vpečatljajut slušatelja 
svoej suščnost'ju, byt' možet potomu, čto v 
osnove ix ležit'jasnost' i ubeždajuščaja 
iskrennost'. 
K takim proizvedenijam sleduet otnesti i 
simfoniju N. Kareva.217

In his references to the "convincing sincerity" of the composer's depiction of "everything great brought us by the Revolution" and his perception of the "lofty meaning of events" Šaporin gives an explicitly political evaluation of Karev's work. This uncontradicted appraisal stands in the novel as an authorial statement of Karev's aim of conveying through his music his faith in the "lofty meaning" of the Revolution and his support of Bolshevik ideology.

This is the only direct reference in the novel to Nikita's pro-Bolshevik views. The general presentation of Nikita seems to exclude the possibility of his adoption of any specific ideology. Nikita himself professes complete apoliticism, and the complex relationship between the composer and the political situation examined earlier suggests an

217 p. 396.
aversion to the Whites, but not an adoption by Nikita of Bolshevik ideology.

Within the "pylinka" Nikita is seen to be completely oblivious of the outside world.218 Moreover, after his return to Petrograd his isolation is again emphasized. Referring to the "tribe of the possessed by music" the author writes: "Sredi etix ljudej, kotorym muzyka zamenjala vse, čto oni utratili, i kazalos', - vse, čto mogli priobresti, privyčnoj stala figura Nikity Kareva."219 Šaparin himself in his article confirms the impression of Nikita's "Weltfremdheit": "Tjagostnost' obščix uslovij togo vremeni usugubljalas' polnoj otorvannost'ju ne tol'ko ot zapadnoevropejskogo muzykal'nogo mira, no i ot muzykal'noj žizni voobšče. Mnogie druz'ja Kareva v tečenje dolgogo vremeni (čto-to okolo dvux let) ne znali da'že o ego vozvraščenii."220 This image of Nikita is also implicit in the comments of Irina and Varvara on the all-consuming nature of Nikita's "first life," his mania for music: "... vse twoi čuvstva do poslednej kroški ušli na nee."221

It is true that Nikita's sudden awareness of the popular appreciation and need for art has political implications, but Nikita's new mood

218"... svjaz' ego so vsem tem, čto ležalo dal'še skripki, byla ničtožna .... Vse ego suščestvo vraščalos' v odnoj pylinke ..." (pp. 91-92). "... pylinki, uže davno stavšej celym mirom, ne ograničennym ni nebom, ni zemlej." (p. 251).

219 p. 303.

220 p. 393.

221 p. 411.
is seen only as a temporary stimulus to creativity, not as an acceptance by the composer of any kind of "social'nyj zakaz."

Saporin's article is the only section of the novel in which Karev's work is given political significance, as a result of which the composer's association with Bolshevik ideology appears as a publicistic statement rather than an artistically convincing integral part of the total presentation of Nikita. It is unlikely that Fedin intends to claim that the artist must inevitably reflect the dominant Bolshevik ideology, however slight his contact with everyday reality. Here again we find an unresolved ambiguity in the presentation of the principal character which adds uncertainty to the treatment of the nature of artistic creativity.

VIII

Nikita Karev fails to be a convincing character, since the various elements in his characterization exist side by side without being integrated into a single personality. The conflict in the novel between the

222 Contemporary critics almost unanimously rejected the thesis that Nikita in his isolation would be able to create music which reflected the ideals of the Revolution. V. Druzin's comments are representative: "Kakim obrazom čelovek, otvbornyj ot Rossii, otgorodivšijsja ot graždanskoj vojny ... ne zamečavši'j neobxodimosti sloma i pererabotki starogo vo imja novogo, absoljutno ne interesovavšijsja novym, t. e. revoljuciej, xarakterom ee, kto ee delal, - kakim obrazom mog sozdat' takoj čelovek muzyku, vyražajuščuju revoljuciju? Vot zakonnaj vojpos, kotoryj nado postavit' Fedinu.... Ny znaem, čto psixologija xudožnika klasivo obuslovena, i muzykant, živuščij i dumajuščij tak, kak žil i dumal Nikita Karev, prosto naprosto ne v sostojanii napisat' takoj simfonii, kakuju emu pripisal Fedin." (Druzin, pp. 75-76). See also K. Arxangel'skiij, "Tvorchesto K. Fedina," Na pod'emе, #10 (1929), p.74; V. Bojčevskij, "Konstantin Fedin," Čitatel' i pisatel', #43 (1928), n.p.; Ja. Grigor'ev, "Brat'ja," Oktjabr', #8 (1928), p. 206; Severin, p. 94; Dolov, p. 78; Tal'nikov, p. 258.
varying conditions of artistic creativity - the "speck of dust" and the "second life" - is never resolved, and the ultimate victory of the "speck of dust" remains doubtful. Moreover, the unexpected identification of Karev with the Revolution is unconvincing. Particularly unfortunate is the episodic introduction of the various character themes without the analysis of transitional psychological states or explanation of their relationships. Finally, the presentation in the novel of Nikita's art - his professional "mania" - has an abstract quality which is accentuated by the nature of the impact which it has on Irina and Varvara, as well as by Saporin's attempt to endow his work with profound political significance.

Since the characterization of Nikita Karev and the question of the artist's relationship to his art, presented through Karev's experience, are unquestionably the principal themes of Brat'ja, Fedin's failure to portray convincingly Karev's "life in art" must be considered the main defect of the book. Moreover, few will accept the pessimistic doctrine of "total loss" which appears to emerge at the end of the novel, and the thesis that the artist must isolate himself completely from the world in order to create. This view has a simplistic quality which our experience of creative individuals and their relationship with their environment readily refutes. Other 20th-Century writers - for instance, Thomas Mann

in Tonio Kröger (1903) and Tod in Venedig (1913) - have provided a more complex and convincing analysis of the alienation of the artist in modern society. Moreover, the abstractness of Fedin's presentation of the essence of art which is inherent in the imagery employed and in the vocabulary, as well as in the nature of the hero's human relationships and his un-integrated personality, detracts from the reader's acceptance of the thematics of the novel. In Brat'ja Fedin did not succeed in conveying a highly pessimistic view of the fate of the artist in artistic images, and the characterization of Nikita suggests that the author himself had been unable to define and relate various views of the artist's situation in society.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to agree with I. Gruzdev's charge in a letter to Gor'kij that the novel is "very boring." Many of the descriptive setpieces, especially those devoted to the Cossack byt in the first part of the novel, are vivid and effective, despite the excessive element of rhetorical ornamentalism. Further, the "Dostoevščina" inherent in the characterization of Varvara Mixajlovna does not reduce

---

224 Significantly, the more abstract "utraty" is preferred to "poteri."

225 "... mne otmenno solidnyj i otmenno gladkij roman "Brat'ja" kažetsja očen' skučnym." (Letter of February, 1929, in Perepiska A. M. Gor'kogo s I. A. Gruzdevym, Moscow, 1966, p. 189). Gor'kij makes no comment in his subsequent letters to Gruzdev.

226 A. Luther wrote that "Das stärkste an ihm [Fedin] ist schliesslich doch nicht das Ideelle, sondern das Bildliche, alle die Partien, in denen die unmittelbar gestaltende Kraft des Dichters sich auslebt ..." (Review of Brat'ja, Osteuropa, #9, 1928, p. 652).
the artistic effectiveness of the conversations between Varvara and Nikita Karev, and between Varvara and Rodion Čorbov.

If Brat'ja lacks the brilliant evocation of the immediacy of situation and environment characteristic of Goroda i gody, it much surpasses the earlier novel in the quality of its dialogue. Not only the conversations in which Varvara Mixajlovna figures, but also those between Nikita and Irina, and between Irina and Rodion, are amongst the most successful sections of the book. Through the discussions between Bax and Rodion the author presents an interesting successor to the "trench professor" of Goroda i gody and analyzes some of the major problems of contemporary Soviet society in a strikingly objective manner. Fedin was not to achieve such objectivity again.
In his next novel, *Poxiščenie Evropy* (1934-35), Fedin continued to use his experiences in Western Europe as a major source of material. After completing *Brat'ja* in March 1928, Fedin was abroad between July and September, travelling extensively in Norway, Denmark, Germany and Holland. He clearly envisaged this journey as a period of creative preparation; to Gor'kij he wrote "...k poezdke étoj ja gotovilsja dobryx pjat' let."¹ After visiting Cologne, Munich and Nuremberg, Fedin spent three days in Zittau on the way to Berlin. He saw his old landlady and was amazed that so little had changed in the previous ten years.² A Dutch friend of Fedin's from Leningrad, G. F. Peltenburg, persuaded Fedin to visit Holland, and was instrumental in obtaining a visa for him. Fedin visited the Peltenburg

¹Letter to Gor'kij from Leningrad, June 3, 1928. (M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli, p. 522).

²Letter to Dora Fedin from Berlin, July 30, 1928. (Fedin und Deutschland, p. 229). For interesting details on Fedin's journey, see the five letters written by Fedin to his wife (Fedin und Deutschland, pp. 226-232).
family in Amsterdam, and the personalities of the members of the family and their way of life supplied a factual basis for the creation of the Western heroes of Poxiščenie Evropy - the van Rossum family.3 Writing to his wife from Rotterdam on September 11, 1928, Fedin already foresaw that a new novel would come out of his Dutch impressions.4 The Peltenburg family were the owners of a large timber import business, and operated a lumbering concession in the Soviet Union. At an early stage, Fedin clearly decided to make the contemporary timber trade between Holland and the Soviet Union the principal subject line of the novel, and consequently made an intensive study of the industry. The author had a number of meetings with the old-guard Bolshevik I. G. Ljuter, who held a high position in the Soviet state timber trading monopoly, "Eksportles".5 Ljuter explained to Fedin the workings of the new mechanized timber loading system in the port of Leningrad, and this technological achievement figures prominently in the chapter Leningrad-port of the novel. Fedin also consulted a professor of the Forestry Institute (Lesotexničeskaja akademija) in Leningrad, and held discussions at the Institute with members of the staff and students.6


4 Fedin und Deutschland, p. 232.


Most of the summer of 1930 Fedin spent in the Pomor'e region, living at Soroka (now Belomorsk) on the Vyg river, a centre of the Soviet lumber industry, where he collected material for the second book of the novel. Fedin had been working intensively on the novel since early in 1930 when in May 1931 his writing was disrupted by a serious attack of tuberculosis. By this time his work was well advanced: he wrote to Gor'kij on June 9, "Vsja istorija razrazilas' v razgar raboty; ja dovel ee do takogo urovnja, čto ostavalo's' tol'ko pisat' - vse bylo složeno, prignano, zagotovleno, i oseh'ju ja xotel načat' pečatat'." Apart from the stay in the Pomor'e region, most of the earlier writing had been done at Leningrad, but after initial treatment in Davos, Fedin renewed his work on the novel while in St. Blasien, and then completed Book 1 at Detskoe Selo (Puškin), where he moved early in 1933. Book 1 first appeared in the Leningrad journal Zvezda (#4-8, 11-12, 1933) and was published in book form in 1934 by the Izdatel'stvo pisatelej v Leningrade. From 1934 to 1935 Fedin lived in Leningrad, with the exception of the summer months of 1934, which he spent at Detskoe Selo.

7. M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli, pp. 524-525.

8. For details on Fedin's treatment for tuberculosis, see chapter on Sanatorij Arktur.

9. Four extracts were published in various journals and in the Literaturnaja gazeta between 1931 and 1934. (See Tvorčestvo Konstantina Fedina, pp. 507 and 520).
Book 2 also appeared first in Zvezda (#6-10, 12, 1935) and was published in book form in the same year by Goslitizdat (Izdatel'stvo pisatelej v Leningrade having ceased to exist).

No English translation of the novel exists. A Dutch translation appeared in 1937 from which, however, four chapters were omitted from Book 2 (Proyektery, Babuškiny skazki, Filip van Rossum ljubit SSSR, Fel'eton Rogova). In a special appendix the translator justifies the omission by claiming that these chapters are completely superfluous to the essential action of the novel and that the idea and unity of the novel are strengthened in the eyes of the foreign reader by their removal.

The first book of the novel is dominated by the figure of the Dutch capitalist Philip van Rossum, whose background and views are presented in far greater depth than those of any other character. By means of descriptive setpieces and Philip's own interior monologue flashbacks a detailed cumulative impression is built up of the cultured prosperity in which generations of such wealthy bourgeois families as the van Rossums have lived. The tone is set at the beginning of the novel when

---

10 Three extracts were published in the Literaturnaja gazeta and other newspapers in 1934. (See Tvorčestvo Konstantina Fedina, p.522).

11 Fedin, who was chairman of the board of the publishing house, was greatly disturbed by the liquidation of the Izdatel'stvo pisatelej v Leningrade and asked Gor'kij to intercede with Ždanov in its favour. (Letter to Gor'kij, May 4, 1934, in M. Gor'kij i sovetskie pisateli, pp.548-549.)


13 J. Huijts, "Verantwoording", De Ontvoering van Europa, p. 471.
Philip's daughter Helena (Rogov is not yet aware of her identity) con-
descendingly inspects the display of local artifacts and paintings in
the Stalhem hotel, observing, "Thank you. My father has a collection
of old Dutch (masters). If I bought anything like that, he would
trash me."\(^{14}\)

In Chapter VI the flowers and pigeons of Lodevijk's house - the
ancestral seat of the van Rossums - suggest the patriarchal opulence of
the family. Lodevijk's winding of the grandfather clock becomes a symbol
of the traditions and apparent permanence of their way of life.

\[\text{Časy pokazyvali četverti luny, časy oboznážali čísla mesjaca, časy otsčityvali}
\text{sekundy: žizn' šestvovala vymerennaja,}
\text{vzvešennaja, - nel'zja bylo ni v čem}
\text{ošibit'sja .... Zavod treščal, pružina}
\text{pevuče vtorila emu. Dva štix zvuka s}
\text{detstva pomnil Filipp.}\] \(^{15}\)

Significantly, Philip's visit to Lodevijk's deathbed is associ-
ated with an episode in which Philip sees Lodevijk's old retainer Captain
Mees winding the clock instead of his master.\(^{16}\)

Philip's cultural interests are seen to be extremely broad and
he has a deep interest in the history of his country. A setpiece is de-
voted to Philip's image of The Hague as an exquisite museum and "...
voplošenie sovershenstva nebesnogo bytija."\(^{17}\)

\(^{14}\)Poxiščenie Evropy, p. 12.
\(^{15}\)p. 46.
\(^{16}\)p. 225.
\(^{17}\)p. 51.
Visiting Leiden with Rogov and Klavdia Andreevna, he identifies himself with the legendary hero van der Werf and "propel celuju bylinu ob osade Lejdena ispancami v šestnadcatom veke." When they arrive at the Oude Ryn, he demonstrates further his profound feeling for history, noting "s dovol'nym vzdoxom ustojčivost' rodnoj kul'tury: esli by ne velosipedy i ne asfal't, čem otličalas' by lejdenskaja idillija ot togo, čto tut proisxodilo trista, četyresta let nazad?"

However, painting seems to dominate his interests, as the collection referred to by his daughter indicates. Proud of the fact that he comes from the same city as Frans Hals, Philip has named the van Rossums' finest ship after the painter despite Lodevijk's objection that ships' names should commemorate towns, great seamen and generals.

\[18\] p. 52.
\[19\] p. 153.
\[20\] p. 154.
\[21\] p. 81.
Philip's interest in art supplies a satisfactory motivation for his visit with Rogov to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, the scene of one of their conversations on economic questions.

Although the reader comes to associate Philip's background and his tours of Holland in the company of Rogov with the cultural traditions and beauty of Holland, a different image is projected by the tours which Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna undertake together. Of these undoubtedly the most significant is the major setpice devoted to Rogov's canal tour in Chapter XVI, "Amsterdam dnem", with its effective presentation of the fearful poverty of the Amsterdam slums. A cumulative impact is produced by the use of series of nouns and verbs descriptive of rottenness and decay:

...togda načal raskryvat'sja zalatij mrakom, nakrytyj plaščom isparenij, podobnyj mogile, vyrtyoj na bolote, gniyuščij černyj Amsterdam. Zdes' slepo kučilis' tyly, zatylki, zadnie fasady drevnix, kazalos', so vremen Isxoda ne čisčennyx, ne mytyx zdanij. Doma stojali v vode, svoimi osnovan'jami, fundamentami obrazuju berega kanala. Daleko v vysotu uxdolili steny - raškrašennye, raspisannya razvodami besčislennyx ottenkov gnili, pleseni,gribo i mxov. Razvody koe-gde oživali, vidoizmanjalis': iz ščelij i treščin, iz kakix-to otdušin i fortocék vylezala, puzyrjas', novaja gnil', stekaja vниз. Nad samoyu povexnost'ju kanala, iz trub i stokov, zizavšix v stenax, xlestit i struilis' potoki nečistot. Ta žiža, po kotoroj probiralsja kater, liš' otdalennno napominala vodu, svoej gustoju massoj tjažko protivjas' rabote vinta. S určaniem i drož'ju vint podymal iz glubiny celye polčišča ryžix, bagrovyx, trupno-sinix polurastvorennyx otbrosov, i oni, kak meduzy, rasšírajjas' i suživajas', otylyvali proč'. Tam, gde padal probivšijja skvoz' nagromožden'ej domov slučajnych luct solnca, v ego svete kadnil'nymi dyham podnimalis' jazyki isparenij. 22

22 pp. 132-133.
The impact is intensified by the description which follows of two little girls playing with a doll in a boat at the foot of some landing stairs, who wave at the tourists as they pass in their motorboat.

Companion setpieces are to be found in Chapter XXI, "Amsterdam noč'ju." The first is devoted to the movement in pairs of policemen about their beats at night and implies the arbitrariness of police control. The extreme metaphor employed, however, concentrates attention on the device rather than on the theme:

Ulica odeta v korsa, šmurki kotorogo natugo zatjanuty, ili oslabilen, ili raspuščeny sovsam: ot strogix zapretov do potvorstva. No i v korsaže ona živet svoej ottalkivajuščej i upoitel'noj žizn'ju, i čelovek ne v silax obojtis' bez nee, kak bol'noj ne možet obojtis' bez rvotnogo, ili p'janica - bez vina.23

The following setpiece presents the experiences of a "passerby" who tours the red-light section of Amsterdam without realizing at first that the voluptuous women in luxurious interiors behind the house windows are prostitutes.24 The naive "passerby" finally turns out to be Rogov. Here again owing to the striking imagery, the emphasis is on the artistic presentation of the women rather than on the presentation of prostitution as an evil social phenomenon.

Noteworthy is the section devoted to the Joedenhoek, the Jewish quarter of Amsterdam, which is visited by Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna immediately after their canal trip.25 Here the emphasis is on the


24 pp. 180-183.

25 This section acquires additional interest owing to its being one of the last fictional representations of the ghetto, notably the
desperation with which street vendors attempt to sell their wares, with its implication of cruel poverty. A more favourable impression is created by the description of the liqueur bar visited by Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna. Almost certainly this bar is a composite description of the famous bar "De drie fleschjes" in the Gravenstraat (where the vast selection of liqueurs and general ambiance suggest the bar in Poxiščenie Evropy), and the "proeflokaal" of Wynand Fockink in the Pijlsteeg (a similar location in a narrow street with tall buildings on each side to that of the bar in the novel).

The presentation of Western Europe in Book 1 is thus complex. If the scenes of poverty - especially the artistically highly effective description of the canal slums - create an impression of the suffering and degradation of the poor, the van Rossums' background and Philip van Rossum's cultural interests suggest the high cultural level of the country and the intellectual interests of the bourgeoisie. Unquestionably, Fedin's intense awareness of the past pervades the pages devoted to Holland and tends to mute the negative impression of capitalism produced by the presentation of the economic activities of the van Rossums.

A similar historical consciousness permeates the section on Norway at the beginning of the novel. The description of Bergen, the setpiece devoted to the fishmarket, and the major setpiece on the bloody Waterlooplein and Jodenbreestraat, before it was largely demolished during the German occupation.

history of the former Hanseatic port evoke in detail the historical background, and the impression is intensified by the description of the Hanseatic museum in Bergen.

Fedin deliberately draws attention to his use of the historical element by introducing lengthy extracts from the Russian translation of the Abbe (Joseph) de la Porte's _Le Voyageur français, ou la connaissance de l'ancien et du nouveau monde._ The somewhat flimsy motivation for the use of this documentary material is provided by Rogov's fascination with this work, which he had acquired in a Copenhagen antique shop. De la Porte's description of the commercial grandeur and the opulence of 18th century Holland serves as a graphic presentation of the historical origins of capitalism in Holland, at the same time adding depth to the characterization of the van Rossums.

The presentation in the novel of the contemporary economic activity of the van Rossums is uniformly negative. Even before Rogov's arrival in Holland, however, we find episodes which are evidently intended to demonstrate the suffering and exploitation resulting from the contemporary capitalistic system in the West. One of the most transparent of such episodes occurs at the very beginning of the novel, when a Norwegian peasant boy nearly falls down a cliff to his death in an

---

27 pp. 18-19, 25-29.

28 p. 28.

29 pp. 95, 96, 97-100.

attempt to rescue Helena's handbag - for which he is rewarded with a dollar bill. Fedin spells out the effect on Rogov: "Rogov byl zol. čto-to ottalkivajuščee kazalos' emu vo vsem étom dorožnom priključenii," which does not, however, despite her inconsiderateness, kill his growing attachment to Helena. Soon afterwards the theme of the exploitation of the poor is further developed in the episode in which Rogov meets the drunken diver Nielsen, who refers sarcastically to the collection-box in the form of a mine with the inscription "Pomogite sirotam pogibšíx v velikuju vojnu morjakov". Later Nielsen refers to the enormous profits made by shipowners during the First World War. This theme recurs soon afterward in a scene between Lodevijk and Philip van Rossum, when during the war the brothers discuss the sinking of three of the firm's ships. After Lodevijk has stressed the fact that the brothers stand to gain financially from the insurance payments on the lost ships, he finally remarks: "Pomjanem pečal'nye duši pogibšíx morjakov. Tjagostnaja utrata." Fedin effectively strikes this note of hypocrisy again later with reference to the death of Philip's own

31 p. 15.
32 p. 21.
33 pp. 32-33. In an article published in 1940 Fedin emphasized his disgust at the way in which, as he believed, thousands of sailors had perished in order to enrich Scandinavian shipowners. (Fedin, "Načal'nye glavy," Pravda, April 30, 1940, p. 5).
34 pp. 40-42.
35 p. 42.
daughter, Helena: Eldering-Ghyser, immediately after dictating a memorandum recommending that none of the van Rossums' ships should be chartered, sends a telegram of Christian commiseration to Philip van Rossum on the loss of his daughter.36

In the person of the oil magnate, Justus Eldering-Ghyser, Fedin clearly sets out to indict the worst aspects of the Western European capitalist system. Eldering-Ghyser possesses none of the redeeming qualities - notably devotion to cultural values - with which the van Rossums are endowed. In him Fedin presents the capitalist predator ("xiščnik") in his most elemental form, and his characterization of this figure is pervaded by the shrill stereotype quality - the "šxematičnost" and "plakatnost" which the writer successfully avoided in his presentation of Holland. Without doubt Eldering-Ghyser is based on Sir Henri Deterding, a director of Royal Dutch Shell, and a bête noire of Soviet publicists during the 1930s.37

Eldering-Ghyser's wealth is associated with his possession of a 16-cylinder Rolls-Royce, which is described in a ridiculously hyperbolic setpiece:

---

36 p. 93. A further association of Christianity with hypocrisy and mercenariness is implicit in the episode in which two Salvation Army members attempt to sell literature to Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna (pp. 186-188).

37 Deterding was married to a Russian, the former wife of a White general, the Armenian General Bagraduni. For the reputation of Sir Henri Deterding in the Soviet Union, see Boris Izakov, Vše menjaetsja, daže v Anglii (Moscow, 1965), pp. 110 and 112. Izakov was Pravda correspondent in London from 1932 to 1937. Referring to anti-Soviet intrigues in England, he asserts "Vše éti "éksperty" po "russkomu voprosu" kormilis' vokrug sekretnyx fondov razvedki i ličnoj kassy neftjanogo korolja séra Genri Deterdinga" (p. 110). Later he refers to Deterding as "postojannyj vdoxnovitel' antisovetskich zagovorov toj pory." (p. 112).
Here the ironic hyperbole clearly militates against the reader's taking Eldering-Ghyser seriously as an archetypal capitalist plutocrat.

Eldering-Ghyser is initially introduced at the end of the elaborate hyperbolic setpiece in Chapter VIII, "Birževoj den' v Rotterdame", where the extreme metaphors involved again make it difficult for the reader to accept the oil magnate as a realistic characterization of a contemporary capitalist. Fedin builds up an extended metaphoric presentation of the Rotterdam Stock Exchange as a special world populated by various "Stock Exchange species" in a hierarchical classification of evolutionary characteristics, influence and power. The emphasis is on

38 p. 83. The author was informed by Rolls-Royce, Ltd. that although Sir Henri Deterding owned two Rolls-Royces during the period 1930-1935, the company had never marketed a 16-cylinder car. (Letter from D.E.A. Miller-Williams, Publicity Manager of Rolls-Royce, Ltd., dated May 13, 1966).

39 pp. 59-63.
the "law of mutual annihilation", which prevails in this merciless world. Of the second crocodile-like species the author writes "... on raskryvает past' - i v nej okazyvatsja desyatok-drugoj bespozvonočnyx pervogo vida." The theme is later developed and ultimately formulated as follows: "Krugovraščalis' řučki i červi, spletali nepročnye seti pauki, moški otčajanno bilis' v tenetax, tarantuly to živo begali, to zamertvo svertyvalis' v konoček.... Každoe sozdanie čtogo Noeva kovčega sudorožno ždalo svoego časa, čtoby ispolnit' zakon, kotoryj privel ego sjuda - zakon vzaimnogo uničtoženija".

The further themes of the concentration of capital and the elimination of competition in the capitalist system are developed in conversations between Philip van Rossum and Eldering-Ghyser, and in the treatment of the machinations of Eldering-Ghyser directed against the van Rossums' firm as well as other oil companies. The Dutch oil king's activities give a black picture of the workings of contemporary capitalism. Not surprisingly in view of Eldering-Ghyser's prototype, his anti-Soviet views determine his attitude toward van Rossum's trading with the Soviet Union. The presentation of Eldering-Ghyser's ideology in the novel is interesting as a literary illustration of contemporary Soviet publicistic writing on the ideological and economic conflict between Western capitalist imperialism and the Soviet Union of the Second Five-Year Plan.

Eldering-Ghyser's proposal to buy piles for new warehouses and dissatisfaction with Philip van Rossum's intention of using Russian

---

40. p. 60.
41. p. 61.
timber supply the motivation for a significant "ideological" conversation. Eldering-Ghyser attempts to exert psychological pressure on Philip by insisting that the market is so swamped with timber that the van Rossums will be driven to raise ever-increasing loans; as will later become clear, Eldering-Ghyser himself controls the principal bank on which the van Rossums rely for short-term credit. At this point, however, he contents himself with insisting that the van Rossums should buy Royal Dutch stock. Eldering-Ghyser buttresses his argument by spelling out the process of capital concentration which is taking place in Europe, and claiming that Holland must further concentrate its capital under unified control in order to withstand the competition of other countries. Eldering-Ghyser attacks Philip's "enthusiasm" for the Soviet Union and his advocacy of recognition of the Soviet Union, finally embarking on a diatribe against the Soviet Union and its supposed plan of undermining the Western economy by swamping the market with cheap exports:

Vy vybrasyvaete nacional'nye bogatstva v stranu, kotoraja vraždebnam i umelo pol'zuetsja raznoglasiyami, podobnymi tem, kotorye proisxodjat vot sejčas, za ētim stolom, čtoby rasstraivat' evropejskij rynok, vzryvat' naši finansy i v konce koncov povsjudu nasadit' svoju anarxiju! 

... Ves' mir boretaja s sovetskim vyozom! A vy poosčrjaete ego svoim bezumiem!

---

42 pp. 64-65.

43 pp. 65-68, 77-79.

44 Eldering-Ghyser cites the statistic that 0.5% of all companies in Germany account for 50% of total capital growth (p.67).

45 p. 68. Fedin may here have in mind Sir Henri Deterding’s formation of a "United Front" in the early 1920s to boycott Soviet oil.
Eldering-Ghyser finally tells Philip mysteriously that the economic situation ("kon"junktura") will develop against him.

Unfortunately, stylistic elements in the characterization of Eldering-Ghyser militate also in this episode against the acceptance of the oil king as a convincing character whose opinions are of consequence. In this episode the leitmotiv of his repellent eating of spinach and asparagus is associated with him throughout, and the first part of their conversation ends strangely with Philip's reading the word "dumping" in Eldering-Ghyser's eyes:

\[
\text{On prisčuril i potom vdrug vytarasičil glaza. V nix mercali kakie-to ledjanye znaki. D-e-m,-pročel Filipp v pravom glazu, - p-i-n-g, - uvidel on v levom. Demping!}^46
\]

Eldering-Ghyser's ruthlessness in business is presented in the episode at Vlissingen in which he discusses company policy with an administrative assistant.\(^47\) In order to induce a competitor, Ost-Benzin, to amalgamate with Shell, Shell is selling substantial holdings of Ost-Benzin stock on the market in order to drive down the share value.\(^48\) Despite his hypocritical assertions to the contrary, Eldering-Ghyser's in retaliation against the Soviet government for its nationalization of the Russian oilfields. The "United Front" soon broke up and Royal Dutch itself began to buy Soviet oil. (See Nubar Gulbenkian, Pantaraxia (London, 1965), pp. 102-103).

\(^46\) p. 68. Italics in original.

\(^47\) pp. 85-95.

\(^48\) Eldering-Ghyser cannot, of course, pursue this policy with the van Rossums' firm since the latter is a private partnership.
policy is clearly to buy up competitors and regulate the market with the aim of reducing oil output and forcing up the price. He claims that Shell is buying up Soviet oil through intermediaries - "stolen" oil - not in order to profit from trade with the Soviet Union, but in order to benefit Ost-Benzin by removing additional supplies from the market. At a time when Soviet nationalization without compensation of Western-owned companies was still a live issue, Eldering-Ghyser's assistant formulates the thesis that by means of its purchases of Soviet oil Shell is acting as the sole protector of the interests of the expropriated shareholders. At this Eldering-Ghyser laughs with immense selfsatisfaction, since he himself is the owner of two-thirds of the almost valueless oil shares.

Finally Eldering-Ghyser gives orders that none of the van Rossums' ships should be chartered, both since the van Rossums do not hold Shell stock and because they propose to use Soviet timber for Shell's new warehouses, despite Shell's official policy of combating Soviet trade.

Apart from the oil king's ruthlessness and hypocrisy, additional negative elements in his portrayal are contributed by his physical interest in the young secretary and his inhuman firing of the driver of a Shell truck which had necessitated his stay in Vlissingen by throwing mud in his eye. The ironic treatment of Eldering-Ghyser's repeated attempts to recollect the significance of the truck's registration number, which constantly recurs to him, forms a successful leitmotiv in this episode. In general, however, the grotesque and hyperbolic elements in the portrayal of Eldering-Ghyser make it impossible for the reader
to accept him as a worthy ideological opponent of Philip van Rossum. Moreover, although the business dialogue is normally convincing, Fedin makes Eldering-Ghyser spell out his proposals to his assistant in a bald manner which, although perhaps necessary for the contemporary Soviet reader, reduces the credibility of the episode for Western readers: thus, referring to the sales of Ost-Benzin's stock, Eldering-Ghyser tells his assistant:

Nado dejstvovat' oživlennej. Ne tot temp. . . . Najti vozmožnost' priobretat' Ost-Benzin pomimo birži i energično likvidirovat' na biržë. No eto ne dolžno nosit' xaraktera afery, bože izbavi!49

Nevertheless, Fedin is clearly successful in bringing home to his readers the contemporary economic themes of the growing monopolistic control of Western economies and the problem of overproduction, one of the vital economic questions of the depression years.

Although Fedin can be acquitted of a high degree of "plakatnost" in his presentation of Holland,50 the same cannot be claimed of the treatment of Germany. A particularly tendentious impression is created by the depiction of the unemployed boilerman, Rudolf Quast, who steals food from a young couple in the knowledge that he will lose the far more valuable tip he would otherwise have received, and finally kills himself.51

49 p. 88.

50 Despite such minor episodes, apart from those discussed, as that in which the sailor Bryver spends part of the fare money given him by Philip van Rossum on an eraser in order to mend his shoe (p. 58).

51 In a deliberate evocation of the title of Heinrich Mann's novel Der Untertan (1918), the second chapter on Quast (Chapter XIII) is entitled "Poddannyj."
Despite the generally successful presentation of Quast's death, which results more from Quast's despairing inertia than a conscious decision to commit suicide, Quast lacks all the human characteristics of Fedin's proletarian Germans in Goroda i gody and creates the impression of an abstract illustration of the theme of the appalling suffering of unemployment.\(^5^2\) Soviet critics objected to the facelessness of the workers who participate in the political demonstration at Görlitz: it is precisely the grey characterlessness of the men on which Fedin concentrates attention:

V ýtót moment na pustynnoj ulici pojavilas' tolpá.... Po četýre v rjad vystupali mračno solidnye, bezmolvnye ljudi. Sxodstvo meždu nimi bylo nesobyknoveno, kak budto žel odin čelovek, razmnožennyj na sotnju. Čelovek byl odet v ponošennýj kostjum, na meste galstuka u nego visel grzaznyj platok, iz-pod šljapy torčali davno ne striženný pučki volos, lico byl o mramorno-sero. Sotni drugix ljudej, vystupavšix s nim rjadom i pozadí nego, povtorjali ego kostjum, ego platok, ego mramorno-seroe lico, slovno otrazienie v zerkale .... Tolpa načala skučivat'sja. Kak semena, sžimaemye v gorst', - smeščalis' i zastupali druga ljudi.\(^5^3\)

By virtue of one of the constructional coincidences of the novel, Philip's sister Maria is married to Krieg, the managing director

---

\(^5^2\) In an interesting episode Quast acts as a "living example" of the plight of the unemployed at a meeting which is raided by the S.A. (pp. 110-112).

of the textile machinery company MBV in Görlitz. Philip van Rossum's visit to his sister in Saxony enables him to be present at the Kriegs' party described in Chapters XXII and XXIII, "Opisanie obščestva" and "Doktriny sovremennosti", two of the most important "ideological" chapters in the novel. These chapters are reminiscent of the Dostoevskian atmosphere of many episodes in Brat'ja in consequence of the highly emotional atmosphere and the extravagance of manner of several of the participants. Chapter XXIII ends with Ensait's letting a Great Dane loose upon the company, followed by Beckmann's haemorrhage, described in considerable physical detail. In this section of the novel the pro-Soviet Swiss engineer Casty and the "moderate" Philip van Rossum are confronted by the Nazi sympathizers Müse and Beckmann.

Although the argument revolves around the advisability of trading with the Soviet Union in view of the great advantage which the latter enjoys as a result of its monopoly of foreign trade, the heated discussion gives Fedin the opportunity of developing the views of what he no doubt wished to present as a cross-section of the contemporary German bourgeoisie. Pieck represents the type of the "social-traitor" ("social-predatel'") - a former socialist, he has grown fat in the council.

54 Presumably, "Maschinenbauerverein". Fedin chooses as the background for the German section of Povieščenie Evropy the town of Görlitz in Saxony, which is only 20 miles from Zittau (the Bischofsberg of Goroda i gody).

55 pp. 190-219.

56 pp. 216-218.

57 The views of Casty and Philip van Rossum will be discussed later.
chambers of Görlitz and is now a wealthy rentier, owning one-third of the stock of MBV. Pieck believes that the West should trade with the Soviet Union, but, advocating in his own way the need for a "uniform policy" proclaimed by Eldering-Ghysel, he calls for a unified exporting organization of capitalist countries in order to counter the advantage of the Soviets' monopoly position.

Müse, on the other hand, who is clearly a Nazi sympathizer, holds that the Soviet Union is industrializing with the sole aim of destroying the West, and that consequently the West should think primarily of defence - "Vrag u vorot!" Attacking Casty for his advocacy of trade with the Soviet Union, he goes so far as to imply that Casty is a Soviet agent.

In this spectrum of views the "brownest" are those of Beckmann, a virulent Nazi whose deformity and sickliness suggest a caricature of Josef Göbbels. Violently attacking parliamentarism and its cult of compromise, as well as "the liberal fashion for the Soviets," he proclaims the nationalistic slogan "Proč vse ěkze." On the economic front he calls for complete economic autarky and speaks of the need to restore handicraft skills.

---

58 "Nam nužen vožd!" he exclaims (p. 199).

59 P. 203.

60 Reich Propaganda Minister from 1933.

61 P. 214.
Although in these chapters Fedin displays great skill in presenting a diapason of characters and opinions within a developing discussion, as in the case of Eldering-Ghyser the "plakatnost" of the characterization of the principal negative figure again reduces the impression of reality and detracts from the effect of Beckmann's views on the reader.

III

The Soviet hero, Ivan Rogov, plays no prominent part in the ideological arguments of Book 1 of the novel. In his early thirties, Rogov is a journalist, and his presence in Western Europe at a time when very few Soviet citizens had the opportunity of travelling abroad is presumably connected with a journalistic assignment, on which the reader is, however, given no information. The fact that he is able to travel from Norway to Holland on a whim suggests that he is completely free in his movements. With the exception of his conversations with Klavdija Andreevna and the discussion in the Rijksmuseum with Philip van Rossum, Rogov contributes little to the development of the ideological confrontation between the West and the Soviet Union. He does, however, make clear his support of Soviet ideology by belligerent remarks to his host:

Philip: "Lukovki tjul'panov ponemnogu podkarmlivajut naše malen'koe korolevstvo."

---

62 Born in 1900 (p. 166).

63 p. 154.
Rogov: "Этим главным образом заняты ваши колонии, а не тюльпаны." 63

The presentation of Rogov's professional background in Book 1 of the novel is strikingly brief and vague: 64

On rabotal togda v komsomol'skoj pečati, i gde tol'ko ne vidali ego krasnoščekogo, obvetrennogo lica, ego voennoj šineli, koe-kak nakinutoj na pleči, v teplo i xolod....Revoljucija bystro privila emu svoju ščastlivu nauku - smelost', on učilsja i učil odnovremeno, peredelyvaja sebja na xodu, večno dvigajas' i nikogda ne ustavaja. On privleč k rabote neskol'kich literatorov i xudožnikov, kotorye uže načinali zasypat'oko "burźue", topivšixsja komplektami dorevoljucinnyx žurnalov. Šti starye ljudi ne tol'ko prinjalis' za delo, no daže pomolodali pod naporom neustannyx trebovanij Rogova, ego planov, predprijatij i vydumok. Sredi svoix molodyx tovariščej, ne uspev ogljanut'sja, on sdelalsja obrazcovym žurnalistom i starym rabotnikom... 65

We gain some idea of Rogov's views, however, from an "ideological" conversation which he has with Philip van Rossum during their tour of the Rijksmuseum. 66 The journalist rudely turns the conversation from El Greco to the effect of the economic crisis on European countries. Whereas Philip holds that Europe is a complex organism within which each country is capable of producing its own antidote

---

64 This aspect of Rogov's characterization was severely criticized by Soviet critics. See especially comments by E. Polonskij, "Poxiščenie Evropy," Načinam obsuždenie romana K. Fedina, "Literaturnaja gazeta," February 12, 1934, p. 2.

65 p. 166.

to poisons from outside, Rogov, referring to the universal drive for rearmament, maintains that there is no essential difference between any of the European countries, and implies that Holland, like Denmark, looks forward to another war in the expectation of enormous profits. Perhaps surprisingly at this period, this thesis of Western "militarism" is not further developed in the novel, despite the significance of the defence theme ("oboronnaja tema") in contemporary Soviet publicistics.

An interesting conversation takes place later between Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna with reference to her leaving the Soviet Union. Klavdija, refusing to accept the term "émigrée", justifies her flight with comments on the greyness and monotony of Soviet life, while Rogov counters with evocations of a bright future. It is of note that Fedin made substantial changes in this conversation for the publication of the novel in volume 3 (1953) of the six-volume collected edition published between 1952 and 1954, with the evident aim of toning down the strength of Klavdija's objections to Soviet life.

Fedin leaves unchanged Klavdija's objections to the importance of "obščestvovedenie" as a school subject:

---

67The 1960 edition of Poxithenenie Evropy is unchanged from the 1953 edition. References to the "original edition" are to the first book edition (Vol. 1, Izdatel' sto pisatelej v Leningrade, 1934: Vol. 2, Goslitizdat, 1935). The majority of Fedin's changes are stylistic and tend toward simplification. The difficulty of making changes in content is illustrated by Fedin's removal of the identification of Philip van Rossum's "kept woman" as "Madame Jeannette" (pp. 164-165), while leaving the reader to encounter unexpectedly the same Madame Jeannette in Book 2, with whom Philip plays curling in St. Moritz (p. 413).
Later, however, when Rogov thinks with indignation of the way in which she must inevitably have blackened the Soviet Union in the eyes of the Finnish authorities in order to ensure her being given the right of asylum, he images her as claiming that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1953</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... obmanon vyrvalas' iz</td>
<td>... obmanon vyrvalas' iz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ostroga, kotorym sdelalas'</td>
<td>yziliiska, kotorym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ej ee strana, i, prenebregaja</td>
<td>sdelalas' ej ee strana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mukan'jami i smert'ju,</td>
<td>i, prenebregaja opasnostjami,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dostigla shrot teriokskoj</td>
<td>dostigla shrot teriokskoj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dobrodeteli.</td>
<td>dobrodeteli.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The care taken over these omissions from a novel written originally in the 1930s, as well as the replacement of "ostrog" by a more literary synonym, in order to weaken criticism of the Soviet Union by an émigrée, illustrates Fedin's political sensitivity in the postwar period.

When Klavdija tells Rogov that she "... mozhet byt', neverno postupala, no chesto. Za chto ja budu kaznit' sebju?", in the later edition the words "no chesto" are omitted, and with them her claim to have

68 p. 168.

69 p. 171. The author's italics.

70 Soon afterward the phrase "... umoljat' besstrastnyj, no spravedlivyy zakon Teriok" is replaced simply by "... umoljat' zakon Teriok." (p. 171).
acted honourably. Klavdija goes on to attack the atmosphere of incessant toil in the Soviet Union: saying that she had always wanted lightness and gaiety and had fled from the boredom and "toska" of Soviet life, she continues:

A naša žizn' ... U nas daže otdoxnut' ne umejut. Otduh govoritsja u nas - toliko podgotovka k trudu. Ja xoču zabyt' o trude, a mne tverdjat na vse laddy: pomni, što zavtra na rabotu, pomni o gudke ili o zvonke, pomni, što ty prikovan na tačke. 71

Klavdija tells Rogov of the longing of young people for gaiety: "Ja byla očen' mołoda. Ja xotela byt' legkoj, krasočnoj. A mne vse vokrug kazalos' sutulym, odnocvetnym. My ne umeem ukrayať naše žizni, ne umeem, ne xotim."

In the original edition a vivid evocation of the fearful drabness of Soviet life in the 1930s 72 replaces the single sentence "A mne vse vokrug kazalos' sutulym, odnocvetnym."

---

71 p. 173. The middle section after "...otdoxnut' ne umejut" is omitted in the 1953 edition, and the last sentence reads "U menja toga vse vremja bylo šuvstvo, što ja prikovan k tačke."

Claiming that Rogov finds dissatisfaction a sign of "čužerodnost'," in the original version Klavdija tells him that such an attitude "... privodit k tomu, čto vse vo vsem soglasny, i ešće bol'še uveličivaet tu že pegost'." Klavdija's heartfelt words constitute a surprisingly severe indictment of the grey uniformity of life in the Soviet Union, with more than a suggestion in her final words that the conformity is conditioned not only by poverty, but also by ideological control.

Rogov blames the "colourlessness" of Soviet life on Russia's legacy of poverty, "prošloj našej ubogoj niščetv",\(^73\) and tells her "Vy dolžny znat', čto kabuki sbivajutsja ne poxodkoj, a bednost'ju. S bednost'ju že borjutsja, a ne begut ot nee." Anticipating his "feuilleton" in Book 2, he foretells a time when the Soviet way of life will change unrecognisably for the better. If Rogov's retorts are somewhat trite, Klavdija's justification of her flight and evocation of her childhood in the U.S.S.R. vividly suggest her personality, despite the perhaps unconvincing intensity of her guilt feelings at having abandoned the Soviet Union. Earlier, in one of the most successful personal episodes in the novel,\(^74\) an argument between Rogov and Klavdija over the chauffeur Willem's solidarity strike had led to Klavdija's being deeply offended by Rogov's deliberately provocative remark that she is a "foreigner, not a Russian." An interior monologue setpiece

\(^73\) This phrase is omitted in the 1953 edition.

\(^74\) pp. 147-150.
follows in which Klavdija, giving the reader additional insight into her attitudes, muses on the insignificance of men's ideological views:

... stoilo li volnovat' sebya ximerami 
čelovečeskix protivorečij? Ljudi sporjat 
iz-za slov, pustyx, kak dutye pugovicy. 
Kogda že delo doxodit do želanij, do 
instinktov, raznica vzgljadov isčezaet, 
budto dym. I toga, nепrikrytyj 
kudrjaškami i zavitkami domyslov, golyj, 
kak Adam, čelovek predstaet vo vsej 
prostote žalkoj obez'jany. Poprobuj 
skazat' éto vslux: kakoj ropot podyemtsja 
vokrug, kak primutsja vse umničat', s 
kakim xenžestvom načnut izobličat' 
otstalost', ložnost', pošlost' takogo 
vzgljada! Zrjažnye reči. Ženščinu ne 
obmanete! Kak raz ženščine xorošo izvestny 
prevraščenija mudrecov v obez'jan. Osobennó - 
krasivoj ženščine, - takoj, kak ja, Klavdija 
von Rossum - melodoj i privlekatel'noj - 
prevosxodno znakoma nikčennost' čelovečeskix 
protivorečij. Vse, i vsegda, i u vsex 
končaetsja želaniem obladat' krasotoju i 
pokloneniem pered neju.'

Klavdija's belief receives confirmation in the novel from the episodes of the urbane and cultured Philip's visit immediately after her fainting fit at the jeweller's to a woman whom he keeps in Amsterdam, and his later attempt to make love to her after offering her a diamond ring.

In the characterization of Rogov in Book 1, Rogov's romantic attachments to Helena van Rossum and then to Klavdija Andreevna play a far greater role than his ideological reactions to his environment and other individuals. Rogov experiences a longing for romantic love and

75 p. 149.

76 pp. 164-165, p. 185.
the intense consciousness of the need for a woman with whom to share his life. Associated with these feelings is a sense of alienation ("otčuž-dennost'") from the world. He is, however, capable of a sense of mystic fusion with the world in certain especially congenial environments, and at moments when he believes that he has found the life-companion ("podruga žizni") whom he constantly seeks. These moments of identification ("slitnost'") with the world are reminiscent of similar transitory sensations experienced by Andrej Starcov in Goroda i gody (the "San'šino feeling") and by Nikita Karev in Brat'ja (the "pylinka" feeling at Ural'sk).

Rogov's personality, however, is essentially different from that of Starcov and Karev in that, while with Starcov the "San'šino feeling" is associated with revolutionary élan, and with Karev the "pylinka" feeling is associated with creative success at the cost of sacrificing all else in life, in the case of Rogov the mystical sense of fusion with the world is a self-sufficient feeling of complete happiness which leads to no further desire for action. Moreover, Rogov is far more active than either Starcov or Karev, who tend to be essentially passive in their relationships, in his search for love, so that in a sense Starcov's agreement with Wahn's remark that "...samoe bol'še v tvoej žizni za éti gody - ljubov'?"77 is even more true of Rogov than of Starcov. Unlike his predecessors in Fedin's work, Rogov appears to take the lead in lovemaking,78 and his journey to Holland is motivated by the virtually

77 Goroda i gody, p. 287.
78 With Klavdija Andreevna: p. 310.
nonexistent prospect of meeting again Helena van Rossum.  

Initially, on the first occasion that he experiences it, Rogov's sense of unity with the world is associated with his intense sense of history. His visit to the Hanseatic museum at Bergen gives him a sensation of the past which is heightened by the sounds of the port: "Ganza vstala pered zažmurennymi glazami Rogova s živoju otčetlivost'ju, počti plastično." Immediately he is overcome by the sense of fusion and of happiness: "Prostranstvo, ves' mir, prinadležal emu, Rogovu, ili net, on sam prinadležal miru, byl dol'koj prostranstva, kotoroe raskryvalos' pered nim. Vdrug on počuvstvoval seba sčastlivym." Soon we find the formulation, "...edinstvo, ustanovivšesja meždu nim i vnešnim mirom." It is at this point that Rogov writes to Frans van Rossum requesting him to facilitate for him a trip to Holland. Later Fedin makes clear the full complexity of Rogov's personality in which such happiness can be experienced only in conjunction with love. Rogov's sense of historical continuity is restored by de la Porte's travel account, which

79 See p. 31.

80 p. 29. Later Rogov's sensation is directly associated with the sea and ships: "Nigde ne voznikalo s takoju ščemjaščej siloj čuvstvo prinadležnosti k miru, kak vozle korablej." (p. 381).

81 "U nego bylo takoe sostojanie, budto on vsju svoju žizn' putešestvoval. Vspominaja o Ganze, on nazyval ee goroda vmeste s abbatom de la Port "anseatičeskimi", točno obretalsja v vosemnadcatom veke. On govoril na jazyke četogo veka tak že legko, kak na jazyke svoix sovremennikov. Odnorodnaja bespredel'nost' prostranstva, okružavšegho ego, - voda, nebo, svet - byla očvidnym, slajlasčim vzor vyraženiem drugoj takoj že odnorodnoj bespredel'nosti - vremeni." (p. 98).
he reads on the way to Holland, and it becomes clear that this happiness is related to his hopes of love: "... opjat' s živoju siloj on ispytal tomitel'noe i vostoržennoe ëuvstvo brodjagi, odurmanennogo prostorom morja. I on perečityval stroki, napisannye let dvesti nazad, s takim volneniem, budto pisal sam nevedomoj korrespondentke, kotoruju večno iskal, otyskivat' kotoruju šel sejčas na korable "v obščuju stolicu vsex narodov.""

Soon afterward Rogov spells out his longing for a "podruga žizni" in the following terms: "Nužen byl kakoj-to soobščnik, razdeljajuščij každuju mysl', suščestvo, vstreči s kotorym bolezennno nedostavalo."83

This theme of Rogov's search for love is the principal theme accompanying the Soviet hero throughout the novel. With it is associated the story of a Norwegian peasant boy, who despite the threats of his master to kill him, climbs up a cliff in order to see his beloved.84 For Rogov the boy's exploit symbolizes the difficulties which he must be prepared to overcome in order to win his beloved. At the beginning of the novel Rogov is reminded of the story by the sight of the Norwegian peasant boy climbing down a precipice in order to rescue Helena van Rossum's bag,85 so that Helena becomes automatically associated with the

82 p. 98.
83 p. 100.
84 It proved impossible to establish the literary origin, if any, of this story. The theme is very similar to that of the short novel Prinsessen på Glassberget by the Norwegian writer Sigurd Hoel (1890-1964) which, however, was not published until 1939.
85 p. 16.
story. Much later, at an embarrassing moment during his heated conversation with Klavdija in the Hermitage, Rogov tells her of the story in detail, and spells out the significance which it has for him. Here Fedin employs the technique, familiar from his earlier novels, of referring at the beginning to significant experiences, the meaning of which will become clear only much later.

In the conversation at the Hermitage, one of the most important in the novel for the characterization of Rogov, he explains his need for love and its association for him with his sensation of mystic union with the world. Here also he tells Klavdija openly of the identification of Klavdija with Helena, which is one of Rogov’s most significant character leitmotivs in the novel.

On this occasion Rogov laughs off Klavdija’s remark that in Norway Helena, not she, had been his beloved. However, the leitmotiv

86 p. 422.
of the "continuity" of Helena and Klavdija recurs throughout the novel, emphasizing strongly the degree to which Rogov's desire for love is literally and intellectually conditioned. For Rogov, it becomes clear, the personality of the loved one is of minor importance: thinking bitterly of Klavdija's unwillingness to break with her life "on the other side" in order to devote herself permanently to Rogov, he muses on the meaning which love holds for him:

Éto ýlo, verojatno, ot knig, pročítannyx
v rannej junosti i, možet byt', daže v
detstve. Vse knigi - malye i velikie -
vospovali ljubov', ili esli na vospevali,
to govorili o nej každaja na svoj lad.
Ona byla glavnoj žiznennoy neobxodimost'ju
- tak polučalos' po knigam. Ni odin geroj,
izobražennyj v knigax, kazalos', ne mog by
žit' bez ljubvi. Daže bol'še: ljubov' byla
funckiej geroev ....
Potrebnost' podražat' imanno geroičeskomu,
neobyknovennoy, vyzvala želanie stat'
poxožim na knižnyx geroev. S samyx molodyx
let, ešče do revoljucionnogo perevorota, Rogov
nosil v sebe neumirajušću meštu učastovat'
v žizni dejateľno, to est' geroično. Poetomu
volej-nevolej on naselil sebja toskoj po
ljubvi. On byl ubežđen, čto nepromennno dolžen
ljubit' ....
Sobytija graždanskoj vojny zaxvatili ego. Ego
potrebnost' v geroičeskom byla udovletворена.
No vsegda i vsjdu kakaja-to dol'ka cerdca
napominala Rogovu, čto on ešče ne ispytal
polnoj mary učastiya v žizni i čto emu ešče
predstojit' byt' ščastlivym, kak byvali ščastlivy
nastojasčie, to est' knižnye geroi. On ljubil
dtu svoju ljubov'. Ženščiny, s kotormy on
vstrečal'sja, byvali tol'ko povodom, tol'kom k
rostu ego edinstvennoj, skrytoj ljubvi.
Inogda Rogov načinal žit' v vosxičennoj uverennosti,
čto so djna na den' proizojdet nakonec neizbežnaja
vstreča. No poiski okančivalis' neudačnej, pripadok
nadeždy smenial'sja bolezńju odinučestva.
Vstreča v Stal'nejme byla neobyčajno. Ona vsja
sostojala iz vnešnego, poverxnostnogo, zritel'nogo.
No vnešnee bylo nastol'ko vlekuščim, čto pokazalos'
Rogovu obitališčem vseh čudesnyh vozmožnostej, kotorye on iskal....
Be smert' on oščutil tak, kak budto ego stolknuli s vysokoj kryşi na mostovu. Klavdija nikogda ne iscelila by ego, cсли by do strannosti ne povtorjala sobou Eleny. Emu bylo legko uverit'sja v éтом, potomu što on sravnival suščestvujúšče s voobražámnym, a voobraženie pokorno žálo u nega na povodu.87

The Helena/Klavdija leitmotiv is handled with great artistic subtlety. Rogov sees Klavdija for the first time at Helena's funeral - it seems to him that it is Helena, restored to life, who is walking beside her father. With ironic effect Rogov feels sure at this moment that there had been no point in his coming to Holland.88 The identification is developed in the episode in the liqueur bar, after which they first become conscious of their love for each other. Here Klavdija herself asks Rogov whether he agrees that she looks like Helena.89

In the moving scene at the end of the chapter the theme of Rogov's search for a life-companion is combined with the ironic solution of Rogov's earlier remark that he had come to Holland in vain:

Net,Rogov ne naprasno priexal v étu stranu, v étot gorod. Tut nastupal konec ego poiskam, ili - net, on ničego ne iskal! No v étu minutu on znal, čto možno navsegda osvobodit'sja ot sostojanija, kotoroe on uprjamo ne xotel nazyvat' odinočéstvom i kotoroe ne bylo ničem inym. S uverennost'ju on gotov byl skazat', čto vedet za ruku suščestvo, nedostavavše emu vsju žizn'.90

---

87 p. 378. The author's italics.
88 p. 123.
89 p. 135.
90 p. 139.
Despite Rogov's instinctive revulsion at her being an émigrée, as he thinks of the Stalhem hotel he is led to accept her by a consciousness that fate has ordained that she replace Helena: "Bezzabotno, nepринужденно проксодит мимо Rogova Elena, i s ētoj minuty, ne priznаває sebe, on ožidaet novoj vstreči s nej. On nastigaet ee gde-to в безлюдnych лабиринтах большого города." When soon afterward their chance meeting outside a bar leads to their kiss and the open expression of their love, the theme of love is for the second time, this time directly, associated with Rogov's sensation of mystic union with the universe:

Rogov ispytyval чудесное слияние с безмолвно боль'шоjo, притаившееся жизнь', сотканной из множества частич, полного и пышного раскрывавшихся в музыке тишины ... Второй раз за все путешествие Rogov telesno oščuščal svoju prinadležnost' miru. No ēto oščuščenie sejčas bylo sil'nee, čem v Bergene: ženschina, stupavšaja noga v nogu, sguščala každое ничтоzное восприятие, pridavala emu ščastlivyyj, pugajušče novyj smysl.92

The identification of Helena and Klavdija is developed in a manner very reminiscent of the relationship between Anna and Irina for Nikita Karev in Brat'ja. Just as for the sensation of Anna's dress blowing on his knee became symbolic for Nikita of his love for Anna, so Rogov thinks of the flapping hem of Helena's dress.93 When Rogov and Klavdija make love, there is a strong suggestion that Rogov's desire for her is determined by her physical evocation of Helena:

91 p. 176.
92 pp. 188-189.
93 p. 176.
In view of the vital importance to Rogov of his search for love, one of the psychologically least convincing episodes in the novel is that in which, abandoning Klavdija, Rogov leaves the van Rossums' house after overhearing the supposed sabotage plot. Just before, it had seemed that Klavdija was about to make a final decision unambiguously to join Rogov's camp and break with her husband, but now Rogov suddenly gives up what is evidently to him the most important thing in life - "On celoval ee, i emu bylo tak, kak budto by on celuet svoju nemnogo odinokuju, no vse-taki ljubimuju žizn'...".

Despite his "searching," there is clearly a strong element of fatalism in Rogov's attitude toward love, an attitude which inevitably reminds one of the passivity of Andrej Starcov and Nikita Karev. But this strain of fatalism does not help the reader to understand why, after not flinching at distance and differences in background, intellectual interests and ideology, not to speak of the bonds of matrimony, Rogov now finds Klavdija's brother-in-law's conversation with an apparent anti-

94 p. 309. In a similar episode later, in which the image of the swaying dress again figures, Rogov is reminded of Helena as he watches Klavdija walk up the great staircase of the Hermitage. (p. 418).

95 p. 189.
Soviet agent about a plot which Rogov scarcely understands and only half believes to be an insuperable obstacle to their union, so that he abandons "...samoe miloe iz vsey sozdaniy, samuju strastnju iz vsey nadezh!"96

By the end of the novel, Rogov, re-evoking the image of the Norwegian peasant boy, appears to accept fatalistically that Klavdija had not been destined to be his love:

Na sveta suščestvujut poteri, prinosjaččie obležienie. Svoe begstvo iz doma van Rossuma Rogov vosprinimal kak postupok, otrezavšij put' nazad. Klavdija? On prekrasno videl ee čerty, po otdel'nosti perebiral ix v pamjati, medlenno i razočarovanno, kak vešči iz staroj kolekci, kogda-to naplnevšej voobraženie strast'ju.... Polski dolžny byli načat'sja snove, i Rogov gocov byl ix snova načat'. No u nego bylo uže men'se nadeždy, čto, najdja, nakonec, edinstvennyj put' čerez skaly, on, kak norvežskij batrak, vskarabkaetsja k svojej celi. 97

In the presentation of Rogov's relationship with Klavdija Andreevna attention is frequently drawn to his lameness, which forms a character leitmotiv associated with him throughout the novel. Although Rogov undergoes treatment while in Western Europe, there is no suggestion that his visit to the West on this occasion is even partially on medical grounds. Rogov's acute sufferings from his leg are clearly a factor in his need for human sympathy and attention, 98 as he himself realizes, and to this extent the theme of his quest for love is heightened.

96 p. 428.
97 p. 491.
98 pp. 167, 483.
Nevertheless, the question of the significance of Rogov's lameness adds to the ambiguousness of his characterization. Perhaps the solution is to be found in the unquestionable identification as a Civil War veteran and Bolshevik supporter which it affords to Rogov.\footnote{Replying to a critic, Fedin made it clear that Rogov is not in fact a Boĭševiko, i.e. Party member, although several Soviet critics continued to assume that he was a Boĭševik. (Fedin, "O kritike "Poxiščenija Evropy,"" Literaturnaja gazeta, March 22, 1934, p. 4).} Given this background, Rogov's inactivity and role as a mere observer appear more justified,\footnote{For a discussion of this subject, see V. Goffenšafer, "Poxiščenije Evropy," Literaturnoj Kritik, #4, 1936, pp. 104-105, and A. Starčakov, "Poxiščenije Evropy" (Kn. 1), Izvestija, August 17, 1934, p. 6.} but while the reader tends inevitably to relate his passivity to his condition, Fedin does not suggest that Rogov suffers severe debilitation except during the periods when he is actually bedridden. Rogov himself is conscious that his malady has soured his temper, which partially excuses his boorishness and bellicosity and adds plausibility to his polemical outbursts.

**IV**

In Book 2 of *Poxiščenje Evropy* Philip van Rossum remains the principal character of the novel. Whereas in Book 1 attention is concentrated on the presentation of Philip on the background of historical, bourgeois Holland, Book 2 focuses upon Philip's experiences in the Soviet Union. With the introduction of Frans van Rossum, Philip's nephew, who manages the concession, Fedin completes the presentation of the van Rossum...
family, whose differing views illustrate the variation in contemporary Western attitudes toward the Soviet Union.

However, the range of opinion and behaviour as between successive generations of the van Rossum family relates not only to socialism, but is far more broadly based. It is evident that the figures of Lodevijk, Philip and Frans represent an evolution between generations which strongly suggests the influence of Thomas Mann. The direction of evolution is from an austere, patriarchal way of life toward greater liberalism and interest in the arts. Further, Philip's normal urbane calm is contrasted to Frans' hysterical fury at Klavdija's infidelity and his final psychological disintegration. Frans also, as Klavdija points out to Rogov, possesses a lightness of temperament and natural joie-de-vivre, as well as a taste for luxury, that the stolid Philip lacks.

101 Although the age difference between Lodevijk and Philip is only ten years (p. 43), the difference in attitudes and manner as depicted by Fedin is far greater than the gap would indicate. This is emphasized by Lodevijk's death (of cancer) in Book I, while Philip celebrates the advent of his "second youth" with his sixtieth birthday at the end of the novel. Frans would seem to be about forty.

102 e.g. Mann's Buddenbrooks (1900). This thematic parallel has been pointed out by Nilsson (Nils Åke Nilsson, Sovjetrysk Litteratur, 1917-1947 (Stockholm, 1948), p. 153).

103 pp. 396-397, 473, 476-477.

104 pp. 135, 158. Significant also is Frans' horseplay with Klavdija before the illfated lunch with Rogov (pp. 387-388).

105 Note the description of Frans' house in Leningrad (pp. 467-468).
Lodevijk would much prefer that the van Rossums concentrate exclusively on the lumber business, giving up their trampship activities. "Mir stoit na lese" he observes, and rejects Eldering-Ghysen's charter proposals with the comment, "On opjat' buдет lez't so svoim mazutom ili parafinom! Do tex por, poka ja živ, firma van Rossumov budet imet' delo tol'ko s lesom!" Characteristically, Lodevijk is by far the most anti-Soviet of the van Rossums, and cannot overcome his bitterness at the Bolsheviki's expropriation of the van Rossums' prewar lumber holdings in Russia. His attitude is, however, based less on ideology than on his belief in the dishonest character of the Russians. On one occasion he amusingly, yet in a manner which is completely in character, develops Philip's view, expressed to Rogov, that essentially nothing has changed in Russia, relating it to the Soviets' repudiated debts:

Бол'шевики - это послевоенный псевдоним русских. Русские отказались платить долги, а дя того, чтобы убедить нас, что это не от нит ва зависит, они назвали бол'шевиками. Это все равно, что я, обанкротившись, назову свою фирму по-новому и буду говорить, что не платить новая фирма, а всё не ван Розсум.

On his deathbed, Lodevijk condemns the Soviet policy toward the concession as a "plot by harmful scoundrels". 109

106 pp. 42, 49.

107 See Philip's conversation with Rogov in Amsterdam. (pp. 116-117).

108 p. 47.

109 p. 222.
Philip's attitude toward the Soviet Union is complex. He prides himself on his knowledge of Russia, where he had spent fifteen years, and, despite his words to Rogov in Amsterdam, in reality recognises the changes that have taken place. Philip spells out his philosophy most clearly during the discussion at the Kriegs', when he adopts the completely pragmatic view that a business man should be concerned exclusively with the profitability of his trade, and should not be influenced by political considerations. "Inače vy iz kommersantov stanovites' gazetčikami." Philip goes on, however, to contradict his own thesis by advocating the widest possible trade between Europe and the Soviet Union on political grounds. He takes up an essentially "smenovekhovets" position, holding that trade with the West will result in Russia's return to a private enterprise system:

Rossija dolžna byť vozvráščena v sem'ju evropejskich narodov, tak kak net inogo sposoboa zastavit' ee otkazat'sja ot bezumstv i zabluždenij. V delovom obščenii s nami ona budet prinuždēna izmenit' sistemu svoej ekonomiki, pribliziv ee k našej i so vremenem vosstanoviv staryj xozjajstvennyj stroj.  

Philip, stressing that "Ja lično vsegda praktik, tol'ko praktik," claims that the West must simply accept the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system: he is opposed to any attempt to establish Western trade monopolies in order to counter the advantages of Soviet unified control - "Ja ostajus' veren svobode torgovli, svobode bor'by s ee protivorečijami."  

---

110 p. 208.  
112 p. 213.
As Tamarčenko observes, 113 Philip is clearly intended by Fedin to embody the self-confident views of 19th-Century laissez-faire capitalism. In his conversation in the Rijksmuseum with Rogov, Philip makes clear his faith in the regenerative capacity of capitalism without recourse to the abandonment of the free market economy:

Kogda v Rossiǐ govorjat o Zapade, podrazumeval' dve-tri deržavy. No Evroso - beskonečno bolee složnyj organizm. Zdes' začastujut' s bolezn'ju boresťa ne poražennyj eju organ, a drugoj, po vidu - maloznačaščij. Zatrudnienia v delovom mire Germaniǐ otrazajutsja na drugix stranax, varno. Odnako ne tol'ko v tom smysle, čto drugie strany tože ispytывают zatrudnienia, no ešče v tom, čto oni vyrabatyvajut' protivojadija, kotorye vremenno ne mogut byt' vyrabotany bol'nymi stranami. 114

To Elderig-Ghyser Philip proclaims his faith in the future of the capitalist system in even stronger terms. Philip rejects the oil magnate's proposals for capital consolidation on the grounds that their economic interests are essentially different: "Vy predlagajut' kapitaly, čtoby usilit' svoi pozicii protiv Rossii. Ja isču kapital, čtoby usilit' svoju poziciju v Rossii. U nas raznye puti." 115

Earlier, Philip, acting as a surprisingly forceful advocatus diaboli, formulates his capitalist credo in these words:


114 p. 125.

115 p. 78.
In Book 2 the principal subject line is supplied by the controversy between Philip van Rossum and his nephew Frans over the Soviet concession, which, of course, provides the motivation for Philip's visit to the Soviet Union. In addition, Philip's inspection of the concession and trip to a Soviet port enable him to experience at first hand Soviet developments during the period of the Five-Year Plans. The winding up of the concessions granted by the Soviet government to foreign operators in the years immediately following the revolution was at this period very much a live issue. It is clear to both Philip and Frans that the Soviets are pursuing a consequent policy of making the concession as unprofitable as possible for the van Rossums in order to induce them to act only as brokers, exporting semi-manufactured timber. The two van Rossums draw, however, different conclusions from this situation. Philip advocates setting up an arrangement whereby the van Rossums would be able to exploit new areas, while avoiding the term "concession" in order not to offend Soviet susceptibilities. In the meantime Philip is confident that the concession could be preserved if only Frans would make full use of

---

116 pp. 77-78.
the terms of the concession agreement, which he himself had drawn up with great care. 117

Frans, on the other hand, who has experienced on the spot the covert sabotage of the Soviet side, views the position as hopeless: he sees no alternative but to have the concession agreement annulled at the earliest possible date in order to free the van Rossums' hands for work as Soviet brokers. When Philip asks Frans, "...kak ty polagayesh', čto v dejstvitel'nosti skryvatsja za poiskami stolknovenij?," Frans replies,... v dvux slovax ... my im ne nužny," and concludes,"Poka oni ešče ne mogut vpolne obojti bez nas. Im nužny rynki, stalo byt' im nužny brokery. Ja prigotovil dannye o dejatel'nosti brokerov. My dolžny nemedlenno postavit' krest na koncessii."118

Fedin's presentation of the concession workers' trade-union's demands, which, as Philip points out, are designed to ensure their rejection, thus providing the pretext for a crippling strike with the aim of inducing the van Rossums to abandon the concession, makes a realistic impression. 119 When Philip asks whether the workers make similar demands at Soviet undertakings, a delegate replies:

117 pp. 48, 197, 357-358, 363. Philip tells Captain Baars: "Van Rossamy ne pretendujut na to, čto u nix otnjato russkoj revoljuciej. No van Rossamy ničego ne ustupjat iz togo, čto revoljucija im predostavila!" (p. 120).

118 p. 358.

119 The assumption must be that the concession agreement, freely entered into by both sides, still has some years to run. The trade-union demands the construction of 1) a "krasnyj ugolok" with an assembly hall seating 300 and ten rooms for study circle meetings, 2) a 25-unit apartment house with a "krasnyj ugolok" seating 50 and a dining room with kitchen, and 3) a nursery for 100 children. (pp. 369-370).
Unfortunately, Fedin's presentation of the question of the van Rossums' deliberate infraction of the concession agreement, i.e. failing to construct a railway line and placing lumber on the Soviet domestic market in excess of the stipulated maximum and then exporting the cash proceeds, is bald and creates an overtly tendentious impression. At this point the cultured urbanity of the Philip of Book 1, as well as his love of timber and the timber industry, appear to desert him, and he is transformed into an Eldering-Ghyser-like "predator." The author

Chamberlin writes that "The Iron Age 1929-1934 witnessed the termination of almost all the scores of concessions ... granted to foreign firms for the operation of factories, mines, farms, and timber tracts," and refers to "... sharp protests on the part of the concessionaires against chicanery and duplicity on the part of the Soviet concession authorities, who were accused of either directly breaking contracts or interpreting them arbitrarily and unfairly." Amongst the main difficulties of foreign operators, Chamberlin mentions the imposition of "... observance of labor conditions which were much better than those which prevailed in the state industries." Chamberlin also refers to the "great difficulties" (apparently not experienced by the van Rossums) of exchanging profits in roubles for foreign currency. (W. H. Chamberlin, Russia's Iron Age (Boston, 1934), pp. 223-224).

120 p. 371.

121 See p. 281.
interrupts a conversation between Philip and Frans, in which the former is about to give his nephew directions for the future management of the concession, with an authorial exposition of the van Rossums' infractions of the concession agreement. Beginning with the words, "Odnako smysl monologov byl ne tak složen," the narrator comments, "Oni [van Rossumy] xoteli, čtoby sovetskaja storona bol'še zabortilas' o suščestve dogovora. Suščestvo že ego, po ix mneniju, sostojalo v izvlečenii iz koncessii pribylej." 

Later during the decisive discussion with the young official of the Glavkontsesskom, Philip is presented as having the single feeling,

.... ja naxozujus' zdes' iz-za deneg, ja govorju, podpisyvaju kontrakty, izučaju obstanovku, provožu s vami vremja iz-za deneg. Ja dolžen izvleč' iz vašej strany kak možno bol'še deneg. Ja budu bit'sja za den'gi. Dlja étogo ja zdes'.

With regard to the question of the infraction of the provisions of the concession agreement to which so much space is devoted, the writer does not explain how an agreement according to which one party undertakes to guarantee a constant relationship between the concessionary's wagebill and the quantity of lumber which the concessionary is entitled to place on the domestic market is compatible with the same party's refusal to increase the latter quantity of lumber when wagerates rise. Yet the van Rossums' excessive sales on the domestic market under this unlikely

---

122 pp. 361-362.

123 p. 446.
agreement constitute the principal grounds for the Glavkontsesskom's annulment of the concession.\textsuperscript{124} Such lapses as these are unfortunate in a novel in which great attention is devoted to the technical aspects of the operations of the van Rossum's concession.

In other episodes van Rossum remains true to the image we gain of him in Book 1. The sections of the novel devoted to the bird-shooting expedition in the Pomor'e region and the episode of Philip's removing an ikon from a cross in the abandoned graveyard at Soroka illustrate his love of hunting and profound knowledge of Russian culture.\textsuperscript{125}

Van Rossum's curiosity about new developments in the Soviet Union results in several significant conversations with Soviet citizens.\textsuperscript{126} Of these perhaps the most realistic impression is produced by Philip's conversation with Šura on the subject of the institution of subbotniki. The degree of social pressure involved is made perfectly clear:

- Vaš subbotnik prinuditel'nyj? - sprosil van Rossum.
- Net, - otvetila Šura.
- Znaëit, vy moëëte ne xodit'?
- Ne xodit'? A ñto skaëit rebjata?
- Ja i govoðju, ñto vy ne svoej volej, a po ñüñoj idête.
- Po ñüñoj? Êto po ñ'ej ëe?

\textsuperscript{124} pp. 361-363, 443-444.

\textsuperscript{125} pp. 333-340, 313-316. The shooting episode represents a superb evocation of the nature and birdlife of the Pomor'e region.

\textsuperscript{126} The inherent likelihood of such conversations is reduced by the unwillingness of Soviet citizens at this period to have any dealings at all with foreigners. "Many Russians would as readily spend an evening with a man in an advanced state of typhus as with a foreigner." (Chamberlin, p. 168).
- Ja ne znaju - po č'ej. Esli by u vas sejčas pojavilos' želanie pojti zulja't', vy ne mogli by iz-za subbotnika.127

Šura counters by referring to unemployment in the West.

Unfortunately, other conversations in which Philip van Rossum participates lack the ring of truth. On his way to join the shooting expedition, Philip talks with Volodja Gluškov, a young lumberman "brigadir," who speaks boastingly of the new construction in the North. Volodja talks openly, but evasively, of the food shortage and the kulaks' sabotage:

- Čto privlekaet sjuda écix ljudej? - sprašival Filipp....
- Na strojkaux i zarabotok, i xleba dovol'no.
- A tam, otkuda narod edet, xleba net?
- Gde kulaki xleb prjatali da gnoili, tam ego net, - skazal on.128

Most unconvincingly for someone with his knowledge of Soviet affairs, Philip is made to answer that he has heard of the use of forced labour in the North, but not of the kulak problem. 129 Volodja says of

127 pp. 279-280.

128 p. 328.

129 In the original version, Volodja says,"Na odno uxo tugovaty, a drugoe u vas čutkoe," with a significantly different implication from the 1953 edition's "...a drugim slyšite vse, čto vam trebuetsja." For a firsthand account of the postcollectivization famine, the persecution of the kulaks and the mass use of forced labour in timber-felling and the construction of the Baltic-White Sea canal, see Chamberlin, pp. vii, 52-53, 67, 75, 80-88, 155-156, 364, 367-368.
the kulaks exiled to the North, "Sjuda pereseleno porjadočno kulakov.
Im, konečno, složa ruki sijet' ne priroditsja. No, esli oni s pol'zoj
robotajut, ix vydvigajut."130

Similarly, the accusation of "lakirovka" can be made against
Philip's conversation with Sergeič, who in Book 2 shares the role of the
principal Soviet hero with Rogov, in a train on the way to the concession.
The dialogue begins with Sergeič's bold assertion in relation to the
Soviet food shortage, "U nas net tem, kotorye my obxodim."131 In this
conversation Philip recognizes the construction élan which he sees around
him in the North, but holds that the price being paid is too high:

No, naprimer, vopros: potrebitel'skij
golod ... I potom - u vas pustye bufety!
Počemu?
- A po toj pričine, o kotoroj vy sami skazali:
perevorot.
- Značit, vaš plan nepravil'no rassčitan.
- Otkuda sie sleduet?
- Vy ved' ne mogli stroit' plan industrializacii
strany na golode naselenija.
- On postroen ne na golode. On postroen na
krajnej ekonomii vo vsem.132

Sergeič frankly admits the shortages, but objects to the hypocris-y of critics who blame the Soviet plan. The class struggle had been
far fiercer than anticipated, and agriculture had suffered enormously
from sabotage. When Philip points out that the crisis had after all
been caused by the Bolsheviks, Sergeič advances the standard argument

130 pp. 328-329.
131 p. 344.
132 p. 345.
that the end justifies the means: "Vy mobilizate protiv nas nuždu, 'golod, razruxu v otmetku za to, čto my razvivaemsja, rastem, množim, širim svoju silu."\textsuperscript{133} Later Sergeič again attacks the hypocrisy of critics who now attack the Bolsheviks for all the backwardness of Russia - "Nam vmenjajut v vinu vse samoe otstaloe"\textsuperscript{134} whereas before they had extolled the same primitiveness as the mark of Russia's natural simplicity.

In this lively dialogue between the two men Fedin somewhat redeems the elements of suppressio veri and stereotyped Soviet publicistics by skilfully adapting the language to the character and background of the participants and by breaking up the discussions with episodes involving a "besprizornik" and Philip's disgustedly breaking off to read a lumber industry newspaper. The conversation ends with Sergeič's rejection of Philip's new plan for continued cooperation with the Soviets - the supply of capital for the construction of a modern port at Soroka. Sergeič finds that the role of the U.S.S.R. as an exporter of raw lumber in return for machinery is obsolete.

At this point the important theme of Sergeič's growing significance for Philip is adumbrated: the Dutchman begins to see in the well-informed and businesslike Sergeič the archetype of the "new Soviet man."\textsuperscript{135} Philip is struck to hear that before the revolution Sergeič

\textsuperscript{133} p. 347.

\textsuperscript{134} p. 351.

\textsuperscript{135} p. 355.
had been only a moulder at a factory.

In the course of the conversation an interesting discussion takes place between Philip and Sergei\vž about the significance of machines in the modern world. Philip, holding that the West is a hundred years ahead of Russia, contends that in the West they already have too many machines. The new trend is toward smaller motors and the decentralization of machines, which will bring with it a resurgence of handicraft skills. Sergei\vž rejects this as a typical fascist thesis: 136 there can never be an excess of machines in the Soviet Union, since there the machine is the friend, not the enemy, of man. Apparently in all seriousness, Sergei\vž tells Philip that increased leisure will enable Soviet workers to go on vacation to Baden-Baden, "ili ešče kuda." 137

True to the attitudes established as typical of him in the earlier parts of the novel, Philip proclaims himself to be the complete pragmatist and "praktik," who rejects all "systems." Of Soviet construction he remarks characteristically, "Vpročem, ob oxotnike sudjat po dobyče, kotoruju on prinosit. Esli vaš opyt udastsja..." 138

---

136 A similar argument figured in the discussion at the Kriegs in Book 1.

137 P. 353. In revising this passage for the 1953 edition, Fedin deleted the association of forced leisure with the economic spectre of the 1930s, overproduction. The amusingly naive original version was: "Kogda u nas budet izbytok produkcii, my ostanovim mašiny. Èto dlya nas ne problema. Rabočie poedut v otpusk, k vam, v Baden-Baden ili ešče kuda. Pridet nužda - mašiny pojдут opjat' v xod."

If Philip remains sceptical to the end, Fedin shows us in the person of the Swiss engineer Casty an example of a Western technocrat's conversion to the Soviet cause. Casty first appears in the discussion at the Kriegs', where he advocates pragmatic views close to those of Philip van Rossum, holding that as a businessman he is not concerned with the political aspects of trade with the Soviets, but only with the prospect of Soviet orders for his factories. The similarity between Casty and the Swiss hero of Sanatorij Arktur is striking: apart from ideological parallels, they are also very similar in their bluff awkwardness. Both share peasant origins and a shambling gait. At the Kriegs' Casty relates an anecdotal experience involving the comic despair of a Moscow cabman when his horse breaks loose from its harness. For him the story is profoundly symbolic of Russia's industrialization and the transition from the horse to the motorcar. Casty realizes that for the time being the Soviet Union needs Western technology, but accepts that Western firms will be thrown out when the plan is completed. Giving the Kriegs and their guests a highly favourable resume of the Five-Year Plan, he maintains that the Bolsheviks will solve the labour problem, despite the high cost of training unskilled labour. Reflecting the contemporary Stalinist preoccupation with American technology, Casty remarks to Philip as they watch the frenzied construction

139 p. 203.
141 pp. 199-203, 431.
in Moscow: "Čerty Ameriki. Zdes' ne sobirajutsja podražat' slepo Amerikancam ili Evrope, a perenimajut samoe celesoobraznoe. Biznes soedinjajut s čem-to mestnym. V rezul'tate polučaetsja socializm."^142 Not surprisingly, Casty finally tells Philip that he is thinking of taking a job in Moscow.\footnote{143}

It is Casty who induces the van Rossums to visit the car plant, an episode which is probably the most overtly tendentious in the novel. On the way Casty relates the unlikely story of how the American specialists who had been hired to set up the plant had turned out to be complete charlatans, including in their number veterinarians and seminarists. In the end the young Soviet engineers had built the plant without any foreign help.\footnote{144} Philip has an unfortunate conversation with a foreman, in the course of which he learns that the shop engineer and the foreman had set up the conveyor belt without ever having seen one before. When Philip asks him how a worker decides where to work, the foreman replies:


\footnote{143}{p. 439.}

\footnote{144}{p. 434. In the 1953 version, an "amerikanskij stanok Bliss" becomes simply a "stanok Bliss."}
The "plakatnost" of this episode is heightened by the authorial formulation of the theme:

Similarly shrill in its presentation of the theme of "dognat' i peregnat'" is the technical setpiece on the automatic timber loading machinery at the port of Leningrad. The effect of the vivid description is vitiated by the crude spelling-out of the theme:

Again, Fedin reduces the impact of the long technical setpiece on the operation of the sawmill with its brilliant presentation of the work of Ermolaj and Senja Eršov by focusing on Philip's surprise at the workers' competence and industry.148
A further example of overt tendentiousness occurs at the end of the setpiece on the rescuing of the lighters during the storm. Philip van Rossum, who is again entrusted with the task of suggesting the ideological conclusion, compares the courageous operation to warfare and wonders why the workers saved lighters which belonged to an export trust:

Kuda spešit čto neponjatnoe plemja so svoim geroizmom, so svoimi vzryvami i s večnym kopan'em zemli, s ětoj nenasytnoj strast'ju povel'vat', bez ogljadki na svoi rubišča, bez vnimanija k poterjam, k ustalosti, k sliškom tugo zatjanutomu remnju na životе? Kuda? 149

Toward the end of the novel the conversation of the middle-aged Soviet couple at the sanatorium and the discussion which follows between Philip and Sergeič at the Baltic resort create the impression of having been included principally in order to illustrate the Soviet system of social security and free medical treatment. 150

Rogov's feuilleton, 151 a lengthy propagandistic article on the achievements of Soviet power, is not at all related to the action of the novel. As in Sergeič's train conversation with Philip, the shrill assertions of Soviet progress betray a hypersensitivity about Russia's prerevolutionary image of backwardness, which is exaggerated in order more vividly to present the contrast. Again, as in the train

149 p. 324.

150 pp. 403-406, 410.

151 pp. 397-403. The feuilleton had been published "nedavno." (p. 306).
conversation, we find a similar refutation, in this case associated with an attack on the cult of Dostoevskij, of the thesis that Russia's supposed "spirituality" is incompatible with material progress. The excessively rhetorical and declamatory style tends to overshadow the skilful use of anecdote, the ironic use of the phrase "strana velikix vozmožnostej," as well as the effective contrasting variation on the themes "čego v nej net" and "čto u nas est'?

V

Despite the element of "plakatnost'" in a number of episodes which have been discussed, in general no attempt is made to "varnish" living standards and mores in the Soviet Union. This is especially true of the section of the novel devoted to Soroka, where the primitiveness of the region and the low cultural standards of the population are made abundantly clear. Interestingly, Fedin makes use of the autobiographical material he had gathered during his stay in the Pomor'e region in order to depict the way of life of the old seacaptain Oldbeliever, Nikodim Nikodimovič. The author gives an ironical portrayal of Nikodim Nikodimovič's reading Oldbeliever hagiographical works. The old fisherwoman Anfisa Petrovna, with whom Philip stays, is also depicted vividly and with sympathy.

152 In the revised edition a section of 47 lines on Nikodim Nikodimovič's musings on the subject of the rewarding of the just and the punishment of the wicked as seen in an example from a holy book is omitted in toto. (1934 edition, pp. 126-127).

153 pp. 274-278.
When Philip visits the Soroka lumber workers' club, he is impressed by the number of ordinary workers he sees reading in the library and playing chess, but in the episode of the foreign sailors' reception and the party which follows, the author does not attempt to endow the Soroka workers with intellectuality or social grace. For the 1953 edition Fedin took pains, in view of the criticism of his portrayal of the Soviet workers, to tone down the negative elements in their depiction during this episode. Whereas in the original version the guests had been "statnee xozjaev, dorodnee, krepče" they became only "statnee xozjaev," and Sergeić, who previously disposed Philip toward him by his "životnoj ujutnost'ju oblika," lost his animal characteristics. The dancers' shouted refrains, "Est' kul'turno otdoxnut'!" and "v rabočij put'!" are omitted, so that the stovemaker Jakov no longer "šepeljava vykrikival, čto bylo moći: - Est' kul'turno otdoxnut'!" The condescension of one of the English sailors, who regrets that he had not brought a dinner jacket and put a tooth brush into his buttonhole instead of a chrysanthemum in order to perplex the "Eskimos" is reduced to regret that he could not make an impression by wearing a dinner jacket.

Fedin also revised an episode involving Philip's attempt to buy black crêpe in Soroka as a sign of mourning for his dead brother Lodevijk. Here Philip's inability to buy crêpe effectively symbolizes

154 p. 263.
156 pp. 259-261.
the novel's fundamental theme of the gulf between old bourgeois Europe and the new Soviet state. The chapter ends with Philip's relieved return to the "HELENA":

Filipp rasklanjalsja. Prjamaja ulica vela ego k pristani, otkuda on mog poexat' na rejd i stupit' na bort svoego paroxoda - malen'koj ploščadki Evropy, kačavšejsja na surovoy, xolodnoy volne.157

In the revised version the salesman's explanation that mourning has died out is shortened so as to reduce the impression of ignorance and crassness, and his final remark, "Raz čeloveka net, to čto že ostaetsja?" is omitted.158

There are further episodes in which the presentation of Soviet citizens suggests an element of authorial condescension, such as those in which Senja Eršov is pilloried by Sergeič for suggesting that a witch-doctor be called in to treat Šura and in which Senja writes a semi-literate letter to the lumber industry newspaper explaining his desire to enter the rabfak.159 Such episodes are countered by the scenes of Soviet industry and collective effort already discussed, as well as by the "ideological" conversations between Philip van Rossum and Sergeič.

157


158 Fedin also omits a description of Philip's sufferings owing to bedbugs while at Anfisa Petrovna's.

159 pp. 325-327, 479, 481-482, 490. For the 1953 edition Senja's style becomes more literary, and a prostoreşnie conversation about the shortage of paraffin between two lumber workers whose tongues have been loosened by drink is omitted.
In addition to the article advancing his views published as a chapter in Book 2 of the novel, Rogov participates in several significant conversations. After their chance meeting at the barber's, Rogov tells Klavdija enthusiastically of his recent visit to the new construction sites and his confident belief in the future. For him the Palace of Culture in Dnepropetrovsk has become a symbol of this brilliant future. Rogov introduces the theme of the face of the "new Soviet man," which is to become identified with Sergei through Philip's conception of him as his "Soviet partner," and to recur significantly at the end of the novel in connection with Philip's bitter thoughts on leaving the Soviet Union. Rogov tells Klavdija, "Ty govoiriš' - vera ... dlja menja voprosa very ili bezverija, ne znaju - s kakix por? - ne suščestvuet." 160

At this point Klavdija criticizes Rogov's article as representative of the cult of size, the worship of the "biggest and the best," which she finds endemic in Soviet life. Unquestionably, as both Simmons and Slonim point out, 161 Fedin here criticizes the arrogant grandiloquence of Soviet publicists. Klavdija protests against the Soviet "pomešatel'stvo na bol'six čisłax":

Vyrastili gde-to tam japonskiju red'ku v polpuda vesom, i rady. A čemu, sobstvenno? Čto s nej delat', s vašej red'koj? Tol'ko i slyšiš' - samoe bol'šoe, samoe dlinnoe ...

160 p. 306.

After this conversation, in which Rogov is reduced to parrying her comments by a caustic personal reference to her dependence on the van Rossums' chequebook, Rogov figures in an episode at the van Rossums' house in Leningrad. With his customary lack of civility Rogov tells his hosts when they complain laughingly that dill is unobtainable that he sees no particular shortages. Rogov then counters a discussion of shortages in the Soviet Union with a reference to unemployment and the deceptiveness of appearances in the West. There is a veiled reference to the contemporary fall in the value of the rouble on the free market and to the Torgsin shops which had been opened all over the Soviet Union:

- Ne preuveličivajte značenija nedostatkov.
- No togda čemu že ja dolžen verit'? Rublju?...
- Valjuta ploxo utešaet bezrobotnych, - tože so směškom skazal Rogov. - Posmotrite - čto sozaet rubļi! 164

Frans, it becomes clear, is greatly impressed by Soviet economic expansion, holding that one should not be deceived by newspaper stories

---

162 p. 307.

163 Rogov claims to have seen unemployed men waiting to be given soup from the leavings of hospital patients.

of breakdowns and sabotage: "... tut za pjanadcat' let sdelano to, na čto v Gollandii ušlo dvesti." 165

A significant conversation follows in which Philip develops the remarks which he had earlier made to Sergeič into an advocacy of the need for a return to nature and to manual labour. Frans then puts forward his technocratic point of view: for him the problem of modern society does not lie in technological progress outstripping man's ethical capacity, but in the lack of professional qualifications of many parliamentarians. 166 This rejection of parliamentarianism, which Fedin clearly saw as characteristic of contemporary Western rightwing trends, had figured earlier in the discussion at the Kriegs' house in Göttingen. Frans advocates a completely technocratic society, in which engineers, scientists and businessmen would take over the government of existing states. Finally he proclaims the necessity for economic planning on the Soviet model. 167 Rogov then delivers a socialist philippic to his embarrassed lunch hosts. Reintroducing the theme of the "new man," he claims that only a proletarian revolution can solve the problem of modern society:

... vy boités', čto k arximedovu ryšagu podberetsja ruka, privykšaja podčinjat' sebe sily kosmosa. Nepokolebimaja rabočaja ruka .... nikakoj plan ne pomožet, poka ne prišel čelovek s žaždoj tvorit', s

---

165 p. 391.

166 As Frans puts it expressively, "Mnogo li členov kakogo-nibud' parlamenta v sostojanii rešit' sistemi uravnenij s tremja neizvestnymi? A etim gospodam platjat' žalovan'e za to, čto oni rešajut zadaci s gorazdo bol'šim čislov neizvestnyx." (p. 392).

167 pp. 392-393.
Toward the end of the novel, it is again Rogov who in a meeting with Komsonol members at Soroka develops the fundamental theme of the relations between the West and the Soviet Union. Rogov expands the claim made in his "feuilleton" of the increasing preoccupation of the West with Soviet achievements. Rogov tells the young workers in this "propagandist's speech" that

In the original version, the significance to the West of developments in the Soviet Union is emphasized by figurative comparisons: Europe is seen as a litmus paper which reflects the effect of Soviet achievements, and the European's brain is encircled by the letters "U.S.S.R." just as a magnetic field is surrounded by iron filings.

---

168. Rogov clearly refers to Hitler in the words, "est' ljudi, gotovye tolknut' k ryvagu Arximeda sumasshed'ego, epileptika, zledeja, li's' by otstranit' pochal'še ten' neumolimoj ruki." (p. 393). In the original version there is a suggestion that Rogov is influenced in his diatribe by his desire to impress Klavdija: "Rogov vozrazhal gorjažo, kak budto ot uspexa rečej zaviselo ego ličnoe delo, možet byt' - ličnoe blagopolučie.... On pozably o zavtrake, stol mešal emu."

169. This phrase is omitted in the 1953 edition. Throughout most of the original version of this section (pp. 283-285) "Evropa" appears instead of "Zapad."

170. p. 488.
Rogov then introduces the theme of the moribundity of the West:

Zapad byl zerkalom i obraženim, sud'ej i podсудимым, Zapad byl prigovorennym, ešče ne skazavším poslečnego slova i ne potreboevším proščal'nogo bokala šampanskogo.\footnote{Surprisingly, this passage was omitted in the 1953 edition, despite Fedin's preoccupation with the doomedness of the West. See, for example, Fedin's 1951 article on Èrenburg, in which he uses the phrases "agonizrjuščij Zapad," and "ugasajuščee obščestvo." (Fedin, "Il'ja Èrenburg. Zametki o tvorčeskom puti," Literaturnaja gazeta, February 13, 1951, p. 2).}

Fedin also omitted the strong formulation, which agrees well with the title of the novel, that "Evropa vzjata v polon sovetskoy ideej, sovetskoy problemy, sovetskoy revoljucije."

Reverting to the theme of his "feuilleton," Rogov describes prerevolutionary Russia as an "Oblomovka": "Našim mirom v prošlom byla Oblomovka, kotoroj my izredka ešče ulybaemaja, kak vyživšej iz uma, no kogda-to dovol'no slavnoj babke."

Rogov attacks the West for its failure to understand that Russia's tutelage is over:

Svoju missiju učitel'stva Evropa predstavljaet sebe večnoj. Vostavšaja, neistovaja Moskovija primiritsja i opjat' vstupit na učeničeskij lenivyj put' kopirowanij.\footnote{With the omission of this passage in the revised version, Philip alone is left to express this view directly: "Gollandcy byli učiteljami russkix, tak i ostanutsja." (p. 258).}

The journalist confesses that Europe is still technologically superior, but concludes that Soviet might is a lancet which "otdeljaet klassovye otnošenija Evropy ot ee tehničeskoj kul'tury, vedja bor'bu so starym obščestvom i otvoevyvaja u nego tehniku dlja novogo."
The omission of these passages concentrates attention on the remainder of Rogov’s talk to the Komsomol members, in which he claims that now that the West had been driven by economic crisis to trade with the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union would ensure that all trade agreements were made on a basis of equality. Rogov relates his thesis to Philip van Rossum’s being driven to give up the concession agreement, which had been disadvantageous to the Soviet Union, concluding, “I tak každyj proscitaetsja, potomu čto my každomu dadim otpor, kto poprobuet rabotu s nami obernut’ k nevygode našej strane.”

Rogov also figures in a notable episode involving foreign espionage and sabotage, a theme which was virtually obligatory for Soviet novels at this period. Unfortunately, Rogov’s handling of the situation was such as to bring down upon him the condemnation of contemporary Soviet critics.

While at the van Rossums’ house, waiting for Klavdija to make a final decision to leave Frans and live with him, Rogov overhears a conversation between Philip and a mysterious man in a bright green suit, with a “Leningrad suburban accent.” The man in the green suit, who presumably represents Finnish lumber interests, proposes to Philip a long-term contract for the supply of lumber, thus enabling him to abandon the concession and break with the Soviet Union. Philip’s guest makes the transparent threat that he is in a position to sabotage the operation of the port at Soroka:

173 See, for example, V. Goffenšefer, “Pomiščenie Evropy,” Literaturnyj kritik, #4, 1936, p. 106.
In an anguished interior monologue, which Soviet critics found utterly incomprehensible, Rogov suffers agonies of conscience at eavesdropping on the conversation of others. He is reminded of an extraordinary nightmare which he had had long before, in which a surgeon had operated on his brain while it lay on a plate.

Rogov понимает, где нога его не ступит 'b' берёз Ego предупреждал старый товарищ. Rogov и сам всегда он соображает кое-что в географии. Он не такой профан в политике. Он предан своему долгу. 177

175 pp. 426-427.

176 The reference is to Rogov's visit to the offices of his old newspaper, when a former colleague had warned him, "Bros' putat'sja s inostrancami.... Tebja opjat' videli s inostrannoj madamoj." (p. 381).

177 pp. 427-428.
At this point, as we have seen, Rogov leaves the van Rossum's house, and with it Klavdija, at the cost of losing forever his personal happiness, as he realizes himself. 178

Later Rogov goes himself to Soroka in order to investigate on the spot the possibility of sabotage, telling Sergeić of his suspicions so vaguely and awkwardly that Sergeić begins to suspect Rogov himself of complicity in some shady affair. In the original version the author makes it clear that Rogov is suffering acutely from embarrassment and shame at having to confess the fact of his having eavesdropped on Philip van Rossum's conversation. 179 In the 1953 revision this interior monologue of Rogov's is omitted.

Originally, Rogov was ashamed of acting as an informer ("donosčik"):  

On govoril: - ja rešil posvijat' v četo delo, kogo ono dolžno kasat'sja. I on dumal: ja rešilsja sdelat' donos. O da, pro sebja on ne stešnjalsja vse nažvat' prjamyi imenami. 180

---

178 See p. 423.


180 He feels that only if the suspected saboteurs were convicted would his act lose its "privkus pošlosti, tol'ko togda ne bylo by stydno za sogljadajstvo, za ėtu vnezapnuju jurkost', za neprošenoe dobrovol'čestvo."
In the new version all that remains is Rogov's passionate desire that his suppositions prove to be justified and the van Rossums and "green suit" be exposed. Fedin clearly convinced himself in the meantime that such anguished misgivings on the part of an "intelligent" were misplaced.

Although, not surprisingly, Sergeič blames Rogov for not identifying the "green suit" and not listening right to the end in order to find out whether van Rossum agreed or not, Rogov leaves him with an immense sensation of relief at having passed on the dreadful burden of the conversation which he had overheard.\(^\text{181}\) In the original version, after Sergeič tells him that he was right to come and that he will report the matter "gde sleduet," Rogov persuades himself that even if the whole affair were to burst like a rain bubble, there was nothing shameful or base in showing prudence, and that he had only done his duty.

Rogov suffers such anguish and hesitation because of the conversation which he overhears that, irrespective of the course which he ultimately follows, his decision to abandon Klavdija exclusively from ideological considerations fails to convince. The reader can scarcely be content with this resolution of the conflict in view of the importance which love has for Rogov and his decision only just before to attempt to force Klavdija into joining her life with his. This Rogov is inconsistent with the image we are given of the "man of action" during the Civil War period.\(^\text{182}\) Rogov's actions are also totally inconsistent with his

\(^{181}\) p. 463.

\(^{182}\) See especially pp. 379-380.
cult of the heroic and the suggestion that for him no prize is worthwhile if the contest does not involve great difficulty and sacrifice.

The reader is inclined to suspect that Rogov begins to find that he can no longer cope with the problems which arise from his relationship with Klavdija. However, Fedin does not offer us this interpretation in his presentation of Rogov, and the contradictions in his behaviour make him unconvincing as well as unattractive as a personality. Rogov's constant rudeness to his hosts, the van Rossums, and his lack of chivalry toward Klavdija consort ill with his cultural interests and highly literary sense of history. Rogov's making love to Klavdija in her husband's house after a lunch at which he has insulted her husband - his host - and disrupted the conversation by propagandistic speechifying is more boorish than brave.

Soviet critics attacked Rogov for his paleness and inactivity, while not perceiving the fundamental contradictions in Fedin's presentation of his character. At no time does the writer succeed in tying together all the various strands in his personality, which could be complex, but manages only to be disparate. Rogov the lover, Rogov the mystic, Rogov the brilliant journalist and Civil War activist, Rogov the polemical conversationalist - Rogov is all these at different times, but the various episodes never fuse to form a convincing all-round image of the man.

VI

In Book 2, as in Book 1, Philip van Rossum continues to dominate the action. The broad background portrayal given to the van Rossum
family in Book 1 and Philip's deep culture would tend in any case to make him a more interesting character than the Soviet citizens with whom he comes into contact. The deficiencies, however, in the characterization of Rogov and the low cultural level of the majority of Soviet citizens depicted, as well as the apparent authorial condescension discernible in several episodes, necessarily focus attention on Philip van Rossum. His experiences in the Soviet Union and his reflections on his new environment, while basic to Fedin's method of presentation of the Soviet Union in conflict with the West, inevitably overshadow the characterization of the Soviet citizens.

Further, the patent tendentiousness resulting from the "plakatnost" of a number of episodes in which Philip experiences aspects of Soviet life and construction reduces the effectiveness of the novel's fundamental theme - the superiority of the Soviet Union in the "struggle of the two worlds." 183 Philip's final admission of defeat is stated rather than artistically demonstrated. The psychological disintegration and death of Frans van Rossum, who had apparently come to adopt a pro-Soviet position, is seen more as a consequence of the collapse of his private life than the downfall of the capitalist system.

Writing in the Literaturnaja gazeta soon after the publication of the novel, Fedin recognised the "structural error" which he had made in the novel. He maintained that the principal task of Soviet literature was the creation of a "Soviet hero," but this created great problems for a

183 Fedin, "Dva vida oružija," Literaturnaja gazeta, February 29, 1936, p. 3.
writer, since whereas in the West one found complete characters already formed, in the Soviet Union the "new man" was still in the process of evolution. He had not yet been able to find a single Soviet "counter-weight" for the complex Philip van Rossum.

...Ja ne mog najti real'nyx, "delovyx" obstojatel'jtv, v kotoryx kapitalist mog by stalkivat'sja s ekvivalentnym obrazom iz sovetskogo mira. A nezhu tem roman postroen imenno na materiale tak nazyvaemoj "celovoj" obstanovki. Ja doljen byl raschlenit', govorja ochen' grubo, "sovetskiy protivoves" na Rogova - celeveka dovoilo izyskannogo - i kommunista Sergei'a - celeveka volevyx i prozrazchxx nrawstvennychx kacestv, Cto poluchilos'? Evropa vedet v romanе razgovor glavnym obrazom jazykом odnogo geroja, Sovetskaja xe stranа - jazykом dvux. Ja nadejalsja, cto tysjači obstojatel'jtv rabotajušxix v našem gosudarstve protiv Filippa, vpolne zamenjat geroja, no ja vižu cto čto - konstruktivnaja ošibka, vytekažuščaja iz zamysla. 184

In the absence of a convincing Soviet hero, the confrontation between the new, revolutionary Soviet system and the decaying Western capitalist system inevitably loses much of its effectiveness. For the G.D.R. weekly Sonntag Fedin explained in 1958 what he had meant by the title Poxiščenie Evropy. He had had in mind, he said, not so much "Raub" ("robbery") as "Entführung" ("abduction"): his intention had been to demonstrate that the Soviet Union showed the only way for man to build a new, just life. When this goal had been achieved and Europe had been

---

outstripped, it would then be possible to speak of the Soviet Union’s "abducting" Europe. 185

Earlier he had replied to a question about the title by claiming that whereas all Russian history had been an imitation of Europe, now the Soviet Union would take the technology needed from Europe in order to build a new world. "Это уже не подражание Европе, а похищение её." 186

Unfortunately, Fedin chose to remove for the revised edition of the novel passages in which he appeared to formulate with particular clarity his views on the opposition between Old Europe and New Russia. In his presentation of the Soviet Union we find an alternation between episodes in which the writer gives us an unvarnished impression of contemporary conditions and others in which the achievements of Soviet construction are presented with an uncomfortable degree of "plakatnost'." It is difficult to agree with Fedin's claim that "у меня нет лжи, нет художественности, нет угодливости, лакировки и сладковости." 187 We find the ideological conclusions drawn for us even in such artistically successful episodes as the rescue of the lighters at Soroka, which is, as the 1965 official Istorija russkogo sovetskogo romana points out, one of several such scenes of catastrophe and natural disaster in Soviet novels of the


Ironically, the most memorable episodes in the novel are the descriptive setpieces in Book 1 devoted to Norway and Holland. In scenes such as the fishmarket at Bergen and the canal tour through the Amsterdam slums, Fedin displays a mastery of description rarely displayed in his earlier novels, where the pervasive authorial element and extreme imagery tend to concentrate attention on device rather than on plasticity. Occasionally, however, as in the setpiece devoted to the "Darwinian" Stock Exchange at Rotterdam, as well as in the presentation of the balalajka orchestra at Soroka in Book 2, Fedin reverts to his earlier manner. The brilliantly successful evocation of Dutch and Norwegian scenes in Book 1 tends to outweigh the unfavourable impression produced by the crudely handled discussion at the Kriegs' and by overtly tendentious episodes such as those involving Quast and Bryver.

In Book 2 some of the most successful episodes are the technical setpieces devoted to the operation of the lumber industry. Fedin's careful study of the industry is evident in his presentation of the saw-mill and of lumber handling at the port of Soroka, where he is

---

188 Istorija russkogo sovetskogo romana, ed. V. A. Kovalev et al. (Moscow, 1965), vol. 1, p. 438. In addition to the bridge disaster in M. Šaginjan's Gidrocentral', the editors might also have mentioned the flooding of the construction site at the end of Leonov's Sot'.

189 pp. 241, 250-252.

190 Technical terminology used in the lumber industry is employed extensively. A few of many examples are: "solomon," naval'ščik," "passy," "dil's," "kondak," "brevnovolok," "pilostav," "zarotčik," "zapan'," "zabolon'."
successful in subordinating technical detail to human interest. The contrast between the sections devoted to the operation of the lumber industry and to the vivid portrayal of life in the Soviet North and the episodes set in Moscow and Leningrad with their "ideological" dialogue creates an impression of artistic unevenness.

In Poxiščenje Evropy Fedin adopts a completely new approach to the problem of structure. Whereas in his earlier novels the writer had combined intricate interweaving of subject lines with chronological transposition in order to achieve suspense and "sjužetnost'" in Poxiščenje Evropy he almost totally abandons any attempt to unify the novel by means of subject lines in favour of the accumulation of individual episodes. In Book 1 the subject line formed by the development of the romance between Rogov and Klavdija tends to give unity to the action, but in Book 2 the controversy over the concession and the romantic intrigue involving the "square" of Rogov, Frans van Rossum, Philip van Rossum and Klavdija are overshadowed by the episodic treatment of various aspects of Soviet life. Fedin stated that the absence of what he terms "edinstvo skvoznogo dejstvija" reflected his adoption of new artistic principles. There was a need, he claimed, to convince readers that they must abandon the idea of the "zastavšaja forma tradicionnogo romana":

Ja otkazyvajus' ot staromodnogo kinematografa, ot begotni i suety geroev, ot preobladaniya sjužeta nad obrazom. Ja isču idejnogo i obraznogo edinstva romana.191

191 Fedin, "Moja rabota nad romanom Poxiščenje Evropy. (Beseda s Konst. Fedinym)," Pravda, November 14, 1934, p. 4. Fedin asserts that the recent development of the novel in the West and in America as well as some Soviet novels (unnamed) demonstrated that "skvoznoe
Unfortunately, the lack of a strong subject line in Book 2 in conjunction with Philip van Rossum's role of "observer" and the deficiencies in the characterization of Rogov result in the book's acquiring a decidedly static atmosphere which is completely at variance with the author's expressed intention of writing a "political novel" in which the "pictures of the contemporary West" would be opposed to an image of the dynamism and dizzy movement of the Soviet Union. Fedin wrote of the contrast which he aimed to create between Book 1 and Book 2:

Fedin did not succeed in this attempt, and Book 1 is unquestionably artistically superior to Book 2. The author, as Soviet critics pointed out, seemed more at home in Old Europe than in the Soviet Union of the Second Five-Year Plan. The problem of conveying an ideological theme in artistic images, which Fedin saw as vital for Soviet literature, had not yet been solved.

dejstvie" was not necessary. In another interview given at about the same time Fedin finds strong praise for Dos Passos (E. Tank, "Konst. Fedin i "Poxiščenie Evropy,"" Literaturnyj Leningrad, #36, 1934, pagination lacking on photocopy).

Fedin, "Moja rabota nad romanom Poxiščenie Evropy, p. 4.

E. Tank, "Konst. Fedin i "Poxiščenie Evropy.""

Italics in original.
CHAPTER IV

SOVIET CRITICISM OF
POXIŠČENIE EVROPY

Immediately after the appearance of Book 1, E. Polonskij in an article in the Literaturnaja gazeta fiercely attacked the characterization of Rogov. Polonskij complains that Rogov is inactive, and that we learn too little of his views: he remains "semi-incognito." Rogov's search for love and his "Weltschmerz" make him a most unlikely Bolshevik. He is more like a Pečorin or a Childe Harold. "Itak, Evropa nepoxiščena. My ne videli Evropu glazami bol'ševika."

Polonskij admits, however, that Europe is shown very interestingly from the purely touristic point of view. In the van Rossums Fedin gives us a convincing symbol of the degradation of the most conservative and strong part of European Bürgertum. Despite the successful episode with Quast, the writer fails to show the class struggle in Europe.

The principal defect of the novel is its static quality as a result of the excessive descriptive material.¹

Ju. Dobranov praises Fedin for tackling the central theme of our time - Europe and the U.S.S.R.² He finds that the accurate picture which


Fedin gives of European exploitation shows that "v "Poxiščenii Evropy" Fedin delaet gromadnyj šag navstreču proletarskomu mirovozzreniju." Fedin has freed himself from his former "Westernism" and demonstrated that "organized soullessness" pervades contemporary bourgeois European culture. Disagreeing with D. Tamarčenko, he holds that Philip van Rossum personifies the "profound decadence" of imperialism. Dobranov praises highly the scene at the Kriegs', in which is shown "the summit of German society in the pre-Hitler period."

Rogov's similarity to Fedin's earlier heroes - Andrej Starcov and Nikita Karev - is clear, but unlike them Rogov is "inseparably fused with the revolution." Nevertheless, Rogov's "capitalist birthmark" shows that Fedin has not yet "matured to a final clear assertion of the internal rightness of the cause of the Socialist revolution." The structural vagueness of the novel and its overloadedness with description, however successful, leads to a loss of dynamism. "Najti etu dinamičnost' možet tol'ko tot, kto vnutrenne okončat'no slilsja s ideей socialističeskoy revoljucii. Konst. Fedin na puti k etomu slijaniju."

V. Ščerbina in a long review in Oktjabr4 complains of the lack of clarity in the characterization of Rogov: many of his feelings and acts are incomprehensible. Rogov is a passive contemplator who is shown only in his intuitive - emotional life, apart from his conversations with

3Tamarčenko's book is discussed later in conjunction with his 1936 article.

Philip van Rossum, and is not an active factor determining the reader's attitude to events. However, seeing in Rogov's relationship with Klavdija Andreevna Fedin's own rejection of "romantic illusionism," she claims that Fedin is abandoning his pettybourgeois romantic attitude to the proletarian revolution. With Rogov, Fedin has taken a big step forward toward the creation of a living Communist. "Novyj geroj ešče ne najden, no avtor ego iščet." She finds Philip van Rossum to be, after Quast, the most successful of Fedin's characters. He is the new type of capitalist, whose actions are characterized by complete cynicism - his attitude is "na moj vek xvatit, a tam xot' trava ne rasti." He represents the most farsighted and reasonable part of the capitalist world, yet Fedin exposes his "suščnost' kul'turnogo zamaskirovannogo xiščnika." She praises Quast, whom she finds to be a "major social artistic generalization."

Discussing Fedin's style, she concludes that the writer alternates between two manners: realistic pictures of life in the West and declarative publicistic sections which have a schematic quality. Although Fedin has abandoned the attempt to achieve "vnešnie slovesnye effekty i vyverty," the large amount of descriptive material slows up the action and leads to a loss of dynamism.

Fedin is successful in depicting the socio-economic situation in the West, but fails to show the organized struggle of the working class under Communist leadership. Nevertheless he demonstrates that capitalism is doomed: "imperialist activity is perceived as the eve of the social revolution - such is the conclusion of the novel."
The author's ideological growth is shown in his transition from secondary problems of the proletarian revolution to the treatment of the most essential problems in all their depth. The main defect of the novel is the historical abstractness in the depiction of capitalism which results from Fedin's ignoring the revolutionary movement in the West.

E. Knipovič⁵ praises Fedin's originality in adopting an extremely complicated composition, but objects strongly to the characterization of Rogov - "rodnoj brat Andreja Starcova i Nikity Kareva." Commenting on the schematism and abstractness of his social views, and the fact that his reason and feeling, conscious and subconscious mind are completely divorced from each other, the critic concludes that "this will-less romantic is totally unlike the generation created by the October revolution."

Like Polonskij, Knipovič finds that Rogov has all the typical features of an intellectual individualist of the beginning of the last century. Interestingly, Knipovič compares Klavdija Andreevna to Anna and Irina in Brat'ja, claiming that Fedin is attempting to demonstrate that such carefree women are instinctively drawn to the "socially alive and new."

Philip van Rossum is a completely anachronistic, atypical type of capitalist. On the basis of this material Fedin will never succeed in showing the nature of the conflict between capitalism and the Soviet Union. Knipovič praises the "novella-chapters" in which the contradictions of Western capitalism are shown, but finds that they are very weakly connected by the general subject line of the novel. Like other

⁵E. Knipovič, "V poiskax novyx putej," Xudožestvennaja literatura, #9, 1934, pp. 1-4.
critics, Knipović complains that the revolutionary leadership of the masses and the "revolutionizing" process is not depicted.

I. Éventov in Zalp⁶ objects to the "programmnost!" and "symmetry" of the characterization of the Western capitalists Philip van Rossum and Eldering-Ghýser. However, Fedin gives a successful picture of the collapse of Western civilization. Éventov particularly praises the sections on the police in Amsterdam, prostitution and the Rotterdam stock exchange, and considers the episode at the end of Book I involving Philip van Rossum and Bryýver to be an effective symbol of the downfall of capitalism. The main defect of the book is that the psychological conflicts are not connected with the principal ideological theme of the novel.

E. Evstafeva in Nastuplenie⁷ finds that Fedin is successful in showing the doomed world of capitalism, while portraying the capitalists as living people, not "plakaty." The novel represents a major step forward for a "poputčik" writer, although Fedin fails to show the revolutionary proletarian movement in the West.

In the Literaturnaja gazeta G. Xoxlov⁸ praised the portrayal of the van Rossums, but criticized some scenes, such as Rogov's overhearing

---


⁸G. Xoxlov, "Zvezda No. 10," Literaturnaja gazeta, November 20, 1935, p. 5. The critic G. Xoxlov had been in emigration, returning only in 1934. As an émigré, he had written for various journals, including Volja Rossi and Sovremennye Zapiski, under the pseudonym of A. Novik. He was arrested in 1937 or 1938 and perished.
the plot and Frans' beating his wife, as "elementary" and psychologically unconvincing. Rogov's "feuilleton" is a complete failure: "... Ona ploxa i kak fel'eton, i kak absoljutno lišnee i očen' vjalo publicis-
tičeskoe otstuplenie."

At a Leningrad writers' discussion E. Dobin complained that there are no Soviet heroes who can be opposed to Philip van Rossum - Fedin's Bolsheviks "meditate, but do not act." S. Marvič condemned the book as a failure. Although Fedin had succeeded in depicting capitalist reality, he had failed "catastrophically" in depicting the relations between the capitalists and the Soviet Union. At a similar discussion in Moscow K. Zelinskij stated that the title of the novel was incomprehensible. The book lacked an internal aim and unity since Fedin had been split between the desire to portray a man of the new society (Sergei1ö) and the objectivistic portrayal of the capitalist Philip van Rossum. 9

M. Serebrjanskij 10 wrote in the Literaturnaja gazeta later that Fedin's "failure" proved that some Soviet writers were unable to "think artistically" and translate living facts into the themes of literary productions.

In an editorial in Literaturnyi Leningrad 11 Fedin is praised for writing a "philosophico-political novel" in which the conflict between

9 B. Rest, "Načalo razgovora - Na sobranii pisatelej Leningrada," K. Zelinskij, (speech at Moscow writers' discussion), Literaturnaja gazeta, March 27, 1936, pp. 1 and 2.


11 "Roman K. Fedina" (Editorial), Literaturnyi Leningrad, March 14, 1936 (no pagination on photocopy).
the two systems of capitalism and socialism is resolved not by arguments and discussions, but by portraying "dynamically and in their development" characters who embody the essential features of the two systems and whose relations demonstrate the "abduction of Europe" by the Soviet Union.

A. Beskina and L. Cyrlin in an interesting article in Literaturnyj Leningrad find that Rogov is a failure. Fedin needed a "character close to him" in the novel, since the negative heroes are clever and the positive heroes are "flat", and consequently he introduced a "continuation" of his old romantic hero Andrej Starcov, and with it the theme of the relationship of the intelligentsia to the revolution. "V romane u Rogova - rol' rezonera, on ponimaet uže mnogoe iz togo, čto ne bylo jasno staromu poputničeskomu geroju, i on spešit vyskazat' čto. Odnako ponimaet on vse-taki malo." Rogov, unfortunately, has a dual nature, since he is both a "rezoner" and a dreamer who acts stupidly - for example, with regard to the sabotage plot. Owing to Rogov the novel has an irritating double theme: "Dve neravnye temy - bor'ba dvux social'nyx mirov i otnošenie intelligencii k revoljucii dany v romane na ravnyh osnovanijax."

Beskina, however, strongly praises Fedin's characterization of Philip van Rossum. The author shows how this atypical capitalist of the "old formation" is driven to play the role of a bourgeois-speculator by

---

general capitalist trends, and the way in which various layers of the bourgeoisie are inevitably turning toward fascism.

Unfortunately, the people of the new world are "far greyer, flatter and less interesting than the people of the old world." Quast and Willem are just "conventional signs" for unemployment and the growth of the working movement. Discussing Fedin's style at length, Beskina praises such chapters in Book 1 as "Amsterdam noč'ju", but considers that Book 2 is characterized by "limpness, inaccuracy, and conventional generalization of depiction." Referring to the chapter "Birža" she remarks, "Here the metaphor has eaten up life .... Fedin sometimes substitutes conventional aesthetic metaphorization for the live flesh of reality" because of his desire to convey the abstract significance of an object.

Owing to the absence of plot ("sjužet") the novel's construction is amorphous and it lacks "active material." "The theme of the collision of the two worlds is developed on the completely inadequate material of historical reminiscences and tourist impressions."

Fedin's attempt to depict Soviet reality is a failure. The result of the author's "generalized illustrations" is that "Na vse postavlennye voprosy otvety zaranee dany - rezul'tat i dlja čitatelja i dlja pisatelja neprijatnyj." Fedin has a condescending attitude toward the Soviet heroes, combined with a "semi-narodnik moralism" in his treatment of their everyday heroism. Since Fedin was more successful in depicting the capitalists than the Soviet people, the West is portrayed better than the U.S.S.R. "Ogromnyj masštab temy prosto ne sovpadaet s masštabom položitel'nyx obrazov, i otsjuda, konečno, samaja ser'eznaja neudača romana."
V. Goffenšefer finds that Fedin failed completely in his attempt to tackle the theme of the "collision of the two worlds." Not only is Philip van Rossum not a "typical representative of contemporary Europe becoming fascist," but there is no representative of the revolutionary struggle in the West. Rogov ought to be the ideological representative of the Soviet world, but after a long period of doubt as to what his aim in life is, we find that it is love. But Rogov fails even in his attempt to save the "lost sheep" Klavdija: "Tak nelepo i prozaičeski končilsja prekrasnyj mif o poxiščenii Evropy."

Rogov does nothing, and reminds one of the heroes of the old gentry novels. In the West Rogov had no-one to whom to express Soviet ideas, except the limited Klavdija, and to her "... Rogov proiznosit takie banal'nye tirady, vydvigает takie ubogie argumenty, чto v глubine dušy nacinaeš' zalet' ego sobesednicu." Rogov's feuilleton and Soroka speech consist of hackneyed generalizations. The reader's trust in Rogov is completely destroyed by the sabotage episode. Such a "razmaznja" and "sljakot'", who is very reminiscent of Andrej Starcov, has no right to be a Soviet hero.

Fedin is unable to portray non-intellectuals. The Soviet citizens in Book 2 are only "imena i sxemy": of Sergeič one remembers only his "kazennye reči" and his omniscient eyes and the remainder are, in Uspenskij's phrase, just "splošnaja vobla." Like Beskina, Goffenšefer is struck by the contrast between the cultured and sensitive Philip and

the "pitiful and primitive" representatives of Soviet youth. Objecting especially to the episode in which Philip attempts to buy crêpe, the critic writes, "Stoit liš' avtoru kosnut'sja konkretnogo obraza živogo sovetskogo čeloveka - kak ironija bezuderžno razlivаетsja v romane."

The author looks down on the new Soviet heroes and "claps them on the back with a friendly grin." It is not the Rogovs, however, who will "abduct Europe" but the "powerful collective force concretely personified by the Sergeišes and the Senjas." Goffenšefer concludes, "pisatel' nažoditsja na bolee nizkom urovne, čem tema, kotoruju on vzjal, i novye ljudi, o kotoryx on pišet. Ėto prixoditsja skazat' Fedinu so vsej prjamotoj."

V. Kirpotin, speaking to a Leningrad writers' meeting in April 1936, discussed the "structure of imagery" required for Soviet literature. The personal and individual must be portrayed within the framework of the social whole without the "individualistic" treatment of characters typical of the old realism. However, the struggle against petty-bourgeois intellectual individualism ("individualizm") does not mean that individuality ("indvidual'nost'") will be crushed.

Poxiscenie Evropy demonstrates that the author in attempting to portray directly contemporary reality is moving in the right direction toward the "organic combination of personal events and feelings with social events, with the significance of historical events." The defects of the novel arise from the use of an old subject ("sjužet") to

14 V. Kirpotin, "Literatura i narod," Literaturnaja gazeta, April 10, 1936, pp. 4-5.
portray this new reality, a subject which results in the characters being treated not "individually" but "individualistically." Presumably Kirpotin has in mind the role played in the novel by Rogov's romantic attachment to Klavdija.

A. Starčakov, writing on Book 1, explains Rogov's lameness as the justification of his inactivity and inertia. Rogov has the sole function of connecting the "number of excellently worked novellas, miniatures" of which the novel consists. Perhaps it would have been better, the critic considers, for Fedin to have published the novellas as a series, without attempting to unify them into a novel, for which unity and "skvoznoe dejstvie" is required.

Although Philip van Rossum is convincingly portrayed without simplication and "does everything that a bourgeois is supposed to do in a Soviet novel," Rogov is not opposed to anyone, and consequently there is no antithesis and no dramatization of the conflict between the capitalist and Soviet systems.

After the appearance of Book 2, A. Starčakov together with G. Mišulovin contributed their final impressions to Izvestija. They assert of a Leningrad writers' meeting that all who spoke agreed (if one ignored the "verbal patterns", which can be compared to a "violinist's rosin") that Fedin had succeeded in depicting the Westerners but failed with the Soviet characters. Sergeij and Rogov are like ghosts: "Net slov, sovetskie ljudi v romane i v samom dele vygljadjat pljugavo."

---

15 A. Starčakov, "Poxiščenje Evropy (Kn. 1)," Izvestija, August 17, 1934, p. 6.

16 A. Starčakov, G. Mišulovin, "Bud'te znakomy!," Izvestija, May 6, 1936, p. 3.
The critics agree entirely with Fedin's confession in his article *Avtor i tema* (that he had been unable to find a "Soviet counterweight" to Philip van Rossum). The failure of the novel is due to the author's not knowing the "professional environment"("delovaja obstanovka") in which the collision of the two worlds took place, and to Fedin's not finding a Soviet hero who would be Philip's equal in the "richness of his internal world." Starčakov and Mišulovin recommend a real-life person - the secretary of the Party Committee at the Kirov plant - to Fedin as a possible hero.

P. Gol'd'in, writing in *Pravda*, complained that the novel left the reader indifferent. Owing to its lack of active heroes and interesting action, the novel reads like a book of sketches ("očerki"), excellent in isolation, about capitalist Europe. The main characters are pale and diffused and Rogov seems to be included only in order to function as the eyes with which a Soviet person sees Europe. The only successful character is Philip van Rossum.

Fedin fails to show the growth of class consciousness or the role of the party amongst the foreign proletariat.

In a major article in *Novyj mir*, A. Fon' o joined the attack on Rogov. Wondering how the journalist could remain a "passive contemplator" during the Five-Year Plan, the critic terms Rogov a "dying type of intellectual," unrepresentative of the Soviet world, as is shown by his

---


bourgeois prejudices over eavesdropping on the sabotage plot and the
wrong idea of social morals he displays in his relationship with Klavdija.

Philip van Rossum is not a typical capitalist, and an "agrarian"
lone capitalist of this type will have no chance of winning in the
struggle against finance capital, represented by Eldering-Ghysler. Fedin
does not show Philip to be defeated at the end of the novel: he merely
retreats "unconquerable" to new positions, and his final metamorphosis
into an advocate of war against the Soviet Union is completely uncon-
vincing.

Fon' o praises the excellent descriptions of nature in Book 1 and
of Soroka and the natural riches of the North, "the best part of the
book," as well as the "subbotnik" during which Šura is injured, which
demonstrates the new collective feelings of Soviet people.

However, Fedin fails to show the character of the new Soviet man.
The author knows the internal world of the van Rossums, Rogov and
Klavdija, but not that of Sergeič, Šura and other Communists and
Komsomol members. Of Sergeič, Fon' o writes: "Očen' mnogo v nem ot toj
sxemy, kotoraja Živogo Sergeeva v konečnom itoge prevraščaet v bezžiz-
nennuju formulu, iz real'nogo suščestva v lubočnuju kartinu, prijatnuju,
vyrisolavnuju neploxo, no vse-taki kartinu."

The failure of Philip's Soviet "antipodes", who are not shown to
be superior to Philip, constitutes the weakest side of the novel. Fedin
does not know the "new men" and Soviet reality well enough to create the
image of a business-like ("delovoj") representative of the new socialist
society. Fon' o concludes that in order to achieve this and turn failure
into success Fedin needs to "filosofski osmyslit' osnovnye javlenija kak mira socialističeskogo, tak i mira kapitalističeskogo."

M. Junović in Krasnaja nov'\(^{19}\) describes Rogov as an abstract "raisonneur, an aesthete and contemplator." We lose belief in his biography after reading of his moral scruples on overhearing the "plot" conversation, and his journey to Soroka is an unbelievable "kustarnoe rassledovanie." The "naivnyj lepet" of his feuilleton simply shows his low political level. He fails to see the detestability of his relationship with Klavdija. The author does not expose the aestheticism which Rogov displays in his attitude to the world and human relationships since he himself is not free from aestheticism.

Junović praises the characterization of Philip, but finds that Fedin erred against the laws of economic development in making him the central capitalist figure. "This is one of the serious defects of the novel." Nevertheless, he successfully embodies contemporary capitalist contradictions, which are leading to monopoly and fascism. On the other hand, Lodevijk is totally anachronistic and Eldering-Ghyser is too abstract and schematic.

Junović praises Fedin for his "qualitatively new theme" of the West's sense of social anxiety and alarm, and its preoccupation with the Soviet Union. However, Fedin reduces the impact by including an excessive amount of descriptive material, however vivid and artistic. Fedin is criticized for giving an abstract picture of the Western proletariat

\(^{19}\) M. Junović, "Staraja professija," Krasnaja nov', #7, 1936, pp. 249-255.
and for not depicting the proletarian struggle. The demonstrators in Book 1 are portrayed as a "splošnjak, bezlikaja massa." The historical sections on Holland betray an "abstraktnyj istorizm."

Fedin has a wrong idea of the past of the Soviet Union, as Rogov's uncontradicted words "splošnaja kurnaja izba" and "Oblomovka" indicate. Sergeič is "dan bedno do primitivnosti": he does nothing but talk and serve as a "mouthpiece for the spirit of the time." The author's failure in portraying Soviet people, who lack the internal world of the Western characters, proves that Fedin does not know the new culture of men such as Sergeič.

Discussing the abundance of description, which slows up the action and overshadows the characters, Junovič concludes that Fedin fails with characterization and consequently has recourse to his "old profession" of achieving artistic effects by masterful external description, which disguises the abstractness of the content and the false ideas of the writer. This is not "socialist art" and it is clear that the force of literary tradition has led to a "conflict between the new content and the old form."

L. Levin in Znamja finds that although Philip is a success, reminding one of Svaaker, the novel as a whole is a failure. The idea of the novel could not be artistically expressed without showing Soviet people, in which Fedin failed completely. "... Ni odnogo iz étix ljudej poprostu ne suščestvuet v romane." Rogov is a conventional figure who

---

exists only to express the author's ideas. Levin concludes by speaking of the irritation aroused by some scenes, for instance the "almost parodistic" scene of the banquet in Soroka: "Takoe izobraženie našej molodeži sverxu vniz prosto nesterpimo."

V. Percov, writing on the "literary year" of 1936, notes that *Poxiščenie Evropy* is an example of the defeat of moralist writers who attempt to achieve their aims didactically rather than through imagery. Referring to the smoothness of the "cultured controversies" between the representatives of the two worlds, Percov writes "Kakoe už tut "poxiščenie" Evropy! Ne poxiščenie, a patriarxal'naja vydača zamuž." Fedin does not show the terrible tension of proletarian revolutionary forces in the West, and the "abduction" of Europe does not proceed from the action, but is imposed on the reader by a moralizing author.

Quoting Lermontov, Percov compares Rogov to Grušnickij, and finds that Rogov's interviews with Philip van Rossum on the subject of socialism fill the reader with embarrassment.

Fedin made an artistic error in depicting the Soviet Union through the eyes of Philip, for whom socialism is "exotica." This affected the treatment of Komsomol members as standard "bodrjaki." Percov concludes that the cause of Fedin's failure lies in the fact that "Moralizirovanie lišeno strasti, poētomu ono ne sozdaet iskusstva."

---

D. Tamarєnko in his book on Fedin, published in 1934, considers that Poxiіснєнє Evropy shows that Fedin has reached a higher stage in his ideologico-artistic development. Fedin achieved very considerable success in his attempt to portray the relationship between capitalism and the Soviet Union. The basic style of the novel is "socialist realism" in that Fedin reveals the conflict between the capitalist system with all its contradictions and the socialist system, but unfortunately a further tendency, "abstract historicism", is also strongly marked.

In order to portray the general bases of capitalism, Fedin makes use of Rogov, who in his romantic loneliness is very similar to Fedin's earlier heroes, Andrej Starcov and Nikita Karev. The author's portrayal of the capitalist system, which is largely successful, and his aim of showing the superiority of socialism over capitalism could only arise on the basis of the "final turning of the best part of the Soviet intelligentsia onto socialist positions." Fedin is very successful in showing the "incurable diseases" of capitalism, and Quast is a brilliant image of unemployment under the conditions of the capitalist crisis. The contrast between the extravagance of the rich and the deprivation of the poor is well shown, and in the sections devoted to the war Fedin shows that he has evidently overcome the petty-bourgeois pacifism typical of Goroda i gody.

Unfortunately the tendency to abstract historicism, which is the main defect of Book 1, considerably reduces the effectiveness of the

22D. Tarmarєnko, Put' k realismu, Leningrad, no date [1934].
idea of the superiority of the socialist over the capitalist system. Lodevijk is a living embodiment of the way of life of 18th Century Holland, whereas Philip represents Holland's golden age of commerce. However, the selection of such an atypical figure as Philip as the central hero means that the exposure of Philip's views on the possibility of the peaceful "regeneration" of the Soviet Union is not enough to demonstrate the superiority of socialism over capitalism: "Ideja romana gorazdo šire ego sjužetnych ramok."

Although scenes such as "Korol'" and "Amsterdam noč'ju" and "Birževoj den' v Rotterdame" deserve high praise, Fedin does not show sufficiently concretely the process of capitalist development which is resulting in the mass destruction of production, the growth of the permanent army of the unemployed and the turning of the bourgeois toward fascism. Tamarčenko praises highly the characterization of Eldering-Ghysler, a typical representative of monopoly capitalism, whom he compares to Svaaker in his combination of the features of Foma Opiskin and Quasimodo.

However, Fedin is at fault in not showing in sufficient depth the origins of German fascism, and in concentrating on the general socio-economic bases of capitalism at the expense of the insuperable contradictions between imperialist states. Fedin also fails to show the growth of the revolutionary movement amongst the proletariat in the West: the demonstration at Gòrlitz is more like a funeral procession than a revolutionary demonstration. Nevertheless, Tamarčenko concludes, despite its faults, the novel "... s bol'šoj siloj
The artistic level of such a novel depends on the degree to which the political theme is made the basis of the "sjužetnoe i kompozicionnoe postroenie" of the novel. Tamarčenko praises the subject line of the romance between Rogov and Klavdija Andreevna in which Fedin succeeds in integrating personal relationships with the basic political theme of the novel.

The main defect of the novel lies in the way in which the political theme forms only a "sjužetnoe obramlenie" for a cycle of virtually independent novellas. The result of the lack of a "skvoznoj sjužet" is a certain hypertrophy of artistic detail.

Without a major political subject line Fedin was unable to give a broad artistic embodiment to his basic theme, the struggle between the two worlds. The "abduction of Europe" is supposedly demonstrated by the exposure of Philip van Rossum's economic illusions. But Frans frees himself of his illusions even more easily, and yet Fedin destroys him at the moment when the Bolsheviks have almost succeeded in "abducting" him from capitalist Europe. The symbolic significance given to this death is consequently unjustified.

---

23 D. Tamarčenko, "O političeskom romane," Literaturnyj Leningrad, March 14, 1936 (no pagination on photocopy).
Nevertheless, Tamarčenko considers Poxiščenie Evropy to be the most important Soviet production in the political genre to appear in recent years.