

main purpose of the new edition. To judge by these first two volumes, one can only look forward to subsequent volumes of equal brilliance and hope that they will not be long in coming.

ANDREW DONSKOV
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Andrew Donskov, John Woodsworth, and Chad Gaffield, eds. *The Doukhobor Centenary in Canada: A Multi-disciplinary Perspective on Their Unity and Diversity*. Ottawa: Slavic Research Group and Institute of Canadian Studies at the University of Ottawa, 2000. Pp. xiii + 365.

Tolstoy's name has always been linked with the Doukhobors—and rightly so. In the early 1890s the sect's charismatic young leader, Petr Vasil'evich Verigin, had become a convert to Tolstoyism, and in 1895 he persuaded those of his followers who were serving as draftees in the Imperial army, to refuse further service. On his orders, on 29 June (which coincided with the celebration of St. Peter's Day) a dramatic act of protest against the Russian state took place when Doukhobors in Transcaucasia, where their settlements were then located, threw their firearms onto heaps and set fire to them. A period of high tension between sect and state then ensued. Recalcitrant Doukhobor draftees were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment followed by exile in Siberia.

Tolstoy was greatly concerned, for he saw in these stubborn peasant draft violators—in fact not quite correctly—spontaneous proponents among the *Volk* of his doctrine, which he had himself discovered only after long and arduous study. When the majority of Doukhobors decided to emigrate to Canada, he was eager to help them. So he took out of the drawer of his desk an unfinished novel, which he now completed and published. Tolstoy donated the lavish royalties he received for *Resurrection*, as the book was finally entitled, toward covering the costs of the Doukho-

bors' journey across the Atlantic. The first party arrived in Halifax, Nova Scotia, early in January 1899. Later, Tolstoy's enthusiasm for the Doukhobors waned as he began to discover some of their imperfections. But he never withdrew his willingness to help them in their new homeland.

The volume reviewed here consists of 23 papers presented at a conference held at the University of Ottawa in October 1999 to celebrate the centenary of the Doukhobors' arrival in Canada. I have selected for comment seven papers which seem to me of particular interest to Tolstoy scholars. I should point out, however, that they amount to less than half of the volume's contents. The reader will find there many other interesting contributions, particularly on the Doukhobor presence in Canada throughout the twentieth century.

The early history of the Doukhobors has long remained rather mysterious because of the lack of written records and the unreliability of sectarian tradition. Moreover, in the documents that are available it is often impossible to identify precisely the sect to which reference is being made. In her essay, "Spiritual Origins and the Beginnings of Doukhobor History" (1-21), a Russian ethnographer, Svetlana A. Inikova, throws light on this puzzling problem. But she makes no claim to have resolved all the outstanding questions concerning the sect's origins: indeed, much work needs to be done before we can have a reasonably clear picture. "The word *Doukhobors* did not appear until 1786" (2). Nevertheless the sect already existed in an organized form early in the eighteenth century, although some of its religious doctrines developed only later.

On their attitude to war, one of the areas where Tolstoy felt particularly close to them, Inikova writes:

The question of the Doukhobors' attitude toward military service did not figure significantly in the eighteenth century. Their numbers included many Cossacks. ... They all performed military service in the Russo-Turkish wars of the eighteenth century. It is known that some Doukhobors refused service in the Russo-Turkish War of 1787-91, but their motivation is not clear. The Cossack Doukho-

bors maintained they were obliged to 'defend themselves on the borders' against the enemy, but not to attack or kill. (11)

In the early nineteenth century the Doukhobors had been settled with government backing at Milky Waters in the fertile basin of the Molochna River. As the result of officially confirmed accusations against members of the community of widespread crimes, including murder—even burying alive of victims—and armed robbery, they were forced in 1841 to relocate in the wild Caucasian frontier area. Subsequent writers have mostly accepted the validity of these charges; even George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic did so reluctantly, and with certain reservations, in their history of the Doukhobors (1968). Recently, however, a young Canadian scholar, John Roy Staples ("The Molochna River Basin, 1783-1861: Settlement, Assimilation, and Alienation on the New Russian Steppe," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1999, 147-70) has argued that the accusations were almost certainly unfounded. Staples writes:

The violence of the alleged crimes has always stood at odds with what is known about [the Doukhobors'] behaviour generally in this time. With evidence of the murders refuted [apart from the occasional crime of violence common in a peasant society], what remains are accounts of a prosperous and uncommonly unified religious community, victimized by religious persecution, not victimiser.

I think Tolstoy would have liked to read that.

On the climax of Doukhobor antimilitarism in the mid-1890s the volume contains two significant essays by young North American scholars: Nicholas B. Breyfogle, "Rethinking the Origins of the Doukhobor Arms-burning: 1886-1893" (55-82), and Joshua A. Sanborn, "Non-violent Protest and the Russian State: The Doukhobors in 1895 and 1937" (83-102). Both authors did their research in Russia after the collapse of communism so that they were able to base their findings on extensive work in the archives: a happy condition not available to scholars since the 1920s.

Breyfogle commences his narrative with the

death of the powerful Doukhobor leader, Luker'ia Vasil'evna Kalmykova, in December 1881. Under her rule the sect had enjoyed excellent relations with the Tsarist authorities in Transcaucasia. Putting their pacifism into cold storage, Doukhobors fulfilled various state obligations, including "invaluable assistance to the Russian military—most notably during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78." In fact, "Tsarist officials saw the Doukhobors as 'model' Russian colonists and granted them certain privileges as a result" (55). When in 1887 conscription was introduced into Transcaucasia Doukhobor draftees regularly performed their military service; no requests were made for exemption from the army or even for non-combatant status there. But relations between sect and state were to deteriorate rapidly over the next few years; within the sect, too, a schism took place between the Small Party, led by members of Kalmykova's family, and the Large Party, which followed Petr Verigin. Each laid claim to leadership of the sect. Breyfogle threads his way skilfully through "the transformations wrought by the successor crisis [which] had laid the ground-work for the dramatic events of the arms-burning and emigration to Canada" (80).

In a largely interpretative essay Sanborn first examines in detail the Doukhobor nonviolent "rebellion" in 1895 and the Tsarist authorities' response to this act of defiance and the "international campaign" launched by Tolstoy in order to gain support for the sect abroad. He then compares this situation with the Soviet response to a hitherto "unknown mass demonstration of Doukhobors near Rostov-na-Donu in 1937" (84). That covered not only military service but state education and forced collectivization as well. Doukhobors in Russia were, of course, by that date a very small group, the majority having emigrated to Canada at the end of the previous century.

One afternoon of the conference was devoted to "The Role of Tolstoy and His Followers." First among the four papers then presented comes the English Tolstoy scholar, Michael J. de K. Holman's "British Tolstoyans, *The New Order* and the Doukhobors in the Late 1890s: Solidarity in Word and Deed" (131-48). In that period Tolstoy-

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