

ism in Britain centred around the Croyden Brotherhood Church in South London and its honorary pastor, John Kenworthy, who also edited the monthly *New Order* as the movement's literary organ. Moreover, "Kenworthy was instrumental in translating [with the assistance of S. Rapoport] and then placing in *The Times* of 23 October 1895 Tolstoy's celebrated letter drawing world attention to the plight of the Doukhobors" (131). Prominent Tolstoyans, such as Aylmer Maude and Vladimir Chertkov, contributed to the journal, which played an important role in Tolstoy's international campaign on behalf of the Doukhobors. On the basis of the journal's not easily accessible files Holman argues that, without the efforts of the Tolstoyans gathered around the Brotherhood Church and the *New Order*, "the Doukhobor emigration could not have proceeded to its successful conclusion" (148).

Next come three papers by Russian scholars. Galina Alekseeva of the Tolstoy Museum at Iasnaia Poliana discusses "James Mavor and the Doukhobors" (149-57), a topic she has also presented in her article, "Leo Tolstoy and James Mavor," *Tolstoy Studies Journal* 10 (1998): 80-88. In the present essay she makes use of materials from the Mavor papers in the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library at the University of Toronto. Like Tolstoy, Mavor, for all his readiness to help the Doukhobors in case of need, found some of their actions hard to accept. As he wrote with obvious exasperation in one of his notebooks: "It was not freedom the Doukhobors sought in Canada; it was license to make themselves a nuisance to everyone with whom they might come into contact. When they left Russia the officials who had to do with them must have been overjoyed" (156).

Lidiia Gromova-Opul'skaia, coeditor with Andrew Donskov of the *Leo Tolstoy—Peter Verigin Correspondence* (English edition: Ottawa, 1995), writes sympathetically on "The Idea of 'Universal Brotherhood' and Unity: Leo Tolstoy and Petr Verigin" (158-70). Ample materials for discovering the views of the two men on this topic are at last available since their extensive correspondence between 1895 and 1910 is now in print. Gromova shows that in late nineteenth-

century Russia others outside the Tolstoyan circle shared at least some of these views. Perhaps what distinguished the two men was the energy and determination with which they worked for their ideal and were prepared to carry it to its logical conclusion.

Finally comes an article by an expatriate scholar, Arkadi Klioutchanski, "L'immigration des Doukhobors: Une fenêtre sur le Canada en retrospective" (171-84). The author notes that Tolstoy discussed the Doukhobors and their emigration to Canada in about 500 of his letters. Only gradually did a clear picture emerge of what awaited them in Canada. "In general ... it was thanks to Verigin and several other Doukhobors that Tolstoy [eventually] came to possess information not only about their life there but also about the country's climate, agriculture, system of administration and immigration procedures" (182). For the Russian public a window was now opened on Canada, a land almost unknown until Tolstoy and his Doukhobor friends brought it before its attention.

The Tolstoy theme by no means exhausts the interest of this well produced volume. (The editors should be congratulated, too, for including footnotes and not endnotes favoured, alas, by many publishers today.) What I have written above, however, should show that there is plenty of value here for Tolstoy studies.

PETER BROCK  
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

---

**L. N. Tolstoi i S. A. Tolstaia. *Perepiska s N. N. Strakhovym. The Tolstoys' Correspondence with N. N. Strakhov.* Ed. A. A. Donskov; compiled by L. D. Gromova and T. G. Nikiforova. Slavic Research Group at the University of Ottawa and State L. N. Tolstoy Museum, Moscow. Ottawa, 2000. Pp. xi + 308. Paper.**

It is a pleasure to welcome the appearance of this book, which manifests a degree of friendly collaboration between Russian and Canadian scholars

that would have been quite impossible only a few years ago. The hitherto ultra-possessive and suspicious Tolstoy Museum in Moscow has allowed a collection of its most treasured possessions, the correspondence between Tolstoy, his wife, and Nikolai Nikolaevich Strakhov, one of their closest long-term friends, to be exported (in copies) and published abroad, in Russian. Moreover, the letters were compiled and the commentary provided by two eminent Russian specialists, Academician Lidiia Gromova (Opul'skaia) and Tat'iana Nikiforova. From the Canadian side the edition contains a meticulously researched and illuminating Introduction by the Ottawa Slavist Andrew Donskov, along with English summaries, also by Donskov, of each letter. The book is attractively printed and illustrated, both with photographs of the correspondents and others and with facsimiles of some of the letters.

The book's specific contents are as follows. In Part I, 24 letters to Tolstoy from Strakhov and 14 replies by Tolstoy; in Part II, 40 letters to Strakhov from Countess Tolstaia, eight from Tolstoy and his wife together, and 38 letters from Strakhov to Sofia Andreevna. The correspondence between Strakhov and the Countess covers the entire period of their acquaintance, from 1872 until 1895, the summer before Strakhov's death in January 1896. The letters between Strakhov and Tolstoy himself date only from the last two years of Strakhov's life, 1894 to 1896, since their voluminous previous correspondence had been published many years ago.

All of Tolstoy's own letters are also to be found in the Jubilee edition, but Strakhov's are only occasionally quoted there in fragments. Some day, of course, one would like to see a combined edition of the entire correspondence, since the 1914 volume is now a collector's item. Anglophone readers who know no Russian would also surely welcome full translations of all of them. A beginning of this project was already launched by the publication in this journal of 12 of Strakhov's letters both in Russian and in Donskov's translation.

Tolstoy's relationship with Strakhov, intellectual and personal, deserves a much fuller study

than can be more than hinted at here. Strakhov was a prolific writer, generally of the conservative camp, a literary critic, philosopher, and popularizer of science. Born like Tolstoy in 1828, Strakhov became famous in the early 1860s, partly through his articles in Dostoevsky's short-lived magazine, *Vremia* (in fact, that magazine was suppressed because of an article by Strakhov on the Polish uprising of 1863), and he maintained an apparently cordial relationship with Dostoevsky until the latter's death in 1881. Strakhov is thus one of the very few individuals—Turgenev is another—who could claim to have known well both the two great novelists, who themselves never met. (Though he never brought the two writers together, Strakhov did initiate a relationship between Countess Tolstaia and Dostoevsky's widow, Anna Grigor'evna.) With Tolstoy Strakhov's friendship was closer and less conflicted than with Dostoevsky, reflecting a deeper affinity of temperament and convictions. In fact, Dostoevsky himself wrote discerningly in 1869, "In this country critics only make themselves known in tandem with the writers who have inspired them [...]. With you, it is a direct and boundless feeling for Lev Tolstoy, ever since I have known you." These "boundless feelings" stemmed from Strakhov's belief that Tolstoy was the very personification of Russian literature, its glory and its hope. Especially after the publication of *War and Peace*, about which he wrote a series of remarkable articles, Strakhov regarded Tolstoy as a matchless genius, whose works would place him at the summit not only of Russian, but of world literature. He recognized, however, that geniuses cannot in any way be "managed"; self-motivated, they can only be nurtured and encouraged. After the religious crisis which followed *Anna Karenina*, a novel which he immediately recognized as a sublime masterpiece, Strakhov was prepared to wait patiently until the latent artist should manifest itself again. When it did, in the form of such works as *The Death of Ivan Il'ich*, *The Kreutzer Sonata*, and *Master and Man*, he rejoiced and applauded, but he knew the matter could not be forced. You had to take Tolstoy as he was. Moreover, Strakhov recognized that the treatises to

which Tolstoy primarily devoted himself after 1881 were themselves works of remarkable power, the product of a man relentlessly and courageously grappling with the most critical existential questions. It seemed to him indeed that there was more sheer intellectual energy generated at Iasnaia Poliana than in all St. Petersburg, if not all Russia.

To take Tolstoy as he was did not mean that you had always to agree with him. Though he saw their moral forcefulness, Strakhov was never fully persuaded by the treatises. He did not become a Tolstoyan. In particular, he could not stomach the cultural nihilism of Tolstoy's later years, the repudiation of the crucial values of statehood, patriotism, industry, science, music, poetry, and philosophy. "People live by all this and will not cease to do so," he insisted.

To this Tolstoy replied in his characteristic "absolutist" mode: "You say that you are troubled by the denial of statehood, science, music, philosophy, patriotism, poetry. But what can I, or you too, do if we as human beings see that from patriotism, statehood, or the philosophy of Hegel or the poetry of Fet much evil stems (from the first two) and much that is unworthy of a human being from the last two [...]"

However, Strakhov generally kept his dissents very low-keyed. He was not a sycophant, but he knew better than to challenge the master too aggressively.

As the letters to and from the Countess show, Strakhov became a close family friend of the Tolstoys. He first came to visit at Iasnaia Poliana in August 1871, and after that returned countless times, almost every year spending part of the summer there and occasionally coming in the winter as well. Both Tolstoys really liked him. The strong terms of affection they repeatedly use in inviting him, the disappointment they express when he is unable to come, go far beyond mere politeness or convention. An old bachelor, apparently without much personal life of his own, Strakhov depended heavily on friendship for social and emotional gratification. He was close to Afanasii Fet and his wife (despite a temporary rupture recorded in these letters) and to the historian/philosopher Nikolai Danilevskii and his wife;

but the Tolstoys clearly outclassed all the others in his affections.

Like most letters, especially in those pre-telephone days, these are refreshingly filled with ephemera: talk about the weather, about planned meetings and visits, and about illnesses—reports on one's own and inquiries about those of one's addressee or the latter's family. But these ephemera are part of their charm. They help give us some of the feel of the real life being lived by these remarkable, but very human people.

Strakhov had endeared himself to Tolstoy partly by his inexhaustible willingness to be of service in any way he could. Beginning with Tolstoy's *Azbuka* (ABC book for children) in the early 1870s, he spent endless hours reading proofs of Tolstoy's works, negotiating with printers and publishers, and keeping financial accounts. Tolstoy hated proofreading and did not do it well; he could seldom resist making massive revisions in the text, which then themselves had to be reset and proofread. Strakhov would clean up after him, trying at least to enforce the rules of correct punctuation. The final texts of both *War and Peace* (1870s version) and *Anna Karenina* both owe a good deal to Strakhov's hand, although latter-day editors have sometimes tried to expunge revisions identifiably Strakhov's and revert to Tolstoy's primary text.

Strakhov was able to make himself equally useful to the Countess. After 1881 she set herself up in the publishing business, issuing edition after edition of her husband's collected works written before that date; and again, it was Strakhov who read proofs of these editions and often served as intermediary with printers. She deeply appreciated his help, but she also liked him for himself. He was evidently a perfect, self-effacing, undemanding guest. Among the visitors at Iasnaia Poliana Strakhov was also for her a welcome antithesis to the *temnye*, the "dark ones," i.e., Tolstoy's often scruffy and uncouth disciples, and likewise to the disciple-in-chief she hated, Vladimir Chertkov.

Even at times of familial strife, Strakhov was remarkably successful at staying on good terms with both Tolstoy and his wife. He recognized that there was a deep bond between them, formed

over decades of common life, that was stronger than their surface quarrels, however passionate; and he took pains not to take sides. To his letter of 14 February 1895 Tolstoy appends a codicil, asking Strakhov to tear it off and burn it (a command Strakhov fortunately disobeyed). There Tolstoy reports that Sof'ia Andreevna had been distressed to the point of hysteria by his giving the story *Master and Man* gratis to the magazine *Severnyi Vestnik*, even accusing him of improper relations with its editress, Liubov' Gurevich. Two days earlier the Countess had written Strakhov, asking him to ascertain from the Petersburg magazine *Vestnik Evropy* what would have been the honorarium for *Master and Man* if Tolstoy had been willing to take money for it; she hoped to force Gurevich to pay, even if the money would only be given to charity. In the end a compromise was reached: the story appeared simultaneously in Gurevich's magazine, in the Countess's multi-volume edition, and in a cheap paperback issued by the Tolstoyan mass-market firm Posrednik. No money was paid for it.

In short, this volume of letters is full of human, as well as intellectual interest. The edition is virtually impeccable, but it is a reviewer's melancholy duty to note whatever flaws he observed. There are a few. First, though there are indexes of names, there is no index of Tolstoy's works. Second, there is no table explaining the abbreviations used. The reader is obliged to guess, for instance, what the bibliographical reference "PTS" might mean. (I conclude that it refers to the 1914 edition of the correspondence, *Perepiska Tolstogo s Strakhovym*.) Third, a two-sentence postscript has been inadvertently omitted from Tolstoy's letter of 14 January 1895 (82) as published in the Jubilee edition. Fourth, in a very few places the commentary is skimpy. For example, I would have liked to know more about the biography of E. N. Drozhzhin by E. I. Popov, published by Chertkov in England in 1898, but written years earlier. Neither of these persons is further identified (117, 120). (I learn from the Gusev chronology that Drozhzhin was a Tolstoyan arrested and imprisoned for refusal to serve in the army, who died in prison of tuberculosis; Tolstoy wrote a

preface to the biography written by fellow Tolstoyan Popov.) The "miracle" that supposedly occurred to an unidentified "Dorobets," reported in *Moskovskie vedomosti*, is not explained (119; it presumably had something to do with spiritualism).

Fifth, the English summaries contain a number of regrettable errors. The Countess's letter to Strakhov of 19 August 1886 is said to say that Tolstoy's "illness has meant few guests at Yasnaya" (35). In fact, the letter says the opposite: "We have a lot (propast') of guests in the house now, which is not especially convenient in view of Lev Nikolaevich's illness." Strakhov's letter to the Countess of 23 November 1891 is said to speak of Tolstoy's "apparently good income" (37), with personal income implied. In fact, the reference is to donations to Tolstoy's famine relief efforts. Sof'ia Andreevna's letter of 4 March 1892 is said to report that her sister, Tat'iana (Kuzminskaiia) has gone home to Begichevka. In fact, the reference is to her daughter, Tat'iana L'vovna, who had gone back to help with the relief work at Begichevka, in Samara Province, which was no home to the Kuzminskiis. Again, in the joint letter to Strakhov of 25 March 1894, the Countess's sisters are said to have been helpful in looking after Tolstoy (42). In fact, the invalid is her son, Lev L'vovich, not her husband; the son is being ministered to by his sisters, presumably Tat'iana and Aleksandra L'vovny, since Mar'ia L'vovna had gone with her father to visit Chertkov's sick wife. Finally, Strakhov's letter to Sof'ia Andreevna of 28 March 1894 is said to inquire as to "possible participation" in the posthumous publication of Fet's poetry by Ekaterina Fedorova, who had previously served as Fet's secretary. In fact, the letter says only that Fedorova "deserves sympathy" (*zasluzhivaet uchastiia*).

These minor blemishes, however, do not at all mar one's satisfaction at the appearance of this fine edition.

HUGH MCLEAN  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY