"After Death, the Movie (1915) - Ivan Turgenev, Evgenii Bauer and the Aesthetics of Morbidity"

Boele, O.F.; Robert Reid and Joe Andrew

After Death, the Movie (1915) - Ivan Turgenev, Evgenii Bauer and the Aesthetics of Morbidity

Otto Boele

Evgenii Bauer's 1915 movie *After Death* is the only fully-fledged pre-revolutionary film adaptation of Ivan Turgenev that has come down to us in its entirety. Of the screen version of *On the Eve*, for example, released in the same year, only a few reels have survived, and of yet other adaptations a title is all that remains.[1]

That so little has been preserved is not surprising if we consider that 85% of all pre-revolutionary films have been irretrievably lost[2], and that of all the Russian classics adapted for the screen Turgenev was not among the most popular authors. Between 1907 and 1918 Pushkin provided the inspiration for no less than 47 films. Gogol and Chekhov come in second and third place with 44 and 25 adaptations respectively. Turgenev was adapted 12 times during this period, still two times more than Dostoevskii.[3]

Although we cannot know for sure why pre-revolutionary film directors so rarely turned to Turgenev's work, we may conjecture that it was generally deemed unrewarding to adapt it for the screen. This is not only suggested by the low quantity of Turgenev adaptations themselves, but also by the reception of *After Death*, which seems to have left many viewers disappointed. The illustrated daily *Theatre Review* (Обозрение театров) found fault with Bauer for including too many apparitions and dreams, thereby making the film, in their opinion, far too long.[4] The viewing board of the Cinema Committee, which was established shortly after the Revolution with the aim of assessing the artistic and ideological value of all films from the imperial period, was dismayed at the significant departures from the original that Bauer had allowed himself to make. To control the damage done by Bauer, the board ordered that the film be renamed *Klara Milich*[5] after the original.

Surprisingly, Bauer himself submitted to this kind of criticism. In response to a letter from a viewer who had been vexed by the film's lack of fidelity to the original, Bauer wrote:

> I completely agree [with Ms. N. I.] and believe that her remarks are applicable to all films illustrating Turgenev. In my opinion, the cinema still has not found the movements and the pace that epitomize Turgenev's delicate poetry.

Bauer also believed that since film directors were raised in conditions that allowed them to take 'barbarous liberties' with the original, inventing new characters and changing the plot as they saw fit, things were not likely to improve any time soon. Turgenev needed to be approached '… with a different soul and with different habits'.[6]

In a recent discussion of *After Death,* Yuri Tsivian does away with the fidelity argument employed by Bauer's contemporary critics and stresses the experimental value of his undertaking. Bauer was more interested in developing and enriching the film medium than in rendering Turgenev faithfully. In order to appreciate the film's innovative character, Tsivian argues, one should not ask what Bauer did to deliver the story *Klara Milich*, but try to establish what made Turgenev so appealing for Bauer in terms of his own films.[7] With this agenda Tsivian consciously shifts the attention from the story to the film, which he felt Bauer was wrong not to defend against the attacks of literary essentialists.

Tsivian's position radically illustrates a more general tendency among film historians as well as literary scholars to break away from the 'rhetoric of fidelity' that has dominated the study of film adaptations for so long.[8] Yet despite this reappraisal of the genre as such and *After Death* in particular, we still may ask why Bauer criticized his colleagues for 'taking barbarous liberties' with the authors, while pleading guilty to the same crime. Had he genuinely hoped to produce a film that was 'faithful' to Turgenev's story? Did he prove himself a literary essentialist as a critic unable to appreciate what he had accomplished as a director? Without even attempting to answer these speculative questions, I will keep Bauer's self-critical comments in mind when I proceed to analyse his film *as* the adaptation of a literary text. In my opinion, comparing Bauer's film to the original will not only reveal how he appropriated the plot for his own purposes and turned what I think is a tragicomedy into a melodrama of metaphysical dimensions, but it will also bring to light the use of dramatic irony in the original that critics preoccupied with the story's occultist motifs have hitherto overlooked.

From Kadmina to Klara and back to Kadmina

Klara Milich tells the story of the 27-year-old Muscovite Aratov, an independent scientist who leads a secluded life together with his over-protective aunt Platosha. His only contact with the outside world is a friend by the name of Kupfer, who after some effort succeeds in dragging Aratov to a soirée and later to a charity concert, where he witnesses the performance of the promising young actress and singer Klara Milich. Unlike the rest of the audience, Aratov is not impressed by her singing and declines when Kupfer offers to introduce him to her. The next day, however, he receives a short note from the actress asking him for a rendezvous. Aratov reluctantly complies, but when they meet he displays an aloofness that makes Klara Milich walk away in anger and disappointment. Three months later Aratov happens upon an obituary in the newspaper informing him that Klara Milich has committed suicide on stage, allegedly out of unrequited love. In what seems to be a prophetic dream Aratov is told to go to Kazan, Klara's native town. In Kazan he meets her relatives and obtains Klara's diary from her sister, and this confirms his worst fears: it was his rebuff that caused her to take her own life. As soon as Aratov has returned to Moscow, Klara starts to haunt him, inspiring remorse as well as passion. He begs to be reunited with her and dies with a blissful smile on his face.

Klara Milich has enjoyed a somewhat ghoulish reputation that pertains not only to the story's plot, but also to the historical events on which it is based. As is well known, Turgenev took his inspiration from the spectacular suicide of the famous actress Evlaliia Kadmina, who poisoned herself during a performance in 1881 and literally collapsed on the stage. Equally eerie, in the opinion of symbolist poet Innokentii Annenskii, is the fact that *Klara Milich* was Turgenev's swan song. The last thing he ever produced, written during the last autumn he was alive, the story lets us experience vicariously how Turgenev prepared himself for death.[9]

Bauer was too much steeped in the mannered aestheticism of Art Noveau and symbolism to disregard *Klara Milich*'s reputation as a tale of the uncanny. Despite the possibility of a realistic and more light-hearted interpretation, which I will discuss below, Bauer took full advantage of the morbidity of the plot by enhancing the role of the

supernatural. His decision to change the title into *After Death* and thereby shift the attention to the world 'beyond' is perhaps the most telling example.[10] In short, while Turgenev leaves us the possibility of a rational explanation for a number of seemingly inexplicable details, Bauer unambiguously presents them as the manifestations of some transcendental force.

Apart from adjusting the epistemological underpinnings of Turgenev's world picture to his own needs, Bauer clearly 'upgraded' the main characters in order to heighten the drama. In the original the dramatic denouement and the vaguely gothic setting cannot prevent Aratov and Klara from looking slightly comical. *Klara Milich*, as I will try to demonstrate, can be read as the story of a misunderstanding between a wayward wannabe and a university drop-out who are both trapped in their own literary clichés. *After Death* offers nothing of the sort. Nowhere do we get the impression that Bauer is poking fun at his characters, as does Turgenev in the story. Bauer even changed the name of the heroine into that of her real-life prototype (Klara Milich into Kadmina), thereby inviting his viewers to associate her with the famous dead actress, rather than with Turgenev's fictional representation, whose success as an artist is quite modest.[11]

This 'upgrading' of the main characters and their milieu is most apparent in what many would consider the film's *pièce de résistance,* the scene in which we see Aratov reluctantly shaking hands at the soirée where he first encounters his fatal love. The scene is famous because it is a masterly example of early mobile framing and precision staging. Aratov's uncomfortable movements, his friend's relentless efforts to introduce him to the guests, finally his introduction to the hostess and to Klara Milich - this is all shot in one single take that lasts for nearly three minutes. What I am concerned with is not the visual magnificence of this shot, but the setting in which Bauer situated Aratov's half-hearted attempts to overcome his unsociable disposition. Everything in the scene seems to indicate that this is a gathering of the upper crust of society. Even if the setting is not meant to conjure up Moscow's most exclusive circles, then we are still entitled to assume that the majority of Bauer's viewers were looking at a world that was far above their own social standing.

In Turgenev's story the description of the soirée evokes completely different associations. The narrator not only characterizes the

hostess as someone of 'undetermined and almost suspect origin', but her whole entourage, he continues, bears '… the stamp of something primitive, phoney and temporary.' The all-pervasive suggestion of vulgarity and bad taste is epitomized by the emaciated figure of a long-haired pianist whose performance of 'Liszt's fantasies on Wagner's themes' makes Aratov leave the soirée in horror. By contrast, the pianist in Bauer's film is reduced to a reasonably neutral figure whom we see modestly playing in the background.

In staging the charity concert Bauer understandably restricted himself to showing Klara Milich, while leaving out the other artists, as this would probably distract too much from the story. Klara Milich appears on stage holding a little book, whose author and title on the cover are impossible to distinguish. We then see her reciting some poetry, which makes the audience almost explode with elation. Although Aratov leaves fairly abruptly, as he does in the story, nothing in the scene seems to suggest that the audience's praise is somehow excessive.

The charity concert is considerably less elevating in Turgenev's story. Klara Milich does arouse the audience's genuine enthusiasm, but the rest of the programme is filled with dilettantes whose often embarrassing performances the narrator describes in sarcastic detail: a 12-year-old boy, 'his cheeks still wet from tears,' is scraping 'some variations' on the violin; an actor reads a scene from Gogol, but without evoking a single sign of approval from the audience; a horn-player, who regularly can be heard practising in the background, reconsiders at the last moment and refuses to go on stage. Even if the narrator's condescending tone is designed to convey Aratov's misanthropy and uneasiness with the situation, the mediocrity of the performers is beyond dispute.

The question, then, that Turgenev makes us want to ask is how talented Klara Milich really is, given that she has to perform in this line-up of artistic misfits. According to the Moscow newspaper that reports her death, she was the 'darling of our critical audience.' However, this may be the obligatory praise that one would expect in an obituary. After her return from Moscow Klara Milich does seem to have been truly successful in her native Kazan, as both Kupfer and Klara's sister testify, but then Kazan is hardly the stage on which to acquire true stardom. Moreover, with the exception of the charity concert in Moscow, Klara appears to have performed only in provincial theatres.

Because Turgenev's story was known to be based on the suicide of Evlaliia Kadmina, some critics have too readily assumed that her literary counterpart was equally talented and successful.[12] On closer examination, however, the differences between the two women speak volumes. Kadmina was 28 when she died, a professional singer who had enjoyed great successes in the Bolshoi and the Marinskii theatres, whereas Klara Milich is identified as a girl of about 19, a merchant's daughter who had never had any proper training. There is dramatic irony in the fact that for all her determination to become an actress and break with the merchant class (a class traditionally renowned in Russia for its mistrust of theatrical art), her last role is in a play by the quintessential connoisseur of the Russian merchant class, the playwright Aleksandr Ostrovskii. Thus Klara seems to have come full circle, playing a part on stage that she sought to escape in real life.

Obviously, Klara's humble descent from the traditional merchant class would have undermined the tragic image that Bauer was trying to create for her. Consequently, the interior of her parental home in Kazan simply precludes any association with the stuffy, patriarchal world as Turgenev describes it. Even if by Bauer's standards this interior might be called austere, the worldly paintings on the wall and the little statuettes on the tripods in the background are a far cry from the Ostrovskii-like world, 'full of icons,' that Turgenev conjures up (**fig. 1**). Bauer's heroine moves in circles not dissimilar to those in which she grew up.

In Turgenev's story Klara's seemingly mysterious aura pales even further, when we consider that her meeting with Aratov is a re-enactment of Tatiana's confession to Onegin.[13] At the charity concert she even recites Tatiana's letter while looking straight at Aratov, as if addressing him personally. After obtaining details of her death, Aratov cannot understand why of all people she chose him. Yet from the perspective of a provincial girl who imagines herself as Pushkin's heroine, he is a perfect match, living like a hermit just as Onegin did.

Но, говорят, вы нелюдим;
В глуши, в деревне все вам скучно,
А мы ... ничем мы не блестим,
Хоть вам и рады простодушно.

> But, they say, you're unsociable;
> in the backwoods, in the country, everything bores you,
> while we … with nothing do we glitter,
> though simpleheartedly we welcome you.[14]

Klara's self-identification with Tatiana is so strong that when Aratov has spurned her she stays true to her ideal by retaining her chastity, even when continuing to work for the theatre. Initially Aratov finds it hard to believe that an actress like Klara has not had any affairs, as Kupfer assures him, but such behaviour is quite in keeping with the two lines that Klara recites with particular expressiveness at the concert:

> Другой! ... Нет, никому на свете
> Не отдала бы сердце я!
>
> Another! … No, to nobody on earth
> would I have given my heart away![15]

In fact, Klara's romantic ideal of strict fidelity, which she cherished even before running away from her parental home, seals her destiny beforehand. Speculating on the slim chances of finding Mr. Right, Klara tells her sister that she will kill herself should she be rejected by the man of her dreams. Whatever it is Klara was hoping to hear from Aratov at the rendezvous, her suicide follows the 'tragic' scenario that she had devised long before going to Moscow.

We do not know whether Bauer ever toyed with the idea of using at least some of the story's many intertextual references, but the Onegin and Ostrovskii subtexts are clearly absent in the film. In effect, Bauer's heroine acquires something genuinely tragic, her passion for Aratov being authentic, and her artistic talents being beyond dispute. Bauer gives us no reason to assume that Klara is somehow being overrated by her audience, nor that Aratov actually dislikes her recital, though this is explicitly stated in the story. Ignoring the fictional Klara Milich, a provincial *aktiorka*, as Aratov calls her disdainfully in the story, Bauer consciously modelled his heroine on a truly gifted and successful *aktrisa*.

Visitations from beyond

Apart from turning the *provintsialka* Klara Milich into an attractive and respectable actress, Bauer also lets us identify with her more intensely than does Turgenev. In the story, Klara never 'focalizes,' that is, we do not get to see Aratov or any of the other characters from her perspective. What she feels or thinks we can only hope to infer from what others observe, but we do not have immediate access to her inner world (her diary is almost empty; according to her sister, '…Klara did not like writing'). Aratov's inability to fathom her real motives is underscored by the fact that for the most part she remains invisible to him. On the photograph that Aratov has obtained from her sister, she is looking away; when they meet on the boulevard, Aratov is walking slightly behind her, so that he cannot see her face, '…only her hat, part of the veil and a long, black, worn-out coat.'

Bauer decided to situate their rendezvous not on a crowded, dusty boulevard in the summer, but in a deserted park covered in snow - an ideal setting for an amorous *tête-à-tête*. Indeed, the staging of the scene is quite different from Turgenev's description, with Klara and Aratov now actually facing each other. This 'adjustment' would seem the most logical way of capturing the ensuing dialogue, even if the sequence of shots that follows contains a peculiar continuity glitch (suddenly the scene is shown from the opposite side). But as a corollary of this 'logical' solution, the camera shows Klara in 'objective' manner, without imposing Aratov's point of view on us. (**fig. 2**)

Bauer goes further, however, by using a number of close-up and medium close-up shots designed to communicate Klara's deepest feelings. This effect, which Seymour Chatman has called the 'interest point of view,'[16] does not let us actually look through the character's eyes, but makes us identify with that character by directly showing his or her emotions. Bauer gives us Kadmina's interest point of view at least twice. First, when she writes a letter to Aratov asking for a meeting, and second, when she poisons herself in the theatre. The first scene is probably the most important in this respect, because it is absent in the original (**fig. 3**). Turgenev focuses exclusively on Aratov's reaction when he receives Klara's letter, but Bauer lets us also witness the writing of it. Thus we come to share not only Aratov's amazement at

receiving a letter from an unknown woman (shown in the next scene), but also her inner struggle that preceded it.

According to Tsivian, Bauer would have made more of Klara's suicide, if the act of 'suicide on stage' had not been used in three other films made in 1913 and 1914 (among which is a screen version of *Tatiana Repina*, another fictionalized version of Kadmina's suicide). Bauer shows a brief, almost informative flashback, in which we see Klara take the poison backstage (in the original Kupfer emphasizes that Klara played the first act 'with the poison inside her' and collapsed on the stage). Tsivian's observation is much to the point, but by arguing that the 'problem was one of overproduction,' he construes Bauer's subdued rendition primarily as the outcome of a negative decision, as if he only wanted to avoid repeating an already hackneyed effect. Bauer's approach to the scene is a very productive one, I would argue, because it shows us Klara's inner struggle and agony in the privacy of her dressing room. Apart from diminishing the theatricality of the act (which also disturbed Aratov in the original), it presents us with yet another opportunity to sympathize with Klara and experience her last moments.

If Bauer turns Turgenev' heroine into a fully-fledged character, then can we discard her visitations from beyond as mere delusions? Is it conceivable that Bauer accorded her a more prominent place in his narrative than in the original, only to reduce her to a chimera of the protagonist after she has died? It is now commonly agreed that the seemingly supernatural events in Turgenev's story can easily be explained in a rational manner, and that Aratov's posthumous encounters with the heroine could therefore be interpreted as the product of his own mind. The mysterious lock of hair, which Aunt Platosha finds in her nephew's hand when he is on the brink of exhaustion, does not necessarily originate from 'beyond', but could also (the narrator speculates) have been hidden in Klara's diary.[17]

What about Bauer? Bauer does not immediately turn his version of *Klara Milich* into something quite fantastic, but he does seem anxious to make the most of the morbidity that Turgenev's story has to offer. To name one particularly lurid detail, Aratov sleeps in the same bed in which his father died. As this information is impossible to convey without intertitles, Bauer decided to ignore it, but compensated for it by turning the portrait of Aratov's deceased mother, which in the original is rather small, into a huge painting hanging above the fireplace. An

ingenious shot in the opening scene shows Aratov occupying a small corner of the frame, while looking in awe at the almost life-size portrait of his mother. The highly suggestive disproportion between the dead mother (huge) and the living son (small) receives additional significance in the light of the portrait's composition. The painting shows Aratov's mother peeping through a set of curtains, as if she is looking at her son from beyond. Bauer has only just introduced the main character to us, and already the dead seem to intrude upon the living (**fig. 4**).

Not surprisingly, perhaps, the curtain, symbolizing the passage between life and death, is Klara's identifying attribute throughout the film. She hardly makes an appearance without some curtain or a portiere being pulled aside, whether on stage or at the soirée where she is introduced to Aratov. Even in the scene in the park the curtain motif is sustained: we see Aratov reading a newspaper, while in the background Klara appears through a kind of sliding gate. This symbolism climaxes in the dramatic episode of Klara's suicide, in which we see her bow to the audience and then immediately close the curtain in a convulsive gesture so as to prevent the spectators from seeing her collapse (**fig. 5**).

Bauer uses the curtain motif for its dramatic effect, of course, but also with the aim of suggesting that the boundary between life and death is not impenetrable. He reinforces this idea in one of the last scenes, in which Platosha finds Aratov exhausted in his bed holding a lock of black hair in his hand. In contrast to the story, as we have seen, the film offers no rational explanation for this discovery. Instead it invites us to accept it as 'proof' of Klara's visitations from beyond.

Rachel Moreley has suggested that Aratov's dreams and visions are difficult to take seriously, partly because in them Klara is presented as an 'outdated icon of idealized femininity', rather than as the self-assured 'new woman' that she was when still alive. Her death allows Aratov to indulge in 'fantasies of female dependency'[18] that have no bearing on the 'real' Klara who killed herself not because of unrequited love, but almost as a protest against the patriarchal order. By visualizing Aratov's dreams as he did, Bauer intended his protagonist to inspire ridicule in the viewer, not pity.

I do agree with Morley that Klara is presented positively as a 'new self-assured woman' (and not as a fickle over-ambitious actress from the provinces as in the original), but her interpretation is premised on the assumption that Aratov's dreams are his own concoctions and

therefore not inspired by some otherworldly force. As I have just tried to show, Bauer was eager to capitalize on the morbid and potentially supernatural in Turgenev's story, which was quite in consonance with his symbolist leanings. In addition, I doubt whether Bauer really wanted to ridicule his hero. In the original Aratov is a rather nondescript figure with a sunken chest who, looking in the mirror, rightly asks himself: 'И какой я красавец?' In the film his role is played by the handsome actor Vitold Polonskii, one of Russia's brightest stars on the silver screen before the Revolution. Surely Bauer must have realized that a character played by such an actor would arouse sympathy, not ridicule.

There is another point that needs to be made in this context. Bauer is known for his sympathetic portrayal of independent and sexually empowered women. The male characters in his films leave a far more unfavourable impression, being either cynical womanizers or disillusioned, obsessed idealists. As Morley correctly observes, '… there are no male protagonists [in his films] the viewer would wish to emulate.'[19] In her analysis of Bauer's films Michele Torre even speaks of the 'emasculated male' who ends up in complete subordination to the female characters.[20] All these observations are correct in themselves, but they need to be refined in the light of the literary tradition on which Evgenii Bauer was drawing. Nineteenth-century Russian literature offers a plethora of weak and ineffectual male characters falling in love with women who are considerably stronger and more independent than they are. A preliminary list of these characters would include Onegin, Beltov, Aduev, Oblomov and a number of heroes in Turgenev's work. Readers may not have wished to *emulate* these protagonists, but could certainly pity or sympathize with them. The same holds true for Bauer, whose indebtedness to this tradition seems to me beyond doubt. Aratov in *After Death* or Viktor in *Child of a Big City*, are emasculated *idealists*, superfluous men in the tradition of the nineteenth-century realist novel. In my opinion, the occurrence of powerless men and strong-willed female characters in Bauer's films cannot be ascribed exclusively to the weakening of patriarchal morality and the fears that this inspired. It is also yet another example of early cinema's respect for the classics of Russian literature, which continued to serve as a reservoir of stock images and characters long after the demise of the realist novel.

To repeat Tsivian's question: what made Turgenev so appealing to Bauer for his own films? I think at least part of the answer can be

found in the specificity of Turgenev's later prose, which, according to a number of scholars, bridges the divide between the 'primary' style of realism and the 'secondary' style of symbolism.[21] Even if the symbolist reception of Turgenev's work was far from unambiguous, as Lea Pild has shown,[22] symbolist poets and critics generally appreciated his stories for anticipating the 'new', supposedly more spiritual, and universal art that they themselves advanced. It therefore seems reasonable to assume that Turgenev's impressionistic and indeed pre-symbolist aesthetics struck a familiar chord with Bauer, who otherwise rarely turned to the big names of Russian realism. Bauer's congeniality with symbolism and his apparent indebtedness to the symbolist reception of *Klara Milich* may also explain why he did not notice, or chose to ignore, the dramatic irony in the original. Irony, to make an obvious point, is not incompatible with symbolism (nor with romanticism to name another secondary style); it *is* incompatible, however, with the generic demands of melodrama. The all too human weaknesses of Turgenev's mediocre protagonists simply would have undermined the loftiness of the supernatural tragedy that Bauer was eager to present.

NOTES

1. For details see *Velikii kinemo. Katalog sokhrnivshikhsia igrovykh fil'mov Rossii 1908-1918*, Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, Moscow, 2002, p. 264.

2. Philip Cavendish, 'The Hand that Turns the Handle: Camera Operators and the Poetics of the Camera in Pre-Revolutionary Russian Film', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, DXXXII, 2, 2004, p. 202.

3. Venniamin Vishnevskii, *Khudozhestvennye fil'my dorevoliutsionnoi* Rossii. Goskinoizdat, Moscow, 1945, p. 159.

4. *Velikii kinemo*, p. 270. The full review was first published in *Obozrenie teatrov*, 1916, № 3011, p. 11.

5. *Kinobiulleten'. Ukazatel' prosmotrennykh kartin otdelom retsenzii kinematograficheskogo komiteta narodnogo komissariata prosveshcheniia*, I-II, 1918, p. 20.

6. *Velikii kinemo*, p. 270-1. The letter and Bauer's reaction were published in *Pegas*, the trade journal of the Khanzhonkov production company (1916, 4, pp. 103-4).

7. Yuri Tsivian, 'The Invisible Novelty. Film Adaptation in the 1910s', in Robert Stam, Alessandra Raengo, eds, *A Companion to Literature and Film*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 2005, p. 101.

8. Stephen Hutchings and Anat Vernitski, 'The *ekranizatsiia* in Russian culture', in Stephen Hutchings and Anat Vernitski, eds, *Russian and Soviet Film Adaptations of Literature, 1900-2001. Screening the Word*, BASSEES. Routledge Curzon Series on Russian and East European Studies, Routledge Curzon, London - New York, 2005, pp. 1-24 (2).

9. I.F. Annenskii, 'Umiraiushchii Turgenev. Klara Milich,' *Knigi otrazhenii*. Nachdruck der Ausgaben St. Petersburg 1906 und 1909. Wilhelm Fink Verlag, München, 1969, pp. 49-73.

10. *After Death* is also the story's original title, which Turgenev changed into *Klara Milich* on the instigation of M.M. Stasiulevich, the editor of *Vestnik Evropy*. See. I.S. Turgenev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v 28-i tomakh (PSS)*, XIII, Izdatel'stvo Nauka, Moscow-Leningrad, 1967, p. 576.

11. For the sake of convenience I will stick to the characters' original names as in Turgenev's story.

12. See, for example, the commentary in the *PSS*. Here Turgenev is quoted as having written that Klara Milich 'sings brilliantly and recites and acts', whereas these are Kupfer's words. Turgenev, *PSS*, XIII, p. 589.

13. Several scholars have pointed to the *Evgenii Onegin* subtext in *Klara Milich*, but none of them have elaborated on these references for a better understanding of Klara's motives. See J.A. Harvie, 'Turgenev's Swan Song, *Klara Milich*', *New Zealand Slavonic Journal*, 1983, p. 109; A.B. Muratov, *Turgenev-novelist*, Leningrad, 1985, p. 96; N.N. Mostovskaia, 'Povest' Turgeneva 'Posle smerti (Klara Milich)' v literaturnoi traditsii', *Russkaia literatura*, 1993, 2, pp. 144-5.

14. Aleksandr Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin. A Novel in Verse*, Translated by Vladimir Nabokov. I (Introduction and translation), Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1990, p. 165.

15. Ibid., p. 166.

16. Seymour Chatman, 'What novels can do that films can't (and vice versa)', *Critical Inquiry*, VII, 1 (Autumn 1980), pp. 121-40 (134).

17. These speculations of the narrator are in keeping with Walter Koschmal's observation that in Turgenev's later stories the realistic explanation is usually only hinted at. See Walter Koschmal, *Vom Realismus zum Symbolismus. Zu Genese unde Morphologie der Symbolsprache in den späten Werken I.S. Turgenev*, Rodopi, Amsterdam, 1984, p. 212.

18. Rachel Morley, 'Gender Relations in the Films of Yevgenii Bauer', *Slavonic and East European Review*, LXXXI, 1, 2003, p. 58.

19. Ibid., p. 68.

20. Michele L. Torre, 'Filtering Culture: Symbolism, Modernity and Gender Construction in Evgenii Bauer's Films,' *Screen Culture: History and Textuality*, John Fullerton, ed., 2004, John Libbey, Eastleigh, p. 110.

21. See, for example, Koschmal, 1984; Lea Pil'd, *Turgenev v vospriiatii russkikh simvolistov (1890-1900-e gody)*, 6, Tartu, 1999, pp. 35-7. For a discussion of the differences between the 'primary' style of realism and the 'secondary' styles of romanticism and symbolism, see J.R. Doring and I.P. Smirnov, 'Realizm: Diakhronicheskii podkhod', *Russian Literature*, 8, 1980, pp. 1-39.

22. Pil'd, p. 35.