The Rusalka as an Endangered Species
Modernist Aspects and Intertexts of Kvapil’s and Dvořák’s Rusalka

Geoffrey Chew

Dvořák may sometimes seem one of the most elusive composers to interpret, and it is particularly easy to forget that he was a contemporary of Debussy and Richard Strauss. A composition of his that is especially mysterious, if one considers his relationship to modernism, is one of his finest and best-known pieces, his opera Rusalka, composed in 1900 and first performed early in 1901. Traditionally it has often seemed a typical Romantic opera, in which an incompatibility between hero and heroine is dramatized by the placing of the heroine in a supernatural realm, and in which this incompatibility leads to an ending in which they are united only in death; but, as Jarmila Gabriélová has pointed out, revisionist interpretations have been current for more than twenty years now. In the present study, I am not offering a definitive solution to the problems of interpreting this work; much no doubt remains to be said. But I believe that some unexpected aspects of its richness may be illuminated if it is considered seriously as a lyrická pohádka, a ‘lyrical fairy tale’, in a specifically modern variant of that genre.

As a general point of departure, we may consider Dvořák’s general response to one of the main problems confronting Czech composers in the last decades of the 19th century: how to reconcile being a leading Czech composer with achieving modernity, in music able to hold its own on a world stage. As is very well known, modernity was an issue for Czech music already around 1870, with this issue being articulated largely through and in controversies surrounding Smetana. With the great success of his Prodaná nevěsta, first performed in 1866, Smetana had convincingly shown how ‘village comedies’ could be perceived to represent Czechness in music in reaction to a German cultural background. But Smetana’s serious operas even at that time raised more intractable questions – for serious, modern Czech music, an engagement with the supreme modernist of the day, Wagner, was inescapable. And with his Dalibor, first performed not long after, in 1868, the charge of Wagnerianism – and with it Germanism – was levelled against him. In fact Dalibor is not very Wagnerian, if one has in mind the compositional and dramaturgical principles adopted by Wagner in his mature music dramas. But

1 This article is a revised and substantially expanded version of my article ‘Fin-de-siècle’ Modernism in Dvořák’s Rusalka, published in the programme for the London performances of Rusalka conducted by Sir Charles Mackerras at the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden, in July 2003 (programme, pp. 36–40), which itself was developed from a paper given at the conference ‘The Operas of Antonín Dvořák’, at Leeds in March 2003.

2 See her recent, as yet unpublished, paper Dvořáks und Kvapils ‘Rusalka’ und das Lebensgefühl des ‘fin de siècle’, with references to several studies since the 1980s, beginning with SCHLÄDER, Jürgen: Märchenoper oder symbolistisches Musikdrama? Zum Interpretationsrahmen der Titelrolle in Dvořáks Rusalka, in: Die Musikforschung, 34/1, 1981, pp. 25–39, and referring also to the famous revisionist production of the opera by David Pountney at the English National Opera in 1983 (see further comment on this below).
the discourse both for and against Smetana in the debate accepted the Wagnerian label, as did Smetana’s friend Otakar Hostinský, whose advocacy of the composer crystallized the notion of ‘modern Czech music’ for later generations. Hostinský argued that Wagner’s principles possessed a universal inner truth, which Smetana had rightly placed at the service of Czech music, and produced a series of writings, several of which were later collected in a classic apologia for Smetana, as founder of modern Czech music, which he published in 1901.3

Though Dvořák is nowadays often alleged to be influenced by Wagner, he was never adequately discussed within this discourse of modernism at that time. The situation became worse just before the First World War, in the context of the polemics between the opposing Smetana and Dvořák camps at that time. And these polemics have cast a long shadow particularly due to the negative view of Dvořák and his music taken by Hostinský’s pupil Zdeněk Nejedlý, with his desire to exclude the composer from the canon of modern Czech music. (Within weeks of its 1901 premiere, Nejedlý had anticipated these later polemics by attacking Rusalka as insufficiently Wagnerian, insufficiently Czech, undramatic and unmodern.4) Through these polemics a picture was constructed of Dvořák, the classicizing, cosmopolitan and possibly anti-Wagnerian reactionary, against Smetana, the Romantic, nationalist and pro-Wagnerian progressive.

It has often been noticed that Rusalka itself stands somewhat apart from the majority of Czech operas of its time. It is not based on a historical or quasi-historical subject, as are numerous older Czech operas such as Smetana’s Dalibor and Libuše, nor is it in the style of newer operas drawing on the Naturalism pioneered in Czech drama in the late 1880s and 1890s by the author Gabriela Preissová, in her plays Gazdina roba and Její pastorkyňa, the latter set by Janáček only a year or two later than Rusalka. At first glance, one might assume that the expansive, lyrical style of the music in Rusalka, apparently an exact match to the lyricism of the libretto, corroborates the impression of reaction: is this, only a few years before Schoenberg’s experiments, a simple reversion to Neo-Romanticism on the part of both the librettist and the composer? I believe the truth lies elsewhere.

The librettist of Rusalka, Jaroslav Kvapil (1868–1950), was a generation younger than Dvořák, but had already by 1900 won a recognized place on the Czech literary, journalistic and theatrical scene; he has long been described as a ‘co-founder of modern Czech theatre’ (spoluvůrce moderní české divadelní kultury),5 and his output had stood in the forefront of modernism even as early as 1889, in his first published collection of poems, Padající hvězdy (‘Falling Stars’). It is not necessary to trace his career through the 1890s, except to note that his work was regularly politically engaged and that it touches on the main new trends of the time, particularly including Symbolism and Decadence. These might be
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3 HOSTINSKÝ, Otakar: Bedřich Smetana a jeho boj o moderní českou hudbu, Jan Laichter, Praha 1901.
4 NEJEDLÝ, Zdeněk: Dvořáková Rusalka, in: Rozhledy 11/8, 25. 5. 1901, p. 205. There is an extensive literature on the polemics of Nejedlý and his associates directed against Dvořák, including most recently the valuable discussion in LOCKE, Brian: Music and Ideology in Prague 1900–1938, PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 2002, especially pp. 105–114.
5 So described, even before his death, in KUNC, Jaroslav: Slovník soudobých českých spisovatelů, Orbis, Praha 1945, vol. 1, p. 446.
regarded as counter-poles to Naturalism, which in its French origins represented the application of scientific, Darwinian principles to literature, and to Realism.

Already in 1891, in a famous essay, the Austrian Hermann Bahr had proclaimed ‘the overcoming of Naturalism’ (\textit{Die Überwindung des Naturalismus}), and had called for a new, modern art for art’s sake, one ‘of the nerves’.\footnote{Reprinted in Gotthart Wunberg (ed.): \textit{Die Wiener Moderne: Literatur, Kunst und Musik zwischen 1890 und 1910}, Philipp Reclam, Stuttgart 1981, pp. 199–205.} Kvapil seems to have been responding around 1900 to an imperative of this type, which, in his case, seems to have involved retaining old themes but handling them in a very new way. This may best be illustrated by a direct comparison between \textit{Rusalka} and a slightly earlier work of his, the four-act drama \textit{Bludička} (‘Will-o’-the-Wisp’, 1896).\footnote{\textsc{Kvapil}, Jaroslav: \textit{Bludička: drama o čtyřech dějstvích}, F. Topič, Praha 1896.}

\textit{Bludička} has a modern, Decadent theme, which is handled in a partially Realist manner. Its hero, Kamil Dušek, is a thirty-two-year-old painter, living in the Malá Strana in Prague with a milliner’s assistant (\textit{módistka}), Stáza Faltysová, since his return from his student days in Paris. But he is a social climber: brutally and abruptly he drops Stáza, and starts to cultivate the world of the salons of the high bourgeoisie, persuading the rich young Helena Lindnerová to sit as his model, teaching her painting, and finally declaring his love for her. But she and her social class do not genuinely value art; the Prague salons are a platform for triviality and mediocrity, a \textit{bludička}, or will-o’-the-wisp, that diverts Dušek from his artistic vocation and eventually brings him to suicide. And in love, too, Helena is far from straightforwardly constant: she is a very emancipated modern woman, quite in favour of the same sexual licence that men enjoy (to Dušek’s astonished outrage), and she is scandalously materialist about personal relationships. As she says, ‘Our whole society is a kind of market in several different currencies’ („Celá naše společnost je takovou tržnicí o několika měnách“).\footnote{\textsc{Kvapil}: \textit{Bludička}, p. 90.} For Dušek she becomes a \textit{femme fatale}, and one of the principal themes of the play is the threat to genuine modern Czech culture, seen as very fragile when confronted by the values of the fashionable, Philistine middle class, who prefers kitsch, and for whom real modern art, Czech or foreign, is ‘too difficult and mysterious’ („příliš těžké a záhadné“).\footnote{\textsc{Kvapil}: \textit{Bludička}, p. 23.}

This \textit{fin-de-siècle} sense of Czech culture being under siege by the forces of modern society is not peculiar to \textit{Bludička} (nor indeed, as we shall see below, to Kvapil): it also underlies \textit{Rusalka}, even though we are dealing in the latter with a quite different genre, the \textit{pohádka} (fairy tale, \textit{Märchen}). Rusalka, the water-nymph, the representative of the Czech tradition, falls in love with a handsome prince, and forsakes the water for him at the price of silence. Pale and silent, she is unequal to the demands of the worldly court in which she finds herself in Act II; and under the pressures of that same court, he is unable to keep faith, and brings condemnation on her for that reason. When finally he attempts to return to her, it is too late and he too is condemned. The profoundly pessimistic denouement means that this is no pastiche of earlier models, even though Kvapil in a teasing introduction to the libretto lays stress on examples from the early nineteenth
century or earlier of the motif of the water-nymph – Friedrich de la Motte Fouqué’s *Undine*, Václav Klípera’s *Česká Meluzína* and Hans Christian Andersen’s *Little Mermaid*, among others.\(^{10}\)

It is clear that feminist interpretations are a possibility for both *Rusalka* and *Bludička* in their different ways; one such underlay the famous interpretation, perhaps one of the most powerful to date, by David Pountney for an English National Opera production in 1983, in which Rusalka, the elder sister of the forest nymphs (*lesní žínky*), is a young girl becoming aware for the first time of her sexuality. Marina Warner has taken the feminist interpretation further, while emphasizing the continuity between *Rusalka* and Andersen’s *Mermaid*, in a discussion of fairy-tale heroines who are silent in the way that Rusalka is, words being deceitful and silence faithful:

The [...] chilling message [of Hans Christian Andersen’s *The Little Mermaid*] is that cutting out your tongue is still not enough [for women at puberty]. To be saved, more is required: self-obliteration, dissolution [...] The Little Mermaid sacrifices her song to no avail – except for the story which keeps faith with her memory. Her siren song condenses all inherited belief in women’s sexual powers; the Little Mermaid surrenders them when she becomes bifurcated [when her tail turns to legs] and bleeds, as if, once the innocence of childhood has passed, that very sexuality turns against its possessor and makes the young woman herself a victim. David Pountney’s imaginative, intense production of *Rusalka* for the English National Opera [...] insisted on this underlying story with piercing contrasts of dazzling white and blood-red in the costumes and décor.\(^{11}\)

So in Pountney’s production, virginal white was used for Rusalka’s costume and blazing red for that of the foreign Princess; the contrast emphasized, for example, the tragic dynamic in such pieces as the Prince’s aria from Act II, which, though essentially a love duet, has Rusalka remaining silent (with the Prince singing for both of them), and the red Princess usurping her place at the end: form, text, costumes all combine to underline the point.

But there is more to *Rusalka* than this. In emphasizing the traditional, non-modern side of the narration, Kvakil omits the most important information: that fairy tales, having endured a cold climate through the Enlightenment right through to the period of Naturalism, had been rehabilitated for the *Fin de siècle* above all by the example of Oscar Wilde, who was very quickly translated into Czech.\(^{12}\) Wilde produced a new, modern variety of fairy tale, which, as he once wrote, represents ‘an attempt to mirror modern life in a form remote from reality – to deal with modern problems in a mode that is ideal and not imitative’.\(^{13}\) We can believe him here: he conceived of the fairy tale not as escapism (which is of
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\(^{10}\) Numerous editions, including KVAPIL, Jaroslav: *Rusalka: lyrická pohádka s hudbou Antonína Dvořáka*, Václav Tomsa, Praha 1945, with the introduction at pp. 5–6.


course the usual interpretation of *Rusalka* but as an encounter with modern problems – but one that avoids the kind of Realism on which Bludička draws. Of Wilde’s tales, the story closest to Andersen’s *Mermaid* (and to *Rusalka*) is his long narrative entitled ‘The Fisherman and his Soul’, from *A House of Pomegranates* (1891), but the modern twists to the tale are significant. Although the fisherman cannot be united with the mermaid (as in Andersen and Kvapil) as long as he has a soul and she does not, the remedy in a modern secularized world is the loss of his human soul by the fisherman, not the gain of a soul by the mermaid. But the consequences are yet more disastrous than those in Andersen’s or Kvapil’s versions: in Wilde’s tale, this process of secularization not only brings about the destruction of both the mermaid and the fisherman, but even empties the sea of its population of sea-people.

For Kvapil, it is the question of the compatibility of national culture and modern society that seems central in *Rusalka*; and this is very similar to the central issue treated in Bludička. I would suggest, in fact, that his libretto for *Rusalka* is a reflection on modernism, achieved by reworking some of the main issues in Bludička in Symbolist terms – so it is a reworking of a tale in which a pair of lovers come to ruin, with a pessimistic undercurrent about the potential for development of modern Czech culture.

Such an interpretation may also be supported by a comparison of *Rusalka* with another Czech literary intertext of this period, not itself a fairy tale, in which the Rusalka motif reappears – with yet more layers of signification concerning modernism. This too may help to bring Kvapil’s and Dvořák’s *Rusalka* tale into focus. Karel Leger’s *Český román* of 1905 is a novel in verse (*román ve verších*) in a mainly Realist style, which once again has as its principal theme the fragility of traditional values in Czech society, including political ones, when challenged by the modern world. This is done through a tale of two generations of the Závěta family. Václav, son of a peasant farmer (*rolník*), is forced to flee his home after physically attacking the local lord, who has tried to exercise his *droit de seigneur* and rape Václav’s young wife. While away, Václav earns and saves enough money to buy the local estate when it declines, and so he returns as lord himself. He gives his son, Vláďa, the education he never had himself, but Vláďa proves unequal to the political and social challenges of the modern world, such as unrest among his tenant labourers: Vláďa is astonished to find that his own Czechness counts for nothing with them when material conflicts arise. He is finally defeated, gives up and goes to live in fashionable, comfortable idleness on the French Riviera, and the estate has finally to be sold to new owners. In his story Leger gives a broad view of the national politics of the time, and includes critiques of the language question, party politics, conflicts of nationality and class, attitudes to modernization, to labour and to tradition, and of the problems raised by the stark juxtaposition of desperate poverty and affluent luxury.

The most important of the subplots, and the most relevant to the present subject, concerns Blaženka, Vláďa’s sister. She is a shy, dreamy girl, who fears,
but then falls for, the worldly, cosmopolitan, up-to-date Baron Géza, Vláďa’s brother-in-law, with tragic consequences (it is no doubt significant that Géza has a Magyar name, but his culture is German). We first meet Blaženka in a fin-de-siècle scene by a forest pool with waterlilies, in the style of the Czech secese or the Viennese Sezession, where we are introduced to the Bluebeard theme that is associated throughout with this subplot. Full of the innocent happiness suggested by her name, she converses with water-nymphs (rusalky) about freeing enchanted princesses from Bluebeard’s thrall. The theme is taken forward in a centrally important event in Chapter 5 („Podzim“, ‘Autumn’), where Géza forces her, against her will, to tell the story of Bluebeard to the assembled company; she has been uneasily casting Géza himself in this role. No sooner has she begun than he interrupts, objecting to the fact that Bluebeard is a German in her version. She starts again, but he interrupts a second time, because Bluebeard’s former wives are still alive in her version, and he will not allow that a woman should remain alive once she has lost love:

„Ne, má slečno, mrtvy měly býti, lásku ztratily a s ní své žití. Na polibky jejich dávno, žel! miláček jich krutý zapomněl. […] Řekněte, co ženě ještě zbývá, ztratila-li lásku? v láse jen celý život její obsažen!”17

(Other important contemporary versions of the Bluebeard story, Maurice Maeterlinck’s Ariane et Barbe-bleue and Béla Balázs’s Duke Bluebeard’s Castle – A Kékszakállú herceg vára, best known through Bartók’s operatic setting –, also have the former wives still alive, for various interesting purposes: there is irony in the fact that Géza is insisting on a traditional version while Blaženka is presenting a thoroughly modern one.) This interruption destroys the story, and the party breaks up almost immediately. The incident marks the beginning of a change also in Blaženka herself, as like Vláďa she is progressively weaned away from the Czechness she possesses at the outset to a new modern worldliness. (Leger cuts this worldliness down to size, representing Blaženka as over-impressed with half-witted minor aristocrats.) Géza’s remarks continue to prey on Blaženka’s mind, once she knows that she does not have his love; and after she is prompted by old Jakub, the idiot with second sight (who takes the role of the water-goblin, vodník or hastrman), she voluntarily assumes the role of Shakespeare’s Ophelia and drowns herself, because ‘they had to be dead’, and Jakub’s words echo the vodník’s refrain in Rusalka, no doubt known to Leger, „Ubohá rusalko bledá!“:

Do vody se zahleděla sině. „Ne!” tak tvrdě řekla, „klam to, klam! jenom černá propast čeká tam,

16 The name is derived from „blažený“, ‘blessed’, ‘happy’.
17 [‘No, my girl, they should have been dead: they lost love, and with it their lives. Their cruel lover, alas, had long since forgotten their kisses. […] Tell me what still remains to a woman if she has lost love? Her whole life has substance only in love!’], Légor, Karel: Český román, op. cit. p. 136.
slizký kořen vrb se v bahno víne.
A ta chladná rozvířená voda
pode břehem, pod nohou mi hlodá!
Slyš, jak zem se drolí!“ – „Zpátky, pro Boha!
Blaženko! zpět! stůjte, ubohá – !“
Ohlédu se k němu, zrak jí svítí:
„Ne, on řekl: mrtvy mají býti!“18

So Blaženka’s former insight has been replaced by the madness that is allied
to it; her words, that she no longer believes the old tales, are belied by her
actions, but she has moved from a ‘naive’ understanding of the national myths to
a ‘sentimental’ one, to use Schiller’s terminology.19 And in the process the old
tales have now become her destruction rather than her strength; Leger’s implied
point is that traditional Czech values may similarly prove unequal to the challenges
of early 20th-century society.

In this light, Rusalka, too, can be at one level an allegory of the dangerous
modern world, which must love the fragile national tradition if that is to survive,
and of the complexities of silence and utterance that are involved when the two
interact and negotiate. From this point of view it is interesting, perhaps, that
Kvapil’s elegy on the death of Dvořák in 1904 also draws on the image of water,
reversing it: he has a striking image of Czech music as a noisy, rushing flood, now
silenced as the water pours into the dark Czech earth:

V ráz ztichy tónů vítězné kaskády,
a česká země otvírá se
přívalům slavného vodopádu.20

It is not surprising that Kvapil should have thought first of asking composers
of his own generation to set his libretto: he tried Oskar Nedbal, J. B. Foerster,
Karel Kovařovic and Josef Suk before approaching Dvořák, and this may not have
been merely because he was in awe of the older master. Admittedly, none of the
composers he approached would have been likely to have produced something
along the lines of Debussy’s Pelléas et Mélisande (1893), which would arguably
have been the most appropriate model in terms of style, or even to have used the
modernist, Straussian idiom used by Vítězslav Novák in setting the Symbolist
verse of Antonín Sova (Údolí nového království, 1903). With hindsight, the only
two Czech composers of the time who might have matched the modernity of the

18 [She stared into the azure water. ‘No!’ she said bitterly, ‘it is a delusion, a delusion! Only a black
abyss is waiting there; the slimy willow-root coils into the mud, and that cold water, disturbed, eats away
under the bank, under my feet! Hear how the earth crumbles!’ – ‘Get back, for God’s sake! Blaženka!
Back! Stop, poor girl!’ She looked back at him; her eye lights up: ‘No! He said they must be dead!’],
LEGER, Karel: Český román, op. cit. p. 269.
19 The reference is to the three essays written by Friedrich Schiller in 1795 and 1796, ‘Über das Naive’,
‘Die sentimentalischen Dichter’ and ‘Beschluss der Abhandlung über naive und sentimentalische
Dichter’, which the author later combined into a single work entitled Über naive und sentimentalische
Dichtung.
20 [At a stroke the victorious cascades of notes were silenced, and the Czech earth opens to the torrents
of the glorious waterfall.] Reprinted in KVAPIL, Jaroslav: Na sklonku října: touhy, pozdravy a tryzny, Čin,
libretto were Janáček and Otakar Ostrčil, in their different ways, but neither was yet established fully as a composer.

Dvořák clearly loved the libretto, and worked quickly at setting it. The issue of his modernism has already been touched on above: and it must be conceded that *Rusalka* does little to simplify one’s task in defining it. There is, in fact, little evidence that Dvořák was alive to his libretto’s modernist aspects: he did not attempt to map the conflict between traditional Czech values and those of the modern world directly in his music, nor to match the evanescent, fluid Symbolism of the text. The musical style in this opera that most obviously constructs ‘Czechness’ – one inherited from the comic, rustic dialogue style used in some eighteenth-century pastorellas – is reserved for the comic gamekeeper and kitchen boy at the beginning of Act II, not for Rusalka. Equally, no specifically modernist style is associated with the threat hanging over the protagonists: this is projected through motives based on the conventional diminished-seventh chords found in so many nineteenth-century operas, from Weber’s *Freischütz* onwards, which are liable to intrude into every lyrical scene – even at the end of the last act. (They are used also in the scornful interjections of the Foreign Princess in Act II, a character whose function is similar to that of Baron Géza in Leger’s *Český román*.) And the ‘neutral’, lyrical style used for the Prince is essentially a development of that of Wagner’s *Lohengrin*: a chromatic, Romantic harmonic style projected mainly through a regular, balanced phrase structure (and in this, a nice touch, it owes something too to the ‘low’ style of gamekeeper and kitchen boy).

Within this taxonomy of styles, however, the music given to Rusalka herself works beautifully as a symbol of nostalgic retrospection. The homophonic first half of each of the two stanzas of her invocation of the Moon in Act I is in Dvořák’s ‘heartfelt’, ‘naive’ style, used for example in some passages in the Biblical Songs, without the slightest hint of the comic style of the low characters, which would have been quite inappropriate. Then each stanza moves into the ‘neutral’, lyrical style I have mentioned above (for example, at „Měsíčku, postůj chvíli!” in the first stanza); and each stanza ends with a hint of the threatening diminished sevenths that recur so constantly throughout the opera. Thus three of the distinct allusive styles in this work are juxtaposed at Rusalka’s first major aria; in them, the central conflict driving this drama is immediately set up in a clear but attractively understated way, and indeed in terms of a musical style that is fundamentally unified overall, whatever its internal contrasts may be.

These reflections may also be useful in interpreting the final scene of the opera, which is often, and rightly, thought ambiguous, with Rusalka and the Vodník declaring the impossibility of salvation for either Rusalka or the Prince, while the music swells to a final lyrical cadence perhaps signifying Redemption through Love as it had done in so many earlier Romantic operas. Audiences may derive consolation from this; but the diminished sevenths never disappear until the funeral march thirty bars before the end of the opera, and Redemption
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through Love, too, may be merely another old fairy tale which by now has lost its power and has become doubtful.

As a final reflection, one may perhaps consider the potential of the opera for future productions. Leger leaves his reader with the thought that the task facing the builders of Czech culture is that of Sisyphus, who in mythology was condemned eternally to roll a rock up a hill, knowing that it would always roll down again from the top. And at some level, as I have argued, *rusalky* personify this fragile Czech culture in the face of Austro-Hungarian modernism. As we have also seen, Kvapil has a similar thought, but because it is expressed in terms of a modern *pohádka*, there is no allegory, political or otherwise, providing a simple interpretation; there are multiple meanings, capable of being constructed in various ways. Pountney set the opera in a Freudian nursery, producing one compelling reading in terms of awakening sexuality; with the Czech Republic on the brink of EU membership, it might be interesting to see a production updated to the present day and reflecting on the prospects for Czech culture in the twenty-first century, especially since we can be sure that no such production will say the last word about a work so mysterious and powerful.
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