

Bibliographical Abstracts

Cutshall, J.A. "‘Not Tolstoy At All’: *Resurrection* in London" *Irish Slavonic Studies* 10 1989 (1991): 31-40.

This article is devoted to a study of two theatrical adaptations of Tolstoy's famous third novel *Resurrection* (1899) which were staged in Paris and London in 1903. The Paris version by Henry Bataille shortened the work by eliminating approximately two-thirds of the characters and philosophical content in order to fit it into a three hour time span. While the French production was very successful and easily played over one hundred times, the British version by Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree and Michael Morton enjoyed less critical praise even though it focused more on Katyusha's evolution by depicting her moral journey from corruption to sainthood in five acts. These two dramatic adaptations clearly show that the piracy of Tolstoy's novel was widespread and yielded mixed results in terms of quality.

Emerson, Caryl. "Solov'ev, the Late Tolstoi, and the Early Bakhtin on the Problem of Shame and Love," *Slavic Review*, Fall 1991: 663-671.

While this article concentrates more on the early Bakhtin than on Solov'ev or the Late Tolstoi, its primary thrust is to show that the later two figures impacted strongly on Bakhtin's early critical development. Like Tolstoy and Solov'ev, Bakhtin rejected the polarization of Russian criticism between aesthetic and civic critics, preferring a criticism that combined form and ethics. Thus, all three were philosophers of religion (albeit in their own ways), who stressed ideas such as love, shame and moral responsibility. Tolstoy's definition of the three kinds of love in his work "Iunost'" led to a preference for active love over the fraudulent forms of love represented by sentiments directed toward the other and self-denial. Bakhtin is shown to draw upon this exalted version of love in his early writings which revolve around discussions of love and shame. As Bakhtin reached his more mature "high carnival period," the ethics of love and shame that are derivative of Tolstoy and Solov'ev tend to give way to a different emphasis.

Frost, Edgar L. "Building a Better Brekhunov: Tolstoj's *Master and Man*" *Russian Language Journal* XLV, Nos. 151-152 (1991): 111-119.

The author regards this story as yet another case of a Tolstoyan character undergoing a spiritual conversion at the moment of his physical demise. In this instance, the ex-peasant Brekhunov returns to his roots after spending much of his life as a money hungry merchant. To facilitate this transformation, Tolstoy establishes a set of signs and symbols. Most significant among these are 1)his change in attitude toward animals from assessing them for their materialistic value to valuing them as helpmates to humankind and

2)his selection of names which associates the name of the peasant Nikita with St. Nicholas and the concept of "victory of the people" (i.e. of the peasantry over the merchant class). Spiritual rebirth comes when Brekhunov gives up his two fur coats to warm the peasant Nikita, who is without a coat. At this moment Brekhunov not only dies physically but becomes one with Nikita, emphasizing both the peasant concept of collectivity (*sobornost'*) and the moral triumph of the peasant way of life.

Schefski, Harold K. "Tolstoy and Jealousy," *Irish Slavonic Studies*, 10 1989 (1991): 17-30.

The author demonstrates that jealousy plays an all-pervasive role in both the works and the married life of Leo Tolstoy. From the early trilogy to the post-conversion stories, jealousy serves as one of the primary emotions by which this writer's characters define their relationship with others. Moreover, what is amazing about this passion in Tolstoy's literature is that its increasing association with violence in the later stories conflicts with the movements of his overall philosophy towards a non-violent ideal.

Nowhere was jealousy a more formidable obstacle for the writer than in his own marriage to Sonya Behrs, whose similar nature transformed it into a reciprocal trait. A careful study of jealousy in the couple's marriage is important because there is reason to believe that it exerted an as yet undetermined influence on the all-too-simple explanation for the collapse of their relationship, namely, that Sonya clung tenaciously to her materialistic concern for family and property, while Tolstoy left just as much to find peace from the jealousy that had afflicted his marriage as to eliminate the hypocrisy between his life and his convictions.

Tavis, Anna A. "Authority and its Discontents in Tolstoy and Joyce." *Irish Slavonic Studies* 12 (1991): 41-55.

Using a Bakhtinian approach, Tavis challenges the commonly held view of Tolstoyan discourse as authoritarian discourse and Joycean prose as libertine. Tavis excoriates biographical critical approaches that generate such stereotypes and oversimplifications and suggests instead that close attention to textual dynamics reveals subversive anarchy in Tolstoy's prose. Conversely, Tavis traces the subtle recreation of ultimate authority in Joyce's works.

Tavis, Anna A. "Rilke and Tolstoy: The Predicament of Influence." *The German Quarterly* Spring (1992): 192-200.

Rilke is on record as rejecting Tolstoy's influence. Tolstoy, he claimed, was only a "cultural" influence, part and parcel of Rilke's general response to Russia. In this brief study, Tavis argues otherwise, claiming that "Tolstoy's image captivated Rilke's imagination as an artist who was struggling against his own creative genius." Tavis discusses Rilke's two meetings with Tolstoy, his response to Tolstoy's death, his reaction to the publication of *Resurrection*, and to Gorky's *Reminiscences of Tolstoy*. She finds that Tolstoy's views on art and the artist were seminal in Rilke's own struggle towards a coherent aesthetic, philosophy and practice.