April 25, 2025

AUTOREFERAT

1.**Name:** Olga Solovyeva (aka Olga V. Solovieva)

2. Diplomas, degrees conferred in specific areas of science or arts, including the name of the institution which conferred the degree, year of degree conferment, title of the PhD dissertation

a. Ph.D. in Comparative Literature, Yale University, 2006

Dissertation, entitled "A Discourse Apart: The Body of Christ and the Practice of Cultural Subversion"; advisors Prof. Dudley Andrew (Comparative Literature and Film Studies, Yale) and Prof. Haun Saussy (Comparative Literature, Yale); reviewers: Prof. Dale Martin (Department of Religious Studies, Yale University); Prof. Carol Jacobs (Department of Germanic Studies and Comparative Literature, Yale University); Asst. Prof. Moira Fradinger (Department of Comparative Literature, Yale University)

b. 1992-1997 Master's Studies: Modern German Literature (Major), Medieval German Literature and Language (Minor), and Slavic Studies (Minor), Freie Universität, Berlin, Germany.

Master's Theis, entitled "Polyphonie und Karneval: Spuren Dostoewskijs im Roman *Doktor Faustus* von Thomas Mann"; advisors Prof. Dr. Anke Benholdt-Thomsen (Germanistik, FU Berlin) and Prof. Dr. Hella Tiedemann (Comparative Literature, FU Berlin) (1997 DAAD Award)

c. Other studies (selected):

2010-2011 University of Connecticut School of Law (Hartford, CT, USA)

2008 (Fall Semester) Cours de Civilisation Française at the Sorbonne (Paris, France)

1991-1992 Visiting Exchange Student (DAAD) at the Institute for Germanic Studies at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

1988-1991 Study of Russian Philology at the Lomonosov Moscow State University

3. Information on employment in research institutes or faculties/departments or school of arts

Assistant Professor of Slavonic Literatures (adiunkt), Institute of Literary Studies,
Faculty of Humanities, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, 2023-
Research Fellow, Center of Excellence IMSERt—Interacting Minds, Societies, Environments, Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, 2023-
Assistant Professor of Comparative Literature, The University of Chicago, 2015-2023
Postdoctoral Scholar and Lecturer, The University of Chicago, 2011-2015
Visiting Assistant Professor of Film, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2007-2008
Lecturer in Film, Yale University, Spring 2007
Lecturer in Film, Smith College, Winter 2006
Instructor, Yale Film Summer School, Summer 2006, 2005
Teaching Assistant, Yale University, 2002-2007
Teaching Associate in German, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1998-2000

4. Description of the achievements, set out in art. 219 para 1 point 2 of the Act

Since graduating in December 2006 from Yale University, where I earned a PhD in comparative literature, my academic activities have focused on interdisciplinary research in comparative literature—with a focus on interdisciplinary rhetoric. I have published two monographs and a co-edited volume, as well as ten peer-reviewed articles and nine peer-reviewed book chapters. I am currently conducting research for two further monographs and two edited volumes. In my work, I develop new approaches to literature and its adaptation to various media, as well as examining the relationships between verbal art of different historical periods and regions of the world, with particular emphasis on the relations between East and West. My research contributes to the development of knowledge in areas such as literary comparative studies, literary theory, Russian-Japanese intellectual relations, East-West comparison, interdisciplinary rhetoric, and public humanities. In my work I show that applying the methods of literary analysis, knowledge of literary theory and history, and study of tropes is vital to understanding other media. The remediation of literature opens new perspectives on poetics and literary history.

Although my native language is Russian, I publish mainly in English and German. My works have been published in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany, and also in China (translated into Chinese). Since obtaining my PhD, I have organized two international conferences and one international film festival on literary adaptations, and I have participated in 21 international scientific conferences presenting my research. Additionally, I have given 15 invited lectures in various countries such as India, Japan, Taiwan, United Kingdom, United States, Poland, Romania, Ukraine, Tatarstan, New Zealand and Australia.

In this autoreferat, I present a detailed description of my scientific activity, which I am submitting for evaluation in the habilitation procedure in the field of literary studies, with particular emphasis on interdisciplinary comparative literature.

I. a) title of scientific achievement (monograph): *The Russian Kurosawa*: *Transnational Cinema, or the Art of Speaking Differently*

Olga V. Solovieva, *The Russian Kurosawa*: *Transnational Cinema, or the Art of Speaking Differently*, authored monograph, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2023. 368 pages. Hardback ISBN: 9780192866004. Ebook.

b) discussion:

Introduction—goals

My monograph *The Russian Kurosawa: Transnational Cinema, or the Art of Speaking Differently* is dedicated to the topic of Akira Kurosawa's screen adaptations of the 19th c. Russian classics— Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Gorky, and the early twentieth century author of ethnographic diaries and fiction Vladimir Arseniev. The goal is to show the relevance of Literary Studies for understanding Kurosawa's cinema, and to approach Kurosawa's adaptations as a new way of understanding Russian classics in their transnational reach and impact. The book uses the literary methodologies of close reading, hermeneutics, literary history, reception theory, translation theory and history, and comparative literature. Kurosawa himself insisted throughout his life that a deep knowledge of literature, and specifically of Russian literature, is a necessary requirement for successful filmmaking. Akira Kurosawa started his career as a writer of filmscripts but it was from reading literature and literary criticism that he learnt how to write and develop characters and plots. The title of the book "The Russian Kurosawa" refers to Kurosawa's lifelong reception of Russian literature— a process the stages and meaning of which are uncovered in this book. I show that Kurosawa's particular affinity for Russian literature goes beyond personal taste. It signals his political and ideological position of democratic dissent, a stance that since the 1860s has been associated in Japan with the translation and reception of Russian literature. The subtitle, "the art of speaking differently," refers to the allegorical meanings of Kurosawa's cinema, a technique which I show was derived from and developed through literary adaptation.

The larger disciplinary goal of the book is to raise the profile of the field of Literary Studies within the field of Cultural Studies in regards to the treatment of film and interdisciplinarity in general. Throughout, I use an interdisciplinary methodology of rhetorical analysis and intermedial comparisons between literature and film. Its stress on the analysis of tropes and aesthetic modes and on the context of intellectual history sets the book apart from Cultural Studies, a field that typically employs sociological methods of research to explicate popular and material culture. As a book in Literary Studies, *The Russian Kurosawa* focuses on literary history, the history of genres, literary aesthetics, literary translation, and the international

circulation of ideas to understand this film director whose thinking drew to an extraordinary degree from literature. My expertise in close analysis of film, which I received in the Department of Comparative Literature at Yale, provides me with skills in proper cinematic analysis and allows me see what properties of those literary sources led to the development of Kurosawa's unique cinematic language. I use the methodology of close reading and literary hermeneutics to understand Kurosawa's adaptations as a process of translation from one language—the language of literature—into another language—the language of cinema. Indeed many facets of Kurosawa's cinema cannot be understood without a background in Literary Studies. Kurosawa exploits visual valences of the literary texts which have been ignored or underappreciated in previous literary scholarship of those texts.

The Russian Kurosawa builds upon my previous scientific work, *Christ's Subversive Body,* to be discussed below. The earlier book dealt with literature and religion through six historical periods, emphasizing a diachronic mode of comparison. In the later book, I focus my analysis to literature and cinema within a narrower time span running from the late 19th century to the second half of the twentieth century. My analysis of literary and visual rhetoric investigates how Akira Kurosawa adapted a nineteenth-century Russian novel (*The Idiot*), a theater play (*The Lower Depths*), a short novel (*The Death of Ivan Ilyich*), and an ethnographic fiction (*Dersu Uzala*) to address the situation of post-WWII Japan, and explains why he chose these particular works as a foundation for his films. To understand Kurosawa's choice of Russian literary sources, one needs understand the specificity of Russian literature in the context of the late 19th century as well as the specificity of its translation history and reception in Japan. Through Kurosawa's adaptation, ideas that had been initially developed and mediated through the Russian-Japanese translation culture entered global cultural circulation in the second half of the twentieth century. Moreover, it was through adapting Russian texts that Kurosawa defined his position in the postwar Japanese debate on the political responsibility of writers in regards to the war and the goals of the postwar democratic reconstruction of Japan.

The reviews of my book in *Nikkei Asia* and in *The Russian Review* both emphasize the importance of drawing the attention of specialists on film and Japan to the Russian intertext of Kurosawa's cinema.

The material contained in the book enlarges comparative literature beyond its traditional focus on European literature. It calls for exploring contacts, differences, and similarities between specific Eastern and Western cultures. While my earlier monograph was limited to Western cultural history, *The Russian Kurosawa* discusses the literary dialogue between Japan and Russia as well as the ways in which literary ideas and technique can inform cinematic techniques. As a result, the book contributes to expanding the epistemological framework of comparative literature by examining how literary texts are translated and adapted in various cultural and historical contexts and media.

The relationship between literary and cinematic language comes to the fore in this analysis, especially in the context of transnational literary dialogue. Foregrounding this relationship is a

key starting point for understanding how 19th-century Russian literature, with its philosophical, ethical and political themes, has been reinterpreted in Kurosawa's cinema. I analyze how the Japanese director, using film techniques such as scene composition, soundtrack, camera work and editing, transforms literary ideas into new artistic forms in order to position himself toward contemporary cultural and social problems. I base my interpretation of Kurosawa's interest in Russian literature on the history of Russian-Japanese intellectual relations, mediated through translation culture and many cross-border literary collaborations (for example, Tolstoy's collaboration with Konishi Masutarō on the Russian translation of the classical Taoist text, Lao Tzu's *Tao te ching*; or Futabatei Shimei's famous invention of modern Japanese literary language through translations of Gogol and Turgenev). This translation culture has been researched by the Oxford historian Sho Konishi in his *Anarchist Modernity: Cooperatism and Japanese-Russian Intellectual Relations in Modern Japan* (Harvard, 2013).

Relying on Konishi's research as well as on the research of a dozen historians of Japanese and Russian literary and intellectual encounters, I show the socio-political valences of Kurosawa's reception of Russian literature. My book demonstrates that Kurosawa updates the tradition of Russian-Japanese populist thought, developed through literary exchanges, translations, and publishing in pre-war Japan, as a program for the reconstruction of Japan in the postwar period and that he uses the adaptations of Russian literature as an indirect means of approaching the most politically sensitive topics of post-war Japan.

My scholarship is in dialogue with current English-language film scholarship on Kurosawa, such as the work of Dolores Martinez, Matsuhiro Yashimoto, Catherine Russell, and Michael Lucken. I show that the long-standing debate about Kurosawa's political alliances and his place between Japanese and Western culture has been misconceived because of a failure to address the primary importance of Kurosawa's adaptations of Russian literature for his worldview and his cinematic techniques which emerged from the needs of literary adaptation—the unique literary signature of his cinema. As a scholar of comparative and Russian literature, I am uniquely positioned to address this missing feature in the previous approaches to Kurosawa.

The book puts particular emphasis on the process of transposition of literary texts to screen. I am interested in how ideas rooted in the 19th-c. Russian literature—such as social responsibility, critique of imperialism, or reflections on defeat and war trauma—were translated into the language of film, while retaining their philosophical depth and universality. One example of this process is the way Kurosawa adapts the narratives of Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy to explore the complex social and historical problems of post-World War II Japan while also developing new cinematic techniques capable of expressing the specificities of these writers' style and the psychology of their characters.

I approach Kurosawa through multi-layered issues of translation: linguistic and "cultural", but also the translation/adaptation of the literary medium into the film medium in a way that challenges the oversimplified binary discourse of "verbal" versus "visual" and thus introduces a new approach of interdisciplinary rhetoric to the field of Literary Studies. The monograph

situates Kurosawa in relation to the powerfully influential translations of Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky and other Russian authors into Japanese at the turn of the 20th century. Taking into account the dense intertextual relations surrounding the translation of Russian texts into Japanese and the historical significance of these translations, the book releases Kurosawa from sterile debates about his "Japaneseness" versus "Westernness" and brings to light political valences of his films that have heretofore been underappreciated and misidentified. As a result, through a detailed discussion of Kurosawa's adaptations of Russian texts, the book offers a new historical and thematic perspective on the director's entire oeuvre. The book shows the global spread of the ideas of democratic anarchism and pacifism beyond the East-West divide and uncovers the persistent presence of a cultural memory of 19th-century Russian democratic thought in the post-World War II Japanese and Russian dissent. Kurosawa's cinema is revealed to be a vault preserving pre-Marxist Russian democratic traditions, mediated through literature, which have been suppressed in Soviet Russia and from which they can be recovered again.

Description of the monograph – results

The book *The Russian Kurosawa* provides a detailed analysis of four reworkings of Russian literary sources by Kurosawa: *The Idiot* (Hakuchi, 1951), based on the novel by Fyodor Dostoevsky; *To Live* (Ikiru, 1952), based on the short novel *Death of Ivan Ilyich* by Lev Tolstoy; *The Lower Depths* (Donzoko, 1958), based on Gorky's play; and *Dersu Uzala* (1975), based on the ethnographic diaries and fiction of Vladimir Arseniev. The monograph highlights the centrality of these "Russian" films to the corpus of Kurosawa's cinema (31 films). They are the intellectually focused, self-reflexive anchoring points of Kurosawa's worldview, articulating the philosophical, ethical and political themes that permeate the director's entire artistic output. Through a process of "revealing the device" (a term coined by the Russian Formalist critic Viktor Shklovsky), I uncover the narrative and formal techniques that Kurosawa adapted from literary sources and explore the philosophical, ethical, and political threads that connect Kurosawa's Russian films with his other productions. I analyze how they intertwine with the fabric of Japanese literary and intellectual history in which Russian literature once played an important role.

Although in his essays, notes on films, interviews and in his autobiography Kurosawa repeatedly emphasized the primary importance of Russian literature for his work, this aspect of his cinema was long marginalized and perceived merely as an expression of the artist's personal taste. It was not until the publication of Sho Konishi's book *Anarchist Modernity* (2013), which brought a groundbreaking recovery and analysis of Russian-Japanese intellectual relations, that the significance of what I call "Japan's Russia" was fully understood.

Konishi reconstructed how early Russian revolutionary thought, conveyed through the Populist and revolutionary Russian literature, entered into dialogue with local Japanese social practices and political movements and thus came to shape Japan's democratic culture of opposition to the modern state between the Meiji Ishin(1868) and the early Shōwa period (1926). This underground network of intellectuals and artists, often suppressed by a militarizing state,

expressed their political ideas through references to Russian writers and thinkers such as Leo Tolstoy, Ivan Turgenev, Peter Kropotkin, and other representatives of nineteenth-century democratic literature. As Konishi emphasizes, his *Anarchist Modernity* "uncovers a previously invisible plane to make sense of some of the most dynamic but fundamentally puzzling intellectual phenomena in modern Japanese history." Kurosawa's cinema is one of those "fundamentally puzzling intellectual phenomena" that I seek to clarify by restoring the Russian and specifically literary context of his films.

I approach this investigation as a scholar of comparative literature and reader of the canon of Western and Russian literature, as well as a film expert. The main thesis of the book is that, under the guise of adapting Russian texts, Kurosawa expressed Japan's post-war conscience and democratic and pacifist aspirations. At the same time, the choice of Russian literary sources allowed him to show the differences between his vision of Japanese grassroots democracy and the version of democracy introduced by the Allied occupation of Japan. It also gave expression to his rejection of the totalitarianism of the Soviet Union. In this context, it becomes crucial to understand the epistemological meaning of "Russia" in Kurosawa's output. The two main mistakes made by scholars regarding Kurosawa's Russian adaptations are reducing Russia to a subset of the "West" or identifying it with the Soviet Union. Kurosawa's "Russia" is a different construction— a *literary* one.

From the 1860s onwards, "Japan's Russia" was a construct driven by Japanese awareness of Russia as an exception within Western paradigm, and of Russian self-reflexivity in regard to Western thought. Coming late to the intellectual tradition represented by Germany, France and England, Russians took a polemical stance towards many of the political and epistemological premises of these traditions, as they had been adopted within Russia. This critical self-consciousness of Russia as an "other" to the West pervades nineteenth-century Russian literary, philosophical, and political discourse. This potential of Russia as the critical conscience of the West was also recognized by Japanese critics of Meiji Westernization.

Referring to "Russia" in Japan allowed for the articulation of difference within the Western paradigm, where authors such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Charles Dickens—critics of triumphal narratives of progress—were integrated into the Russian tradition of opposition to Western capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism. They too were received in Japan as dissenters from the majority civilization of the West. This 19th-century Russian tradition of social and moral criticism, represented by Tolstoy, Kropotkin, and others, also permeated Japan as part of the intellectual reaction to Westernization.

The relation of Russia to the West is thus not a merely geographical one and is certainly no binary opposition but an ideological synecdoche, in which "Russia" represents a critical conscience: it stands for nineteenth-century Russian intellectual opposition to such Western ideologies as social Darwinism with its justification of social inequality, of brutal industrial capitalism, and of the scramble for colonies. The Russian internal opposition was aimed above all at the Westernized structures and governing elites of the Tsarist autocracy for failing to

address the empire's many social ills. Lev Tolstoy, the most outspoken critic of the Russian state and of the Western civilization it embraced, became the iconic face of that Russia. Tolstoy synthesized Western socialist and anarchist thought with Asian communalist philosophies, combining social analysis with psychological depth and spirituality. His fictions and treatises addressed human beings on the level of individual conscience and thus acquired a tremendous appeal and impact around the world. It is through him that "Russia" came to be received and embraced as a method of dissent in the West and the non-West alike. There is a tremendous bibliography on Tolstoy's legacy in the world. For the more recent efforts, see Charlotte Alston's book on Tolstoy's reception in the West, *Tolstoy and his Disciples: The History of a Radical International Movement* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014). On Tolstoy's reception in the non-West, see the edited volume *Lev Tolstoi i literatura Vostoka* [Lev Tolstoy and the literatures of the East], edited by Kim Rekho (Moscow: Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of World Literature, 2000). The collection impressively covers the reception of Tolstoy in Japan, China, Korea, Mongolia, India, Burma, Vietnam, Persia/Iran, the Arab world, and Afghanistan. Gandhi is merely the best known of the global Tolstoyans. Indeed, Japanese debates on politics, literature, and the responsibilities of writers from the years 1942-1952 were still permeated by the references to Russian democratic literature, with Tolstoy leading by far in the number of references and Dostoevsky coming second. See *The Politics and Literature Debate in Postwar Japanese Criticism, 1945-1952*, eds. Atsuko Ueda, Michael K. Bourdaghs, Richi Sakakibara, and Hirokazu Toeda (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2017).

The relation of nineteenth-century Russian literature to the Soviet paradigm is similarly complex. Russian social-democratic literature was admitted to the Soviet canon only conditionally, in a censored form, carefully glossed and framed so as to conform to a teleological view of civilizational progress leading to the October Revolution. Social-democratic, anarchist, and all other forms of revolutionary thought or social engagement were necessarily regarded an "immature" stage of development surpassed and obviated by the scientific materialism and absolutism of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, "Russia," which in the Soviet Union could designate only pre-Soviet Russia, relates to the Soviet paradigm either by anticipation, or even by antithesis, as the oppressions which nineteenth-century democratic literature described and condemned reached unspeakable proportions under the Soviet regime. To exclude critical representations of Soviet reality, the Soviet state introduced the doctrine of "socialist realism," which permitted only the representation of reality as envisioned by the Communist Party.

Kurosawa himself, an avid reader not only of Russian literature but also of scholarship about Russian literature, was highly aware of these differences and used them actively as a means of signification. I argue that it was through his self-differentiation from American militarism, on the one hand, and Soviet militarism, on the other, that Kurosawa came to participate in the efforts of Western postwar intellectuals as well as of Soviet intellectual dissidents to create a new transnational democratic imagination on the premises of a radical rethinking and recovery of the tradition of critique of Western modernity. Russian literature was an essential vehicle for this undertaking because due to the Tsarist and later Soviet censorship, imaginative literature had

functioned as a major conduit for political and social criticism that could not be directly expressed. Since Kurosawa used Russian sources as a historically and politically charged medium of polemics and dialogue with his intellectual contemporaries in Japan and around the world, an understanding of the nuances in his choice, treatment, and integration of these sources is indispensable for identifying the director's political sensibility.

Anarchist Modernity, Sho Konishi's book about the role of Russian literary translation as a mediator of Russian-Japanese intellectual exchange brought a long-term historical perspective to my initial findings about Kurosawa's stance in the postwar reconstruction of values. It shed light on the intellectual and political genealogy that lay behind Kurosawa's choice of Russian sources: The Japanese reception of Russian literature as a traditional pathway for democratic political dissent. Through the recovery of this piece of Japanese intellectual history, Kurosawa's interest in Japanese history and intellectual history, his affinity for nineteenth-century democratic Russian literature, his commitment to Japanese grassroots democracy, his politically unaffiliated stance during the Cold War, and the global and universalist scope of his cinema finally formed a unifying pattern.

Through the analysis of Kurosawa's Russian literary adaptations and the patterns of thought that they reveal, my book attempts to fill in a blind spot of scholarship in regard to the political and intellectual meaning of Kurosawa's cinema and what it reveals about the global circulation of ideas and possible impact of literary exchanges.

In my eyes, Kurosawa's postwar revival of Russian-inflected pacifist anarchism of Lev Tolstoy and his legacy in Japan explains what has been perceived for decades as the director's ambiguous position between East and West. Taking into account the Russian (and Russo-Japanese) literary roots of Kurosawa's democratic persuasion eliminates this ambiguity and the concomitant unproductive debate as to whether Kurosawa is the most Japanese or "the most Western" of directors (*Akira Kurosawa und seine Zeit*, edited by Nicola Glaubitz, Andreas Käuser and Hyunseon Lee [Bielefeld: transcript, 2005], 9). Until well into the 1990s, Western scholarship about Kurosawa was informed by a tendency to construe the relationship between Western and Japanese sensibilities as a chasm and to discuss Kurosawa's work in terms of attempts to bridge this chasm.

My comparative approach through Russian literature demonstrates that such a portrayal of Kurosawa's international or intercultural filmmaking, however, is better seen as a forced construction which in the end only confirms the incompatibility of these cultures from which it started. The binary theorizations of East-West relations, which my book overcomes, concerned all aspects of culture, including literature, because they mostly addressed the development of characters and plot in Kurosawa's films. For example, Bert Cardullo's article "The Circumstance of the East, The Fate of the West" establishes a radical polarity between Eastern and Western cultures already in its very title. Cardullo argues that Kurosawa bridges the chasm between West and East in that he renders Western tragic situations and individualistically self-absorbed characters in terms of Japanese subordination to circumstance, that is, in terms of the Japanese

interest in how the human being reacts to his environment (Bert Cardullo, "The Circumstance of the East, the Fate of the West," in James Goodwin, *Perspectives on Akira Kurosawa* [New York: G.K. Hall, 1994], 115). Or Stephen Prince observes in his classic article "Zen and Selfhood: Patterns of Eastern Thought in Kurosawa's Films" that the strong individual presence of Kurosawa's heroes coexists paradoxically with their propensity for radical social altruism. He traces these features back to the same chasm between East (Zen) and West (Selfhood) as Cardullo did, in order to advance an argument about Kurosawa's "bushido model," his updating of the "way of the samurai." This "bushido model," according to Prince, dialectically reconciles the features of Western individualism and Eastern Buddhism. In this model the traditional ethics of the samurai's duty to his lord is likened to Western individualism, enriched by the spiritual dimension of Zen, and interpreted as an attempt to get "in touch with the oneness in the midst of multiplicity and the many within one" (James Goodwin, "Zen and Selfhood: Patterns of Eastern Thought in Kurosawa's Films" in Goodwin, *Perspectives on Akira Kurosawa,* 227). Zen helps translate "the samurai's obligation to serve his lord into the hero's obligation to serve humanity" and thus becomes *aufgehoben* in the Westernized, secularized social altruism of Kurosawa's characters. (Against this pseudo-dialectic of cultures, one should point out that the currency of "bushido" as a representation of Japanese national character dates from Inazō Nitobe's 1900 book *Bushido, The Soul of Japan: An Exposition of Japanese Thought* in English, a work subsequently appropriated by militarist ideology.)

The newer, more fluid theorizations of non-binary ways of thinking about East and West , which I follow, are also not specific to cinema, but apply to all aspects of culture, including literature. More recently, in *Imitation and Creativity in Japanese Arts* (2016), Michael Lucken suggested breaking with "the reasoning that systematically conflates Westernization or Americanization and the promotion of individualism. Indeed in many cases, he writes, Asian references to the West have nothing to do with the desire to empower the individual, and many cultural projects objecting to social consensus were undertaken and completed without reference to the West or with at most only very superficial allusions" (112). In this spirit, attempts to frame Kurosawa's work in terms of a chasm between East and West have been put aside and a new, more complex and flexible perspective on Kurosawa has finally made its way. For example, in *Kurosawa: Film Studies and Japanese Cinema* (2000), Mitsuhiro Yoshimoto sees Kurosawa's authorship as "a discursive product, the critical meaning and social function of which are constantly negotiated by Kurosawa, critics, and audiences"(61). Nikolas Glaubitz's edited volume *Kurosawa und seine Zeit* [Kurosawa and His Time] (2005) focuses on the director's cinema as a field of negotiation for intercultural media aesthetics in which both cultural overlaps and cultural contrasts tend to transcend simple East-West dichotomies. In her study *Remaking Kurosawa* (2009), Dolores Martinez shows Kurosawa as a global filmmaker whose work stands not in contrast or opposition to the West but as an integral part of world culture and art, participating in complex and fluid forms of cross-fertilization. Martinez places Kurosawa within the context of global, cosmopolitan filmmaking, noting "that we cannot write about his career without taking into account his position in a postwar, postindustrial, late capitalist setting – a setting that presumes the existence of global processes and networks" (6). Or in *Classical Japanese Cinema Revisited*

(2011), Catherine Russell advocates for "situating classical Japanese cinema within a more historical and geopolitical framework, augmenting art-historical methods with more sociopolitical approaches to cinema as a cultural practice" (2).

The restoration of the Russian transnational literary intertext of Kurosawa's films thus fits within the agenda of situating the director's work in a multinational historical and geopolitical framework and of reading it, as Lucken suggests, as "a reformulation of the social contract." The role of Kurosawa as a leading film director in postwar Japan's re-opening to the world and the internationalism of his cinema with its much-discussed humanism and focus on social ethics become more fully comprehensible once we have traced its political and historical roots to what Konishi calls anarchist "worldism" with its vision of people without a state, mediated through a long tradition of Tolstoy-reception in Japan. Thus the word "transnational" in the subtitle of my book refers primarily to ideological content.

A closer look at Kurosawa's literary adaptations within the postwar global context of ideas reveals that the Japanese director shares ethical and social concerns with many artists and intellectuals of the industrial nations that participated in the Second World War. Kurosawa's Japan is a people partaking, outside state structures, in the common predicament of postwar humanity while engaging with ideas from all over the world via the translingual medium of cinema. The context of postwar cultural and literary criticism is the common ground on which Kurosawa meets the West, the shared guilt of Western-style industrialization and militarization.

In Kurosawa's case, guilt—one encompassing topic of my book—could be expressed only via equivocation or allegory. As the director explained in his autobiography, given his own collaboration with the militarist state on propaganda during the war he could never be "self-righteous" about "what happened during the war." Accounting for Kurosawa's many constraints in regard to political and self-censorship as well as considering the limits of representability, this book develops an interdisciplinary methodology of reading which overlays the close analysis of Kurosawa's films with close reading and historical commentary on his Russian literary sources and their reception in Japan.

Drawing on the work of many historians of Japan, Japanese literature, and Japanese-Russian literary translation, I situate Kurosawa's cinema in the immediate and long-term context of Japanese history and Russian-Japanese intellectual relations, a context with which the director ingeniously engaged by silently registering his responses, interpretations, and criticisms in the language of cinema, using props, photography, and mise-en-scène. Having initially developed the technique of silent representation under the conditions of militarist and then Allied censorship, both of which kept close tabs on film scripts, but not on the final film production, Kurosawa later perfected it as a cinematic style. But having eluded the censors, Kurosawa's silent representation often also escapes critics and unprepared viewers. Therefore, this book offers an in-depth discussion of Kurosawa's cinematic choices of music, setting, props, iconography, and costumes, and explains how these choices were informed by the literary

sources. These apparently incidental matters are always politically, socially and historically charged, as the literary sources which inspired Kurosawa's creative decisions.

One of the obstacles to serious engagement with Kurosawa's Russian literary adaptations has been (ironically) the director's extraordinary erudition in the matters of Japanese, Russian, and Western intellectual and literary history on which these films comment. Kurosawa knew not only the Japanese, Russian and Western literary canons but also understood how individual works within those canons relate to each other. His adaptations, as well as his one literary text—his autobiography, are rich in play with Russian and other literary allusions. One sees that the director was perfectly aware of how Dostoevsky's temporality of consciousness and social agenda dovetail with those of Tolstoy, how Turgenev's "nihilism" differs from Artsybashev's, how much the Japanese reception of Nietzsche owes to Russian polemics against the philosopher and his reception in France or Germany, how Chekhov's style reverses that of Gogol, how much the explorer Arseniev draws on the vision of Tolstoy and other critics of civilization; how all of these Russians responded to the Western canon; and finally how Japanese writers added new meanings to that Russian response.

For anyone educated in Russian and Western history of literature, philosophy and visual arts, Kurosawa's mastery of the nuances of the Western paradigm is awe-inspiring and even overwhelming. Moreover, Kurosawa provides an original commentary on this paradigm from the point of view of postwar intellectual and social concerns which happen to be Japanese, developing them in a visual language of dazzling cinematic techniques which he is inventing before our very eyes. All these techniques are philosophically and psychologically charged. They signify beyond the immediate needs of visual representation. This use of cinematic language is what Kurosawa learned from the demands of literary adaptation; and his cinematic language makes us better understand the meanings inscribed in his literary sources.

This book sets out to uncoil at least some of Kurosawa's complicated but highly meaningful knots of intellectual, literary references together with analysis of his unique cinematic idiom. Up to now, the fact of literary adaptation has usually distracted from rather than revealed the meaning of Kurosawa's cinematic language. Scholars of his Russian films tend to refer the reader to the literary originals, as if filming Russian nineteenth-century novels or early twentieth-century plays were self-evident in postwar Japan. **This book goes to the literary originals to explain that Kurosawa adapts not the nineteenth-century Russian sources as they appeared in their Russian context, but the Russian sources as they were translated and received in the prewar Japan, becoming thereby a part of Japanese literary and intellectual tradition.** The meaning of the resulting films emerges through the aesthetic shifts enabled and enhanced through multiple transnational, transhistorical, and intermedial adaptation. It is important to emphasize that such am intervention in Kurosawa's work could be made only from the platform of Literary Studies, as Cultural and Film Studies usually bypass the aesthetic specificity of literary works and of literary history which lie at the heart of this book.

The Russian Kurosawa thus draws attention to Kurosawa's mastery of adaptation of literature which is rooted in his astute awareness of the visual aspects of literary medium—the literary imagery, metaphors, plot composition, elements of style. I show that Kurosawa sometimes condenses a paragraph or a whole thematic cluster of the adapted works into one meaningful prop or setting, or builds a whole scene around one word in the original. Close analysis of the transposition of the ideas and literary tropes and figures into cinematic images, camera work, and editing here is intended to defy the often-expressed but unsupported claim that Kurosawa filmed his Russian sources as-is, scene by scene, with no changes. My analysis of Kurosawa's invention of cinematic language for conveying intellectual content through historical reflection—a cinematic language of conscience, aims at showing that his cinematic participation in the intellectual discourse of the twentieth century, which he practiced through literary adaptations, was on a par with the verbal media of expression.

The six chapters of this book begin with the historical contextualization of Kurosawa's worldview in immediate postwar and long prewar period. They follow Kurosawa's working through the trauma of the apocalyptic collapse of Japan's Western modernity represented by the militarist colonial state and demonstrate his embrace of a political vision of Japanese grassroots democracy born out of prewar Russian-inflected anarchist thought, mediated through the Japanese history of his Russian literary sources. Following Kurosawa's persistent return to nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Russian literature throughout his career reveals the non-linear temporality and layered topographical historicity of his cinema and testifies most forcefully to his allegiance to the alternative, non-teleological modernity of early anarchist thought, which has been developed through the Russian-Japanese exchange in revolutionary literature.

In the book, Kurosawa emerges as a cultural figure still relevant not only for world cinema and literature but also for decolonizing global knowledge production. The book's relevance goes beyond the small circle of Slavicists and Japanologists, as it also contributes to the larger fields of transnational film and literature studies, adaptation studies, and the comparative history of Japanese-Russian literary relations.

Chapter 1 of the book, entitled "'Some Nice Music': The Russian Subtext of Kurosawa's Films," contextualizes Kurosawa's first postwar film *No Regrets for Our Youth* in the history of Russian-Japanese intellectual relations since the Meiji Ishin. Since these intellectual relations were mediated through the Russian Populist literature, the chapter discusses what stylistic, formal, and ideological elements of the Russian literature were attractive to Japanese in the period of the Freedom and People's Rights Movement in Japan, as well as the translation channels through which it arrived in Japan. The chapter interprets Kurosawa's choice of Mussorgsky's piece "The Great Gate of Kiev" from his piano suite "Pictures from an Exhibition" as a key to understanding of the director's programmatic commitment to recovering the Japanese prewar tradition of grassroots democracy, which was closely associated with the history of literary reception of Russian literature. This tradition has been formed in the wake of Meiji Japan's opening to nineteenth-century revolutionary Russia through the culture of literary translation, established in

Japan by the Russian anarchist-Japanologist Lev Mechnikov, who founded the Russian language program at the Tokyo School of Foreign Languages (TSFL), which educated a whole generation of Japanese translators from Russian through the studies of Russian revolutionary literature, the most famous of them—the writer Futabatei Shimei, credited with invention of modern Japanese novel through Russian translations and usage of vernacular Japanese in imitation of Gogol's style. The Russian critic Viktor Shklovsky characterized Russian literature as "anti-literature" for its focus on ideas over the literary form—the quality which made it particularly attractive in Japan. Lev Mechnikov, the main historical actor in opening Japan to revolutionary Russia was an exact contemporary of the Narodnik composer Musorgsky whose music is meaningfully engaged in the film, in the context of the Takigawa incident, when professor of criminal law was dismissed from his post for his alleged socialist sympathies, manifested among other things in his reference to Tolstoy's novel *Resurrection*. Tolstoy's work was forbidden in Japan during the time of militarism for its pacifist, anti-statist, socially engaged nature. Musorgsky's worldview has been representative of the democratic worldview of the second half of the 19th-century, developed primarily through Russian literature. In his musical idiom, Musorgsky famously imitated the vernacularism of Gogol's literary style, and polemicized with Pushkin in his opera "Boris Godunov," using the Russian history by Populist historian, former serf Nikolai Kostomarov, instead of the imperial historian Karamzin. The chapter discusses Musorgsky's music in the light of Russian literary history and literary works he used in developing his own musical idiom. The literary theorists engaged in this chapter include Vissarion Belinsky, Georg Lukács, Viktor Shklovsky, Boris Eikhenbaum, Indra Levy. The chapter shows that through a network of contextual allusions, the film is designed to trigger the cultural memory of the tradition of literature-mediated Russian-Japanese dissent to the militarist state.

Chapter 2, entitled "'Toad in a Box': Self-Restoration as People's History," continues contextualization of Kurosawa in the history of the Russian-Japanese anarchist dissident movement, mediated through the Russian-Japanese literary exchange. This chapter focuses on Kurosawa's only literary text per se— his autobiography, *Gama no abura*, translated into English as *Something Like an Autobiography.* The chapter discusses Kurosawa's references to Russian literature—Turgenev, Gogol, Artsybashev, as well as to the Western literary tradition—Dante, and Japanese literature— Kurosawa's contemporaries Shiba Ryōtarō, Yamamoto Shūgorō, and medieval writers Murasaki Shikibu and Sei Shōnagon. My analysis of the autobiography shows it as an allegorical construction of the intellectual history of Japan, where Kurosawa positions himself as a heir to progressive Western pedagogy, including the pedagogical teachings of Lev Tolstoy and Lev Vygodsky, who built upon Tolstoy's teachings, and to a family of ideas derived from Russian, Western, and Japanese literature. For example, Kurosawa's father is understood through likenesses to the Meiji-era Westernizers and modernizers like Fukuzawa Yukichi, or the Akiyama brothers, self-made military leaders during the Russo-Japanese war, depicted by Shiba Ryōtarō. The portrayal of Kurosawa's mother is legible as an embodiment of the Tokugawa women's virtuous spirit of rebelliousness, depicted by the Japanese Populist writer Yamamoto Shūgorō. Kurosawa's close school friend Uekusa Keinosuke is depicted through the Western tradition of metaphysical romance, and his brother Heigo—one of the major influences in Kurosawa's life and his alter ego—is constructed as a Russian Narodnik in a likeness of

Turgenev's protagonist in *Fathers and Sons*—Evgeny Bazarov. Kurosawa himself absorbs and inherits all these traditions and develops them into a unique cinematic language of his transnational cinema. The chapter shows Kurosawa's self-fashioning as a people's director, not as a genius and exception, but as a typical average Japanese walking the streets of Tokyo. The chapter shows that Kurosawa understands himself as a cinematic Futabatei, that is as the inventor of the modern language of postwar cinema "for all the people" through vernacularization of ancient and modern, high and popular, domestic and foreign visual idioms. Kurosawa's formation of the cinematic language is contextualized in the history of formation of Japanese modern literature, with a reference to such literary scholarship as Michael C. Brownstein's work on formation of Japanese literary cannon and Tomi Suzuki's study on the development of the "I-novel" genre (*shi-shōsetsu*) in Taishō Japan. Suzuki showed how the "I-novel" developed from quasi-biographical literary sketches written for a circle of an author's friends into a much broader concept "generating a critical discourse that informed not only the nature of literature but also views of Japanese selfhood, society, and tradition." I show that Kurosawa's autobiography, written in the early 1980s, harks back to the tradition of the genre from the period of Taishō democracy in his engagement with "Japanese selfhood, society, and tradition."

Kurosawa's autobiography is also read through the prism of theoretical work on the genre of autobiography by the literary scholar Paul de Man. I write: "Autobiographical writing has been understood by literary scholars as a 'pact' with the reader (Lejeune), as an act of 'reading the self' (Varner Gunn), or as the achievement of a 'narrative identity' continuous with the writing self (Ricoeur). But it is the literary theorist Paul de Man's understanding of autobiography as an existentially rooted allegory of 'defacement' and 'restoration' that best captures Kurosawa's endeavor in his book" (*The Russian Kurosawa*, 100). In the light of de Man's theoretization, Kurosawa's "defacement," expressed in his image of himself as a "toad in a mirror box," is read as an expression of guilt for collaboration with fascism. To highlight this point, Kurosawa's autobiography is compared to the biography of the anti-fascist cinematographer Jean Renoir. I argue that Kurosawa's autobiography constitutes a literary counterpart to the director's first post-war film *No Regrets for Our Youth.* The comparison with the film brings out the autobiographical nature of the film as an "epitaph" (de Man) to the demise of grassroots anarchist democracy in Japan, embodied autobiographically by Kurosawa's brother Heigo and cinematically by the protagonist of the film Noge. Through close-reading and contextualization of the dense literary intertext of Kurosawa's autobiography in the history of the Russian, Japanese, and Western literature and criticism, I recover Kurosawa's reconstruction of the genealogy of his democratic, anti-militarist, and anti-statist worldview from pre-war Japanese-Russian anarchist pacifism, which had been mediated through the reception of Russian literature in Japan and historically framed as an alternative to Western modernity. My analysis problematizes the idea of *auteurism* (focus on a director's personal style) showing that Kurosawa's self-fashioning in his autobiography allegorized the whole intellectual movement of modern Japan and that Kurosawa understood his filmmaking as an expression of the sensibility of common Japanese people. Both historical chapters frame Kurosawa's Russian intertext and its integration with other literary traditions from a point of view of literary history, theory, and stylistics.

In chapter 3, "*The Idiot:* Where the East Meets the West," I focus on Kurosawa's adaptation of Dostoevsky's novel *The Idiot* in the context of the postwar international revival of interest in Dostoevsky. I discuss the specifics of the temporality Dostoevsky's novel and how the propensity of Dostoevsky's literary technique to represent personal retrospection as history inspired and informed Kurosawa's cinematic adaptation of the writer's novel. Relying on such theorists as Caryl Emerson and Mikhail Bakhtin, I show that Dostoevsky developed a novel of conscience, and created a tradition of what I call "ethical modernism" which differed from the modernism of Friedrich Nietzsche. The chapter shows how Kurosawa participates in the postwar reinvention of modernism via Dostoevsky. The chapter discusses the history of Dostoevsky-reception in Japan, and refers to the literary critic Ara Masahito to demonstrate how the reception of Dostoevsky differed before and after the war. Kurosawa's reception of Dostoevsky is contextualized globally and compared with the postwar reception of Dostoevsky by Thomas Mann, as well as with the role of Dostoevsky in the work of the postwar Irish Catholic philosopher William Desmond who places Dostoevsky next to the work of Solzhenitsyn. André Gide's book about Dostoevsky is also consulted because it helps explain how Kurosawa's cinematic techniques follow and enact the suggestions of the literary text. In the light of Kurosawa's many statements on his philosophical and aesthetic debt to Dostoevsky, his favorite writer, discussed in this chapter, the philosopher Gilles Deleuze is drawn into the global conversation about Kurosawa's work because Deleuze has shown that Kurosawa's cinema possesses a philosophical dimension. I reveal this dimension as a structure of the Dostoevskyian novel of consciousness. The chapter shows how Dostoevsky's structure of consciousness can be understood as historical conscience and how such reading of Dostoevsky's novelistic temporality provides Kurosawa with a means of reflection on Japanese war crimes as a continuation of the criminality inherent in the colonial claims of Western modernity. Kurosawa's adaptation falls into the time of the recovery of the anarchist Kōtoku's anti-imperialist heritage—the context reconstructed by the literary scholar Robert Tierney. The chapter shows the importance of literature and of the discipline of Literary Studies for understanding the meaning of cinematic adaptation of literature in the global and local contexts.

In chapter 4, "'To live! To live how?': Tolstoyan Religion in *Ikiru*," I discuss Kurosawa's adaptation of Tolstoy's late writings in the film *Ikiru*. I show how the plot of this film reproduces the logic of the metatext of Tolstoy's writings, starting from the short existential novel *The Death of Ivan Ilyich* via his treatise *What Is Art?* to his later texts such as *The Meaning of the Russian Revolution*. The chapter demonstrates how Kurosawa participates in the literary debates of his time. The chapter reveals how Kurosawa's own aesthetic in *Ikiru* reproduces Tolstoy's understanding of what art is and how via Tolstoy Kurosawa dismisses aspects of contemporary entertainment culture. The entertainment culture is represented by the "literature of flesh"— the Japanese postwar literary movement, based on the Japanese reception of a short story "Intimité" by Jean-Paul Sartre and represented by such writers as Sakaguchi Ango, studied by literary scholar Doug Slaymaker. In Kurosawa's eyes, the entertainment culture brought by the American Occupation, studied by literary scholar John Treat, repress the consciousness of war and defeat and thus interferes with the necessity of mourning as a precondition of postwar recovery. The history of the Tolstoy-reception in Japan is discussed in detail, and contextualized in the Japanese

history of polemics with Nietzsche, in which Tolstoy was seen as an ethical counterpoint to the German founder of the modernist aesthetics. The chapter shows that Kurosawa's film reproduces Tolstoy's polemics with the literature of western Décadence, as Kurosawa's film polemicizes with the postwar entertainment culture. The chapter on Tolstoy shows the interconnection of the postwar Tolstoy-reception with the reception of Dostoevsky—whereas Dostoevsky allows us to recognize, historicize, and reflect on a war trauma, Tolstoy suggests the psychological ways of overcoming it. The chapter demonstrates that only the analysis of the literary history of Russia and Japan, made possible by the tools of the discipline of Literary Studies, can provide a way of understanding the philosophical and literary meaning of Kurosawa's cinema.

In chapter 5, "*The Lower Depths*: Beggar Cinema, or Resistance to National Narcissism," I situate Kurosawa's post-occupation film *The Lower Depths* (1957) in the context of the reception of the Russian writer and dramatist Maxim Gorky in Japan. I use the historicist approach of the Soviet-Korean scholar of Russian and Japanese literature Kim Rekho to show that through the reception of Gorky's play "The Lower Depths" the modern theater was introduced in Japan. I also discuss how Gorky was situated in the context of Japanese social and literary movements. The chapter shows that Gorky's play "The Lower Depths" is close in sensibility to Dostoevsky's writings and that Kurosawa's adaptation of Gorky follows the theme of postwar trauma in his adaptation of *The Idiot*. Kurosawa's choice of Gorky's play is motivated by its existential theme of poverty and the role of human agency in society and history, which becomes especially relevant in the context of postwar Japan with a high level of poverty and a large class of beggars and war invalids. But Gorky also is relevant for the postwar Japanese debate on what constitutes realism. Kurosawa's adaptation of Gorky is aesthetically contextualized through the work on Russian realism by the literary theorist Georg Lukács which had been translated into Japanese by the time of Kurosawa's work on the adaptation. Lúkacs's postwar literary theory of Russian realism helps understand Kurosawa's adaptation of Gorky's "The Lower Depths" as a way of critically positioning himself toward a postwar debate on "beggar photography" that has been reconstructed by historian Julia A. Thomas. The chapter shows how Kurosawa uses Gorky's photographic realism of war photography to contradict the Japanese cultural establishment's demand for self-censorship in representing war-inflicted misery and the traces of Japanese defeat. In fact, Gorky used the photographs of real beggars to provide the realist representations of his characters and help Stanislavsky develop his realist method of "the fourth wall." The tradition of 19th-century Russian realism and its revival by Kurosawa is contrasted with the Japanese nationalist trend of late 1950s of filming historical epics glorifying the Japanese victory in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05. The knowledge of Gorky's literary aesthetic and literary theory of Russian realism helps understand Kurosawa's *The Lower Depths* as an act of radical defiance of the demands of national narcissism.

In chapter 6, "The Erased Grave of Dersu Uzala: A Nonwar Cinema of Memory and Mourning," I discuss Kurosawa's reception of the ethnographic and semi-fictional work *Dersu Uzala* of the Russian writer Vladimir Arseniev. The chapter provides a detailed examination of the filmscript's sources in the writings of the Russian explorer and ethnographer Vladimir Arseniev. It uncovers the meaning of Arseniev's engagement in the Far East, the colonialist reception of his writings in

Japan, Arseniev's civilizational criticism in the steps of Lev Tolstoy and his advocacy on behalf of the nomadic populations of the Far East. The chapter shows how Arseniev's reception in militarist Japan as a colonialist guide and in Stalinist Russia as a children's writer destructed from his advocacy for indigenous rights. The chapter focuses on the linguistic characterization of the film's Goldi (Nanai) protagonist Dersu Uzala, and its differences in the novel and the Russian-language film. I examine the discrepancies between the events of the novel *Dersu Uzala,* as described in Arseniev's diaries and by eye witnesses, and the plot of his fiction. The discrepancy shows his working through the sense of colonial guilt. The theme of guilt is also reflected in Kurosawa's late 70-mm color film *Dersu Uzala* (1975), made in the Soviet Union. The script of the film was co-written with the Russian writer Yuri Nagibin. As Kurosawa's previous Russian films, literary adaptation here is a detour via a Russian source to address the topic of colonial crimes, which has remained contentious in Japan and suppressed in the Soviet Union. Kurosawa's film is revealed as an antiwar film drawing on the sensibility of the Japanese Nonwar Movement in the time of the Russo-Japanese war and on anarchist children's literature of the Taishō period. The chapter shows how through Arseniev's writings Kurosawa returns to his immediate postwar project of tackling the question of Japanese colonial crimes against the indigenous populations of Japan's conquered territories.

The conclusion of the book, entitled by a quotation from Dostoevsky, "All-Binding Thread" discusses Kurosawa's other literary adaptations— Shakespeare, Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, George Simenon, Dashiell Hammett, Ed McBain, Yamamoto Shūgorō. I explain how these non-Russian adaptations relate to the "Russian" films by showing that Kurosawa's non-Russian adaptations fall within the same hermeneutic horizon of meaning circumscribed by the Russian-Japanese worldview of democratic dissent, which has been programmatically developed and elaborated through Kurosawa's study and reception of Russian literature. I point out the great appreciation of Kurosawa's adaptations of Russian literature by the Russian dissident directors Igor Kosintsev and Andrei Tarkovsky. In fact, Kosintsev's adaptation of Shakespeare was modeled upon Kurosawa's films, and Kurosawa's *Ran*— an adaptation of *King Lear*—is in fact a direct response to Kosintsev. My book has been researched and written to prepare a road for scholars of Literary Studies to open their methods to interdisciplinary research and reading which allowed me to follow a complicated loop from the democratic heritage of the Russian literature to Kurosawa's cinema through which it has been relayed back to the dissident Russia of the late Soviet period.

c) Accompanying publications (peer-reviewed articles and book chapters)

My book *The Russian Kurosawa* has been developed through a series of peer-reviewed publications in specialist journals and volumes, edited by Japanologists, as well as in the multiple lectures and talks I have given over the years in front of scholars of Japanese and Asian Studies to receive feedback. My understanding of Kurosawa's use of Russian literary sources as a guise for the taboo contents of his time and a method of circumventing the censorship has crystalized during my work on the peer-reviewed articles "Kurosawa Akira's *The Lower Depths*: Beggar Cinema at the Disjuncture of Times," *Journal of Japanese and Korean* Cinema, 5.1 & 2 (2013):

37-58; “The Erased Grave of Dersu Uzala: Kurosawa’s Cinema of Memory and Mourning,” *Journal of Japanese and Korean Cinema*, 2.1 (2010): 63-79; “Kurosawa Akira’s *The Idiot*: Where the East Meets the West,” *Journal of Japanese and Korean Cinema*, 1.2 (2009): 129-142. Sho Konishi’s historical research on the political meaning of the reception of the democratic Russian literature put this discovery into a long-term historical perspective. My further integration of this material into the book was filtered through this long-term historical context, which confirmed my own findings about the differentiating function that the Russian literature had in the Japanese reception of the “West” allowing the Japanese intellectuals to articulate their own Position beyond the East-West divide. The topic of Kurosawa’s working through the moral burden of the Japanese war crimes made my work resonate in China. As a result, the articles on *Dersu Uzala* and *The Lower Depths* were translated into Chinese*:* the article on the adaptation of Gorky’s play *The Lower Depths* was reprinted in Chinese translation by Yan Peiwen in *Zhongguo xueshu* (*China Scholarship*), 12.1 (2015): 200-231; and the article on *Dersu Uzala* was reprinted in Chinese translation by He Tian in *Zhongguo xueshu* (*China Scholarship*), 9.1 (2011): 177-198. The two other chapters from *The Russian Kurosawa* book appeared in a shortened and refocused form in the edited volumes on methodology of East-West comparison which allows to rethink Japanese-Russian literary encounter and its role in the wider world.

The chapter “Reopening the ‘Great Gate of Kiev’ in Kurosawa’s *No Regrets for Our Youth*” in *Japan’s Russia: Challenging the East-West Paradigm*, edited by Olga V. Solovieva and Sho Konishi (Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2021), 339-368, refocuses my first chapter about Kurosawa’s ideological positioning in the postwar Japan within the bigger methodological project of “Japan’s Russia.” And the revised second chapter of *The Russian Kurosawa* about the director’s literary autobiography has become the closing chapter of the coedited volume about the reopening of Japan, entitled “*Something Like an Autobiography*: Akira Kurosawa on Free Pedagogy and Restoration of Japan’s Democratic Self” in *Reopening the Opening of Japan: New Approaches to Japan and the Wider World*, edited by Lewis Bremner, Manimporok Dotulong, Sho Konishi (Leiden: Brill Publishers, 2023), 379-400. This iteration of the chapter places Kurosawa’s autobiography in the context of the 1960-70s Japanese recovery of the progressive pedagogical tradition associated with the Japanese reception of Lev Tolstoy. These derivative publications from *The Russian Kurosawa,* addressed to different specialist fields, help position my work on Kurosawa as part of a contemporary project of rethinking the intellectual and literary histories of East and West in terms of transnational literary exchanges where the traditional notion of influence is replaced by a more fluid and equitable notion of confluence of cultural developments and encounters around the globe.

II. a) title of additional scientific achievement (co-edited volume): *Japan’s Russia: Challenging the East-West Paradigm* (with Sho Konishi)

Olga V. Solovieva and Sho Konishi, *Japan’s Russia: Challenging the East-West Paradigm*; co-edited volume. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2021. 560 pages. Hardcover ISBN 9781621965534. Paperback ISBN 9781638570011. Ebook.

b) discussion:

Introduction—Goals

My co-edited volume entitled *Japan's Russia* expands the topic of Kurosawa's reception of Russian literature into the broader field of Japanese-Russian intellectual relations and East-West comparison, thus foreshadowing and intellectually complementing the larger scholarly achievement of *The Russian Kurosawa*. The volume covers the temporal span from the early Meiji era to now and consists of fourteen scholarly contributions which I commissioned from scholars in a variety of disciplines and historical periods. All of them are characterized by showing complexity in the transnational knowledge production between Japan and Russia as a challenge to traditional binary views on the knowledge exchange between West and East as that between "colonizer" and "colonized," seen exclusively through the prism of political and ideological hierarchies and power relations. Although the case studies are based on Russia and Japan, the methodology of the volume provides an example of a fresh approach to the study of the East-West paradigm in general. Besides developing the concept of the book, and working with the authors on their chapters and editing the volume, I co-wrote the introduction and contributed three chapters to the volume. One chapter was co-written with my undergraduate student. The purpose of the book is to examine and illuminate how the case of Russia and Japan gives material for theoretically rethinking and reconfiguring the East-West paradigm not in terms of socio-geographical divides but in terms of more complex cultural and political tensions and marginalities within both cultures.

Description of the edited volume—results

The co-edited volume *Japan's Russia* laid foundations for the new field of Japanese-Russian intellectual relations outside Russia and Japan. Premised on the multidirectionality of influence, *Japan's Russia* introduces readers to many currents in intellectual interactions between Japanese and Russians. For example, in my chapter, "Envisioning the Sea of Tonality: Takemitsu's and Tarkovsky's 'Nostalghia'" (co-written with Elma Hoffman) (369-394), I show the relevance of Dostoevsky's 1880 speech about Pushkin for the transnational sensibilities of Andrei Tarkovsky and Japanese composer Tōru Takemitsu. In fact, the Populist overtones of Dostoevsky's speech constitute the common denominator of Takemitsu's and Tarkovsky's notions of nostalgia. And in my chapter, "Voicing the Nuclear, Resisting the State in Svetlana Alexievich's Chernobyl and Hitomi Kamanaka's Fukushima" (397-422), I analyze the Chernobyl book by the Belarusian writer Sviatlana Aleksievich and compare her interviews with Chernobyl victims with the documentary process of Kamanaka Hitomi who worked with the victims of Fukushima. The comparative method helps understand Aleksievich's cinematic style of literary montage as well as her treatment of human agency in her book. Only an interdisciplinary methodology of comparison between literature and film can open the specifics of each documentarist's meanings and style.

In the volume, "Japan's Russia" is not a theme but a method of transnational reading. I frame it not in terms of the reception or influence of one literature or culture upon another but in terms of

synecdoche and confluence. *Japan's Russia* focuses on what happens between national literatures when they enter various forms of contact. In doing this, the volume changes the methodology of the historical inquiry from the focus on the Hegelian time-space configuration of the "system of world-history," in which the spatial units "East" and "West" rearrange temporality as the progressive "West" and backward "East," as well as Reinhart Koselleck's notion of "collective singular"—two historical methodologies that both contributed to the development of the notion of "nation-state" and operated through that notion. That very paradigm still dominates academic research in literary or cultural history, even when it is held up for critique. Methodologically, *Japan's Russia* steps out of this paradigm by refocusing issues on people and communities that defy categorization. It breaks "singularities" into heterogeneous multitudes, disregards cultural hierarchies, and understands time and space in an Einsteinian way, not as the realities in which we live but as modes in which we think. Japan and Russia are shown to be imaginary and fluid notions held together through the networks and practices of heterogeneous actors. The volume also changes the disciplinary constellation between literature and history. In it, literature enhances the reality of history. It provides historical evidence by capturing the patterns of ideas which are produced and mediated by historical actors. Thus the volume proposes and demonstrates a new interdisciplinary methodology where literary methods can be productively combined with methods of inquiry in other disciplines.

The volume was positively reviewed in *The Russian Review*, *Slavic Review*, *Modernist Cultures,* and *boundary2*, and received the 2023 ICAS Edited Volume Accolade in English Language Edition.

III. a) title of other scientific achievement (monograph): *Christ's Subversive Body: Practices of Religious Rhetoric in Culture and Politics*

Olga V. Solovieva, *Christ's Subversive Body: Practices of Religious Rhetoric in Culture and Politics*, authored monograph, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2018, 328 pages. Paperback ISBN 9780810135994. Hardcover ISBN 9780810136007. Ebook ISBN 9780810136014.

b) discussion:

<u>Introduction—goals</u>

The monograph entitled *Christ's Subversive Body: Practices of Religious Rhetoric in Culture and Politics* (Northwestern University Press, 2018) is based on my 2006 dissertation in the Department of Comparative Literature (Yale), although the last (sixth) chapter of the book was researched and written after graduation and the remaining chapters were expanded and revised for publication.

The book's goal was to show 1) how rhetorical discourse analysis, as practiced in the field of Literary Studies, can provide a method for interdisciplinary comparison; 2) to build a diachronic

comparison between several historical periods and cultures (ancient and modern), by using literary methods.

In this book, I addressed the theoretical premises of the "comparison through time" and practiced diachronic comparison through six different periods: early Christianity (the iconoclasm of Epiphanius of Salamis in the 4th c. AD); Late Middle Ages (the alchemical manuscript, *Book of the Holy Trinity*, written at the Council of Constance in the early 15th century, pre-Reformation period); the counter-Enlightenment discourse of the physiognomist and writer Johann Kaspar Lavater, Dostoevsky's metadiscourse of the novel; Pasolini's cinema of poetry; and the theoconservative discourse in the contemporary United States. In my book all these instances of discourse that I analyze are called a "discourse apart." In each case, the authors of the discourse in question relied on the concept of the Body of Christ. Their use of this concept was precisely the reason why I chose those examples for my book. I'm not a religious or cultural studies scholar, and had never written about religion or engaged with this topic before this book. My methodological interest in diachronic comparison preceded my choice of material. The choice of materials was determined by the desire to face up to the challenge of diachronic comparison. I wanted to find a common denominator for texts from the ancient and modern periods and from a large geographical range. At that time I was interested in the body, and more specifically in the rhetorical strategies at work in the genre of the literary portrait. The combination of the two led me to the notion of allegory, and via allegory I got interested in Christian religion, because Christianity, especially early Christianity, is concerned with bodies and rhetoric.

I decided to take the concept of the body of Christ as a common denominator for the diachronic comparison, first of all because it is a concept that has survived from early Christianity to now, and it is a concept that can hold together the large geographical span of Western civilization, from the ancient Mediterranean, via Central and Eastern Europe, to the United States. It is also a concept that surfaces throughout different Christian dominations—Orthodoxy, Catholicism, and a great variety of Protestant denominations. The major challenge of diachronic comparison is to find a common denominator which would be valid and relevant for ancient and modern periods. Pier Paolo Pasolini observed: "Christ would not be universal if he were not different for each different historical phase." This observation pins down the diachronic comparative methodology which looks for the commonality through difference.

I started reading scholarship in early Christianity, and the most important revelation for me at the time was the work of John Gager who applied the anthropological studies of Mary Douglas to the interpretation of Christological doctrines. Gager gave me the idea that you could look at the Christological dogmas structurally, because like any other body-image, they reflect tensions in society. I started looking for a structural commonality among the discourses from different periods that I chose. At that time, I also discovered the book by Dale Martin, *The Corinthian Body.* Martin analyzed the rhetoric of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians in terms of ancient medical practices and ancient notions of the body held by the Greco-Roman upper classes and by the lower classes. I also found useful Alain Badiou's book *Saint Paul and the Foundation of Universalism.* Badiou specifically analyzed the rhetorical positionality of Paul, Paul's stance of

imitation of Christ, in his letters. These two books helped me to derive the general matrix from the discourses I analyzed in my dissertation.

In *The Corinthian Body,* Dale Martin used Marx's class theory and Bakthin's discourse analysis to analyze Paul's letter and showed how Paul redefined the notion of society based on the image of the body in terms of overturning or subverting ancient class hierarchies. Martin showed that Paul's notion of the Body of Christ, or the Church, was based on a lower-class understanding of the body. Paul used the rhetoric which allowed him to replace the upper class notion of the body with the lower-class notion of the body, and to convince rhetorically the upper classes to accept the lower-class notion of the body as their own. In this way he subverted the class hierarchies of antiquity. I realized that in each instance of the discourses I chose for my book, one system of values was displaced by another; that the body of Christ fulfilled the same subversive function but in different contexts of different epochal concerns. The title of my book *Christ's Subversive Body* is an hommage to Martin's book. Martin's book helped me discern this rhetorical operation of subversion in the discourses which practice overturning of values by using religious language outside the strictly religious context, mostly in the cultural context.

I realized that all the seemingly unconnected periods and discourses I chose used the same rhetorical operational mode to produce a subversive discourse that aimed at challenging and changing the ideological status quo of the period in question (for better or worse). The body of Christ was in fact a "christological operator" (as René Nouailhat put it) which through two millennia has been able to acquire a variety of materializations, such as the building of a church, the body of a book, a model of society, or a novel of consciousness. The major challenge of my book was to build a diachronic comparison which would avoid the notion of influence or teleological linearity. Diachronic comparison, to be functional and effective, needed a generative,and not thematic model, one adjustable to the historical context and able to account for the epistemological differences of different periods.

This approach is not unprecedented. The French scholar of ancient Christianity René Nouailhat already outlined a program of studying the ideological functioning of Christianity by approaching the figure of Christ precisely in these terms. In his 1985 article "The Christological Operator," Nouailhat showed how certain structural elements of dogma (such as, for example, the heterogeneity of its pre-Christian religious and philosophical sources, the ambiguity implicit in Christ's divine and human natures, the paradox of triumph through defeat or life through death, and the church's alliance with and adoption of the universalism of Roman imperial claims) resulted in its peerless status as an "ideological operator." The figure of Christ as ideological operator is capable not only of meaningfully organizing religious discourse, no matter how contradictory or heterogeneous the ideas composing it, but also of grouping and regrouping participants in religious discourse, no matter how diverse, along varying political lines. I preserved this helpful understanding of the figure of Christ as an "ideological operator," but limited the discursive operation under scrutiny to the type of subversive discourse in Paul. However, my book does not deal with Pauline theology or ecclesiastical politics in their own

right but focuses on adaptations of the Christ-driven subversive modality of Paul's discourse in the realm of culture, literature, and politics.

Description of the monograph – results

My book shows that only the methodology of close reading and structural analysis, as practiced in Literary Studies, can provide a tool for approaching hybrid-, multi-layered textual constructs, as the discourses analyzed in my book. Below I retrace the analytical steps I made in order to build this diachronic comparison. I analyzed the discursive formation for each period, and noticed the following similarities: When the notion of the body of Christ is used discursively or rhetorically (not dogmatically), it contains three elements: 1) the topos of imitation of Christ which designates the rhetorical positionality of the speaker/author of discourse; 2) the Eucharist as a medium of nonverbal communication; 3) the body of Christ in Church or community, meaning congregation, or society, or humankind, or even universe, that is some collective audience. It is a medial model with a three-dimensional structure. It strongly emphasizes the authorial presence in the discourse. In the Pauline topos of imitation of Christ, he speaks for Christ, or in place of Christ; this vicariousness becomes a priestly model, but also a model for being the author of a discourse. It has an important medial and material aspect in the form of the Eucharist, and puts a strong emphasis on the reception/audience/context of presentation. By its nature this type of discourse that I chose to study is interdisciplinary. Reading such discourse requires interdisciplinary methodology of the "total speech act" (J. L. Austin) and of three-dimensional reading. Three-dimensional reading means in this case that we read the author and the positionality of the author not only in the text but also in the context of the epoch, in the larger context of the time, including the non-textual, performative elements of discourse.

The elements of this model can be regenerated in a variety of forms in the new historical contexts and by the new historical actors. Each case of subversion discussed in my book relies on the Pauline positionality of the imitation of Christ in order to undertake a shift in an established system of values – to change social perceptions, or systems of representation, or to influence constellations of power by assuming the positionality of Christ. The emphasis on the authorial presence in the topos of imitation of Christ is especially important here because the discourse in question does not obey any principle of aesthetic autonomy but quite deliberately oversteps it as part of its subversive scheme. Badiou wrote that "No discourse can lay claim to truth if it does not contain an explicit answer to the question: Who speaks?" Thus the "discourse apart" usually springs from the authors' personal involvement with the issues at stake, which they usually make quite pronounced in advancing their goals. For example, Dostoevsky's concern with the reform of criminal justice was a direct result of his own imprisonment and conversion in Siberia. He made this experience manifest in his essayism and it subliminally informs his philosophical novels.

The subversive discourse I studied greatly depends on its author's direct participation and social standing. The resulting utterances are not impersonal forms of discourse, though they harbor positions that may be inhabited by a variety of subjects. All instances of this discourse inherit

from Paul their legal and religious performativity. To achieve their goals, the subversive adventurers reenact the foundational Pauline discourse but in different cultural circumstances. And of course, the adoption of Pauline subversion outside of an ecclesiastical or theological context cannot be a mere repetition; it is readjusted to the needs of the moment. Taken out of the realm of religious practice, the reenactment of Pauline discourse focuses mostly on its formal features and modifies them according to new discursive needs. The Pauline modality of discourse is adjustable to different historical conditions and capable of ever new medial and discursive embodiment and transformation. Therefore its re-adoption in different historical periods provided a handy common denominator enabling diachronic comparison.

What are the Pauline features which constitute the commonality of the "discourse apart" along a diachronic axis established in the book? The first common feature is that it is a "counterpublic discourse" (to use a term coined by the literary scholar Michael Warner). It starts on the ideological margins of society but actively seeks to work its way through the existing public norms by verbally infiltrating and changing the terms of established discourse. Secondly, in the steps of Paul, this discourse apart preserves an archaic microcosm/macrocosm model conducive to a correlation of different "texts" within one given cultural paradigm. This discourse is informed by the logic of a double text, where the text is a microcosmic model of a social discourse at large. And the interventions which you undertake in the text *en miniature* are expected to work their effects by way of magical analogy on the rest of society.

While working on my book, I drew several conclusions about diachronic comparison: A diachronic comparison can be only structural because it should abstract from the historical differences; the shared common denominator should be "generative" but adjustable to the new historical and medial circumstance; the diachronic comparison is not a reception history, and should avoid the linear, teleological model of development. The diachronic comparison also faces a challenge of limited transmission, as many ancient discourses are transmitted only in fragments, and often our knowledge of the ancient historical periods is limited and sketchy; therefore the diachronic comparison also often needs to rely on findings from other disciplines, making it intrinsically interdisciplinary.

I worked with the methodology of comparative literature in mind, as we strive to understand it today: "the job of the comparatist is to invent new relations among literary works (and relations with things that have not been previously classed among literary works)" (Haun Saussy). So my book proceeds from a series of examples and constructed its own subject matter, Christ's subversive body, instead of merely interpreting an array of canonical texts at hand.

I treat the topics of the six chapters as "points of departure" (*Ansatzpunkte*) in the sense once elaborated by Erich Auerbach in his essay "Philology and *Weltliteratur*." Each topic offers "a firmly circumscribed, easily comprehensible set of phenomena whose interpretation is a radiation out from them and which orders and interprets a greater region than they themselves occupy." Each of these subjects "is as circumscribed and concrete as possible, and therefore describable in technical, philological terms."

The diachronic model of comparison developed in my book through the "points of departure" tries to account for historical contingencies and specificity in the operation of common discursive modalities. In this way the book addresses at least one desideratum of comparative literature today pointed out by Sheldon Pollock in his ACLA keynote address in 2010—the inclusion of pre-modern periods in comparative research. Without a diachronic comparative approach, Pollock reminds us, "you do not know the contingencies that have made that thing what it is; you do not understand that all products are outcomes of processes that could have been otherwise; … that the processes themselves are multiple, that there is in culture no mechanical development from initial conditions, no 'path dependency.'"

Given the historically and culturally diverse set of contexts in which Pauline discourse has been invoked, we are confronted with the situation *par excellence* where "a single point of departure will not be sufficient—several will be necessary." But "if the first one is present, however," writes Auerbach, "others are more easily available, particularly as they must be of the kind that not only links itself to others, but also converges on a central intention." In fact, all examples of the "discourse apart" in my book, despite a variety of the points of departure, converge on a common rhetorical pattern of the Christ's subversive body.

The book was written and published within the American academia where the discipline of comparative literature welcomes interdisciplinarity. Its intervention in the Polish academia falls within the discipline of literary studies, opening it toward interdisciplinary rhetoric and diachronic comparative literature. The book was positively reviewed in *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, *Comparative Literature Studies*, *Modernism/modernity*, and *Rhetorica.*

c. Accompanying publications (peer-reviewed articles and book chapters)

Although my goal in the book was to overcome the limitations of traditional disciplines, some chapters of the monograph *Christ's Subversive Body* were published as articles in specialized journals in order to test my expertise in the different historical periods and fields of knowledge before I integrated this material into a larger comparative project. The endorsement by the experts in different disciplinary fields, such as Early Christianity, Italian Studies, Film Studies, or Material Studies allowed me to avoid the trap of dilettantism, the criticism often encountered by the interdisciplinary works and works of diachronic comparison. The following cluster of articles and book chapters represents my explorations of ideas around my first monograph in the areas of literary, cinematic and religious rhetoric.

My article on Pasolini "The Intellectual Embodied in his Medium, or the Cinematic Passion of Pier Paolo Pasolini," *Italian Culture*, 29.1 (2011): 52-68, explored Pasolini's "cinema of poetry" which he developed through the study and analysis of sign-language as a form of body-language. I show how Pasolini's literary and cinematic work (much of it consisting of literary adaptations) culminates in his adaptation of Matthew's Gospel and how Pasolini's work constitutes an

interdisciplinary meta-text which can't be fully understood without integrating the methods of literary analysis with those of the analysis and study of cinema.

In my article about the alchemical manuscript *Book of the Holy Trinity*, I uncover the self-reflexive references to the book's conception and production as the body and blood of Christ in an evocation of the demands of the Reformation groups. I also conceptualize this medieval book in the habits of medieval cultures of reading. My article was first published as "Corpus Libri als Corpus Christi: Zur prekären Transsubstantiation des alchemistischen Sprachstoffes im *Buch der Heiligen Dreifaltigkeit* (1415-1419)," in the volume *Poetiken der Materie: Stoffe und ihre Qualitäten in Literatur, Kunst und Philosophie*, edited by Thomas Strässle and Caroline Tora-Mattenklott (Freiburg a.B.: Rombach, 2005), 145-164. In the book I added considerations of medieval authorship and offered a broader contextualization of this alchemical manuscript in the religious politics and book culture of the early Reformation period.

The two articles on Epiphanius of Salamis and his early iconoclasm, preceding the monograph, focused separately on the analysis of his "Letter to John, Bishop of Jerusalem" ("Epiphanius of Salamis and his Invention of Iconoclasm in the Fourth Century A.D.," *Fides et Historia*, 42.1 [2010]: 21-46) and his "iconoclastic fragments" from other writings ("Epiphanius of Salamis Between Church and State: New Perspectives on the Iconoclastic Fragments," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum / Journal of Ancient Christianity,* 16.2 [2012]: 344-367). In these articles I offered the first historical interpretation of Epiphanius' iconoclasm since the time of the discovery of the iconoclastic fragments in 1916. Using the interdisciplinary and literary comparative approach (as found in Erich Auerbach), I suggested that the phenomenon of Epiphanius' early iconoclasm can be understood as a politically motivated rhetorical strategy targeting the imperial iconography at the moment of acutest competition between the Church and the Roman State.

In my further two publications I continued elaborating on the ideas discussed in the book *Christ's Subversive Body* in order to take the results of the book to readers in other disciplines. One example is my article "Peepshow, Death Camp, Art Gallery: The Spaces of Pasolini's *Salò* and Mauri's *Intellettuale,*" *TDR: The Drama Review,* 63.1 (Spring 2019): 64-82. Taking up my previous analysis of Fabio Mauri's happening *Intellettuale,* an event which occurred in an art gallery designed by the Italian architect Leone Pancaldi, I drew together three strands: Pasolini's adaptation of Sade's novel *The Hundred Days of Sodom* into the film *Salò*; the quasi-sadistic spotlighting of Pasolini as author by Mauri in this happening; and the experiential background of Pancaldi's architecture, which responded to and reconfigured the architect's earlier experience of a concentration camp. The triangulation of Pasolini's, Mauri's, and Pancaldi's work allowed me to dramatically underscore the methodological significance of interdisciplinarity and bring Pasolini's adaptations of literature to the attention of scholars in performance and theater studies. These publications continued the task of disseminating my research results and fine-tuning the interdisciplinary methodology developed in the book as an extension of close reading to other disciplines.

IV. Scientific achievement—peer-reviewed articles and book chapters

Introduction—goals:

The selection of articles and book chapters listed below use an interdisciplinary methodology of comparative literature which combines textual analysis with formal analysis of film and other media. The intermedial potential of literature and literary adaptation are in the focus. These articles demonstrate what I call "three-dimensional" reading: reading of texts in historical and interdisciplinary context, where the experience of reading uncovers how individual works of art participate in larger discursive formations and thus identifies more complex and previously unidentified meanings of literary production.

a) Title of scientific achievement (book chapter in an edited volume): **"After the Freeze and the Thaw: Kawabata Yasunari's Nobel Prize and the Soviet Rediscovery of Japan,"** *Japan Behind the Iron Curtain*, edited by Irina Holca and George T. Sipos (forthcoming with Routledge's Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies Series in 2025)

Description:

This book chapter discusses how Kawabata Yasunari's 1968 Nobel Prize in Literature changed the course of the history of Japanese literary studies in the Soviet Union. The shift was significant: from the persecution of Japanologists and Japanology to the revival of translation and publishing of Japanese literature. The chapter re-traces the reception of Kawabata in the Soviet Union from the late 1950s to the Perestroika time, with a special focus on two ground-breaking articles on Kawabata written by two Soviet literary scholars Tatiana Grigorieva and Kim Rekho in 1971. The chapter contributes to the disciplines of comparative literature, history of ideas, and literary history.

b) Title of scientific achievement (book chapter in an edited volume): "**Horror Old and New: Nakata Hideo's *Ringu* (1998) between J-Horror and Hibakusha Cinema." *A Companion to Japanese Cinema*, ed. David Desser. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2022, 382-400.**

Description:
This book chapter is a contribution to the new Blackwell *Companion to Japanese Cinema*. It discusses Suzuki Koji's novel *Ring* (1991) and its adaption to the screen by Nakata Hideo in 1998. The novel was written in the context of the AIDS epidemic, but I show how Nakata changes Suzuki's original so as to create a film about the repressed memory of atom bombings. Nakata's use of color, iconography, and underhanded references to radiation disease changes Suzuki's mythologizing tendency into a critical reflection on historical experience, thus representing a form of criticism of Suzuki's novel.

c) Title of scientific achievement (peer-reviewed article in a scholarly journal): "**Rebellion: A Note on Agamben's Reception of Dostoevsky in *The Open.*" *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature/Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée,* 43.4 (2016): 520-530.**

Description:
This article not only deals with the question of Russian-Italian intertextuality but also with interdisciplinarity. It brings the disciplines of literature and philosophy into a dialogue. Through close readings of Dostoevsky's and Agamben's texts, I discuss how Agamben's misquotation of Dostoevsky's novel *The Brothers Karamazov* sheds light on the self-reflexivity and ethical underpinnings of the philosopher's treatise *The Open*. I show how Agamben's philosopical project in *Homo Sacer* and *The Open* reiterates the ethical dilemmas of Dostoevsky's novels. The application of literary analysis and knowledge of literary history casts new light on the philosopher's work.

d) Title of scientific achievement (book chapter in an edited volume): "**Fassbinder's France: Genet's Mise-en-Scène in Fassbinder's Films."** ***A Companion to Rainer Werner Fassbinder*****, ed. Brigitte Peucker. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012, 333-351.**

Description:
This peer-reviewed book chapter for a Blackwell *Fassbinder Companion* analyzes how Jean Genet's novel *Querelle de Brest* and the Genet-specific synecdochal poetics of mise-en-scène informed Fassbinder's adaptation of this novel but also his other productions which deal specifically with psychological power relations and which I call "Fassbinder's France." The article shows how Fassbinder engages and enters into a dialogue with French literature, in his turn, synecdochically via Genet. The chapter deals with the problem of intercultural cinematic adaptation of literature.

e) Title of scientific achievement (peer-reviewed article in a scholarly journal): "'**Bizarre Epik des Augenblicks': Gottfried Benn's 'Answer to the Literary Emigrants' in the Context of his Early Prose."** ***German Studies Review,*** **33.1 (2010): 119-140.**

Description:
This article offers a close reading of Benn's radio speech, entitled "A Response to the Literary Emigrants," in the context of his early prose and literary debates in the Weimar Republic. The article analyzes the literary sources which went into the production of this piece (e.g., Goethe). On the basis of this analysis, I offer an answer to the question about the reasons for Benn's brief embrace of the national-socialist state. I show that in this radio speech the writer restages the aesthetics of his early prose but in a political context, thus transitioning from literature to the politics of his later pro-NSDAP essays. This transition occurs as a shift between two possible perspectives on reality, the epic and the transient—an alternation which he had experimented with in his early work. Benn's adaptation of the poetics of his early prose to the political actuality in his speech betrays the features of a false projection of the fascistic appropriation of the world (Adorno/Horkheimer) and allows an insight into the mechanism of Benn's political conversion.

f) Title of scientific achievement (peer-reviewed article in a scholarly journal): **"Polyphonie und Karneval: Spuren Dostoevskijs in Thomas Manns Roman** ***Doktor Faustus.*****"** ***Poetica*****, 3-4**

(2005): 463-494. (In German.)

The article discusses the elements of Dostoevsky's poetics in Thomas Mann's novel *Doktor Faustus* in the context of Mann's essay "Dostoevsky—Within Measures," written as a preface to an American edition of Dostoevsky's short novels. The article shows how the reception of Dostoevsky's early prose allows Mann to solve the aesthetic challenges of writing a novel of conscience which combined the historical biographical genre (focused on the life of the composer Adrian Leverkühn) with the genre of subjective self-reflection (the narrator Zeitblom). Mann's discovery of Dostoevsky's philosophical polyphony and carnival, which informed his own novel, inspired Mikhail Bakhtin's second, reworked and expanded version of his book *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. The article relies on Bakhtin and Bakhtin studies, as well as on the work of the German theorist of literature Renate Lachmann, for its theoretical framework.

5. Presentation of significant scientific or artistic activity carried out at more than one university, scientific or cultural institution, especially at foreign institutions

a. Project "Japan's Russia: Challenging the East-West Paradigm" (sponsored by the Franke Institute for the Humanities, the Center for East Asian Studies, the Center for Eastern European and Eurasian Studies at the University of Chicago, and Japan Foundation New York), resulted in an international conference and co-edited volume. The project was carried out at the University of Chicago and University of Oxford, 2017-2021.

In 2018-2021, I collaborated with the historian of modern Japan Sho Konishi at the University of Oxford on a research project about the Russian-Japanese intellectual relations, entitled "Japan's Russia: Challenging the East-West Paradigm." The topic is of high relevance to the discipline of comparative cultural studies because it decenters the US-driven approaches to the study of national cultures. The project consisted in organizing an international conference, directing a research group with a focus on methodology of transnational history and East-West comparison, and publication of the results in an edited volume on the basis of this international collaboration. This collaborative scientific activity was carried out at Oxford and Chicago in the course of several lectures, talks and conferences. The conference "Japan's Russia" at the University of Chicago was co-sponsored by the Japan Foundation (New York) and subsequently showcased as an example of work which the Foundation strives to promote today. Grace Gallie from the Foundation wrote: "We hope to encourage creative proposals by providing examples of successful projects. The University of Chicago's 'Japan's Russia' conference came to mind as an excellent example of the type of projects we hope to support - interdisciplinary, comparative approaches to Japanese Studies." See https://www.jfny.org/grants/grants-for-japanese-studies/jfny-grant-for-japanese-studies/ In the course of this collaboration I gave a talk on Akira Kurosawa's reception of Tolstoy in his film *Ikiru* at Oxford's Nissan Institute for Japanese Studies in November 2017, a talk at the UChicago conference, and a plenary lecture at the Nissan Institute's conference "Reopening the Opening of Japan" in May 2019. The volume which resulted from this series of events, *Japan's Russia: Challenging the East-West Paradigm* (Cambria Press, 2021), co-edited with Sho Konishi, is a collaborative effort by an international

group of scholars from Tatarstan, Ukraine, Japan, UK, USA, Australia, and Denmark which I have been leading since 2018. The volume was discussed above. It received "the 2023 ICAS Prize—accolade for the English-language edition."

b. Project "Cultures of Protest in Contemporary Belarus, Ukraine, and Russia" (sponsored by the Neubauer Collegium for Culture and Society and the Pozen Center for Human Rights at the University of Chicago). This project resulted in an international workshop, "Cultures of Protest in Contemporary Belarus, Ukraine, and Russia"; a photoexhibit, "Belarus—Faces of Resistance"; and an edited volume, "Belarus—Faces of Resistance" (forthcoming with Academic Studies Press in 2025). The project has been carried out at the University of Chicago, the Human Rights Center "Viasna" in Minsk, the Democracy Study Center of the German-Polish-Ukrainian Society in Kyiv, and since September 2023 at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń.

In 2018-2019, within this project, I collaborated with Yulia Ilchuk, sa cholar of Russian and Ukrainian literature at Stanford University. The goal of this project was to create a productive dialogue among Ukrainian, Belarusian and Russian intellectuals and artists who share the values of democratic governance, human and civil rights, and freedom of artistic expression, as well as among scholars of the recent history and culture of these three countries. Establishing this dialogue is crucial to better understanding of the complex interconnection of culture and politics in the region.

The workshop conducted within the framework of this project at the Neubauer Collegium for Culture and Society in February 27-March 1, 2019 brought together public intellectuals from all three countries, among them the human rights leader and essayist Ales Bialiatski from Belarus, the civil society activist and journalist Serguei Parkhomenko from Russia, and the art curator Vasyl Cherepanyn from Ukraine. In a three-day workshop, along with colleagues from UChicago, NCU in Toruń, and the members of the local Belarusian, Ukrainian, and Russian communities, the participants discussed and showcased their cultural projects, spoke about their experience with arts and politics in their respective countries, and planned collaborations for the future. In the course of this project, I traveled to Minsk and Kyiv to confer with my colleagues and collaborators at the Belarusian and Ukrainian institutions, and gave a lecture at the German-Polish-Ukrainian Center for the Study of Democracy in Kyiv. Although temporarily interrupted by the Covid pandemic and then by the war in Ukraine, the project has continued as a series of online roundtables, courses, exhibits and publications. The project is now housed at the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, thanks to the efforts of the Polish project participant Dr. Adam Kola.

6. Presentation of teaching and organizational achievements as well as achievements in popularization of science or art

a. Achievements in Teaching

Pedagogical Experience and Teaching Philosophy

My teaching is based on research and experimentation with methodologies of comparative cultural studies: multilingual, multi-media, multi-cultural, and encompassing various historical periods and fields of inquiry. As background: I taught German language for two years (1997-1999) at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, and then went through two years of pedagogical training as part of my graduate education at Yale, as reflected in my graduate transcript. Since 2006 I have continuously taught at American educational institutions of higher learning (Smith College, Yale College, Georgia Institute of Technology and from 2011 to 2023 at the University of Chicago). At the University of Chicago, I took advantage of pedagogical initiatives promoted at the university and developed and taught several interdisciplinary courses introducing students to comparative approaches to literature and culture.

I believe in object-based and experiential approaches to learning. My courses typically include work in art galleries, museums, library collections, and theaters. For example, in Spring 2018 I taught a class on Thomas Mann's 1,500-page novel *Joseph and His Brothers* (1926-1943) using the resources of the University of Chicago's Oriental Institute (now renamed ISAC). To understand this German novel, my students toured the Mesopotamian and Egyptian galleries of the museum and conversed with a biblical archeologist, a scholar of biblical and Rabbinic traditions, and a Hebrew-language linguist. This is what we do as comparatists. Like the writers and artists whose work we study, we cross the borders of disciplines, time periods, and genres to understand in full how literature works. The topics of my students' papers ranged from the echoes of Luther's theology in Mann's novel, to the dialectics of human and divine will, to a comparison of the novel with Andrew Lloyd Webber's musical "Joseph and the Amazing Technicolor Dreamcoat." As these topics show, the course did achieve my aim of fostering a diversity of styles of investigation (history of ideas; religion and literature; intermedial research). Likewise, when teaching a core course in Media Aesthetics, I invited students to explore the unique public art collection on the university campus and create an individualized campus tour for their family and friends. Many of them created original poems, short stories, advertisement spoofs, or philosophical dialogues. After exploring the works' size, material, meaning and context, students integrated their insights, won on the ground, with our class material. They were invited to reflect on why this particular piece of art was placed in this particular place and on the purposes of public art in general. How do these works allow us to reflect on campus life? How do they relate to the space and context of their placement? In the academic year of 2022-23 alone, my teaching used the resources of the Renaissance Society, the Court Theater, Special Collections at the Regenstein Library, the ISAC, and the Smart Museum of Art; Museum of Chicago History, and many diasporic museums in Chicago.

Grant-supported Courses

Among all the classes I have taught in my career, I would like to emphasize four courses designed with the support of competitive grants for innovative pedagogy:

a. Graduate Course "Destruction of Books, Images and Artifacts in Europe and South Asia" (co-taught with the South Asianist Tyler Williams) was chosen for support through the Center for Disciplinary Innovation and taught in Spring 2018;

b. Graduate/Undergraduate Course "Russian Anarchists, Revolutionary Samurai: Introduction to Russian-Japanese Intellectual Relations" was funded through the Title VI Federal Grant of the Center for East Asian Studies) in Spring 2020;

c. Undergraduate Course "From Dostoevsky to Samurai to Spaghetti Western: Adaptation and Akira Kurosawa," was taught as a College SIGNATURE course in Spring 2021;

d. Undergraduate Course "Diasporic Memories and Narratives: Designing the Multi-Ethnic Museum of Belarusian Emigration" (co-taught with the scholar of Polish literature Bożena Shallcross) was funded as a capstone course by the Institute on the Formation of Knowledge in Spring 2022 and taught again as part of the "Big Problems" Curriculum of the Franke Institute for the Humanities in Spring of 2023.

Full List of Courses Taught since the Conferment of Ph.D.

The University of Chicago

FNDL 24615: Dostoevsky's *Injured and Downtrodden* (taught in Russian) (Spring 2023)
SOSC 19001: Western Mediterranean Civilization-I (Winter 2023)
SOSC 19004 Rome: Antiquity to the Baroque-I: From the Beginnings of Rome to the Empire (Fall 2022)
XCAP KNOW/BPRO 29943: Diasporic Narratives and Memories: Designing a New Concept for the Museum of Belarusian Emigration (Spring 2022/23)
FNDL, REES, CMLT 27804: Dostoevsky's *Demons* (taught in Russian) (Spring 2022)
Huma 12500: Human Being and Citizen-3 (Spring 2022)
CMLT 24410/SIGN 26081: From Dostoevsky to Samurai to Spaghetti Western: Adaptation and Akira Kurosawa (Spring 2021)
Huma 11000: Readings in World Literature-1 (Fall 2020)
CMLT 39710 REES 29815 REES 39815 EALC 29710 EALC 39710: Russian Anarchists, Revolutionary Samurai: Introduction to the Russian-Japanese Intellectual Relations (Spring 2020)
FNDL 25106, CMLT 25106, GRMN 25106: Thomas Mann's novel *Lotte in Weimar* (1939) (taught in German) (Winter 2020)
SOSC 19011: Vienna in Western Civilization 2 (Fall 2019)
CMLT 43302: Films by Akira Kurosawa and Their Literary Sources (Winter 2019)
SOSC19002: European Civilization: Medieval and Early Modern Mediterranean World (Winter 2019)
CDI 50204 1: Destruction of Books, Images and Artifacts in Europe and South Asia (co-taught with Tyler Williams) (Spring 2018)
CMLT 33302: Kurosawa and His Sources (Spring 2017)
FNDL 25100: Thomas Mann, *Joseph and his Brothers* (Spring 2017)
Huma 12400: Human Being and Citizen 2 (Winter 2017, 2018)
CMLT 20109: Comparative Methods in the Humanities (Winter & Fall, 2017; Winter & Fall 2020; Winter 2022)

CMLT 21705/31705: The Novel-Essay and Its Past: From Artsybashev's *Sanin* to Musil's *Man Without Qualities* (Spring 2016)
Huma 16100-02: Media Aesthetics 3: Sound (Spring 2016)
Huma 16100-03: Media Aesthetics 2: Text (Winter 2016)
CMLT 21704: Intercultural Adaptation: Kurosawa and his Russian Sources (Fall 2015)
Huma 22305: *The Films of Jean-Luc Godard* (Spring 2015)
CMLT 34410: *Kurosawa and his Sources* (Winter 2014)
CMLT 24409/34409: *Modern Rewritings of the Gospel Narratives* (Spring 2013)
German 25312: *Thomas Mann in His Epoch* (Spring 2012)

Georgia Institute of Technology
Film 2500: *Introduction to Film Studies* (Fall 2007, Spring 2008)
Film 3254: *Film History* (Fall 2007)
Film 3256: *The Films of Jean-Luc Godard* (Spring 2008)

Yale University
Film 320: *Close Analysis of Film* (Spring 2007)

Yale University, Teaching Assistantship
Film 321: *Hollywood in the Twenty-First Century* (Spring 2007)
(Prof. Ron Gregg)

B.A. Theses Advised

In my time at the University of Chicago, I advised the following B.A. theses:

Marco Laghi, "Learning to Hear the Subaltern: The Pedagogy of Pasolini and Tolstoy" (2020)
Sophia Singer, "Goda's 'Air Doll' and its Consequences: Reframing a Dialogue of Filmic Adaptation" (2020)
Christian Bone, "VroniPlag and Dissernet: Technology, Aesthetics and Politics in Plagiarism Detection Platforms from Germany and Russia" (2021)
Karina Hollbrook, "The Three Trees at Midzuho: Konstantin Gaponenko, Tolstoyan Humanism, and Russian-Japanese-Korean Triangulation in *Tragedy at Midzuho Village*" (2022)

The theses' topics show the opening of comparative literature to such fields as cultural studies, pedagogy, global media studies, digital humanities, and East-West comparison. I take pride in having guided such pioneering work.

Besides my work with undergraduate students, I mentored graduate students from other institutions. I advised graduate students from Oxford, Yale, and the Federal University of Uberlandia (UFU) in Brazil and mentored postdocs from Harvard, Kyoto and Waseda Universities, as well as the Universities of Sydney and Tokyo.

The major goal of my pedagogical efforts is to ensure that my students receive high-quality, individualized training based on current research in literary studies and humanities. I do my best to show them how to make the fullest and best use of the educational resources and initiatives offered by their educational institutions and the cities they live in.

b. Organizational Achievement

In 2016-2022 I served as DUS in the Department of Comparative Literature. In this capacity, I introduced the following curricular and organizational innovations to the program:

Curricular Innovation—Design of a New Methodology Course

To bring our undergraduate majors' education up to date with the stand of the discipline, I developed a new mandatory methodology course focusing on the interdisciplinary methodology of Comparative Literature, also including such new fields as East-West comparison and diachronic comparison. This course replaced an older *Intro to Comp Lit* course which focused exclusively on literature. The new course, entitled "Comparative Methods in the Humanities," opened the door of our discipline to students across the humanities and other divisions. It attracted students in mathematics, pre-Med, arts and other disciplines across campus. The hands-on comparative assignments in this course were set up so that students start their initiation into methodology with practical analysis and reading of texts and artifacts before they proceed to theory. This method prevents the dogmatization and banalization of theory, and allows students to judge theory on the basis of their own first-hand experience of texts and other cultural artifacts. I structured the syllabus so as to demonstrate the on-going feedback loop between theory and practice which characterizes the development of our field.

Introduction of Publishing Experience to Undergraduate Training

I started cultivating undergraduate publishing experience as an important optional part of our curriculum. Considering the fact that most of the graduates in Comparative Literature pursue careers in academia or the publishing industry, the experience of publishing their work in undergraduate journals is an important part of their professional training. I always encourage students to submit their best work to undergraduate journals and work with them and the journals' editors to guide the young authors through the process of publication. I usually set up my class material so that it would allow students to develop ground-breaking contributions, which, if properly executed, may constitute cutting-edge contributions to the field. Many students opted to take advantage of this learning opportunity. I have worked with students on individual and group publications in such undergraduate journals as *Oswald Review*, *Berkeley Journal of Comparative Literature*, and *Proteus*: *the Rutgers University Undergraduate Journal of Comparative Literature.*

Contribution to Undergraduate Research Training

I did my best to promote undergraduate research. At the University of Chicago, I regularly drew my students into my own research as compensated assistants within the College's Micro-Metcalf Internship Program (Karina Holbrook, Nick Wilkins) and as translators (Oliver Okun). I have also advised research projects within the College Summer Research Fellows Program (Elma Hoffman) and the Quad Faculty Research Grant (Katherine Sinyavin). In the summer of 2022 I advised an undergraduate student from Emory (Mackenzie Noxon) under the Leadership Alliance Program for students from underprivileged backgrounds. I usually set up students' research assignments so as to give them opportunities for their own publications and conference presentations. Their working experience for me as research assistants contributes to their own research projects and careers. As of now, I have supervised the following publications by my students, often developed on the basis of work done in my courses or research projects:

May Huang (Class of 2019), "More Than Looking: Translation as Imagination in Williams Carlos Williams's 'The Dance' and Gary Snyder's 'Deer Park'," *The Oswald Review: An International Journal of Undergraduate Research and Criticism in the Discipline of English.* Vol. 20.1 (2018) [Comparative Methods in the Humanities, Fall 2017]

Ella Parker (Class of 2020), "*The Ship of Fools:* Hieronymus Bosch in Response to Sebastian Brant," *The Oswald Review: An International Journal of Undergraduate Research and Criticism in the Discipline of English.* Vol. 22.1 (2020) [Vienna in Western Civilization II, Fall 2019]

Elma Hoffman (Class of 2021), (with Olga V. Solovieva), "Envisioning the Sea of Tonality: Takemitsu's and Tarkovsky's *Nostalghia." Japan's Russia: Challenging the East-West Paradigm*, eds. Olga V. Solovieva and Sho Konishi (Cambria Press, 2021). [Kurosawa and his Literary Sources, Winter 2019 and the College Summer Research Fellows Program, 2019]

Oliver Okun (graduate student), trans. "About the Local and What All Hold in Common: Belarusian Human Rights Activist Ales Bialiatski in Conversation with Olga V. Solovieva," *B20*, February 5, 2020.

Development of a Translation Program

In the course of 2018-19 at the University of Chicago, in close collaboration with the College Master, the Language Center Director, and a lecturer in Creative Writing and literary translator, I developed a translation program for a cross-divisional undergraduate minor in Translation Studies and a translation track for the program in Comparative Literature. The program was intended to teach undergraduates to develop and apply their foreign language knowledge to the production and analysis of translations. The minor was designed so as to give students majoring in a variety of fields the tools to consider the practical and theoretical issues brought up by translation as an aesthetic, cultural, and ethical practice. This program could be a great asset to the Division of Humanities, if implemented at the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń.

c. Popularization of scholarship and art

Public Lectures

My methodology of experiential learning was showcased in Family Weekend classes at the University of Chicago for several years.

In 2016 I taught a model class entitled "Media-Specific Aesthetics: William Carlos Williams 'The Dance'." The class introduced the interdisciplinary method in Comparative Literature through a hands-on analysis of William's poem "The Dance" and Pieter Breughel's picture "Kermesse," on which the poem is based. The class's goal was to teach the analysis of the production of meaning across different media. The method was close reading and translation of the textual elements into visual ones and vice versa.

In 2017 I taught a model class entitled "Aristotle's Lecture Room," based on my Core Course "Human Being and Citizen." In this class, I introduced students to objects from Aristotle's time, in order to convey viscerally how Aristotle's pattern of thinking reflects the cultural values and aesthetic norms of the day. The philosopher developed his *Ethics* not in a rarefied space of abstraction but in the concrete setting of an ancient classroom in the company of participating colleagues and students.

In Fall 2021, I taught a model class "Akira Kurosawa's and Vladimir Arseniev's *Dersu Uzala.*" In this class, I showed how to read this film through the interconnected and overlapping histories of Japan and Russia in their colonial claims to the Asian mainland.

At the University of Chicago, I also regularly gave public lectures to the community of alumni and guests during the Humanities Days and Alumni Weekends, which showcased the University's libraries and collections and my work based on those collections to the broader interested public:

"Nakata Hideo's *Ringu* (1998) and the Memories of Atom Bombings," Humanities Day Lecture, University of Chicago, October 2016

"James J. Tissot and his 'Prodigal Son' Etchings at the Smart Museum of the University of Chicago," Humanities Day Lecture, University of Chicago, October 2015

"A Portrait of the Artist as President's Wife: Maude Hutchins at the University of Chicago," Humanities Day Lecture, University of Chicago, October 2013

"Stages of an Exile: Thomas Mann in Chicago," Humanities Day Lecture, University of Chicago, October 2012

The roundtable "People and Cities in Protest: Technologies and Ethics of Representation," the UChicago Alumni Weekend, Spring 2023

Curatorial Work

"Japanese Ghost Films" (with Angela Dalle Vacche, Allison Whitney, Andrea Wood), Film Festival, Georgia Institute of Technology, April 2008

"The Russian Kurosawa," Film Festival, The University of Chicago, May 2013

Non-Academic Publications

"Ales Bialiatski, Together: On the 2022 Nobel Peace Prize and East Slavic Solidarity," *B20*, January 10, 2023.

"'Not just for use of their own…': Solidarity in Times of Discord," *Cambridge Journal of Postcolonial Literary Inquiry,* 9.1 (2022), 77-84.

"About the Local and What All Hold in Common: Belarusian Human Rights Activist Ales Bialiatski in Conversation with Olga V. Solovieva," *B20*, February 5, 2020.

Contributor to the Blogzine "Printculture," available at http://www.printculture.com.

"The Pitfalls of Meritocracy: James J. Tissot's 'Prodigal Son' Etchings at the Smart Museum," May 31, 2015. *Sightings* (Blog of the Martin Marty Center at the University of Chicago)

"Dress Code: You Are What You Wear in *The Bitter Tears of Petra von Kant*." *Film Comment,* Nov./Dec. (2002): 53-56.

7. Apart from information set out in 1-6 above, the applicant may include other information about his/her professional career, which he/she deems important.

In this part I would like to outline my future academic trajectory as I envision it: At the moment, I'm preparing for publication my next edited volume for the Nissan Institute Series in Japanese Studies at Routledge, entitled *LifeIntertexts: Japanese-Russian Transnational Encounters and Global Triangulations*. The new interdisciplinary volume expands the concept of "Japan's Russia" yet further, making it a vehicle for the worldwide circulation of knowledge, building upon Prasenjit Duara's notion of "circulatory histories." The triangulating methodology of this volume should allow for a "convergent comparison" (Duara) of three and more cultures in order to overcome the habit of binary East-West approaches. Within this volume, I contributed a chapter in Literary Studies on the novel by the Japanese writer Kenzaburō Ōe and his reception of Russian, Western, African and African-American literature.

I'm also working on my third monograph, entitled *Thomas Mann's Russia: Stages of a Conversion*, a topic on which I have been working for many years. The book explores the centrality of Russian intertexts to Thomas Mann's trajectory of political conversion, from the nationalistic conservatism of *Reflections of a Non-Political Man* (*Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*, 1918) to the democratic internationalism of his exile period. Two chapters of the book have been fully developed; the remaining chapters already exist in the form of talks or published articles. The book starts with an analysis of Thomas Mann's reception of Dostoevsky in his *Reflections*, followed by chapters dedicated to his essays "Goethe and Tolstoy" and "Brother Hitler," and finally the novel *Doctor Faustus*. Building upon the Frankfurt School

sociologist Leo Loewenthal's observation that Dostoevsky was the modern author who produced the most copious intellectual response in Germany in the late 19th- and early 20th century, and engaging with writings about Dostoevsky by Alfred Weber, Otto Kaus, Stefan Zweig, André Gide, and many other representatives of the reception of Russian literature in Europe, the book goes beyond questions specific to Mann, showing the broader role of Dostoevsky's literature in the formation of German democratic consciousness in the early twentieth century.

At the moment, I'm also preparing an ERC grant with a history of Eastern and Central European literary theory in mind. This should result in a series of books introducing the young scholars to the methods of diachronic comparison, literary adaptation, and interdisciplinary studies in Comparative Literature. Examples can be gleaned from my books where they were first developed through the concrete case studies.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by Olga Solovyeva
Date: 2025.04.28 10:25:40 CEST

Applicant's Signature