

The Maude Translations of the *Sevastopol Stories*

Susan Layton
University of Edinburgh

Louise and Aylmer Maude have earned a high reputation as translators who conferred with Tolstoy and consulted various editions of his writings. Speaking of their work as a whole, with emphasis on *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*, Henry Gifford in 1978 pronounced their renderings the “soundest we have” (328). Concurring with Gifford, Michael Katz (vii) selected the Maude translations (but slightly emended the style) for the Norton critical edition of Tolstoy’s *Short Fiction* (1991), a collection including the first two *Sevastopol Stories* (*Севастопольские рассказы*). During the past few years, commentators have pointed out shortcomings of the Maude versions of *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*, particularly in connection with new English translations of those novels (McLean, “Which Anna?” 40-42, 45-48; and “Briggs’ Translation” 105, 106; and Turner 233-52).

In 2001, however, the Maudes again received unqualified praise in the Everyman’s Library publication of Tolstoy’s *Collected Shorter Fiction*, a two-volume set containing the Sevastopol trilogy. An unsigned note in volume one states that all the Maudes’ translations of Tolstoy “are still widely regarded as the best” (797). But with respect to the Sevastopol cycle, that assessment is even more questionable than it has proved to be for *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenina*.

The Maudes’ translations of the *Sevastopol Stories* predate the first major landmark in the history of establishing authoritative Russian versions of those works, the 1932 redaction in volume four of the Jubilee Edition of Tolstoy’s

writings. The Maudes published their first translation of Tolstoy’s Crimean War trilogy in 1901 (reprinted in 1903); they published a second version in 1932, the same year as the Jubilee redaction but apparently too early to have profited from it. The Maudes’ 1932 version first appeared in *Tales of Army Life* in the Oxford Centenary collection of Tolstoy’s works in twenty-one volumes (1929-37).

Everyman’s Library has reprinted the Oxford Centenary translation without, however, correcting its deviations from the canonical Russian versions. What exactly are the “canonical” versions of the *Sevastopol Stories*? How seriously do the Maude translations deviate from them? How much value can a translation retain if based on an outdated original? Such are the central issues the present essay will examine.

The very question of authoritative Russian texts is unusually complicated in the case of the Sevastopol trilogy. The editor of the pertinent Jubilee volume, V. I. Sreznevsky, took into account all the sources available at the time, most importantly those never published when Tolstoy was alive. No manuscript of “Sevastopol in December” (“Севастополь в декабре месяце”) survives, but there are manuscripts and proofs for “Sevastopol in May” (“Севастополь в мае”) and “Sevastopol in August 1855” (“Севастополь в августе 1855 года”).¹ Sreznevsky drew on those sources to revise and augment the versions of these narratives that circulated in Tolstoy’s lifetime. Among the latter, the most significant is Tolstoy’s *War Stories* (*Военные рассказы*, 1856), a collection containing the Sevastopol trilogy

along with the Caucasian army tales “The Raid” (“Набер”) and “The Wood-Felling” (“Рубка леса”). The book was issued by the educational division of Alexander II’s General Staff. The military branch of the Russian state was thus the first publisher of the *Sevastopol Stories* in book form. This arresting fact has escaped general attention and understandably so since a conspiracy of silence suppressed it in the Soviet period. The Jubilee Edition was no exception to that rule.² In our post-Soviet times, N. I. Burnasheva (and apparently she alone) has recounted the precious little that is known about how the General Staff came to publish *War Stories* through the mediation of Aleksei Davydov, the proprietor of a bookshop in Petersburg (*Раннее творчество* 208-11, 215-17; and “Комментарии” 298-300).

Censorship had become more lenient in the post-war period, allowing Tolstoy to prepare for *War Stories* versions of the Sevastopol narratives that were bolder than those originally published in the *Contemporary* (*Современник*) in June and September 1855 and January 1856. All the same, the *War Stories* texts of “Sevastopol in May” and “Sevastopol in August 1855” lacked much material that is now available from sources unpublished in the author’s lifetime. By drawing on those sources, Sreznevsky created the Jubilee redactions of those two stories that are, respectively, by my estimate around 11 percent and 8 percent longer than the *War Stories* versions. But Sreznevsky created the false impression that censors of *War Stories* had deleted all the material previously disallowed in the *Contemporary*.³ In fact, both the military and civilian censors readily passed the manuscripts Tolstoy submitted for *War Stories* (Бурнашева, *Раннее творчество* 215; and “Комментарии” 299-300). With this in mind, Burnasheva has raised the possibility of “self-censorship” on Tolstoy’s part, a decision not to say all he wanted to say, lest he suffer reprisals.⁴

She also noted, however, that Tolstoy appeared eager to publish *War Stories* in order to

enhance his literary reputation and to earn money. Finally, she suggested Tolstoy’s outlook may have evolved in the post-war period, so that he no longer felt so angry and satirical about the Sevastopol siege as he had when he first wrote about it (*Раннее творчество* 208-09, 212-15; and “Комментарии” 298).

Despite oversimplifying Tolstoy’s role in the textological development of *War Stories*, Sreznevsky’s editorial work on the Sevastopol trilogy remains an indispensable achievement.⁵ For the most part, Sreznevsky established the enduring content and contours of the three Sevastopol narratives. His editing procedures never changed; nor did his source-base greatly alter.⁶

Later Russian scholars, however, found good reason to disagree with many of his specific editorial choices. Particularly controversial were cuts Sreznevsky made in the *War Stories* version of “Sevastopol in December” on the basis of a letter (not extant) that Tolstoy wrote to Aylmer Maude, apparently in the late 1890s. (This essay will later consider this event in depth.) For instance, by privileging different sources at various points, the twenty-volume collection of Tolstoy’s selected works (*Собрание сочинений в 20 томах*, first published in 1960 and used as the basis of David McDuff’s English translation of 1986⁷) deviated slightly from the Jubilee Edition, most strikingly for our purposes by restoring the material Sreznevsky had deleted from “Sevastopol in December.”⁸

After re-examining all the sources, Burnasheva prepared a new redaction of the Sevastopol cycle for Volume Two (2002) of the latest academic edition of Tolstoy’s complete works, set to reach one-hundred volumes. Immediately evident is the change in the number of chapters in “Sevastopol in August 1855,” now twenty-eight rather than twenty-seven.⁹ There are changes in content as well, sometimes due to Burnasheva’s adhering to the *War Stories* edition more closely than previous redactions. In “Sevastopol in May,” for

example, Burnasheva substituted болван (idiot) for скотина (pig), repeated three times in Captain Mikhailov's quarrel with his inebriated servant Nikita (chapter four).

More complicated is an emendation near the end of "Sevastopol in December." As published in the *Contemporary*, the story contained an authorial prediction that the enemy would never take the city. Tolstoy deleted that assertion when preparing *War Stories*. The Jubilee and twenty-volume editions of the Sevastopol trilogy reinserted it, but the new redaction has removed it.¹⁰ As a final example, we may note the shortening of the authorial apostrophe to God in the concluding paragraph of chapter fourteen (chapter fifteen in the latest edition) of "Sevastopol in August 1855." Cumulatively, such changes may subtly alter a reader's interpretation of characters and themes. All the same, close scrutiny is required to detect most of Burnasheva's emendations, many of which concern merely punctuation or paragraphing.

However small the changes may be, the latest academic edition of the *Sevastopol Stories* now stands as the new authoritative Russian target text awaiting translation.

The editorial process has thus left the Maudes' 1932 translation far behind and their English renderings obsolete. But as my analysis will show, the character and degree of their obsolescence varies for each of the *Sevastopol Stories*. Furthermore, being out of date does not mean these translations should be disregarded. To the contrary, it gives them great historical interest. This significance stems from the Maudes' primary reliance on the *War Stories* versions of the Sevastopol cycle. That 1856 collection basically set the *Sevastopol Stories* as they appeared in all subsequent editions of Tolstoy's collected works during his lifetime. With the exception of an emendation he made in 1886, that edition represents his last word as author of the Crimean War trilogy.¹¹ *War Stories* is thus a historically momentous collec-

tion, in no small part because of its publisher, the Russian state. Yet, this censored book has received little scholarly attention, in part perhaps because of its rarity: in the United States, only the libraries at Harvard and Indiana University catalogue it.

But more importantly, the posthumous Russian editing of the *Sevastopol Stories* has marginalized *War Stories*, dismissing it as a product of censorship, if only in the indirect form of "self-censorship." Regardless of the extent of the censors' role, *War Stories* deserves special study: its very obsolescence opens a window on that historical Tolstoy, who differs considerably from the Sevastopol author whom we know today. I would go even further, to suggest the Maudes' Centenary "Sevastopol in August 1855" may offer a model for the new translation of the trilogy.

In doing their translations of the *War Stories* versions of "Sevastopol in December" and "Sevastopol in May," the Maudes unearthed no previously unpublished material. Their 1932 translation of "Sevastopol in August 1855," however, interpolated manuscript material never before made available in English. (The question of the source will be discussed below.) The Maudes bracketed all this new material. By imitating this method, a new English version could deliver the entire Sevastopol cycle twofold: both as it existed when Tolstoy was alive and as posthumously edited, beginning with the Jubilee redaction. The purpose of such an edition would be to stimulate thinking about the public profile of the "Sevastopol Tolstoy" in imperial Russia, the issue of self-censorship, and the state's appropriation of his Crimean War trilogy that began in 1856.

In turning now to the Maude translations, let us first situate them within the larger history of English renderings of the Sevastopol trilogy. The three stories first appeared together in English in New York in 1887 (Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 401, 444, 492), translated by the American artist and author Frank D. Millet.¹² As stated on the

book's title page, he translated these stories from French. Although not named there, the French version was evidently the so-called *Souvenirs de Sébastopol*, translated anonymously and published along with *Les Cosaques* in Paris in 1886.¹³ Judged in terms of its source base, the French version is quite decent, and Millet's English renders it reasonably well.¹⁴ Interestingly enough, Millet's translation is still with us: it was reprinted, unrevised, by the University of Michigan press in 1961 and came out yet again in 2004. After Millet's pioneering venture, two more English translations of the *Sevastopol Stories* appeared in 1888, both in London: Isabel Hapgood's *Sevastopol*, and an anonymously translated text published under the title *Recollections of Sebastopol* (in *The Cossacks and Other Stories*). While the main title suggests reliance on *Souvenirs de Sébastopol*, *Recollections of Sebastopol* appears in fact to have plagiarized Millet: the overlap is nearly word for word.

All these early translations contain a sentence that Tolstoy deleted from "Sevastopol in May" when preparing the fifth edition of his collected works, published in 1886. The sentence was Tolstoy's revision of a passage the acting editor of the *Contemporary*, Ivan Panaev, had added near the end of the eviscerated version of "Sevastopol in May" the journal ran in September 1855 under the title "A Spring Night in Sevastopol 1855" ("Ночь весной 1855 года в Севастополе"). As first published in *War Stories* and all editions of Tolstoy's collected works prior to 1886, that sentence cast Russia as the spotless victim of the Crimean War: "But at least it is heartening to think that we were not the ones who started this war, we were simply defending our country (родной край), our native land."¹⁵

Young Tolstoy crossed out those words in a copy of *War Stories* he gave one of his aunts (Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 428-29). He also disowned the sentence in a letter from May 1858 to E. F. Korsh (*PSS* 60: 269-70). Yet, through

steady reprinting, that assertion of his country's innocence was part of Tolstoy's public persona in Russia for thirty years. It has remained so much longer in the English-speaking world, thanks to the reprinting of Millet's translation.¹⁶

The Maudes entered this history in 1901 when they translated the Sevastopol cycle after consulting Tolstoy's collected works of 1889 and 1893.¹⁷ Syntax is occasionally awkward in this initial version. But in terms of accuracy, the overall results are admirable, in accord with the Maudes' generally high standing as translators, though their language can strike false, "Victorian" notes. An example is their rendering of смрадный as "heavy" rather than "stinking," with reference to the air in a dugout where soldiers have just spent the night in "Sevastopol in August 1855" (chapter twenty-three, chapter twenty-four in the latest edition). There are other errors in meaning as well, including the mistranslation "a soldier with spades" in the following: По траншее этой встретите вы, может быть, опять носилки, матроса, солдат с лопатами... ("Sevastopol in December" 15). On the whole, however, the Maudes' 1901 translation is very reliable. Two years later they republished the same translation with a preface by Tolstoy. The preface consisted of pacifist reflections on the Sevastopol siege that he had written in 1889 in response to a Russian officer's request to provide an introduction to his memoirs of Crimean War service.¹⁸ The Maudes' 1903 title page furthermore carried a quote from the author praising the translations as the best he could ever wish to have.

Despite Tolstoy's blessing, the Maudes chose to revise those translations when preparing the *Tales of Army Life* volume of the Centenary edition in 1932. This was a light revision, however. In all three stories, in fact, many passages of this final translation remain identical to those of 1901. One can observe, furthermore, that the Maudes appear to have second-guessed themselves mainly in the first couple of pages of "Sevastopol in De-

ember.” In the opening passage, for instance, they fiddled around with Tolstoy’s simple but powerful descriptive phrase concerning the city at dawn: *снега нет—все черно*. Accurately conveying the general impression of darkness at this early hour, the 1901 version translates this as “there is no snow, all is black.” But in 1932, the Maudes changed this to “there is no snow on the hard black ground” (89; 2001 reprint, 81) (Millet’s translation contains a similar phrase “there is no snow on the ground, the earth is black” 15).

Coming as it does in the first lines of the Maudes’ 1932 version of the story, this misstep is glaring. But it is not typical. All things considered, the Maudes’ revision of 1932 succeeded in improving their 1901 translation.¹⁹ Their lexical changes were generally well motivated. “Handsome lad,” for example, is surely preferable to “pretty boy” (*красивый мальчик*) as a description of the young infantry officer Volodia Kozel’tsov (“Sevastopol in August 1855,” 218). In addition, the Maudes’ syntax is improved in the 1932 version: standard English patterns prevail over the underlying Russian word order.

Let us now consider peculiarities of the Maude renderings of each Sevastopol narrative. To begin with the most meddlesome, their versions of “Sevastopol in December,” as of 1901, omitted significant material they incorrectly believed Tolstoy could not have written. Perhaps the Quaker Maudes found old Tolstoy’s pacifism so compelling that they had trouble imaging him a patriot in his youth. He certainly fed their delusion. As Aylmer Maude put it in the first of his two prefaces to the 1901 translation, young Tolstoy had managed “to wring out of himself a few patriotic words” concerning the defense of Sevastopol. Maude continued:

What [Tolstoy] was able to constrain himself to do in that direction was, however, not sufficient to satisfy the censor or the editor of the magazine in which the sketches first appeared;

and the latter, on his side, added sundry patriotic touches. Knowing this to be the case, I selected certain passages which had a spurious ring and wrote to Tolstoy about them. His reply was: “With reference to the translation of *Sevastopol*, all the extracts you sent were either altered or inserted by the editor to meet the wishes of the censor, and it would therefore be better to omit them. The last extract quoted by you is especially abominable; it was added by the editor and displeased me very much at the time.” (“Preface to this edition” xv-xvi)

Maude’s letter to Tolstoy with the “certain passages” has been lost. The “especially abominable” passage was Tolstoy’s revision of the sentences Panaev had added to the “spring night” text published in September 1855. Regarding the formulations Maude considered “spurious” in “Sevastopol in December,” Tolstoy’s reply was unreliable. One need only consult his letters and diary of 1854-55 to verify his intensely patriotic reactions to the Crimean War. Furthermore, he had never before disowned any part of “Sevastopol in December” (Бурнашева, “Комментарии” 402-03). We may note as well that in 1909 Tolstoy, in a typically cranky outburst against all he had written prior to his conversion, dismissed his Sevastopol cycle as a *mélange* of “humor” and “patriotism” (Маковицкий 4: 98).

To all indications, then, we can put no credence in Tolstoy’s response to Maude’s inquiry about “spurious” formulations. Tolstoy’s memory may have been playing him false. It seems equally probable, however, that this disavowal of patriotic passages was a prevarication, manifesting Tolstoy’s well-known practice of grooming his public image.

Having conferred with Tolstoy, the Maudes made six deletions in “Sevastopol in December.”²⁰ The first occurred in the passage where the author conducts “you” (the reader) to a bastion to ob-

serve combat. There Tolstoy named “straightforwardness and stubbornness” as national characteristics evident in the Russian fighters. He then went on to dignify war in a sentence the Maudes left out: “But in addition to those principal traits, it seems to you that the danger, fury, and suffering of war have also impressed here on each face a conscious sense of personal worth, a lofty idea and feeling” (*Военные рассказы* 168; *Полн. собр. соч. в 100 томах* 91).

The rest of the Maudes’ deletions occurred in the story’s penultimate paragraph. First, they removed the authorial assertions that the strength of the Russian people would never falter and that “they [Sevastopol’s defenders] can do anything.” The Maudes next removed a sentence that attributes the Russians’ fighting spirit to love of the homeland. As already in *War Stories*, the passage reads:

Из-за креста, из-за названия, из угрозы не могут принять люди эти ужасные условия: должна быть другая высокая побудительная причина. И эта причина есть чувство редко проявляющееся, стыдливое в русском, но лежавшее в глубине души каждого—любовь к родине. (*Военные рассказы* 173; *Полн. собр. соч. в 100 томах* 93)

Men will not accept such horrible conditions for the sake of a cross or rank, or because they have been threatened: there must be another, lofty motivation. That motivation is a feeling rarely manifested in Russians, a feeling that arouses diffidence in them but lies deep within every heart—love of the homeland.²¹ (my translation)

By cutting that second sentence, the Maudes’ translation left a blank, for the reader to fill in: what exactly *is* the lofty motivation?

The Maudes’ final two cuts further toned down the story’s patriotic fervor. Both come at the end of the penultimate paragraph. Tolstoy’s

fighters gladly face death “not for the sake of the city but for the homeland”—a phrase the Maudes eliminated. They also expurgated the sentence that immediately follows: “Long will Russia bear grand traces of the Sevastopol epic whose hero was the Russian people.” (*Военные рассказы* 174; *Полн. собр. соч. в 100 томах* 93)

In sum, then, the Maudes’ version of “Sevastopol in December” is a bowdlerization. But since they had consulted Tolstoy before tampering with the text, their translation influenced Russian editors. An example was the 1912-13 edition of Tolstoy’s collected works prepared by his secretary and biographer Pavel Biriukov, a personal friend of Aylmer Maude. Although all Maude’s cuts purportedly had Tolstoy’s seal of approval, Biriukov accepted only three (the sentence concerning the traces of loftiness war etches on Russian faces, the phrase “they can do anything,” and the diffident patriotism formulation).

The Maudes exerted their most important influence on Sreznevsky, editor of the Jubilee redaction. Sreznevsky accepted only two of the cuts (the perception of loftiness on the Russian combatants’ faces and the diffident patriotism sentence). Sreznevsky admitted, though, that he had doubts about the legitimacy of the latter deletion, in view of independent evidence of young Tolstoy’s patriotic attitudes toward the Crimean War (386). Deleting that sentence in the Jubilee Edition did in fact fail to win a consensus among Soviet scholars. No later than 1948, a version of the Sevastopol cycle restored the material Sreznevsky had cut in conformity to Maude’s translation and quotation of Tolstoy’s letter (*Собрание художественных произведений в 12 томах* 1: 395, 397). In 1956 the eminent Tolstoy scholar Kupreianova was still faulting Sreznevsky on this point (Купреянова 96). Needless to say, the twenty-volume edition of 1960-65 also parted ways with the Jubilee text, thus codifying a practice that has persisted into the latest academic redaction of “Sevastopol in December.”

By contrast to the Maudes' bowdlerization of "Sevastopol in December," their final translation of "Sevastopol in May" is almost perfectly faithful to its source, the *War Stories* text as emended by Tolstoy in 1886. But that faithfulness means the Maude translation is missing roughly eleven percent of the canonical version established by the Jubilee Edition.

The nature of the missing material may surprise the average reader and even some Russian literature specialists. In the form first printed by the tsar's General Staff, "Sevastopol in May" depicts extensive suffering and death: wounded Russian soldiers piled in pools of blood on the floor of the medical dressing station, soldiers in agony on the operating table, and the field of the dead where a little boy comes upon a headless corpse (*Военные рассказы* 212-14, 254-55). While abounding in horrors of the siege, the *War Stories* version of this narrative conforms to the mutilated "spring night" text in suppressing virtually all descriptions, speech, or secret thoughts that would detract from the public image of the Russian officer: no worn-out boots, for instance, or unspoken terror at the prospect of having to fight).²² The knowledgeable reader of the Maude translation will also look in vain for the last two paragraphs of chapter one of the canonical Russian version, where the author wonders about the "madness" of sending tens of thousands of men into battle. Why not settle disputes on a smaller scale, he asks, by staging combat between little groups, or even a series of duels between two men from the warring sides?

Most importantly, the Maudes' source of "Sevastopol in May" greatly muted the theme of social tensions in the army, in particular, the military aristocrats' contempt for field officers and the ranks. Pursued in *War and Peace* and now regarded as a definitively Tolstoyan preoccupation, the theme of social snobbery in the army is most memorably illustrated in chapter five of the canonical "Sevastopol in May." Elite

officers have gathered for tea, conversation, and song in an elegant Sevastopol apartment. After adjutant Prince Galtsin marvels at the pleasures they are enjoying, the others respond. Consider first the *War Stories* version, as rendered by the Maudes, with a euphemistic substitution of "shirts" for "underwear" (белье):

"Well, if we didn't even have that much," said the old and ever-dissatisfied lieutenant-colonel, "the constant uncertainty we are living in—seeing people killed day after day and no end to it—would be intolerable. And to have dirt and discomfort added to it..."

"But our infantry officers live at the bastions with their men in the bomb-proofs and eat the soldiers' soup," said Kalugin, "what of them?"

"What of them? Well, though it's true they don't change their shirts for ten days at a time, they are heroes all the same—wonderful fellows." (120; 2001 reprint, 108).

In the canonical Russian version, this passage is longer and acquires a totally different character:

"Well, if we didn't even have that," said the old lieutenant-colonel, ever discontented, "things would be simply unbearable—the constant suspense, the sight of slaughter with no let-up day after day—just think if we were out there in the mud with no comforts."

"But how about our infantry officers," said Kalugin, "living at the bastions with the soldiers in a bomb-shelter and eating soldiers' borscht? How about them?"

"Now there's something I don't understand," said Prince Galtsin, "and, I must confess, don't believe: that men in dirty underwear, crawling with lice and never washing their hands, can possibly be capable of bravery. You know what I mean, *cette belle bravoure de gentilhomme*—it's just not possible."

“But they don’t even understand *that* kind of bravery,” said Praskukhin.

“What rot you’re talking,” angrily interrupted Kalugin. “I’ve seen a lot more of those men here than you have, and I’ll tell you once and for all: our infantry officers may have lice and not change their underwear for ten days at a time, but they’re heroes, amazing men.” (*Полн. собр. соч. в 100 томах* 104; my translation)

Such open expression of upper class contempt for social inferiors in the army is absent in the Maudes’ “Sevastopol in May,” as it is in the emended *War Stories* version they used as their reference. Unfortunately for the translators, they apparently had not noticed that pertinent material had already been interpolated into “Sevastopol in May” as published in Tolstoy’s collected works in 1928 in Moscow and Leningrad, just four years prior to the publication of the Jubilee volume (Срезневский 392). Nobody can keep track of everything concerning Tolstoy. But what seems strange is that the Maudes never revised their “Sevastopol in May” after the Jubilee Edition appeared.

To judge by the Maudes’ 1932 version of “Sevastopol in August 1855,” they would have jumped at the chance to integrate previously suppressed material into “Sevastopol in May,” had they known about it. Thanks to the Maudes’ bracketed interpolations in “Sevastopol in August 1855,” their Centenary version of that story happens to overlap closely the Jubilee redaction. While conclusive identification of the source of the new material would require further research, a strong possibility is Biriukov’s 1912-13 edition of Tolstoy’s writings. In preparing the twelfth edition of Tolstoy’s collected works (1911), his wife and son Sergei were the first to make use of the manuscript of “Sevastopol in August 1855” that Tolstoy had deposited in the Rumiantsev Museum in 1884 (Срезневский 395; Бурнашева,

“Комментарии” 472).²³ But Biriukov also used that manuscript (Бирюков 279). In view of Maude’s friendship with Biriukov, he presumably would have paid close attention to the latter’s editorial work, just as Biriukov had heeded Maude’s deletions from “Sevastopol in December.” At any rate, the Maudes’ “Sevastopol in August 1855” matches Biriukov’s redaction with only a few exceptions that might be due to inattention on the part of the translators.

The new material in the Maudes’ final version of “Sevastopol in August 1855” includes all of chapter five (chapter six in the latest Russian redaction). Set in the last posting station on the road to Sevastopol, that chapter consists mainly of the thoughts of a Russian officer who deeply regrets having volunteered for active duty. Other material omitted from the *War Stories* version of “Sevastopol in August 1855” concerns corruption in the army commissariat, social snobbery in the military, and moral failings of Russian commanders.

One example of the Maudes’ bracketed presentation of their interpolations comes near the end of chapter fifteen (chapter sixteen in the new Russian redaction). After recovering from his wounds, the elder Kozel’tsov has reported for duty at a bastion where he finds a former comrade transformed by a promotion. These are Kozel’tsov’s perceptions (with the Maudes’ punctuation emended):

It isn’t long since this same Batrishchev used to hobnob with us, wore one and the same dark cotton print shirt a whole week, ate rissoles and curd dumplings every day, never asking any one to share them—but look at him now! [A fine linen shirt showing from under his wide-sleeved coat, a ten-ruble cigar in his hand, a six-ruble bottle of claret on the table—all bought at incredible prices through the quartermaster at Simferopol]. In his eyes that look of the cold pride of a wealthy aristocrat

crat, which says: though as a regimental commander of the new school I am your comrade, [don't forget that your pay is sixty rubles once in four months, while tens of thousands pass through my hands, and] believe me I know very well that you'd give half your life to be in my place!" (194-95; 2001 reprint, 174)

There are inaccuracies here. In the first sentence, for example, "used to hobnob" should in fact read "used to get drunk" (кучивал); while по неделям means "for weeks at a time" or "week in, week out" rather than "a whole week." The Maudes' "wealthy aristocrat" also missed the nuance of аристократ богатства captured in McDuff's translation "aristocrat of wealth" (151). Despite the inaccuracies, the Maudes' editing style remains suggestive. By using brackets in this manner throughout "Sevastopol in August 1855," they allow readers to see immediately the differences between the printed words that circulated in Tolstoy's lifetime and the formulations published posthumously.

This editorial practice gave the Maude translation of that story its special historical dimension. It would be good to have a Russian edition of the *Sevastopol Stories* that achieved the same thing throughout. Short of that, however, a new translation alone could extend the Maudes' style of bracketing, with explanatory annotations as needed.

The latest Russian redaction of the *Sevastopol Stories* has made the time ripe for a concordant English version, one that might furthermore serve as a source of information about *War Stories*, a book evidently admired by Alexander II and used as the basis for reprinting the *Sevastopol Stories* in Tolstoy's collected works throughout his life.²⁴ The reader with no Russian would learn something about *War Stories*, an intriguing book little known outside academic circles. Russian literature specialists can of course consult *War Stories* independently. But as indicated earlier, the book

is rare outside Russia. Even for the scholar, then, the delivery of Tolstoy twofold could provide a preliminary guide to *War Stories*, specifying the interpolations of the author's posthumous editors.

The larger agenda would be to interpret the *War Stories* versions of the Sevastopol narratives in light of their first publisher, the tsar's General Staff. As Maude and others have suggested, one can perceive in the Crimean War trilogy antecedents of the old Tolstoy's pacifism, particularly in "Sevastopol in May." (Maude, "Preface to Sevastopol" xxxviii; Simmons 1: 136; Knapp 170). But since the Russian army itself published Tolstoy's imagery of "blood, suffering, and death"—the first story's famous characterization of war—pacifists have obviously never had a monopoly on its meanings. How did Russian officialdom understand the horrors of war in the *Sevastopol Stories*? Does the essence of that matter not lie in Tolstoy's representing the defense of Sevastopol as a tragic duty imposed on Russia by foreign invaders? And what of the Russian army's continuing patronage of the *Sevastopol Stories* long after Tolstoy's conversion?

Apparently following a standard edition of Tolstoy's collected works, the "Солдатская библиотека" series issued "Sevastopol in December" and "Sevastopol in May" in 1899 and an abridged version of the much longer "Sevastopol in August 1855" in 1903 (Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 391, 430, 472-73). This situation complicates our usual conception of the post-conversion Tolstoy in opposition to the state. In conversation with a British pacifist in 1907, Tolstoy declared that the Russian authorities would eventually have "to choose between me and the bayonets" (Leslie vii). But the choice was not really so stark since the state had a Crimean War Tolstoy it was evidently (and perhaps maliciously?) pleased to offer to its soldiers. As these observations should suggest, the Sevastopol Tolstoy of imperial Russia poses thorny problems concerning the very concepts of authorship and authority,

the issue of self-censorship, and a militarist state's appropriation of imaginative literature.

Notes

The author wishes to thank Michael Denner and an anonymous referee for their comments.

1. For description of the major sources, see Срезневский 385-86, 391-92, 395-96; and Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 281-82, 382, 409, 453. Of particular interest is the history of "Sevastopol in May," first published under the title "A Spring Night in Sevastopol 1855" ("Ночь весной 1855 года в Севастополе"). The regular censor of the *Contemporary*, V. Beketov, edited Tolstoy's submission relatively lightly, no doubt because the journal editors favored less risky formulations the author had sent for them to use at their discretion. The story was printed in the journal's August issue. But then the chief of the Petersburg censorship, Count Muskin-Pushkin, saw the proofs and flew into a rage. He demanded the excision of the story, leaving a gap in the August issue. Before allowing publication the following month, Muskin-Pushkin deleted over a third of the text and forced the journal editor Ivan Panaev to make additional modifications. Given the mutilation, Panaev felt he was doing Tolstoy a favor by publishing the piece anonymously: see Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 419-25; Евгеньев-Максимов 56-57; Срезневский 388-90; and Шифман 440-41.

2. The press of the General Staff is not cited in any of the indexed references to *Военные рассказы* throughout the Jubilee Edition. Note especially the misleading description of *Военные рассказы* as a книжка (booklet) "published by the book merchant A. I. Davydov," in Н. М. Мендельсон, "Комментарии" on "Набер" 3: 300. Книжка may have a pejorative nuance here since *War Stories* contained many misprints and "typographical absurdities" (Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 300). My references follow her in eliminating such errors.

3. In listing variant readings for all three stories (173-278), Sreznevsky repeatedly indicates that such and

such was "not in the *Contemporary* or the 1856 edition" and then states "Removed by the censor." This format glosses over Tolstoy's own decision to exclude from the *War Stories* manuscripts material censors had deleted from the *Contemporary* versions.

4. For general objections to inferring authorial intentions from censorship and the risk of punishment, see Morson and Emerson, 109.

5. Of special note is Sreznevsky's catalogue of variant readings (173-278), which allows a reader to track his editorial decisions line by line. No other edition of the *Sevastopol Stories* performs this service.

6. L. D. Опул'skaia published an additional, fragmentary source for "Sevastopol in August 1855" in 1978: Бурнашева, *Раннее творчество* 14. See also idem, "Комментарии" 281, concerning Burnasheva's unprecedented consideration of "A Spring Night in Sevastopol 1855," printed but not distributed in August 1855 (see note 1 above). My spot checking showed that her use of this latter source simply corroborated readings already present in the Jubilee Edition or the twenty-volume edition of the Sevastopol cycle.

7. McDuff mistakenly claims that those Russian versions "are the ones ultimately sanctioned by Tolstoy" (32). Although this translation tends to read very well it unfortunately shows many signs of carelessness, including several omissions. For examples, see Gebhard.

8. This edition also broke with Sreznevsky by privileging hand-corrected proofs of "Sevastopol in August 1855" rather than the manuscript type-set at the *Contemporary*: see Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 282. Burnasheva's new redaction has also favored the proofs.

9. Tolstoy's densely written manuscript has a barely perceptible 4 indicating a new chapter. Typesetters at the *Contemporary* overlooked it and the mistake persisted: see Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 469-70.

10. Shifman's commentary in the twenty-volume edition failed to mention this deviation from *War*

Stories. But see *Военные рассказы* 172; Срезневский 183; and Бурнашева, “Комментарии” 390.

11. In addition to this emendation, Tolstoy in the early 1900s revised chapter sixteen of “Sevastopol in May,” concerning fraternization during a cease-fire. The latter remained unpublished during his lifetime (Архангельская 182-92; and Бурнашева, “Комментарии” 430).

12. A friend of John Sergeant and Mark Twain, Francis Davis Millet (1846-1912) did paintings now in the Metropolitan in New York, the Tate in London, and other museums. He published fiction, and his work as a war correspondent during the Russo-Turkish War (1877-78) won him decorations from the Russian government. He died in the sinking of the Titanic: see www.jssgallery.org/Other-Artists/Millet-Francis-D-Millet-htm (last consulted September 28, 2007).

13. Inside the book, the stories appear under the general title *Scènes du Siège de Sébastopol*.

14. Millet retained French transliterations of Russian names, such as Natacha, Kalouguine, and Korniloff. He also conformed to the French source in treating the first chapter of “Sevastopol in May” as an unnumbered prologue. (That chapter was much shorter in *War Stories* than in the posthumously edited versions.) One of Millet’s mistakes was the mistranslation of *déception* (разочарование) as “deception” rather than “disappointment” (“Sevastopol in December”).

15. *Военные рассказы* 255 (with misprint of край for кров: see Бурнашева, “Комментарии” 421, 423). Panaev’s more militant formulation in the *Contemporary* read: “But we were not the ones who started this war, we were not the ones who provoked this terrible bloodbath. We were simply defending our home (родной кров), our native land (родную землю), and we will go on defending it to the last drop of blood” (Бурнашева, “Комментарии” 428).

16. In the 1961 reprint it reads: “We must at least take consolation in the thought that we did not begin the war, that we are only defending our country, our native land” (109).

17. Maude, “Preface to *Sevastopol and Other Military Tales*,” xliii. Without citing Maude’s preface, Burnasheva claims he followed the 1897 edition of Tolstoy’s collected works (“Комментарии” 444).

18. Those memoirs were А. И. Ершов, *Севастопольские воспоминания артиллерийского офицера* (1856; 1889). For the Russian version of this preface and its history, see PSS 27: 520-25, 729-37 and Архангельская 184.

19. There are still some errors, however, including a continuing problem with the accusative plural солдат с лопатами, now rendered as “a soldier with a spade,” 102; 2001 reprint, 92.

20. Only four of these are cited in Бурнашева, “Комментарии” 402.

21. Tolstoy’s notion of diffident patriotism has given translators trouble. Hargood, for example, erased the difference between стыдливое and стыдное (shameful):

Men will not accept these frightful conditions for the sake of a cross or a title, nor because of threats; there must be another lofty incentive as a cause, and this cause is the feeling which rarely appears, of which a Russian is ashamed, that which lies at the bottom of each man’s soul—love for his country. (33)

Perhaps considering стыдливое redundant, McDuff simply omitted it:

Men will not put up with terrible conditions like these for the sake of a cross or an honor, or because they have been threatened: there must be another, higher motivation. This motivation is a feeling that surfaces only rarely in the Russian, but lies deeply embedded in his soul—a love of his native land. (56)

22. The censor did allow, however, the famous long passage about vanity as the dominant passion of the times (chapter three). This authorial digression has a universal import, not specifically targeting the military.

23. I have not had access to the 1911 edition.
24. On the reading of *War Stories* within Alexander II's family, see Бурнашева, "Комментарии" 395.

Works Cited

- Архангельская, Т. Н. "Новая редакция 16-й главы рассказа 'Севастополь в мае 1855 года,'" в кн. Пузин, Н. П. и Т. Н. Архангельская. *Вокруг Толстого*. Тула: Приокское книжное издательство, 1982.
- Бирюков, П. И. "Примечания ко II-ому тому," в кн. Л. Н. Толстой, *Полное собрание сочинений в 20 томах*, т. 2. Москва: тип. И. Д. Сыткина, 1912-13.
- Бурнашева, Н. И. "Комментарии," в кн. Л. Н. Толстой, *Полное собрание сочинений в 100 томах*, т. 2. Москва: Наука, 2002-.
- , *Раннее творчество Л. Н. Толстого*. Текст и время. Москва: Издательство МИК, 1999.
- Евгеньев-Максимов, В. Е. *'Современник' при Чернышевском и Добролюбова*. Ленинград: Художественная Литература, 1936.
- Gebhard, James J. Review of *The Sebastopol Sketches*, trans. David McDuff, in *Slavic and East European Journal* 31:3 (1987): 442-43.
- Gifford, Henry. "On Translating Tolstoy." *Leo Tolstoy, Short Fiction*. Ed. and with revised [Maude] translations by Michael R. Katz. New York: Norton, 1991.
- Katz, Michael R. "Preface," *Tolstoy, Short Fiction* (see immediately above).
- Knapp, Liza. "The Development of Style and Theme in Tolstoy." *The Cambridge Companion to Tolstoy*. Ed. Donna Tussing Orwin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Купрянова, Е. П. Молодой Толстой. Тула: Тулское издательство, 1956.
- Leslie, Shane. "Introduction to Tolstoy's *Sevastopol*." *Tales of Army Life*, vol. 4 of Centenary Edition of *The Works of Leo Tolstoy*. Trans. Louse and Aylmer Maude. 21 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1929-37.
- Маковицкий, Д. П. *Яснополянские записки в 4 томах*. Москва: Наука, 1979-81.
- Maude, Aylmer. *The Life of Tolstoy*. vol. 2. London: A. Constable, 1910.
- , "Preface to This Edition of Tolstoy's Works." *Tolstoy, Sevastopol and Other Military Tales*. Trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude. London: Oxford University Press, 1901.
- , "Preface to *Sevastopol and Other Military Tales*." *Tolstoy, Sevastopol and Other Military Tales*.
- McDuff, David. "Introduction." *Leo Tolstoy, The Sebastopol Sketches*. Trans. with introduction and notes by McDuff. London: Penguin, 1986.
- McLean, Hugh. "Review Article: Anthony Briggs' Translation of *War and Peace*." *Tolstoy Studies Journal* 18 (2006): 102-06.
- , "Which Anna?" *Tolstoy Studies Journal* 13 (2001): 38-48.
- Morson, Gary Saul and Caryl Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin. Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Шифман, А. И. "Комментарии," в кн. Л. Н. Толстой, *Собрание сочинений в 20 томах*, т. 2. Москва: Художественная Литература, 1960-65.
- Simmons, Ernest J. *Leo Tolstoy*. 2 vols. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.
- Срезневский, В. И. "Комментарии: Севастопольские рассказы," в кн. Л. Н. Толстой, *Полное собрание сочинений в 90 томах*, т. 4. Москва, Ленинград: Художественная Литература, 1928-64.

- Tolstoy, L. N. *Collected Shorter Fiction*. Trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude and Nigel J. Cooper. 2 vols. London: Everyman's Library, 2001.
- , *Les Cosaques. Souvenirs de Sébastopol*. Traduit du russe. Paris: Hachette, 1886.
- , *The Cossacks and Other Stories*. London: Vizetelly, 1888.
- , "Ночь весною 1855 года в Севастополе," *Современник* (1855), no. 9: 5-30.
- , *Полное собрание сочинений в 90-и томах, академическое юбилейное издание*. Москва: Государственное Издательство Художественной Литературы, 1928-58.
- , *Полное собрание сочинений в 100 томах*. т. 2. Москва: Наука, 2002.
- , *Sebastopol*. Trans. from French by Frank D. Millet. Introduction by W. D. Howells. New York: Harper, 1887 (rpt. with introduction by Philip Rahv, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961; rpt. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2004).
- , *Sevastopol*. Trans. Isabel F. Hapgood. London: Walter Scott, 1888.
- , *Sevastopol and Other Stories*. Trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude. London: Grant Richards, 1903.
- , *Собрание художественных произведений в 12 томах*, т. 1. Москва: Правда, 1948.
- , *Собрание сочинений в 20 томах*. Москва: Художественная Литература, 1960-65.
- , *Tales of Army Life*, vol. 4 (1932), in Centenary Edition of *The Works of Leo Tolstoy*. 21 vols. Trans. Louise and Aylmer Maude. London: Oxford University Press, 1929-37.
- , *Военные рассказы графа Л. Н. Толстого*. СПб.: тип. Главного Штаба Его Императорского Величества по Военно-Учебным Заведениям, 1856.
- Turner, C. J. G. "The Maude Translation of *Anna Karenina*: Some Observations." *Russian Language Journal* 51: 168-70 (1997): 233-54.