BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Jahn, Gary R. "Tolstoj and Folklore: The Case of 'Čem ljudi živy?'" Russian Language Journal XLIV, 147-149 (1990), 135-150.

The author traces "Čem ljudi živy?" to its original source, V.P. Shchegelenok, who collected and recorded folklore bearing religious themes. According to Jahn, Tolstoy's adaptation of the story was directed at capturing and retaining Scegelenok's striking turns of phrase, while maintaining the order of events was of lesser importance. Evidence of the latter can be seen in the fact that Tolstoy eschewed the original chronological narrative and replaced it with an inverted structure that was more characteristic of a riddle or mystery format. In addition, Tolstoy increased the didactic nature of the work by adding elements such as God's questions and the angel's explanation of the answers. In this sense, Tolstoy wished to bring the story into the category of literature for the common people.

As far as language is concerned, Tolstoy pruned the work of words of foreign origin, avoided the standard literary norm and placed increased emphasis on Biblical and popular expressions. In contrast to the human characters, the angel speaks in a very formal language, while the narrator shares the simple expressions of the people at first and then gravitates closer to the more complex phrases of the angel.

Despite Tolstoy's adaptations of the work, he adhered to the idea that the story represents a perfect example of true folklore since it was created for the people, derived from "artistic products of the people" and written about the people whom it was intended to enlighten.

Mandelker, Amy. "The Women with a Shadow: Fables of Demon and Psyche in *Anna Karenina*" *Novel. A Forum on Fiction* (Fall, 1990), v.24, no.1, pp. 48-68.

The author identifies in Anna Karenina a mythological sub-text: the folk legend of a man without a shadow inverted to become a woman with a shadow. While working on Anna Karenina, Tolstoy collected stories for his Azbuka and thus was lakely to have encountered Chamisso's Peter Schlemihl and Hans Christian Anderson's "The Shadow" which both provide Anna Karenina with intertextual connections. Anna's relations with Vronsky are considered as that of a man with a Shadow and the Fountain overtones of the legend are explored as teh quest for knowledge. Thus, Vronsky (the shadowy demon lover) and Anna (his helpless victim) echo Amor and Psyche, whose romance was also conducted in shadow. Anna's attempt to know love, like Psyche's kindling of light to regard Cupid, results in her doom. Tolstoy's artistic use of folklore subtexts, Mandelker argues, reflects his quest for mythopoeris.

TOLSTOY STUDIES JOURNAL

Mandelker, Amy. "A Painted Lady: Ekphrasis in Anna Karenina." Comparative Literature (Winter, 1991), v.43, no.1, pp.1-19.

Defining "ekphrasis" as "a literary description of a visual work of art," the author focuses on the various portraits of Anna in the novel and on the important digression on art presented in the scene where Mikhailov and Vronsky display their portraits of her as examples of genuine and false art respectively. The writer asserts that Tolstoy's attitudes on art that are summarized nearly two decades later in What is Art? are already operative in Anna Karenina. For example, Lyovin only truly understands and feels sorry for Anna when he sees Mikhailov's portrait of her, a scene which fulfills Tolstoy's third notion of Christian art (namely, "its ability to inspire brotherly love"). Moreover, Mikhailov's three paintings, "Pilate's Admonition," "The two boys fishing in a stream," and Anna's portrait are ranked in ascending order of value based on the criteria of genuine art that will be set down in What is Art? Thus, the famous treatise on art is already embedded in the text of Anna Karenina and Lyovin (along with Mikhailov, of course) functions as Tolstoy's vehicle for understanding Tolstoyan aesthetics.

Orwin, Donna T. "Nature and the Narrator in Chadzi-Murat." Russian Literature XXVIII (1990), 125-144.

The author rejects the tendency of most writers to regard nature as the ultimate moral standard in Tolstoy. In Orwin's account, Tolstoy ultimately replaces nature with rational consciousness in his attempt to locate the final arbiter of morality. The story of *Hadji-Murat* provides the best example of this assertion. As Tolstoy's last Caucasian tale, it corrects his earlier ones and achieves this not through philosophy but by images and structure. In the work, Tolstoy subordinates nature to rational consciousness by separating nature (i.e. beauty) from the good (i.e. reason). The narrator proves the best representative of the latter because through rational consciousness he unites the stories of all the characters (Butler, Hadji-Murat, etc.), who individually never proceed further than the level of nature itself (i.e. self-love).

Rogers, Philip. "A Tolstoyan Reading of David Copperfield." *Comparative Literature*, (Winter, 1990), v.42, no.1, pp.1-27.

The author cites David Copperfield as one of the most influential works in Tolstoy's development. The young Tolstoy found Dickens' work particularly useful in his trilogy, Childhood, Boyhood, and Youth. In Rogers' opinion, Tolstoy did not exactly borrow or imitate Dickens here but rather interpreted and revised him. Parallels are drawn between Nikolenka's relationship with Natalya Savishna and Davy's interaction with Peggoty. Also, comparisons are made in the depiction of the two

BIBLIOGRAPHY

protagonists' response to their mother's death. Whereas Davy masks his uncomfortable feelings and apologizes for them, Nikolenka gives every detail about the corpse and wallows in his emotions which come across as a confession. In short, Rogers sees Tolstoy's role as addressing directly those questions which lie beneath the surface in David's narrative. In each case, Tolstoy takes the subtleties of Dickens one step further, giving his own work an increased moral consciousness that is absent in David Copperfield.

> Harold K. Schefski, California State University, Long Beach