

Constance Garnett, Aylmer Maude, S. S. Koteliansky
Russian Literature in England
1900-1930

Huda Albert Jabboury

Thesis submitted for fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
University of Sheffield
Department of English Literature

August 1992

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Ian MacKillop for his continuous help and advice.

Similarly I would like to extend my thanks to the following people for their constant encouragement and useful advice:

Mr. W. B. Leatherbarrow from the Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies, University of Sheffield; Professor M. J. de K. Holman, Department of Russian Studies, Leeds University. I am grateful to the librarians and archivists of the Department of Manuscripts in the British Library, Reading University, and Sheffield University. Special thanks are due to Peter Folden of the Oxford University Press for the trouble he took in making accessible the papers of the Oxford University Press, and to Mrs. Ann Gotteri for proof reading the thesis.

I would like to thank the Syrian Government for the financial support. Finally I wish also to thank my parents for the emotional support that saw me through my long stay in Sheffield.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Russian Cult	5
1. Britain and Russia	5
2. The Novel and the Cult	10
3. Coverage of Russian Material in Serious Periodicals 1914-1930	32
(a) Fiction	43
(b) Poetry	47
(c) Travel	48
(d) Scholarly Studies	49
(e) Translators	51
(f) Writers and Publishers	52
(g) Publishers	53
Notes	59
Chapter Two: Constance Garnett	70
1. Early Life and Education	71
2. Marriage and Preparation for a Career as a Translator	74
3. The Translations	81
(a) Tolstoy	81
(b) Turgenev	87
(c) Dostoevsky	93
(d) Chekhov	98
(e) Gogol and Herzen	118
4. The Quality of Translations	122
Notes	127
Chapter Three: Aylmer Maude	144
1. Family Background and Education	144
2. Meeting and Contacts with Tolstoy	148
3. Maude as a disciple	154
4. Maude the Tolstoyan	160

5. Maude becomes a Translator	175
6. The Centenary Edition	179
(a) The Heinemann Project	182
(b) The Unwin and Doubleday Project	184
(c) Oxford University Press Project	185
7. Maude's Tolstoy	199
Notes	207
Chapter Four: S. S. Koteliansky	221
1. Background and Education	221
2. Joining Literary Circles	224
3. Koteliansky's Position in English Literary Life	228
4. Collaborators	233
(a) The Murrays	233
(b) The Woolfs	235
(c) D. H. Lawrence	236
5. The Reception of Koteliansky's Translations	239
6. The Other Koteliansky	245
Notes	252
Conclusion	263
Bibliography	266
1. Archives	266
2. Periodicals	274
3. Books and Articles	276

Summary

This thesis is concerned with the lives and works of three translators who made Russian literature available for the British public. It is an attempt to account for the role these translators played in arousing interest in the classics of Russia. The translations of Constance Garnett, Aylmer Maude and S. S. Koteliansky were responsible for making Russian literature feature in the intellectual life of the British culture during the first decades of this century. The relation of my work to these initiatives is described in the Introduction.

Chapter One deals with England's discovery of the Russian novel through translations and its consequences that led to the spread of the "Russian cult." This took place during the first two decades of the twentieth century which witnessed great interest in Russian literature. The British public was introduced to the major treasures of the Russian classics, and what is more, to a handful of the new generation of Russian authors. In registering the response of the literary figures of the day on reading these translations and a survey of serious periodicals, evidence is established for the cult status of Russian writing.

Chapter Two throws light on the life and work of one of the most eminent of translators, Constance Garnett. The chapter surveys the wide range of Russian authors she presented, with particular emphasis on her translation of Chekhov, and the impact of her translations in the establishment of the writer's reputation in England.

Chapter Three focuses on Maude's career as a translator and accounts for his greatest achievement, the accomplishment of the Centenary Edition of Tolstoy's works. Other aspects of Maude's activities are drawn upon, particularly, the fact that he was a disciple of Tolstoy. Attention is also paid to his status as an authority on Tolstoy.

Chapter Four is devoted to S. S. Koteliansky and his achievements. Koteliansky's prestigious position in the English literary life, in addition to his being a supplier of new material in the field of Russian translations are stressed. The collaboration of a handful of the literary figures in the production of his translations is looked upon as further proof to the presence of the Russian cult.

The thesis concludes with an account of archive materials relevant to its field.

Introduction

The aim of this thesis is to survey all the materials relevant to the working lives of Constance Garnett, Aylmer Maude and S. S. Koteliansky. There is a basic list of manuscript sources in the *Location Register of Twentieth Century English Literary Manuscripts and Letters* (British Library, 1988). All these have been examined, and other sources used, notably the University of Leeds collection of Aylmer Maude material which had not been assembled at time of the compilation of the Location Register.

This thesis is a study in literary mediation, of the process by which Russian writers were acclimatized to British culture in the twentieth century, with particular reference to the period between 1900 and 1930. This is not a study of translation practice or comparative literature. This must be stressed at the outset because, although I deal with men and women of letters who were translators, this thesis is concerned with cultural conditions in the country in which the Russian works were received, with the sociology of its literature and with its publishing practices. My study follows the interest in the history of the book that developed in the 1980s, producing, for example, the journal *Publishing History*. The main concern of these new enquiries is announced in the first issue of the journal is - to "treat publishing in its widest context, from the earliest contacts between author and publisher to the time when the printed text reaches the public." My concern is with this "communication circuit that runs from the author to the publisher . . . [including] the printer, the shipper, the bookseller, and the reader," to use the words of Robert Darnton in "What is the History of Books?" his introduction to *Books and Society in History* (1983) the collection of papers of the 1980 Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Rare Books and Manuscripts. This particular aspect of the literary world has been neglected. It was not until the beginning of this century that interest in this field arose with the publication of studies in France of *La Livre* in France, creating openings for the development of this type of research. In an article in *Critical Inquiry* (14: Spring 1988), "Publishing History: A Hole at the Centre of Literary Sociology", John Sutherland traces more recent interest to Robert Escarpit's *Sociologie de la Litterature* (1958). He shows how and why the field has been neglected and summarises the contribution of three scholars, Darnton himself, Jerome McGann and D. F. MacKenzie. For Darnton "book history . . . is best conducted by studying the 'life cycle' of a single book or the exemplary careers of single-book people." McGann considers the literary work as a "social product" thus stressing the efforts of the publisher, reader, merchandise, and the author in begetting the literary work. For him the work is created under the effect of determined conditions. Hence his emphasis on

the production of the book and its material existence. MacKenzie's concern is the "sociology of the text". My study is of translators: what they translated and their relation with publishers. It represents but a part of a new trend in literary studies.

The thesis is not a study of the reception of Russian literature in England, but rather the effect of Russian writings on English writings and English culture. It is well-known that the Russian novel had its effects on the novel throughout Europe, yet with a particular concentration in England. It is also said that without translations of Turgenev, Tolstoy, and moreover, without translations of Dostoevsky and Chekhov the contemporary English novel could not have been created. Russian literature in England was appearing as early as the 1850s, but it only became popular during the second decade of the twentieth century. The part Russian writers played in the shaping of English literature is evident in its influence on these writers who emerged as major figures after 1900. The enthusiasm for the Russians was great, and it was mainly led by J. M. Murry, Virginia Woolf amongst others.

This thesis is concerned with the identity of the main mediators, Constance Garnett, Aylmer Maude and S. S. Koteliansky. We deal with the British and immigrant figures, as representatives of certain aspects of English culture, aiming to show what they produced, why they produced it, along with the effect of their works, best discerned in their contribution to a dominant phenomenon in the 1920's known as the "Russian cult." The services of the translators were not always acknowledged. Recognition of their achievements was not up to the impact of their accomplishment. It was due to Garnett, Maude and partly Koteliansky that the English public discovered the treasures of Russian literature.

The main concern of this study is to bring literature in contact with its moment, or, in other words, to place it in its social context. The examination of surviving manuscripts, mainly letters, of the three translators is at the heart of this thesis.

The examination of this unpublished material highlights the process of the production of the literary work - be it a translation or a creative work. A consideration of such issues as the relation between the author and the publisher, the publisher's role in affecting literary taste throws light on the writings of the literary world.

It is fortunate that a large number of manuscripts have been preserved by different academic institutions. These papers constitute the primary sources of this thesis. Despite their significance as records of the times, they provide an insight into the way the translators laboured to procure the completion and the publication of their products. Moreover, they provide many details of the characters, lives, and works of the three mediators.

The first chapter of the thesis deals with the Russian cult, and the proofs of its presence as a literary phenomenon. The first decades of the twentieth century witnessed a great interest in Russian literature. The British public was introduced to the major treasures of Russian classics, and what more, a handful of the new generation of Russian authors. That Russian literature was the fashion of the day is evident in the reaction of the literary figures and the periodicals' coverage, both seen as reflections of the literary atmosphere and general interests of the period. The introduction of Russian translations incited a great enthusiastic reaction which marked the period with a famous literary phenomenon best known as the "Russian cult." However, the popularity of Russian literature was almost confined to the intellectuals and literary circle of the day. The interest of the public is not our concern here. The emphasis will be on these literary figures who instigated the cult somehow and their enthusiastic response to the influx of Russian literature in translation.

In the second chapter attention will be focused on achievements of Constance Garnett as a translator and the effect of her translations of Russian novelists in determining their popularity, and the impact of the translations on the Russian cult. However, particular attention will be paid to Garnett's translation of Chekhov's complete works and its effect on the reception of the writer in England. For her translations of the writer was partly responsible for the establishment of his reputation both as a short story writer and dramatist. The chapter shows that Garnett was pioneer in the field of translations from the Russian. Through her labouring efforts she was able to introduce the major classic writers of Russian fiction. She was the first English translator to translate the complete works of Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Gogol, and Herzen; the credit for introducing Tolstoy in a good translation was also hers. Her introduction to Dostoevsky's works was one of the main reasons behind the emergence of the cult for the Russians in the second decade of the century. Similarly her translation of Chekhov was regarded as the second most important happening in the field of translation from the Russian. The efforts of Edward Garnett in promoting the public's interest in Russian fiction will be also stressed.

In order to account for the role Garnett played in determining the popularity of of the Russian authors, and to assess the impact of her translation of Chekhov in building up the story of the writer's reception in England I rely on the works of scholars who have researched the subject before me. These sources include Carolyn Heilbrun's *The Garnett Family* (1961), David Garnett's biographical account of the family in three parts, *The Golden Echo* (1953), George Jefferson's *Edward Garnett: A Life in Literature* (1982), in addition to the recent published biography of Garnett by Richard Garnett entitled *Constance Garnett: A Heroic Life* (1991). For the primary sources reliance is on the Garnett papers in the Chatto and Windus

archive which consist of files of unpublished letters comprising the body of correspondence between Garnett and consecutive heads of the firm. The letters are very illuminating in the sense that they throw more light on certain matters of translation and publication of Russian authors. Chatto and Windus also maintained albums of reviews since 1900, and which contain many pieces from national and provincial newspapers. This helped in the assessment of the reception of Garnett's translation of Chekhov.

The third chapter is concerned with Maude and his greatest of achievements, the completion of the Centenary Edition of Tolstoy's works. Maude's position as an authority on Tolstoy, an interpreter, translator and expounder of his ideas in England, will be also studied. His personal friendship with Tolstoy is examined, in addition to its influence on his choice for translation as a career. However, the long process of preparation for the Centenary Edition remains our main interest. Its completion was the result of a lifetime struggle to make the dream of presenting Tolstoy in a presentable English translation come true. Primary sources consulted for the Maude chapter come from different institutions. The Maude archive, which constitutes the largest of the collection, is currently in the possession of Professor M. J. de K. Holman of the University of Leeds. (Sheffield University Library has a xerox copy). The papers of the Society of Authors, and the Marie Stopes papers have also been used and are kept at the Department of Manuscripts at the British Library. The Oxford University Press correspondence with Maude is kept at the Press's headquarters. The Crossley Carpet Collection papers are reserved at Wakefield County Record Office.

The fourth chapter is devoted to S. S. Koteliansky, the Russian emigrant and later British citizen, and his translations which secured him a place in the literary world of the period. Moreover, Koteliansky's friendships with the literary figures of the day enhance his significance to the Russian cult in the light of the collaboration of the literary figures in the production of his translations, in addition to his introduction of new Russian authors like Shestov and Rozanov.

The main primary source for this chapter was the examination of the tenth volume of Koteliansky's correspondence, which was reserved from public use till recently. The volume is part of Koteliansky letters in the possession of the Department of Manuscripts, the British Library. The volume covered personal matters in general, with complete disregard to translation issues. The contents of the volume threw more light on Koteliansky's personality and friendships.

CHAPTER ONE

The Vogue for Russian Literature 1914-1930

This thesis is primarily about the impact of the translators and their concern with the novel. So we turn to the novel first and then to the British novelists. A general survey of the periodicals which were sensitive to Russian matters, both vogue and cult, will be considered. The material in the third section forms the background to the second section. This section illustrates the media in which many contacts with Russian writing were established. A great number of writers participated in the concern for things Russian shown in periodical publications. But this thesis is concerned primarily with Garnett, Maude and Koteliansky; much of their lives' work was given to one particular literary medium - the novel - and they also associated with certain literary celebrities, or affected the work of these celebrities. So it is to this genre, the novel and to these celebrities I shall turn in the second section of this chapter, before my survey of how the periodicals registered Russian writing and thinking. But first let us briefly consider in general terms the rapport between Russia and Britain or what one writer has called the East-West Passage.

1. Britain and Russia

Political events were the main motives behind the establishment of the early connections between Russia and Britain. In fact, the early English interests were partly dependent on commercial issues, and partly on political ones. The state of England's colonial empire in the sixteenth century and Europe's trade war served as the starting point that laid the foundations of the early contacts between the two countries.¹ Russia began to be feared on the grounds of the vast size of its empire, its expansionist policy, its interest in the Far East and the Balkan countries. The Russian empire was regarded as the political rival to the British empire. However, it "was not until she began to be feared that Russia came to be known."² The Crimean War (1853-1856) marked the crux of the British interest in Russia at this early stage. Indeed, "the Crimean war awakened curiosity in England about the enemy, and there was a demand for details about Russian life and manners."³ That the whole English interest in Russia was subject to political circumstances is evident. The political situation had always played a

significant role in arousing the English interest in Russia - the country, its affairs and most importantly in its literature. The Crimean War came as the perfect embodiment of the fact. "Public interest was in a languishing state until in England, the Crimean War, . . . stimulated political interest in Russia." ⁴ This interest, however waned after the war. Yet it was re-awakened again and even more strongly at the time of Russia's war with Turkey in 1877. The situation was very much the same in 1905, the time of the Russo-Japanese war and in 1917 the time of the Russian Revolution. In the light of the situation the English attitude varied, depending mainly on whether Russia was seen as enemy or friend. People also turned to works of fiction to quench their thirst for more information about the country. But due to political prejudices and the feelings of hatred towards the enemy, most of the literary productions were misinterpreted. Consequently, a distorted picture of Russian life became current. ⁵

Russia's state as a friend prompted greater interest in Russian history, culture, and literature. During the last years of the Edwardian era there was a special vogue for the Russians which was the outcome of a desire to break English insularity and to know Europe better. Indeed, one important aspect of English cultural history at this period was the discovery of Europe. In other words a Europeanization of England was taking place. The process of changes English society had been undergoing since the last decades of the Victorian period was responsible for this. ⁶

In order to cast off the spell of its aloofness and detachment, England began to destroy the barriers that had long isolated her from Europe. The fact that Britain was becoming a part of Europe became evident in the growing interest of the English in other countries constituting the continent. "The night of ignorance", according to one reviewer, "is slowly and surely giving way to the bright day of knowledge and understanding." ⁷ Both France and Russia were among the European countries that received much attention during this period. "Russia," in particular, "was discovered and extravagantly admired through these years." ⁸

Despite the fact that the time of change in England began after the death of Queen Victoria in 1900, "in many ways the reign of Edward VII was a marking time, a breathing space in which to recover from the incubus of the Victorian stability." ⁹ As far as the liberating movement is concerned, King Edward VII was an influential figure. The important thing to remark here is that the sovereign was a reforming King, . . . meaning that he brought the new monarchy up to date." ¹⁰ He not only challenged the conservative views that were dominant in the previous era, he also played a remarkable role in determining England's open approach towards European countries. Moreover, he was described as a "good European." By means of his travels he tried to improve Britain's relations with other European countries and also aimed to show its interest in Europe. ¹¹

Russia became a friend as part of the improvements in political relations characteristic of this period. The political attitude adopted by the new Liberal government accounted for this change. Unlike previous governments, the present one was less jingoistic and more sympathetic to other liberal movements abroad. Hence lay England's sympathy with the revolutionary movement in Russia. Likewise, much of the misinformation and ignorance about Russia, the country, its people and literature - which were current before - began to be dispelled.¹²

British interest in Russia reached its highest mark during this period. Russian literature and writers were flooding Europe and Russian influence was making itself felt. However, the impact of this influence was greater in England than in any European country. The degree of British enthusiasm for Russian writers was indicated by the spread of a cult. Russian literature became the literary fashion of the early decades of the twentieth century. The introduction in translation of Dostoevsky's works in 1912 initiated the "Dostoevsky Cult." The appearance of Chekhov's works later exerted a similar reaction and the new cult, this time, came to be known as the "Chekhov Cult." Other Russian writers came to be known as a result. Russian literature became the vogue.

In this chapter of my thesis I will try to describe and account for the factors that generated the Russian cult, reflecting on the views of the scholars who studied the Russian influence in England.

F. A. Mumby remarks that "fashions come and go; literary 'booms' are created when least expected;"¹³ this is true of the state of Russian literature in England during the early years of this century. While most critics would agree with the first part of the above statement in the sense that the "Russian Cult" was a phenomenon which was no sooner born than it died, others would disagree with the truth of its second part. The fact that the cult was not as sudden as it seemed was argued and proved. Gilbert Phelps in *The Russian Novel in English Fiction* (1965) selects the eighties and nineties of the last century as the period during which Russian literature established itself in England. The appearance of numerous translations from Russian literature helped arouse interest in Russian fiction and served as the background for the acceleration of interest that amounted to the spread of the cult for the Russians. These early translations "are in some ways as plausible a starting-point for the Russian infiltration in 1912, if for no other reason than that they are the first stepping-stones."¹⁴

The enthusiasm for the Russians in England was regarded as a literary phenomenon, which critics called the "Russian cult", "Russian fever", or sometimes the "Russian craze." The roots of the cult can be traced back to the last years of the Edwardian era where there was a

special vogue for everything Russian. This coincided with England's discovery of Europe; "Russia was discovered and extravagantly admired through these years." The cult was by no means confined to the field of literature, but embraced other aspects of cultural interests such as music and dance. On the cultural side the period witnessed the introduction of the Russian Ballet in 1910. There was a fashion for Russian dress and customs; people frequented music halls and fell in love with Anna Pavlova:

Russian literature, Russian modes of dress, Russian drama, Russian opera, and Russian ballet had sudden vogues between 1910 and 1914. In one form or another, Russian influences reached most levels of English life; intellectuals discovered Dostoevsky, music hall gallery-goers fell in love with Pavlova, and society ladies wore dresses inspired by Bakst's ballet designs . . . Russia, it seemed, offered something for everybody.¹⁵

In dealing with the Russian cult stress will be laid on the "Dostoevsky cult" and the "Chekhov cult", since the English public greeted the appearance of both writers' works in English translation with great enthusiasm.

Let us consider the reasons that made the Russian influence so palpable. The reasons are, indeed, many, and rather complex. The views of literary critics and scholars differed as regards the analysis of the motivations behind the emergence of the Russian cult. That the English soil was ready to receive such an influence was much in evidence. It was a time of change in the British society in different spheres of life; politically, culturally, scientifically and philosophically. The old values were shaken under the subsequent events that ranged from the discovery of psychoanalysis by Freud, to the introduction of the new movements in art and literature; Post-Impressionism and Daddism were the new modes in painting, Modernism emerged as a new tendency in literature. Russian works were seen to accord with the literary fashion of the day. Many writers saw in them an embodiment of the rejection of old conventions, and evidence of the traits of Modernism.

The end of an era - that of the Victorian age - brought relief and hope. But the seemingly quiet and prosperous Edwardian era, was a disturbed and unsettled period in itself. Many issues were debated which subsequently led to the openness to Russian influence. The dissatisfaction with the state of the English novel and the controversy over French Naturalism certainly paved the way to the introduction of the Russian novel. There was also the fact that Russian translations multiplied at the end of the nineteenth century. That the atmosphere was appropriate for the Russian influence was also apparent in the group of enthusiasts and promoters of Russian literature who had their say in the reception of the new literature.

Matthew Arnold and Edmund Gosse were ranked among the first critics to fight for the cause of the Russian novel. The efforts of Maurice Baring, Arnold Bennett, and Edward Garnett can not be underestimated in this respect. Besides, the emergence of the group of new publishers served more the aims and hopes of the promoters of Russian literature. These young publishers, whose international and cosmopolitan tastes accorded with the spirit of the age, carried on the task of publicizing the Russians. Among these publishers the names of William Heinemann and Martin Secker are paramount. The new generation of publishers encouraged some of the old publishing houses to follow in their footsteps. Among the pioneer in this respect were firms like Unwin and Chatto and Windus. In addition to the role the Russian exiles played in England which was also of great significance. They were regarded as reliable commentators on the literature of their own country. They helped to find a public for it, and to lessen prejudice if need be. The names of Prince Kropotkin, Serge Stepniak, Vladimir Volkhovsky and Prince Mirsky come to mind. Mirsky's books on the history of Russian literature were viewed as coming from a competent critic.

As a matter of fact the deteriorating state of the English novel, and the dissatisfaction with the crude qualities of the French school of Naturalism as represented through the works of Balzac and Zola were two of the main factors that determined the coming of the Russian novel. De Vogue's *Le Roman Russe* (1884) played an effective role in this sense. Since he classified English and Russian realism as belonging to one group, thus, leaving the French novel aside.

2. The Novel and the Cult

The novel was one of the many phenomena affected by Russia. It is to this novel I would turn. Russian fiction became important in Britain because of the way it could solve some of the problems posed by the growth of Naturalism.

The controversy over Naturalism raged through the nineteenth century. The history of the debate focused on the publication of Zola's translations in English by the publisher Vizetelly and on the story of his trial in 1888 as a result. The chief basis of the charge against him was his publication of Zola's *Nana* (1884). The English were acquainted with French Naturalism long before the introduction of Zola's writing. The works of other French Naturalists were available in English translation like those of Balzac, Baudelaire, Rousseau and Diderot. ¹⁶ Nevertheless, a complete denunciation of the school as a whole was the general attitude of the English. English hostility centred in two groups with completely different attitudes. The conviction of the first group, constituted of men of letters and critics, was based on aesthetic and philosophic grounds. On the other hand, the verdict of the other group, including the leading journals, newspapers, and the public, was built on moral grounds. ¹⁷

One of the advantages of the debate over Naturalism was that it resulted in a genuine burst of interest in Russian fiction. The debate coincided with the appearance in English translations of a few Russian works. ¹⁸ Immediately, the French Naturalists were set, not only in comparison, but in obvious contrast with the Russian Realists. Appreciation for Russian realism was great. The works of Turgenev and Tolstoy were found to be lacking in the repulsive sense of the French school. The publication in France of de Vogue's *Le Roman Russe* helped the good reception of Russian Realism. In his book de Vogue alluded to the advent of a new school of the Russians and praised its compliance with the "desire of the public for forms more in accordance with the positive science of the day." He also emphasized the respectability of its realism on the basis that "it submits itself to religious and spiritual values."¹⁹ This particular quality, de Vogue found to be embodied in the literature of both Russia and England. "The Russian Realists like the English were always moved by a moral principle."²⁰ The English owed a great debt to de Vogue, who was the first critic to point out the vast difference between the characteristics of the two modern schools, and who put the Russian and the English novel on the same rank. Edmund Gosse wrote that

In the course of his Russian studies De Vogue had discovered a school of realists, who were no less serious and thorough than Zola, but who admitted far more spiritual unction into their attitude to life. In Dostoevsky and Tolstoy he found great masters of fiction who appreciated the value of scientific truth,

but who were not content to move a step in the pursuit of it without being attended by pity and hope.²¹

It was clear that both schools were in accordance with the spirit of the age, its modern issues, and its new manifestations. Nevertheless, in contrast to the French novel, an inclination towards conventional canons in matters related to morality and religion was still felt in the Russian novel. Hence the difference in the reception of both schools in England. While the French Naturalists were received with utmost hostility and revulsion, the Russians, on the other hand, were very warmly welcomed and their realism was greatly praised and appreciated.

The shortcomings of the contemporary English novel came to be judged in the light of the controversy over Naturalism that raged in the nineteenth century. Old-fashioned critics disliked the new wave of sensationalism in fiction. They abhorred the immorality of French realism, but at the same time they were critical of the English novel in general. The controversy over realism and the first introduction of the French novelists came as a new challenge to the English novel which was struggling to maintain its balance between the "romantic" and the "scientific" attitudes of the new age. Balzac and Zola enraged the Victorians for their immorality. French Naturalistic fiction presented a challenge to all the beliefs the Victorians held so dear. Hence the vehement protest against this new literary tendency which gave birth to Naturalism. As a result the English novel was criticised on the grounds of its becoming decadent, conventional, and unable to meet the public's demand for a novel capable of depicting real life. It was found to be "in a state of almost continuous adaptation and flux."²² The charges against the novel were many: that it "was becoming feeble and hypocritical," that it was not in accord with the spirit of the age, that it had exhausted its resources, and that it gave much attention to the issue of morality. Such was the sense of despair that one critic declared "the famous English novelists . . . have passed away and have left no successors of like fame." The condition of the novel required, in another critic's view, a "powerful foreign influence" and that "*that influence will have to be Russian.*"²³

This disappointment in the English novel contributed to the interest in Russian fiction. Perhaps the impact of Russian influence is best shown by Virginia Woolf in her article on modern fiction:

The most elementary remarks upon English fiction can hardly avoid some mention of the Russian influence, and if the Russians are mentioned one runs the risk of feeling that to write of any fiction save theirs is a waste of time.²⁴

In the same article Woolf broods on the idea of the conventionality of the English novel when she describes the three Edwardian writers: H. G. Wells, Arnold Bennett, and John Galsworthy as conventional writers in the sense that they are materialists concerned with the body more than the spirit.²⁵ In "The Russian Point of View", she discusses, in more detail, the idea of the English novelists' conventionality when she praises the Russians' concern with the soul and the feelings of the character. In the light of this characteristic she accuses the English novelists of being conventionalists, restricting themselves to certain rules and traditions in the making of fiction.²⁶

All these factors contributed to the introduction and popularity of the Russian novel in England. In the light of all the events, from the debate over Naturalism to the dissatisfaction with the state of the English novel, "the Russian way was the *only natural* way for the English genius." However, the starting point of what was known to be one of the great literary phenomena of the day, the "Dostoevsky cult", was the publication in 1912 of Garnett's translation of Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*. Garnett's introduction of Chekhov's works four years later generated another cult, the Chekhov cult, which many critics saw as a continuation to the previous one. The cult for both writers prompted interest in other Russian writers old and new, and modern. The works of writers like Artsybashev, Aksakov, Garshin, Goncharov, Gogol, Bunin, Rozanov and many others were brought into light during this period. Thus, 1912 was the high watermark in the story of Russian fiction in England. Dostoevsky's book was declared to be "the greatest novel ever written." Young intellectuals like J. M. Murry, Katherine Mansfield and Frank Swinnerton regarded Dostoevsky as their idol. The fever that Dostoevsky initiated "increased in fury until in 1918 it became the prevalent factor of the hectic evolution of young intellect." ²⁷

Gilbert Phelps, who sees in the Dostoevsky cult the elements of a fever, relates its origins to the diversity of changes and developments which English society had been encountering in the nineteenth century. The cult was a result of the culminating atmosphere of changes; "it symbolized a powerful liberation of emotions that had been held in check by nineteenth-century Rationalism, and over rigid aesthetic theories." Dostoevsky's novels, in his view, accorded with the ideas, new issues and tendencies of the period. With such understanding he describes the cult as, ²⁸

the last flare-up of the Romantic decadence in response to a sudden acceleration of the self-destructive disintegrating forces within contemporary society as the period of the First World War approached. ²⁹

Helen Muchnic, in her remarkable study of Dostoevsky's reception in England, relates the emergence of the cult to other factors. That Dostoevsky's cult coincided with the Great War was a natural result of the fact that the best translation of his work appeared between 1912 and 1921. The effect of war propaganda in favour of Russia was only partly responsible for the reception of Dostoevsky. For the rhapsodies with which the writer was received could not be attributed to such an influence. The reasons of its emergence were ascribed to the social context of British society.

It was a complex intellectual phenomenon, composed partly of war-time sympathies, partly of mysticism, partly of a new interest in abnormal psychology and in the revelations of psychoanalysis, partly of an absorbed concern with artistic experimentation. Dostoevsky represented an ally, a mystic, a psychologist of the unconscious, a designer of a new fictional form. ³⁰

In *The Intelligentsia of Great Britain* Mirsky attributes the enthusiasm for Dostoevsky among British intellectuals to the increasing interest in the workings of the mind in English literature during the liberal era. Moreover, he views the irrationality of the Dostoevsky cult as a result of the collapse of the hopes of the nineteenth century.

the incomparably mystical, exaggeratedly irrational cult of faith in Dostoevsky was just what was needed to replace the rarefied naturalistically rationalistic faith of Shaw. Faith in vital forces disappeared, and a faith in the miraculous appeared.³¹

Pre-war years witnessed a great interest in Russian literature on the grounds of its sensitivity to social and ethical problems. Turgenev's and Tolstoy's works provided a perfect sample of social realism. In this period Tolstoy's works surpassed Turgenev's in popularity, while those of Dostoevsky overshadowed Tolstoy's. The cult began among the intelligentsia during the war. Beside the worship of suffering, that appealed to the intellectuals in Dostoevsky, the cult was with its sense of irrationality and exaggeration the opposite of, or rather, an alternative to the "rarefied naturalistically rationalistic faith of Shaw." Mirsky believes that the intellectuals' interest in Dostoevsky did not wane after the war. What really happened was a shift in the focus of interest. "They became a little forgetful of Dostoevsky as prophet of a new heaven and new earth. Yet the less they believed in him as prophet, the bigger he became as a supreme embodiment of introspection and great authority on agonised hearts."³²

Dostoevsky was also pre-eminently a novelist of cultural collapse. Perhaps this also explains his appeal to the English at a time where the comforting certainties of pre-war Europe were being challenged.

Frank Swinnerton expresses similar views when he attributes the cult to the effect of the new tendencies the English society was following. The spirit of the age was against Victorianism. The emergence of new tendencies towards modernity was felt in the introduction of psychoanalysis and Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams*; in the arts there appeared the new school of Post-impressionism in painting and Modernism in literature. Swinnerton also gives credit to Constance Garnett who was responsible for introducing Dostoevsky in translation. ³³

In 1912 every young literary or pseudo-literary person in London seized and consumed with a fury of delight the first complete translation, made by Constance Garnett of Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*. It was declared the greatest novel ever written. ³⁴

Just as Dostoevsky's works resulted in the creation of one of the famous phenomena of the day, the presentation of Chekhov's works in translation was regarded as the second most important event of the day. The introduction of Chekhov was also greeted with great enthusiasm, particularly among the intellectuals. The Chekhov cult might not have been as hysterical as Dostoevsky's, yet there is enough evidence that it existed. Phelps saw the Chekhov cult as a continuation of Dostoevsky's. Though translations of his works began to appear in 1916, it was only in the nineteen twenties that enthusiasm for his art grew. By 1926 Constance Garnett had already completed the translation of his short stories, plays, and letters. In addition to that there were also available in translation reminiscences and memoirs about the writer.

According to Mirsky, the English interest in Chekhov came late at a time when his countrymen had lost interest in his work. English enthusiasm came as a natural response to the prevailing states of mind in the post-war period, at a time when the rejection of heroic values was prevalent. This unheroic quality appeared to the English in the works of one of its leading apostles; Samuel Butler. In Mirsky's view, Chekhov came to fulfil what Butler had already started. The English intellectuals were attracted to Chekhov on the basis of two other qualities. The first quality being ethical, as seen in Chekhov's attitude to civilization as a system of negative values; while the second one was aesthetic, as discerned in his style and narrative method which allows nothing to happen. ³⁵

Although he was appreciated both as a short story writer and a playwright, Chekhov achieved greater success as a playwright. And it was the success of Chekhov, the dramatist, that increased his popularity. This took place in the mid-twenties when some of his plays were

performed successfully on the British stage. It was only then that the presence of a Chekhov boom was publicly realized.

When the Chekhov play was first introduced it faced some difficulties in reaching the sensibilities of the English public. This was due to the fact that his plays were far from conventional, and that he introduced new techniques in play-writing, which was unacceptable yet. As a result Chekhov's originality was incomprehensible to the English public which was used to clear and straightforward presentation of either comedy or tragedy. His tragicomic plays baffled the public at the beginning. The Stage Society's performance of his masterpiece *The Cherry Orchard* in 1911 was a complete failure in the public's eyes. Frank Swinnerton reported the withdrawal of the audience before the end of the third act. The *Times* reviewer called the play a fiasco and blamed the quality of the translation for the bad performance, and the play's Russian's atmosphere for the public's hostile attitude.

Though Anton Tchekhov's comedy may be a harmonious work of art, presented at home in its own atmosphere before people who know all about it, if they do not actually live, the life it depicts, Mrs Garnett's *Cherry Orchard* cannot but strike an English audience as something queer and outlandish, even silly. ³⁶

Chekhov then was still relatively unknown except among intellectuals. Moreover, his plays did not engage the popular recognition, but a few perceptive minds recognised the bitter relevance of his writing to the English scene. Thus, despite the hostile reception of *The Cherry Orchard*, the dramatic merits of Chekhov did not escape the notice of critics like Arnold Bennett. Bennett attributed the failure of the play to the English public's inability to understand Chekhov's message. Part of the blame he laid on the actors who were unable to portray the Russian personality. ³⁷

The Chekhov play was finally accepted in England and the 1925-6 season witnessed Chekhov's great success on the English stage. Performances of five of his plays were done by different theatre groups in London and the suburbs. The Moscow Art Theatre played an important role in this respect. Commenting on the successful run of his plays in 1926, Nabokov cited the great admiration of English critics for Chekhov when they likened him to Shakespeare. Nabokov agreed with Mirsky's point, quoted earlier, that Chekhov's ability to present characters other than heroes was one of the reasons that made him appeal to the English audience. ³⁸

After this brief sketch of the origins and motives behind the Russian cult, our concern will be focused on the evidence of its presence as a literary phenomenon. For this purpose we

will turn to the biographies, diaries, journals, letters, literary and critical reviews of some of the literary figures, particularly those who made the cult what it was, for proof. The testimonies and statements of this literary circle will, thus, constitute the body of evidence for the presence of the Russian cult. Besides the remarks of the literary figures, we will look at another area in which the cult was apparent. This being the field of publication, and the specialized works that the cult produced. In this respect, our examination of the periodicals for the presence of Russian material will serve as a second proof of the existence of a cult for the Russians.

Despite the fact that it was the new generation of English writers that led the cult for the Russians, the role the older generation played was also influential. The emergence of the Russian cult in the first decade of the twentieth century coincided with the period in which many English writers were just beginning their literary career, and were having their own works produced. The list of these writers included of D. H. Lawrence, J. M. Murry, Katherine Mansfield, Virginia Woolf, E. M. Forster, and many others. G. B. Shaw, H. G. Wells, Arnold Bennett, and John Galsworthy were writers at the height of their powers and fame. Although Bennett and Shaw were among the pioneers who asserted the greatness of Russian writings, the admiration of the younger generation was greater in the sense that their statements and observations on the Russians constituted the main body of the cult. Swinnerton, in *The Georgian Literary Scene*, accounts for the enthusiasm of the intellectuals of the day with every thing Russian:

Russian art and literature were the rage with all those sensitive people who may be expected to produce the more cultured varieties of fiction, painting, music and formative criticism. Arnold Bennett, at the height of his influence with such people, had committed himself to the statement that all the great novelists of the world were Russian; one heard for the first time - or at any rate for the first time with appreciation - of Goncharov, Schedrine, Leskov, even of Tchekhov. ³⁹

J. M. Murry's response to the Russian cult was unique in its vigour and enthusiasm. In the case of both cults, that of Dostoevsky and Chekhov, he was the most enthusiastic among the writers. In the eyes of many scholars and critics, Murry's reaction to the cult might have seemed extravagant and his literary criticism of the writers and their works was not regarded as completely sound. Nevertheless, his great enthusiasm ranked him as the primary spokesman of both cults.

Dostoevsky was a hero for Murry, and Chekhov he adored. His enthusiasm for the former came immediately after the publication of *The Brothers Karamazov* in 1912. Murry was among the young intellectuals who expressed their utmost admiration and fascination for the author by calling him their idol, and ranking the book as "the greatest novel ever written." The

cult for Dostoevsky which the novel's publication initiated was described by Rose as "the predominant factor in the hectic evolution of the young intellect." Rose proceeds to say that the hectic quality was very much discernible in Murry's "biography of Dostoevsky and in parts of his *Evolution of an Intellectual*." ⁴⁰ Indeed, Murry's writing of *Fyodor Dostoevsky: A Critical Study* (1916) can be seen as a proof of the extent of his enthusiasm. Dostoevsky's works inspired the writing of the book. The book was commissioned by Martin Secker to pay off a £30 debt on *Rhythm* - the short lived magazine which he founded with D. H. Lawrence. In *Between Two Worlds* Murry explained how he tried to start on the book, how he found nothing to write about the writer, and how after reading Dostoevsky's major novels the book came so easily that Murry felt that he was nothing more "than the amanuensis of a book that wrote itself." ⁴¹

Murry stressed the fact that his book was, by no means, an attempt at critical analysis of Dostoevsky, but rather an expression of his emotional reaction after reading some of his novels when he used the writer's own words in his speech on Pushkin: "I do not speak as a literary critic; I am only thinking of what may be prophetic in his works." The motivation behind the compilation of the book arose from his need to adopt an attitude towards Dostoevsky as a cultural phenomenon.

For the first time in my life, I had the experience of certitude. It was no question of my opinion of Dostoevsky; I had no opinion of Dostoevsky; and if I expressed any personal opinions about him in the book, they were certainly exaggerated and probably wrong. All that happened - I speak, of course, of my sensation only - was that the objective 'pattern' of Dostoevsky had declared itself, through me as instrumental. ⁴²

The book had opened new vistas in Murry's life and career. The process of writing the book "had loosened my muscles as a critic; I could think and write freely. My reviews were no longer task-work, but a genuine satisfaction to myself." No wonder that he called the writer his hero:

Dostoevsky had permanently enlarged my consciousness. When that happens it happens once for all. . . I never go back on my heroes. Once a hero for me, always a hero. That is the tribe to which I belong. ⁴³

When Murry is talking of art in its "wildest dreams" he appoints Dostoevsky as "its wildest dreamer" and simultaneously praises the writer's faculty of combining the beautiful and the grotesque. Dostoevsky's art "has only begun to touch the furthest fringe of this 'utter

beauty in utter grotesqueness' - which is no less than the secret of the world, the mystery of being, and the heart of God." 44

In his introduction "The Dream of a Queer Fellow" Murry praises Dostoevsky's artistic qualities and calls him the great writer of the Russian land.

Likewise, Murry's admiration for Chekhov exceeded the boundaries of ordinary enthusiasm, for it amounted to a sense of adoration:

Gentlemen, were I to confess the whole extent of my admiration of Anton Tchekhov, I should be ashamed. It is an adoration. I know that he is not a great writer in the sense in which Tolstoy and Dostoevsky were. And yet I think he achieved a greater victory than they did. 45

Murry refused to agree that Chekhov's works created a "wild enthusiasm." "Our enthusiasm for Chekhov never grows, never diminishes; we take him into ourselves, and he is part of our life for ever." 46

Moreover, Murry was the first of the young critics to appreciate Chekhov's genius and to point out the modernity of his art. For him Chekhov was the "only great modern artist in prose, a genius, a standard by which modern literary effort must be measured." If compared with other so-called modern writers, Chekhov appeared to be "a good many phases in advance of all that is habitually described as modern in literature." 47 In Murry's view, the secret of Chekhov's modernity lied in the simplicity of his art. Such was its quality that under the surface of this simplicity there was hidden a sensitivity to all the complexities modern consciousness was involved in. "The simplicity of Tchekhov is very wise and very cold; it is an achievement wrung out of such knowledge and surpassing inward honesty." Chekhov's great achievement was the reconciliation of the "greatest possible diversity of content with the greatest possible unity of aesthetic impression." 48

Murry praised the quality of Chekhov's art that consisted in what he called "a unity of multiplicity." What made this unity so special was that it was, "far more nakedly aesthetic than that of most of the great writers before him." 49 Murry's further contribution to the cult and his promotion to Russian writers were obvious in his collaboration with Koteliansky to introduce more translations like Kuprin's *The River of Life*, Shestov's *Anton Tchekhov, and Other Essays*, in addition to his translations of a volume of Dostoevsky's short stories. (More will be said about the collaboration of Murry and other literary figures in the translation of Russian novels in the chapter on Koteliansky.) Like everybody else Katherine Mansfield was fascinated

by Dostoevsky. Nevertheless, Chekhov remained her hero; her admiration combined an interest in the writer and the man.

Mansfield's admiration of Dostoevsky was confined to the time when his cult had swept the literary scene. She was infatuated by *The Brothers Karamazov*, declared the writer her idol and the book "the greatest novel ever written." Her observations on reading *The Idiot* and *The Possessed*, recorded in the March entry of her Journal in 1916, indicated a dissatisfaction with Dostoevsky's portrayal of characters:

Having read the whole of *The Idiot* through again, and fairly carefully, I feel slightly more bewildered than I did before as Nastasya Flipovna's [sic] character. She is really not well done. She is badly done. And there grows up as one reads a kind of irritation, a *balked* fascination, which almost succeeds finally in blotting out the first and really marvellous 'impressions' of her. What was Dostoevsky really aiming at?⁵⁰

Praise of Dostoevsky's method in throwing more light on Shatov was mentioned, and how it came up to reader's expectations, created by the author's earlier hint, in addition to the faculty of truthfully depicting the vindictive feeling that comes over women in pain

How did Dostoevsky know about that extraordinary vindictive feeling, that relish for little laughter - that comes over women in pain? It is a very secret thing, but it's profound. They don't want to spare the one whom they love.⁵¹

However, her appreciation of Dostoevsky and acknowledgement of the enthusiasm that his novels stimulated in England came as a clear cut confirmation of the cult. Her analysis of the advent of the cult was very well depicted in her review of the Garnett translation of *An Honest Thief, and Other Stories*.

If we view it from a certain angle, it is not at all impossible to see in Dostoevsky's influence upon the English intellectuals of to-day the bones of a marvellously typical Dostoevsky novel. Supposing we select London for his small provisional town and his arrival for agitating occurrence - could he himself exaggerate the discussions he has provoked, the expenditure of enthusiasm and vituperation, the mental running to and fro, the parties that have been given in his honour, the added confusion of several young gentlemen-writers declaring (in strict confidence) that they were the real Dostoevsky, the fascinating arguments as to whether or no he is greater than Jane Austen.⁵²

Mansfield's literary affinities with Chekhov had been noted by many critics. It is presumed that Chekhov's art of short story writing had exerted a great influence on her work. From him she learned to write stories of uneven length.

Tchehov makes me feel that this long to write stories of such uneven length is quite justified. "Geneva" is a long story, and "Hamilton" is very short, and this ought to be written to my brother really, and another about the life in New Zealand. ⁵³

The extent of Chekhov's influence on her art of writing was apparent in the similarity between her story "The Child Who Was Tired" and Chekhov's story entitled "Sleepy.". On this basis she was accused of plagiarism. Many critics expressed indignation against this charge, and hastened to defend Mansfield's creative faculties as a writer. They related similarities between the work of the two writers to her affinities with Chekhov the man, with whom she had a sort of spiritual kinship. She registered her spiritual closeness to the writer in a letter written when she was very ill and was terrified by the idea of death:

But I really have suffered such AGONIES from loneliness and illness combined that I'll never be quite whole again. I don't think I ll [sic] ever believe that they wont [sic] recur- that some grinning Fate wont [sic] suggest that I go away by myself to get well of something!! Of course externally and during the day one smiles and chats & says one had a pretty rotten time, perhaps - but God! God! Tchekhov would understand. Dostoevsky wouldn't. Because he's never been in the same situation. He's been poor and ill & worried but infirm - the wife has been there to sell her petticoat - or there has been a neighbour. He wouldn't be alone. But Tchekhov has known just EXACTLY this that I know. I discover it in his work often. ⁵⁴

The Bloomsbury group's reaction to the Dostoevsky and Chekhov cults is worth mentioning, because the group shared in the enthusiasm for both writers. Moreover, they made a palpable contribution to the cult. In addition to their reviews and literary articles, they helped to expand the range of the cult through their publications of translations from the Russian in the Hogarth Press.

The group's interest in Dostoevsky arose from the current interest in psychoanalysis and the new theories of Freud. Their interest in Freud and Dostoevsky was equalled to that of Voltaire and Spinoza. However, Proust and Chekhov remained their favourite writers. In the latter, the group found "a Russian writer who was completely bourgeois." The group's enthusiasm for Chekhov enhanced the reception of the writer in England. ⁵⁵

Virginia Woolf's admiration of Russian writers was very great; "if the Russians are mentioned one runs the risk of feeling that to write of any fiction save theirs is a waste of time."⁵⁶ Three Russian writers appealed to Woolf greatly: Dostoevsky, Chekhov and Tolstoy. In Dostoevsky she liked his concern with the soul which dominates his works, in Chekhov she praised his fine insight that enables him to predict life truthfully, however, Tolstoy remained her favourite and the "greatest of novelists." Besides, the Russian novel fitted Woolf's conception of modernity in fiction. On this basis she criticized the old conventions of the English novel, and found that the main fault with English novelists was that they cared much about the fabric of things resulting in their negligence of character. ⁵⁷

Thus, the main point of her admiration centred on the Russians' occupation with the "soul", which she found to be the main characteristic in Russian fiction in general. English writers were urged to follow the Russian example and adopt the treatment of the soul in their fiction.

Learn to make yourselves akin to people. I would even like to add: make yourself indispensable to them. But let this sympathy be not with the mind - for it is easy with the mind - but with the heart, with love towards them. ⁵⁸

In the novels of Dostoevsky she realized an embodiment of this particular hallmark of the Russian soul. Reading Dostoevsky was, indeed, an exciting experience

The novels of Dostoevsky are seething whirlpools, gyrating sandstorms, waterspouts which hiss and boil and stuck us in. They are composed purely and wholly of the soul. Against our wills we are drawn in, whirled round, blinded, suffocated, and at the same time filled with giddy rapture. ⁵⁹

Woolf acknowledged the impact of Dostoevsky's works when she reviewed *The Eternal Husband and Other Stories* for *The Times Literary Supplement* in 1917. She paid tribute to the services of Constance Garnett who enabled the English public "to measure what the existence of this great genius who is beginning to permeate our lives so curiously mean to us," whose novels were becoming "an indestructible part of the furniture of our minds." At the end of the review she had something to say about the soul, when she praised Dostoevsky's depiction of most complicated states of the mind:

Alone among the writers Dostoevsky has the power of reconstructing the most swift and complicated states of mind, of rethinking the whole train of thought in all its speed, now as it flashes into light, now as it lapses into darkness; for he is

able to follow not only the vivid streak of achieved thought but to suggest the dim and populous underworld of the mind's consciousness where desires and impulses are moving blindly beneath the sod.⁶⁰

Two years later, her review to another volume of stories in the Garnett translation highlighted the peculiar sense of Dostoevsky's humour. "Because of his sympathy his laughter passed beyond merriment into a strange violent amusement which is not merry at all." There was a call, at the end of the review, not to underrate the value of this faculty in his art.⁶¹

Lytton Strachey was one of the earliest critics to refer to the element of humour in Dostoevsky's works; a faculty which "has not been sufficiently emphasized by critics." The fact that his most famous and widely read novel *Crime and Punishment* lacked this quality was by no means a justification for labelling its writer as humourless. In "A Russian Humorist" he singled out those works - not yet available in translation - which showed Dostoevsky's humour at its best. The novels *Uncle's Dream*, *The Eternal Husband*, and *Another's* were "typical examples" showing "Dostoevsky in a mood of wild gaiety." Dostoevsky's humour was very much apparent in *The Idiot* and *The Possessed* (Garnett translation). Strachey attributed many qualities in the writer's art to this particular characteristic:

Dostoevsky's humour appears in its final and most characteristic form, in which it dominates and inspires all his other qualities - his almost fiendish insight into the human heart, his delight in the extraordinary and the unexpected, his passionate love of what is noble in man, his immense creative force - and endows them with a new and wonderful significance.⁶²

In dealing with Chekhov there was stress on the predominance of the soul as the chief characteristic in his fiction too; there was an indication of the presence of modernity in the writer's style, in addition to the inconclusiveness of the stories and their creation to a sense of bewilderment.

The soul in Chekhov was of a different kind. Unlike Dostoevsky's morbid soul, Chekhov's was "delicate and subtle . . . , subject to an infinite number of humours and distemper." The writer's new technique was responsible for creating a sense of bewilderment at the end of every story. There was always present the question, "what is the point of it, and why does he make a story out of this? We ask as we read story after story."⁶³ Woolf likened Chekhov's making of a story to a hen's picking up of grain. Despite the strangeness of his choice, yet there was no doubt that Chekhov "chooses what he chooses with the finest insight."⁶⁴ In her view, the method of inconclusiveness, of leaving things unsolved, is simply the result of fastidious taste".

Once the eye is used to these shades, half the "conclusions" of fiction fade into their air; they show like transparencies with a light behind them - gaudy, glaring, superficial. ⁶⁵

The fact that his stories concluded in an unrecognizable way begot this inconclusiveness, but it, nevertheless, made them more lifelike. "The method which at first seemed so casual, inconclusive, and occupied with trifles, now appears the result of an exquisitely original and fastidious taste."

In England at any rate the novel is not a work of art. There are none to be stood beside *War and Peace*, *The Brothers Karamazov*, or *A la Recherche du Temps Perdu*. In France and Russia they take the fiction seriously. ⁶⁶

The Woolfs' extra contribution to the cult of the Russians came through the publications of the Hogarth Press. The press was started in 1917 by both Leonard and Virginia. The whole idea of the foundation of the press started as a hobby. ⁶⁷ It was only after the success of Virginia's *Kew Gardens* that the matter of publication was taken seriously. Moreover, one of the first books that secured the press's success was a Russian translation of Gorky's *Reminiscences of Leo Nicolayevitch Tolstoi*. "The success of Gorky's book was really the turning point for the future of the press and for our future." ⁶⁸ Other publications of Russian works began to appear since 1922. The significance of these translations sprang from the fact that they were done by members of the Russian cult. Almost all of the Russian translations were the work of S. S. Koteliansky and his collaborators. Among the latter were the names of literary figures like Virginia and Leonard Woolf, Katherine Mansfield and J. M. Murry, D. H. Lawrence and others. The translations included the works of Dostoevsky; *Stavrogin's Confession* constituting an unpublished chapter of *The Possessed*, and *Letters From The Underground*, Bunin; *The Gentleman From San Fransisco*, Tolstoy; *The Autobiography of Countess Sophie Tolstoi*, Chekhov; *The Notebooks of Anton Tchehov*, Gorky; *Reminiscences of Tolstoy, Chekhov and Andreev*. These books threw more light about these Russian writers whose works had already become available to the public. Through the publications of their press the Woolfs publicized the works of the Russians, adding, thus, more to their contribution to the cult. As a reviewer to *The Nation and Athenaeum* Leonard Woolf extended the sphere of his services. Through the weekly column "Books in General" he voiced much enthusiasm for and evaluation of Russian works, and writers.

Forster's views about the Russians are mentioned immediately following those of the Bloomsbury group. Although Forster did not regard himself as belonging to the group, he

shared their cult of personal relationships, and it is an attitude that permeates almost everything he wrote, fiction and non-fiction alike.

The works of Russian writers featured in his treatment of the novel in *Aspects of the Novel*. When discussing types of character, Forster considered Dostoevsky's as "round characters." Dostoevsky's characters appealed to him in a similar way that the novels did to Virginia Woolf. Like her he laid much emphasis on character creation in a novel.

Dostoevsky's characters ask us to share something deeper than their experiences. They convey to us a sensation that is partly physical - the sensation of sinking into a translucent globe and seeing our experience floating far above us on its surface, tiny, remote, yet ours. We have not ceased to be people, we have given nothing up, but "the sea is in the fish and the fish is in the sea." 69

Speaking about the prophetic aspect of the novel he draws a distinction between two authors whose similarity sprang from their saturation in the Christian spirit. These were Dostoevsky and George Eliot. Forster labelled the former as a "prophet" and the latter as "non-prophet." Both writers had vision. However, in George Eliot there was much of the preacher, while Dostoevsky's portrayal of character won him the quality of a prophet. He reached this conviction after comparing two passages from *Adam Bede* and *The Brothers Karamazov*. 70

Now the difference between these passages is that the first writer is a preacher, and the second a prophet. George Eliot talks about God, but never alters her focus; God and the tables and chairs are all in the same plane, . . . In Dostoevsky the characters and situations always stand for more than themselves; infinity attends them, though they remain individuals they expand to embrace it and summon it to embrace them. 71

The views of D. H. Lawrence, the last literary figure to be quoted in this sketch, create some difficulty. This is due to the discrepancies in Lawrence's attitude towards the Russian cult, and Russian writers in general. Lawrence may not rank in line with the other enthusiasts of the Russian cult, nevertheless, he was part of the cult, and his views were important. He might not have been a promoter of the cult, nevertheless, there is evidence that he read most of the Russian works that excited the greatest of admiration in all who read them during this period. His letters to friends are full of references to his readings.

Lawrence's response to the Russians was best described by George Zytaruk who commented that it was "in its most inclusive form ambivalent: he is simultaneously attracted

and repelled." 72 Indeed, Lawrence expressed admiration and repulsion at the same time. Despite all his hostility against them, the Russian novelists meant a great deal to Lawrence. But at the same time, he found their art both crude and uncivilized.

Oh, don't think I would belittle the Russians. They have meant an enormous amount to me, Turgenev, Tolstoi, Dostoevsky - mattered more than anything, and I thought them the greatest writers of all time. And now, with something of a shock, I realize a certain crudity and thick, uncivilized, insensitive stupidity about them, I realise how much finer and purer and more ultimate our own stuff is. 73

In his Foreword to *Studies in American Literature* Lawrence found Russian and American literature equal on the basis of their achievement of modernism

Two bodies of modern literature seem to me to have come to a real verge: the Russian and the American. Let us leave aside the more brittle bits of French or Irish production, which are perhaps over the verge. Russian and American. And by American I do not mean Sherwood Anderson, who is so Russian. I mean the old people, little thin volumes of Hawthorne, Poe, Dana, Melville, Whitman. These seem to me to have reached a verge, as the more voluminous Tolstoi, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Artzibashev reached a limit on the other side. 74

Lawrence criticized the Russian soul which seemed to writers like Virginia Woolf and E. M. Forster as one of the outstanding characteristics of Russian fiction. He seemed to have realized its impact in determining the popularity of the Russians. Hence his attack on it.

So far, we have only lately wakened up to the sympathy-suffering coruscation, so we are full of it. And that is why the Russians are so popular. No matter how much of a shabby little slut you may be, you can learn from Dostoevsky and Tchekov that you have got the most tender, unique soul on earth, coruscating with suffering and impossible sympathies. And so you may be most vastly important to your self, introspectively. Outwardly, you will say: Of course I'm an ordinary person, like everybody else.- But your very saying it will prove that you think the opposite: namely, that everybody on earth is ordinary, *except* yourself. 75

Lawrence's attention was brought to the Russians by his friends. George Zytaruk in *D. H. Lawrence's Response to Russian Literature*, reported on Lawrence's reading of the Russians. In tracing Lawrence's early acquaintance with Russian works, Zytaruk asserts that Lawrence was familiar with the works of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov as far as 1909.

He also stressed the fact that Lawrence's friendship with the translator S. S. Koteliansky was responsible for much of his knowledge of the Russians. In addition, his relations with figures like the Garnetts and the Murrys put him in direct contact with the cult for the Russians and enabled him to read more Russian works. Lawrence's relations with these literary figures may account for his "ambivalent attitude" for the Russians. For his hostility sprang partly from his indignation against the promoters of the cult and partly from his jealousy of the attention they were receiving. He hated the Russians because they presented a threat to him. It so happened that the popularity of the Russians coincided with the time of his own productions. He was annoyed by the fact that these foreigners were receiving all the attention and praise which he would have liked his fiction to receive. He turned to American literature for an alternative, and praised literature in English as the best. His feelings were best expressed in a letter to Katherine Carswell after reading Turgenev's *A Sportsman's Sketches* in 1916

It amazes me that we have bowed down and worshipped these foreigners as we have. Their art is so clumsy, really, and clayey, compared with our own. I read *Deerslayer* just before the Turgenev. And I can tell you what a come-down it was, from the pure and exquisite art of Fenimore Cooper - whom we count nobody - to the journalistic bludgeoning of Turgenev. But it is a characteristic of a highly developed nation to bow down to that which is more gross and raw and affected. . . . No enough of this silly worship of foreigners. The most exquisite literature in the world is written in the English language.⁶⁷

Lawrence tried to undermine the impact of the cult by turning to American literature and writers, by his attempts to popularize other non-Russian writers like the Italian Verga, and by his preference for other Russian novelists who were not part of the cult like, Rozanov.

In his attempt to minimize the cult for the Russians he turned to American literature. According to George Zytaruk, Lawrence brought Dostoevsky into his discussion of *The Scarlet Letter* because he hoped to counter some of the enthusiasm for his cult which was sweeping the literary world.

The Scarlet Letter is a profound and wonderful book, one of the eternal revelations. Those who look for realism and personal thrills may jeer at it. It is not thrilling in the vulgar way. But for those who talk about the profundities of Dostoevsky, it is far more profound than the epileptic Russian, and for those who talk about the perfection of the French novel, it is more perfect than any work of fiction in French.⁷⁷

Similarly Lawrence turned to Verga in order to publicize his fiction in an attempt to undermine the attention paid to the Russians' works, in particular those of Chekhov. Lawrence's introductions to Verga's translations made it quite clear that he translated him "in

order to propagate a writer who was, in most aspects, the "blank opposite" of Flaubert, Zola, Turgenev, Tolstoy, Chekhov, and Dostoevsky." ⁷⁸ Lawrence was introduced to Chekhov, the playwright, through his friends. At the beginning he liked his plays; he even compared them with his own plays. But the fact that Chekhov's plays were gaining in success while his were not successful might "have been an initial reason for Lawrence's distaste for him."⁷⁹ He preferred Verga's stories to those of Chekhov whom he found to be more depressing than the Italian writer.

They are as short and as poignant as Chekhov. I prefer them to Chekhov. Yet nobody reads them. They are "too depressing." They don't depress me half as much as Chekhov does. I don't understand the popular taste.⁸⁰

Long before there was any cult for Chekhov, Lawrence expressed a different opinion of the writer. When he was first introduced to his plays in 1912 he called him "a new thing in drama," ⁸¹ and described his plays as "exceedingly interesting." A year later he wrote to Edward Garnett telling him about the need for a revival in the theatre, and called for a reaction against the plays of G. B. Shaw and John Galsworthy. ⁸² He also hoped that there would be an audience for his own plays. However, few years later, when Chekhov's plays were achieving a great success he called him "a second-rate writer and a willy wet-leg." ⁸³

Thus, Lawrence's attitude towards Russian literature fluctuated from complete admiration to utter disdain and revulsion. That Lawrence's comments on Russian fiction sprang from personal antagonism is clearly evident, for he only started to revile the Russians after his estrangement with the Garnetts and the Murrys. Lawrence's "opinions on this subject were mainly formed in the years from 1913 to 1916, from the time he met John Middleton Murry until the first great quarrel with him." ⁸⁴ The great rift took place when Murry published his book on Dostoevsky, Lawrence was also reading Verga for the first time. Lawrence was supposed to collaborate with Murry on writing the Dostoevsky book. Due to his illness he failed to send Murry the notes which he had promised. By that time Murry had read Dostoevsky's four major novels and the book wrote itself. In the letter that Lawrence addressed to both Murry and Katherine Mansfield in February 1917, he stated his criticism of the writer. He also sent his notes on the writer and asked Murry to translate them into his own language.

- 1- He has a fixed will, a mania to be infinite, to be God.
 - 2- Within his will, his activity is twofold:
 - (a) To be self-less, a pure Christian, to live in the outer whole, the social whole, the universal consciousness.
 - (b) To be pure, absolute self, all-devouring and all consuming
- That is the main statement about him. ⁸⁵

Lawrence proceeded by focusing his attack on Dostoevsky's portrayal of sensual characters like Dmitri Karamazov and Rogzhin, and the spiritual kind as presented in *The Idiot*, in the person of Alyosha, and Stavrogin. The whole point of Dostoevsky's purpose he found to lie in the individual's ego longing to be God-like. He expressed his liking of *The Idiot* because the book represented the last stage of Christianity, as opposed to Karamazov who was concerned with the last stages of sensuality. He concluded the letter by calling Dostoevsky's novels "great parables, . . . , but false art."

They are only parables. All people are *fallen angels* - even the dirtiest scrubs. This I cannot stomach. People are not fallen angels, they are merely people. But Dostoevsky used them all as theological or religious units, they are all terms of divinity, like Christ's 'Sower went forth to sow,' and Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. They are bad art, false truth.⁸⁶

Lawrence's letter to Koteliansky who sent him a copy of Dostoevsky's *Letters from the Underworld*, which the latter translated with J. M. Murry, show the connection between his distaste of Dostoevsky and his relation with Murry:

Thank you for the little Dostoevsky book. I have only read Murry's introduction, and Dostoevsky's "Dream of a Queer Fellow." Both stink in my nostrils. I call it offal, putrid stuff. Dostoevsky is big & putrid, here, Murry is a small stinker, emitting the same kind of stink. How is it that these foul-living people ooze with such loving words. . . - No, when he was preaching Dostoevsky was a rotten little stinker. In his art he is bound to confess himself in hate and torture. But his "credo" -!
- my God, what filth.⁸⁷

The discrepancy in his attitude towards Dostoevsky persisted till the end of his life. When reading Dostoevsky's letters in 1915 he described him as "a pure introvert, a purely disintegrating will", yet all the same he called him "a great man" and admitted that he had the "greatest admiration for him. I even feel a sort of subterranean love for him."⁸⁸ In 1926 he wanted to reread Dostoevsky "not as fiction, but as life. I am so weary of the English way of reading nothing but fiction in everything. I will order *Karamazov* at once." Nevertheless, his hostile attitude did not change. Lawrence's last statement about the author came in 1930 when he wrote an introduction to Koteliansky's translation of *The Grand Inquisitor*:

One gets tired of being told that Dostoevsky's Legend of the Grand Inquisitor "is the most profound declaration which ever was made about man and life." As far as I'm concerned, in proportion as a man gets more profoundly and personally

interested in himself, so does my interest in him wane. The more Dostoievsky gets worked up about the tragic nature of the human soul, the more I lose interest. I have read the Grand Inquisitor three times, and never can remember what it's really about. This I make as a confession, not as a vaunt. It always seems to me, as the Germans say, mehr Schrei wie Wert. ⁸⁹

That Lawrence's response to the cults of Dostoevsky and Chekhov was related to his personal views and attitudes about individuals, is quite true. As mentioned earlier, Lawrence's hostility to the Russians arose in the first place from his indignation against the promoters of the cult. Zytaruk mentioned that Lawrence's hatred to Dostoevsky was a projection of his indignation at Murry's enthusiasm and adulation. ⁹⁰ Similarly, he came to hate Chekhov on the grounds of J. M. Murry's and Katherine Mansfield's great enthusiasm. As a consequence, he was provoked to an extravagance of the opposite kind. In this respect, his views of both Dostoevsky and Chekhov, can be best understood as being part of a plan to undermine the impact of the Russian cult.

When Koteliansky sent him a copy of *Chekhov's Literary and Theatrical Reminiscences*, he wrote to him " I'll read the Tchegov book next. But Tchegov, being particularly a pet of Murry & Katherine, is rather potted shrimps to me." ⁹¹ He expressed similar feelings in another letter to Koteliansky on receiving a translation of Rozanov. "I am very pleased to have Rozanov - I'm really rather tired of Tchegov & Dostoevsky people: they're so Murryish." ⁹²

Lawrence's preference to Rozanov can be seen as part of his attempt to undermine the Russian cult. He liked Rozanov's attitude which embraced the pagan and phallic vision his predecessors had ignored. It is well known that Lawrence's main criticism of three of the great Russian writers focused on their being didactic: "In Turgenev, and in Tolstoi, and in Dostoievski, the moral scheme into which all the characters fit - and it is nearly the same scheme - is, whatever the extraordinariness of the characters themselves, dull, old, dead." ⁹³ In this sense, Rozanov was " the first Russian as far as [Lawrence was] concerned who has said anything to [him]." Accordingly, he placed him over Dostoevsky and Tolstoy:

For the first time we get what we have got from no Russian, neither Tolstoi nor Dostoievsky nor any of them, a real, positive view of life. It is as if the pagan Russian had wakened up in Rozanov, a kind of Rip van Winkle, and was just staggering at what he saw. His background is the vast old pagan background, the phallic. And in front of this, the tortured complexity of Christian civilization - what else can we call it? It is a kind of phantasmagoria to him. ⁹⁴

Through his acquaintance with Koteliansky Lawrence came to read more Russian authors. Ivan Bunin was another writer that appealed to Lawrence. He particularly liked his short story "The Gentleman from San Francisco", which he helped Koteliansky in translating. The story appeared in a volume of short stories under the same title in 1921. There was also Shestov. Lawrence read the works of other Russians like Kuprin and Gorky. In 1916 he wrote to Katherine Mansfield: "Kot gave me a Kuprin. It reads awfully well. But I don't think much of those lesser Russians." ⁹⁵ He read Gorky's short stories as far as 1913. "I've read all the 4 1/2 [pence?] Maxim Gorkys, I believe - I love short stories." He found Turgenev "so very critical" and described him as "a sort of male old maid."⁹⁶

Despite this hostile attitude, the impact of the Russians, especially Dostoevsky, on Lawrence's fiction cannot be ignored. *The Man Who Died* is an appalling novella, but it is inconceivable without *The Brothers Karamazov*. Likewise his reading of Rozanov is said to have had an artistic influence on him, in addition to Tolstoy's works, particularly *Anna Karenina*, and the influence it had on his writing of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

In the observations and comments of the literary figures of the day are expressed much of the story of the great enthusiasm for the Russian fiction. Their statements also testify to the presence of a cult for Russian fiction.

Although scholars, like Phelps, traced the story of Russian fiction in England to an earlier period than the second decade of the twentieth century where the enthusiasm for Russian literature reached its high watermark. But the fact remains that the origination of the Russian cult as a literary phenomenon can be dated in the year 1912. The publication of *The Brothers Karamazov*, in English translation for the first time, initiated the Dostoevsky cult, which, in itself made Russian literature and other Russian writers more popular in England. The introduction of the Russian novel to England in the eighteen eighties, according to Muchnic, was fortunate. The role de Vogue's *Le Roman Russe* played in this concern was remarkable. His studies of the quality of Russian realism and its similarity to that of the British novel, as opposed to French naturalism, was in favour of the Russian novel. For Russian realism was seen to accord with British taste, unlike French naturalism which seemed to offend the British with its repulsiveness. In Muchnic's view, the introduction of Dostoevsky's works was met with great enthusiasm due to the fact that he was seen as an embodiment of the mood of change the period was witnessing. In Dostoevsky's influence on various contemporary writers, Muchnic saw an evidence of the presence of a cult for him. In our study of the reaction of literary figures to Russian translations we have demonstrated the presence of a cult for Russian fiction in England.

There were other proofs to the cult's presence than the testimonies of the literary figures. A survey of the major serious periodicals of the period is carried out in search of the presence of Russian material and evidence of the popularity of Russian literature in England.

3. Coverage of Russian Material in Serious Periodicals 1914-1930

Surveying the Periodicals

The main concern of this section is to show how certain periodicals surveyed Russian translations and material in general, and the contribution they made to the acclimatisation of Russian literature in England. In this respect, my choice of the serious periodicals is related to their significance as organs registering the mood of the specific period which they represent. Because these serious periodicals provide a commentary on literary taste, fashion and concern of the period, they - especially the weekly periodicals and the little magazines - present and reflect the literary atmosphere of the period. They provide an almost day by day index of British interest in Russian matters. We must consider the range of literary periodicals between 1914 and 1930. Before we proceed to do so, a brief outline of the development of periodicals is necessary here.

Periodicals featured greatly in the cultural and social life of the English people. The serious kind, in particular, was a mirror of the literary and political tendencies of the period. The significance of these organs resides in the fact that they are records of the impressions and events of their period. The periodicals were surveyed in search of extra evidence for the presence of a Russian cult beside the observations of the literary figures.

Although the history of English periodicals can be traced back to the seventeenth century, the rise of the miscellaneous review and its development by the end of the century, to be a vehicle of all forms of literature, planted the seed which led to the emergence of the reviews. So the monthly review type of periodical became popular during this period. The *Monthly Review* which began in 1751 is regarded as one of the earliest reviews of importance in English literature, was a miscellaneous periodical. The *Critical Review* which started in 1756 and the *Edinburgh Magazine* that began in 1773 followed in the same steps. However, the periodical, in its current context which consisted of reviews of books developed during the nineteenth century. Therefore, "the beginning of the nineteenth century found the Review, i.e., a serial made up of articles purporting to be criticisms of books, existing as a distinct periodical type beside the more common magazine."⁹⁷ Periodicals of that period fell into three classes: the middle-class family magazine, the quarterlies or reviews, and the literary weeklies. Thus the literary weekly was also a product of the nineteenth century, and it grew in correspondence to the introduction of professionalism in journalism. The loss of interest in literature towards the end of the nineteenth century prompted the birth of a new kind of literary magazine. The little magazines, as they were known, represented the highest point of specialisation in books and literary reviews.

I have chosen a period of sixteen years for the purpose of the survey. My choice of the period from 1914 to 1930 for the survey of the periodicals, is based on two grounds: first, that the first part of the period witnessed the publication of Garnett's translation of Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* (1912), which initiated the cult for Russian literature, and secondly, that the chosen period was an important one politically, socially and as regards literary concerns as a perfect reflection of the growing British interest in Russia, the new political awareness and the consequent interest in Russian literature.

In my consideration of the periodicals for the survey I distinguish between three different kinds: (a) the review, i.e., the literary periodical of the nineteenth century which developed and survived during the twentieth century; (b) the weekly journal of belles-lettres; (c) the little magazine as a new form of journalism.

The periodicals of the first class flourished mainly throughout the nineteenth century when they were first founded. Nevertheless, they continued to develop at the outset of the new century. Although they combined a mixture of contents such as politics, literature, science, art, they were called literary periodicals. Under this first division can be grouped the names of the *Contemporary Review*, the *Quarterly Review*, the *Fortnightly Review* and the *Nineteenth Century*. However, the oldest of these periodicals were the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* reviews.⁹⁸ Their policy was similar; in politics, both reviews were the mouthpiece of the Tories. They also agreed in matters related to literary criticism. The former was established in 1802. Since its establishment in 1912 till its death in 1929, it was edited by Harold Cox, while the *Quarterly* first started in 1809. George Prothero was in charge of its editorship from 1899 till his death in 1922. There also arose specialized fiction magazines; Thackeray's *Cornhill Magazine* (1860), was the best example for the presence of the vogue for reading novels. Serialisation of fiction was adopted by other periodicals; Dickens's *Household Words*. The review combined the characteristic of the old type of reviews and the little magazine.⁹⁹ *The Cornhill Magazine* started in 1860 under Trollope's and Thackeray's editorship. Reginald John Smith edited it until its demise in 1916.¹⁰⁰ George Peabody undertook the *Contemporary's* editorship in the twentieth century. The review was founded in 1866 and it covered politics, foreign affairs, along with classical and modern literature.¹⁰¹ James Knowles established the *Nineteenth Century* in 1877 (it later changed its name to *The Nineteenth Century and After*). Rowland and George Prothero edited the *Quarterly* from 1883 to 1899, and from 1899 to 1922 respectively. The general outlook of the review was conservative. Social, political and historical material featured to a great extent through its pages more than literary.¹⁰² The *Fortnightly* was first published in 1865 under William Leonard Courtney's editorship. The scope of its publication was politics, literature and intellectual life

in general; in it both classical and contemporary literature were also reviewed. ¹⁰³ The *English Review* was founded by Ford Madox Ford in 1908.

The literary weeklies prospered in the middle and latter part of the nineteenth century. The year 1828 marked the birth of the weekly literary journal. Both the *Spectator* and the *Athenaeum* were founded that year. ¹⁰⁴ They differed from the old reviews not only in form but in content. In size they were much smaller than the reviews. When they first appeared they consisted of sixteen pages, and were issued weekly. Their size expanded through the new century. Almost all the weeklies consulted here contained twenty-four pages. On the other hand, they were not concerned with publishing creative literature; they tended rather to publish critical comment, books' reviews, and literary gossip. Like the reviews, before them, the *Belles-lettres* combined a homogeneous content of politics, literature and science. The *Athenaeum*, the *Nation and Athenaeum*, the *Spectator*, the *Saturday Review* were all labelled as journals of politics, literature, science and art. Under this group we will list the *Times Literary Supplement* which came into existence as a section of the *Times* newspaper in 1902 and which in 1914 became a separate issue. The paper was devoted wholly to the discussion and reviews of books, thus differing from the other *belles-lettres* which covered political, scientific and other fields of life besides the literary. ¹⁰⁵

The emergence of these literary journals had its effect in professionalizing periodical criticism, and in the *belles-lettres* acquiring a prestigious status over the *Review* or the magazine. Besides,

The weekly frequency of its appearance and its large circulation have combined to enhance its value as an advertising medium for publishers. This, in turn, has brought it prosperity. Generations of competent writers have given it critical authority. Moreover, it acquires value from its immediacy and from its ability to cover well the field of its interests. ¹⁰⁶

Despite their reflections to the interests of the age and their prestigious status, the weekly journals were read by minority. Murry's *Athenaeum* was a weekly "journal of English and Foreign Literature, Science, the Fine Arts, Music, and Drama." The paper consisted mainly of reviews. "was aimed at an elite and foredoomed to failure." ¹⁰⁷ The heavy loss of the paper prompted Murry's decision to merge it with the *Nation*. The latter was a liberal weekly supporting the Liberal party, while the *New Statesman* was considered a Socialist paper, but its "literary interest never lessened." A common characteristic the weekly journals had was that they were ephemeral. This is clearly indicated by their small circulation and their appealing to a limited audience. ¹⁰⁸

The third type of periodical was a product of the modern movement. It was a literary organ specializing in books and writers. The commercial press and the inexpensive facilities of printing paved the way to the emergence of a more specialized kind of literary magazine. They came to be known, in America, as the "little magazines" and in England as "little reviews." While the appearance of this new type of magazine coincided with the beginning of the modernist movement in America, the English little reviews tended to "grow directly out of the conservative and scholarly tradition of the older quarterlies and better magazines." Nevertheless, "the historical reasons for their appearance are in general the same as in the United States."¹⁰⁹ Malcolm Bradbury relates the emergence of this type of magazine to the lack of interest in literature in the periodicals and to the narrowness of the literary public.¹¹⁰ Louis Dudek, in his account on the history of printing and its relation to literature, states that the intellectuals or the avant-garde of the day, who founded this kind of magazine at the beginning of the century, took them as a chance to air their own views and interests, and to show their disgust with the material world. He proceeds to explain that the advance of the modern movement and the insular exclusion, which these intellectuals experienced as a result, prompted their choice to start their own means of expression.¹¹¹ In this context, the little magazines were seen as better representatives of the literary atmosphere of the period. Simply because their writers wrote to satisfy themselves rather than to please a sector of the public.¹¹² In other words, they were vehicles for the interests and views of their own editors. J. M. Murry's experience in this field was prolific. He edited four magazines; all of them were short lived: *Rhythm*, the *Blue Review*, *Signature*, and the *Adelphi*. The latter, which he founded in 1923, was the only one that lasted for sometime. It not only became an outlet of Murry's personal taste and views, but also "one of the most authoritative of the post-war reviews." T. S. Eliot's experiment with *The Criterion*, which he established in 1922, was the most representative of this type of magazine. Like Murry's *Adelphi*, it was also regarded as an outlet for Eliot's personal, social, critical and literary interests. Moreover, it was regarded as the magazine most representative of the 1920s. The magazine had an international flavour through its publication of translations and of more work in its original language. It also reflected Eliot's own interests over its seventeen years of publication. During its first period more literary work appeared in it. By the late 1920s and early 1930s articles of a political nature, in addition to critical writing and reviews filled its pages.¹¹³ Elsewhere, the *Egoist* under Ezra Pound's editorship pursued a similar policy. The magazine served as an outlet for Pound's and his friends' views and interests. It published the Imagist poetry of Pound, Richard Aldington and H. D. (Hilda Doolittle, Aldington's wife.) Indeed the magazine became "a source of imagist poetry, of unconventional fiction, and of solid critical statements."¹¹⁴ When Pound was editing the *Little Review* in 1917 he made it also an outlet for himself and other writers like T. S. Eliot, Wyndham Lewis, F. M. Hueffer (later Ford), and Joyce. Desmond MacCarthy's *Life and Letters* was established in 1928. The journal published articles and reviews appealing

to continental writers. ¹¹⁵ Likewise the *Calendar of Modern Letters* published contemporary fiction, poetry, essays and reviews of literature of other nations. ¹¹⁶

The little magazines were directed to different audiences: "the intelligent general reader, the intelligentsia, and the fashionably smart public." Their tendencies were different and varied. Most of them had avant-garde tendencies responding to progressive movements in art, literature, and many other social issues. Only a few of them appealed to the general middle-class general reader. They all had a modest circulations as "an indication of their specialism."¹¹⁷

The aim of this survey is to describe the treatment of Russian art of all kinds as it featured in these periodicals. This is a comparative study of the periodicals through the pages of which most of the publications of Russian translations produced within the selected period were either reviewed or noticed. The survey covers a period of sixteen years. Fifteen periodicals were consulted. The survey has two objectives: first, to study the frequency with which Russian books and articles were cited, thus proving the popularity of Russian literature in the cultural and literary atmosphere of the period; second, to prove the assumption that Russian literature appealed to the avant-garde or the elite of the age.

I have followed, for the classification and grouping of the data involved, a month by month and year by year check of Russian material in the periodicals. General searching and examining of the periodicals have been carried out, besides the analysis of the periodicals' contents. The material consisted of reviews of books, articles about authors, notices of books' publication and their reprints, in addition to general articles dealing with performances of Russian music and ballet. It has been my intention to demonstrate the presence of Russian literature, thus excluding political material and stressing only the literary and other related matters of interest to the British public, like Russian music and ballet, and travel books.

Russian Material in the Periodicals

My survey shows the extensive presence of Russian literature at the beginning of the period, that is the war years between 1914 and 1918. A similar but less intensive presence, can be discerned towards the end of the period, i.e. 1918-1930. The proportion amounts to 60% during the first period compared to the 30% in the second. The reviews, articles and notices presented a miscellaneous bouquet of Russian authors who belonged to different ages. They covered works by the Russian classics: Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Chekhov, and also works by the younger generation or contemporary authors. Among these were the names of Sologub,

Kuprin and Bunin. However, much of the coverage consisted of material belonging to the three great Russian authors.

Indeed, an important finding of the survey was the high percentage of the works of Dostoevsky, Chekhov, and Tolstoy. The range of material can be divided almost equally between the first two authors, the complete translation of whose works was accomplished within this period owing to the diligent work of Constance Garnett. Tolstoy's case was somehow different. The bulk of his fiction was not yet available for the British public. There were present instead separate volumes of his works. These constituted translations of his major novels, in addition to various minor works. These translations were done by different hands notably Maude, Garnett and J. D. Duff. The noticeable thing still is the presence of much biographical and autobiographical material in relation to Tolstoy. (This might have been because of his recent death in 1910.)

The translations also presented many of the less famous Russian writers. The list contained authors who belonged to the new, young generation of Russian writers. Both the writers and their works were introduced for the first time to the English public. Each one of them was represented by one work or two; only in a few cases were they represented by more than one work. Moreover, these volumes usually contained the best of their fiction. Sologub, Bunin, Kuprin, Rozanov and many others were introduced in this way.

Although the first period was dominated by translations from both new and old writers, this seemed to have continued well into the second period of our survey. Translations from the modern Russians were reviewed in periodicals like the *Egoist* which introduced the works of Sologub and Remizov as early as 1915. The *Spectator* reviewed John Cournos' translation of three books by Remizov, Boris Pilmiak, and another anonymous writer in its literary supplement of 1924. The reviewer described the books as "very interesting," and added that "they make us demand other of the modern Russians from the translators, so that our conception of the Spirit of Europe in its latest phase may be more complete." On the other hand, the reviewer of the *New Statesman* welcomed in 1918 the translation of Aksakoff's autobiographical works, which, though long delayed, aroused the appetite of the reviewer for other masterpieces of the kind.

Russian novels we know; we know something of Russian poetry; but we have hitherto been given few or no translations of Russian biographies and memoirs; yet if these books are fair examples, in this department also of Russian literature there must be much that would delight us.

The second half of the period (1918-1930) was rich with translations of Gogol, Herzen, Aksakov, Rozanov, along with Chekhov and Dostoevsky (represented here through biographical material mainly), in addition to Tolstoy. The flood of books about Tolstoy still continued, since, the last two years - 1928 to 1930 - saw the beginning of the publication of the Oxford University Press series of his complete works in Maude's translation.

The production of Russian drama continued through both phases of our survey, but they appeared to be more popular in the second half - especially during the mid twenties - when Chekhov's plays were achieving great success. Turgenev's, Tolstoy's and Gorky's dramas had their share also, as did some of Dostoevsky's works.

In the old type of periodicals, in the reviews of one hundred years ago, less Russian material was presented in the weeklies. It is true that during the nineteenth century these periodicals were the main periodical literature. Nevertheless, their fortune did not remain the same with the approach of the turn of the century. As a matter of fact, it seems that these sort of periodicals lost their significance specifically at the beginning of our period. According to Denys Thompson, the year 1914 marked the end of the old style of reviews. Cheap printing and the new technology played its role in terminating what were once "the vestiges of nineteenth century journalism."¹¹⁸

The change in the fortunes of the reviews is partly responsible for the small percentage of Russian material. We must not take Thompson's statement to imply the demise of these reviews. Rather, his words serve as an indication to the fact that these reviews no longer reflected the mood of the age. Most of the old reviews lost their interest in literature and became more concerned with politics. Three of them: *Blackwood's*, the *Quarterly*, the *Edinburgh*, were the mouthpieces of the Tory party. Russian material was hardly present through the pages of these reviews. Although *Blackwood's* exerted a great literary influence in the nineteenth century, but from 1914 it excluded itself from any engagement with literary issues in the new century. Moreover, it became apparent that its fiction had an imperialist air.¹¹⁹ In its general outlook the *Quarterly* was conservative. The bulk of its contents was social, political, or historical.¹²⁰ (Its sole contribution to the Russian cult was the publication of Edward Garnett's "Tchehov And His Art " (October, 1921). The *Edinburgh* was also mostly concerned with political and economic reviews about Russia, with the one exception when it reviewed Andre Gide's *Dostoevsky* (January 1926). The policy of the *Twentieth Century* was much the same. Its range of topics was political and historical more than literary.¹²¹ The *Contemporary Review*'s interests flow in the same channel. Its reviews covered areas like politics, history, foreign affairs, in addition to classical and modern literature. The political tendency of the review was reinforced after the war by its editor George Peabody Gooch.¹²²

The coverage of Russian material was restricted to the first two years of the survey. The material concerned consisted of a volume about the Russian language and another dealing with Russian history, in addition to an article about translations from Lescov and Grigorovitch.

As is apparent, these reviews were concerned mainly with political and historical matters. By nature, they were also slightly conservative. Generally speaking, they tended to publish established authors, and not to welcome the talent of new writers. However, two exceptions should be noted in this regard: the *Fortnightly* and the *English* reviews. The former was the most liberal of reviews in the sense that it published Pound and Joyce. In scope it covered politics and literature, but coverage of literature came second in importance during the period of our survey. Under William Leonard Courtney's editorship, the review's reputation flourished during the Great War and for a decade after.¹²³ The percentage of Russian material was approximately an item per year over the whole period of sixteen years. The material consisted largely in general articles about Russian literature and writers. There were extracts from translations by Tolstoy "Reminiscences of Tolstoy" by his son (June-September 1914), and Chekhov "New letters of Anton Tchekov" (March 1919). Besides, the articles were written by Russian specialists like J. A. T. Lloyd, John Cournos, Robert Birkmyre, and Adeline Lister Kaye. Lloyd's contribution was two articles about Dostoevsky: "Feodor Dostoieffsky", "Dostoievsky and Flaubert ", in addition to two general articles: "The Russian Novelists of the Nineteenth Century", and "The Russian Dream of Freedom." Cournos also contributed two: "Feodor Sologub"; and "Leonid Andryeev " There appeared an article about Shestov "A Philosopher of Tragedy"; two about Gorky: "Conversations with Maxim Gorky", "Maxim Gorky and the English stand-point"; and a single one about Tolstoy "Tolstoy's Heroines."

Under Ford Madox Ford's editorship the *English Review* came to support "the kind of revolt and retrenchment in art and life that is characteristic of the little mags. [sic] " The review published translations of different authors: Tolstoy, Chekhov, Gorky. Russian material figured in another of these old reviews, which was particularly noted for its opposition to the modernist issues.¹²⁴

The *Nineteenth Century's* range of Russian material consisted in an article about Soloviev: "A Great Russian Philosopher", a translation of Andreev's "Russia, Germany, and the Allies,: 'S.O.S' ", an article by Maude "The Russian Problem", and another entitled "Turgenev and Girlhood", in addition to the two part article "Three Evenings with Count Leo Tolstoi."

The *London Mercury* under the editorship of J. C. Squire reflected the presence of a cult for the Russians through its reviews of many Russian works in translation like the volume of Dostoevsky's biography by his daughter, the translation of the latter's *Stavrogin's Confession and the Plan of the Life of a Great Sinner*, Tchertkoff's *The Last Days of Tolstoy*, Gerhardi's *Anton Tchekhov*, Koteliansky's *The Life and Letters of Anton Tchekhov*, Maude's *Tolstoy on Art*, and N. H. Dole's *Tolstoi's Dramas*, in addition to articles written by competent critics like Mirsky's "The Literature of Bolshevik Russia", and "Some Remarks on Tolstoy" and other relevant material on the theatre of Soviet Russia.

So, the survey showed that Russian literature did not feature greatly in the reviews of old type. That there were only a few references to Russian material is indicative of limited concern with literature. Russian material was rare in the reviews.

One more notable fact of the survey is the frequent occurrence of reviews and articles of Russian books and translation in the weekly journals. The scope of Russian material was so vast that it featured almost through the contents of every year of the weeklies' issues. The question that rises now is why is this the case with the weeklies ?

This fact can be better explained in the light of Graham's statement in connection with the rise of the weekly journals and the phenomenon of the "professionalising of periodical criticism."¹²⁵ In Graham's words the introduction of this specialism in the history of journalism is credited to the literary weeklies. Their introduction increased the number of professional critics, all of whom wrote in the literary weeklies. Leonard Woolf did a good deal of freelance journalism mostly for the *New Statesman*, the *Nation* whose literary editor he became in 1923, and the *Athenaeum*.¹²⁶ J. M. Murry's editing of the latter made him and his friends regular contributors, though "many of them personal acquaintance, but nearly all outstanding." Among them were the names of Katherine Mansfield, the Woolfs, E. M. Forster, and Koteliansky.¹²⁷ This fact surely marks a great event in the history of periodical literature in England. For the competence and efficiency of the reviewers, or better literary critics, must have enhanced the value of the articles as well as the papers in which they appeared. Thus, by means of the professionalism of criticism, the abundance of literary critics, in addition to the nature of the literary journals themselves, where the review of books is an essential part of its construction, the proliferation of Russian material in the weeklies can be understood.

The survey showed that the weeklies' material provided a valid and comprehensive picture of the whole publishing business and production of Russian books. In this regard the

Times Literary Supplement came at the top of the list in its presentation of Russian material, was followed by the *Athenaeum*, the *New Statesman*, the *Saturday Review*, and the *Spectator*.

It is not surprising that the first place was occupied by the *Times Literary Supplement*. As a newspaper the *Times Literary Supplement* was of the highest literary quality in this respect. Since its first appearance in 1902 it has been claimed "the most widely read and respected critical organ in the English literary world."¹²⁸ The contribution of its reviewers was by no means lessened by the anonymous policy of the newspaper. Its reviews certainly reflected the literary output of the period. The field of Russian literature was presented in it through reviews of translations, scholarly studies, notices of new publications, and general articles. No translations were published. Because it was mainly concerned with the discussion of new books, through its pages were reviewed most of the new publications of Russian translations.

The *Athenaeum*, under J. M. Murry's editorship was one of the leading weekly journals of the 1920s. In 1921 it amalgamated with the *Nation* and became the *Nation and Athenaeum*. The paper had Hubert Douglas as its political editor and Leonard Woolf as the literary editor. As a belles-lettres journal, it carried the reviews of new books. It also published extracts from different translations. S. S. Koteliansky's and Katherine Mansfield's rendering of *The Letters of Anton Tchekhov* appeared over a period of six months (April-September 1919), and a fragment of Madame Dostoevsky's *Reminiscences*, in Koteliansky's translation, appeared in 1926. Although it followed a similar framework to the *Times Literary Supplement*, it differed from it in the fact that the names of its reviewers were in full given. Among the list of its contributors we find the names of Francis Birrell, Victoria Sackville-West, Edwin Muir, Bonamy Dobree, and D. S. Mirsky.

The *New Statesman* was one of the successful journals of the period. It was founded and edited by Charles Clifford Dyce Sharp till 1930. Desmond MacCarthy became in 1913 the journal's dramatic critic, then its literary editor. He reviewed in it until 1929 under the pen name "Affable Hawk"; he also wrote the weekly section "Books in General", and reviewed productions of Chekhov's plays on the English theatre. The journal's other contributors included Sydney Waterlow, Gerald Gould, and Raymond Mortimer.

Another important weekly in the period of our survey was the *Saturday Review*. The weekly was edited by five consecutive editors; G. A. B. Dewar (1913-1916), Arthur A. Baumann (1916-1921), Sydney Brooks (1921), Filson Young (1921-1924), and Gerald Barry (1924-1930). It included reviews of works by Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Tolstoy, Gogol, Herzen, Turgenev, Andreev, and Kuprin. There were fewer reviews of fiction, and some more

about books of a general nature, in addition to general articles. Contributors included Edward Shanks, Gerald Gould, and Paul Vinogradoff.

The *Spectator* reviewed general books about Russia the country and its people. In the field of fiction reviews were confined to works by Aksakof, Kuprin, Remizov, Aldanov, Soleviev, and Pilmaik, in addition to reviews of biographical books by Gorky and Dostoevsky.

It is not surprising that the high percentage of Russian material happened to be in the weekly journal. This phenomenon becomes rather clearer when we know that this kind of periodical had become the "most influential literary type" of the age.

Its prestige now exceeds that of the Review or the magazine. The weekly frequency of its appearance and its large circulation have combined to enhance its value as an advertising medium for the publishers. This, in turn, has brought it prosperity. Generations of competent writers have given it critical authority. Moreover, it acquires value from its immediacy and from its ability to cover well the field of its interests. ¹²⁹

Indeed, the professionalism of journalism, in addition to the abundance of reviews in the weeklies, accounts for the high presence of Russian material in them. For the majority of criticism of that period was written by literary critics and published in the weeklies.

The little magazines were fortunate in their editors who were leading the modern movement of the age. Since Russian literature was identified as one of the modern issues, the editors' interest in it came only naturally. Hence the abundance of Russian material in their magazines. For the little magazines, which were well established by the 1920s, attempted to provide a "a version of the twentieth-century literary review." ¹³⁰ The three most important among them were *The Criterion*, edited by T. S. Eliot, the *Adelphi*, edited by J. M. Murry, and the *Calendar of Modern Letters*, edited by Edgwell Rickword. Besides being a vehicle for Eliot's own interests and views, the *Criterion* helped to introduce European culture to the English reader. It presented French and other foreign writers for the first time in England. As regards Russian literature, the review published more new material about Dostoevsky, some book reviews about Chekhov, and other relevant reviews. The translations were all done by Koteliansky; "Two Unpublished Letters of F. Dostoevsky", "Plan of the Novel, The Life of a Great Sinner", "Dostoevsky on *The Brothers Karamazov*", "A Few Extracts from Letters; exchanged between Leo Nicolayevich Tolstoy and N. N. Stakhov relating to F. M. Dostoevsky." Some book reviews about Chekhov were also available. The few issues of the

New Adelphi consulted present yet another picture of the growing interest in Russian matters. Its scope was varied as it touched on the recent publications of writers like Tolstoy and Gogol, and on other relevant matters, including a review of a ballet performance and a book about Russian ballet, in addition to material related to Soviet Russia. The short lived *Calendar of Modern Letters* which published some of the literature of other nations, printed also a great number of translations from Russian. Its list of the latter included Dostoevsky's memoirs by his wife, a play by Chekhov, some meditations by Rozanov, stories by Isaac Babel, Leonov, Remizov, and Nievierov. Desmond MacCarthy's *Life and Letters* was also influential in introducing both modern and old Russian authors. The magazine published a story by Rozanov, reviewed books by Gogol, Tolstoy, Lermontov and Pushkin. Another important little magazine was *The Egoist*. It published translations by Sologub, Chekhov, Remizov, in addition to a two part article which surveyed Russian translations available in English.

By the end of the nineteenth century politics replaced literature in the weeklies. Moreover, literature came to lose its grasp and interest with the general public with the advance of the modernist movement. The financial situation of the weeklies was responsible for their short lived existence. Although figures of their circulation are not available for us, their demise, or sometimes amalgamation with other weekly journals can be taken as an indication of their appeal to a small public. From the outset, the little magazines with their specialized nature were not aimed to appeal to the taste of the general public. They had a small circulation and were read by those who contributed to their pages and the educated class. We reach the conclusion that the Russian material in these periodicals appealed only to a small sector, specifically to those who contributed and wrote to them, who formed the avant-garde of the period.

Specific Subjects

Everything Russian was very popular in the years of our survey. Russia had become an ally in the current war. Consequently, there was a vogue for Russian literature, and everything Russian in general. Books of politics, travel books, besides the masterpieces of Russian literature figured to great extent in the journals and periodicals of the day. The periodicals' material shows the popularity of almost everything Russian. Therefore it is clear that the Russian cult was not merely confined to literature. The cult seems to have absorbed various aspects of the social, cultural and political life of the Russian people. The evidence of this truth is discernible in the many varied items the pages of the periodicals contained. There were translations of fiction, poetry, histories, travel books and dictionaries.

(a) Fiction

In the field of fiction there were translations from the works of nearly thirty five Russian authors. These writers belonged to different ages, ranging from the early part of the eighteenth century, to the great classics of the nineteenth, and ending with a handful of modern and contemporary writers of the present day. The list of writers included names like Pushkin, Lermontov, Aksakof, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, besides those of the younger generation such as Bunin, Kuprin, Rozanov, Sologub, Remizov, and many others.

The introduction of Sologub's *The Old House and Other Tales* in the translation of John Cournos, who was "the first to put some of Sologub's tales into English, and has done it extremely well." prompted the reviewer to say, "We would like to see more of Sologub's work in English as well as the other new Russian authors whom Mr. Cournos has up his sleeve."¹³¹

The appearance of any new translation was very welcome, especially when the author and book concerned were of great value. John H. Ingram, reviewing the publication of Goncharov's *Oblomov* in *The Bookman* (November, 1915), welcomed the delayed presentation of such a Russian classic to the British public at the outset.

Even the name of Goncharov is barely known in this country, although he is the author of one of the finest romances of the last century. Not only is his *Oblomov* a classic in Russia, but it has gained great popularity in other lands, although beyond an article by the present writer, published some years ago, no attempt appears to have been made to acquaint British readers with its merits.¹³²

The quality of translations was often questioned and examined. The translator's - C. J. Hogarth's - failure to give the complete conversations between Oblomov and his serf annoyed the reviewer; "*Oblomov* is a lengthy romance, and some abridgement of it might have been permitted, but the wholesale exclusion of so much of the most characteristic portions is inexcusable."

Indeed, although the abundance of Russian translations was greeted with a warm welcome, nevertheless, there was much concern that these translations should represent their originals truthfully, unabridged and unmutilated. The standard of many translations was questioned on such grounds and accordingly, the translator's merits were judged in comparison with famous names like Garnett and Maude. The popularity of the Russians was

so high that, in some cases two translations of the same book were available. The appearance of a new translation of Aksakoff's autobiography - J. D. Duff's translation of the same was highly praised - under the title *Chronicles of a Russian Family* in M. C. Beverly's translation, prompted a strong reaction from the reviewer: "What a pity it is ! It is only necessary to recall Mr. J. D. Duff's version of parts of Aksakoff's work to realise how great an opportunity has here been missed." More was said about the quality of the translation.

But alas! to most readers the translation will surely appear strangely forbidding; and, considering what Mr. Duff made of his volumes, the blame cannot be laid on any quality of insurable stiffness or craning dullness in the original. It represents a retrograde step in the English translations of Russian literature, back to the pre-Garnett, pre-Maude era of laboriously pedestrian work, and accords ill with the book's ambitious scope, handsome binding and not negligible price.¹³³

The vogue for the Russians prompted the re-publication of old books. A volume of poems that belonged to the middle ages was reprinted in 1916. *The Epic Songs of Russia* was first published thirty years ago, says the reviewer, "where there was not enough Western interest in Russia to give it the success it deserves." Such was the vogue for the Russians that any Russian book, even of an unknown writer, was welcomed. The *Times Literary Supplement* of 1915 noted a translation from the Russian edition that contained selections of Afansiev's collection of short stories. *Russian Fairy Tales*, first published in 1874. A new translation of a George Calderon's rendering of Chekhov's plays *The Seagull* and *The Cherry Orchard* was published in 1924. The introduction of the works of writers of the old generation like Aksakoff, Pushkin, Lermontov and many others was very welcome.

The notable fact is that translations were not confined to works done at first hand from the Russian. There still existed that strange phenomenon of introducing Russian translations at a second hand either from French or German. Here are a few examples which support this fact. *The Athenaeum* reviewed a reprint of a translation of Gogol's *Dead Souls* from a French version that first appeared in 1885. The introduction of this mutilated version was regretted by the reviewer: "We regret that so defective a piece of work should have been reprinted after the lapse of nearly thirty years. The text probably does not do Gogol any grave injustice." There were translations from the German also; an English version of a German translation of *Letters of Fyodor Michailovich Dostoevsky to his Family and Friends*, appeared in 1914. The translator of *The Diary of Dostoevsky's Wife* also used the German version of the book. A translation of *Dostoevsky: the Man and his Work* by the German Julius Meier-Grefe was available. The reviews, however, showed that the reaction against the presence of such books was strong. One reviewer called for books about Russian literature by either English or

Russians, when he noted a translation from the German of a book entitled *Contemporary Russian Literature*.

Not only literary or fictional works found their way to the British reader. There was an interest in learning the Russian language. The publication of the first part of a *New Pocket Dictionary of the English and Russian Languages* was welcomed:

The author and the publishers deserve wholehearted congratulations for their production, which will go a long way to make English students of Russian completely independent of German publishers, who have hitherto been the interested middlemen. 134

Moreover, there were also available special books for the sake of those interested in learning the Russian language. Books like Jarinstov's *The Russians and Their Language* was intended for those who were studying the language, and A. Jamieson's *Line-upon-Line Russian Reader* were popular. However, other means for learning the language were available through the publication of works of fiction in Russian. The *New Statesman* in 1916 noted briefly the publication by Cambridge University Press of *Sevastopol*, in Russian, for this purpose. The book contained a vocabulary, in addition to an introduction and notes, an account of idiomatic expressions and difficult constructions. More books with this aim were published. Garshin's *The Signal: and, Four Days on the Field of the Battle* was available in Russian as noticed in the *Nation* in 1918. In 1924 J. D. Duff introduced the Russian text of Tolstoy's *Family Happiness* with notes and recommended the volume for beginners in Russian.

Russian music and opera were also fashionable. Drury Lane saw the productions of Russian composers. The *Athenaeum*, the *Nation* and *Athenaeum* reviewed consecutively Moussorgski's "Boris Godounov", and the first presentation in English of Borodin's "Prince Igor" in 1914. While the Russian ballet had its share of reviews; articles about the ballet's history and its development appeared in 1919. Raymond Mortimer wrote more about "The Russian Ballet" and Diaghilleff's new season at His Majesty's Theatre in 1929.

Translations of writers of both the old and new or contemporary generation continued in the two phases of the period surveyed. Alexander Kuprin's *A Slav Soul, and Other Stories* (1916) *Yama - The Pit* (1930); Osip Duimov's *The Flight From the Cross*; (1916), N.E. Shchedrin's *The Gollovlev Family*, (1916), J. Potapenko's *A Russian Priest* (1916); Andreev's *Plays* (1915), *The Life of Man*, *The Dark* (a novel, 1923) *He Who Gets Slapped* (a drama, 1923), *Samson in Chains and Katerian* (1924); M. A. Aldanov's *Saint Helena* (1924), Leyskov's *The Sentry and Other Stories*. (1922), Danchenko's *With a Diploma* (1915);

Artzibashev's *The Breaking Point*, (1915), *Tales of the Revolution* (1917); Bunin's *The Village* (1923); Lyeskov's *Cathedral Folk* (1924); Remizov's *The Clock* (1924); Old writers: Herzen's *The Memoirs* (1924); Gogol's *The Complete Works* (1923-28), Pushkin's *Poushkin's Prose Tales* (1914), *The Captain's Daughter* (1928), Gorky's works in translation spanned the period between 1914 and 1928, in addition to the works of Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov, whose works had the highest percentage in the survey. The notable fact is that the complete edition of Tolstoy's works began to appear at the end of the second half of the survey. The quantity of translations presented during the two periods of our survey is certainly an indication of the great popularity of Russian literature in England.

The subsequent political events and the changes Russia encountered through this period were somehow responsible for keeping alive interest in Russia the country, and its literature. A revival of interest in Russian fiction took place after the Russian Revolution. *The Nation and Athenaeum* (1925) lamented the mediocre translations of the work of the new generation of Soviet writers. "The English public is a yet quite ignorant of this new Russian fiction. The only translation that has yet appeared of any one of the young writers ("*The Flowers of the Wilderness*," by Boris Pilniak) is not characteristic." ¹³⁵ However, the call of the reviewer for more works out of Soviet Russian was answered. *The Criterion*, (1929-1930) reviewed the publication by John Courmos of *Short Stories out of Soviet Russia*.

These tales are a far more searching commentary upon social, moral, and economic conditions in Soviet Russia than is any amount of statistics or propaganda supplied by biassed zealots for or against the new regime. The writers represented are those who have come to the fore during the last decade. Their ages range between thirty and sixty, and they come from all stations in life: peasants, lawyers, tradesmen, or members of the professional class. ¹³⁶

The range of Russian translations was varied, it covered works of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in addition to modern and contemporary ones.

(b) Poetry

Translations of Russian poetry were not as abundant as of fiction. There was scarcely any translation of the works of any Russian poet. Instead, volumes of anthologies of Russian poetry were available. *The Saturday Review* [No. 3276, (10 August 1918)] noted the publication of *Selections of Russian Poetry* as "a collection of typical Russian lyrics from Karamzin to Sologub, with English translations of a severely literal kind." *The New Statesman*

(February 1917) reviewed under the heading "Russian Verse " two volumes of poetry. The first volume, *Russian Songs and Lyrics*, contained some fragments from Pushkin's works, the reviewer tells us, besides selections from other poets whose names were not mentioned. The second volume was a collection of popular poetry of the Ukraine entitled *Songs of Ukrania*. The *Times Literary Supplement* in 1917 listed the name of this volume in reprint: *Modern Russian Poetry*. The book was a part of a Slavonic anthology, which included selections from the modern poetry of the Poles, Czechs, and Serbs; it included the works of ten poets, the names of whom were not mentioned. Other anthologies were many: *The Heroic Ballads of Russia* (1921), *Modern Russian Poetry* (1923), *The Oxford Book of Russian Verse* (chosen by Maurice Baring, 1925), *Russian Poetry* (chosen by B. Deutsch, and A. Yarmolinsky, 1929) to mention only a few. The latter was concerned with the poetry of Soviet Russia. While the former's compilation of Russian verse was welcomed having come from Maurice Baring; "Here in his praise of Russian poets, he conveys again that sense of fascination, measuring it subtly and almost imperceptibly by the standards of all great art." Baring's intimate understanding of Russian poetry was appreciated, but his choice of poets was found to be incomplete. (*The Times Literary Supplement*, 29 January, 1925).

(c) Travel

In this area, there were many studies and sketches about Russia, the country and its people. Russia the country had always fascinated and aroused the curiosity of the British. Travel books were, at an earlier stage, the main source of information about Russia. Then, their disadvantages were greater than their advantages; they offered a good medium for much of the misinformation and misrepresentation of Russia. The remarkable fact is that these were reliable studies written by competent writers who specialized in Russian affairs. Now these books were written by either native Russians or English scholars. The works of Maurice Baring, Stephen Graham, Hugh Walpole, and Donald Mackenzie were regarded as trustworthy. Having lived in Russia as a diplomat, and having served as a military correspondent for the *Morning Post*, Maurice Baring developed great sympathy for the Russian people. Accordingly he wrote enthusiastically, not only about the country, its people, but also its literature as will appear below in the section on scholarly studies. Among his productions were *Russia and the World* (1905), *A Year in Russia* (1907), and *What I saw in Russia* (1913). Stephen Graham was also attracted to Russia by the spirit of her literature, living among the peasants, travelling in Russian territories, and composing valuable accounts based on his experience in the country like *Russia and the World* (1915), *Through Russian Central Asia* (1916), *Russia in 1916* (1917). *The English Review*, reviewing the first of these books mentioned here, praised his skill and understanding of the Russian people. The book:

is welcome, for we know comparatively little of the Russians, and Mr Graham is unquestionably one of the few Englishmen who have pierced to the heart of that very remarkable race. He deals lightly with many subjects and many phases of Russian civilization, and on the whole his opinions reveal common sense and always a sensitive reflection of the Russian spirit.¹³⁷

On the other hand, the *Spectator* of 1917 welcomed Graham's new book *Russia in 1916* in the wake of the latest interest in Russia after the Revolution: "these slightest sketches of life and travel in Russia last year are well worth reading in view of the recent Russian news."

Donald Mackenzie's and Hugh Walpole's studies and sketches were regarded as very informative. The former's *Russia* (1876) - Mackenzie was in Russia between 1870 and 1875, during this period he familiarized himself with the life of the people and studied them - remained the standard authority on Russia till the time before the revolution of 1917. His other books included *Stories of Russian Folk-Life*, and *Russia Before Dawn*. Walpole's sketches of Russia in war time were published in the *Saturday Review*. They consisted of his observations of different aspects of Russian life and character: "Moscow Sketches", "In Warsaw", "The Sleepy Inn ", and "Ivan Alexandrovitch ".

Among the native Russians we mention the name of Madame N Jarintzov. Her books were appreciated for the information they offered to the English readers.

These studies and sketches are intended to bring the real Russia - her sorrows, her joys, and her hopes - before the eyes of the English, and the authoress certainly succeeds.¹³⁸

Accounts of individual's travels in Russia were also popular. Books like *Real Russians*, *What I Know of Russia*, and *My Siberian Year* were written by individuals after accomplishing a journey to Russia.

(d) Scholarly Studies

The first ten years before the Great War saw the growth of academic studies of Russia. And during the war period it was possible to study Russian at universities. Besides, certain universities like Oxford, Cambridge, London and Manchester had readerships and lectureships

in Slavonic studies. Specialists and scholars in Russian literature became numerous. William Morfill was one of the first lecturers in Slavonic studies at Oxford University. He later became a Professor. There was also Neville Forbes, a reader and later a Professor. Bernard Pares founded the School of Russian Studies in Liverpool in 1907.¹³⁹ The foundation of a chair of Russian at the University of Leeds goes back to the year 1916. The interest was so great that when the news was noted in the *Review of Reviews* the reviewer wished other universities to follow in the steps of Leeds:

For it is only by a knowledge of the Russian language that we can grow in our understanding of the Russian people that we can hope to obtain the best relations politically, commercially and socially, with our great Ally in the future.

So, besides the translations of fiction, there were also studies about Russian literature and authors. These studies were useful. For they served as a good means to enhance the reputation of Russian writers, whose translations had already been introduced to the English public, and to inform those who were interested to know more about the nature and characteristics of Russian literature.

A pioneer in the field of Russian studies was Maurice Baring. His books *Landmarks in Russian Literature* (1910), *An Outline of Russian Literature* (1914) and *Main Springs of Russia* (1914) were among the first studies in this field. Despite the fact that they were not taken very seriously by critics, they presented the British public with a sympathetic view of Russian literature. Arnold Bennett found *Landmarks in Russian Literature* an interesting book.

It is unpretentious. It is not "literary." I wish it had been more literary. Mr. Baring seems to have a greater love for literature than the understanding or knowledge of it. He writes like a whole-hearted amateur, guided by common sense and enthusiasm, but not by the delicate perceptions of an artist. ¹⁴⁰

Bennett, nevertheless, found the book "illuminating", and praised particularly Baring's chapters on "Russian characteristics and on realism in Russian literature." Books of this sort were also written by competent Russian or English critics. Prince Kropotkin's *Russian Literature, Ideals, and Realities* came into its second edition in 1916, (having first appeared in 1905). The *New Statesman* (7 October 1917) welcomed this second edition of the book, and the author's effort to bring it up to date:

It is a very interesting and thorough piece of work, and with this volume and Mr. Maurice Baring's short book in the Home

University Library any Englishman entering on a systematic study of Russian literature will be quite able to find his way about it.¹⁴¹

Another Russian who wrote interesting books about Russian literature was Prince D. S. Mirsky. His studies were welcomed as readable books which provided the sort of useful knowledge about Russian literature from a "Russian critic we trust." His books were praised for their precision and completeness. The reviewer of the *Times Literary Supplement* greeted the publication of *Modern Russian Literature* in 1925 describing it as "an admirable summary of Russian literary history," and proceeded to say that "his little book is clear, accurate and extremely serviceable." Likewise the issue of *Contemporary Russian Literature 1881-1925* (1927), received the same warm welcome from the same periodical. The book was seen to

cover the whole ground with extraordinary thoroughness, and it introduces us to the works of writers with whose names only we are familiar; in short, we have nothing but admiration for Prince Mirsky's enthusiasm and industry.

Mirsky's later book *A History of Russian Literature From the Earliest Times to the Death of Dostoevsky 1881* (1927) was very enlightening.

We doubt whether anybody else has made so wide and encyclopaedic a study of Russian literature as Prince Mirsky. There does not seem to be a Russian writer of the smallest degree of interest or importance whom he has not studied and for whom he has not found a hierarchical resting-place. His book at once became the standard work of reference of its kind.¹⁴²

Thus, the value of Mirsky's studies was very much appreciated. Both books were described by another reviewer as "the only detailed study of the subject there is in English, and we may add that nothing so compact and at the same time so complete exists even in Russian."

The Russian cult also produced some critical studies of individual writers. These were specialized studies written by famous literary figures and scholars. In this regard we mention J.M. Murry's *Feodor Dostoevsky: A Critical Study* (1916); Edward Garnett's *Tolstoy* (1914), and *Turgenev* (1917); Charles Sarolea's *Essays on Russian Novelists* (1911), G. R. Noyes's *Tolstoy* (1919); William Gerhardt's *Anton Chekhov, a Critical Study* (1923); Janko Lavrin's *Dostoevsky and His Creation: A Psycho-Critical Study* (1920), *Gogol* (1924), in addition to *Tolstoy and Modern Consciousness* (1924). There was also D. S. Mirsky's *Pushkin* (1926). This period gave way to the re-issue of old books; Prince Kropotkin's *Russian Literature:*

Ideals and Realities appeared in a revised edition in 1916. The presence of such studies certainly shows the seriousness of the British interest in Russian literature.

(e) Translators

Our survey of the periodicals stresses not only the abundance of translations, but also of translators. On the whole, the number of translators amounted to over sixty. The names of our three major mediators come first in the list; Constance Garnett, Aylmer Maude and Samuel Koteliansky. The familiar names of those who proceeded them in the field of translation are among the list. Under this category appear such names as: George Calderon, J. M. Duff, Marian Fell, Isabel Hapgood, Nathan Haskell Dole, Adeline Lister Kaye. Among the list of Russian natives we note the names of Mme Jarintsoff, Nathalie Duddington, E. Yakounikoff, Avraham Yarmolinsky and others. There is also the group of miscellaneous translators including Majorie Hatton, Athelstan Ridgeway, Alfred Hayes, P. E. Matheson, Jane Harrison, R. R. Townsend, Malcolm Morby, John Cournos, Mrs David Soskice and many others. Added to this list of translators is the group of literary figures whose interest in Russian literature induced them to learn the language in order to help in the production of more translations from Russian. D. H. Lawrence started to learn the language, Virginia and Leonard Woolf gained preliminary knowledge of Russian. Indeed, the collaboration of these literary figures with Koteliansky can be best explained as part of their enthusiasm for the Russians; they included J. M. Murry, Katherine Mansfield, Virginia and Leonard Woolf, and D. H. Lawrence.

(f) Writers and Publishers

The concern of the survey is not only to show what was published, but also to note the identity of the writers on Russian literature. They included the best known writers of the time including Donald Mackenzie, Desmond MacCarthy, Bertrand Russell, Havelock Ellis, Victoria Sackville-West, J. A. T. Lloyd, T. E. Carr, Bonamy Dobree, Leonard Woolf, J. M. Murry, Katherine Mansfield, and others.

These reviewers belonged to two groups. The first group constituted established men of letters, who were poets, novelists, literary and dramatic critics. Among these were the names of Leonard and Virginia Woolf, Katherine Mansfield and J. M. Murry, and Desmond MacCarthy. On the other hand there was the group of free-lance writers of whom the literary society of the period was full. They were starting their literary life; they turned to journalism as a means of earning a living which would enable them to enter literary society and because of

the opportunity it would offer them, to pursue their own writing. Most of these contributors had their first literary efforts accepted by the common penny magazines. The situation is well described by Thomas Burke in *Son of London*. He describes his experience of different penny magazines at the beginning of his literary career. He also mentions the suitability of the circumstances for the beginner. A wide field was offered him in the pages of the dailies, weeklies and monthlies. Besides there was a varied range of these periodicals: the penny weeklies, the six penny fiction magazine, the serious journalism's organs of monthlies or weeklies.¹⁴³ Some of these writers remained on the outskirts of the literary world; others forged careers for themselves and grew to become famous figures. Desmond MacCarthy started as a free-lance, in 1913 he became a dramatic critic for the *New Statesman*. He was one of the few critics to deal with Tolstoy, Ibsen and Chekhov. Edwin Muir started as a free-lance writing verses for the *New Age*. Later, he became Orage's assistant. He also developed to become a poet, critic and a translator of German fiction. Bonamy Dobree started as a dramatic critic. Robert Lynd, a journalist and an essayist, made his living on free-lance journalism; he started to write for the two penny magazines, then became the assistant literary editor of the *Daily News*. He contributed book reviews and essays to the *Nation* and the *New Statesman*.

(g) Publishers

Publishing Russian material must have become a competitive area during the set period of our survey. The abundance of English translations of Russian works must be viewed in the context of the issue of copyright between Russia and Britain. The absence of copyright laws in relation to Russian translation helped increase the range of publications as well as the number of publishers whose firms undertook Russian translations, and accordingly the production of Russian translations in the book market. Russia, before and after the Revolution, had not been a member of the Berne Convention. Publishers of Russian literature were many as translations were numerous. However, the fact remains that not all of these publishers' productions were trustworthy. In other words, the quality of their translations was not reliable. This was not true of those publishers with whom the three translators studied here.

Our survey lists twenty-three publishing firms two of which are credited with introducing the complete works of famous Russian authors for the first time to the British public. William Heinemann's achievement lies in his introduction of Turgenev's and Dostoevsky's works in the Garnett translation. Chatto and Windus is credited with the presentation of Chekhov's works, and of Gogol and Herzen's memoirs. Once again the translation was done by Constance Garnett. Oxford University Press, through its World's Classics series achieved publication of the 'Maude Tolstoy', although their task was not

complete (the series introduced only twelve volumes of Tolstoy's works), and later the complete works of Tolstoy in the Centenary Edition.

As for the rest of the firms their publication of Russian works may not have had the same fame and value as the aforementioned publishing houses, but still they played a considerable role. These firms introduced various works of different authors: Chapman and Hall, Routledge, Kegan Paul, Collins, Dent, Maunsel and Co., Constable, Duckworth, Blackwell, and the Hogarth Press.

A close look at the "Publishers' List", in the *Times Literary Supplement* speaks for itself. In February, 1915 the advertisements under the heading "Notes" read as follows :

Russian Literature figures prominently in the spring announcements. Mr. Fisher Unwin is bringing out a new edition of Gogol's *Dead Souls* with a preface by Mr Stephen Graham. Another of the great Russian realist novels, *The Golovlevs*, by Shchedrin (Saltikov), is to appear for the first time in an English translation to be published by Messrs. Jarrold. ¹⁴⁴

Other announcements included a translation by J. E. Hogarth of Andreyev's play, *The Life of Man*, which enjoyed a long run at the Arts Theatre in Moscow. This was coming from Messrs Allen & Unwin. ¹⁴⁵ Duckworth's "New Books" for the *Times Literary Supplement* introduced the volume *Stories of Russian Life*, by Anton Chekhov. His list of May of the same year included titles like *Plays* by Andreyeff, a volume of *Plays* by Chekhov (four Plays), in addition to *The Black Monk, Etc, The Kiss and other Stories* in the Reader's Library series. While Constable's list for October 1915 listed two books about Russia, *Russia And Self-Government*, by Paul Seton-Watson, and *Epic Songs of Russia*. (ed. by Isabel Hapgood) ¹⁴⁶

Maunsel's list for January 1917 included Russian material like : Leon Shestov's *Anton Tchekhov And Other Essays*, Koteliansky 's and J. M. Murry's joint translation of *Pages From The Journal of An Author: Fyodor Dostoevsky*. ¹⁴⁷

Such was the interest in Russian literature during the 1914-1918 war, that even those publishing firms which were not concerned with the publication of fiction introduced their share of translations from the Russian. The firm of George Allen and Unwin was associated with various kinds of books related to socialism, politics, philosophy. Nevertheless, in the wake of British interest in all things Russian, the firm did its part in response to that demand. They published Kuprin's *The Duel* and an abridged version of Goncharov's *Oblomov*. Eventually, the firm came to publish works by Chekhov, Kuprin, Dostoevsky, and Ropshin.

This took place after the firm had taken over the firm Maunsel & Co and its series of " the Modern Russian Library." 148

As we have seen, the vogue for the Russian fiction prompted some publishers to commission Russian translations in response to the demand stimulated by the war. Nevertheless, it must be noted that, in some other cases, the special interests of the publisher had its impact on the choice of the material to be produced by his firm. In this respect we mention the publishing firms of William Heinemann and Martin Secker. The youth of both publishers determined their firms' policy of promoting and publishing the new and modern.

Heinemann offered the British one of the great services in the history of Russian translations in this country. His cosmopolitan interests in the literatures of European countries were responsible for his decision to publish Russian authors. Heinemann was known to be "internationalist by habit and inclination, a good linguist, fond of foreign literature," 149 His first list of publications included a series of translations from foreign works. In the "International Library" series he introduced Polish, Italian, German, and Scandinavian translations. He might not have been a pioneer in the field of publishing Russian translations, yet much credit was his; he was the first to publish Garnett's first translation from the Russian, Goncharov's *A Common Story* (1894), and followed it with her version of Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You*, and later Turgenev's works. 150 The year 1912 was regarded as a landmark in the publishing life of Heinemann and the story of the introduction of Russian literature to England, when he came to publish Dostoevsky. That year marked the publication, for the first time, of *The Brothers Karamazov*. The issue of the book, was in a way the main impetus behind the "Russian cult ." 151

Another publisher who is also credited for his introduction of Russian authors namely those who belonged to the new generation, was Martin Secker. Secker was at the time of our period the hope of every young writer. He was one of the young publishers who offered good opportunities to the new writers as well as old. Indeed, he was known as "the publisher of the young and the new." 152 His list was rich in its contributors; Frank Swinnerton, Gilbert Cannan, Norman Douglas, Francis Brett Young, Arnold Bennett, G. K. Chesterton, J. M. Murry, D. H. Lawrence, besides Hugh Walpole and Compton Mackenzie. 153 Among the new Russian writers his list included translations by Shestov (in Koteliansky's translation), Sologub, Bunin, and Artzibashev. Secker is credited with having introduced the works of Sologub to the English public. In a letter addressed to the editor of the *Athenaeum* he announced the publication of a Sologub translation.

Next week I hope to publish *The Old House, and Other Tales*, by Sologub, in a translation which has been made from the

Russian by John Cournot. Perhaps it may be of interest to point that, while the Continental nations usually give a lead to England in matters of translation, in this instance M. Sologub's work has not yet appeared at all in French, and only to a very limited extent in German. 154

A characteristic that both Heinemann and Secker shared is that they were both young publishers. Their enthusiasm and attempts to introduce young and foreign writers can be understood in the context of the period they both lived in, and in their wish to follow its new tendencies.

The presence of a handful of young readers for the other publishing firms sometimes had its influence in choosing new writers. Thus, other firms which were not run by young heads, compensated for this by their employment of young readers. Chatto and Windus, a firm run by a joint effort of its old heads and the new generation can be taken as an example. The firm had two readers in the persons of Geoffrey Whitworth and Frank Swinnerton. 155 Through the efforts of the latter, the firm came to publish Chekhov's works. The firm T. Fisher and Unwin had also, for a time, young readers on its board like Edward Garnett and W. H. Chesson. 156 The notable fact is that some of these readers were themselves Russian enthusiasts and were part of the Russian cult.

Through the pages of the periodicals, weeklies and little magazines surveyed here is expressed much of the story of the great enthusiasm for the Russians and their literature. By studying these periodicals we demonstrated the importance of Russian literature in the cultural life of the British. The contents of each of the journals consulted reiterates the fact that the time was appropriate for the reception of Russian masterpieces, and that there was a cult for the Russians.

The bulk of the old reviews' material was mainly political, historical, sometimes philosophical, or religious, and less literary. Thus, the percentage of Russian material was comparatively meagre in the reviews of the first type. Because they were less concerned with literature, and they tended to publish well-established writers, they did not seem to reflect the literary interests of the day. As a result Russian literature was hardly presented on their pages. Hence the scarcity of Russian material in them. Nevertheless, there were exceptions. The *Contemporary Review* published famous authors of the day like Kipling, Wells and Yeats; Tolstoy and Ibsen were among its foreign authors. The *Fortnightly Review* - which achieved great success during the Great War years and for a decade after - published contemporary literature in the shape of the works of Pound. However, it remained for the *English Review*, which, although it belonged to the old type, was seen as representative of the new trends in

literature, to break down the old barriers completely. Under the editorship of Ford Madox Ford it contributed to the modernist movement and also to the Russian cult through its publication of Garnett's translation of Chekhov's stories, in addition to some translations of Gorky and Tolstoy. The old type of magazine, or review, particularly those which survived into the twentieth century, were less concerned with the literary issues of the day. This was attributed to the fact that these reviews were interested in the already established authors. The percentage of Russian material was relatively meagre in the reviews. As a result Russian literature was hardly presented on their pages.

The weekly journals did better than the old reviews in the sense that Russian material featured more in their pages. More importantly, the material was dealt with very enthusiastically through promoters of the Russian cult who were the editors and the main reviewers of this new literary type of periodical. Owing to this fact much first class reviewing and criticism were published in their pages. Among the members of the Bloomsbury group, the services of Leonard Woolf are worth mentioning. Through the weekly contribution, of the department of "The World of New Books", he reviewed many Russian books. So did J. M. Murry in the *Athenaeum* which he edited from 1919, and Katherine Mansfield who became a regular contributor when Murry took over the editorship of the periodical. Desmond MacCarthy reviewed some of the productions of Russian plays, and reviewed a few Russian translations in the section "Books in general." There were also other contributors who belonged to the literary circle of the day and whose efforts enhanced the reputation of Russian literature.

The little magazines presented their share of Russian material, for they reflected "far more accurately than the more popular publications, the spirit of a literary period."¹⁵⁷ Being the mouthpiece of the new age with all its different tendencies, the little magazines' contribution was remarkable. They were particularly renowned for their introduction of new Russian authors. The *Egoist* was pioneer in this respect. The works of Sologub, a contemporary Russian author, were presented since 1915. The *Criterion* which was regarded as the "most authoritative of them" did a lot to make available European literature. It presented new translations from the Russian, publishing some of Koteliansky's translations. The *Calendar of Letters* was prominent in presenting foreign translations. Moreover, the magazine specialized in translations from Russian and French prose. In this area it did much to develop English interest in contemporary Russian literature through its publication of translations from the Russian Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Rozanov, Babel, Leonov, Remizov, Nievierov.

We demonstrated the importance of Russian literature in the cultural life of the Britain by studying these serious periodicals. The periodicals' material offered us a valid picture of the

whole publishing business, the production of Russian books, and the craft of reviewing these books, besides the availability of the suitable means for their appearance i.e., the proliferation of magazines and journals. The periodicals showed very great interest in the many translations produced between 1914 and 1930, and proved that Russian literature was popular. The amount and range of this material is good proof of the presence of Russian influence in England during the chosen period of the survey. This study also stressed the impact of the periodicals' contribution on the reception and popularization of Russian fiction.

Owing to the general public's lack of interest in new ventures as advocated by the intellectuals, and the fact that the literary periodicals and the little magazines were aimed at a small, intelligent public,¹⁵⁸ the assumption can be made - supported by fact - that the general public had hardly anything to do with what these magazines promoted. Besides, in the light of the small circulation of the little magazines¹⁵⁹ and weeklies, we have yet another piece of proof to support the view that their material did not correspond to the general public's taste. Although the presence of a Russian cult became apparent through the contents of these literary organs - which reflected the prevalent literary taste of the period - our survey reached the conclusion that the number of those who read the serious press was not great. The circulation of these periodicals had always been small. In this way they were found not to account particularly for the taste and mood of the general public. The demise of interest in literature in the periodicals towards the end of the nineteenth century and the consequent rise of specialized periodicals determined the small circulation of the literary periodicals, and made literature lose its interest with the general public.¹⁶⁰ The fact that the little magazines were aimed at a very particular audience helped increase the chasm between the promoters of the Russian cult and the ordinary reader. The survey, thus, revealed the confinement of the readership to a small branch of the public, that is the `elite, the avant-garde, and the educated class.

Notes

1. George Katkov, Brewin Oberlander, Nikolaus People, George Van Rauch, eds., *Russia Enters the Twentieth Century, 1894-1917* (London: Temple Smith, 1971), p. 71.
2. Dorothy Brewster, *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1954), p. 138.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 66.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 68.
6. Samuel Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 307.
7. "What to read in Russian Literature", *The Times Literary Supplement* (18 February 1915), p. 54.
8. Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*. p. 336.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Simon Nowell-Smith, ed., *Edwardian England 1901-1914* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 16.
11. Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*. p. 312.
12. Nowell-Smith, *Edwardian England 1901-1914*. p. 69.
13. Frank Arthur Mumby, *Publishing and Bookselling: A History from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1930), p.338.
14. Gilbert Phelps, "The Early Phases of British Interest in Russian Literature", *The Slavonic Review* 38. 1959-60, p. 423.

Despite his contention that Garnett's publication of *The Brothers Karamazov* started the Russian fever, Phelps believes that there was an early history behind it that prepared the way for this stage of great interest in Russian literature. He traces the early concern of the British to the time commercial and political contacts were made, and mentions the years between 1814 and 1841 as the period where Russophobia was strong, and its revival during the Crimean War. pp. 419-421.

15. Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*. p. 336.

16. Clarence Decker, "Zola's Literary Reputation in England", *P.M.L.A.* Vol. X L I X, 1934. pp. 1140-1146.

17. Gilbert Phelps, "Russian Realism and English Fiction", *The Cambridge Journal* Volume III, (October 1949 - September 1950.), pp. 284-85.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 287.

19. Gilbert Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction* (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1965), p. 33.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-5.

21. Phelps, "Russian Realism and English Fiction."p. 287.

22. Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction* . p. 23.

23. Phelps, " Russian Realism and English Fiction."pp. 281-85.

24. Virginia Woolf, "Modern Fiction", *The Common Reader* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1951), p. 193.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 219-221.

26. Virginia Woolf, "The Russian Point of View", *The Common Reader* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1951), p. 227.

27. William Rose, Jacob Isaacs, *Contemporary Movements in European Literature* (London: 1928), p. 12.

28. Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction*. p. 171.
29. Ibid.
30. Helen Muchnic, *Dostoevsky's English Reputation (1881-1936)*. pp. 5-6.
31. Dmitri Mirsky, *The Intelligentsia of Great Britain*. tr.by Alec Brown.(London: Victor Gollancz, 1935), pp. 102-04.
32. Ibid., pp. 107.
33. Frank Swinnerton, *Background With Chorus: A Footnote to Changes in English Literary Fashion Between 1901 and 1917* (London: Hutchinson, 1956), p.144.
34. Ibid., pp.145-6.
35. D. S. Mirsky, "Chekhov and the English", *Monthly Criterion* Vol.VI, No. 4 (October, 1927).
36. "The Cherry Orchard", *The Times* (30 May 1911)
37. Arnold Bennett, *Books and Persons: Being Comments on a Past Epoch 1908-1911* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1917), p. 214.
38. Charles Nabokoff, "Chekhov on the English Stage", *Contemporary Review* Vol.129, 1926.
39. Frank Swinnerton, *The Georgian Literary Scene: A Panorama* (London: William Heinemann, 1935), p. 295.
40. Rose, Isaacs, *Contemporary Movements in European Literature*. p. 12.
41. John Middleton Murry, *Between Two Worlds: An Autobiography* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1935), p.368.
42. J. M. Murry, *Fyodor Dostoevsky: A Critical Study* (London: Martin Secker, 1916), p. v.

43. Ibid., pp. 368-9.
44. Murry, *Between Two Worlds* . p. 456.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., p. 464.
47. J. M. Murry, *Discoveries: Essays in Literary Criticism* (London: W.Collins Sons & Co., 1924), p. 85. A review of *The Bishop and; Other Stories* in the Garnett translation.
48. J. M. Murry, *Aspects of Literature* (London: W.Collins Sons & Co., 1920), p. 85.
49. Murry, *Discoveries* . p. 87.
50. J. M. Murry, ed., *Journal of Katherine Mansfield* (London: Constable & Co., 1927), p. 62.
51. Ibid., p. 63.
52. Katherine Mansfield, "Some Aspects of Dostoevsky", *The Athenaeum* (8 November 1919)
53. Murry, *Journal of Katherine Mansfield* . p. 65.
54. Vincent O' Sullivan, Margaret Scott ed., *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield, Volume Two 1918-1919* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 230.
55. Mirsky, *The Intelligentsia of Great Britain*. pp. 114-115. See also Mary Martha Baizer, *The Bloomsbury Chekhov* (Washington University, P.hD. thesis 1985) read on microfilm.
56. Virginia Woolf, "Modern Fiction ." p. 193.
57. Virginia Woolf, "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown", *Collected Essays Volume One* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1966), pp. 327-332.

58. Virginia Woolf, "The Russian Point of View." p. 221.
59. Ibid., p. 226.
60. Virginia Woolf, "The Eternal Husband and Other Stories", *The Times Literary Supplement* (22 February 1917).
61. Virginia Woolf, "The Honest Thief and Other Stories", *The Times Literary Supplement* (23 October 1919)
62. Lytton Strachey, "A Russian Humorist", *The Spectator* (11 April 1914)
63. Woolf, "The Russian Point of View." p. 225.
64. Ibid., p. 222.
65. Ibid.
66. Virginia Woolf, "Modern Fiction." p. 93.
67. Leonard Woolf, *Sowing: An Autobiography of the Years 1911-1918* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1964), p. 215.
68. Leonard Woolf, *Downhill All The Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919-1939* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1967), p. 67.
69. E. M. Forster, *Aspects of The Novel* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1966), p. 138.
70. Ibid., p. 136.
71. Ibid., pp. 136-7.
72. George J. Zytaruk, "D. H. Lawrence's Reading of Russian Literature", *D. H. Lawrence Review* 1969-71, p. 121.
73. James T. Boulton, ed., *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence* Vol. I. 1901-1913. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p.45. or CL I.,p. 488.

74. Foreword to D. H. Lawrence, *Studies in Classic American literature* (London: Martin Secker, 1933), p. Viii.
75. Boulton, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol. I., pp. 126-7.
76. Harry Moore, ed., *The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence* Vol. I. (London: Heinemann, 1962) p. 488.
77. Armin Arnold, ed., *The Symbolic Meaning* (New York: Viking Press, 1964), p. 154.
78. Armin Arnold, "D. H. Lawrence, The Russians, and Giovanni Verga", *Comparative Literature Studies* Vol.2., 1965. p. 251.
79. Ibid., pp. 252-4.
80. Edward D. McDonald, ed., *Phoenix, The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence* (London: William Heinemann, 1936), p. 223.
81. Moore, *Collected Letters*. I., p. 108.
82. Moore, *Collected Letters*. II., pp. 182-3.
83. Ibid., p. 1109.
84. Armin Arnold, "D. H. Lawrence, The Russians, and Giovanni Verga ." p. 250.
85. Moore, *Collected Letters* . I., p.432.
86. Ibid.
87. Moore, *Collected Letters*. I. pp. 469-70.
88. Boulton, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol., II., p. 314.
89. Ibid., p. 367.

90. George J. Zytaruk, *D. H. Lawrence Response to Russian Literature* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971). p. 125.
91. George J. Zytaruk, ed., *The Quest for Rananim: D. H. Lawrence's Letters to S. S. Koteliansky 1914 - to 1930* (London: Queen's University Press, 1970), p. 311.
92. Ibid., p. 310.
93. Boulton, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol., II., p. 182-3.
94. McDonald, *Phoenix*. p. 370.
95. Moore, *Collected Letters*. I. p. 443.
96. Ibid., p. 192.
97. Walter Graham, *English Literary Periodicals* (New York: Octagon Books, 1966), p. 225.
98. Ibid, p. 233.
99. Ibid., p. 141.
100. Alvin Sullivan, ed., *British Literary Magazines: The Modern Age, 1914-1984 Historical Guides to the World's Periodicals and Newspapers* (New York: Green Press, 1986), p. 103.
101. Ibid., p. 95.
102. Ibid., p. 389.
103. Ibid., p. 182.
104. Louis Dudek, *Literature and the Press : A History of Printing , Printed Media , and their Relation to Literature* (Toronto: the Reyrsen Press, n.d.), p. 244.
105. Ibid., p. 113.
106. Ibid.. pp. 140-1.

107. F. A. Lea, *The Life of John Middleton Murry* (London: Methuen and Co., 1959), pp. 66-7.
108. Graham, *English Literary Periodicals*. p. 339.
109. Dudek, *Literature and the Press*. p. 141.
110. Malcolm Bradbury, *The Social Context of Modern English Literature* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), pp. 185.
111. Dudek, *Literature and the Press* . pp. 136-140.
112. Denys Val Baker, *Little Reviews* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1943), p. 5.
113. Sullivan, *British Literary Magazines*. p. 115.
114. Ibid., p. 144.
115. Ibid., p. 222-24.
116. Ibid., p.p. 77-9.
117. Bradbury, *The Social Context of Modern English Literature* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), pp. 184-85.
118. Denys Thompson, "A Hundred Years of the Higher Journalism", *Scrutiny* 4 (June, 1935), p. 32.
119. Sullivan, *British Literary Magazines*. p. 58.
120. Ibid., p. 390.
121. Ibid., p. 465.
122. Ibid., p. 95.
123. Ibid., p. 182.

124. Ibid., p. 141.
125. Graham, *English Literary Periodicals*. p. 343.
126. Leonard Woolf, *The Journey not the Arrival*. p. 92.
127. F. A. Lea, *John Middleton Murry*. p. 66.
128. Graham, *English Literary Periodicals*. pp. 334-5.
129. Ibid., p. 343.
130. Dudek, *Literature and the Press*. p. 114.
131. *The Egoist* Volume 2 (1 June 1915)
132. *The Bookman* (November 1915)
133. *The New Statesman* (12 January 1918)
134. *The Times Literary Supplement*. (13 July 1916) p. 329.
135. *The Nation and Athenaeum* , 1925.
136. *The Criterion* 1929-30.
137. *The English Review* (April 1916) p. 270.
138. *The Contemporary Review*. (September 1914) p.427.
139. Helen Szamuely, *British Attitudes to Russia 1880-1918* D.Phil. Oxford University, 1982. pp. 349-354.
140. Arnold Bennett, *Books and Persons: Being Comment on a Past Epoch 1908-1911* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1917), p. 208.
141. *The New Statesman*. (October 14 1916) p. 44.

142. *The New Statesman*. (July 3 1936) p. 327.
143. Thomas Burke, *Son of London* (London, 1948), pp. 182-188.
144. *The Times Literary Supplement*. (11 February 1915)
145. *The Times Literary Supplement*. (4 March 1915)
146. *The Times Literary Supplement*. (7 October 1915)
147. *The Times Literary Supplement*. (25 January 1917)
148. Sir Stanley Unwin, *The Truth About A Publisher: An Autobiographical Record* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1960), p. 159.
149. Frederic Whyte, *William Heinemann: a memoir* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1928), p. 33.
150. *Ibid.*, p. 62-9.
151. *Ibid.*, p.147.
152. Ivor Brown, *The Way of My World* (London: Collins, 1954), p. 145.
153. *Ibid.*, p. 131. Martin Secker's publication of Russian translations included, Sologub's *The Old House, and Other Tales* (1915), *The Created Legend* (1916), *The Little Demon* (1916); Artzibashev's *Breaking Point* (1919), *Tales of the Revolution* (1917), Bunin's *The Village* (1923), *Fifteen Tales*. (1924).
154. *The Athenaeum* No. 4572, (12 June 1915), p. 592.
155. Oliver Warner, *Chatto and Windus: A Brief Account of the Firm's Origin, History and Development* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1973), p. 19.
156. Dudek, *Literature and the Press*. p. 113.
157. Walter Graham, *English Literary Periodicals* (New York: Octagon Books, 1966), p. 343.

158. Malcolm Bradbury, *The Social Context of the English Novel*. p. 185.

159. Ibid., p. 186. Bradbury provides an account of some figures of circulation of these little magazines. The *London Mercury* reached 10,000, the *Adelphi* 4,200 in 1917 which dropped to 1,700, the *Calendar of Modern Letters* 7-8,000 and the *Criterion* 800- dropped to 600.

160. Ibid., p. 184.

CHAPTER TWO

Constance Garnett (1861-1946)

"All those for whom Russian literature was the new found land of this century looked to Constance Garnett as the great revealer."¹ From 1912 probably until the Second World War, her name was for most people synonymous with translations from the Russian. An obituary described her as "the best-known translator of Russian classics into English."² To her untiring efforts millions of readers owe the greatest of debts: their knowledge of the treasures of Russian literature.

Literally millions of American and English readers are indebted to her tireless energy for their knowledge of a whole new world of fiction and drama, which in turn has exercised a powerful influence on many of our prominent authors who have never learned a word of Russian. For this eminent service, we must be grateful.³

Edward Crankshaw adds to her precedence when he maintained that Garnett was "a providence and a legend." He goes on to say that her devoted work has enriched the lives of the readers: "To us she means Russian literature in England."⁴

Through marriage Constance Garnett (nee Black) became a member of a literary family. The Garnetts were :

members of the intellectual aristocracy, that English phenomenon, which first arose in the beginning of the nineteenth century, when members of families of intellectual distinction - families like the Darwins, the Wedgwoods, the Trevelyans, the Macaulays, the Stephens, the Stracheys, to name only a few - began to intermarry and to produce outstanding scholars, teachers, artists, and civil servants.

Taking up positions in every part of the English intellectual world, they challenged the moral standards of the class above them, and at the same time changed profoundly the opinions of the upper middle class to which they belonged. This intellectual aristocracy has flourished for over a hundred years because the many marriages between talented members of it families have often produced remarkably able and gifted children. ⁵

The Garnett family was, indeed, a remarkable group. All its members were endowed with creative gifts and talents. Among them were a naturalist, the founder of the *Manchester Guardian*, an Assistant Keeper of the British Museum, and a Superintendent of the Reading Room in the British Museum. ⁶ However, the most distinguished of its members "Edward, and Constance are remembered, rather for the work they did in fostering the genius of others."⁷ Indeed, both husband and wife played an influential role in the development of the modern English novel. On the one hand, Constance Garnett was weaving, through her translations, the story of the influence of Russian fiction on English writing. On the other hand, and through his post as a publisher's reader and as a literary critic, Edward Garnett became "the greatest discoverer of literary artists English publishers have ever known." ⁸ Added to this is his role in popularising Russian fiction and Russian writers in England.

The Blacks were not as eminent in the literary field as the Garnetts. Nevertheless they were a remarkable family. Constance Garnett's grandfather, Peter Black, was a Scottish sea-captain, who served as naval architect for Tsar Nicholas I. Her father David Black was a solicitor and coroner for Brighton. Among her brothers and sisters, we find a mathematician, a chemist, a social worker and a novelist. Her mother was the daughter of George Patten, a miniature painter. David and Clara were married in 1849.⁹

1. Early Life and Education

As a child Garnett lived in the warmth of a big family. Constance, the sixth child in a family of eight, was born on 19 December 1861. She was the only one who had "fair hair and blue eyes." ¹⁰ The healthy and cheerful child "soon became the invalid of the family," after she developed abscesses in both her legs; when she was only three she contracted tuberculosis of the hip-joint. ¹¹ Garnett spent the early years of her childhood lying "flat in a long bath chair with a splint bound round [her] from knee to waist."¹² She was back on her feet after being operated on. Bad health accompanied her through her girlhood. At thirteen she had an attack of rheumatism in her left leg which resulted in some heart weakness. ¹³ Besides she was born extremely short sighted.

She did not remain the invalid of her childhood. This sense of being an invalid was soon discarded when her parents recognised that she was a talented and intelligent child. Although born to a Victorian couple, Garnett was fortunate for her parents were not ordinary parents. They both believed in the necessity of the education of both boys and girls. Their children's education began at home and "was a combination of mutual aid and self-improvement." Constance, likewise, was instructed first by her mother and later by her brothers and sister. Of her education at home Constance left this account;

While the elder and the two younger went to school, my mother taught me herself - and all the family took a hand in my education. I used to follow my mother into the kitchen repeating my lessons while she made pies, Arthur taught me Mathematics, Ernest taught me geography and mapmaking, Clementina taught me French and German. Arthur also superintended a certain amount of elementary science teaching and performed chemical experiments in the store-room. I had a good memory and was eager to learn. Great things were expected of me by my mother and Arthur. ¹⁴

After this preliminary education she was sent to a boarding school. Prior to that she attended some University Extension Lectures on Latin given by the Principal of Brighton College. There she read Erasmus. Her life as a boarder was miserable - particularly when she was separated from the other girls on the grounds of her being a non-believer. She spent one year there and was miserable; she even attempted to take her own life. She was lucky to have been rescued by her brother who realised his sister's unhappiness. ¹⁵ She later went to Sussex Square, Brighton's new High School for girls.

In 1876 Garnett came out with third class honours in the Cambridge Junior Local Examinations. After two years she got second class honours in the Senior Local. She sat the exam again in 1878 where she procured a first class honours in religious knowledge, English, Latin, French, German, and Mathematics. Her success won her a scholarship to Newnham College, Cambridge. ¹⁶

Garnett was only seventeen when she left home to go to Cambridge; she was "the youngest girl in the college." Cambridge was the turning point in her life. She enjoyed her years there and described them as the best years in her life. "At Newnham, Constance enjoyed three years of rapturous bliss which at moments became so intense that she felt she could not bear it." ¹⁷ Cambridge came as a revelation to her, and was the chance through which she "made her escape from the suffocating prison of Victorian family life." She enjoyed the social life, made friends, experienced the pleasure of living independently and most of all enjoyed her studies.

Her original intention was to study Natural Sciences, but she chose to do Classics and Mathematics. She dropped Mathematics in the end, and concentrated on Latin and Greek. She enjoyed, in particular, the subtleties of the Greek language, its grammar and syntax, most important she liked Greek literature and Greek philosophy.¹⁸ In 1882 she got a second class in the first part of the Classical Tripos, and gained a First Class Honours in the second part which left her tired and exhausted. After graduating from Newnham she was appointed as a lecturer in Classics for a short time by the council of Newnham College. Constance was happy to leave the college because " the academic life was not congenial to her." ¹⁹

Constance was advised to go into a family as a teacher, on account of her poor health. ²⁰ She became a teacher of Classics to the Whites' family. Robert Owen White, JP was a wealthy cement manufacturer. Garnett was employed to monitor the education of the Whites' elder girls, and their little brother. Although this was not her ideal of a job, she took it anticipating that a better one would turn up.²¹ At the same time she became tutor to the children of Charles and Mary Booth. Charles Booth was a wealthy shipowner, who wrote the famous book *Life and Labour of the People of London* . ²²

The better job she was waiting for was available after three and a half years. Charles Booth recommended her to Walter Besant for a post in the new project designed to regenerate the East End. Constance was thus employed as a librarian at the People's Palace, despite her lack of training and the experience necessary for the job. Constance's wages were £80. She was later promoted to Head Librarian and her salary reached one hundred pounds. She enjoyed the interesting life of the East End where she took lodgings in Whitechapel. ²³ Garnett later resigned her job in order to get married.²⁴

Constance continued to enjoy the feeling of freedom and independence that Cambridge had opened up for her. Her job provided the economic independence which she had always cherished. Her experience led to the development of other tendencies in her character. Politically Constance was not very active. ²⁵ However, the beginning of her political activities dates back to the time of her employment in London. Living with three of her sisters at Fitzroy Street, Constance made more friends. Through her sister Clementina, she joined The Club where social discussions took place. ²⁶ She also began to frequent the meetings of the Fabian Society, which was emerging as a new political organization, without becoming a member. The Fabian Society led to various new friendships: Bernard Shaw, Sydney Olivier, Graham Wallace, Ramsay MacDonald and Edward Pease. ²⁷

Garnett became a member of the Fabian Society in 1893. Her decision to join the society was influenced by Sergey Stepniak, a Fabian. The following year, she was elected to the Executive Committee of the Society, with her sister Clementina. Nevertheless, Garnett was not a regular attender of the Committee's meetings. And when it was time for re-election on the Executive Committee she requested not to be nominated. She remained a member, but by 1897, she had already lost touch with the Fabians, and "was becoming increasingly disillusioned with them."²⁸ With her sister, she detested the Potter sisters and the kind of state socialism which owed much to the efforts of the Webbs. On such grounds she resigned her membership. Despite this fact, the socialist inclination in her political outlook remained for a while. She sympathized with the Russian revolutionaries and their cause. But she came to hate the Bolsheviks, although she admired their leader Lenin.

She continued to show interest in politics, but without a direct contact. When the Liberals won in the 1906 election she was overjoyed.²⁹ She also followed with interest the developments within the two factions of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party.

2. Marriage, and Preparation for a Career as a Translator

Through Clementina's association with Richard Garnett (who assisted her in her work at the British Museum), Constance, at the age of twenty-four, met Edward who was six years her junior. Edward was strongly attracted to Constance who refused to take him seriously in the beginning. Yet later, she was as much in love with him as he was with her. They were engaged and got married in 1889.

After getting married they lived in the East End, and they were very happy. They were both attracted by the cosmopolitan nature of the East End, with its many Jews, foreigners, and members of the working class. In 1891 they left the East End for 24 John Street, then for Holmhurst, Surrey. Before they settled at the Cearne, they lived at Froghole near Crackham Hill. The couple's dream of building a small house of their own, was realized when Constance's father left her £1,000. An increase in Edward's salary who was working for Pawling and Heinemann as a reader was quite helpful.³⁰

The choice of the Cearne's site in an isolated area, reflected the Garnetts' unattachment to the "Victorian, social hierarchy, and also their opposition to the conservative elements in the Edwardian Society."³¹ They both strongly opposed the Boer War and England's expansionist policy. David Garnett, in *The Golden Echo*, mentions another reason for Edward's choice which had to do with a fatherly concern as regards his son's upbringing: "that I should grow up knowing the Olivier children."³² (Sydney Olivier and his wife lived in the vicinity of Limpsfield Chart, Surrey.)

Ironically enough, what had been chosen to be an isolated house, turned out to be a gathering place for writers, artists, architects, socialists and Russian emigres. Many writers felt at home at the Cearne, and always longed to spend some time with the Garnetts. "For Lawrence the Cearne represented intellectual energy, books and debate about literary issues."³³ Joseph Conrad also visited and enjoyed the atmosphere of the house. In a letter to Garnett he wrote "I . . . look forward to my next visit to your hermitage."³⁴ Other literary men were frequent visitors to the Cearne, in addition to the group of Russian exiles.

Most of these Russian emigres, whom Edward befriended, were members of the Social Revolutionary Party who were denounced as revolutionaries under the Tsar's autocratic regime. In doing so, Edward was following an old family tradition in befriending European refugees, a tradition which dates back to the time of his grandfather's connection with Antonio Panizzi, and later his father's relation with the Rossettis. Among these Russian exiles we find the names of Felix Volkhovsky, a Ukranian who escaped imprisonment in Siberia, Sergey Stepniak; an artillery officer who escaped abroad after being charged with the assassination of a general and Nicholas Tchaikovsky, Peter Kropotkin, and Prince Tcherkessov.³⁵

Edward was not politically motivated like his wife. He never took politics seriously. Nevertheless, his "social connections reflected an involvement in the youthful revolt against what was seen to be Victorian bond limiting human freedom and fulfilment."³⁶ His befriending of the Russian exiles, besides being a family tradition, might be attributed to the fact that "Edward was very sociable." There was also the tendency in his character reflecting his liberal mind and revolutionary outlook towards life which was in tune with "the rousing revolutionary influences of Wagner, Ibsen, William Morris and Tolstoi . . . , and above all Nietzsche."³⁷

Constance's marriage into the Garnett family must be regarded as fortuitous in the determination of what was to become the sole occupation of her life, because, through this marriage, Garnett was introduced to the main influences that set her on the long way of translation. Hence the significance of the Russian exiles who, in a way, "were to influence both their lives and perhaps indirectly the course of English literature."³⁸ Two of these Russians stimulated Garnett's interest in Russian literature: Felix Volkhovsky and Sergey Stepniak. The former, who escaped imprisonment and came to England, was issuing an emigre journal *Free Russia* and running a Free Russian bookshop.³⁹ Similarly, the latter had been a strong propagandist against the Tsarist government as a journalist and writer. He collaborated with Volkhovsky in issuing *Free Russia* and also founded the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom in 1890. He had taken refuge in England in 1884.⁴⁰

Felix Volkhovsky, whom Edward brought to the Cearne one afternoon, suggested to Constance that she should learn Russian during the idle period of her pregnancy. For this purpose he provided her with a Russian dictionary, a grammar book and a Russian story. The story was Goncharov's *A Common Story*. Constance began learning by translating passages from the story. She found the complexity of the language very exciting. In the beginning it took her hours to translate a sentence; she later improved and was able to translate a page per day. Thus she wrote to her father-in-law, who must have been the source of encouragement to her at this early stage, about the process of translating *A Common Story* :

I do a few pages - some four or five - of a Russian novel every day, but want a dictionary still for every sentence; and I think it will be some years before I have, as you say, 'mastered' the language, even in the sense of reading it as fluently as French. The idea of speaking it had faded away before an increased knowledge of the subtlety of the language. ⁴¹

On the completion of her translation, Volkhovsky took her to see Stepniak who liked the translated story and suggested that it should be sent to a publisher. Following Stepniak's advice, Garnett sent the story to Heinemann who published it in 1894, offering Garnett £40 and a commission to translate Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. Heinemann had a foreign translation list, which included works by Ibsen.

The Garnetts met the Russian exile through Volkhovsky in the summer of 1892. A strong friendship developed between them and the Stepniaks. Their acquaintance was useful to Garnett as translation matters were concerned. Nevertheless, it had its negative side when it later began to affect their marital life. Stepniak's personality attracted Constance from the beginning. Meeting Stepniak was in Constance's words "one of the most important events of my life." Not only that, but it seems that she was more than a little in love with him. In her view,

He had the perfect intellectual honesty so rare in the English. At the same time he was undisciplined, incapable of living by rule. His 'softness' made me despair; he was shamelessly exploited by the other Russian exiles, and often did injudicious things, simply because as he said . . . [I can't bring myself to hurt anyone]! ⁴²

Stepniak's encouragement must have played an important part in determining Garnett's choice of translation as a career. "He encouraged her to pursue her translations, and it was due to him that she began to have a sense of vocation to translate Russian literature, and

Edward to promote it." ⁴³ In this sense, Stepniak's role remains greater than that of Volkhovsky. Stepniak not only encouraged Garnett to carry on translation, but went so far as suggesting that she should visit Russia. This she did in 1894 and 1904 intending the visits "to train her (sic) in Russian ways, outlook, language, and atmosphere in preparation for the task of translating sixty or seventy volumes of its literature."⁴⁴

The desire to be financially independent, along with a sense for longing to the old days when she enjoyed working as a tutor and a librarian - keeping in mind the fact that "personal independence" was her greatest ideal in life - can be taken as another motivation for becoming a translator. According to her sister-in-law

She is bent body and soul upon getting and making money and owns that at present she feels uncomfortable and unsettled, she wants to be independent of everyone, and to be that of course she must be financially free. ⁴⁵

while Richard Garnett believes that although Garnett had always valued financial independence for women since the time she was working in London before marriage, nevertheless, she "had not taken up Russian in order to make money."

Learning Russian did not prove difficult, since she had a good ear for languages. When she sat the Cambridge Local Senior Examination she got first class honours in English, Latin, French and German. At Newnham, her talent for the Greek language was recognised by her tutor Francis Jenkinson. He always asked her to translate beautiful passages trusting in her ability to do them more justice than other girls.⁴⁶ Besides, "much of the teaching was still linguistic, and so Constance gained a rigorous training in the art of translation and developed great skill in expressing precise meanings."⁴⁷ Thus Constance had the right background for her future career. And when it came to learning the Russian language, she could manage on her own. The first step was the Goncharov story. By means of Stepniak's help she had the chance to practise the language with its native speakers. Stepniak passed her on to his friends with whom she communicated in Russian and sometimes in French.⁴⁸ Entertaining these visitors helped improve her Russian. The progress was noticeable, when Vladimir Korolenko visited England she "was able to hold a conversation with him in Russian."⁴⁹ Her visit to Russia in 1894 was intended to improve her spoken Russian. Although she found difficulty in following a conversation at the beginning, at the end of her stay she could understand and speak Russian better to the extent that she received compliments from the native people on her accent. Nevertheless, she is reported to have said that "the construction of the sentences - almost always in the impersonal, and in the general like Latin - and so much more positive than ours - is still very difficult for me."⁵⁰ Despite this she never considered herself a "linguist", although

she could speak Russian, French "fairly fluently," and German "quite adequately." ⁵¹ Her acquisition of foreign languages can be ascribed, besides the fact that she was gifted in languages, to a legacy inherited from both her family and her husband's. It is well known that Richard Garnett, her father-in-law, was a translator of German, Italian and Portuguese. Her mother, on the other hand, knew a good deal of French and Italian; she did try her hand at translating from both languages. Her father did his bit of translating from the German as a means to increase his income at one stage. ⁵²

Garnett paid two visits to Russia in the winter of 1894 and the summer of 1904. The nature of the visits varied. While the main purpose of the first was the desire to understand and speak Russian better, and to acquire first hand information of the country and its people. The second visit was merely for the sake of a holiday. During the first visit she travelled alone, and was accompanied by David, her son, who was only twelve years old, during the second visit.

Garnett left for Russia on New Year's Eve 1893 for a three month visit on Stepniak's advice. When the suggestion for the visit was made the main motive was the necessity for Garnett to know the country whose literature she was preparing to turn into English. However, Stepniak had other purposes in mind. Being an exiled revolutionary, it seemed that he "always had need of innocent-looking emissaries to carry letters and books that could not safely be sent through the censored mails." ⁵³ Garnett agreed to be the means of communication between the Russian exiles in London and the secret revolutionary organisations in Russia for Stepniak's sake and because the visit had the sense of adventure which she liked. She also volunteered to carry the money raised in England for the famine relief, and a letter from Stepniak to the Russian novelist Korolenko, in addition to lists of information to be obtained concerning her translation of Turgenev. ⁵⁴

Zinaida Vengerov who arranged for this visit met Garnett at St Petersburg station and took her to the lodging where she stayed while in Moscow. She arrived in Russia at the time of the Russian Christmas; she enjoyed the celebrations and festivities of the occasion. She also made lasting friends, and was introduced to Aleksandra Alekseeva Shteven who was responsible for building schools for the peasants in Tolstoy's style.

While in Russia she went as far as Nijhni Novgorod, and visited the areas stricken by famine. She also managed to meet Tolstoy, Korolenko, and a friend of Chekhov. Sasha Shteven invited her to visit Yablonka, her family's estate. On their way there they visited a few of the peasants schools and stopped in Moscow where she took the opportunity to see Tolstoy. The writer, who impressed her greatly, encouraged her as regards her future translations after

hearing of her rendering of *The Kingdom of God is Within You*, and told her of his preference for the English translations of his works over the French.⁵⁵ Her second stop was Nijni Novgorod where she met Korolenko and delivered Stepniak's letter. The Russian writer gave her a letter to Stepniak, a few copies of his book *The Famine Year* and his recent collection of short stories. Garnett went back to Moscow where she stayed for a while. Then she set off to St Petersburg, returning by land to England; she arrived in London on 24 February.⁵⁶

The visit achieved its desired aim. Garnett's Russian improved, and she accomplished her mission as Stepniak planned. Nevertheless it had its negative effects on Garnett's relation with her husband. It made marriage difficult. When she left for Russia, Garnett left her one year old boy in the care of a nurse. Her husband's pride was hurt by the fact that his wife undertook this adventurous journey for the sake of a man with whom she was more than a little in love.

At the end of her first visit to Russia Garnett expressed her wish to go back every year. However, ten years passed before she returned there. This time she did not travel alone but was accompanied by her son. They both sailed from Hull to Helsingfors where they caught a train to St Petersburg where they stayed for two weeks. They then set off to Moscow where they were received by a Madame Pogosky. After a week in Moscow they headed for Tambov Province, Central Russia where they stayed with Aleksandr Ivanovich Ertel for a month. They also paid a visit to Sasha Shtven, now Mrs Yershov in Tula Province. Their stay at the Yershovs left them in ill health. They stopped at the Ertels before they returned to England.

The memories of these two visits remained with her all her life. To Bates, in one of their meetings at the Cearne, she spoke of her first visit to Russia which had always had a special place in her heart, being the cause of her becoming a translator; "she was reminiscing of days in Russia when she travelled half across the continent, alone, by sledge, simply in order to train herself in Russian ways, outlook, language and atmosphere in preparation for the task of translating sixty or seventy volumes of its literature."⁵⁷ That her two visits to Russia achieved the desired aim was evident in the fact that they placed her on the right track for an eventful career. Translation, which she first undertook as a means to pass the idleness of pregnancy became her life-work, a job which she continued to do till old age, and which kept her busy for nearly thirty-five years. Most important of all, it resulted in the notable achievements that helped to rank her as a distinguished figure in English literary life.

Garnett thought seriously of becoming a translator when Heinemann accepted Edward's proposal to publish Turgenev's works. She was delighted at the prospect of its offering her the ideal chance to keep her financial independence. In preparation for her career as

a translator, Garnett sought the help of Stepniak in correcting her work. She made arrangements to pay him a percentage of her wages.⁵⁸

Her diligence at work resulted in the appearance of the Russian classics during the period between 1894 and 1928. In the end her translations amounted to nearly seventy volumes of Russian prose works. Her list of production came to include the works of Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Gogol, Tolstoy, and Herzen.

Her delight in the process of translation was so great that it often fascinated the young David who "would watch the changing expressions on her face, eager, frowning, puzzled or amused." "The Russian words," he recalls, "were translated not only on the foolscap sheet of paper in front of her, but into English features and flesh and blood."⁵⁹ Such was the quality of her concentration while doing the translations that this same absorbing tendency in work was realized by D. H. Lawrence who related his observations in an interview:

"Constance Garnett", he recalls, "was sitting out in the garden turning reams of her marvellous translations from the Russian. She would finish a page, and throw it off on a pile on the floor without looking up, and start a new page. That pile would be this high really, almost up to her knees and all magical."⁶⁰

Her devotion to her work led to a deterioration in her already weak eyesight. She was short-sighted from childhood. Work on translation worsened her eyesight; it almost left her blind (the year she translated *War and Peace*). This fact did not deter her from continuing her work. But it rather left her more determined to carry on what she had already started; she sought the help of an amanuensis ⁶¹ "who read the Russian aloud and to whom [she] dictated the English." She was helped in this role, by Juliet Soskice, Natalie Duddington and Sybil Wilson. Juliet Soskice was the first of her assistants. She was Ford Madox Ford's sister who learned Russian when she married David Soskice, a Russian Lawyer involved in revolutionary activities. ⁶² Mrs Duddington gradually took over from Juliet and became Constance's amanuensis. ⁶³ She was Natalie Ertel who came to England to continue her education in 1906, and was later married to the Theosophist, the Rev. John Nightingale Duddington. Natalie earned her living by translating Russian and later became Constance's amanuensis. ⁶⁴ Together they worked for long hours and sometimes hardly stopped for meals. The next stage of the method followed in translation consisted of Garnett's reading over what she had already dictated, then turning "it over in her mind and mak[ing] corrections. Sometimes she felt the exact word had escaped her and worried over it for days until finally it would come to her." ⁶⁵

She also used to pay them for their services. Later, when Natalie took to translation Garnett helped her by "checking proofs and trying to solve 'difficulties.'"⁶⁶

With the influx of Russian material on the English market, and the abundance of translations and translators there was always the difficulty of finding a publisher to take a whole edition of a Russian writer. But Garnett was lucky. Heinemann, who had a list of foreign translations, seemed willing to publish Turgenev and later Dostoevsky.

In the course of the present sketch of the Garnett translations, attention will be paid to the impact of the joint efforts of the Garnetts, both husband and wife, in weaving the story of the reception of Russian literature in England, and the popularization of Russian writers. Acknowledgement will be due to Constance for her untiring labours in translating the classics of Russian literature. Simultaneously, Edward's prefaces to some of his wife's translated volumes, in addition to his critical articles about Russian literature and Russian writers played an important role in enlarging the public's knowledge and understanding of Russian writings. In dealing with this section we will follow the appearance of Garnett's translations in chronological order.

3. The Translations

(a) Tolstoy

The importance of the Garnett translation of Tolstoy rises from the fact that, in the eyes of the few contemporary figures, she was responsible for introducing the Russian writer to the English public. She translated his work before Aylmer Maude, the authority and Tolstoy's main translator and interpreter. Her translations appeared in a library edition published by Heinemann between 1901 and 1904. In addition to *The Kingdom of God is Within You* she translated the writer's two major novels: *Anna Karenin*, and *War and Peace*, besides a volume of stories, *Ivan Ilyitch and Other Stories*.

It can be said that Garnett's career as a translator began with Tolstoy. After the success of her first attempt at any translation from the Russian; Goncharov's story, Heinemann commissioned her to translate *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. Heinemann had arranged to buy the copy and rights in the book from the German publisher. Meanwhile, Garnett, who was planning to visit Russia that year, hoped to finish the translation before setting off on her trip.

Her first intention was to complete the translation by the end of October 1893. For this reason she was "working tremendously hard." She did not complain when a second volume turned up, but expressed her pleasure that she had more work to do.⁶⁷ By this time, she was aware of the impossibility of having the book finished as she had previously planned. However, she managed to finish it before leaving for Russia. The book was issued in February 1894 while she was still in Russia. The issue of her version coincided with the publication of the book as number twenty in the Walter Scott Edition of Tolstoy. Nevertheless, her version was found to be superior to Aline Delano's according to the reviewer of *The Academy*, who criticised Delano's choice of the sub-title "'Christianity not as a mystical doctrine, but as a new life-conception'" as "'very Teutonic.'" On the other hand he praised Garnett's phrasing of the title "'Christianity not as a mystic religion but as a new theory of life'" as "'intelligible' and 'in sensible English.'"⁶⁸

Garnett embarked on translating Tolstoy's two major novels before Heinemann's commitment to a new edition of his works in October 1901. She chose to commence with *Anna Karenina* which she read in 1896 in the original. The book was available in Vizetelly's and N. H. Dole's version. On reading the English version of the book she found it was "'so exceptionally bad that it gives hardly any idea of the original.'"⁶⁹ Without waiting for a commission from Heinemann she began translating the book. Actually Heinemann did not seem keen on translating any Tolstoy after his loss on *The Kingdom*. But he eventually agreed to take it for twelve shillings per thousand words, offering no royalty. The translation was completed in May 1901.

In the meantime Garnett was thinking of *War and Peace*. But Heinemann was not very keen. The proposed American edition of Leo Wiener was to come out soon, and he did not want to risk his chances. Besides he seemed to be apprehensive about the idea of her translating the book on her own. So he offered to have the book done in collaboration with other translators. He was worried because,

He did not want to put such a huge egg in a frail basket, and entrust the translation of a novel of half a million words to an overworked woman, plagued with sick headaches and suffering from deteriorating eyesight, who had a house and a kitchen garden to run, a family and friends to feed and a son to educate.⁷⁰

Heinemann's proposal was met by Garnett's "'indignant refusal.'" And she insisted on translating it alone, without the help of the potential collaborators, who might have been the Maudes. She also managed to finish it before leaving to Russia on her second visit. The strains

of hard work left their effect on her poor eyesight, which deteriorated as a result. The completion of the work almost left her blind, but nevertheless, proud. For she is reported to have said later that she "should like to be judged by my translation of Tolstoy's *War and Peace*. But Tolstoy's simple style goes straight into English without any trouble. There's no difficulty." ⁷¹

Katherine Mansfield's letter of appreciation to Garnett is the perfect proof of the fact that "Garnett was regarded as having presented Tolstoy to the English speaking world." ⁷²

As I laid down my copy of *War and Peace* tonight I knew I could no longer refrain from thanking you for the whole other world that you have revealed to us through these marvellous translations from the Russian. Your beautiful industry will end in making us almost ungrateful . . . Yet my generation (I am 32) and the younger generation owe you more than we ourselves are able to realize. These books have changed our lives, no less. What could it be like without them?
I am only one voice among so many who appreciate the greatness of your achievement. I beg you to accept my admiration and my deepest gratitude.⁷³

Indeed other voices of admiration to the magnificent work done by Garnett came from other men of letters. John Galsworthy's reading of the latter half of volume II of *Anna Karenina* left him "so full of admiration" that he sent a letter to her praising her rendering; "in any case yours has been a wonderful piece of work, and I am all the more eager for *War and Peace*." He also expressed his wish to read her translation of *The Cossacks*. ⁷⁴

Garnett did not make any more translations from Tolstoy. She undertook the translation of one volume of his stories: *Ivan Ilyitch*, which was part of the Heinemann edition. At the time of its publication the edition was not successful. Heinemann lost money on this "expensive and abortive edition." During her first visit to Russia Tolstoy offered Garnett his *The Four Gospels Harmonised* to put into English translation. The work, which was unfinished as yet, was to be in three volumes. Although she entertained the thought of translating this interesting book, which she was sure would find a good market, she refrained in the end on the basis of its old language which she thought "it would be *very* difficult to translate," and because it would disrupt her translation of Turgenev. ⁷⁵ Likewise, the project of her translation of *Resurrection* failed. In 1921 she was offered Chertkoff's *The Last Days of Tolstoy* by Heinemann. She took the book "unread" and was "so disgusted by its hypocritical and malicious moralising that she 'simply could not carry on with it.'" ⁷⁶ The scheme to translate Tolstoy's *Letters* for William and Norgate did not materialize. When she was offered the book, due to shortage of time, she agreed to translate only one third of the book with the help

of Juliet Soskice. The publisher, however withdrew the offer. Garnett and Juliet Soskice had already translated part of the book for which they were paid twelve pounds. ⁷⁷ Garnett's last translation of Tolstoy was *Christianity and Patriotism* which was published by Jonathan Cape on Edward's recommendation.

Edward who had joined the firm of Jonathan Cape in 1921, was the one who persuaded them to publish Constance's translation of *Christianity and Patriotism*. Edward's interest in Tolstoy coincided with the time his wife turned her attention to the writer. He wrote about "Tolstoy's place in European Literature." Jointly with Constance he wrote an article about *Resurrection* for *The North American Review*. His *Tolstoy* was published in 1914.

Just as Constance had spent almost all her life in "the prodigious task, colossal even in its material magnitude, of translating modern Russian literature", ⁷⁸ Edward, on the other hand, pursued for forty years "one of the dreariest of all occupations, the reading of manuscripts." ⁷⁹ There was so much to be done, so many promising writers to be given advice that the impact of Edward's post as a reader, and critic, who fostered these talents can hardly be ignored. Nor must we forget his role as a defender and propagandist of Russian literature. His campaign to promote the new discovered literature was discernible through his trials to introduce to the British public the works of Russian authors and provide them with a better understanding of their art.

Unlike Constance, Edward had little formal education. He left school in the fourth form at the age of sixteen. He owed his vast knowledge in literary subjects to the fact that he had been brought up in a literary atmosphere. Being a member of the Garnett family he was widely read and bookish. After leaving school he spent most of his time reading and wandering among the book stalls of Farringdon Road. ⁸⁰

He might not have been properly qualified yet his abilities and talent were never doubted. He did very well in the realm that he chose for a career. Moreover, he secured himself a name in the world of publishing business. His outstanding faculty as a reader - a first rate one - was recognised by all his employers at the different publishing firms he worked for. He first entered the business as wrapper of parcels at Unwin. He became afterwards a publisher's reader; a job which he followed till the end of his life and in which he achieved great success.

It is true that he did not get on well with most of the publishers. That was simply because he was always on the side of the authors. At Unwin he stayed for ten years and was unhappy; he was also underpaid. He went to Heinemann for whom he worked for several years, but all the same he did not get on very well. After getting the sack from the latter he

worked for Duckworth from 1900 till the time of World War I. He later moved to work for John Lane. Finally he was employed by Jonathan Cape - the former sales manager at Duckworth who started his own publishing firm - where he stayed till the end of his life. ⁸¹

Edward's talent, we are told, functioned best when the subject was critical, when the reason more than the imagination was the source of his inspiration. Nevertheless, he tried his talent at creative literature. And he wrote a couple of novels, several plays, prose poems, in addition to sketches of anti-war satire nature. His first novel *The Paradox Club* was written when he was eighteen. His second was *Light and Shadow*; it dealt with a gloomy theme. He anticipated at one stage writing a historical novel about Ireland; an idea which he dropped in the end. ⁸² For the theatre, he wrote a play about Robin Hood which was acted by his son and some neighbouring children. ⁸³ Among his other dramatic productions were *The Feud*, *The Breaking Point*, *Mischief*, *The Political Sex*, and *The Trial of Jeanne d'Arc*. He managed to get some of his plays into production. However, they did not achieve any success. Melancholy characterized the themes of his plays. ⁸⁴ His volume of prose poems *An Imagined World* was also melancholic and depressive. His satires against the war were compiled in a book: *Papa's War and Other Stories*. It might be true that his genius did not operate in the field of creative writing. Yet it had its profound influence in nurturing this same faculty in other writers. The greatness of his critical and editorial work lies in the letters, conversations, and observations he addressed to the writers whom he advised. His other critical writings were found to be lacking in the immediacy and harshness his letters were remarkable for. ⁸⁵

By means of his post as a reader of manuscripts Edward became one of the most influential literary persons in the country. Besides, "he had a powerful hand in much of the best that was written in England." ⁸⁶ For nearly forty years his main occupation was discovering, fostering and encouraging men's talents. His merit was that most of these authors whom he discovered, whose talents he fostered, and who became famous writers later on, had been recognized by him before the world did them any justice. A glimpse at the biographies, letters or journals of some of these authors reveal the extent of his influence on their literary career, and at the same time show much of the writers' gratitude to him. For as a result of his advice, comments and suggestions for improvement either in style or expression, the writers very often engaged in textual changes and sometimes in rewriting whole passages or whole manuscripts. The writers always acknowledged Edward's help; his comment on the manuscript of *Almayer's Folly* is "what made me an author." ⁸⁷ Thus Conrad writes when recalling his first meeting with Edward. D. H. Lawrence's inscription of *Sons and Lovers* reads "to my friend and protector in love and literature, Edward Garnett, from the author." ⁸⁸ Edward always directed the writers to follow the modern outlook in fiction writing.

Through his job as a publisher's reader "Edward was now on his way to becoming one of the most influential literary figures in the country." Moreover, "he was acquiring a reputation as one of the principal protagonists of the new Russian realism, defending it against such formidable opponents as George Saintsbury and Edmund Gosse." ⁸⁹ His long-term battle for the establishment of a new form of literature was the second sphere that he succeeded in accomplishing. The battle was fought through the pages of the periodicals. His first article in this regard appeared in the *Speaker*. ⁹⁰ In "The Contemporary Critic" he classified critics as academic or contemporary. The former, he described as a person who had a passion for all that is "old and seasoned," besides his tendency to ignore the demands of the market. ⁹¹ In his view, the critic should examine "the prevailing tendencies around him." He also challenged Andrew Lang's view on modern literature which he believed to be characterized with vulgarity. His reply to Lang's indictment was that modern literature was only mirroring and reflecting aspects of European society and life where decadence and vulgarity exist. ⁹² This tendency in Garnett's view for modernity echoes the essence of his liberal and radical ideas. For Edward was, by nature, "a rebel against the established powers." ⁹³ The record of his social connections indicates his involvement in the social and literary issues of the day. He took much interest in Wagner, Ibsen, Tolstoy and many new theories of the day. Moreover, he was particularly attracted to the modern school of Russian Realism and its authors. These writers were the source of inspiration in his battle for the novel. For "the greater Russian writers Tolstoy, Turgenev and Chekhov - provided him with the models of what fiction should be."⁹⁴ According to these criteria he urged the writers whom he advised to follow the Russian example. His propagation of Russian literature and Russian writers was much in evidence through his attempts to get his wife's translations published, and through his many articles. His services in this field were acknowledged to be so great that Conrad described him as the "Russian Ambassador (sic) to the Republic of Letters." ⁹⁵

Among those he advised were such celebrated writers as Conrad, John Galsworthy, D. H. Lawrence; of the new generation of authors we mention Henry Green, Liam O' Flaherty, Sean O' Faolain, H. E. Bates, of his help and encouragement to women writers the names of Mollie Skinner, Naomi Mitchison and Norah James should be remembered. The pages of the prefaces he wrote to some of his wife's translations and the articles he wrote in the periodicals. These articles reflect his views about Russian writers in general, with particular emphasis on two favourites, Chekhov and Turgenev.

(b) Turgenev

Despite the fact that Turgenev was among the first of the Russian writers to be introduced to the English public (his reputation dates back to the time of the Crimean War when *A Sportsman's Sketches* appeared in 1855), he was not adequately translated, and his fiction was introduced, for the first time, in the Garnett translation which appeared between 1894 and 1900. Conrad's statement, made in a letter to Edward Garnett, is a true acknowledgment of Garnett's role in bringing Turgenev's fiction to England.

Turgenev for me is Constance Garnett and Constance Garnett is Turgenev. She has done that marvellous thing of placing the man's work inside English literature, and it is there that I see it - or rather that I feel it. ⁹⁶

Turgenev was the first Russian novelist to be read by the English public in both Britain and America. The first translation of a work by Turgenev appeared in 1855. His realism and squeamishness appealed to the British public greatly. It is true, however, that from the Crimean War up the 1880s the interest in him was not literary. He was rather read for the information he could give about Russian life and activities in general. W. D. Howells praised his novels as offering the model of realism that should be adopted by American writers. It was Henry James who brought this current opinion to London. ⁹⁷

Translating Turgenev was Edward's initiative, his wife provided the means. Edward, who read Turgenev and liked his art, felt the need for a complete edition of his works in English to put an end to the prevalence of the cheaper and bad translations from the French. Constance, who read Turgenev in French, was also very keen on the prospect of translating him. ⁹⁸ "Edward is very hot about a scheme for a complete edition of Tourgueneff [sic] - " Constance wrote to Stepniak's wife to inquire about the bulk of Turgenev's works, the possibility of having them done in ten volumes, and her husband's readiness to write the introductions. ⁹⁹ On her part, Constance had already started to translate Turgenev before she left for Russia on her first visit. She chose to begin with *Rudin*. No publisher was yet secured to undertake the translations. ¹⁰⁰

The initial plan was to submit the proposal to Unwin. On the latter's refusal, the project was offered to Heinemann who consented to take it. While Constance was in Russia, Edward was negotiating terms of agreement with Heinemann. They settled on letting "the vols. come out every *three* months; that is what I should prefer." The decision was reached in compliance with Constance's wishes. ¹⁰¹ After *Rudin*, she started to work on *A Sportsman's*

Sketches. She continued the hard work on other volumes. Within over a year Garnett was able to produce six volumes of Turgenev. ¹⁰² Although she accepted the challenge, translating Turgenev proved a difficult task; "Turgenev is much the most difficult of the Russians to translate because his style is the most beautiful." ¹⁰³ She found it "almost impossible to do justice in English to the beauty and poetry of the original "of the story "Enough." She expressed feelings of unequality when she was doing another story "A Lear of the Steppes."¹⁰⁴

Garnett completed her version in 1900 when the fifteenth volume *The Jew and Other Stories* appeared. Her edition contained all the writer's novels and a selection of his stories. Garnett had enjoyed translating Turgenev immensely; he was her favourite writer. At the time of their first appearance the volumes did not achieve much success. The public was not particularly enthusiastic about the completion of the Garnett version of Turgenev. It was indifferent, unlike the men of letters who considered Garnett's accomplishment a big literary event. Arnold Bennett believed that Turgenev only appealed to the men of letters and not to the public. ¹⁰⁵

In spite of the public's indifference, Garnett's achievement was recognised by the contemporary literary figures. Their praise, appreciation and enthusiasm for the translations were in evidence through the pages of their correspondence. The joy of those who read Turgenev for the first time was greater than those who knew his works by means of other translations. John Galsworthy, who read the writer through Garnett's translation, blessed the chance that made her learn Russian, together with the energy and insight to render it perfectly. He preferred the art of both Turgenev and Tolstoy to any other Russian writer. ¹⁰⁶ Galsworthy is said to have modelled his *Villa Rubein* on Turgenev's method. Conrad, on reading her translation of Turgenev, the only Russian writer for whom he had an unflinching affection, was unable to think of Constance otherwise than "the incomparable translator of an incomparable novelist." It must be remembered that Conrad was not under the spell of novelty when he expressed his delight on reading her translation, and when he described her labour as containing much originality as if it were coming from the master's hand.

Thanks. It is admirable. I am not speaking of Turgeniev. But surely to render thus the very spirit of an incomparable artist one must have more than a spark of the sacred fire. The reader does not see the language - the story is alive - as living as when it came from the master's hand. This is a great achievement. I have been reading with an inexpressible delight - not the delight of novelty for I knew and remembered the stories before - but with the delight of revelling in that pellucid, flaming atmosphere of Turgeniev's life which the translator has preserved unstrained, unchilled, with the clearness and heart of original inspiration. To me there is something touching like a great act

of self-sacrifice and devotion in this perfect fidelity to a departed breath. ¹⁰⁷

His admiration was expressed in another letter where he called Garnett an "interpreter and not a translator." ¹⁰⁸ Other writers expressed their indebtedness to her translations in learning the art of fiction writing. David records his mother's joyfulness on coming back from a dinner party "glowing with gratification at the compliments that Arnold Bennett had paid her translations of Turgenev, to which he declared he owed much in learning the art of a writer."¹⁰⁹

Various factors helped the establishment of Turgenev's reputation in England in the eighteen nineties. However, Turton credited Garnett and Henry James with the greatest influence:

It is to her [Garnett] and to Henry James that most credit must go for securing Turgenev's reputation in England in the nineteenth century; the work of making him 'the novelist's novelist', began by the one as a literary tribute, was completed by the other in a pioneering linguistic feat of the greatest importance. ¹¹⁰

In his attempt to account for the popularity of Turgenev in the 1890s, Turton listed more than one reason that helped the rise of Turgenev's popularity and the demise of Tolstoy. In the light of the new development in the theories of the novel which sought to promote its potentialities and function, Turgenev's fiction "served as a model for, and epitome of that peculiar combinative power of the novel" which consisted in the unification of the poetic and scientific facts. ¹¹¹ He went on to say that the mood of the period happened to be in accordance with Turgenev's pessimism. The latter faculty, which was treated with some reservation in the 1870s by Henry James and others, became accepted in the 1890s because "pessimism had come to be an important, indeed arguably the dominant, strain in the outlook of many writers."¹¹² There was also a change in publishing policy and the emergence of new publishers which led to the influx of foreign literature into England. ¹¹³ William Heinemann was among the pioneers in the country; his "enthusiasm for foreign works, especially ones that conformed to the new, shorter format, would have made him a natural choice for Constance Garnett to offer her translations to." Garnett could not have chosen a better time for the presentation of Turgenev's translations. ¹¹⁴

The necessity for a complete presentation of Turgenev's fiction was a common belief shared by the Garnetts. The presence of Stepniak backed and helped the realisation of the plan. Each one of them understood the beauty and reality of Turgenev's fiction. Hence their

combined effort to make the dream come true. They were all essential for the realization of the dream. For Edward, Turgenev's novels represented a model of how the novel should be, and also reflected his view of the world where only reality reigns. For Stepniak, Turgenev's works were important because they foresaw the birth of a new political movement in Russia. While for Constance the beauty of the writer's style and his descriptive faculty presented a challenge.¹¹⁵

Garnett's dedication of the final volume of Turgenev to Stepniak is an acknowledgement of the role he played in making her undertake the job. "To the memory of Stepniak whose love of Turgenev suggested this translation."¹¹⁶ She might not have attempted the translation without Stepniak's persuasion. For it was he who encouraged her, after the success of the Goncharov story, to carry on translating. He was also helpful in going over translations and correcting proofs. For this purpose they used to have sessions in the Garnett residence, at the British Museum, and at Stepniak's cottage when they moved next door to the Peases in the Chart.¹¹⁷ Stepniak's death was a "blow from which it took my mother long to recover,"¹¹⁸ David recalls. However, his death strengthened Garnett's relations with his widow and other Russians. Stepniak's widow continued her husband's job; she went over the translations and corrected proofs.

Garnett had entrusted Stepniak with the writing of the introductions for the edition. Heinemann was discontented about the prospect of having them written by Stepniak, because he was "' afraid of his politics.'" And he wanted either Henry James or Bjornsen to undertake that task. Garnett was displeased with this plan and was ready to dispense with the whole idea of the introductions if they were not written by Stepniak: "the idea was his, and no one else can give the facts about these epoch-making novels as he can. Other writers may write their critical introductions, they cannot write the critical-historical introductions that he can, which will make the edition unique."¹¹⁹ Edward volunteered to take over the job, after Stepniak's reluctance to continue the task because of Heinemann's dismissive treatment; *Rudin* appeared with Stepniak's signature at the end of the introduction and not on the title page.¹²⁰ Eventually Stepniak wrote five of the introductions, and the rest were written by Edward.

Garnett strongly objected to the idea of Edward's undertaking the writing of the introductions. She feared his inability to provide a standard criticism of the writer, and she did not want him to take time and trouble over them. Richard Garnett believes that Constance did not want Edward to write the introduction for fear of losing her independence. Her fears were groundless, for,

as it turned out, Edward was better suited to introduce Turgenev to the English than Stepniak was. Stepniak wanted

his readers to read Turgenev in order to understand Russia; Edward wanted them to appreciate Turgenev in order to understand how novels should be written. His prefaces were well received and helped to establish his reputation as an authority on Russian literature in parallel with Constance's as a translator. ¹²¹

Edward's criticism constituted in the mingling of both political and aesthetic outlooks. The secret of the introductions' importance lies in the blending of these two characteristics. On the one hand, the introductions supplied the English public with the best material about the habits and customs of the Russian society. On the other hand, they promoted the writer's art and helped to popularize the novel as a form of art.

Edward's analysis of the novels focused on Turgenev's artistic qualities, and on his faculty of poetic vision, in particular, as the one characteristic that gave the writer a great insight into the truth and reality of life. "He is a great realist, and his realism carries along with it the natural breath of poetry." ¹²² In the evidence of such aesthetic qualities as "balance, grouping, perspective, harmony of form and perfect modelling," Turgenev surpassed, in Edward's view, not only Dostoevsky and Tolstoy, but any other European novelist of the nineteenth century. The supremacy of his art, Edward Garnett continues, stemmed from his poetic insight which was present all the time, expressed in the non-metrical composition of his prose fiction. In this regard Turgenev was described as a poet using fiction as his medium.

A common characteristic of Edward's criticism was an emphasis on the mastery of Turgenev's art. On such grounds the novels were analysed. *Rudin* was praised for its well-structured technique and perfect form, *Smoke*'s simple style threw light on the writer's technical skill. In his introduction to *The Jew* volume Edward called on the reader and English men of letters to acknowledge the role of the novel as "the most serious and significant of all literary forms." ¹²³ Turgenev, he described, as the greatest of all novelists "in the sense that he is the supreme artist." ¹²⁴ The young novelists in England are advised to treat the novel as a form of art. "If you would study it in its highest form, the form the greatest artist of our time has perfected - remember Turgenev." ¹²⁵

Edward's introductions were influential in enlarging the public's knowledge of Russian life and society. In this respect, the novels were represented as reflections of certain political and social tendencies in Russia at a particular period. *A Sportsman's Sketches* is described as an epoch-making book which profoundly affected Russian society and hastened the emancipation of the serfs in 1861-63 (the book was first published in 1847), *Rudin* as representing the Russia of the fifties, *On The Eve* as reflecting Russia's national aspirations and outlooks, *Fathers and Children* as foretelling the rise of the Nihilist movement of the

sixties, *Virgin Soil* as giving a historical justification of the Nihilist movement and the prophecy of its surface failure, in addition to the volumes of stories which were seen as reflecting the particular social atmosphere of the different eras.

Through these introductions Edward championed Turgenev as a great artist. He also gave prominence to the novel as a form of art and tried to place it on the same level as poetry. His efforts were recognised by contemporary men of letters. Arnold Bennett thought of his analysis of the novels as "the best criticism of fiction."

Your prefaces to the different volumes contain some of the best criticism of fiction that I have come across. Especially that of *Smoke*. Strictly technical criticism of fiction (particularly on the point of construction) seems almost a minus quality in both England and France. ¹²⁶

Edward's "perfect sympathy and insight" in pointing out the "high qualities" of Turgenev's art were praised by Conrad. When the introductions were published in book form in 1917 under the title *Turgenev*, T. S. Eliot reviewed the book in *The Egoist*. He called it "the first serious study of [Turgenev] in English." He also described it as "pioneer "

As the first book on the subject, it contains just the necessary information; taking up the novels one by one and sketching their genesis and accounting for the ideas which went into them. . . it enables a reader of Turgenev to see the novels in relation to each other, and the relation of the characters in different novels. It invites us (and its concise brevity is an added provocation) to consider the work of Turgenev as a single work, the art of Turgenev as steady and laborious construction, not as a series of scattered inspirations. ¹²⁷

Thus, the credit is Garnett's for having introduced his works and for establishing Turgenev's reputation in England. The role of promoting the writer's art, and the novel as a form of art, is ascribed to Garnett's husband, who achieved this aim through his introductions to his wife's translated volumes. Such was the effect of the Garnetts' collaboration on the establishment of Turgenev's reputation. Through Constance's translations, the public was introduced to the writer's fiction, while Edward's prefaces helped to enlarge their knowledge about Russia and Russian life and threw light on the merits of Turgenev's art. Garnett's labour was further acknowledged when she won one of the six prizes of the *Academy's* 'Awards to Authors' for 1899. Garnett received twenty-five guineas for her work on the translation of Turgenev. ¹²⁸

(c) Dostoevsky

Like her translation of Turgenev, her translations of Dostoevsky were the first presentation of the writer's works in English. Their significance stems from the great enthusiasm they aroused, and the fact that they instigated the "Russian Cult" as one of the strange literary phenomena that prevailed in the second decade of the twentieth century. The truth of the matter is that the publication of Garnett's translation of *The Brothers Karamazov* in 1912 was regarded as the "starting point of the fever." 129

Once again Garnett could not have chosen a better time for the introduction of Dostoevsky's works to the English public. The growing interest in psycho-analysis and Freud's theories created the perfect atmosphere. The first Dostoevsky translation appeared in 1881. When *Crime and Punishment* appeared in 1886 R. L. Stevenson called it "the greatest book I have read in ten years." The initial vogue for Dostoevsky was over by 1900. 130

When in 1881 the first English translation of the writer appeared, he did not receive a warm welcome. Although his realism and psychological insight were praised, the morbid and unhealthy elements in his fiction were treated with caution. Muchnic attributes the unpopularity of Dostoevsky to certain "unfamiliar qualities" in his art. Among these was the form of his novels, which were seen as being too long and disordered. There was also "the strangeness of his spirit" which made English readers label his novels as "feverish and intense" and made them sound strange compared to the usual atmosphere of the English novels. On such grounds, interest in him waned through the nineties due to the new approach to aesthetics. The understanding of the motives behind his use for the abnormal and the extraordinary in order to "assert, with a fuller courage and a deeper confidence, the nobility and splendour of the human spirit," helped to change the initial attitude of the critics towards his art. 131

A revival of his reputation happened when Maurice Baring published his *Landmarks in Russian Literature*. 132 Indeed, Maurice Baring's contribution in this respect should be acknowledged. In *Landmarks in Russian Literature* (1910) he described Dostoevsky as "equal to Tolstoy and immeasurably above Turgenev." He drew the attention to the lack of a good English translation of Dostoevsky's works; "there is at the moment no complete translation of Dostoevsky's works in England, and no literary translation of the same. Only one of his books: *Crime and Punishment* is known at all, and the rest of them are difficult to obtain in the English language." 133

In England Dostoevsky cannot be said to be known at all, since the translations of his works are not only inadequate, but scarce and difficult to obtain, and it is possible to come across the

most amazing judgements pronounced on them by critics whose judgement on other subjects is excellent. ¹³⁴

Indeed, Dostoevsky's works were only procurable through the ugly translations in the Vizetelly version which was out of print. Swinnerton bought "an ugly Vizetelly production of *A Friend of the Family* and *The Gambler*." ¹³⁵ When Maurice Baring approached a publisher in 1903 with the proposal to translate the novels of either Dostoevsky or Gogol, he was told that there was no market for such books in England. The publisher's judgment was right at that time. However, Russian writing was soon to be regarded as great. During the war years, Dostoevsky became the vogue while both Tolstoy and Turgenev declined in popularity. Bennett's eulogistic review about *The Brothers Karamazov* in the *New Age* marked the beginning of the change. He called the book "one of the supreme marvels of the world." The book became a kind of a holy book when it appeared in Garnett's translation in 1912. ¹³⁶

Garnett started translating Dostoevsky at the insistence of Natalie Duddington. In 1908 they collaborated on translating "An Honest Thief" which appeared in *The Living Age*. Natalie was campaigning for Dostoevsky and wanted Garnett to join her. Garnett's choice to begin with *The Brothers Karamazov* came at Natalie's suggestion; the book was the latter's favourite. Once again Garnett undertook to translate the works of a writer before procuring a publisher. The brave efforts of Arnold Bennett had a hand in convincing William Heinemann that he should take Dostoevsky. Bennett, who had read the book in French and was fascinated by it, called on publishers to entrust the job of bringing the writer's fiction in England to Constance Garnett. Heinemann was a little reluctant in taking Dostoevsky due to a fear of publishing such long novels. He was induced to agree to publish Dostoevsky's translations by the persistence of Arnold Bennett. He accepted the proposal in 1901, and agreed to assign the translation to Garnett to Bennett's great joy who felt "like a social reformer who has actually got something done." ¹³⁷

Garnett's translations of Dostoevsky appeared between 1912 and 1920. In this sense, she was pioneer, because her translations were the first edition in English of the writer's works. The establishment of Dostoevsky's reputation was largely dependent on her translations. Indeed, it was not until the appearance of the Garnett translation that Dostoevsky began to be read with interest in England. Due to the absence of a complete translation of his works in English, his reputation in England was not like the established fame and recognition he enjoyed in Russia, Germany and equally in France. The rekindling of his reputation had to wait till the time of World War when he was idolized. In other words, he had to wait for the Garnett translation which introduced his works, for the first time, to the English public, and simultaneously secured his reputation in England. The war years witnessed a decline in the

popularity of both Tolstoy and Turgenev. It was Dostoevsky now who won great admiration. Arnold Bennett's article in the *New Age* after reading a French translation of *The Brothers Karamazov* paved the way for Dostoevsky's reputation in 1910. And Garnett's translation which appeared in 1912 established and confirmed the appreciation for Dostoevsky.¹³⁸

That the period of Dostoevsky's greatest popularity should have coincided with the World War is partly but not entirely due to accident. It so happened that the best translation of his work appeared between 1912 and 1921 so that only then was the way opened to a real appreciation. Furthermore, wartime propaganda in favour of Russia must be held in large part responsible.¹³⁹

Phelps attributed the great enthusiasm for Dostoevsky, which almost reached the degree of "hysteria," to the influence of the First World War.¹⁴⁰ The war, in his view, disturbed the intellectual and social currents of the period. He saw the emergence of the Dostoevsky cult as an inevitable consequence of the changes in the social, economic and philosophical circumstances of the period. He considered the cult as a "renaissance", since it reflected a liberation from all nineteenth century rationalist and rigid theories. In this sense, Dostoevsky's novels were seen as the embodiment of the issues of the period where the impact of Bergson, Freud, the Impressionist movement, and the Symbolist poetry symbolized the break from the past.¹⁴¹ He emphasized the role the literary historians of the period, like Kropotkin and Maurice Baring, played in increasing the enthusiasm for Dostoevsky. Of particular importance were the works of Dmitri Mereshkovsky, which "helped to provide the mystical vocabulary that was to be put to such energetic use a few years later."¹⁴²

Robert Lynd's expectation in the *Daily News* that "'it is possible that the greatest literary event of the year in this country will be the appearance of the first volume . . . of Mrs Garnett's translation of the novels of Dostoevsky,'" was right.¹⁴³ The appearance of *The Brothers Karamazov* created a cult for the writer. The impact was so great that "writers like Middleton Murry and Frank Swinnerton made Dostoevsky their idol and declared the *Brothers* the greatest novel ever written."¹⁴⁴ Eleven more volumes of Dostoevsky appeared between 1912 and 1920. The volumes achieved a great success, contrary to Edward's expectations; that "the British public would never take to Dostoevsky."¹⁴⁵

Despite the marvellous success of the translations, "Constance lost more than a modest prize."¹⁴⁶ For she had followed her husband's advice and agreed to do Dostoevsky for a flat payment rather than having the royalty agreement she had for Turgenev. Edward could not believe that Dostoevsky's novels would sell in England. Edward, who wrote a

review of the writer in 1906, shared the view of the early critics concerning the reasons for the delay in Dostoevsky's arrival in English translations, "the Englishman's fear of morbidity." Nevertheless, he defended Dostoevsky and praised his insight into the world of the suffering and the tortured, and called *The Brothers Karamazov* a great book. ¹⁴⁷ Constance shared his view; she was sceptical about letting *Crime and Punishment* appear as the second volume in the series for fear of affecting the sales of the other volumes. With this understanding she accepted Heinemann's mediocre terms. He offered nine shillings per one thousand words. ¹⁴⁸

When Edward saw that the volumes were doing well, in an attempt to compensate for this financial loss, he pursued the matter with Heinemann by asking for a re-negotiation of fees and royalties. Constance also wrote to Heinemann about her dissatisfaction with his poor payment after she realized the success of the series. "I am actually being paid less for what I am doing for you now than for the work I did when I had no name and no experience." ¹⁴⁹ In the end, Heinemann consented to pay three shillings more per thousand words on the last five volumes and to pay a five percent royalty after the sale of three thousand copies. ¹⁵⁰

Garnett's accomplishment was greeted with cries of admiration from literary circles. Even those writers to whom Dostoevsky did not appeal, read her translation. The journals of writers like John Galsworthy, Joseph Conrad and D. H. Lawrence are full of references to their reading of Dostoevsky in her translation.

Virginia Woolf considered the influence of Garnett's translation as an important factor in the change from the Victorian novel to the modern novel in England: "After reading *Crime and Punishment* and *The Idiot*, how could any young novelist believe in 'characters' as the Victorians had painted them?" ¹⁵¹ She pays tribute to Garnett when reviewing the fourth volume of her translation for the *Times Literary Supplement*:

Each time that Mrs Garnett adds another red volume to her admirable translations of the works of Dostoevsky we feel a little better able to measure what the existence of this great genius who is beginning to permeate our lives so curiously mean to us. His books are now to be found on the shelves of the humblest English libraries; they have become an indestructible part of the furniture of our minds. ¹⁵²

Dostoevsky's works were read by most of the literary circle. Those who did not admire the writer's art enjoyed the quality of Garnett's translation that introduced them to the writer's works for the first time. Galsworthy remained resolute in his admiration of the art of both Turgenev and Tolstoy

I am reading the *Karamazov Brothers* (sic) a second time; and just after *War and Peace* I am bound to say it doesn't wash. Amazing in places, of course, but my God! - what incoherence and what verbiage, and what startling of monsters out of holes to make you shudder. It's a mark of these cubistic, bold - bespattered - poster times that Dostoevsky should rule than roost. Tolstoy is far greater, and Turgenev. ¹⁵³

Lawrence who was antagonistic to Dostoevsky read the Garnett translation also; to Lady Ottoline Morrell he wrote in 1915 about his reading of *The Idiot*.

I have been reading Dostoevsky's *Idiot*. I don't like Dostoevsky. He is again like the rat, slithering along in hate, in the shadows, and in order to belong to the light, professing love, all love. But his nose is sharp with hate, his running is shadowy and rat-like, he is a will fixed and gripped like a trap. He is not nice. ¹⁵⁴

Likewise, he expressed his dislike of Dostoevsky's work when in 1916 he wrote

I have taken a great dislike to the *Possessed*. It seems sensational, and such a degrading of the pure mind, somehow. It seems as though the pure mind, the true reason, which surely is noble, were made trampled and filthy under the hoofs of secret, perverse, undirect sensuality. . . . But Dostoevsky mixing God and Sadism, he is foul. ¹⁵⁵

Those for whom Dostoevsky did not appeal as a writer, read the Garnett translation and regretted that she wasted her efforts on his works. Conrad, who considered Dostoevsky "too Russian" for him, read the *The Brothers Karamazov* and had this to say about Garnett's translation

Of course your wife's translation is wonderful. One almost breaks one's heart merely thinking of it. What courage! What perseverance! What talent of - interpretation let us say. The word 'translation' does not apply to your wife's achievement. But indeed the man's art does not deserve this good fortune. Turgenev (and perhaps Tolstoy) are the only two really worthy of her. Give her please my awestruck and admiring love. One can be nothing less but infinitely grateful to her whatever one may think or feel about D. himself. ¹⁵⁶

Garnett's translation of Dostoevsky was significant because it not only introduced his works in a readable edition but because it instigated one of the literary phenomena of the period best known as the Russian cult. It was her introduction in 1912 of *The Brothers Karamazov* for the first time in English that started the great enthusiasm for Dostoevsky and made everything Russian desirable and popular.

(d) Chekhov

One of Constance's many remarkable achievements, that came next in importance to her translation of Dostoevsky, was her translation of Chekhov. The publication of her version of Chekhov (1916-1922) was regarded as the second most important happening in the field of translation from Russian literature.¹⁵⁷ She was pioneer, for her rendering of the author was the first complete presentation of his works in English.

Just as her translation of Dostoevsky had resulted in the spread of the Dostoevsky cult which marked the crux of the English interest in Russian fiction, so her translation of Chekhov led to the emergence of the Chekhov cult. Through these translations, Chekhov shared in the vogue which Russian novelists were enjoying with English readers. The enthusiasm that was formerly felt for Dostoevsky was now directed towards Chekhov. The interest in the writer was so great, particularly during the last years of the Great War, as to "put Dostoevsky in the shade with English readers."¹⁵⁸ He was brought to the public's attention during the years when the Dostoevsky cult was reaching, and then falling away from, its peak. The Chekhov craze was in many ways a continuation of it. It was a continuation, however, in a minor key; it represented "the first period of convalescence after the fever had burned itself out, a period of languor, melancholy and inertia."¹⁵⁹

The Garnett translation contributed to the establishment of Chekhov's reputation and the reception of his works in England. Most important is the fact that English readers were indebted to these translations for their knowledge of Chekhov. "In England Chekhov was fairly well known, through scattered volumes of translations, before fresh impetus was given to admiration of his work by the complete Garnett translation."¹⁶⁰ Up until his death in 1904 Chekhov was still a shadowy literary figure in England and America.

Despite the fact that Chekhov's work began to spread beyond the boundaries of his own country, he was virtually unknown to English readers until Garnett brought his work before the English reading public. By the end of the nineteenth century Chekhov was not translated into English, though he had already been translated into German, French and Danish. However, separate translations of his had been appearing since 1891 in English. The only translation available in English of his work was two volumes of short stories done by R. E. C. Long in 1903, and 1908 respectively. The volumes were entitled *The Black Monk, and Other Stories*, and *The Kiss, and Other Stories*; they were published by Duckworth on Edward's advice. Scattered translations of some of his tales were also available rendered by various translators: Marian Fell's *Stories of Russian Life* (1914), and *Russian Silhouettes; More Stories of Russian Life* (1915) were published by Duckworth. Koteliansky, with the collaboration of J. M. Murry, translated *The Bet and Other Stories* in 1915. Adeline Lister's

translation of *The Steppe and Other Stories* appeared in 1915 as well. Through diligence at work Garnett was able, not only to surpass but to overshadow the achievements of these translators. Chekhov might have begun to attract attention and become fairly well known through such translations. But, in fact, he had to wait for the appearance of the Garnett translation for his reputation to be established in England.

The publication of Chekhov was of considerable importance to Constance, since it marked her change of publishers and the rise in payment for her work. Her Chekhov rendering was published by Chatto and Windus, the firm which from then on carried out the publication of all her other translations. With the firm she was happy, and she also received better treatment than she had from Heinemann. Garnett's association with her first publisher lasted for more than twenty years. During this period Heinemann published the major part of her translations which included works by Turgenev, Tolstoy and Dostoevsky. The financial dissatisfaction with Heinemann over the Dostoevsky publication put an end to Garnett's connection with his firm. This came after Heinemann's refusal to take Chekhov.

When Garnett proposed the idea of translating Chekhov's tales in book form in June 1914, Heinemann seemed uninterested. He turned down her offer on the basis that she was still busy with the Dostoevsky translations. He even offended her when he remarked that, "it never occurred to me that you would be interested in publishing Tchekof;"¹⁶¹ Nevertheless, he seemed willing to undertake what he described as a "publishing venture", if Garnett would make a synopsis of the first six volumes, and if he found an American publisher to back up the idea. His proposal never materialized.

The publication of Chekhov, thus, fell to Chatto and Windus. Securing them as a publisher for Chekhov was the outcome of the fortuitous meeting between Edward Garnett and Frank Swinnerton, who was the firm's reader then. At an evening party given by R. A. Scott James and his wife to their literary staff, the two men met over an embarrassing incident and had the following conversation; as narrated by Swinnerton:

"You wrote an article the other day on a Russian edition of Chekhov's letters," said I. "Yes ", said he. "We - Chatto and Windus - have just published some letters of Dostoevsky's. Would Chekhov's be worth translating?" He hummed, staring at me. "No, I don't think so", he said. Then he apparently remembered hearing me say the name of Chatto and Windus. "What an enterprising firm your's is!" he exclaimed. . . . He glared down. "My wife wants to translate some of Chekhov's tales." "I've seen several of her translations in *The New Weekly* ". "Hm." He thought, "Heinemann is considering the idea. He doesn't seem very keen. If he decided against them,

would your firm. . . . ?" "Certainly!" said I. or it may have been in a more cautious phrase: "I think so." 162

Swinnerton had some difficulty before he convinced his senior partners with the idea of publishing Chekhov.

The publication of Chekhov's tales restored to the firm its prestigious status which it had lost by the approach of the nineties. The firm was famous in the heyday of the three volume novel, when it published works by Swinburne, Stevenson, Ouida, Besant, Wilkie Collins, Charles Reade, Clark Russell and many others. The coming of the one-volume novel and the emergence of new, daring publishers like Hutchinson and Methuen made the firm lose touch with the new age. The firm was out of touch with the new tendencies in the publishing business. Frank Swinnerton who had been with the firm since 1907 described them in his *Autobiography* as "publishers who had not quite adjusted themselves at that time to newer conditions." They remained Victorian. 163

The introduction of Frank Swinnerton, Geoffrey Whitworth and other young people to the firm helped its move towards a new and better phase. To Philip Lee Warner was assigned the task of putting "new life into the firm." 164 He succeeded in his mission and "drove the quite, sedate, old fashioned, almost moribund business into feverish activity." 165 He was credited for introducing new blood to the firm. After settling with the firm for one year, he called on Frank Swinnerton and offered him a job as proof-reader and as his general assistant. 166 Geoffrey Whitworth was the firm's art editor, and much more than that; "many of our best books reached the list through his effort." Swinnerton and Whitworth "made an excellent pair." 167 When they arrived at the firm, the control of business was in Percy Spalding's hand after the retirement of Andrew Chatto senior. Spalding read manuscripts, but had no control on business matters. He was "losing touch with popular taste," and "was more interested in figures than in literature." So, they both enjoyed "within limits, exceptional liberty." 168 They were both responsible for many of the new books and writers included in the firm's list.

The decision to publish Chekhov by the firm was taken by Frank Swinnerton. By his insistence, Percy Spalding was persuaded to experiment with two volumes of Chekhov. It was not easy to convince him, but since "he had developed great confidence in my judgement, . . . [he] finally withdrew his objections." 169

Thus, Frank Swinnerton shared the credit with Garnett for introducing Chekhov in 1916. Like Arnold Bennett who was so pleased when Heinemann agreed to publish Dostoevsky, Swinnerton expressed his delight when the Chekhov edition appeared. It is true,

he said, "that they would have been translated and collected if [he] had never lived; but they would have not appeared in 1916."¹⁷⁰

Garnett's early desire to bring Chekhov to the English public dates back to the time of her first visit to Russia. From Chekhov's friend, Baroness Iskul von Gildenbrandt, Constance heard of Chekhov's latest work: "Ward No.6" and about the Sakhalin articles. The first attempt to translate the writer was actually pursued by both Edward and Constance. On reading the story, they thought of offering it to Fisher Unwin for publication. Their first attempt, however, proved unsuccessful, because Unwin declined the offer. Their endeavour continued. On hearing of the appearance of the Sakhalin articles in the *Russkaya Mysl* Constance was hoping, by securing the translation rights of these articles, to be able to introduce Chekhov to the English public, and at the same time, to pave the way for his stories. The scheme did not materialize. ¹⁷¹

Undeterred by the failure of the first two attempts, Constance tried again in 1896. She turned her interest to Chekhov's plays, *The Sea-Gull* in particular. She wrote to Chekhov asking his permission to translate the play for a theatre production. She also told Chekhov about her campaign to bring his short fiction to the English public:

Dear Sir

I have read with great admiration several of your stories in Russian, and have translated one or two of these, and am trying to introduce your work to the English public. Short tales are not as a rule liked by the English reader, but we hope to find among the younger generation a certain number able to appreciate the psychological truth and delicate workmanship of yours.

But I hear that your play, the *Sea-Gull*, has made a great sensation in Petersburg. If you would care to entrust me with the translation of it, I would make every effort to bring it before the English public. I have some influence with the Independent Theatre and with several dramatic critics and excellent connexions with publishers. I can confidently say your work would have better chances in my hands than in most. ¹⁷²

In order to interest Chekhov in her projected translation, she sent him a copy of her translation of Turgenev's *A Sportsman's Sketches*. Chekhov answered her letter and promised to send a copy of the play. The plan fell through like her other two attempts. The play was introduced on the British stage in 1909, but through another translation. Garnett's second attempt to translate a Chekhov play came after nearly ten years from the first attempt. In 1906 she finished translating *The Cherry Orchard*. ¹⁷³

Garnett's keen interest in presenting Chekhov's plays to the English public was in evidence through her determined effort to get her latest translation performed. On hearing of the Moscow Art Theatre tour in certain European countries, Constance hoped by translating the play to have it performed by the company. But the company did not come to England. She tried to interest the Stage Society in the play as soon as she completed her translation. However, the Society did not perform the play till 1911. ¹⁷⁴

Garnett's final attempt to introduce Chekhov before 1916 came in June 1914, when she tried to persuade Heinemann to publish Chekhov's tales. The latter refused in the light of the fact that she was busy with Dostoevsky. ¹⁷⁵

So, Chekhov had to wait till 1916 when Chatto and Windus published the first two experimental volumes. The issue of these volumes was the first link in a long chain. It was followed by the publication of the remaining volumes which constituted, in the end, the collected English edition of Chekhov's works. The main body of Garnett's work consisted of seventeen volumes, thirteen of which were devoted to his tales and appeared between 1916 and 1922, and two volumes of plays in 1923, in addition to two volumes of letters in 1920 and 1926.

Garnett, who supposedly had started to translate Chekhov earlier, managed to get her translations published before 1916. They appeared in different periodicals, and were mainly renderings of short stories. Ford Madox Ford took "At a Country Cottage", "That Hateful Boy", and "A Gentleman Friend" for *The English Review*; they appeared in 1910. *The English Woman*, under Mrs Grant Richards' editorship, published "Hush." ¹⁷⁶ Scott-James, who was editing *The New Weekly* published three of her translations. ¹⁷⁷

While Edward secured Chatto and Windus to take Chekhov, Constance, in the meantime, drafted a plan for the publication of his works. She planned the edition to appear in eight volumes, to extend to ten volumes later, if liked, and to contain all his stories except some early and inferior journalistic sketches. Chatto offered good terms for the edition. Garnett was offered twelve shillings per thousand words, five per cent royalty after the fifteen hundred copies, and the American rights of the edition. ¹⁷⁸

The edition, however, ran to thirteen volumes. Garnett must have suggested the addition of the eleventh and twelfth volumes to Percy Spalding, and was very happy to hear of his approval to extend the edition:

I am so glad you feel able to undertake the further volumes of Tchekhov; Tales. I will take it then as definitely settled that you

can let the series run to twelve volumes & will arrange the remaining stories accordingly. 179

After selecting the stories for the eleventh and twelfth volumes, she found that there were three hundred stories left. Hence the idea of the thirteenth volume of the edition. She approached Percy Spalding with her plan to make up another volume "equal - or nearly equal - in merit" to the other volumes:

I have now made a selection of the stories for vols 11&12 - I find that there are nearly 300 stories left. Among these I think I could easily make up another volume equal - or nearly equal in merit to these - Do you think the series would stand a 13 volume? I shall be very glad to undertake it, if you should think fit - as the inclusion of some of these stories - collected after his death by his family - will make the English edition more interesting & representative of the whole of his work. Let me hear what you think. 180

The stories that constituted the thirteenth volume were translated by October 1921. 181 She chose the title *Love and Other Stories*. By the publication of this volume the Garnett translation of Chekhov's tales was completed. The task which she began in 1916 reached an end in 1922. During these six years Chekhov's tales appeared in the following order: *The Darling and Other Stories*, *The Duel* (1916), *The Lady with the Dog*, *The Party* (1917), *The Witch*, *The Wife* (1918), *The Bishop* (1919), *The Chorus Girl* (1920), *The Schoolmistress*, *The Horse - Stealers*, *The Schoolmaster* (1921), and *The Cook's Wedding and Love* (1922).

When Garnett proposed to do Chekhov's plays, she had not finished her work on his tales. At the same time she was preparing to do Gogol. To Percy Spalding she wrote suggesting the idea; "Another project I have much at heart is the translation of Tchekhov's plays - they would make two little volumes uniform with the Tales, I believe." 182

The publication of the plays had to wait till 1923, where they appeared in two volumes: *The Cherry Orchard and Other Plays*, *Three Sisters and Other Plays*. Her work on the plays clashed with her rendering of Gogol. Besides, she had still in her hand, the last three volumes of the tales. By October 1921 she had only translated two of the plays. They had to be put aside, so that she could finish Gogol's *Dead Souls*. 183 By then, she had the stories of the thirteenth volume translated. During 1922 she was busy with Gogol, and her preparation for translating Herzen. Despite that she found time to do the plays. By 12 June 1922 she had "made considerable progress with the plays & shall be able to let you have the 1st volume of

them in another month or six weeks." ¹⁸⁴ At the end of 1922 she managed to have all the plays ready for the printer, with the exception of two little farces. She chose to include *The Cherry Orchard*, *Uncle Vanya*, and *The Sea Gull* in the first volume; she thought of these plays as first rate plays. The second volume contained *Three Sisters*, *Ivanov* and six short farces. She proposed to call the first volume after the first play, and the second *The Bear* or *The Proposal* for selling purposes. ¹⁸⁵ The inclusion of the two short farces in the second volume was abandoned because "they have no literary merit."¹⁸⁶

We are inclined to believe Edward Crankshaw's statement that "the theatre did not strongly appeal to Garnett, and that she translated for it as a duty - as part of her duty to Chekhov." ¹⁸⁷ Indeed, she might have done what seemed to her an agonizing task out of a desire to make her edition of Chekhov complete. She not only found it hard to do the plays, but she also encountered many difficulties before she completed their translation. She found "the rendering of Tchekhovs' (sic) dialogues in the plays . . . a very difficult task." ¹⁸⁸ On these grounds she demanded to be paid separately for each volume, and asked that the payment should not be on the basis of the number of the words: "I should like to suggest that you should pay me not on the number of words but a fixed sum of £45 per volume (with royalties as on the Tales)." She based her request on the fact that, "a volume of plays will take [her] twice as long as the volume of stories."¹⁸⁹

Garnett faced many obstacles when doing the plays. Apart from the difficulty of translating the dialogue, she admitted her carelessness over the question of stage directions and her inability to provide the right dates of the plays. She found it almost tormenting to deal with the stage directions. Since she was very keen on the quality of her translations, proofs of her work were usually subject to correction and comparison with the original. Nevertheless, she used to ask the help of Percy Spalding in this concern

I should be most grateful if you would correct the stage directions in the plays for me. I am afraid I am abnormally stupid over proof-correcting & about stage directions the Russian is no guide, for . . . the printers in Russia have no principles, on the subject & trust to the impulse of the moment.¹⁹⁰

She acknowledged her incompetence in this respect when she was dealing with the second volume: "I have no wishes or principles about the stage directions in the plays and in fact, I am afraid, no principles was [sic] followed in vol.I " ¹⁹¹ Because she found it hard to correct the proofs of the second volume, Garnett had to ask Spalding "gratefully for a

competent person in the office to look through the proofs."¹⁹² Her request was met, and the proofs were sent to Charles Prentice to be examined. This matter evoked apologetic feelings from Garnett; "I am distressed at the trouble I have put you to over the Tchekhov plays. And please accept my object apologies for the discrepancies in the spelling of names and stage directions." ¹⁹³

Another problem that she faced in the course of her translating the plays was her failure to provide the actual dates of the plays' first performances. Reviewing the London productions of Chekhov's five major plays in 1925-1926 Charles Nabokov criticized her translations on this point:

The Cherry Orchard, The Sea Gull, Ivanov, Uncle Vania and The Three Sisters (I quote in the order of production) have all been seen in London in the course of the last twelve months . . . we find topsy-turvydom in the order in which the plays are placed, and it is quite impossible to understand by what principle the translator was guided in her choice. ¹⁹⁴

Other different kinds of complications came up at the time of her translation to the second volume. She related the delay in sending the volume on time to the problem of nautical terms in *The Wedding*, which she admitted to be beyond her. ¹⁹⁵

Despite all these complications she managed to complete her task and have the plays translated in two volumes as she had wished when she first suggested to translate them. And once again she was a pioneer in her work. The two volumes of plays were the first complete presentation of Chekhov's plays in England. They were published in 1923. Although a few translations of his plays in English had been available, Chekhov had to wait for the Garnett translation for a complete introduction of his dramas. The earliest translation of his plays was the one-act play *The Marriage Proposal* which was done by W. H. Chambers in 1903. In 1909 George Calderon, who was associated with the Scottish Repertory Theatre and the Stage Society translated *The Sea Gull* for a performance by the Scottish theatre. Calderon had *The Cherry Orchard* translated and published with the previous play in a book form in 1912 under the title *Two Plays of Tchekhof*. In the meantime, Garnett had already done *The Cherry Orchard* for a publication by the stage society in 1911. The addition of Chekhov's dramatic works completed Garnett's translation of his works.

Thus, Garnett's dream came true and she managed to present Chekhov in a collected edition to the English public. On receiving her copy of the fifteenth volume she wrote to Spalding,

It is a great joy - & pride - to me to have completed the translation of Tchekhov. It had been a cherished project for many years - & thanks to Chatto & Windus it has been carried out exactly as I hoped & desired - I should hardly have cared to do it at all if it could not have been published in cheap form accessible to the young people who cannot spend a great deal on books. And I believe the little volumes have been widely read & appreciated by just the class of readers I had hoped to reach. ¹⁹⁶

Garnett added two volumes of Chekhov's letters to the edition. The publication of the volume of Chekhov's *Letters to His Family and Friends* appeared in 1920. Chatto had wanted her to translate a volume of Chekhov's letters ever since 1914, when they published a successful volume of Dostoevsky's letters. The offer was made again in 1917. But it was not taken up by her till 1919, because she was busy with Dostoevsky. Spalding proposed the volume to be similar in size to the Dostoevsky volume, for a fifteen percent royalty, in addition to a £60 advance payment on the day of publication. ¹⁹⁷

Her translation of the second volume was out in 1926. She heard, from a Russian friend, that Chekhov's letters to his wife had just been published. She wrote to Spalding about her wish to have the volume for translation. ¹⁹⁸ He secured the copyright of the book. When she finished translating it she proposed to give the title *Tchekhov's Love Letters*,¹⁹⁹ in the hope of inducing more people to read it. The sales of the volume were very poor, however. She came later to regret this decision: "I feel it was a sordid & rather vulgar idea!" Her translation was ready by 1924, but the book was not issued till 1926. ²⁰⁰ This was the last volume she translates of Chekhov. However, she anticipated translating Bunin's *Reminiscences of Tchekhov* when she heard of its publication. (folios, 808, 809; 22, 31, 8, 1924).

Our main concern in this section is to account for the effect of Garnett's translation of Chekhov's works in securing a good reputation for the writer in England. It has already been mentioned that Brewster considered the Garnett translation of Chekhov as the second most important happening in the field of translation from the Russian. Crankshaw expressed the opinion that "Chekhov, for us, is Mrs. Garnett, and Mrs. Garnett is Chekhov - for better or for worse." ²⁰¹ It is claimed that the Garnett translation of Chekhov put Dostoevsky's cult on the wane. Not only that, but it introduced a new cult, the Chekhov cult, the strength of which may not have been as great.

He was brought to the public's attention in fact during the years when the Dostoevsky cult was reaching, and then falling away from, its peak. And the Chekhov craze was in many ways a continuation of it. It was a continuation, however, in a minor key; it represented the first period of convalescence after the fever had burned itself out, a period of languor, melancholy and inertia. 202

Gilbert Phelps, in his analysis of the motives of the Chekhov cult, ascribed the writer's popularity to his "*mystique* [which] though as productive as that of Dostoevsky in esoteric jargon and downright silliness, was more in tune with the mood of the times and the spiritual lassitude of post-war era."²⁰³ D. S. Mirsky, who did not like Chekhov, "found the English liking of Chekhov incomprehensible." The English response to Chekhov was bound to the states of minds prevalent in post-war England. In this respect, he attributed the worship of Chekhov to "the English intellectual's thirst for the unheroic, of which Samuel Butler was the forerunner and Chekhov the fulfilment." Two features attracted the English intellectual in Chekhov, the one ethical, summed up in his attitude towards civilization as a system of negative values. The other feature was his style, "which allows nothing to 'happen', but only and smoothly and imperceptibly to 'become'." 204

C. W. Meister, in his study of Chekhov's reception in England and America, noted that the acclaim of his short fiction was quick to come, whereas his drama had to wait till the mid twenties for a full and complete appreciation. The introduction of Chekhov's short stories coincided with World War I, which, in itself, had influenced the reception of his fiction. For "Englishmen were eager to learn about their new ally, Russia, and many felt that literature was the proper medium for such learning." ²⁰⁵ The less innovative technique of the tales helped their good reception. The realism of his fiction, his form, and style were praised by many critics. The effect of his fiction was obvious on the young short story writers in England who adopted his way of writing, like Katherine Mansfield, H. E. Bates and others.

Richard Garnett believes that Garnett's "new edition did not receive much attention in the press," and that "Chekhov did not make the same impact as Dostoevsky but was carried along as much by the Russian craze as by his own merits." ²⁰⁶ Despite the fact, that both Chekhov and Gorky were regarded as "glosses on or postscripts to the Dostoevsky cult," ²⁰⁷ Gilbert Phelps credits Garnett with the establishment of his reputation: "But it was Constance Garnett's translation of his works in thirteen volumes between 1916 and 1922 that really established his reputation."²⁰⁸

In this section, the significance of Garnett's translation of Chekhov will be accounted for, in addition to the fact that the new edition did receive considerable recognition

from the press. For this purpose we have studied the Chatto and Windus album of reviews where pieces from various national and provincial newspapers - which reviewed the successive volumes of the edition - are kept. Moreover, attention will be focused on the role Garnett's translation played in determining the writer's reputation in England.

The appearance of each volume of the new edition was either noticed or reviewed by the different newspapers and literary periodicals. A common characteristic of the reviews was an emphasis on the Garnetts' role in spreading interest for Chekhov's works and art. Tributes were largely paid to Constance but the efforts of her husband were also acknowledged. The reviews praised her labour in introducing the translations, and that of her husband in providing a better understanding of the writer's art.

Robert Lynd's eulogistic tone, when he reviewed for *The New Statesman* the first two volumes of Chekhov's translations was reminiscent of his praise of Dostoevsky.

We are apparently to have a complete edition of the tales of Tchekhov in English from Mrs. Garnett. It will deserve a place, both for the author's and the translator's sake, beside her Turgenev and Dostoevsky. In lifelikeness and graciousness her work as a translator seems to me to reach a high level. Her first two little volumes confirm one in the opinion that Tchekhov is, for his variety, abundance, tenderness and knowledge of the heart of the "rapacious and unclean animal" called man, the greatest short-story writer who has yet appeared on the planet.²⁰⁹

The publication of the first two volumes: *The Darling*, and *The Duel* showed the extent of Chekhov's popularity. The reviewer acknowledges his genius in depicting common people in his fiction, "there has, I think, never been so wonderful an examination of common people in literature as we find in the short stories of Tchekhov. His world is populous with the average man and the average woman." Chekhov's merit is that his genius lies in its being "a general practice" in the sense that he combines his humanity with his profession as a doctor. He differs from other novelists, namely the tragic realists, whose main concern is the portrayal of ordinary people in a way that makes them appear better than they are actually. For Chekhov this problem is solved, because he

sees that no man is ordinary when once he is seen as a person stumbling towards some goal, just as no man is ordinary when his hair is blown off and he has to scuttle after it down the street. There is bound to be a crisis in his life at some time or

other. Tchegov will seek out the key situation in the life of a cabman or a charwoman, and make them glow for a brief moment in the tender light of his sympathy. He does not run sympathy as a "stunt" like so many popular novelists. He sympathises merely in the sense that he understands in his heart as well as in his brain. He has the most unbiased attitude, I think, of any author in the world. 210

The Times Literary Supplement praised the quality of Garnett's translation in "these two attractive little volumes." In spite of his ignorance of Russian, the reviewer stated that "though none may presume to judge a translation who does not know the language of the original, there is always this to be said of Garnett's renderings - that they do not read like translations." 211 The credit was by no means entirely Constance's. Edward's introduction received similar appreciation. His interesting "Note on Tchegov's Art", was described as "that most appreciative little essay will certainly send any one who read it to the perusal of the tales themselves;" and the *Guardian* felt that his view should be trusted "when he says that they [Chekhov's tales] demand the attention of all who want to understand modern Russian life, especially the life of the educated class." 212

The translated volumes were regarded as a means through which more knowledge of Russian life and character was revealed. The stories in the first two volumes were regarded "as a social study of the varying types of middle class Russian society." The student of Russian life and letters was invited to read the stories for a better understanding and appreciation of the creative talent of the writer as well as for a better picture of the Russian nation Chekhov portrayed so faithfully. They were thought of "as illuminating as any travels and lengthy sojourns in a strange land among a foreign folk." 213 The reviewer of the *Athenaeum* called his readers to read Chekhov's tales "not only for their fine literary qualities, but also for the sake of learning more of Russian character, as shown in peasant and aristocrat." 214 In reviewing the eighth volume of the edition *The Chorus Girl*, the *Yorkshire Post* regarded the new collection of stories as a major factor contributing to the increase of the student's knowledge of Chekhov's faculty of psychological analysis of his countrymen. 215 The same volume was seen by *Auckland Star* as one of the manifestations of the growth of interest in Russian literature in England. The reviewer was sure that the stories would be read by many people, not only for their literary value, but for the light they threw on Russian life. 216 The reviews of the plays followed the same line. The plays that comprised the first volume were seen as reflections of "the aimlessness and the apathetic hopelessness of Russian life." 217 The same plays were regarded by another as "expositions of that Russian futility, of society in a state of disintegration, which came to an issue in tragic revolution." 218

The issue of every new volume brought more knowledge and new facts about Russian life. It also increased the English public's understanding of the writer's art. In other words, the appreciation of Chekhov's art and genius was mainly dependent on Garnett's translation. Chekhov "was a master of the Russian short story, and Mrs Constance Garnett's admirable translation from the Russian enable the English reader to appreciate the remarkable quality of his work." ²¹⁹ Indeed, the translations were appreciated on the grounds of their throwing more light on the qualities of the writer's art and genius. "Though many of them [stories] are too brief and sketchy to allow of any elaboration of plot and incident, they show the writer's power, his insight into character, combined with a characteristic touch of mysticism." ²²⁰ Leonard Woolf noticed the brevity of Chekhov sketches, and their lack of the conventional elaborate plots and incidents. Nevertheless, he praised his power and insight into character. The subtlety and the range of his distinctive genius, the mingling of humour, beauty and irony; the conciseness of his method, and the problem of the incompleteness and lack of a definitive unending of his stories, he saw as part of Chekhov's new method in writing.

But this incompleteness, this sense of questioning to which there is no answer, is not in the accidental facts of the stories, it is present because it is part of Tchekhov's mind and art. It is present even when the story is rounded off with the completest of finalities, death. ²²¹

Woolf labelled Chekhov as the unflinching realist and differentiated between his brand of realism and that of the French school. His realism constituted in the power of picking and introducing the right details:

Dealing with the subtleties of emotions and human relations, he is able with a few words, a single sentence, to place his scenes with all their subtleties vivid and clear-cut before his reader's eyes. Without hesitation or hurry, he picks a word here, a sentence there, and with that contemptuous aloofness which accompanies the certainty of great skill - you can see it at its best in conjurers and billiard players - produces from under the handkerchief a little definite and rounded piece of real life in the form of a short story. That is why so much is made of his "unflinching realism." He has the air of a man who with extreme detachment is going to show you exactly what a little piece of life is like, and to show it to you without comment, without feeling, without any of the tiresome moralisations or bestowal of praise and blame. ²²²

The *Times Literary Supplement's* reviewer commended the life-like characteristic of his tales, his subtle method of reconciliation between futility, failure and beauty, in addition to the harmonization between the two extremes of tragedy and farce in his atmosphere. ²²³ The public was discovering new things about the writer; how he came to trust his own genius, in addition to the perfection of his craftsmanship in the art of short story telling, and the hallmark of the universality of his stories. ²²⁴ J. M. Murry recognised Chekhov's realism, and emphasised it as the distinctive characteristic that makes his work unparalleled. His real world is never a creation or reconstruction of our world, but rather a reflection of it as it actually is. "This impression of reality is overpowering, because it is enchanting. It seems that Tchekov, without restating or reconstructing life, reveals an utterly unsuspected beauty and freshness, so that we say to ourselves not only "This is life," but "This is Life." Murry proceeds to defend Chekhov's pessimism which he regards as a part of his genius. "But this so-called pessimism, which apparently causes many readers to stumble, is but one aspect of his work among many, a single manifestation of his larger genius." Chekhov's depiction of common reality was responsible for the sense of greyness that characterises his stories. Hence the description of his stories as being "glimpses of the stream of life; they have an unmistakable unity, but they have no plot." Murry moves on to discuss Chekhov's method which seemed confusing to many. His discarding of plot in his stories is part of his modernity and his distance from the conventional traditions of writing literature. This method sprang from Chekhov's interest in life and not in creating an imaginary world. His love of life enabled him to portray it faithfully down to its minutest details. "And this almost ecstatic delight in the uniqueness of life is the prime condition of magic of style." ²²⁵

The publication of Chekhov's *Letters to His Family and Friends* in 1920 added to the merits of Garnett's already much appreciated work. "For this volume we owe yet another debt to Mrs Garnett, to her courage, assiduity, and skill. She has made a selection from the total of eighteen hundred and ninety letters published by Tchekov's family," the *Times* reviewer tells us. ²²⁶ Maurice Baring who reviewed the volume for *The New Statesman* wrote "Mrs Garnett has rendered another great service to English readers and to English literature (they already owe her an immense debt of gratitude for her translations of Turgenev and Dostoevsky and of Tchekov's stories) by translating a selection of Tchekov's letters." ²²⁷

In selecting the material for the volume Garnett chose two hundred letters of the whole eighteen hundred and ninety published by his family after his death. In her choice, she was directed by what seemed to her to throw more light on his character, his life and his ideas. Walter de la Mare praised Garnett's accomplishment in the volume very highly:

There are certain books of whose richness and multifariousness it is extremely difficult to give a brief account, and of which anything in the nature of criticism seems to be superfluous. such a book is the selection from Tchehov's letters. Mrs Garnett, to whom we are already unrepayably indebted for the greater part of our knowledge of Russian literature, tells us, that her translation represented less than a twelfth part of the collection published by Tchehov's family. Yet within this compass is contained the essential material of an autobiographical account in Tchehov's own-words not merely of any chief events and activities of his life, but also of his thoughts, moods and emotions as a man, his aim and ideals as a son of genius. 228

While more had been known about Chekhov the writer through the tales, the publication of his correspondence presented a fascinating revelation of the mind of a writer who was so familiar and popular with the English reader. 229 *The Liverpool Daily Courier's* reviewer thought of the volume as worth a niche beside famous letter writers: Lamb, Stevenson and Walpole Fitzgerald. It is a tribute to Garnett that Chekhov "has reached the same rank as Stevenson." 230

Thus the volumes of the Garnett edition were received successively, as they appeared in publication by various newspapers and literary journals. In this respect, the edition received the attention it deserved. What added to the merits of her accomplishment is the fact that Chekhov's art and fiction began to be analysed, and understood through the efforts of enthusiasts like J. M. Murry, Leonard Woolf, and Katherine Mansfield. The impact of her achievement was acknowledged by Murry when reviewing the eleventh volume of the edition :

To her devotion it is due that the English-speaking nations possess the finest series of translation from the Russian in the world. They are better than the German, they are incomparably superior to the French. Because of their inferior versions the most enlightened French critics are even today groping in the dark to find the real significance of Dostoevsky and Tchehov. Not a word has been written in French on either of these authors that goes more than skin-deep. Dostoevsky is still what he was to de Vouge, the prophet of "the religion of suffering" and the author of "Crime and Punishment," while Tchehov is scarcely more substantial than a name. 231

Through Garnett's translations of Chekhov much interest had been aroused in him as a writer and a man. Her edition covered the major bulk of his stories, plays and letters. His reception both as a short story writer and a playwright came to be realized as a result of her efforts in

introducing a collected edition of his works. She began her task in 1916 and completed it in 1923. Thus her edition was largely responsible for the establishment of his reputation. Other factors were involved in the creation of the Chekhov cult, and the securing of his reputation in England. Yet the fact can not be denied that Garnett's translation of his works had been one of the major influences in its emergence. The Chekhov cult, as already mentioned, was seen as part of the Russian craze and a continuation of the Dostoevsky cult. However, the Garnett translation, as this section will show, helped to place him in the context of English literature. Chekhov was only "fairly known", in England through scattered volumes of translations. But "fresh impetus was given to admiration of his work by the complete Garnett translation." 232

In 1900 Constance Balmont, a symbolist poet, bemoaned the fact that the English-speaking world was deprived of Chekhov's stories though they had already been translated into French, German and Danish. Maurice Baring led the advanced attitude of Chekhov in this period. But it was not till the first performance of one of his plays on the English stage that Chekhov came to be known. The period lapsing between his death and this date hardly mentions any thing about him, though the Russo-Japanese War had aroused interest in Russian life and literature. In 1907 John Hankin broke that hostile attitude and praised Chekhov as the prophet of the rapidly developing "Moscow School" of drama, and argued that Chekhov's deep insight in delineating the souls of men and women is far more important than that of the false feeling of thrill. Then came Maurice Baring's praise of his inner insight. Moreover, Baring recognised the characters as real life types, and described his technique as the best, condemning the conventional way where for the sake of plot the mask might be removed, whereas, in real life this could never happen unless as a result of an outbreak of feelings.

The esteem for the writer amounted to a cult, which was led by members of the Bloomsbury group, J. M. Murry, Katherine Mansfield, and many other enthusiasts like Arnold Bennett, Maurice Baring, Frank Swinnerton, John Hankin, and Bernard Shaw. Each one of these critics and men of letters championed Chekhov and his art. The introduction of Chekhov's drama in England (and America) was most unfortunate. His plays were characterized as lacking in the essential element on which a drama should be based. This misunderstanding was soon to disappear when critics such as St John Hankin, Maurice Baring, and George Calderon understood and appreciated Chekhov's new technique in drama. Hence their importance to Chekhov. "They had clarified Chekhov's interpretation of realism, had stressed his universal appeal and had seen that the rejection of the 'well made play' principles would require a change of attitude as much on the part of actors as of audiences." 233 The role Arnold Bennett played was also influential. He stood up for the writer and defended the new technique he employed. He was one of the early critics to promote Chekhov's art.

Arnold Bennett ranked Chekhov with the other great Russian writers; he began to talk about his merits from 1908 in *The New Age*. His review of R. E. C. Long's translation of two volumes was the starting point. He not only recognised Chekhov's realism but ranked him with "the fixed stars of Russian fiction - Dostoievsky, Turgeniev, Gogol, and Tolstoy -" ²³⁴ Likewise, he hastened to defend Chekhov's dramatic technique in 1911 when the performance of *The Cherry Orchard* by the Stage Society evoked much hostility and criticism. He put the blame for the play's failure on the actors who presented the characters in a more comic way than intended by Chekhov, a thing which resulted in their looking grotesque and fools. He proceeds to reflect on Chekhov's genius in portraying these characters as ridiculous as they would be in real life. The realistic approach Chekhov adopted in portraying his characters was alien to the English audience and resulted in their misunderstanding of the characters whom they never thought would exist. Bennett assures them that "persons equally ridiculous and futile do exist in England, and by the hundred thousand; only they are ridiculous and futile in ways familiar to us." Of Chekhov's art he has this to say

In naturalism the play is assuredly an advance on any other play that I have seen or that has been seen in England. Its naturalism is positively daring. The author never hesitates to make his personages as ridiculous as in life they would be. In this he differs from every other playwright that I know of. . . He has carried an artistic convention much nearer to reality, and achieved another step in the evolution of drama. ²³⁵

Much about the development of the artist's technique was revealed through the translated volumes. The introduction of the second and last volume of his plays enabled the reader to follow the evolution of his dramatic art.

Mrs Garnett, benefactress of the age, has now completed her translation of Chekhov. This, the last volume of the series, contains two four-act plays - "Three Sisters" and "Ivanov" - and five short pieces. "Ivanov" was produced in 1887 (Chekhov was then twenty-seven) and "Three Sisters" in 1901 (three years before his death), so that the span of the author's singular development lies between them, from the melodramatic awkwardness of the earlier play to the highly elaborated art of the later. ²³⁶

Although less innovative in technique, "when it first appeared Chekhov's method of short story-telling was called formless,"²³⁷ but later the short story established itself as a

new form which had even its influence on the shaping of the works of some other short story writers such as Katherine Mansfield. The efforts of critics like J. M. Murry, William Gerhardt and Stark Young stressed the presence of unity in Chekhov's work. ²³⁸ These critics provided a better understanding of Chekhov's art. J. M. Murry wrote extensively about Chekhov's method in *The Nation and Athenaeum* between 1920 and 1926. ²³⁹ Virginia Woolf analysed Chekhov's method of writing also. Reviewing the fifth and sixth volumes of his stories for the *Times Literary Supplement*, she described the inconclusiveness of the stories as "giddy, uncomfortable." But, at the same time, she praised

the method that at first seemed so casual and inconclusive, ordinary and upon the level of our own eyesight, now appears to be the result of an exquisitely fastidious taste, controlled by an honesty for which we can find no match save among the Russians themselves. ²⁴⁰

She continued her praise of the writer's art in subsequent reviews of the Garnett translation:

The new volume makes the same first impression as its predecessors, that of extraordinary perfection of craftsmanship. Other impressions come later, but one's first feeling is admiration for one of the most highly skilled creators of short stories that the world has known. Though dealing with conditions which scarcely any Englishman is familiar and but few can adequately realize, these stories bear, as it were, a hallmark of universality. One cannot believe that they are of the type of art likely to be affected by time or place, by fashion or environment. One cannot think that there is likely to be any dispute as to their position in literature. They are indubitable masterpieces after their own fashion. ²⁴¹

The efforts of Edward Garnett's interpretation of Chekhov's art and that of Frank Swinnerton - who made the publication of Chekhov's works possible in 1916 - should also be remembered. Through the endeavours of all these critics and enthusiasts Chekhov came to be popular among this intellectual circle. And his cult, thus, flourished. The British public liked Chekhov's objectivity and his reflection of Russian conditions. Edward Garnett emphasized this point in the introduction he wrote to one of his wife's translations.

Garnett appreciated Chekhov's craftsmanship. His greatness lies in the objective way in which he depicts his characters: "he stands close to all his characters, watching them

quietly and registering their circumstances and feelings with such finality that to press judgement on them appears supererogatory." 242 In addition he shows his greatness in delineating the problems and intricacies of life resulting in an atmosphere that is a true reflection of every day life. In order to understand his art "Tchehov must be seen in relation to Russian culture, if his English readers are not to see him out of focus."243 Edward took pains to promote Chekhov as distinctively modern. In his view it is the fusion of the scientific and artistic attitude which made Chekhov modern. This faculty of his art did not characterize his outlook as hard or bitter. Since the general case is that once the writer uses the scientific approach, he is doomed to be captured within its limited boundaries. But Chekhov's profound understanding of human nature helped him overcome this weakness. Another aspect of his modernism lies in the fact of his being a "representative of the changing horizons and complexity of the social organism of the new Russia."244 Such was Chekhov's greatness and wide range of themes and subject matter that he was able to cover so many aspects of Russian life. Not only that but "he caught the new vistas of our modern emotions and apprehensions; the new "values" moral and intellectual of our modern vision."245.

The issuing of the Garnett version of Chekhov's plays in 1923 aroused the same reaction of misunderstanding to Chekhov's dramatic art. The failure of the performances of a few of his plays was attributed to the lack of unity in his art, and to Garnett's carelessness over the stage directions. The quality of the plays' translation - particularly the dialogue - was strictly criticized. Percy Lubbock found the plays of the second volume to be "swathed in a veil which it is impossible to strip away entirely, and which perpetually hampers a really close view of them."

In narrative the veil is of far less account, and there Mrs. Garnett has often made us forget it. But in dialogue the difficulty is immensely increased, and in dialogue such as Chekhov's it may perhaps be insuperable. 246

He also accused Garnett of translating literally, and not having followed a consistent rule in rendering the dialogue.

The Garnett translations introduced Chekhov the playwright, but it was not until 1925 that he became fashionable among theatre audiences. Moreover, the translation was responsible for creating a vogue for Chekhov, particularly during the plays' run in the 1925-26 season. Garnett's translation of the plays was used by various theatre groups; *The Cherry Orchard* was produced by Fagan company, *The Sea Gull* by Ridgeway, while *Ivanov*, *Uncle*

Vanya and *The Three Sisters* were produced by the Stage Society under Komisarjevsky's direction.

Tchehov's drama has been coming into its own in this country lately with a rush. The surprisingly decent run which *The Cherry Orchard* had was followed by a performance of *The Sea-Gull* at the Little Theatre, which gave a great deal of pleasure; the Stage Society performed *Ivanov* to enthusiastic audiences the other day, and at the present moment *Uncle Vanya* is running at the Duke of York's Theatre, and *The Three Sisters* is being performed at Barnes to such good houses that we may expect it to move to the centre of London shortly. What is more, the same sort of playgoers who usually ask their neighbours at dinner with bright alacrity, if they have seen the latest Noel Coward or Milne play, now actually show a disposition to use Tchehov as a conversational gambit. This is indeed surprising.

The establishment of Chekhov's reputation as a playwright can be partly attributed to the efforts of critics like Desmond MacCarthy, James Agate, Ivor Brown and W. A. Darlington who showed unceasing support for his plays, and partly because of the introductions to his stories. Nevertheless, the credit remained Garnett's

The spread of the taste for Chekhov has been due mainly to two causes, though I think we dramatic critics have helped in a measure: Constance Garnett's translation of his stories (*Chatto and Windus*), and, above all, the delicate, imaginative expertness of M. Komisarjevsky. 247

Although the rising interest in the Moscow Art Theatre induced more enthusiasm for Chekhov's drama, Chekhov had to wait till the mid-twenties for his drama to be accepted. During 1925-26, production of five of his plays were performed with a great success. The plays were directed by Komisarjevsky. Meister listed four factors in his attempt to account for Chekhov's dramatic success then: "his role as a fiction writer, publication of his personal papers, the post-war disillusionment, and visits of the Moscow Art Theatre." 248

The 1920s was the decade in which Chekhov's reputation was finally established and received its highest acclaim. After the Garnett introduction of his works, numerous biographical works, and reminiscences of him by Russian authors appeared in publication on a regular basis between 1920 and 1927. "This period, then, is characterised by the acceptance

and indeed emulation of Chekhov's technique as a writer of short stories and plays." 249 "After the acceptance of the Chekhov story came that of the Chekhov play, received at first with bewilderment but recognized in time as a play depending for its effects upon mood and atmosphere, and dramatizing futility."250

Such was the impact of the Garnett translation of the writer that Chekhov as a short story writer and playwright was evaluated through her version of his works. Fifty years after the death of the author her version is considered one of the standard translations available. The credit is all Garnett's for introducing Chekhov's work during that period. Moreover, her translations attained for Chekhov's stories the position of an English classic. Her version still remains "the only substantial selection of Chekhov's stories available in English." 251

Garnett's translation of Chekhov helped to establish the Russian writer as part of the Russian craze in Britain. Chekhov was hardly known to the English at the beginning of the century. It was only after the introduction of his works in cheap editions of the translations of Garnett that he became popular. His reputation was assured by the second decade of the century. Garnett had already presented the bulk of his work in English. Besides there were many publications about his life and letters that led to increased knowledge about the writer's life and art.

(e) Gogol and Herzen

Garnett's presentation of Gogol's works was the first complete appearance of the writer in English. The translation, which covered the novels and dramatic sketches of the writer, appeared in six volumes between 1922 and 1928. Gogol's first translation in English dates back to 1847 when *Blackwood's Magazine* published a translation of his story "The Portrait." 252 In 1860, when translations from the Russian multiplied, *Taras Bulba* and *Night of Christmas Eve* were published. A mutilated version of *Dead Souls* appeared in 1854 under the title *Home Life in Russia*; the book was ascribed to a Russian noble, and was thought to present a true record of Russian life. It was not until 1886 that the book was rightly ascribed to its author, and that happened when Isabel Hapgood published her version. That was further mutilated when "a concocted *Continuation* " of it was added, and "this defect was not remedied until Constance Garnett published her version in 1922."253

In 1921 Percy Spalding wrote to Garnett suggesting the plan of translating Gogol: "a good translation of Gogol is badly wanted. Would you be interested in doing it? . . . Presumably one would start with "Dead Souls." 254 Garnett was surprised at the coincidence because she had been of late considering doing Gogol:

How curious that you should write about my translating Dead Souls! Or have you perhaps chanced to meet my husband & discuss the subject with him? I have for sometime considered translating Gogol - (when I have finished Tchekhov's stories). I have been intending to write to you & ask you whether you would undertake it. Certainly it would be best to begin with Dead Souls.²⁵⁵

She signed the agreement concerning Gogol in May. She agreed with all the terms it mentioned but objected to the item relating to the date of its completion. She, thus, altered the date from 1921 to 1922. By October she had already started to work on *Dead Souls*.²⁵⁶

Her rendering of Gogol clashed with her work on Chekhov. When she agreed to do Gogol, she still had on hand the translation of the thirteenth volume of the tales, and she had not begun working on his plays. In order to finish *Dead Souls*, she had to put aside the Chekhov plays and to devote herself to translating the book. The book was ready by June 1922,²⁵⁷ and appeared in publication at the beginning of November 1922.²⁵⁸ She was delighted to see the *Times Literary Supplement's* good notice; she also hoped that this would help the book's sales. After *Dead Souls* she embarked on translating a volume of stories. *The Overcoat* volume which contained five stories, "The Nose", "The Portrait", "The Carriage", "The Overcoat", and "The Diary of a Madman", appeared in 1923.²⁵⁹ The fourth volume of the edition *Evenings at a Farm Near Dikanka* appeared in 1925, because during the last two years she was busy finishing Chekhov's letters to his wife, and she was also working on Herzen. The fifth volume contained four stories: "Old-fashioned Landowners", "Taras Bulba", "Vy", and "The Story of how Ivan Ivanovich quarrelled with Ivan Nickiforvitch." She started to translate the dramatic works, which were to constitute the sixth volume in 1926; the volume was entitled *The Government Inspector*. D. S. Mirsky who reviewed the volume for the *Nation and Athenaeum* ranks Gogol's place as second in Russian estimation after Pushkin. He also praises Garnett's efforts in making him available in English translations. "In Germany he is already the increasingly successful rival of Dostoevsky, and in England Mrs. Garnett has now set her indefatigable energy to the accumulation of a complete English Gogol." He goes on admiring the writer's dramatic technique and its similarity to that of Ben Jonson and Shakespeare. However he stops short of acknowledging the quality of Garnett's translation:

Mrs. Garnett's reputation as a translator from the Russian is sufficiently firmly established. But what was good enough for Turgenev and Chekhov is not necessarily good enough for the greatest master of Russian prose. Both the imaginative richness

and the never-failing adequacy of Gogol's Russian is largely squandered away by Mrs. Garnett. She knows the meaning of Russian words, but is often ignorant of their associational and emotional value - as well as of Russian life. Her Gogol never produces the impression her Chekhov does on me. When I am reading Mrs. Garnett's Chekhov I am under the delusion that I am reading the Russian original; with her Gogol I am keenly conscious of the reality. (4 December 1926) p. 340.

The last volume *Mirgorod* appeared in 1928. Garnett's translations were always welcomed "Seldom have we had such a wholly delightful book from Russia, seldom such a boisterous, mischievous one as this. And of Mrs. Garnett's translation can one say more than that one never thinks of it as a translation at all?"²⁶⁰

At time of their publication Gogol's volumes were doing very badly. Accordingly the firm was losing money. Garnett had hoped for the sales to improve when the edition would be complete. But the situation remained the same. She was distressed at the idea of the firm losing money, and was ready to hold back the last two volumes of the edition. But Chatto were kind enough and they did not drop the volumes. The only volume that procured a considerable success was *The Overcoat*.

Herzen, elsewhere Alexander Gertsen, was a Russian aristocrat whose advanced political views led to his exile in Siberia. Obtaining permission to leave Russia he came to live between London, Paris and Geneva. In England he started a paper, *The Bell*. His memoirs are interesting because of the light they throw on the political situation in Tsarist Russia under Nicholas II, and the influence Herzen's political views had on the growth of the reform movement. Spalding suggested to Garnett the translation of Herzen, while she was still working on Gogol, "in order that Gogol might not be left to come out alone." Garnett accepted the suggestion: "About later work - I have always desired to translate Herzen - the Memoirs - . . . If you would care to arrange for a translation of Herzen's Memoirs I shall be delighted to undertake it."²⁶¹

Garnett used the new complete edition of the memoirs which was published in Berlin in 1921 by the Slovo Company. The edition was authorized by Herzen's family. Garnett wanted her edition to be the authorized English edition. ²⁶² So, the firm secured the copyright from the German company. ²⁶³

Translating Herzen presented certain difficulties. In addition to the historical references which needed to be checked by her assistant, there was the problem of the transliteration of names from different European languages. ²⁶⁴ Garnett's failing eyesight added another complication; she was completely dependent on her reader now. For this reason,

she could not give Spalding a fixed date to complete the edition. ²⁶⁵ However, the major obstacle which threatened to put an end to her translation was the American edition of the *Memoirs*, which the Yale University Press and Humphrey Milford were about to publish. The two volumes of J. D. Duff's version of the memoirs were published by the Oxford University Press just few months before her own version. The latter appeared sometime in March 1924.²⁶⁶ Garnett feared that the firm would not go on with the three remaining volumes, and would abandon the idea of the publication. "What are we to do? I feel distressed to think that of course there can be no thought of the other three volumes - & I have grown so fond of Herzen & taken so much pleasure in the work - it is like parting from a dear friend. ²⁶⁷ But Spalding was determined to carry on with the rest of the edition. ²⁶⁸ The third volume came out in November 1924, and was followed by the fourth volume shortly after. ²⁶⁹ The bad sales of the edition threatened the appearance of the final volume. Despite all these difficulties she completed the edition which ran to five volumes, and appeared under the title *My Past and My Thoughts*. Her edition was not complete. Although she was not very happy about it, Garnett undertook to make a few cuts from the original: "I hate abridgements as a rule, but I am afraid his extremely leisurely style will put English readers off." The cuts in the Herzen volumes amounted to 190 lines out of 10,000 lines. ²⁷⁰

Leonard Woolf reviewed the publication of the first two volumes of the memoirs in J. D. Duff's and Garnett's translation, and found it a "curious coincidence" to have two versions of Herzen's memoirs. He, nevertheless, praised Garnett's two volumes because they had

the immense advantage of completeness. While Mr. Duff stops at the end of Part II., she gives us in addition Parts III. and IV, thus more than doubling the length of the book, an important consideration, especially when it is remembered that some of the best things in the memoirs are to be found in the latter half.²⁷¹

When the last volume of Gogol appeared in 1928, Garnett wrote to Olive - Edward's sister - "I have given up translation for good now." Nevertheless, that was not the end of her translations. For David tried to persuade her to do some more translations. Indeed, he succeeded in making her translate Turgenev's play *A Month in the Country*. Besides, Spalding seemed to have suggested to her to translate Schedrin. Although she was convinced that the writer's works should be available in English, she refrained from undertaking the job. (folios 837, 29, ix, 1922).

4. The Quality of the Translations

Before bringing this chapter to a close, a few words must be said about the quality of Garnett's translation in general, and about her Chekhov rendering in particular. It should be noted that the detailed study of the faults and virtues of the translations are not within the scope of this study. What is more important is to give a record of some of the criticism her translations received.

At the time of their first appearance, Garnett's translations were praised highly on the ground of their being directly translated from the original Russian. In general the translations were described as good and as reading like the original. The enthusiasm her translations evoked in the British men of letters is but a proof of their remarkable quality. Some of these men who read the Russian classics in French or German paid tribute and commended her achievement. Arnold Bennett, who happened to read Dostoevsky in French, thought the writer's works read better in French translation. This statement came before his reading of Garnett's translation; he heralded her version of *The Brothers Karamazov*. He also spoke highly of her versions of Turgenev and Chekhov.

It should be noted that much of the early criticism was done in the absence of any knowledge of the Russian language. Edward Crankshaw's is one of the earliest in this respect. Despite his ignorance of the Russian language he praised Garnett's accomplishment when he wrote that "to us she means Russian literature in English." He thought of her as "the born translator," and more important he did not think of her only as a translator but as "an artist in her own right."²⁷² She not only put Russian passages into good English. But she "re-created the Russian classics in another medium: the medium of English experience."²⁷³

The lack of specialized studies in this field prompted such treatment of her translations. Some of the Russian natives who read her translations marvelled at this excellence. Others criticized them very strictly. D. S. Mirsky forgot that he was reading a translation when reading the tenth volume of her Chekhov tales:

I had not opened a book of Tchekhov's for these two or three years. But the novel experience of reading Tchekhov in a foreign language did not seem at all novel to me - of such exceptional and sustained excellence is Mrs. Garnett's version - the old familiar pages of the unseemly and shabby original editions were all the time before my eyes.²⁷⁶

Charles Nabokov, when reviewing the production of Garnett's versions of Chekhov's plays in the successful 1925-26 season, praises the efforts of the director, and, at the same time, criticizes the actors' failure to convey the emotional atmosphere of the plays. Although he mentions the lack of rehearsals as part of the reason, he puts most of the blame on the quality of Garnett's translation. Nabokov found fault with Garnett's disregard of the way proper names were pronounced; she translates the French 'Alexandre' into 'Alexandr', she keeps the Russian expression "Ach," and fails to distinguish between the different meanings of the word "seitchass", confusing the use of its five English equivalents, in addition to her misuse of the word talent. He found the language as "heavy as lead because it is obviously a translation." He adds that her literal translation resulted in sentences that were hard to utter by actors. "Such sentences occur so often that to memorise a part in any of these plays must, indeed be a strain."²⁷⁷

In the course of the whole bulk of the Garnett translation of Chekhov, it was the quality of her translations of the plays that received the severest strictures. This criticism came from the press, as well as from the specialized critics. His rather more eulogistic criticism did not prevent Crankshaw from pointing out "certain blind spots " in her work: "She did, it seems to me, lack the sense of dialogue."²⁷⁸

The dialogue in Chekhov's plays was the main point on which the attack centred. Percy Lubbock attributed this to the fact that "Mrs Garnett tries to keep too closely to the Russian wording; she might have allowed herself a looser rule in dialogue." In "A Note on Translations" Beverly Hahn found fault with Garnett's translations of the plays. "Mrs Garnett does occasionally take liberties with Russian colloquialisms and other idioms," but,

the question of their 'quaintness' or otherwise seems to me a matter of taste; allowing for the fact that there are probably better translations of the plays, still the number of Garnett's 'misconceptions' seems to me to have been exaggerated.²⁷⁹

His examination to two passages from Garnett's and Elisaveta Fen's translation of *The Cherry Orchard* found Garnett's version "generally more accurate to the original, surer and more eloquent."²⁸⁰ Despite his criticism Hahn acknowledged Garnett's role in enhancing the writer's reputation. He regarded her edition as the "standard translation of the main body of [his] stories, novellas and plays." The fact that they were completed by one "single translator" added to their merit, thus "preserving a certain uniformity of sensibility."²⁸¹

Lauren G. Leighton shared Hahn's view that Garnett had a good ear for English sound. In his assessment of the quality of translation of Chekhov's stories and plays, he examines different translations by analysing different passages which presented problems of style in addition to other related problems of "lexicon, syntax, and intonation." When discussing the issue of the contemporaneity of translations, Leighton did not rank Garnett with Long and Koteliansky whose translations were found to be "outdated."²⁸²

Mrs Garnett has often been cited as an example of an outdated translator, but the fact is that her work has survived extraordinarily well. Her versions are still used by such modern editors as Ralph E. Matlaw, Magarshack, Yarmolinsky, David Greene, and Edmund Wilson (Wilson did not acknowledge his use of her texts). No matter how persistently some modern critics try to dismiss her work as hopelessly "Victorian," she remains an icon - her thirteen-volume collection of stories has just been republished in a new paperback format.²⁸³

Such was Garnett's merit that of all the pioneer translators, she was regarded as "more competent, more skilful, and more enduring." And her translations were the only ones that had survived. ²⁸⁴

Professor Tovey, the Russian linguist who made a comparative study of Garnett's translations, was delighted to read her versions: "I consider it a test of the mastery of the art of translating if a devotee of the original is charmed by a translation." ²⁸⁵ Tovey found Garnett's translation of Gogol's *Dead Souls* "the best illustration of [her] inevitable ear for language." Her examination to two phrases from the book in Garnett's and Nabokov's translation credited Garnett with rendering "the sense and rhythm of the original," ²⁸⁶ while Nabokov's poetic and lyrical style was very unlike the original. Tovey gave high praise to Garnett's translation of Dostoevsky, and of Turgenev. With the latter she forgot that she was reading an English translation rather than the original text. ²⁸⁷

Garnett's translations of both Dostoevsky and Turgenev were highly regarded by later scholars of Russian literature. Helen Muchnic who studied Dostoevsky's English reputation described Garnett's translation of the writer as "the first adequate translation in English and remains the most honest, close, and natural one."

It reproduces better than other translations the special quality of Dostoevsky's style, an eminently "plain" style, of a plainness that is the product of two qualities: a sharp intelligence which

strikes through to the ultimate simplicity of what it observes, and a democratic temper which expresses itself most easily in colloquial rather than "literary" idiom. A good translation should convey his effect of bare simplicity. but before Constance Garnett this was not achieved, as one may readily see by comparing the different versions of any given passage.²⁸⁸

Likewise Garnett's version of Turgenev "set a new standard for translations of Russian literature" on the grounds of its being a translation from the Russian directly. Turton, who defended Garnett's translation of the writer against critics who found her version to be "full of omissions and errors," admitted the presence of these defects. "But the former are few and relatively minor, while the latter appear to occur mainly in idiomatic dialogue - and then rarely." ²⁸⁹ The power of her handling of the narrative and descriptive passages was set against the lack in "idiomatic inflexibility."²⁹⁰

In spite of the fact that her translations were found to be inaccurate and full of slips and faults, they are still highly regarded by modern scholars. The fact that they are still appearing is but a proof of their merits.

Garnett's devotion to her-life work of the task of translation was gratifying. Her thirty-five years in the business produced over seventy volumes of translations of the masterpieces of Russian literature. Such was her reputation that her name became synonymous with the great Russian writers whose works she introduced to the English speaking world.

Indeed, the merit of the Garnett translation lies in the fact they introduced for the first time English versions of the works of the great Russian classic writers like Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov, and that they put an end to dealings with translations of a second-hand nature which were done either from French or German. The lack of any English version made popular these French and the German translations. Many English readers acquired their knowledge of Russian works through the channels of foreign translations. The introduction of the Garnett editions enabled the public to appreciate and to prefer the English versions. The enthusiastic response to the translations was much in evidence. Each time her translations appeared, a vogue was created for the writer whose works she introduced. Her Turgenev created a vogue just before the close of the century, her Dostoevsky was responsible for instigating the Russian cult, and her Chekhov started a boom for the writer. Her translations of Gogol and Herzen might not have had similar effects but, nevertheless, were influential in introducing their works to the British public for the first time in complete editions. Her translations not only introduced the works of the great Russian authors but also initiated the study of their art, and appreciation of their works. Furthermore, they had their impact on the

course of the English novel. The British public and most of the literary figures of the day were indebted to Garnett for their knowledge of Russian literature. This came to be discernible in the works of those English writers who started to follow the example of the Russians. The impact of Dostoevsky was great; it left its marks even on the works of those writers who did not like his art. D. H. Lawrence's indebtedness to Dostoevsky is evident to some critics in his writing of *Women in Love*, *Kangaroo*, *The Escaped Cock*, and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Similarly, Dostoevsky's influence on Conrad's fiction is apparent to critics in *Under Western Eyes*, *The Sisters*, *Nostramo*, and *The Secret Agent*. The influence of Chekhov on the study of short story and play-writing was largely acknowledged. Katherine Mansfield's indebtedness in learning the art of short-story writing from Chekhov cannot be denied. G. B. Shaw, not only modelled his *Heartbreak House* on *The Cherry Orchard*, but after reading Chekhov's plays felt ashamed that he had written plays before.

Notes

1. Carolyn Heilbrun, *The Garnett Family* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961), p. 165.
2. "Constance Garnett", *New Republic* (6 January 1947), p. 40.
3. Ibid.
4. Edward Crankshaw, "Work of Constance Garnett", *The Listener* (30 January 1947), p. 195.
5. Carolyn Heilbrun, *The Garnett Family*. p. 15.
6. Ibid., pp. 34-48.
7. Ibid., p. 16.
8. Frank Swinnerton, *The Georgian Literary Scene: A Panorama* (London: William Heinemann, 1935), p. 243.
9. Richard Garnett, *Constance Garnett.: A Heroic Life* (London: Sinclair - Stevenson, 1991), p. 8.
10. David Garnett, *The Golden Echo* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1953), p. 6.
11. Ibid., p.31.
12. Ibid., p. 35.
13. Ibid.
14. Richard Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 16.
15. Ibid., pp. 26-27.
16. Ibid., p. 29.

17. David Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. p. 6.
18. Ibid., p. 31.
19. Ibid., p. 35.
20. Ibid.
- 21 Richard Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 36.
22. Ibid., p. 47.
23. Ibid., pp. 55-60.
24. Ibid., p. 64.
25. Ibid., p. 38.
26. Ibid., pp. 39-41.
27. Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. p. 9.
28. Ibid., p. 23.
29. Richard Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. pp. 231-2.
30. Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. pp. 15-19.
31. Ibid., p. 59.
32. Ibid., p. 16.
33. James T. Boulton, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Volume I. (Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 16.
34. Frederick R. Karl, Laurence Davies, eds. *The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad*. Volume I: (1861-1897) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 268.

35. Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. pp. 10-13.
37. George Jefferson, *Edward Garnett : A Life in Literature* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1982), p. 19.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid., p. 74.
40. Ibid., p. 83.
41. Ibid., p. 76.
42. Ibid., p. 81.
43. Ibid., p. 86.
44. H. E. Bates, *Edward Garnett* (London: Max Parrish, 1950), p. 31.
45. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 110.
46. Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. p. 6.
47. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p.32.
48. Ibid., p. 87.
49. Ibid., p. 103.
50. Ibid., p. 130.
51. Ibid., p. 129.
52. Ibid., pp.8-9.
53. Ibid., p. 106.
54. Ibid., p. 115.

55. Ibid., p.122.
56. Ibid.,p. 130.
57. Bates, *Edward Garnett*. p. 31.
58. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p.109.
59. Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. p. 53.
60. Edward Nehls, *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*. Vol. II: 1919-1925, (Madison: the University of Wisconsin Press, 1958), p. 413.
61. Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. p. 104.
62. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 170.
63. Ibid., p. 251.
64. Ibid., pp. 250-1.
65. David Garnett, *The Flowers of The Forest*, Being Volume Two of *The Golden Echo*. (London: Chatto & Windus, 1955), p. 182.
66. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 328.
67. Ibid., pp.108-9.
68. Ibid., pp. 132-3.
69. Ibid., p. 191.
70. Ibid., p. 198.
71. Crankshaw, "Work of Constance Garnett." p. 195.
72. Heilbrun, *The Garnett Family*. p. 186.

73. Ibid., p. 166.
74. H. V. Marrot, *The Life and Letters of John Galsworthy* (London: William Heinemann, 1935), pp.36-7.
75. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 122.
76. Ibid., p.318.
77. Ibid., p. 250.
78. Bates, *Edward Garnett*. pp. 28-29.
79. Ibid., p. 84.
80. David Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. p. 8.
81. Heilbrun, *The Garnett Family*. pp. 70-2.
82. Ibid., pp. 79-81.
83. Garnett, *The Golden Echo*. pp. 72-3.
84. Ibid., pp. 131-135.
85. Heilbrun, *The Garnett Family*. p. 95.
86. Ibid., p. 66.
87. Ibid., p. 65.
88. Ibid., 149.
89. Daniel Weissbort, "Constance Clara Garnett", in Harry B. Webber, ed., *The Modern Encyclopaedia of Russian and Soviet Literatures* , Vol. 8. 1987, p. 111.
90. Heilbrun, *The Garnett Family*. pp. 97-9.

91. Edward Garnett, "The Contemporary Critic", in *Friday Nights* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1922), p. 354.
92. Ibid., pp. 358-365.
93. George Jefferson, *Edward Garnett: A Life in Literature*. p. 73.
94. R. A. Scott-James, "Edward Garnett", *The Spectator* (26 February 1937) p. 362.
95. Edward Garnett, ed., *Letters from John Galsworthy*. p. 209.
96. G. Jean - Aubry, *Joseph Conrad, Life and Letters* (London: William Heinemann, 1927), p. 192.
97. Donald Davie, ed., *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction*. p. 1.
98. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 73.
99. Ibid., p. 109.
100. Ibid., p. 95, 108.
101. Ibid., p. 123.
102. Ibid., p. 145.
103. Crankshaw, "Work of Constance Garnett." p. 195.
104. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 183.
105. Arnold Bennett, *The Academy* (21 October 1899)
106. Marrot, *The Life and Letters of John Galsworthy*. p. 391.
107. Frederick R. Karl, *The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad*. p. 236.
108. Ibid., p. 209.

109. Jefferson, *Edward Garnett*. p. 183.

110. Glyn Turton, *Turgenev in the Context of English Literature, 1850-1900*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Warwick, 1984.

111. *Ibid.*, p. 232.

112. *Ibid.*

113. *Ibid.*, pp. 246-7.

114. *Ibid.*, p. 248.

115. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 96.

116. *Ibid.*

117. *Ibid.*, p.149.

118. *Ibid.*, p. 154.

119. *Ibid.*, p. 109.

120. *Ibid.*, p. 142.

121. *Ibid.*, p. 143.

122. Ivan Turgenev, *A Lear of the Steppes*. tr. by Constance Garnett. (London:William Heinemann, 1922), p. xiv.

123. Ivan Turgenev, *The Jew and other Stories*. tr. by Constance Garnett. (London:William Heinemann, 1922), p. iv.

124. *Ibid.*, p. xii.

125. *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

126. James Hepbrun, ed., *Letters of Arnold Bennett*. Volume II: 1889-1915, (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 81.
127. T. S. Eliot, "Turgenev", *The Egoist*. (December, 1917), p. 167.
128. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p.182.
129. Gilbert Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction* (London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1956), p. 15.
130. Sidney Colvin, ed., *The Letters of Robert Louis Stevenson to Family and Friends Vol II* Ninth Edition. (London: Methuen, 1910), pp. 20-21.
131. Muchnic, *Dostoevsky's English Reputation*. pp. 66-7.
132. Donald Davie, ed, *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction*. pp. 2-4.
133. Maurice Baring, *Landmarks in Russian Literature* (London: Methuen, 1910), p. 81.
134. Ibid., p.131.
135. Swinnerton, *Background with Chorus*. p. 139.
136. Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968) pp. 336-7.
137. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 259.
138. Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*. p. 337.
139. Muchnic, *Dostoevsky's English Reputation*. p. 5.
140. Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction*. p. 181.
141. Ibid., pp. 170-1.
142. Ibid., p. 161.

143. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 262.
144. Samuel Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*. p. 337.
145. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 263.
146. Bates, *Edward Garnett*. p. 45. or see Richard Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 265.
147. Edward Garnett, "Dostoevsky", *Academy* (1 September 1906), p. 202.
148. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 259.
149. *Ibid.*, p. 265.
150. *Ibid.*
151. Virginia Woolf, "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown", *Collected Essays Vol. One* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1966).
152. Woolf, "More Dostoevsky", *The Times Literary Supplement* (22 February 1917)
153. Marrot, *The Life and Letters of John Galsworthy*. p. 391.
154. George J. Zytaruk, James T. Boulton eds., *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence Vol II*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), p. 311.
155. *Ibid.*
156. Aubry, *Joseph Conrad: the Collected Letters*. p. 140.
157. Dorothy Brewster, *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1954), p. 173.
158. *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* (12 April 1920)
159. Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction*. p. 187.
160. Brewster, *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships*. p. 232.

161. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 289.

162. Frank Swinnerton, *Background With Chorus: A Footnote to Changes in English Literary Fashion between 1901 and 1917* (London: Hutchinson, 1956), p. 92.

163. Frank Swinnerton, *An Autobiography* (London: Hutchinson, 1937), pp. 108-9.

164. *Ibid.*, p. 109. Lee Warner was introduced because the firm was having difficulties in meeting the competition of new publishers. according to Swinnerton, their list was lacking in new and successful names. On such grounds their business was failing. On his arrival Warner carried changes that were not always met with consent, but he was determined to update the firm. p. 122.

165. *Ibid.* p. 123.

166. *Ibid.*, p. 109. Lee Warner worked for Dent for a short while; Swinnerton described him as "the reader, adviser, inventor of books and whirlwind." He offended Dent by addressing a memoranda to him using his initials. Before he left the firm, he told Swinnerton, "I am going to Chatto and Windus. Got a partnership. When I've got room for you, I'd like you to come." Swinnerton, *Background With Chorus*. p. 92.

167. *Ibid.*, p. 155. Whitworth became later the Director of the British Drama League and a great encourager of amateur dramatic craft. He was more than the firm's art editor since many of the best books on their list came through his efforts.

168. *Ibid.*, p. 161.

169. *Ibid.*, p. 174.

170. *Ibid.*

171. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 160.

172. *Ibid.* p. 161.

173. *Ibid.*, pp. 161-2.

174. Ibid., pp. 254-5.
175. Ibid., pp. 288-9.
176. Ibid., pp. 253-4.
177. Ibid., 287.
178. Ibid., pp. 304-5.
179. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 721 (17 March 1919).
180. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 741 (1 March 1921).
181. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 757 (6 October 1921).
182. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 739 (16 March 1921).
183. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 757 (6 October 1921).
184. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 753 (12 June 1922).
185. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folios 790-91 (13 December 1922).
186. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folios 793 (23 December 1922).
187. Crankshaw, "Work of Constance Garnett."p. 196.
188. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 740 (16 March 1921).
189. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 731 (26 March 1921).
190. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 761 n.d.
191. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 773 (16 August 1923).
192. Ibid.

193. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 759 (14 January 1923).
194. Charles Nabokoff, "Chekhov on the English Stage", *Contemporary Review* Vol 129, 1926. p. 757.
195. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 771 (21 July 1923).
196. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 781 (23 November 1923).
197. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 306.
198. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 802 (28 May 1924).
199. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 789 (14 July 1924).
200. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 806 (5 August 1924).
201. Crankshaw, "Work of Constance Garnett." p. 196.
202. Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction*. p. 187.
203. Ibid.
204. D. S. Mirsky, "Chekhov and the English", in Donald Davie, ed. *Russian Literature and Modern Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 206.
205. Charles Meister, "Chekhov's Reception in England and America", *The American Slavonic and East European Review* XII, 1953, p. 114.
206. Garnett, *Constance Garnett*. p. 305.
207. Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction*. p. 185.
208. Ibid., p. 187.
209. Robert Lynd, *The New Statesman* (18 November 1917), p. 160.

210. "The perfect Story-Teller", *The New Statesman* (18 November 1916), p. 159.
211. "Tchehov's Tales", *The Times Literary Supplement* (9 November 1916), p. 537.
212. *The Guardian* (8 February 1917).
213. *Glasgow Herald* (4 January 1917).
214. *The Athenaeum* (December 1916).
215. *The Yorkshire Post* (14 April 1920).
216. *Auckland Star* (10 April 1920).
217. *Granta* (18 June 1923).
218. *The Manchester Guardian* (16 June 1923).
219. *Truth* (15 May 1918).
220. *The Yorkshire Post* (14 August 1918).
221. Leonard Woolf, "Tchehov", *The New Statesman* (11 August 1917), p. 464.
222. *Ibid.*, pp. 447.
223. "Tales by Tchehov", *The Times Literary Supplement*. (22 September 1921), p. 609.
224. *Ibid.*
225. J. M. Murry, "The Method of Tchehov", *The Nation and the Athenaeum* (8 April 1922), pp. 57-8.
226. *The Times*, (12 February 1920).
227. Maurice Baring, "Tchehov", *The New Statesman* (21 February 1920).
228. Walter de la Mare, "Tchehov's Letters", *Westminster Gazette* (28 February 1920).

229. "Letters of Tchegov", *Outlook* (14 February 1920).
230. "The Letters of Anton Tchegov", *Liverpool Daily Courier* (9 February 1920).
231. J. M. Murry, "The Method of Tchegov." p. 57.
232. Brewster, *East-West Passage*. p. 232.
233. Victor Emeljanow, *Chekhov: the Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), pp. 39-40.
234. Arnold Bennett, *Books and Persons*. p. 117.
235. Ibid.
236. Percy Lubbock, "Chekhov Translated", *The Nation and Athenaeum* (8 December, 1923) p. 379.
237. Brewster, *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships*. p. 232.
238. Emeljanow, *Chekhov: the Critical Heritage*. p. 13.
239. Ibid., p. 20.
240. "Tchegov's Questions", *The Times Literary Supplement*. (16 May 1918), p. 231.
241. "Stories by Tchegov", *The Times Literary Supplement*. (18 November 1920), p. 756.
242. Edward Garnett, *Friday Nights*. p. 41.
243. Ibid.
244. Ibid., pp. 52-3.
245. Ibid., p. 66.

246. Percy Lubbock, "Chekhov Translated", *The Nation and Athenaeum*. (8 December, 1923), p. 379.
247. Desmond MacCarthy, *The New Statesman*, (6 March 1926). The 25th May 1925 was hailed by Francis Birrell as a date to be remembered in the history of the English theatre for being the day on which Chekhov was first put on for a run in London. "Chekhov Arrives at Hammersmith," *The Nation and the Athenaeum*, (30 May 1925) p. 267. In another article, reviewing the performance of *Uncle Vanya* on Barnes Theatre, Birrell attributes much of Chekhov's reputation with the British public to the efforts of Komissarjevski. In his view, the success of the play and the actors' excellent performance in presenting it was due to the producer. "Chekhov Well Produced", *The Nation and the Athenaeum*. (23 January 1926) pp. 583-4.
248. Meister, "Chekhov's Reception." p. 117.
249. Emeljanow, *Chekhov: The Critical Heritage*. p. 16-18.
250. Brewster, *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships*. p. 236.
251. Beverly Hahn, *Chekhov, A Study of the Major Stories and Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. x-xi.
252. Brewster, *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships*. p. 65.
253. Phelps, *The Russian Novel in English Fiction*. p. 17.
254. Percy Spalding to Garnett, Reading Letterbook No 589 (15 march 1921).
255. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 739 (16 March 1921).
256. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 728, (23 May 1921), f 757 (6 October 1921).
257. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folios 753-7.
258. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 734.
259. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 1086 (13 May 1921).

260. "Evening on a Farm Near Dikanka", *The New Statesman* (21 August 1926) p. 534.
261. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 755 (12 June 1922).
262. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 784 (16 September 1923).
263. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 1090 (2 October 1923).
264. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 755 (12 June 1922).
265. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folios 788-9 (26 June 1922).
266. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 811 (31 March 1924).
267. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 787 (4 September 1923).
268. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 1088 (10 November 1923).
269. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folio 1101 (4 June 1926).
270. Constance Garnett to Percy Spalding, Reading, folios 790-1 (13 December 1922), folios. 793-4 (23 December 1922).
271. *The Nation and Athenaeum* (5 April 1924).
272. Crankshaw, "Work of Constance Garnett." p. 195.
273. *Ibid.*, p. 196.
274. *Outlook*. (30 July 1921).
275. Nabokoff, "Chekhov on the English Stage." p. 762.
276. Crankshaw, "Work of Constance Garnett." p. 196.
277. *The Nation and Athenaeum* (8 December 1923).

278. Hahn, *Chekhov: A Study of the Major Stories and Plays*. p. xi.
279. Ibid., p. xiii.
280. Ibid., p. x.
281. Lauren G. Leighton, "Chekhov in English", in Toby W. Clyman, ed., *A Chekhov Companion* (London: Greenwood Press, 1985), p. 292.
282. Ibid., pp. 294-5.
283. Ibid., pp. 302-4.
284. Roberta Rubenstein, "Genius of Translation", *Colorado Quarterly* Vol. xxii, No 3, 1974. p. 364.
285. Ibid.
286. Ibid., p. 365.
287. Muchnic, *Dostoevsky's English Reputation*. p. 62.
288. Turton, *Turgenev in the Context of English Literature, 1850-1900*. p. 306.
289. Ibid., p. 317.

CHAPTER THREE

Aylmer Maude (1858-1938)

The services of the translator to what must be called the serious reading public are too easily underrated, and for a variety of reasons it is possible that the debt English people owe to Aylmer Maude, the translator and interpreter of Tolstoy, has not been adequately recognised. It was Maude more than any other man, it might be said, who through his translations of Tolstoy discovered for an unsuspecting generation of readers here the almost fabulous realm of Russian literature. There were others besides him who produced English versions, both here and in the United States, of Tolstoy's novels and his more celebrated controversial writing. Some were even earlier in the field, two or three were both good Russian scholars and skilful translators. But Maude was without doubt the most conscientious and the best equipped of them all. ¹

Indeed, Aylmer Maude is renowned as an authority on Tolstoy, an interpreter and expounder of the writer's ideas in Britain. He might not have been the first to introduce the writer to the English public. But his monumental edition of Tolstoy's works - published in twenty-one volumes between 1928 and 1937 - is still regarded as the standard English version. His main tribute to the writer was the completion of the Centenary Edition, which is unique in its quality, and which is still regarded as the best translation of Tolstoy's works in English. The concern of this chapter is to deal with each one of these points. However, special attention will be paid to the issue of the Centenary Edition. How it originated, the long and tedious preparation for it, and eventually, its completion, is our subject.

Before we proceed to discuss these issues, a brief sketch of Maude's life, education, early career in the business sector, in addition to the circumstances that made him Tolstoy's translator will be provided.

1. Family Background and Education

Aylmer Maude was born on 28 March 1858 at Ipswich, the north sea port in Suffolk. His father, Francis Henry Maude, was curate of Holy Trinity Church. His mother, Lucy Thorp, came of Quaker stock. ² Maude was the younger son and he had an elder sister.³ As a boy Maude was educated at Christ's Hospital, London, where he spent six years from 1868 to 1874. He must have had some preliminary education at home, since the admission to the school required the pupil's knowledge of reading. ⁴

The poor background of his family required a charity based education. For Christ's Hospital was "one of the most noble achievements in English education, founded, and continued over the centuries, out of goodwill and charity." ⁵ The school was ranked as a lower-middle class school, with a tendency to attract poor and unfortunate families. Its pupils came from different classes of society; they were the sons of merchants, clerks, clergy, professional, military, or naval officers, besides fatherless boys. ⁶ Admission to the school was made through the recommendation to one of its many Governors. Nevertheless, the economic status of a family was paramount in the final acceptance procedure. Maude's parents, we may conclude, were not very well-off and that they belonged to the clerical lower-middle class. Thus, Maude entered the school on the ground of his being the son of a clergyman, when he was nominated by one of the school's benefactors.

The school qualified its pupils for hardly anything but the chance to enter the commercial life.⁷ Christ's Hospital had a traditional system of education, and very few of its boys went to Cambridge or Oxford.⁸ Children usually left the school at an early age to join business life. Despite this, the school produced a handful of distinguished names in the eighteenth century. Among the Hospital's Old Blues - as its students were known, owing to their blue coat dress - were Charles Lamb, Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Leigh Hunt. ⁹ Maude emerged later as one of its remarkable figures in the literary world. It is doubtful, though, whether his success in the field of translation could be attributed to the school's education.

Maude's years at the school were the most wretched years of his life; he had many unhappy memories. Although no records have survived of that early period of his life to help us find out why he should call his years at the school the "most wretched" ¹⁰ of his life, we have reasons to believe that the conditions of the school itself might have been responsible for his unhappiness. Life, it appears, was very harsh at the school. "Not only was the diet hardly

above subsistence level; flogging seems to have been an everyday occurrence, and bullying was rampant." ¹¹ However, he was relieved of his misery and unhappiness when he was invited by his sister to go to Moscow.

Maude's eldest sister, Lucy, who was a governess for a wealthy Russian family in Moscow, took Maude to be educated in Moscow. He was only sixteen years old when he arrived in Moscow. There he attended the Lyceum for two years (1874-1876). The expenses of his studies were provided by Lucy's employer, out of gratitude to her. Maude left the school due to an unpleasant incident, and he started to earn his own living. ¹² Among the papers of the Maude archive there is a letter from a relative of Maude referring to his decision to leave the school. The nature of the incident that prompted his departure, however, is not mentioned. But Maude was encouraged to come back to England. ¹³

We may assume that Maude went to Russia with the object of establishing a career. He took up residence in Russia, and stayed for twenty-three years before returning to England in 1897.¹⁴ After leaving the Lyceum he worked as a tutor of English to the boys of a wealthy family for a period of three years (1887-1880). It seems that he was engaged on a clerical job for the following three years (1880-1883). ¹⁵ Then he joined the business world where he stayed for nearly fourteen years occupying an important post in the carpet industry. Maude was in his mid-twenties when he began his career as a director of a carpet manufacturing firm, and later as a manager of the wholesale department of one of the largest and most famous British firms. He owed his admission into the carpeting business to his connections with some of the British business men in Moscow.

In 1884 he married Louise Shanks, the daughter of James Stewart Shanks, an English businessman settled in Moscow. Their marriage was solemnized at the British Consulate in Moscow, and was actuated according to the rites of the Established Church. He had four sons: Arnold, Aylmer Henry, Herbert and Lionel. Further contacts with the British community enabled him to enter the business world. As a result of his acquaintance with Guy Mirrielees, the Scottish head of the largest department store in Moscow, he was employed as a director of the carpet section of Muir and Mirrielees between 1883 and 1890. At the end of his engagement with the company and for the next seven years, from 1890 to 1897, he was associated with the Russian Carpet Company as a manager of the wholesale division of its Moscow branch.¹⁶ The company was a branch of John Crossley and Sons Ltd., the British carpet manufacturer of Halifax. Maude's services as a manager with the previous company were appreciated by the

head of the company who expressed his deep regret at Maude's departure and wished him luck in his new job

As you are about to leave our business we have much pleasure in hereby attesting our entire satisfaction with your . . . and services in the capacity of manager of our Carpet branch since your entry in November 1883 up to the present day. We regret that you are leaving and wish you every success in your new undertaking. ¹⁷

Maude's new undertaking was in the same field. He became the manager of the Moscow branch of the Russian Carpet Company.

We might wonder what were Maude's qualifications that secured his admission to the board managing the affairs of both companies. His past occupation as a teacher of English could hardly have qualified him for such a post. However, there is the possibility that his education at Christ's Hospital might have provided the basis for his engagement in the business world. The school, as mentioned earlier, prepared its students to enter commercial life. Added to this is Maude's experience as a clerk. Maude's career in the carpet business was a prosperous one. The wages John Crossley and Sons paid its employees were high compared to other carpeting firms. Although the managers and executives were paid less than the salesmen and designers, they were paid an average of £300 per year. ¹⁸ Moreover, Maude was fortunate enough to get a large share of the Russian Carpet Company's profits, which enabled him to retire from business early. The Maudes were left with a good provision to live on after returning to England. ¹⁹ However, for the sake of business convenience he held on to the post till the end of 1897.

Maude resigned from the board of the company when he decided to return to England in 1897. His decision was taken under Tolstoy's influence, as will appear later. In a letter to Marchetti, the head of the company, written in 1896, Maude expressed his desire to quit his job and his eagerness "for each step which tends to set me free to follow my bent." ²⁰

Maude did not break his business association with Russia when he returned to England in 1897. He did not sell his shares in the company. Thus, his contacts with the company continued. The transference, and later, selling of his shares were undertaken through his brother-in-law, James Shanks. Moreover, his advice on business-related matters was often sought. The letters from the Muir and Mirrieles file, in the Maude Archive, deal with such

matters as money transfer, in payment of shares dividends due to Maude from the company, while the correspondence relating to the Russian Carpet Company, included in the Crossley Carpet Papers, deals with business matters and the transference of shares. Some of the letters in this collection date from the time when Maude was still with the company. ²¹

2. Meeting and Contacts with Tolstoy.

Before returning to England Maude had made the acquaintance, and become a close friend of Tolstoy. Through this friendship Maude came to be not only Tolstoy's translator, but interpreter and expounder of his ideas in Britain. Indeed, his friendship with the writer laid the foundation for a life's devotion to the translation of his works into English and to the propagation of his ideas. This relationship, as will appear later, formed the nucleus for his great achievement, the Centenary Edition. It made Maude famous as Tolstoy's best translator, and, at the same time, presented Tolstoy's complete works in a standard version to the English public.

Maude's friendship with Tolstoy was also significant for him as a person. It not only made him an authority on the writer, but it affected his personality and way of thinking. It broadened Maude's view of Russian life, and gave him different perspectives on life in general. Their friendship lasted until Tolstoy's death, covering a period of twenty-two years. Maude saw a lot of Tolstoy between 1895 and 1897. He continued personal contact with him despite his return to England in 1897. Maude was also in touch with members of Tolstoy's family after the writer's death.

In 1888 Maude's brother-in-law Dr. P. S. Alexeyev took him to see the great Russian. Maude was greatly impressed by Tolstoy's personality, and his patience in explaining his views, which did not interest Maude then. At that stage Maude was barely acquainted with Tolstoy's writings. But he was aware of his disapproval of money-making, an idea which Maude found difficult to comprehend. During this period Maude was engaged in his business in the carpet industry. Moreover, he was vigorously convinced of the power of the science of political economy. ²²

When asked to call on the writer again, Maude did not do so immediately, and not till some time had passed. Maude attributed this to various reasons - shyness, a feeling that it would not do to teach Tolstoy political science, but mostly owing to a belief that Tolstoy had

nothing to teach him. ²³ Ten years passed before they met again. When Maude read Tolstoy's later works, he became interested in his views. He also felt the need to consult him on things that perplexed his understanding. Their second meeting thus took place in 1897. ²⁴

For the previous ten years Maude had been very much involved in his work as a manager of the carpet company. The world of business with its strains, and stresses, its competitive atmosphere started to tell on his health:

the strain and worry of competitive commercial life told on my nerves and health. I began to see that political economy needed hitching on to the rest of life, and read Tolstoy's later works with attention. ²⁵

It can be said, that Maude's reading of Tolstoy's later works was actually the starting point of their friendship. The experience changed Maude's views about the writer. So radical was the change, from an almost complete scepticism and disbelief in what Tolstoy preached into a conviction that his message was one of ultimate truth. Thus, Maude found himself again at Tolstoy's house, and their friendship started from that time: "From that time till the day which I left Russia I never spared an opportunity of obtaining his guidance and instruction from him."²⁶ His visits to the writer's house became more frequent and he saw a great deal of him during the first quarter of 1897. ²⁷

Tolstoy influenced Maude immensely. Through his acquaintance, Maude's view of life broadened and he became more interested in discussing matters of the spirit. He also came to know more of Russian life and customs. "I had left England when I was sixteen . . . till the time I began to know him, my outlook had been a narrow one . . . his writings and conversations came as something fresh and immensely inspiring. I stepped out into a world of new interests." ²⁸ However, the greatest of influences was Maude's sympathizing with his teaching and new ideas. The last issue would change the course of Maude's life completely, and would lead him to a new vocation which would gain him renown as an important figure in the literary world.

On reading Tolstoy's later works which expounded the latter's views on social, economic, and moral issues, Maude was converted to Tolstoyism; he became one of Tolstoy's many disciples. He accepted Tolstoy's theories and interpretations and particularly his indictment of the industrial system. Under Tolstoy's influence Maude was to engage in the

activities of one of the Tolstoyan communities in England and to help the Doukhobors migration.

Despite the fact that he refused to be called a Tolstoyan, his activities and practices, at one stage in his life, contradict this, and, moreover, stress the notion that he acted in a Tolstoyan manner. His giving up of the well-paid job in the carpet industry came as a result of his acceptance of Tolstoyan principles. Simultaneously his return to England and settlement in a Tolstoyan community there was induced by Tolstoy. Tolstoy, it should be remembered, did not force Maude, or anybody else, to join such communities. However, the fact that Maude wanted to put into practice Tolstoy's views is a decisive proof of his converting to Tolstoyism. "I was naturally anxious to see the practical application given to Tolstoy's views by the men he most commended." ²⁹ This point will be discussed in more detail in the following pages of this chapter.

In 1897 Maude returned to England on Tolstoy's request and recommendation. He gave up his prosperous carpet business. He had lived in Russia for more than twenty-three years and was looking forward to the time when he could retire from business and go back home. Having accepted Tolstoy's principles as regards money making, Maude found it difficult to reconcile his new beliefs with his commercial undertaking:

His denunciation of existing conditions made me feel dissatisfied with the methods of so clean and honest a business as the one in which I was engaged. Tolstoy's indictment of the whole industrial system is so scathing that, as it were, it wipes out the discrimination between better and worse business, and sets one comparing things as they should be rather than with things as we can make them. ³⁰

The Maudes joined the Purleigh Colony, Essex. They agreed to abide by the rules of the community and accepted the new way of life; they agreed to live on a smaller allowance and share the Tolstoyan life of the community. Maude's desire to see the practical application to Tolstoy's views was the main motivation behind his joining the colony. He was anxious to find the truth behind Tolstoy's belief in the immorality of all governments and their legal institutions:

Churches and Governments stood condemned because the actual results of their activity did not correspond with the aims they professed. The time had come to submit Tolstoy's teaching to the same test. ³¹

Cooperative communities were popular in England before the spread of the Tolstoyan movement. The desire to escape from the industrial system and the need for a more moral way of life initiated the formation of such communities. With such a background of communal experiments the Tolstoyan movement was introduced to the country. In England, Tolstoyism grew up as a result of the effect of Tolstoy's writings, and as a reflection of the social changes characteristic of British society then. Tolstoyan communities flourished at the end of the 1890s and by the beginning of the twentieth century most of these groups had disappeared.

A brief sketch of the tendency towards Tolstoyism in England, and its roots, is essential for the understanding of Maude's experience as a member of one of these communal settlements that were prevalent at the end of the last century. The introduction of Tolstoyism in England coincided with the emergence of alternative communities. The utopian ideas represented a mood of rejection of the capitalist system. The eighteen nineties were years of intensive activity in this concern, and Essex and the West Riding were popular places for establishing these communities. Anarchist views were a common characteristic of the new cooperative societies. The last decade of the nineteenth century was a period tinged with a general opposition to the State. The practices of the industrial system, with its increased bureaucracy and monopoly, induced anarchism as a form of revolutionary activity with the aim of preparing a new social order. Nevertheless, there were ideological differences among the anarchist communities. Anarchism in England was classified into two distinctive ideologies, "'anarchist communism' and 'religious anarchism'". Both Tolstoy and Kropotkin exercised their influence on the development of practical anarchism in England. Tolstoyism was regarded as religious anarchism to distinguish it from the other sort of anarchism associated with violence. Through his writings and personal contacts with a number of English communitarians Tolstoy influenced the English community movement. Tolstoy's ideas of moral consciousness and the rejection of the State were particularly attractive to the communities in England. The Purleigh colony was the first Tolstoyan community in England. Other landmarks in Tolstoyan community activity, besides the Purleigh settlement in Essex, were Croydon in Surrey, and Whiteway in Gloucestershire, in addition to the communities that spread in the north.³²

Although Tolstoyism never existed as a sect, yet the rise of a Tolstoyan movement both in Russia or abroad came as a strong proof of its great impact. The best manifestation of its existence was seen in the emergence and spread of the many communal settlements that

adopted Tolstoy's views and which were largely prevalent at the end of the last century. Such colonies were established in Russia, in Europe, in England and Holland and in the United States. The prophetic writings of Tolstoy had their impact on a great number of people who out of a desire to accord their lives with what Tolstoy preached tried to live up to his newly founded doctrine. Among those who came under the spell of Tolstoy's teaching were Chekhov, Nikolai Leskov in Russia; Edourad Rod, Romain Rolland, Paul Bourget and Paul Margueritte in France. ³³

Tolstoyism consisted in the formation of groups or settlements where the communitarian system of living, cooperative denial of human law and state influence, self-government and self-supporting principles were being practised. The colonists were people who accepted Tolstoy's views of no-Government, no-property and non-resistance, and who wished particularly to undo with the industrial system and to live by the dictates of conscience and reason. ³⁴ Tolstoy might not have encouraged such colonies, but he regarded them benevolently. The formation of such colonies outside Russia was attributed to those disciples who accepted Tolstoy's views as a basis for life. The disciples include J. K. Vanderveer in Holland, Eugene Schmidt in Austria-Hungary, and J. C. Kenworthy who was the founder of the first venture of its kind in England, the Purleigh colony. ³⁵

What was Tolstoyism? W. B. Edgerton defines it as "the whole complex of beliefs that coexisted from about 1880 on in the mind of Leo Tolstoy", and his doctrine of non-resistance, consisting of the rejection of the state and all institutions derived from it.

Unquestionably Tolstoy himself, however, considered the heart of Tolstoyism to be the doctrine of non-resistance to evil through violence, which Tolstoy had derived from studying the New Testament record of the life and teachings of Jesus. This fundamental doctrine, which might be called Christian anarchism, led Tolstoy with ruthless logic to reject the state, which can exist only on the basis of physical force, and all the institutions that derive their authority from the state, including the law courts, the police, all military forces, and even the state-supported and monopolistic Orthodox Church. ³⁶

Edgerton also attributes Tolstoyism to Tolstoy's youthful enthusiasm for Rousseau, and to his acquaintance with the writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon.

Nevertheless, critics and Tolstoy's specialists agree that in essence Tolstoyism consists of Tolstoy's doctrine of non-resistance and that he arrived at this doctrine after his study of the teaching of Jesus in the Gospels. In his own words Maude writes:

In the ultimate form to which Tolstoy developed it, the doctrine of Non-Resistance means that *no physical force must be used to compel* any man to do what he does not want to do, or to make him desist from doing what he likes.³⁷

According to P. Brock "Tolstoy's conversion", the birth of Tolstoyism "dates back to the late 1870s."³⁸ In his view, Tolstoyism represented Tolstoy's conception of a new religion: "his new religious outlook had not formed suddenly in his mind; a long spiritual and mental evolution lay behind its emergence into the open then." Other critics regarded Tolstoyism as the "only uninteresting and dull aspect of the life of one of the greatest geniuses the world has ever known."³⁹

Although Tolstoyism spread in different European countries, in England it was connected directly with Tolstoy through the participation of some of his friends in popularizing his new doctrine. Tolstoy's stature as a moral teacher was upheld together with the artistic significance of his works. This is the case because Tolstoy the prophet and Tolstoy the artist were presented simultaneously in Europe. The European reader was acquainted with *What I Believe, War and Peace, Anna Karenina, A Confession*, and this gave prominence to Tolstoy the artist, whose moral and artistic insights were praised by such critics as Arnold, De Vogue, and Dupuy.

M. J. de K. Holman attributes the spread of Tolstoyism in England to the popularity Tolstoy enjoyed. His ideas on social issues "fell on fertile and well prepared ground", and his moral, religious, and political views accorded "with the prevailing anti-establishment mood" of the period. It was a time of unrest where political, social and religious issues were debated. Tolstoy's religious and political tracts appealed to many individuals, who were longing to experiment with a new order of life. Added to this is the fact that Chertkov made England the chief centre of his publishing activity when he came to live in the country after his banishment from Russia.⁴⁰

Tolstoy's ideas of non-resistance were the main inspiration for the communities. Tolstoy, in fact, exercised his influence through his writings and personal contacts with a

handful of these communities. Hence the profound influence he exercised on the English community movement. This close link was established through the circulation of Tolstoy's views, through the making of his translations by participants in the colonies, and finally through pilgrimages made by colonists to Yasnaya Polyana. ⁴¹

All communities that were shaped according to Tolstoy's ideas were known as Tolstoyan. They were called so because they accepted the cooperation of religious anarchism of Tolstoy's ideals as the best means to achieve their aim. Also, most of these colonies propagated Tolstoy's writings and saw in his example the nearest manifestation of their adventure. ⁴²

Such communities were attempts to put into practice the philosophy of Tolstoy as it was then emerging through various translations of books, pamphlets and letters. The Purleigh Colony (1896), the Ashington Colony (1897), the Brotherhood Workshop in Leeds (1897), the Wickford Colony (1898), the Whiteway Colony (1898) and the Blackburn Brotherhood (1899) were all attempts to reorganise life on Tolstoyan lines. ⁴³

The pre-eminent among these colonies was Purleigh, because of its link with the other communities. Whiteway, however, comes as the most significant owing to its long survival. Wickford, Blackburn and Whiteway share the same characteristics with each other in regard to their promotion of Tolstoy's writings. Another common feature is that their founders were previously members of the Purleigh Colony, and that after the latter's dispersal they allied themselves with various other colonies; they were regarded as the initiators. ⁴⁴

3. Maude as a Disciple

The Purleigh Colony promoted - like other Tolstoyan communities - a form of religious anarchism. Purleigh was the outcome of the Brotherhood Church, Croydon, near London, which was established in 1894 by J. C. Kenworthy and J. Bruce Wallace. Kenworthy was converted to Tolstoyism when he read Tolstoy's works in 1890. He was on his way to America with his family. He returned to England and lived in Canning Town among the poor for two years where he attempted to establish societies on cooperative principle. With the help of Bruce Wallace he formed the Brotherhood Trust as the nucleus for a future co-operative society. Its members came from "anti-establishment groups." The Brotherhood drew in

Atheists, Spiritualists, Individualists, Communists, Vegetarians, and many others. Kenworthy's aim was "the establishment of an alternative society based on brotherly and honest labour." The best way to achieve the Utopian vision was to follow the promising principles as advocated by Tolstoy, and to practise this form of new labour and living in actuality. The need to extend the cooperative venture at Croydon prompted the move to Purleigh, Essex. The active participation in a land colony was thought to be the key to achieve the ideal of "bread-labour." Search for the land began in the second half of 1896. However, the formation of the colony dates back to 1897. Ten acres of land were bought from a J. Nunn. This step was taken out of desire to live the communal life in actuality. The land was purchased with the financial support of different members, particularly Arnold Elijorat who was a lecturer in Chemistry at the Royal College of Science, Kensington. Elijorat came into a legacy which he donated to the colony when he joined as a member. The colony commenced with three pioneers. And work on the land started; a workshop, an incubator, and a green house were built. The constructive work of building homes and cultivating the earth continued during 1897, and the number of active colonists increased. With the arrival of Chertkov and Maude and the attraction of other individuals, the colonists' number amounted to sixty-five. The activities of the colony also attracted publicity. In addition to the *New Order*, Kenworthy established a printing press at the site. ⁴⁵

Purleigh was also the pioneer in advocating Tolstoyan ideas. The colony maintained links with Tolstoy through the presence of two of his friends. Chertkov came to raise money for the Doukhobors, Maude came back to settle in the vicinity, in addition to the arrival of two Doukhobors families. *The New Order*, the colony's journal, published the settlement's news, as it had reported the meetings of the Brotherhood Church before. The Brotherhood Publishing Company published Tolstoy's social and religious works. Some of these translations were done by Maude. ⁴⁶

The aim of the colony as put in the words of one of its members was 'bread labour.' "The principle at the basis of the undertaking, is to substitute as far as that may be done, co-operation for competition. " The colonists "profess to be a creedless association, with a Christian-Socialistic tendency of the Tolstoy cast, and go in for hard work and self-sacrifice."⁴⁷ Two of the colonists ascribed their conversion to the effect of the writings of Leo Tolstoy. The colonists consisted of businessmen, and a few Russians among whom, it was claimed, was a princess. When the venture first started there were colonists living and cultivating the land. Others joined later or lived nearby the colony's site. This increased the number of colonists to sixty-five.

In 1897 Maude returned to England with his family. At first they stayed for a few months at the Brotherhood Church, Croydon. They later moved to stay at Wickham's Farm, near Purleigh. Wickham's was near Danbury, about half-a-mile from the colony. There Maude lived in a "square red and white brick " house.

Maude became engaged, with his family, in the physical and spiritual activities of the colony. These actions took the form of donating money, accommodating colonists, and providing food. His wife cooked vegetarian meals for the colonists. (She is reported to have said that her years at the colony were the best of her life.) The *Essex County Chronicle* reporter described Maude as "a distinguished member" of the Brotherhood, ⁴⁸ when he went to interview him. The reporter found Maude engaged on work when he called on him: "He was thinning out kale." Maude was, in fact, made an honorary member of the colony and this qualified him to attend all the colony's monthly meetings. It also provided him with "an equal voice with the full-timers in resolving colony business." ⁴⁹ Maude spent two years at the colony, where he practised Tolstoyan principles in full. On the colony's dispersal in 1900, he left Purleigh and moved to Great Baddow, Chelmsford.

The Purleigh Colony eventually collapsed in 1902. More than one reason contributed to the colony's failure. Holman relates it to friction between colonists after the 1900 disputes, and also to the colony's involvement in the Doukhobors migration. ⁵⁰ The latter part of 1897 witnessed signs of frustration and dissatisfaction with achievements. The colonists' occupation with the provision of physical needs left them with little time to spread their collective principles in the neighbourhood. The approach of 1898 brought tensions and ideological differences, but the problem of productivity and the issue of the acceptance of new applicants gave rise to some class prejudice, and this in its turn, initiated the Whiteway split. The split was initiated by the incident of expulsion of two colonists. There were also the problems resulting from marketing Tolstoy's translations without full realisation given to commercial implications, besides the strain the Doukhobors migration added to the already existing problems. The colonists' support to the migration financially acted as the last blow to its existence. The colonists donated a large sum of money which consisted of the colony's major budget. ⁵¹ On his part, Maude attributed the colony's failure to a flaw in Tolstoy's teaching, besides his implicit allusion to the role Chertkov played in worsening things.

The cause of the failure of our movement lay in the confusion which resulted from trying to combine a gospel of poverty, self-abnegation, and brotherhood, with an autocratic

administration of large affairs and the irresponsible power of one man. ⁵²

Another indication of Maude's conversion to Tolstoyism can be discerned in his help to settle the Doukhobors in Canada. His involvement in the process of the sect's migration sprang partly from his willingness to serve Tolstoy, from his complete devotion to his principles, and partly from his belief in the cause of the sect's right to live as it advocated.

Maude first heard of the Doukhobors through Tolstoy and his circle of friends. It was in 1895 that he first heard of the sect. The Tolstoyan conception of the sect's saintly and idealistic conduct played the main part in Maude's effort to help their settlement in another country, and to put an end to the Russian authorities' persecution of the sect on grounds of their religious and pacifist beliefs. The Doukhobors were members of a religious Russian sect. Their origins go back to the middle of the eighteenth century in South and Central Russia. Their faith consisted in "the idea of a Universalist and undogmatic religion rejecting outward forms and rites and a priesthood." Tolstoy's interest in the sect sprang from the similarity between their beliefs and the new religion he formed. ⁵³

The Tolstoyans, with Tolstoy, interested themselves in the affairs of the sect on the basis of their being peaceful people who realized the ideals of Christianity. On hearing the news of their persecution, Tolstoy was moved by sympathy towards the sect. From 1895 onwards, he wrote in condemnation of the sect's persecution, thus, giving publicity to what the Russian government was anxious to conceal. ⁵⁴ Tolstoy's interest in the sect sprang from the fact that its doctrines and beliefs were in accordance with his Christian teaching. He was pleased to find that the sect carried out the same principles he was advocating. Hence his call on Tolstoyans to regard the Doukhobors as an example:

The Doukhobors were in the eyes of the Tolstoyans, a folk who had well-nigh realized the Christian ideal; and it was incumbent on us not merely to sympathize and help them, but also to assimilate our lives and customs to theirs, as much as our own inferior moral development would allow. ⁵⁵

Maude was back in England when he got a letter from Tolstoy explaining his involvement in the sect's affairs. At the same time different organisations volunteered to help the migration of the sect after the Russian government granted them permission to leave the

country. Besides the Tolstoyans there was help from the American Quakers, in addition to individual volunteer workers in Russia, Canada and England.

Despite this wide interest in the Doukhobors question, England was the centre of the help movement. To be more specific, it was at the Purleigh colony that the first steps towards the safety, and later, the actual accomplishment of the migration were taken.

The presence of Doukhobors sympathizers like Vladimir Chertkov, Aylmer Maude, and Prince D. A. Hilkof, besides the arrival of two Doukhobors families induced much enthusiasm among the colonists. Chertkov, Tolstoy's close friend and propagandist, to whom the writer entrusted the management of his public affairs outside Russia, namely the publication of his prohibited works and the migration of the Doukhobors, arrived in Croydon on March 1887 to raise funds for the sect. Later he joined the colonists at Purleigh where he organized a campaign for their support. Maude, as mentioned earlier, had returned to England and chose to live a communal life. Prince Hilkof also chose to live at Purleigh on his release from exile in Russia. The two Doukhobors families of Ivan Ivin and Peter Makhortov, came to Purleigh as delegate representatives of their sect seeking a country to migrate to. The colony offered individual volunteers and financial support to secure the migration.⁵⁶ Other individuals and organizations became involved in the migration, nevertheless, it was due to the services of both Maude and Hilkof that the process was successfully accomplished.

Maude's involvement in the sect's problems came after he took over from Chertkov, at Tolstoy's request, the task of arranging the *Resurrection* Committee Fund. (The story of the publication of the novel and Tolstoy's decision to devote its profits to help the sect is told by Maude in detail in *Tolstoy and His Problems*.) Maude continued to supervise the Fund for years, even after the final settlement of the sect. However, the greater part of his help took the shape of a more direct contact. For the practical arrangements of the migration became his responsibility.

In 1898 permission was given for the sect to leave Russia.⁵⁷ The search for a place, thus, began. At first four places were suggested: Texas, Chinese Turkestan, Chinese Manchuria, and Cyprus. The choice was eventually settled on Cyprus.⁵⁸ But the idea was abandoned after D. A. Hilkof and the two Doukhobors families visited the island and reported the inadequacy of soil and climate. Canada was suggested as an alternative. In order to assess the suitability of the country, the two families went to Canada accompanied by Maude and Prince Hilkof. Hilkof was invited by the two families because he had lived among members of

the sect while serving a term of banishment. They asked Maude's help because he contributed to the relief of the sect and also spoke Russian. ⁵⁹

The party left for Canada on the first of September on board *S. S. Vancouver*. They sailed from Liverpool and arrived at Quebec. Arnold Eliorat, a member of the Purleigh Colony, paid the expenses of the two families, while Maude and Hilkof paid their own fares. ⁶⁰

Hilkof's and Maude's task was to find if Canada would prove a suitable country for the sect. Once this was established, the next step was to facilitate the process of migration and see what help the Canadian Government could offer. The inability of the Doukhobors delegates to take independent decisions resulted in Maude's and Hilkof's unwillingly bearing responsibility before the Canadian Government. The selection of land fell on Hilkof as he had some knowledge of agriculture, ⁶¹ while the matter of negotiating, in addition to lecturing and interviewing in order to lessen the prejudice against the sect, were Maude's part of the responsibility. Maude was furnished with letters from Chertkov. His own connections in the carpet industry led him to James Morgan, a carpet merchant, who introduced him to R. B. Angus, a banker and a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Through the latter a meeting was arranged with Thomas Shaughnessy, the vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. A deal was reached in which the railway would transport the Doukhobors to the site of their new settlement in Canada. ⁶²

In order to stimulate interest in the sect and to promote them as good and desirable settlers, Maude undertook another journey. He travelled to the United States, where a strong opposition front was active against the sect's settlement in Canada. In his efforts to disperse all the old prejudices arising against the sect, he met people of importance, lectured on the sect, and was interviewed by journalists. This was by no means an easy job. In the event, he had to meet University professors, and tried to contradict publicly rumours that spread about the sect which were propagated to strengthen the opposition. Moreover, he wrote to the press rectifying the mistakes prevalent about them in some American books and encyclopaedias. He succeeded in publishing the true facts about the sect in two American newspapers; *The Evening Post* and *The New York Tribune*.

In Canada, Maude stayed for a three and a half months. While he was still there two ships loaded with Doukhobors migrants arrived. ⁶³

4. Maude the Tolstoyan?

"Greatly as I admire Tolstoy, I do not claim to rank as a Tolstoyan." ⁶⁴ Maude justified this statement on the basis that, unlike other Tolstoyans, he refused to accept all that Tolstoy advocated in connection with the doctrine of non-resistance. According to his definition, Tolstoyans not only regarded Tolstoy as a great teacher, but agreed totally with all his views on non-resistance, including the condemnation of governments, law courts and private property.

Despite his disapproval of being called a Tolstoyan, his convictions and way of life, at one stage, prove the contrary. He joined the Purleigh colony, he helped in the Doukhobors migration, and he adopted a strictly Tolstoyan life. So, he not only accepted Tolstoy's principles theoretically, but also put them to the test of practice.

Maude's conversion to Tolstoyism meant his acceptance of Tolstoy's new conception of life. This act resulted in the repudiation of his career as a businessman. His return to England and joining of the Purleigh colony were done under Tolstoy's influence, as already mentioned. Although he did not live at the actual site of the colony, but in the vicinity, and in spite of his being only an honorary member, he was active in managing its affairs. This was sometimes physical: he helped to dig up the fields and to clear thistles. *The Essex County Chronicle* reporter found Maude in action in the fields: [I went]

in quest of Mr. Aylmer Maude. After a variety of turnings and twistings, I found his house - a square red and white brick one - and asked if he were at home. His wife, apparently a Russian lady, told me that he was at work at the colony, which, though only half-a-mile distant over the field, is in the parish of Purleigh. I accordingly started to go across to him, . . . At the colony I saw several men engaged in different kinds of work - some building, some gardening. They directed me to Mr. Maude, whom I found thinning out kale. He was of medium height and of slight build, and looked as though he had been far more used to top hat and frock coat and the other appendages of city life than to "roughing it." His costume at the time of which I speak consisted of a tennis shirt and trousers and a kind of sombrero. He wore no boots, having found that others who went without them did not catch cold so easily. ⁶⁵

At the time of the colony's dispersal in 1900, Maude moved to live at Great Baddow, Chelmsford. Nevertheless, Maude lived up to his new principles throughout the following eight years. His strong belief in the doctrine and absolute acceptance of Tolstoy's ideas were

demonstrated in his maintaining of a Tolstoyan way of life. According to his son's account, the years between 1897 and 1905 were Maude's years of devotion to Tolstoyan principles. This period was a perfect manifestation of his belief in the efficacy of the doctrine of non-resistance, during which he refused to accept jury service. Moreover, he became a vegetarian, and was elected as the vice-president of the Vegetarian Society in his town. Besides, he attended Vegetarian Summer Schools. (He also used to send his children there). Added to this was his abstention from all materialistic temptation.⁶⁶

Experience of quarrelling within the colony, disputes about publishing Tolstoy's works, and the realization of the impossibility of achieving reforms by democratic methods, in addition to his experience with the Doukhobors' migration - which opened his eyes to more faults in Tolstoy's teaching - caused Maude to abandon Tolstoy's extreme no-government ideas. Hence his criticism of Tolstoy's doctrine of non-resistance, and his disapproval of many of Tolstoy's interpretations of the doctrine. This point will be discussed in more detail in the course of this section. We turn now to account for Maude's pacifism.

Maude's pacifism can be seen as another proof of his being a Tolstoyan. The first traits of his pacifism can be discerned in his acceptance of the doctrine of non-resistance. His activities in this field varied. He expressed condemnation to the idea of war in general. He not only detested war as a horrible evil, but also fought vehemently the introduction of conscription in 1916 in England. For this purpose he joined the International Arbitration and Peace Association of which he was a member from 1914.⁶⁷ His involvement in the process of the Doukhobors' migration can be related to his pacifist beliefs. Definitely, his pacifist views may account for his enthusiasm about the sect and his readiness to help them. His voluntary help sprang partly from a desire to serve Tolstoy, and partly from his belief in the sect's cause and in their right to live as they advocated. The sect's pacifism impressed Maude a great deal. Before his disillusionment with the true facts of their pacifism, Maude looked upon the Doukhobors as the perfect ideal of a community who understood the actual meaning of peace. He saw in the sect's refusal to carry arms or to kill their fellow-men, the best solution to the problem of war. Maude was among the speakers in the meeting called by the Purleigh Parish Council in 1898 to consider the Czar's peace proposals. The resolutions reached at the meeting were a denunciation of the idea of the slaughter of human beings, an expression of sympathy and support to the Doukhobors cause, in addition to an abstention from war in all its forms "including competition, and to root out from his heart the selfishness on which this is based."⁶⁸ Maude's pacifism was, to a great extent, stimulated by the Tolstoyan principles that he had accepted.

In tracing back the origin of Maude's pacifism, it is very likely that his pacifism was the result of Tolstoy's influence. Maude, as already indicated, had a religious upbringing both at home and at school. However, to assume that he might have developed any pacifist views at this stage is very unlikely. It is possible that his mother's Quaker's views influenced him in the direction of pacifism, however we know that, at around ten years of age, he left home for Christ's Hospital where he spent the early years of his boyhood. Despite the fact that Christ's Hospital was a religious foundation, it is very doubtful whether we can attribute his pacifism to the school's influence. Hence the strong probability of attributing his pacifism to Tolstoy's influence. This can be certainly related to his acceptance of Tolstoy's doctrine of non-resistance.

Despite the fact that Maude did not share all Tolstoy's views on the matter, particularly in regard to the repudiation of Governments and the non-use of physical force, he fully agreed with Tolstoy's scathing indictment of war and of patriotism as being the main cause for much of the evil in the world. Accordingly, Maude's pacifism will be considered in the light of this point by focusing on two themes: patriotism and anti-imperialism.

Such was the impact of Tolstoy that Maude's views seem to be reflections of Tolstoy's, particularly as regards the idea of patriotism and its being the cause of war and evil. In *The Kingdom of God is Within You*, which Maude considered as one of Tolstoy's most remarkable works, Tolstoy described the feeling of patriotism as unnatural and irrational, as being the cause for the ills from which mankind was suffering, and as a feeling better suppressed than cultivated. Tolstoy was completely against the idea of patriotism, defined as the desire for benefits for one's own people at the expense of other people or state, since this involves getting these advantages at the expense of other peoples. In conclusion he writes, that as a feeling patriotism is harmful, bad, and as a doctrine stupid. Maude's condemnation of patriotism echoes Tolstoy's own views. For he sees in national selfishness a dangerous force rather than a virtue:

It is a terrible fact that people are brought under the delusion that the triumph and expansion of *their* nation is identical with the triumph of goodness. National selfishness is not seen to be a dangerous force, but, under the name of patriotism, is openly extolled as a virtue, so that the smouldering ill will created by national and radical jealousies continually threatens to break into flames. ⁶⁹

On the basis of his indictment of patriotism as a dangerous term and the cause of war, Maude wrote "War and Patriotism" (1900), in which he expressed his strictures and indictment of the British government for its role in the Boer War. In this article Maude exposed "the fallacies by means of which this war and all wars are executed and perpetuated." ⁷⁰ He wrote the article as a reply to John Bellows' pamphlet, *The Truth about the Transvaal War and the Truth about War*. The pamphlet justified the British government's role in the Boer War. The attitude of such professed friends of peace as Bellows, who justified the war on the grounds of patriotism and national feeling, shocked Maude, for the Society of Friends, to which Bellows belonged, advocated peace. Nevertheless, he supported a government war.

In the course of his reply to Bellows' pamphlet Maude condemns the British government's involvement in the process of manufacturing lies in order to justify its interference in the internal affairs of an independent state. He disapproves of the dishonest and fraudulent way in which the British wove a conspiracy in order to seize the Transvaal. By asserting their claim to suzerainty over the Transvaal and by refusing arbitration they succeeded in winning the war. Maude proceeds by pointing out the charges against the British Government. He also condemns war and its main cause, patriotism.

Maude argues his case first by denouncing the fact that patriotism is a virtue. On this basis he expresses his indignation at the phrase in the National Anthem which promotes such a feeling:

"Confound their politics,
Frustrate their knavish tricks"?

Is it not significant, by the way, that in our National Anthem we should keep a bit of blasphemy like that, ready for loyal and patriotic use, even before we know who our next 'enemy' is to be?⁷¹

He proceeds to assert the fact that patriotism is a danger which cultivates the prevalence of wrongdoing and murder and he likens it to state of slavery:

Patriotism distorts our vision; it burdens the people; it causes blood to flow in torrents; it is a perennial spring of hatred, malice, and evil-speaking; and its influence is still so strong because some people will not think about it, and some, having thought, are still unable or unwilling to speak out. There can be

no hope of right action till we have cleared our minds and know at least *which way we ought to face*... . we are called on to realise that to kill men is as bad as to enslave them. ⁷²

Maude's attitude towards the expansionist policy of the British government is an indication of another aspect of his pacifism. In this sense, he attributes the tendency towards imperialism and the desire to seize other people's countries to the same patriotic feeling that desires certain advantages for one's country at the expense of other nations, and also questions the justice behind forcing civilization on people. Under the name of civilization much wrong is being done.

Is the growth of our moral perceptions to be stopped until the British Empire has been sufficiently expanded to satisfy the ambition of the most inflated Englander? Who, after all, can yet tell what the final outcome of the conquest of India, of the greed that caused it, and of the violence that characterised it, will be? Does a nation's life consist in the abundance of the things that it possesses? And does an empire gain in well-being when a small minority "make fortunes" in a distant land, and return to establish families which henceforth live, generation after generation, on the labour of their fellow-men, for whom they in exchange, perchance, make laws which contravene, but do not surpass, the two great commandments approved of by Christ?⁷³

Maude is of the view that patriotism no longer needed in civilised society. The fear of extermination in prehistory may have helped to cultivate this feeling among people, thus making it rather "natural and inevitable." Only in this form is patriotism acceptable since it involves individuals sacrificing themselves for the sake of the group against unavoidable danger. Nowadays it is a force that causes loss of life. It is "a gigantic superstition, and it is fast becoming an hypocrisy under cover of which unscrupulous men snatch at wealth or power." ⁷⁴ In this context Maude likened it to a state of cannibalism, and slavery. Moreover, he expressed his wish for the dispersal and the death of the British Empire, and that it should crumble to dust. "Let the British Empire perish rather than become a hindrance to the spread of brotherhood among all who share our common humanity."⁷⁵

Thus, Maude's indignation at war and its causes is quite in evidence. However, there was one instance where he pleaded the cause of just war, when he sympathized with the war that Lincoln launched to liberate the slaves in the United States. In his view, that was a just

war, fought for a just cause: "I, for my part, will say no word in favour of war. The war Lincoln directed was, perhaps, the most excusable recorded in modern history."⁷⁶

Maude owes his understanding of the idea of patriotism and his discovery of the fallacy of the attitude that encourages the benefits of one nation to the detriment of another on the basis of expediency with complete disregard of moral laws to Tolstoy's teaching. Despite the fact that Maude's pacifism derives from Tolstoy's doctrine of non-resistance, yet it differs in its refusal to accept the attitude that physical force is a great evil, and that it should be resisted. In this respect, Maude does not share Tolstoy's extreme version of pacifism that calls for the abolition of all governments and their laws. But on the contrary, he acknowledges the functions of governments and their institutions; police, law-courts, and, moreover he stresses the necessity of human law.⁷⁷

But even with every one really trying their best to obey that law, it would still remain true that the abolition of human tribunals would not lessen, but would enormously increase their difficulties. ⁷⁸

Maude's argument against Tolstoy's complete refusal of the use of physical power constituted the main point of objection to the doctrine of non-resistance. Maude only agreed with Tolstoy's indictment of government, and expressed disapproval of the whole doctrine which he described as "too rigid, too logical, too precise and too unqualified to be true." ⁷⁹ In his view, the doctrine had the disadvantage of throwing all human affairs in confusion, besides the fact of its being untrue. One of Tolstoy's mistakes, Maude thought, was that he promoted principles that were not sufficiently tested. When he set himself to criticise the doctrine, Maude was keen to find out why practice was against a theory that seemed theoretically plausible.

Maude understood the doctrine of non-resistance to deal with the promotion of inward and spiritual grace, and not with any act of repudiation. He owed a modification of his understanding of the doctrine to Jane Addams. She was also a non-resister, and ran a settlement in Chicago to help the immigrants arriving in the United States. Her settlement, which Maude had visited, marked the turning point in his acceptance of Tolstoy's doctrine.⁸⁰ Her non-resistance - as he witnessed it in Hull House (the name of the Chicago settlement) - struck him as being moderate and not as rigid as was Tolstoy's. Her non-resistance was an attitude of the mind. In her principles, both love and pity are the motives of reforms in addition to the use of physical force when necessary. Maude was impressed by her ability to maintain

"her own balance and a steadfast faithfulness to lessons learnt by a different experience in other surroundings," 81

I was hardly conscious that it had touched me, but, steadily, from that time onward, my faith in the efficacy of the Tolstoyan formulary waned, - until, at last, years later, I disentangled the Tolstoyan argument against political action, and found its root to lie in the assertion that all use of physical force to restrain one's fellow-man is necessarily wrong. 82

From that moment Maude felt himself to be out of sympathy with Tolstoy's doctrine. But it was not for many years later that he disentangled himself completely from it. During this time he was busy checking the validity of the principles he accepted in theory. This practice put him on the right track that would lead him to the rejection of the theory as a whole.

Thus, Maude came to adopt Addams' conception of the doctrine and to reject Tolstoy's. Moreover, he realized the difference between their attitudes; "Tolstoy's test applies to the action; my test applies to the motive." 83 Maude also noticed that the main difference between Addams' doctrine and his resided in the fact that while she "had for years been bringing her theories and hopes to the test of experience, and finding out how much she could accomplish," he was "theorizing and, without the ballast of experience to steady me, eagerly urging an extreme programme." 84

Addams gave Maude the clue, but "it was years before I got the non-Resistant argument (as I venture to hope I now have) into its true perspective." 85 In spite of his acknowledgement of Addams' influence, Maude's own experiences within the Tolstoyan colony and the Doukhobors' migration came as the final clue to his complete rejection of the doctrine.

Maude's criticism of Tolstoyism stemmed from his realization of the defects of the doctrine of non-resistance. The communal experiment at Purleigh, and elsewhere, opened his eyes to flaws in Tolstoy's teaching; "defects of Tolstoyism as "a constructive policy" became obvious when the colonies started to put his principles in practice." as did the Doukhobors' migration. 86 Like other Tolstoyans, he was disappointed to find that the rejection of the industrial system did not achieve the desired aim, and that it did not result in the prevalence of harmony among men. From the beginning the motive that prompted him to join the Purleigh

colony was the desire to test the practicability of the principles that he accepted in theory. By accepting the Tolstoyan way of life he

wanted to see whether his [Tolstoy's] principles conduced to a more harmonious and efficient organization of human affairs. Slowly, reluctantly, and regretfully, I was forced to admit that they did not. ⁸⁷

Although he became aware of the defects of Tolstoy's doctrine from the time he set himself to put its principles into practice, at the beginning he, with other colonists, was reluctant to admit the presence of certain faults in Tolstoy's teaching. His admiration and respect for the writer were responsible for delay in the exposure of these deficiencies.⁸⁸

The first lesson Maude learned at the Purleigh colony accounted for his disbelief in the same principles which he previously accepted without question. The Tolstoyans followed literally Tolstoy's views as regards the denunciation of human law, including the repudiation of civil, local law, government institutions, and above all, the existence of the state. Nevertheless, a chaotic state was the result of adopting the Tolstoyan way of life.

The failure of the colony as an attempt to enable people to 'get out of the industrial system' and earn 'an honest living' (in contradistinction to ordinary industrial and commercial pursuits, which were regarded as dishonest) was a confirmation of the invariable experience of the Russian and other Tolstoy Colonies. We ought to have expected and been prepared for that result. ⁸⁹

The defect in the system lies in the fact that it was "insufficiently tried." ⁹⁰ All previous attempts to cure social ills by encouraging people to follow isolated courses other than the main stream of human life have failed. No satisfactory record of any Tolstoyan group either in Russia, Europe or America has been reported. Tolstoy's condemnation to all governmental or any established institutions was extreme. The lack of definiteness in relationships was, in Maude's view, the main reason behind the failure of the communal venture at Purleigh, and many other Tolstoyan colonies. Experience showed him that it was the "lack of definiteness" in human relationships which was the main obstruction to the application of Tolstoy's principles, and that "a great stumbling-block in the Tolstoy Colonies proved to be the law of Non-Resistance, which condemns all physical force used to prevent any one from doing what he likes." ⁹¹ More harm was being done by accepting this rule rigidly. This practice resulted in the

spread of quarrels and the waste of much human energy. All the communities formed under the influence of Tolstoy's teaching either in Russia or abroad failed to maintain his principles. Tolstoy's denunciation of these vital issues that secure harmony in the society served as the main obstacle against the success of his theory. Confusion was the outcome of the colonies' adoption of Tolstoy's rigid principles. It follows that "definiteness in our relations with our fellow-men is essential to harmonious intercourse; and that the ultimate and chief reason for the existence and persistence of legal tribunals is . . . to supply men with the nearest approach we can get, to impartial arbitration for the settlement of their disputes" ⁹² Disregard of the human system that our ancestors passed on to us was the major mistake of Tolstoyism. Maude did not condemn the whole process of living up to one's moral and mental faculties, but opposed strongly the application of such rules rigidly as he witnessed it in the Tolstoyan colonies.

Maude's experience with the Doukhobors through his involvement in the process of their migration opened his eyes to more faults in Tolstoy's teaching. It also provided the appropriate opportunity to criticize Tolstoy, a thing which he had been delaying for some time for fear of blundering again. By writing his book about the sect *A Peculiar People: The Doukhobors* (1905) - the aim of which was to apologise to the Canadian government for his part in recommending the sect as desirable settlers - Maude was able to criticize Tolstoy's doctrine of non-resistance.

As will become clear from what follows, more than one reason prompted Maude to write his book about the Doukhobors. His wish to apologise to the Canadian Government for his recommendation of the sect is certainly to be taken as the main reason. Another factor was the desire to challenge, and, at the same time correct the mistaken attitude of Tolstoy and the Tolstoyans for their part in advocating much of the misinformation prevalent about the sect. The book also offered Maude a chance to criticize the impracticability of Tolstoy's non-resistance theory. There was also the intention to give the English public, and maybe all those who heard or helped the sect, the true facts of their history and beliefs.

Maude wrote the book as a form of apology to the Canadian Government. With other Tolstoyans, Maude helped the Doukhobors settle in Canada by acting in the role of negotiator with the Canadian Government in connection with the migration:

Personally my only regret is to have helped, however unwittingly, to mislead the Canadian Government or any one

else. By this book, in which I do public penance, I try to atone for that blunder. ⁹³

Maude concentrated on two points in order to show the mistaken attitude of Tolstoy and the Tolstoyans as regards their unreserved praise of the sect. In the first place he highlighted some hidden and unknown characteristics of them which accounted respectively for the puzzling behaviour they indulged in during the first two years of their settlement in Canada. Secondly, he proved that their pacifism was no more than an attitude of revenge against the authorities.

Accepting the Tolstoyan version of the sect as highly enlightened people, peaceful, and ideal Christians, Maude assured the Canadians that the sect would prove to be admirable settlers. The availability of fresh information that threw more light on the sect opened Maude's eyes to the reality of the mistaken attitude adopted by Tolstoy and the Tolstoyans. The news of the sect's misconduct in Canada, in particular the incidents of the Pilgrimages in 1901 and the Nudity Parades that followed, in addition to the knowledge of the real status of their leader, on whom they looked as a sort of Deity, assured Maude of the wrongness of the Tolstoyans' view and showed him their defects and unreasonableness as a religious sect. ⁹⁴ He resolved to write the book only after his realization of a reluctance on the part of Tolstoy and the Tolstoyans to offer any explanation of the sect's misbehaviour which contrasted with their view of the matter.

Thus, Maude's wish to rectify the mistaken opinion advocated by the Tolstoyans about the sect is another motive for his writing the book. Their ignorance of certain faults concerning the sect's beliefs accounted - in his view - for their state of misinformation. However, Maude was angry that their attitude continued unchanged even in the light of the new information that the sect's recent acts revealed. The realization of this negative attitude forced Maude into taking serious action. Feelings of moral obligation for those who assisted in the migration movement and for the Canadian Government led him to take full responsibility in order to clear the situation. He particularly felt the need for this initiative when the Tolstoyans refused to acknowledge the fact that they had been misinformed about the sect and offered no explanation of what seemed a contradictory view of previously stated facts. Unlike Maude who admitted the fact, the Tolstoyans remained "extraordinarily blind to what was fairly obvious to other observers." ⁹⁵

Maude explains the wrongfulness of the Tolstoyans' view by bringing to light other aspects of the sect's characteristics. The Tolstoyans described the sect as "peaceful people",

"submissive", "highly enlightened", "a folk who had well-nigh realized the Christian ideal."⁹⁶ By relying on the reports of friends, both Russian and English, who lived among the sect once they settled in Canada Maude succeeded in disclosing the secrets behind the sect. This new knowledge brought to light a discovery of the sect's ignorance and their reliance on superstition, particularly as regards their attitude towards their leader whom they held as a sort of God-Man, or "an incarnation of the Deity." In this respect, Maude labelled them as "illiterate", "superstitious", "ignorant". Maude's sources were reliable coming from people who were in direct contact with them. Herbert P. Archer, who lived among and taught the sect English in Canada, wrote thus to Maude about them.

We have been thinking of the Doukhobors as a religious people. Really, as always, there are religious Doukhobors, but not a religious Doukhobors sect. The sect, because it is a sect, is self-centred, self-righteous, and intolerant.⁹⁷

Moreover, by studying its history, Maude was able to find out the origins of the sect's non-resistance views. And once again he succeeded in showing the mistaken attitude of the Tolstoyans. Tolstoy and the Tolstoyans (with whom Maude had been in alliance and whose views he had accepted) regarded the sect's objections to carrying weapons as an action "resulting solely from the fact that the Doukhobors understood Christianity sanely and adhered to it faithfully."⁹⁸

Maude argues that the sect were not a pacifist group from the beginning, but that their pacifism was adopted later. Having read Tolstoy's non-resistance doctrine, Peter Verigin - their leader - while in exile required his brethren to adopt non-violence and not comply with conscription. By spreading these principles among his followers he hoped to avenge himself against the authorities, and this act "furnished an admirable weapon against the government that had banished him."⁹⁹

By writing the book Maude aimed not only to correct mistaken views of the sect or to challenge Tolstoy, but also to provide the English public with a truthful portrait of the sect. In Maude's view, all that had been written about the sect had been done not impartially, but rather "to make out a case for or against them." From the beginning two contradictory opinions prevailed about the sect. The view expressed by the Russian authorities was consistent with the one expressed by the Canadian, American, and English newspapers. They all looked at the Doukhobors as "degraded savages, objectionable and contemptible, besides being too stupid to

appreciate the privileges Canada offers them." The Tolstoyans represented the second mistaken view and presented the sect as "highly enlightened, free from superstitions, and needing no government because they are morally so much superior to the rest of mankind." ¹⁰⁰ Maude showed that these views were "tenaciously held and both wrong":

The complex truth is, that the Doukhobors are a sober, hard working, frugal folk, possessed of many qualities, but hampered by a superstitious belief in the wisdom and power of their leader, and a rooted distrust of all Government except their own. ¹⁰¹

The book certainly offered Maude a chance to criticize Tolstoy's principles of non-resistance which he had formerly taken to be true. On the one hand, his experience with the Tolstoyans in the Purleigh Colony helped him in this aim, for in their behaviour he saw much which confirmed his view of the matter. The Doukhobors experience, on the other hand, provided him with more evidence and made him realize the flaws in Tolstoy's doctrine of non-resistance, no-government and no-property laws. Maude's criticism of Tolstoy's teaching sprang from his recognition of certain flaws in the doctrine of non-resistance: "There are some aspects of Tolstoy's teaching which are not morally commendable, and which it is a duty to challenge." Indeed, this realization encouraged him to challenge Tolstoy over matters which he previously felt unable to oppose and which he "instinctively slurred over" because his "admiration for the writer and appreciation of his work was great." ¹⁰² In the last chapter of the book, "Criticism of Tolstoy", he shows the unworkability and impossibility of Tolstoy's non-resistance theory.

From the beginning Maude found Tolstoy's denunciation of government and state power illogical. By denouncing much that was essential for human life, Tolstoy, Maude thought, "included in one wholesale condemnation, customs, institutions and occupations, the abolition of which would leave us worse off than we now are." ¹⁰³

For his criticism of the doctrine of non-resistance Maude relied on Tolstoy's letter to the Doukhobors in Canada. The letter came as a reminder to the sect of the necessity to remain true to the principles they believed in and not to be led astray by the new life they were leading. Maude chose this letter as a basis for his criticism because it "sums up Tolstoy's "anti-poverty and anti-force opinions." ¹⁰⁴

Maude begins his criticism by stating the fact that the ideas Tolstoy had been preaching were not new, and that through the ages many a conscientious man expressed similar tendencies towards the non-violence doctrine. However, Tolstoy differed from other reformers in that in his case he pushed the doctrine of non-resistance to an unprecedented extent. This resulted in Tolstoy's creation of his own superstitions instead of the ones he denounced in the Orthodox religion, superstitions of non-resistance, non-violence, and no property laws. ¹⁰⁵

Maude believes that Tolstoy's ideas are not original, "though in modern times they have never before received such emphatic, systematic, or world-wide proclamation as Tolstoy has given them." ¹⁰⁶ Maude admires Tolstoy's "excellent maxim of economic morality." ¹⁰⁷ But disagrees with Tolstoy's conviction that individual property is immoral while communal property is moral. In his view, private property represents the selfishness of an individual, while communal property represents that of a clan. Tolstoy erred when he adopted axioms without testing their truth. "But axioms must not be accepted without strict examination; for the root of much perplexity lies in them." ¹⁰⁸ The institutions that Tolstoy vehemently denounced, if "rightly used, make further reforms easy of attainment that without them would be almost unattainable." ¹⁰⁹ Definiteness in relation to material objects is needed for it facilitates harmony among men. Tolstoy was oblivious to the complexity of social problems. ¹¹⁰

In their denunciation of much that was essential for human life, Maude discerned a similarity between the Secularist and the Tolstoyan attitude. While the former overlooked the true use of the Bible in an attempt to get rid of superstition, the latter were "so bent on checking the malevolent and harmful use of force and their selfish use of property, that they condemn the whole institution of human laws and Governments," ¹¹¹ Tolstoyism erred because it did not preserve what was good in the order of society. Maude's reply to the no-property laws is that definite arrangements in property matters are a moral duty as is promoting harmony among men. Maude disagrees with the notion that advocates the rejection of human arrangements on the basis of their imperfections. He admits the presence of flaws in human law as it exists now, yet, he still thinks that to denounce these laws as unsound would be a grave mistake. In his view, the best policy would be to point out the flaws in the social system and to try to improve them rather than remove them. For the benefits of the laws are undeniable despite their defects. He asserts the necessity of the juridical institutions. Despite their defects, they remain effective in spreading harmony among people. As for the no-violence law, Maude did not rule out the use of physical force as rigidly as Tolstoy did. In his view, the use of physical force is sometimes necessary. The distinction between good and bad actions, and their benevolent or malevolent motives is essential in the determination of the use or non-use of physical force.

Tolstoy's distinction is unsatisfactory because "it fails to condemn much that is bad, and does condemn things that are good." ¹¹²

Maude did not rule out the use of physical force as rigidly as Tolstoy did. In his view the use of this force is sometimes necessary. What is more important is that using one's own judgement is essential, that axioms must not be accepted without being examined, that human legal institutions - despite their deficiencies - make reforms easily attainable, and that governments are needed: "it is still true that we should be worse off without any Government; . . . it is not by abandoning the institutions of one's country, but by amending them and working them honestly, that progress is being made." ¹¹³ The practicable way of regulating human affairs is within the governmental system. Definiteness is required, since definiteness facilitates harmony, and lack of definiteness leads to quarrels, bitterness and waste.

Thus, Maude finds the doctrine of non-resistance, as advocated by Tolstoy, to lack the proof of practice. Theoretically, the doctrine might seem plausible, but once it is put to practice, its flaws are discernible. The total denunciation of human laws proved to be the essence of wrongfulness in the doctrine. The process prompted a lack of definiteness in relationships which is an essential factor for preserving harmony. That the doctrine of non-resistance proved useless to all who tried it other than Tolstoy is related, in Maude's view to the simple fact that it best suited the writer's circumstances and achieved its aim, that is the indictment of Russia's Tsarist Government. That the Tolstoyans, who adopted the writer's way of life, failed while he succeeded is due to their different circumstances. Hence the necessity to correct the untrue aspects in the same doctrine which was infallible for "one individual." ¹¹⁴

Maude did not dismiss the validity of Tolstoy's reasonable views. Although he critically examined Tolstoy's non-resistance doctrine, he did not underestimate its good sides. Maude agreed with Tolstoy that Governments are the source of evil, and that war must be condemned. It is true that Maude did not believe all Tolstoy's views about religion and social problems to be right. Nevertheless, he admitted that "he was always thoughtful and stated important matters plainly and impressively." ¹¹⁵ Thus, Maude did not rule out the whole theory of non-resistance as a failure. On the contrary he showed its good and bad aspects.

In this respect Maude only accepted those of Tolstoy's attitudes that, to him, appeared true. On the basis of this statement one might understand why he refused to be called a Tolstoyan. However, we must bear in mind the fact that he only reached this conclusion as a result of his experience in living out what Tolstoy advocated, and that he actually accepted the

whole doctrine of non-resistance at one stage in his life, as already indicated. He differed from other Tolstoyans in not thinking that Tolstoy's views were all right. In this respect, his attitude was not that of the blind adoration of a disciple. He was not carried away by his enthusiasm; he not only discerned, but also criticised - with much insight and power - faults in the writer's teaching. Maude did not rule out the whole doctrine as a failure. On the contrary, he showed the doctrine's good aspects, and at the same time pointed out its weak points. The obvious fault in the doctrine, he found to be Tolstoy's assertion of the no-value of human existence at the expense of the moral law he formulated. The doctrine had the disadvantage of making all human activities appear worthless. Tolstoy erred when he ignored the basis of the human laws which are essential for the existence of society:

Tolstoyism, in its eagerness to cure the terrible evils that result from selfishness, has become reckless about conserving what is good in the present order of society. It does not value those results of past efforts expended in the right direction, which have become sacred to us because they are so human and pathetic. In this respect, It is like the nurse who poured out the baby when emptying its bath. ¹¹⁶

Although Maude admitted that Tolstoy "was always truthful and stated important matters plainly and impressively", nevertheless, he was convinced that the doctrine resulted in concealing from mankind his greatness as a thinker. Moreover, he regretted the fact that people have drawn attention to this side of his teaching. "It is sad that a thinker and moralist of Tolstoy's calibre should tumble down like this to the level of the expediencies, evasions, and pusillanimities of the most ordinary pulpit." ¹¹⁷

Maude's critical tone was quite obvious. This becomes more frequent in his later accounts of the doctrine. In the course of his description of the Tolstoyan movement in his *Life*, there is a further assessment of Tolstoy's views on political, religious and social matters. He tried there to develop his criticism. Nevertheless, he did not altogether discredit Tolstoy's views:

We sympathize with his aims and detest the things he detests, yet we cannot but question some of his sweeping generalizations. But because his views are not all right, they are not therefore all wrong, and the service he renders us is the greater because he approaches life from another side, and help us to see it through other eyes. ¹¹⁸

5. Maude becomes a Translator

For nearly forty years Maude's sole occupation was the translation of Tolstoy. The knowledge of the beginnings of his interest in Tolstoy and the reasons for his decision to bring him to the English public are essential to the understanding of the story of his life-long struggle to make his dream come true. The story began at the time of his discovery of the inadequacy of the already existing translations of Tolstoy's works. The lack of good translations initiated the idea of providing a definitive English edition. His great admiration of the writer's works set him on the road of producing this edition.

When Maude made Tolstoy's acquaintance in 1888, he was impressed by his personality but not interested in his works. Having read Tolstoy's later works in which the writer expressed his social and philosophical views, he became convinced that his message contained some truth. It is probably right to say that Maude's liking and admiration of Tolstoy's later works constituted the main motive behind his decision to translate him. *What Then Must We Do?* "was the first of his works that seriously gripped my attention", writes Maude, "and it caused me to seek his acquaintance." Such was the book's influence on Maude that it made him abandon his prosperous business as a manager for the Anglo-Russian Carpet Company. It also made him devote years of his life "to an attempt to make Tolstoy's works intelligible to Englishmen." 119

It is worthwhile mentioning that many of the early translations that Maude undertook belong to the later phase of Tolstoy's production. These works were of either religious, ethical or social nature. Moreover, they reflected the writer's newly-formulated philosophy best represented by his no-Government, no-Resistance views. These works had great influence on Maude and were in a way, responsible for his temporary conversion to Tolstoyism later. Maude's choice to translate these works is an indication of the great interest he took in Tolstoy's views at that stage. He had accepted Tolstoy's new theories, and this interest in the writer's works must have prompted the desire to bring his works to the English public. The lack of a definitive edition and the poor quality of the existing translations strengthened his notion of undertaking this task.

That Maude was qualified to do the translation of Tolstoy's works is established through his mastery of both Russian and English. Added to this is his residence in Russia for almost two decades and his personal knowledge of the author, besides his sympathy and admiration of the writer's art, and his sincere wish to provide the English world with a good edition of the writer's works. All these combined to make him the perfect translator. The task

demanded not only the knowledge of Russian and the language to which the works are translated but also an acquaintance with the peasant and other Russian customs and speech.

When did Maude first try his hand at the business of translation? His earliest attempt dates back to 1896. The piece he translated was an extract from the writer's diary which was called "The Demands of Love." Maude's first attempt at translation was published in *The Daily Chronicle* in 1898.¹²⁰

The first major work that he translated was *What is Art?* He began translating the work during a stay in Russia in 1897. Maude had returned in the autumn of that year to Russia where he spent a few weeks and visited Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana. The purpose of the visit was to secure the translation rights and copyright of the book. Tolstoy was still working on the book, and thought he could finish it in time for Maude's visit. But the book took months to finish and, in order to complete the translation, a correspondence started between Maude and the writer over the book. A lot of hard work was involved during this period. Tolstoy supplied Maude with the finished manuscript and advised him to omit the passages intended to suit the censor.¹²¹ Apart from the extract of the writer's diary, mentioned above, the present work was the first of his translations to be published. The Brotherhood Publishing Company published it in extra numbers of its periodical *The New Order* in 1898. The translation had Tolstoy's authorization and recommendation: "I ask all those interested in my views on art to read the book in the present translation." The following year it appeared in the Scott Library Series and the Free Age Press Publication. The book was received badly by critics, but the quality of the translation received warm praise.¹²² The translation of *What is Art?* and *Resurrection* translated by Maude's wife "had shown that there was a demand for new works of Tolstoy, if faithfully translated so as to give English readers a readable book."¹²³ Thus, Maude's career as a translator began.

Despite the fact that the major part of Tolstoy's work was available to the English public through different American or British editions, and that many translators preceded Maude, this did not deter Maude in his objective to produce his own version.¹²⁴ But he met many difficulties. Many plans with British and American publishers failed. Nonetheless, Maude managed to secure publication of all his renderings before the Centenary Edition. Some of these renderings were published by the Brotherhood Publishing Company and some by the Free Age Press, both of which were closely connected with Tolstoyism in Britain. Other works were published by Nelson, Richards, Constable, Heinemann and Oxford University Press

Maude's first connections with publishing firms came indirectly through Tolstoy's influence. The Brotherhood Publishing Company was recommended to Maude by Chertkhov as possible publishers of Tolstoy's works. Thus he agreed to hand his work to them, a decision

which he came to regret later. The company was founded by John Kenworthy, to whom Tolstoy entrusted the right of the publications of his works. The right passed later to Chertkov who took charge of the firm and was also responsible of printing Tolstoy's controversial works in Russian and English through his private printing press. The firm published Maude's translation of "A Letter on the Peace Conference " which appeared in 1899.

The following year saw the publication of *What is Art?* in three parts as extra numbers of the *New Order*. In 1900 a Russian folk tale under the title "The Empty Drum" and "How an Imp paid for a crust " appeared. In the same year Albert Broadbent published "The First Step." The publication of *The Hanging Czar* by the Independent Labour Party followed in 1908; the book was translated by Maude and others.

The duties of the Brotherhood Publishing Company passed on to Chertkhov after he came to settle in England. Chertkhov published Tolstoy's prohibited works in Russian in his own publishing house: the Izdatel' Stvo Svobondongo Slova, which he founded with his wife. Later he started an English branch of the firm, the Free Age Press. The aim of the press was to publicize Tolstoy's recent writings on matters related to politics, religion, and social issues. Tolstoy withdrew the right of the first publication from the Brotherhood Publishing Company and entrusted the new job to Chertkhov and the Free Age Press. The firm was concerned with the publication of "cheap, un-copyrighted editions of translations of Tolstoy." ¹²⁵ The press's publications of Tolstoy's works amounted to twenty-nine volumes. ¹²⁶ The translations were done by different hands; Chertkhov, Arthur Fifield, Maude, and others. At first, Maude agreed to contribute to the press's productions on the basis of its conforming with Tolstoyan principles. Yet his dissatisfaction with the press's policy later on, and the fact that he did not get along well with its manager made him cease to translate for it. ¹²⁷

Complying with the press's aim and the very fact that Tolstoy's reputation as a moral teacher was strongly rooted in England at the time, the press published between 1900 and 1910 a series of religious, social and ethical works entitled "New Booklets on Important Subjects." The series was edited by Chertkhov and Arthur Fifield, and the translations were done by different hands. The press's publications were successful; they sold well. Maude's translation of "Patriotism and Government" and "A Letter to a Non-Commissioned Officer" were published by the press. The press also published Maude's translation of *The Slavery of our Times* in 1900, in addition to *The Russian Revolution*, and for a limited period only, Louise Maude's translation of *Resurrection*, which was issued with "copyright reserved." ¹²⁸ All appeared in the firm's list of publications.

More than one reason contributed to Maude's decision not to submit his translations to the company any more. The quality of its translations and the haste with which they were made, his disapproval of the idea of parting with his copyright in translations, a policy which the press advocated, in addition to his dislike of the press's other policy of making the translators appear nameless, contributed to the decision. His aspiration to have copyright translation was to some extent destroyed by the "No Rights Reserved" policy the press was following in accordance with Tolstoy's view about the matter. This last issue urged him to have his translations published through well-known firms.

Thus, Maude turned to individual publishers for an alternative. However, misfortunes of different kinds befell his cooperation with these publishers. These varied in nature, from the bankruptcy of one publisher to the refusal of another to publish his translations.

Grant Richards was the first of the individual publishers that Maude approached. His firm published a few of Maude's early translations. The first of these volumes *Essays and Letters* appeared in its World's Classic series in 1901. Between 1901 and 1903 Grant Richards also published Maude's Revised Edition of the Works of Leo Tolstoy. The edition consisted of three volumes. Two of the volumes were done by Maude. The first was a volume of short stories entitled *Sevastopol and Other Military Tales* (1901). The second was a volume of *Plays* (1903). The third volume was *Resurrection* (1901) translated by Louise Maude. This was followed by another volume of stories in 1904, *Esrhadon and Other Tales*. The firm was bankrupt in 1904. When Richards' company failed Maude turned to Constable.

In 1911 Constable published *In The Days of Serfdom and other Stories*. In the same year Thomas Nelson published *Father Sergius, and Other Stories and Plays*, a volume edited by Hagberg Wright which contained an introductory essay by Maude, "Tolstoi as a Dramatist." *Hadji Murad, and Other Stories* followed in 1912, and a volume of *Plays* in 1914. *The Teaching of Jesus* (1909) appeared in the series of Harper's Library of Living Thought.

Tolstoy on Art was published by Small Maynard in America in 1923. The book contained *What is Art?*, and some of Tolstoy's other writings on art. Maude secured a publisher to the book through his literary agent Leonard Moore. Maude was eager to have the book, which contained Tolstoy's works on art, published since it was not going to appear in the World's Classics because it had illustrations and was not purely translation as it contained Maude's own writing. *Family Views of Tolstoy* was published by Allen and Unwin in 1926, in addition to Tolstoy's *Diaries*.

After the collapse of Grant Richards, the World's Classic series passed on to Oxford University Press. Maude succeeded in convincing the press to continue the publication of his translations in the World's Classics. On the 24th October, 1905 he wrote to the press of his wish to include a series of Tolstoy's best works in the World's Classics series. He explained the situation as regards the unavailability of good translations in the light of the absence of copyright in the original. He suggested the publication of his translation of *Twenty-three Tales* and assured the press of its success. The press undertook to publish the book. It followed that nine of Maude's translations appeared in the same series between 1921 and 1923. These included in addition to *Twenty-three Tales*, *The Cossacks*, *Resurrection*, *Anna Karenina*, *Confession*, *What I Believe*, *War and Peace*, and a volume of *Plays*. Maude signed no agreement with the press. They paid him £100 a volume in advance of royalties on newly-translated works and £5 on volumes transferred to the World's Classics. ¹²⁹ An increase in payment occurred in 1919. Milford doubled the advance payments on all the World's Classics volumes: "I am willing to double them, i.e., to make the £25 £50 and the £50 £100 (all in advance and on account of royalties), and to pay half these sums on delivery of the MS., the other half on publication of six months after delivery of complete MS as at the present. ¹³⁰

6. The Centenary Edition

The origin of the Centenary Edition dates back to 1896, with Maude's intention to present Tolstoy in a "readable and reliable form " after his recognition of the unintelligibility of the already existing editions. Thirty years had elapsed since the inception of the idea. It was not until 1927 that a publisher was secured to undertake the issue of the edition. Meanwhile many plans with different publishers in England and America failed. Among these plans were the abortive plans of the Heinemann project in 1913 and that of Unwin and Doubleday in 1922. Nevertheless, Maude's industrious attempts culminated in success when he managed to sign an agreement with the Oxford University Press in 1927.

Maude's discovery of the unintelligibility of the existing editions of Tolstoy's works initiated the whole idea of the Centenary Edition. While still living in Moscow, he worked on comparing few passages from an English version with the original Russian text. His interest in Tolstoy's later works at that stage - particularly in *On Life* - led him to compare some passages from Isabel Hapgood's version of the book with the original Russian. "This was not merely obscure but unintelligible, and I decided that an effort ought to be made to enable English readers to understand what Tolstoy said." ¹³¹

Further examination of other American and English editions of Tolstoy's works made him realize that none of the editions he consulted did Tolstoy justice. Maude's dissatisfaction

with the quality of the early editions of Tolstoy's works prompted the strongest of strictures. He not only criticized the editions but also dismissed most of them for being inadequate and unreliable. Among the early translations he criticized were those of the Free Age Press, Leo Wiener, Isabel Hapgood, Nathan Haskell Dole, and Constance Garnett.

He criticized the Free Age Press for its inability to pay attention to the quality of its translations and also for the speed with which its volumes were issued. Moreover, he criticized the lack of supervision by any one who knew Russian, in addition to the defect of the translations being too literal.

My chief criticism of the Free Age Press is that, instead of paying due attention to the quality of its versions, and delaying publications until that had been properly attended to, it made the great mistake of being in a hurry, and issued inferior versions, which subsequently blocked the way for better translations.¹³²

He criticized Professor Leo Wiener's "professedly 'Complete Edition' " for the speed in which the volumes were produced and their abundance in errors, the manner and poor quality of editing which created confusion among readers. Nevertheless, his main indictment of the edition related to its inclusion of various compilations like "Thoughts on God", "On the Meaning of Life" and "The Relation of the Sexes" as part of Tolstoy's work. While the truth is that these were made up of extracts from different diaries, letters and notebooks, and that Tolstoy himself protested against the publication of such compilations. Besides the edition contained translations of unrevised works by Tolstoy. Maude also dismissed the idea that the edition was complete, since it was published in 1905 and that Tolstoy continued to be productive during the five years before his death.¹³³ Besides criticizing Isabel Hapgood's translation of *On Life* as bad and unintelligible, Maude criticized N. H. Dole's bad translations, particularly his version of *War and Peace*. Dole made Napoleon invade Russia from the west by crossing the Vistula, and have made the soldiers march for two hundred versts without closing their eyes. He also put a cathedral in a small village. Of all these early translations Maude only praised the quality of Garnett's translation. Her library edition of Tolstoy was praised and he often recommended her translations. Nevertheless, her rendering of *War and Peace* did not escape his criticism. In Appendix II of the Centenary Edition of his *Life* volume he gave many instances of Garnett's mistranslation.

The actual date of the commencement of the Centenary Edition's publication was 1928. Both Maude's choice of the name and the date of the edition was related to the approach of the centenary anniversary of Tolstoy's birth. Maude's general scheme was to have the whole

edition ready by 1932 at the latest, but it took him another ten years to accomplish the task. The last volume appeared in 1938.

Many factors accounted for the delay in bringing the edition at the fixed date. The difficulty of finding a publisher, the question of copyright and the conscientiousness of Maude as a translator; all contributed to the delay. Maude's idea of a collected edition of the writer's works was the only solution he could see for much of the injustice he believed Tolstoy's translations had suffered at the hands of earlier translators. He was aware of the difficulty of accomplishing this task and of issuing a proper edition of the writer's works in the light of Tolstoy's denunciation of copyright, and the impossibility of securing a publisher for such an edition in the presence of the many different editions of his translations in English.

The five projected plans of the edition stretched over fourteen years. All Maude's early attempts to produce a collected edition of Tolstoy's works failed. Despite this he was still determined. He knew somehow that the approach of the centenary of Tolstoy's birthday was his last hope; he and his wife were getting old. For this reason he had tried to interest the Oxford University Press in his project since 1919, but with no success. However, in 1922 the Press looked as if it was ready to consider his offer. In the meanwhile he did not spare a chance to make a deal with other publishers. One of his early attempts to secure this objective was his call upon other translators of Tolstoy to collaborate in order to produce the writer's untranslated works in addition to their own renderings in a collected edition. The edition, he thought, would have included those versions that he singled out as good, which constituted slightly more than half of Tolstoy's works, and it would have appeared within three or four years. That project did not see the light, and Maude's search for a publisher continued. The failure of the project was probably due to the translators' refusal to collaborate. It is not clear whether Maude approached all the translators with his idea. However, it is certain that Garnett rejected the offer. Heilbrun mentions that Maude actually proposed to collaborate with Garnett on the translation of *War and Peace*, and that she refused.¹³⁴

Maude's second attempt came five years later. In 1905 he approached the Oxford University Press with the idea. His plan was to convince the press to carry on the publication - in its World's Classics series - of his translations of Tolstoy's works. The Oxford University Press was among the first publishers to whom he proposed the idea. Maude contacted the press when they took over the World's Classics series from Grant Richards. Although Maude did not mention the Centenary Edition, he certainly had the idea in mind when he wrote to Henry Frowde, the managing director then, of his wish to include the best of Tolstoy's works in the World's Classics series. The idea was not very clear in his mind.

I have no cut and dried, yes or no, proposal to make. I want to explain the situation, and see how far - if at all - I can interest you in a plan which will, I think, in the nature of the case, probably have to be adopted by some publisher, some day. ¹³⁵

The idea must have appealed to the press. In reply to Maude's proposal Frowde wrote that the press would undertake such a plan depending on the sale of the *Twenty-Three Tales* volume, which Maude had proposed to be done in a volume similar to *Essays and Letters*. When the World's Classics series transferred to the Oxford University Press in 1905 after Grant Richards' bankruptcy, Maude proposed the idea of the publication of the volume in a popular form similar to *Essays and Letters*. The idea of a collected edition might have failed, but Maude succeeded in his original plan to publish his translations in the World's Classics series. The press published eight volumes of Maude's translations. Thus, Maude's two first attempts to secure a collected edition of Tolstoy's works met with failure. Nevertheless, his search for a publisher continued. This time he turned to Heinemann. ¹³⁶

(a) The Heinemann Project

Maude's third attempt to secure a publisher came before the outbreak of World War I. He approached Heinemann with a plan in 1913. The strong probability of the project's success was much in evidence. In this respect, the Heinemann project can be seen as the earliest attempt by Maude to produce a collected edition of Tolstoy's works. "A Memorandum of Agreement" was drawn up in 1913, but it was never signed. This edition, to which Constance Garnett was to contribute, besides three or four other translators, was to consist of 15 volumes excluding any volumes on the life of Tolstoy. The edition was to be published by Heinemann in the British Empire and H. Doran of New York. The failure to reach an agreement with the American publishers grounded the whole idea. ¹³⁷

The major obstacle that Maude faced concerning his collected Tolstoy, was the low fee of 6/- per thousand words Heinemann was offering. Despite his dissatisfaction with the cheap rate Maude seemed ready to accept and to do the edition on such terms. However, when the matter was delayed through the course of negotiation with Doran concerning the American royalties, he started to have serious doubts "whether I can really get satisfactory translations made at 6 /- a thousand words." Hence his demand for an extra fee.

Maude was to be the editor providing prefaces to all volumes, and receiving no payment for this work, while, being paid £10 for each volume as an editing charge. In the case of any newly translated volume a charge of 6s per one thousand word was to be payable on the

day of publication, in addition to a royalty of 10% on the first 5000 copies in the British Empire and 5% later. The American royalty would constitute 75% of a 5 cent royalty. The editor would have no claim on volumes translated by Garnett and the launching of the edition was dependent in accordance with Heinemann's conditions on the completion by Garnett of her translating Dostoevsky, but it was not to be before 1915. Negotiations and arrangements for the edition began at the beginning of 1913.¹³⁸ Strangely, there seems to be no record of Garnett's response to these terms.

However, some difficulties arose during the negotiation period. From the beginning Maude was dissatisfied with the low rate of payment. Other obstacles came to the surface as a result of Maude's publication of his early translations, in particular as regards the issue of copyright. In this respect, trouble arose with Funk and Wagnall and Dodd concerning the American rights of *Resurrection* which were held by the latter, and with Constable over the reprinting of the volume of *Plays*. Besides there was some more delay relating to Doran's refusal to comply with Maude's wish to pay 10 percent royalty on all editions selling at a higher price than £1. In practice the deal was cancelled when a letter to Doran on this point failed in its aim.¹³⁹ But Heinemann was keen on the edition; when Doran backed out he started looking for another publisher. Maude seems to have lost hope in the accomplishment of the edition when negotiations reached this complicated stage. To Gazenove, of the Society of Authors, he wrote in March 1914: "I am not altogether sorry about the Tolstoy Edition, as I am at present, and for some time to come, over busy."¹⁴⁰ However, he was still prepared to consider any offer from Heinemann. The matter was "still alive"; Heinemann was negotiating it with Harper's. In the end, Maude's insistence that he would not take less than a 10s per thousand words for the translations called the matter off completely.¹⁴¹

After the failure of the Heinemann project Maude turned once again to the Oxford University Press. This time the idea of the Centenary Edition was more clear in his mind. With this understanding he must have proposed the idea of the edition to Humphrey Milford some time in 1919. But the latter's reply was negative:

I do not feel inclined at present to publish a library edition of Tolstoy's complete works. So much may happen between now and 1928 - everything moves at such a rate now-a-days - and I do not want to have my hands tied so far ahead.¹⁴²

The press was in the meantime still publishing Maude's translations in the World's Classics.

Maude did not give up. In 1922 he tried to induce the Oxford University Press to undertake the issue of the Edition. The idea seemed very likely to become reality. The press was more responsive to the proposal this time. However, it was less inclined to include Tolstoy's peace works such as *The Kingdom of God is Within You* for fear of the lack of demand. The press also needed some sort of financial backing. For this purpose, Maude turned to the American philanthropist Henry Ford. He tried to interest him in the cause of the Edition, and asked for financial help in order to induce the press to take the publication of the Edition in time for the centenary of Tolstoy's birth in 1928. In his letter to Ford, Maude spoke of the importance of peace for the welfare of mankind. He sent Ford a copy of Shaw's appeal, and explained the necessity of issuing a library edition of Tolstoy's works in English in the light of the absence of any reliable or readable versions of his works, despite the presence of different translations which, by no means, represented the bulk of Tolstoy's works but only a fraction of what he wrote. He also explained the need to include Tolstoy's works on peace in this edition which would run to thirty volumes including the fifteen volumes he and his wife had already translated. He also mentioned that Oxford University Press was publishing a pocket edition of his and his wife's translations, and how they would "continue this series as long as the sales justify the expenditure," but that due to shortage of funds they rejected Maude's proposal to undertake to publish a library edition. Maude asked Ford to lend the Press £20,000 on the basis that the cost of each volume would be £600. He promised to return the money by 1929 at the latest, and to share the profits of the edition's sale with him.¹⁴³ Maude's attempt to secure the money needed by the press from Ford was a failure. However, the press did not completely rule out the idea of the edition. Maude's proposal was taken seriously and studied. But it was not until the advent of 1927 that an agreement was reached in this regard as will appear later.

(b) The Unwin and Doubleday Project

In the time, while the Oxford University Press was still considering the idea of undertaking to publish the Centenary Edition, Maude turned to other publishers in search of a deal now that the year 1928 was nigh. Maude's last trial with other publishers came in 1927 just before signing the agreement with the Oxford University Press. There is proof that Maude approached Unwin with this project earlier. A letter from Maude to Thring dated 2nd February 1926 refers to the matter. Maude sent Unwin's proposal to Thring to judge the latter's terms. Unwin was ready to pay "£50 for editorial work and a further sum for newspaper advertising." Thring found the offer quite fair.¹⁴⁴ Maude managed to secure a deal with Allen and Unwin to produce a limited edition of 750 sets in Britain on the condition that a similar number of sets could be sold in America. The deal failed because Maude was unable to meet the demand of the

American firm to present its subscribers with letters in Tolstoy's handwriting. Another stumbling block to signing the agreement was the existing translations of Tolstoy's works. Nelson Doubleday refused the proposal for the edition on the grounds of the market's being flooded with other editions of Tolstoy's works such as those of Crowell, Scribner and Page.¹⁴⁵

Maude's only hope was Oxford University Press. He had great expectations that they might eventually agree to undertake to do the edition. After the failure of the Unwin project he wrote to Tatiana Tolstoy:

Our failure to get any co-operation in America for the Centenary Edition is a disappointment, and makes it impossible to produce so large an edition as I had hoped for, but I still expect the Oxford Press to produce a Centenary Edition of twenty-one volumes in the first place, and to promise the rest later if sufficient subscribers for it come forward. ¹⁴⁶

Indeed, Maude's expectations proved right. By 13 December of that year he had signed the agreement with the Oxford University Press to publish the Centenary Edition. Before we proceed to give the details of the agreement, it is essential to account for the great deal of trouble and the effective campaign that Maude pursued to sign up the deal.

(c) Oxford University Press Project

Signing the agreement with the Oxford University Press was the result of a long preparatory period in which Maude led a well-organized and extensive campaign. The campaign started in 1922 with a letter of appeal to the press and was followed by other related activities within the Tolstoy Society which was especially founded for this purpose in 1925. The process of the whole campaign was slow. It involved the securing of subscribers, a publisher, prefaces and introductions to each of the volumes.

From the beginning the campaign was designated to promote the edition and to secure enough subscribers for it in order to induce the Oxford University press to undertake the publication. Maude's public campaign for the Centenary edition began in 1922 with George Bernard Shaw's letter of appeal to the press, which appeared in the *Times* (29 April). The appeal, which was jointly written by Shaw and Maude and signed by over a hundred and twenty names representing the leading English and American writers, dramatists and critics,

drew the public's attention to the lack of a complete edition of Tolstoy's works in English. The main purpose of the letter was to promote interest in the need for a collected English edition of Tolstoy's works. It mentioned the Oxford University Press project and invited subscription from lovers of literature to buy the edition as a whole, thus, securing the copyright issue to the edition and finding a way out of the intricate situation which Tolstoy's denunciation of copyright, in addition to the lack of any international copyright agreement concerning Russian translations, had created.

Sir,

We desire to call the public attention, especially in circles interested in literature and in general cultural questions, to the lack of a complete edition of the works of Leo Tolstoy in the English language. Unfortunately the means adopted by Tolstoy to secure the widest possible circulation of his books had just the opposite effect. He invited all publishers in all countries to take the fullest advantage of the absence of international copyright between Russia and other countries by publishing his writings in such translations as they could procure without any reference to his moral or legal rights. In the case of any less famous author this step would have prevented his works being translated at all, as it is practically impossible to engage modern capital in publishing, or any other enterprise, without property rights. In Tolstoy's case it led to the appearance of great number of translations, including some very incompetent ones, of a few of his books which were considered specially interesting as stories, or were capable of being turned to account for propaganda. These few books have consequently become more or less well known; but the profits of their publication have been so divided that they have in no instance been able to carry a complete edition on their backs. Accordingly, no complete edition has yet appeared; and the one projected for the Tolstoy Centenary of 1928 by the Oxford University Press, translated by Aylmer Maude, whose competence and acceptance by Tolstoy himself are unquestionable, may prove commercially impossible unless the public, by subscribing for complete sets and specifying this edition in their purchases of separate volumes, makes up for the absence of legal rights and for the miscarriage of Tolstoy's public-spirited intention in the matter.

Shaw proceeds to praise Maude's merits as a translator, his personal knowledge of the writer, his familiarity with Russian life and Tolstoyan colonies. He concludes the letter by expressing the feeling that without such an edition there would be

a grave loss to our national literary equipment; and we earnestly hope that the opportunity of completing the nineteenth century bookseller both of our public and private libraries by a complete edition of his works in English will not be missed. ¹⁴⁷

Shaw's letter was signed by many English and American prominent literary figures and critics. Among the list of signatures were the names of Arnold Bennett, Edward Carpenter, Gilbert Murray, Bernard Pares, Bertrand Russell, May Sinclair, Graham Wallace, Hugh Walpole, H. G. Wells and many others.

In order to stimulate interest in the edition, Shaw's letter was followed by the formation of the Tolstoy Society in 1925. Indeed, the idea of the formation of the Tolstoy Society sprang from the necessity to support Shaw's letter of appeal. The Society was founded under the presidency of Lady Grey Fallodon. The Society's main job was to secure as many subscribers as possible to the edition in order to induce the Oxford University Press to complete the whole edition. It also aimed at promoting a celebration of the centenary of Tolstoy's birth in 1928 and in securing a better reputation to Tolstoy, the playwright, through the promotion of his plays in the English theatre. Shaw wrote:

May I ask you to let your readers know that under the presidency of Lady Grey of Fallodon a Tolstoy Society has been formed which aims at prompting a celebration of the Centenary of Tolstoy's birth in 1928, and more particularly at the publication of a complete edition of his works and the production of his plays. ¹⁴⁸

The Society had a secretary and a few hundred members. Arnold Bennett was invited to be its vice president but he refused. ¹⁴⁹ Particulars of the edition's proposal were sent to people in order to interest them to join the society. Members of the society paid one pound subscription fee and promised to buy the complete edition on publication. The list of the Society's members included the names of such prominent figures in the literary and academic world: Jane Addams, W. A. Albright, Robert Atkins, Maurice Baring, John Galsworthy, Desmond MacCarthy, Walter de la Mare, Prince D. S. Mirsky, Gilbert Murray, Dr. Marie Stopes, J. D. Duff, Humphrey Milford, C. Hagberg and many others. The Society's main aim was to secure as many subscribers to the edition as possible in order to induce the Oxford press to undertake the publication.

The Society was responsible for other activities such as securing the performance at London theatres of Tolstoy's plays. Maude hoped by this to show the English public Tolstoy's greatness as a dramatist. He went through much trouble to achieve his aim. In order to raise money for the project he wrote to his son Herbert in America asking for his contribution if possible.

It is curious that, although Tolstoy's plays have been successful not only in Russia but all over Europe, he is as yet almost unknown as a dramatist in England, and if in this year of his centenary we could secure recognition for him as a playwright our versions of his six plays would become valuable, besides the advertisement for his books generally that a production at a London theatre would give. The question is whether I shall be able to find enough money to get one of the plays produced. To do so would cost from £1500 to £2000, and I might perhaps be asked to put up half or two-thirds. I

don't want to press you at all in the matter, but shall be very glad if you see your way to take a share in it. ¹⁵⁰

For the realization of his aim Maude corresponded with the managers of many theatres, like the Century Theatre and the Ventures Theatre, in order to secure the production of two of Tolstoy's plays. At the same time he was negotiating the project with Robert Atkins of the Liverpool Repertory Theatre. In 1926 to Robert Atkins Maude proposed the idea of producing two Tolstoy's plays in London. The latter promised a production, but failed to fulfil the promise in the end. ¹⁵¹ Nevertheless, Maude succeeded in having *The Fruits of Enlightenment* and *The Power of Darkness* performed in Newcastle and London. The plays were presented consecutively by the People's Theatre in March 1927, ¹⁵² and by the Moscow Art Theatre at the Garrick Theatre in April 1928. ¹⁵³ When Maude heard of the company's intended visit to England he wrote to Frank Gregory, the General Manager of the Garrick Theatre, about his and the Society's wish to have *The Power of Darkness* produced in London in commemoration of the centenary of Tolstoy's birth.

The Tolstoy Society would be extremely interested if they would give it in London in which case we will do everything in our power to see that it is well attended. This play has been successful all over the Continent, and as this is the centenary year of Tolstoy's birth, it would be particularly suitable to have it given in London just now. ¹⁵⁴

Indeed, the play was scheduled to be performed by the company. The play was performed in April, 1928. The performance was not successful to Maude's disappointment, who felt that it did not achieve the desired aim of promoting Tolstoy as a dramatist. The popularity of Chekhov's plays on the English stage was partly responsible for the play's failure.

I am so sorry to hear that the Art Theatre did not do *The Power of Darkness* very well. They seem to prefer Chekhov's plays, which is unfortunate, for nothing would help our efforts to reawaken interest in Tolstoy more than a successful production of one of his plays in London. ¹⁵⁵

In the course of the preparation for the campaign Maude had to deal with a major issue that of copyright. This issue presented serious complications for Maude. Maude's publication with different publishers of some of his early translations which he desired to include in the Centenary Edition, prompted the need to reach a settlement with these publishers. This was the case, particularly, with those translations which were published with Maude's unintentional

disregard to the copyright issue. Maude, however, was very conscious of this problem of copyright from the beginning, because he always had in mind the idea of producing a collected edition of Tolstoy's works.

Maude regarded Tolstoy's renunciation of copyright as an act that deserved respect, however, he regretted the fact that this act had not benefited his readers. It rather resulted in English readers having no collected edition of his works. This act of repudiation sprang from Tolstoy's disapproval of payment and legal restraints. Although he followed his bent, but the fact remains that "the legal enactment of copyright confers benefits not on authors and publishers alone, but also on readers; and the chief of these benefits is the definiteness it gives to what would otherwise be a perplexing, speculative and quarrelsome affair." ¹⁵⁶ The absence of copyright in new books is disastrous as they would remain unpublished. Maude put part of the blame on Chertkov who was publishing Tolstoy's didactic works in English noncopyright. This step "discouraged any English publisher from undertaking a complete edition of his works." Maude hoped that "the completion of the Centenary Edition for libraries, and of the cheap 'World's Classics' pocket edition for the general public, should supply that deficiency before very long." ¹⁵⁷ One of the main things that hampered such an edition was the absence of copyright in Tolstoy's works. Hence Maude's concern with the provision of this right in all his early translations. For this reason Maude had to make sure to hold this right in his translations. From the beginning his aim was to produce a collected edition of Tolstoy's works. The call on subscribers to specify the Centenary Edition when purchasing any volume guaranteed the copyright for the whole edition.

The protection of copyright was always important to Maude. His keenness to secure it for all his translations, as we have seen earlier, caused him to make separate deals with individual publishers and not to comply with the conditions of the Brotherhood Publishing Company and the Free Age Press. The same issue occurred when the idea of the Centenary Edition looked as if it were going to take place. Negotiations with Oxford University Press were still taking place, and there was a strong probability that they would accept the project and bring the edition to light. At the same time G. B. Shaw's appeal referred to the matter of copyright and the best means to keep it. Subscribers were invited to buy the whole edition and to specify the Maude edition in case of separate purchases of the volumes. By this way Maude secured the rights for his edition.

However, one of the main difficulties that faced Maude was securing this right for his proposed Centenary Edition. He was always aware of the necessity of keeping the copyright issue of all his translations. For since he started to translate Tolstoy, his intention was to bring about a collected edition of the writer's works: "I therefore made it a rule carefully to retain the

copyright in translations I made, so that they might be available for inclusion in a collected edition." ¹⁵⁸ But despite his care he faced many problems. His early experience with Tolstoyan firms stressed the necessity for this right for the realization of his dream in bringing a definitive edition of Tolstoy in English.

His experience with the "No Copyright Reserved" policy of the Brotherhood Publishing Company and the Free Age Press opened his eyes to the necessity of such a procedure. The two firms were closely connected with Tolstoyan issues, and followed in Tolstoy's steps as regards the denunciation of copyright. So, in accordance with Tolstoy's wishes, he agreed to submit his translations to the two firms, and to comply with their policy. He later realized that their policy with its failure to mention the translator's name was by no means to his advantage in the long run. On these grounds he stopped collaboration with them. He was aware of the importance of this issue since the time of his collaboration with the firm. The copyright issue was so decisive that Maude had to plead with Tolstoy for a solution. He wrote explaining the matter to him. But Tolstoy's sympathies remained with the two firms.

The considerations which you advance against the Free Age Press, and in favour of copyright, are just; but so is the consideration that the manner of publishing should accord with the bases which are preached in the editions. And I think that the latter argument is more important than the former. I think if you do not agree to that, then your and your wife's beautiful translations of works that have already been published in bad translations, deserve to find a publisher. If not, still what you have in view to do is very pleasant to me. ¹⁵⁹

Maude had always been keen on the issue of copyright, because of his knowledge of the intricacy of the situation. As Russia did not belong to the Berne Convention, anyone could translate a Russian work as soon as it appeared. Tolstoy's denunciation of copyright in his works added to the complexity of the matter. In the light of this issue Maude took many precautions whenever he made a deal with a new publisher. All these arrangements were preparing the way to the publication of the Centenary Edition. Securing his rights in *What is Art?* and *Resurrection* endorsed with Tolstoy's authorization formed the basis for the projected edition.

So, with the absence of any copyright control by Tolstoy on his works, Maude's only chance was to secure this right in all his translations. He kept the copyright in all his early translations; his agreements with the different British and American publishers indicated this matter very clearly. His realization to the significance of the matter came through his experience with the Free Age Press. He refused to abide by their policy of "No Copyright Reserved", and

insisted on a full acknowledgement to his right as a translator. He stopped freely submitting his work to them, and cooperating with them on the grounds of his disagreement with Chertkov's policy. Likewise, he tried to follow the same line with the different publishers.

Having failed to procure the copyright in his translations from Tolstoy personally, Maude had to follow Tolstoy's advice and turn to other publishers in order to secure the copyright in his translations. In dealing with these publishers, he made sure that he was the owner of copyright. Very often he would pay the expenses of the production of his early translations himself. He paid the expenses for printing, binding, advertising, in addition to a commission to the publisher when he issued *Resurrection*. In this way he presented the first authorised translation of the book, and remained the holder of the copyright. Similarly, he paid Constable for the production of *Life of Tolstoy*. He always stressed the issue of copyright in his agreements. The context of the "Memorandum of Agreement" between him and Grant Richards in relation to *Resurrection* was clear on this point.

The author retains the copyright in the book and property in the plant, but he assigns the publisher the exclusive right of publishing the said work in book form in the British Isles and British possessions other than Canada. Provided that the author may remove the publication of the work by giving the publisher six calendar months' notice in writing; and provided that if the work be allowed to run out of print for so long a period as two consecutive months, the whole rights shall revert automatically to the author. ¹⁶⁰

The American right of the same book was in the hand of Messrs. Dodd Mead. Maude was worried that they might block his arrangement for the Centenary Edition in 1928, and that he might need permission from the firm to include it in the projected edition. "The American copyright of my wife's translations of this book was sold to Dodd, Mead & Co (subject to a royalty payable to us) in 1899. I understand that copyright in U.S.A. has to be renewed after 25 years. Is there anything my wife has to do in the matter?" ¹⁶¹ There was no justification for his fears as Robert Thring of the Society of Authors assured him. The firm did not own the copyright in the book, "they merely owned a right to publish." ¹⁶² Although the copyright in the book would expire in 1927, nevertheless, the firm had no claim for renewal. The copyright in the book and the right for renewal would belong to Maude's wife only.

Maude secured the copyright in the books that Grant Richards published for him in the same way; in relation to the latter's publication of *Essays and Letters* "the copyright remained mine, & I could re-use the matter (specially, in any collected edition of Tolstoy's works etc.)" ¹⁶³ but it was not to be used in any form that definitely competed with the World's

Classics. As for his rights in Grant Richards' list of books, after the collapse of the company, the matter was resolved in his favour. The books were taken, on the firm's bankruptcy by the Resurrection Fund Committee, of whom Maude was the chairman. The committee later passed the rights on these books to Maude.

A similar problem arose in relation to *What is Art?* The book was copyright in England where it first appeared in 1898. However, Maude had allowed his version to be used by Crowell, the American publisher, without payment and subject to no contract. The book was also published by Walter Scott in England. Scott was, nevertheless, paying Maude a royalty on the book. In 1922 Maude tried to withdraw consent from Crowell to publish the book. Crowell refused Maude's proposal to withdraw his permission to use the book. Negotiations with Charles Scribner, who edited the edition for Crowell, and Walter Scott proved a difficult matter. Maude wanted both publishers to renounce their rights in the book and to stop publishing it. Correspondence with the two publishers was undertaken by Robert Thring of the Society of Authors on Maude's behalf. Crowell claimed that Maude had sold him the rights in the book in 1898, and that he could not stop the American sales. But he promised to stop Walter Scott from publishing it in England. Maude could not remember giving the copyright away, and thought that since it was first published in England it could not be legally copyright in America. The Crowell book had the "copyright" mark

because if Crowell could maintain a copyright in that work it would be a very serious obstacle to my finding up a publisher for the Centenary Edition on Tolstoy's works that I am aiming at.¹⁶⁴

In the end Crowell agreed to their terms and Maude was holder of copyright in the book.

Maude never parted with his dramatic rights in the volume of plays which was published by Constable and the Oxford University Press, but remained the holder of the copyright. The Society of Authors collected royalties on them for Maude. He received up to £900 from the dramatic rights.¹⁶⁵ Similarly, Maude did not sell the copyright to the Oxford University Press when they were issuing his translations in the World's Classics series. But he only allowed them reprint the volumes for selling purposes. Maude never gave away the copyright in his translations published by the press; he only allowed the press to use his translations on a fifty-fifty basis. Robert Thring wrote to Maude,

If you have not sold the copyright to the University Press it seems to me that although you have been allowing them to sell for the purpose of reprinting on a fifty-fifty basis, that you

could stop them in the future, if you have got the legal right to do so under your contract, but you would have to give them a formal notice to the effect. 166

He also retained the copyright in "Family Happiness." In 1922 J. D. Duff agreed to supply Maude with his translation of the story for inclusion in one of the World's Classics series, with acknowledgement for his authorship. Duff assigned the copyright to Maude on the latter's payment of £24 out of the £100 he received in advance of royalties. Maude secured the copyright in the story for ever; the fifth clause of the agreement which was signed on 30th April 1922 stated:

Should Mr. Maude, succeed in getting the same matter republished in library-format he undertakes to pay Mr. Duff a further sum, calculated in like proportion out of what he may receive in advance of royalties of the said re-publication of the volume. Such second payment to complete Mr. Maude's obligation in the matter. 167

Further complications arose as regards the issue of copyright in relation to the publication in the Centenary Edition of *Hadji Murad*. Because he had sold his translation of the volume for \$600 to Curtis Brown, the American agent who commissioned him to do the translation, and was the owner of copyright in it, Maude was able only to publish the book in England but not to export it to America. In order to include the book in the Centenary Edition Maude re-bought the copyright in it from the publisher. 168

Maude's campaign was culminated by great success, for the Oxford University Press consented to publish the edition. In 1927 Maude received a letter from its head concerning the terms on which they were ready to undertake the project. There survived no document that indicates the signing of this agreement, because in those days there were no formal contracts drawn between the authors, translators and the publishers. What we have is the letter that Milford sent to Maude outlining the press's conditions

Dear Aylmer Maude,

Centenary Tolstoy

I have been thinking over this, and I am willing to agree to the following arrangement:

1. I will produce eleven hundred sets (one thousand for sale) of a 21 volume edition, Crown 8 vol. size, bound in cloth, using the existing plates of the World's Classics for the 13 volumes already published there and the one now being set up. The volumes will not be separately sold.

2. The remaining seven volumes (two of the Life - you might let me know the titles of the others) are to be published in the Classics not less than six months after their first appearance in the Centenary Edition.

3. In the productions of these 21 volumes I shall aim at publishing 5 next August, and the rest probably in two batches of eight volumes each in August 1929 and August 1930.

4. The first five will be (reset) Twenty-Three Tales; the Art volume (now resetting); Plays; and your biography (two volumes).

5. The price of the set is to be £9.9 0

6. In order to avoid any difficulty with the booksellers I will publish 'For the Tolstoy Society' and will allow the Society a discount of 10% on this published price, on all copies ordered through them. But this will prevent me making an offer of a lower price (say £8.10.0) for each on other non-Society orders.

7. I will pay you a royalty of 10% on the published price; not paying any in advance. But if when the time comes for publication in the Classics you have not received a sum equivalent to your usual £50 advance on each new volume, (and £20 on the two volumes of the Life) I will pay you at once an amount equal to the deficiency.

8. Each volume is to have a photogravure frontispiece, and each book an Introduction which you will obtain. Where one book runs to two or three volumes the first only, of course, will have an Introduction. Neither Photogravure nor Introduction will be reproduced in the Classics.

9. In consideration of your paying for these Introductions, and of the increased publicity we hope this edition will bring to the World's Classics series, I am willing to divide the profits (if there are any) on this edition in the proportion of 50% to myself and 50% to you. I understand that half of yours goes to the Countess Tatiana, and that therefore the edition may be, unofficially and indirectly, said to help the family.

10. The American sales will be in the hands of my New York branch. I will communicate with them as soon as I hear that you agree to this whole arrangement; they will of course fix their own prices.

11. I agree that we must offer our subscribers a chance of the other fourteen volumes. But I think we must only do so conditionally on sufficient subscriptions being received. Personally I doubt whether they will be; it would mean practically the whole 1000 subscribers going in for the extra.

Actually I should like to be assured of three or four hundred subscribers before I started printing. Could the Society produce that number of subscriptions?

Yours,

H. Milford. 169

Maude's original plan was to have the edition ready by 1928, but the delay in securing a publisher prevented the success of this plan. When Oxford University Press agreed to publish the edition, Maude hoped to have it complete by 1932, but it took him six more years from that date. The process of editing which involved re-translation of old volumes and translation of new ones like *The Kingdom of God is Within You* was partly responsible for the delay. Added to this was the matter of providing introductions to the volume; a procedure which involved writing to critics and writers in order to get their approval.

The whole edition was completed in 1938. It was limited to 1,000 sets in twenty-one volumes, with introductions by leading English and American writers. The price was £ 9.9s. net and the volumes were not sold separately. The edition was available to the public in cheap editions in the World's Classics series.

Although he was approaching his eighties Maude had lived to see the accomplishment of his dream. He had waited long enough, but this waiting proved justified, as did the time and effort he put into it. Not only was his edition the first standard English version of Tolstoy's works, but its publishers were very prestigious. The Oxford University Press was a scholarly publishing firm. When he started the project he did not anticipate it would take him that long to finish it. "I had no idea when I started, that the presentation of his works to the English-speaking world would be so arduous and lengthy a task, but it is one I do not regret having devoted my life to, and which I think, was worth doing." 170

The Centenary Edition was thus completed in April 1937. It was intended mainly for the libraries, and was published in a limited number. The cheap form of the edition appeared in the World's Classics Series. Shortly after the publication of the volume in the Centenary Edition, a reprint of it was issued in the World's Classics series. Thus Maude achieved his aim by presenting a definitive library edition of Tolstoy's works and a cheap edition for public consumption. The edition hardly procured any financial profit for the Maudes. The truth is that Maude contributed to finance the edition himself, and certainly he made a loss. Maude had to pay the expenses of resetting earlier translations. He paid Oxford University Press £280 in order to reset *War and Peace*. Of his financial loss he left this account:

I am more than £1000 out of pocket over the Centenary Edition, having, besides . . . expenses, paid for the resetting of several volumes, with my earlier translations of which (for the "World's Classics") I was not quite surprised. 171

Besides he had offered half of the profit to the Tolstoy family as he promised Alexandra Tolstoy in one of his letters. He would have liked to offer the whole of the profit, but he needed the money to live on with his wife since they had been living on small means. 172

Maude's desire to make his edition the standard English edition required more effort and work on his part. Although he had previously translated most of the works he wanted to include in it, his conscientiousness led him to re-translate, and in some cases, rewrite, works of translation or other relevant writings of Tolstoy. Both *Anna Karenina* and *War and Peace* were re-translated, the second volume of his *Life of Tolstoy* was rewritten. His knowledge of the poor qualities of previous editions, which he criticised continuously, might have been the stimulus behind his extra effort to present the works in as perfect and reliable a form as possible. This delayed the completion of the Edition in the set time.

Maude's general plan for the edition was to present Tolstoy's works in the chronological order of their first publication, with the exception of works of similar character, plays, folk stories, and essays. These were grouped together in different volumes disregarding the date of publication. The need to read and understand the full idea of the development of the writer's thoughts, particularly his religious and moral views, depended mainly, in Maude's view, on reading his works in the order they had been written in. The disregard of presenting translations in this sequence "has till now led to much misunderstanding, and to underestimation of Tolstoy's profound treatment of life's fundamental problems." 173

The edition is by no means complete in the sense of its presenting all that Tolstoy produced. When the idea of the edition was first projected the aim was to present a complete edition of Tolstoy's works. On the publication of the prospectus inviting subscription either for a thirty-five volume or a twenty-one volume the demands received were in favour of the twenty-one volume. Thus the idea of attempting a complete edition was abandoned. The inclusion of a further fourteen volumes would have made the edition complete in the sense that it would have contained all that Tolstoy wished to publish. The inclusion of the additional volumes was conditional and subject to the success of the first twenty-one volumes and on the number of subscribers who would express a wish to have the complete works. The Society must have failed in securing a sufficient number of subscribers sufficient to induce the Oxford University Press to complete the edition of thirty-five volumes. Besides, this decision was somehow threatened by the news of the Soviet Government's preparation to publish a Jubilee edition of ninety volumes. Although Maude was concerned about this news and feared its effect on his proposed edition, he was determined to carry on the project. For, in his view, to have to wait for another ten years for the completion of the edition, and maybe another ten years to have it translated was too long. The injustice done to Tolstoy's works prompted this quick response. Relying on Tolstoy's maxim that "gold is got only by sifting", Maude feared that the Russian Jubilee would rather "promote mental indigestion than a healthy appetite for what Tolstoy would have wished us to read." In the light of his understanding of Tolstoy's wishes Maude stated the main objective of his edition to be the presentation to readers of all that Tolstoy published or wished to have published. On such grounds, he excluded from the edition what he considered works of "local or temporary interest," such as his school books and *Four Gospels Translated and Harmonized*, in addition to omitting the accounts of relief work during the famine years and any unrevised or uncompleted posthumous stories. "In a word the claim made for this edition is to be not the bulkiest but the best edition of Tolstoy's works in our language." 174

The Centenary Edition's twenty-one volumes contained most of Tolstoy's important works, but excluded the diaries, notebooks and letters. Maude's version is still considered the

standard one of Tolstoy's works in English despite the fact that new translations of Tolstoy's major novels have been published in the Penguin edition by Rosemary Edmonds. The centenary edition is found to be lacking in balance as regards its exclusion of the letters and diaries of Tolstoy which make forty-five volumes of the standard Russian edition.

When it first appeared the Centenary Edition was considered as the standard complete edition of Tolstoy's works in English. Although it did not have a great influence on the reception and reputation of the writer, it put an end to all dealings with the various incomplete, and unreliable editions of his works in English. The *Times Literary Supplement* greeted the completion of the Edition by reviewing *Recollections and Essays*, the concluding volume:

Here is the concluding volume of the Tolstoy Centenary Edition; and it is no more than fitting to salute the completion of the whole enterprise with gratitude to the publishers and to Mr. Aylmer Maude, whose editorial labours have throughout been marked by exceptional care and industry. Nobody could have brought greater devotion to the task of compiling and translating anew into English a complete edition, unabridged, uncensored and faithful to Tolstoy's final corrections in manuscript or in proof, of the works which Tolstoy himself selected for publication. ¹⁷⁵

Moreover, his translations had the special characteristic of appearing in a complete and un mutilated form for the first time and, in many cases before the Russian version. Tolstoy declared the Maude's version of *What is Art?* and his wife's translation of *Resurrection* as the authorized, complete and correct edition of both books. Tolstoy wrote a preface to the book

This book of mine, *What is Art?*, appears for the first time in its true form. More than one edition has already been issued in Russia, but in each case it has been so mutilated by the Censor, that I request all who are interested in my views on art only to judge of them by the work in its present shape. ¹⁷⁶

The edition evoked different responses from critics. Some, like Dorothy Brewster, were convinced that the Edition enhanced Tolstoy's reputation. "As for Tolstoy, it was not until 1928, when the Centenary Edition of his works began to appear (under the editorship of his biographer Aylmer Maude) that his stature as man and artist could be measured." ¹⁷⁷ Others, like J. A. Smith, were of the view that Tolstoy's reputation was well-established earlier and long before the publication of the Centenary Edition. In his view, the scattered translations, and the existing "available" collected editions of Tolstoy's work helped keep Tolstoy's name known, in addition to the appearance of biographies and other Russian works

which threw light on his art and personality. All these works helped to introduce Tolstoy to the English public. He proceeds to say that the critical analysis of Tolstoy's artistic methods and the publication of his diaries and letters after 1911 led to a further development in the writer's reputation, but that the publication of his posthumous works did not change the earlier approach to his art or personality. 178

Nor did the publication (1928-1937) of a complete and definitive translated edition of his works, the Centenary Edition, translated and edited by Louise and Aylmer Maude, result in a definitely new or different interpretation of Tolstoy's fiction. And this despite the fact that Maude's translation has been generally agreed to be the most satisfactory in English -- and despite Arnold Bennett's assertion that it "puts a new complexion on Tolstoy." As a matter of fact, Maude's translation of one of the major novels (*Resurrection*) and of several of the major stories had been available in English since the early years of the century; and the other major novels (*Anna Karenina* and *War and Peace*) had been available in a translation which made Maude always ranked very nearly on a par with his and his wife's -- namely, Mrs Constance Garnett's. The "new complexion" put on Tolstoy by the Maude translation was so nearly the same as to be practically indistinguishable from it. 179

For unlike Turgenev or Dostoevsky "Tolstoy's fame, having once taken root, in 1886, was never seriously headed back."180

In accounting for Tolstoy's reputation outside the Soviet union since 1910, on the other hand, A. V. Knowles ascribed the spread of appreciation of Tolstoy's fiction to two factors, the Russian Cult, which in his view led to further interest in Tolstoy despite the fact that it concentrated on Dostoevsky, and the presence of good and reliable translations:

Constance Garnett was the instigator, but it was Aylmer Maude in his Centenary Edition (1928-1937) who ensured that Tolstoy was readily, readably and accurately available to English-speaking readers.181

Despite his call for the need of a new edition of Tolstoy's works based on the 'Complete Collected Works', Knowles asserts "that Maude's versions are still by and large the best in English." Other scholars believe that the Centenary Edition remains to this day "the most scholarly edition of Tolstoy's works in the English language." And the Maudes are rated among the four translators of Tolstoy "ahead of all others in English". With their Centenary Edition they "made their bid to establish an Authorised Version." 182

The preparation for the Centenary Edition took many years and it involved a great amount of hard work. Nevertheless, Maude's life's work was crowned with the greatest of achievements. The edition which came to be known as the "Maude" Tolstoy was considered as the standard English translation. The labours of the translators were duly acknowledged and the merits of their production received the praise it deserved as already quoted. Bernard Shaw praised Maude

Translating Tolstoy is not a matter of pegging away with a dictionary: it is the labour of re-thinking Tolstoy's thought, and re-expressing it in English. Tolstoy himself has appealed to Europe to judge *What is Art?* by Mr. Maude's translation, and not by the censored and mutilated Russian version. And nobody can possibly read it and suppose that Mr. Maude is neither a highly competent translator or else a man of original genius who is writing under the pseudonym of Leo Tolstoy.¹⁸³

Shaw was by no means exaggerating when he described Maude not only as a translator but as a creative writer. His statement was certainly appropriate. For Maude's work was a task of love springing from a real and genuine desire to present Tolstoy's works in a definitive English edition, and a complete sympathy with the writer's works. There is no better evidence that supports the truth of this fact than Tolstoy's own words praising the quality of Maude's translations on the grounds of his "mastery of both the languages, and besides that, to my great pleasure, you love the thoughts you transmit." The merits of the volumes of the Centenary Edition were greatly appreciated. *The Times Literary Supplement* when reviewing *War and Peace* commended the quality of the translation in general. Furthermore, the reviewer had this to say after a comparison of a chapter or two of the present version with the Maude's former translation and with the Russian:

it must be said that it is painstaking work, straightforward and accurate, . . . As a further example of their industry, the editorial notes records the discovery of a mistake which has disfigured successive editions of the Russian text - the substitution of Vistula for Viliya as the name of the river that Napoleon crossed after the Niemen.¹⁸⁴

7. Maude's Tolstoy

Maude was renowned as an authority on Tolstoy. His acquisition of this remarkable position can be attributed to different factors; his provision of the first English written biography of the writer, his translation and presentation of Tolstoy's works in a collected edition, in addition to his being regarded as Tolstoy's interpreter. He was always remembered

not only as a translator but also an interpreter of Tolstoy's works. In recognition to his services in this literary field he received a Civil List Pension of £100 in 1932. The fact that he admired Tolstoy's works greatly, sympathized with his ideas, and that he was one of his disciples strengthened his status as a defender of Tolstoy and an expounder of his ideas in England.

Maude was described as "Tolstoy's most authoritative Anglo-Saxon biographer."¹⁸⁵ In 1902 Maude returned to Russia. He visited Tolstoy at Yasnaya Polyana and was authorised to write Tolstoy's biography. The book appeared in two volumes; *Life of Tolstoy: First Fifty Years* (1908) and *Life of Tolstoy: Later Years* (1910). In the first volume Maude covered Tolstoy's childhood and youth up to the period of his marriage, while in the second he dealt with the development on his mind that led to his conversion to the status of a prophet. The appearance of the two volumes ranked Maude as Tolstoy's best biographer. Both volumes were regarded as a standard work. Praise and appreciation to Maude was soon recognised and his services were acknowledged. "Interest in Tolstoy in this country has been well served by Mr. Maude's "Life," a detailed authoritative and conscientious piece of biography."¹⁸⁶ His personal acquaintance with the writer, in addition to his knowledge of both Russian and English enabled Maude to use Russian sources and unpublished reminiscences.

No Englishman other than Maude, could claim the same advantages as a biographer - for though some Englishmen might boast of as good a knowledge of Russia and the Russian language as Maude, none could combine with that knowledge Maude's intimacy with Tolstoy's works and acquaintance with the man himself. The author drew on Russian sources: Biryukof's life, various memoirs, magazine articles, and unpublished reminiscences.¹⁸⁷

Despite this eulogistic attitude to Maude as a biographer of Tolstoy, his achievement was not met everywhere with the same enthusiasm and great appreciation. The chief criticism of Maude's biographical account centred on the fact that it was full of personal reminiscences of Maude and Tolstoy.

His two-volume life of Tolstoy is an exhaustive study, perhaps not remarkable as literary biography but nevertheless clear and authoritative, neatly touched by personal reminiscences and impressions of Tolstoy in the midst of his literary labours.¹⁸⁸

A note on Tolstoy's biographies in *The Nation* (New York) in 1912 reads like this: "Those who wish an appreciation of his true significance as a man of letters and as a moral force, would do well to pass by Maude and the others and to turn to Rollan."¹⁸⁹ Nevertheless, at the time of its appearance Maude's biography was regarded as the only available and up to date account of the writer's life in English. Besides it had the advantage over Tolstoy's two

Russian biographies, by Biryukof and Sergyenko, in that it covered the incidents of Tolstoy's life up to his flight from home before his death. The only English account of Tolstoy was available through a translation of the first volume of Biryukov's book. Maude issued a one-volume biography entitled *Leo Tolstoy* in 1918. It was an abridged version of his extensive two-volume biography. The Russian Revolution stimulated Maude to write this book. Maude succeeded in finding a good market for it in Russia itself. The book became very popular among the Allied troops there. Maude created great interest in the writer as a result of his lectures on him as part of his programme for the Russian Expedition which he joined as a lecturer for the Y. M. C. A.

Maude was not only considered as a translator, but also an interpreter of Tolstoy. M. J. de K. Holman describes him as "one of the most distinguished interpreters of Tolstoy's life and works to the English-speaking world."¹⁹⁰ As part of his role as an expounder and interpreter of Tolstoy's views he wrote books, many articles, and also gave lectures. *Tolstoy and his problems* (1901), and *The Doukhobors: A Peculiar People* (1905) were his first attempts in this regard. In the case of the first book Maude tries to explain Tolstoy's views regarding different aspects of life or literature, in addition to some of his thoughts on war, imperialism and ethics. In his preface to this book he explains the necessity he felt to make clear some of Tolstoy's strange views, and to present these views as belonging to a particular period or relating to certain incidents in his life, particularly as some of his views run counter to what is already established in treatises and books. That some of Tolstoy's views in "Talks With Tolstoy " may appear out of date is by no means Tolstoy's fault, Maude tells the reader, but the blame rather rests on the delay that Tolstoy's works suffered from in reaching the English public through translation. All the nine articles in the book like "What is Art?", "Patriotism and Government " and many others were written for the purpose of explaining Tolstoy's ideas as regards different issues. Thus, the object of the book is explanatory and not adulatory. Maude felt the need to cross-examine Tolstoy's views. The same motives initiated the writing of the second book. Maude's main objective was to account for his and Tolstoy's involvement in the Doukhobors migration to Canada, and to show the true history of this Russian sect by throwing much light on their virtues and eccentricities. Both books offered Maude a good opportunity to criticize Tolstoy on points he dared not to raise before, partly out of respect and partly out of the lack of evidence to support his charges. Then came his writing of the *Life* where he presented Tolstoy's different views on social, religious, and moral problems in such ways as deserved Tolstoy's own praise: "I have just read your presentation of my religious views. It is very good. I thank you for it from my soul, and press your hand in friendship."¹⁹¹ The obituary in *The Times Literary Supplement* praised his presentation of the account of Tolstoy's "conversion" which has not been surpassed by those who wrote better biographies than his own, and added that "Nobody had interpreted more sympathetically

the moral principles of Tolstoy's rationalized Christianity and his doctrine of non-resistance to evil."

Maude wrote and lectured indefatigably and with great earnestness on his subject, and in recent years was specially concerned to dispel misconceptions here of Tolstoy's views on art and to defend the artist and teacher against partisan attacks occasioned by the publication of Countess Tolstoy's diaries. It is fitting that he should have lived to complete the main task to which he had addressed himself so devotedly. ¹⁹²

Maude had sincerely assigned himself as Tolstoy's defender. He often protested against mis-statements about Tolstoy that appeared in newspapers or periodicals. As a way of correcting misconceptions and misrepresentations of Tolstoy's views, he would write to newspapers and point out the untruth of the facts mentioned, and state things and facts as they should be. To the editor of the *Pall Mall Magazine* he writes in 1903 about Elbert Hubbard's blunders in an article where he accused Tolstoy's wife of having her husband certified insane by the court; "Mr. Hubbard's statements are impudently and ridiculously untrue." Maude calls on Hubbard to give sources, "or - if he has invented his witnesses as well as his facts - I should like to ask him to admit that in his endeavours to hoax the public, he has gone beyond the bounds of what is either wise or decent." ¹⁹³

Maude sent two similar letters to the *Times Literary Supplement* protesting about false remarks in one of its review concerning his *Life of Tolstoy*. The reviewer attributed Tolstoy's flight from home wrongly to "his determination to be true, at last, to his principles and to enter a monastery if need be" Maude showed the untruth of this statement by stressing that,

The plain fact is that Tolstoy never had any intention of entering a monastery, but during the last thirty years of his life he was firmly and increasingly convinced that the established Church was a great obstacle to the prevalence of any true religion.

Just before his death he visited his sister at the nunnery to which she was attached, and the ecclesiastical party, which wanted to have it believed that Tolstoy had wavered in his convictions, utilized this occurrence to spread a false report that he had thought of rejoining the Church. ¹⁹⁴

In another letter to the same periodical he complained about a remark in the review of Nazardoff's *Life of Tolstoy* which attributed to Tolstoy words he did not say by enclosing them between inverted commas.

It remarks that the author of *War and Peace* held a theory of art which denounced that work as "impious" and "absolutely insignificant." As these words are put in inverted commas, the suggestion seems to be that they were used by Tolstoy himself. I feel confident that he did not use them, for I discussed that very question with him when with his co-operation I was translating *What is Art?* That work was for a long time grossly misrepresented; but I flattered myself that the introduction in the Centenary Edition might have partly cleared up the misunderstanding. I, therefore regret to note its recrudescence in the attribution to him of the works I have commented on above. 195

Maude's Editor's Notes to the various volumes of the Centenary Edition were very helpful in interpreting many aspects of Tolstoy's art and life and their correlation sometimes. He defended Tolstoy against the blunders of some critics who took his work as representing actual facts of his life. In this regard he used to point out which of Tolstoy's stories were autobiographical and which were not. For instance, he denied that the stories in *Childhood, Boyhood And Youth* were autobiographical by recounting Tolstoy's annoyance when the story "Childhood" appeared in a periodical under the title *My Childhood*, and by mentioning that only the feelings and thoughts of Nicholas in the story were those of the young Tolstoy,¹⁹⁶ while he assured the reader that *Resurrection* and was based on an incident that took place in actual life. In his editor's note to *Tales of Army Life* Maude reminded the reader to keep in mind the different stages of Tolstoy's career when reading the stories. For that purpose he also gave an outline of Tolstoy's life and remarked that "nothing causes more misunderstanding than the habit of reading opinions he expressed in the 'eighties and 'nineties into novels and stories written in the 'fifties and 'sixties." ¹⁹⁷ In order to make Tolstoy's views on art intelligible to the reader he wrote an introduction to *What is Art?* He provided the volumes of *War and Peace* with sketch-maps to assist the reader.

Maude's lectures on Tolstoy helped to enhance his position as an interpreter of the writer. He lectured in Britain and abroad for different societies, social or religious, and in universities and colleges. We are told by his son that he took a course in lecturing at one stage in his life. We know that as part of his organised campaign for the Centenary Edition he delivered lectures on Tolstoy's art and life, and had to travel to different cities to answer invitations to lecture. Maude went with the Expedition of the North Russian Relief Forces as a lecturer for the Y. M. C. A. His lectures on Tolstoy were of great value, not only to British but also Allied troops in Russia.

Maude not only interpreted but also examined some of Tolstoy's views, and his endeavours in this concern were greatly esteemed, particularly his criticism of the non-resistance doctrine:

No-one has subjected Tolstoy's later doctrines to a more sympathetically critical examination than Maude . . . Nevertheless no-one saw the good elements in Tolstoy's teaching more strongly than Maude, and no one did more than he did to spread that teaching by translation and commentary throughout the English-speaking world. He devoted his whole life to the task. ¹⁹⁸

During World War I Maude went back to Russia with the expedition of the North Relief Forces as a lecturer for the Y. M. C. A. He stayed there from November 1918 to mid-June 1919. Maude was sixty years of age when he accepted to accompany the Russian Expedition. Maude's decision to travel abroad the country was related to his disappointment after the culmination of his short affair with Dr Marie Stopes.¹⁹⁹ Besides his lectures to the Allied forces and the native Russians, Maude was engaged in journalism. During his stay in Russia he acted as a war correspondent for *The Manchester Guardian*.

That his lecturing expedition was useful and successful in giving Maude the peace and tranquillity his nature was seeking is in evidence in his letters home

Besides my lectures, I have told stories and played simultaneous chess for the amusement of the Y.M.C.A. soldiers. With the M. G. [Manchester Guardian] articles, and reports to B.[British] Trade Corporation, and my efforts to keep pace with current events here, and to improve my Russian, I find that the day is not long enough. I am however not as vigorous as I should like to be, but have on the whole not much to complain of, and, in particular, I like my work, and could hardly be anywhere where such capacities as I have could be more fully utilised, which is an important matter.²⁰⁰

His lectures, particularly on Tolstoy, were of great value to both the British and the Allied forces. He also lectured on the British Government's policy in Russia. In this respect his lectures were directed to promote the cause of the expedition and in favour of the Allied intervention. He lectured in English to the Allies and in Russian to the people of the district. To the Russians he spoke about the best ways for regenerating Russia after the Bolsheviks' departure. His Russian lectures were well received, just as his talks on Tolstoy were warmly regarded.

His lecturing expedition is significant for the light it throws on Maude's political views. It shows his anti-Bolshevik attitude and that he was in favour of intervention in Russia, and of the destruction of the Bolshevik power. The Bolsheviks he called "the worst rulers Russia has had since the Tsar Yoke was broken, and are flagrantly false to their own principles." He regarded Bolshevism as an international disease which must be countered by international efforts. In his view, Constitutionalism was the only solution for Russia. In his role as a journalist Maude wrote many articles about the situation in Russia condemning the Bolsheviks and praising the role of the Expedition. *The Manchester Guardian*, however, published only three or four of them, and rejected the ones that Maude would have liked most to be published. This was largely due to the fact that the newspaper's policy was not in favour of the Expedition. He only came to find out about this later. As a result he stopped writing for the newspaper. Even the articles that appeared in the paper did not represent his real thoughts for they were published after some modification to suit the paper's general policy. The paper published only extracts from Maude's articles as dispatches; these appeared in March and April of 1919.

The Expedition proved useful to Maude, the translator and interpreter of Tolstoy. His lectures on Tolstoy must have stimulated much interest in the writer. For there was a great demand for some of his works both at the Y. M. C. A. and Archangel book shops. Consequently, Maude took this chance to promote his own translations. Orders for copies of *Sevastopol*, *Resurrection*, *Plays*, *Leo Tolstoy*, *What is Art?* and *The Cossacks* were made. Maude made a small profit out of selling these volumes. There was a great demand for *Leo Tolstoy* owing to the view that Tolstoy's ideas were, in a way, responsible for the Russian Revolution. Maude wrote to his son Arnold who was in charge of providing the copies of the volumes

I am being asked about the book, and as soon as it can be sent I shall be glad. Also a dozen of *23 Tales* from the Oxford Press would be welcome books, which should be thin paper if possible and cheapest binding. 201

Various stands and influences in Maude's development and life made him sympathetic to Tolstoy's ideas. He maintained an independent and critical stance in relation to Tolstoy as man and thinker, never lapsing into adulation, but evidenced a lifelong respect for Tolstoy which expressed itself in determination (eventually rewarded) to produce a definite edition of his collected works for readers in English. The fact that a cheap World's Classic edition was also to be available seems to indicate that Maude felt it was important for Tolstoy to reach as wide an audience as possible, not that they might be 'converted' as to a new religion, but that, they like Maude, they might be stimulated to think for themselves.

It was largely due to Maude's sincere dedication that he won this prestigious status as the English authority on Tolstoy. He was indeed more than a translator. For his efforts in expounding the writer's ideas were as much appreciated as his provision of the first scholarly English edition of the writer's works. It was a life-long struggle involving unrelenting efforts and numerous sacrifices. His loyalty to the writer was the impetus behind his perseverance. To this we add his conviction in the cause of the aim he set himself to achieve, notwithstanding the challenges and great difficulties such a resolution would encounter. The encounter was fought and won. Indeed, he went through much trouble in order to secure a publisher for the edition. Despite the great disappointments he met, he did not give up the search. At the end he managed to persuade a renowned publishing house to undertake the project. The Oxford University Press is considered a scholarly firm. The achievement was long-awaited, but the result was very rewarding. And the Centenary Edition of Tolstoy's works stands as the standard English edition of the writer.

Notes

1. "Obituary", *The Times Literary Supplement* (3 September, 1938), p.566.
2. Janko Lavrin, "Aylmer Maude", *Dictionary of National Biography* 1831-1940.
3. Maude Account: Brotherton Library. There is a short memorandum by Maude's son in the Maude collection in the Brotherton library, University of Leeds, which is not included in the copy of the Maude collection at Sheffield University. It contains some personal details to which is made reference. The memorandum is referred to as Maude Account: Brotherton Library.
4. C. M. E. Seaman, *Christ's Hospital: the Last Years in London* (London: Ian Allan, 1977), p.48.
5. Brian Gardner, *The Public Schools: an Historical Survey* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1973), p.77.
6. Seaman, *Christ's Hospital*. pp. 47-48. Only the children of the poor were selected by the Governor. The provision of a detailed financial statement to support his nomination was essential, "no boy is admitted whose parents have a larger amount of income than we think they ought to have in order to receive the benefit of a charitable institution." The school was described as "a ragged school. It was for destitute children found in the streets of London."
7. Gardner, *The Public Schools*. p. 79.
8. Seaman, *Christ's Hospital*. p. 55.
9. Gardner, *The Public Schools*. pp. 78-79.
10. Maude Account: Brotherton Library.
11. Gardner, *The Public Schools*. p. 79.
12. Maude Account: Brotherton Library.

13. At/1 A, B, Archive. A letter in the Maude Archive refers to Maude's decision to leave the school. The letter, At/1 A,B (25 September, 1896), is addressed to Maude by one of his relatives in England who despite his justification to his action, called it "a little precipitate." The relative also urged Maude to return to England: "I think your best course is to return to England at once."

14. When Maude first met Tolstoy and heard of his disapproval of money-making he told the writer "'I understand, Leo Nikolaevich, that you disapprove of all money-getting? That interests me very much for I am in Russia to try to earn some money.'" Aylmer Maude, *Life of Tolstoy: Later Years*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931), pp.241-242.

15. Maude's marriage certificate records his occupation as a clerk. Maude's marriage certificate, At /2 (Maude, Archive).

16. M. J. de K. Holman and David Collins, "Aylmer Maude's Letters from Archangel: 1918-1919." *Sbornik*. No 6-7 (Papers of the Sixth and Seventh International Conferences of the Study Group on the Russian Revolution) [Jan.1980-Jan.1981] p. 108.

17. At/4. Archive. Letter to Maude from Muir and Mirrieless (31 march 1890).

18. J. Neville Bartlett, *Carpeting the Millions: the Growth of Britain Carpet Industry* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1977), pp.142-144.

19. R. C. C. Letter to G. Marchetti (27 December 1896). Box 12 (R. C. C. Correspondence) in the Crossley Carpets collection C 300.

20. Holman, *Sbornik*. p.108.

21. Maude Archive, letters, At/10, At/11A,B, At/12, At/13A,B, At/14-17. For more information of Maude's contacts with the company see letters in Box 12 in the Crossley Carpets collection.

22. Dr. Alexeev was Lucy's husband, Maude's sister who worked as a governess in Russia. According to Maude's son Lucy married a Russian. Dr Alexeev was interested in the temperance movement, and he wrote a book about the drink problem to which Tolstoy wrote an introduction: "Why do Men Stupefy themselves."

23. Aylmer Maude, *Tolstoy and His Problems* (London: Grant Richards, 1901), p. 32.

24. Maude, *Life: Later Years* (1911), p. 341. Tolstoy's later works were those which he wrote after his conversion to the new philosophy of non-resistance at the end of the 1880s. Among these works were *My Confession*, *What I Believe*, and *What Then Must We Do?*

25. Maude, *Tolstoy and His Problems*. p.33.

26. Ibid.

27. Aylmer Maude, *The Life of Tolstoy: Later Years*. (London: Constable and Company, 1911), p.532.

28. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. p. 521.

29. Ibid., p. 532.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Dennis Hardy, *Alternative Communities in Nineteenth Century England* (London: Longman, 1979), pp. 2-17, 156-186, 172-180.

33. Edgerton, pp. 64-5.

For more details of Russian Tolstoyan experiments see Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911).

34. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. p. 310.

35. W. H. Armytage, "J. C. Kenworthy and the Tolstoyan Communities in England", *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* Volume xvi. 4, 1956-57, p. 392.

36. W. E. Edgerton, "The Artist Turned Prophet: Leo Tolstoy after 1880", *American Contribution of the Sixth International of Slavs* II, 1968. pp. 66-7.

37. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. p. 353.

38. Peter Brock, *Pacifism in Europe to 1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), p. 464, pp. 453-4.

39. M. A. Aldanov, "Some Reflections on Tolstoy and Tolstoyism", *The Slavonic Review* 7, (1928-29). p.483.
40. M. J. de K. Holman, "The Purleigh Colony: Tolstoyan Togetherness in the Late 1880s", in ed., Malcolm Jones, *New Essays on Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), p. 195.
41. Hardy, *Alternative Communities*. p.176.
42. Ibid., p. 208.
43. Ibid., p. 172.
44. Ibid.
45. M. J. de K. Holman, "The Purleigh Colony: Tolstoyan Togetherness in the Late 1880s", pp. 195-206.
See also, W. H. G. Armytage, "J. C. Kenworthy and the Tolstoyan Communities in England", *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* Vol. xvi 4 (1956-57). pp. 391-396. and by the same writer "Tolstoyan Colonies", in *Heavens Below: Utopian Experiments in England, 1560-1960..* (London: Routledge, 1961).
46. E. R. O. T/P 181/8 "Bread Labour at Purleigh" and "The New Order at Purleigh", *Essex County Chronicle*. The notes are based on the Cuttle newscutting as compiled by E. R. O. in 1971.
47. E. R. O. T/P 181/8, *Essex County Chronicle*.
48. Holman, "The Purleigh Colony: Tolstoyan Togetherness in the Late 1880s." pp. 204-5.
49. Ibid., p. 206.
50. Ibid., pp. 212-13.
51. Holman, "The Purleigh Colony: Tolstoyan Togetherness in the Late 1880s." pp. 208-218.
52. Maude, *Life: Later Years..* (1911) p. 548.

53. Aylmer Maude, *A Peculiar People: the Doukhobors* (London: Richard Constable and Company, 1905), p. 59.

54. *Help*, an appeal to draw the attention of the world to the Doukhobors' persecution was published in 1896. The appeal was compiled by Vladimir Chertkov, Paul Biryukof and John Tregoubof at Tolstoy's recommendation. Part of Tolstoy's work in the same year was *The Christian Teaching* which he intended for the Doukhobors. At Tolstoy's request an article on the sect "A Russian Religious Sect" appeared in *The Times* (23 October, 1895). Moreover, Tolstoy decided to allow the publication of *Resurrection* and offer its profits to help the sect's migration to Canada.

55. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 59.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

57. *Ibid.*, p. 46. The Doukhobors were so anxious to leave Russia that they did not wait for the answer concerning the adequacy of Cyprus. Around 1,126 of them sailed from Batum to Larnaka in 1889, where they stayed till December. The Society of Friends transported them to Canada. George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*. (London: Faber and Faber, 1968) pp.123-29.

58. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 49.

59. *Ibid.*, p. 313.

60. *Ibid.*, p. 53.

61. *Ibid.*, pp. 55-9.

62. *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

63. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

64. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 220.

65. E. R. O. T/P 181/8/42 "Another World in Essex: Idealists at Purleigh", *Essex County Chronicle*.

66. Maude Account: Brotherton Library.

67. In the Maude Archive there are some letters which indicate that Maude was a member of the International Peace Association; C/337.

68. E. R. O. T/P 181/8/42 "Purleigh", *Essex County Chronicle*.

69- Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 3.

70. Maude, *Tolstoy and His Problems*. p. 220.

71. Ibid., p. 251.

72. Ibid., pp. 256-57.

73. Ibid., pp. 163-4.

74. Ibid., p. 253.

75. Ibid., p. 257.

76. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 301.

77. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911) p. 468.

78. Ibid., p. 47.

79. Ibid., pp. 47-8.

80. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 52.

81. Ibid., pp. 65-6.

82. Ibid., p. 68.

83. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911), p. 364.

84. Ibid., p. 522.

85. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 279. Ibid., pp. 530-1.

86. Ibid., 315-16.

87. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911) p. 548.

88. Ibid., p. 379.

89. Ibid., p. 547.

90. Ibid., pp. 280-281.

91. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911) p. 312.

92. Ibid., pp. 281-311.

93. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 322.

94. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911) p. 548-557.

95. Ibid., p. 510.

96. Ibid. p. 551.

97. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 240.

98. Ibid., pp. 223-24. The incident which acted as the main stimulus for the pilgrimage movement was the publication by the Free Age Press of Verigin's letters. He wrote the letter while he was in exile and never intended them to be seen by his people. The letters deal with his eccentric no-violence policy which he developed after reading Tolstoy's. pp.223-24.

99. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911), p. 507.

100. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 59.

101. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. p. 551.

102. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 279.
103. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. p. 363.
104. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 284
105. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911).p. 59.
106. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 282.
107. Ibid., p. 284.
108. Ibid., pp. 285-6.
109. Ibid., p. 287.
110. Ibid.
111. Ibid.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid., pp. 287-99.
114. Ibid., p. 297.
115. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911), p.
116. Maude, *A Peculiar People*. p. 289.
117. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911), pp. 365-6.
118. Aylmer Maude, *Leo Tolstoy* (London: Methuen, 1918), p. 209.
119. Leo Tolstoy, *What Then Must We Do?* tr. by Aylmer and Louise Maude.(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. xiv.

120. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911). pp. 530-31.

121. *Ibid.*, p. 536.

122. Aylmer Maude, "Tolstoy's Place in Literature", *The Fortnightly Review* CXXX, 1928, p. 331.

123. Maude Account: Brotherton Library.

124. Tolstoy's works were available through Professor Leo Wiener's *The Complete Works of Count Tolstoy* which appeared in twenty-four volumes in 1904-1905 and was published by J. M. Dent, London. Of the earlier editions there were the Scott edition and Vizetley's edition. Other translators of Tolstoy include: Nathan Haskell Dole, J. D. Duff, Isabel Hapgood and Constance Garnett.

125. Holman, "Translating for the Free Age Press ." p. 186.

126. Holman, "Half a Life's Work: Aylmer Maude brings Tolstoy to Britain", *Scottish Slavonic Review* 4, 1985, p. 42.

127. Holman, "Translating Tolstoy for the Free Age Press." p. 185.

128. *Ibid.*, p. 190.

129. O. U. P. folios 194-5 (21 November 1919) Humphrey Milford's Letter Book No. 92. From 6 November 1919 To 12 December 1919. Society of Authors Papers, 56748, folio 15 (28. February 1925).

130. O. U. P. folio 460. (3 November 1919) Humphrey Milford's Letter Book (From September 6th 1919 To November 6th 1919) folio 460 (3 November 1919).

131. Leo Tolstoy, *On Life, and Essays on Religion*. tr. by Louise and Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. (Oxford University Press, 1934), pp. xx-xxi.

132. Maude, *Life: Later Years* (1911), p. 692.

133. *Ibid.*, pp. 693-95. Tolstoy protested against the false statement attributed to him relating to the sex question as a result of the publication of one of these complications in the French

journal *La Revue Blanche* "The opinions there attributed to me are grotesquely absurd, and are a careless, second-hand, and incorrect summary of a collection of articles and undated extracts put together and published by my friend, Vladimir Tchertkof." The Archive papers contains also a draft of a lecture delivered for the National Book Council in 1927 which recapitulate most of the points dealt with in the appendix regarding mistranslations of Tolstoy's works.

134. Ibid., p. 696.

135. O. U. P. Letter to Henry Frowde (24 October, 1905) Tolstoy: *Twenty-three Tales* W.C.72, 250072, C.C.Contract File.

136. O. U. P. Letter to Frowde, (9 October, 1905) Tolstoy: *Twenty Three Tales*. W.C.72, 250072, C.C.Contracts File. .

137. M. J. de K. Holman, "Half a Life's Work: Aylmer Maude Brings Tolstoy to Britain." pp. 43-4. See also these letters in the Maude Archive C/127-8, 138, 171, 183.

138. C/327-8. Archive.

139. C/177-80, C/154, C/163, (2 March, 1914) Archive.

140. C/160, (2 March, 1914) Archive.

141. C/164, 165, 166, 167, Archive.

142. O. U. P. folio 460, (21 November, 1919) Letter to Humphrey Milford, [Mr Milford Letter Book. From September 16th 1919 To November 6th 1919]

143. G/46-51 (2 October, 1922) Letter to Henry Ford. Archive.

144. Letter to Maude, G/58, Archive.

145. folio 77. Mss 56748, Society of Authors Papers.

146. Add/46, (29 November, 1927) Letter to Tatiana Tolstoy. Archive.

147. Maude, *Life: Later Years* (1931) Appendix III. pp. 468-9.

148. "The Tolstoy Society", *The Times Literary Supplement* (3 June 1926), p. 374.
149. Arnold Bennett, *Books and Persons*. p. 121.
150. I/41 Letter to son Herbert (5 January 1928), Archive.
151. Ajj/53 A, B/1,2,3,4. Letters to Atkins. Archive.
152. To Tatiana Lvovna - Tolstoy's daughter - Maude wrote; "I am just back from Newcastle where an amateur society have produced *The Fruits of Enlightenment* very well." Add/25 A,B (6th March,1928) Archive.
153. I/413, (17 April, 1928) Archive.
154. I/187 A,B. (3 April,1928) Archive.
155. Add/ 33 A. Archive.
156. Aylmer Maude, "Tolstoy's Mistake", *The Bookman* (August 1922) pp. 208-9.
157. Leo Tolstoy, *Ivan Ilych and Hadji Murad* tr. by Aylmer and Louise Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. xvi.
158. Tolstoy, *Ivan Ilych and Hadji Murad*. p. xviii.
159. Maude, *Life: Later Years*. (1911),.p. 572.
160. Aw/4, (1901) "Memorandum of Agreement" between Maude and Grant Richards. Archive.
161. folio 98 (4.10.1922). Mss 56747, Society of Authors papers.
162. folio 200 (19.3. 1924), Mss 56747, Society of Authors papers.
163. O. U. P. (12 October,1905), Tolstoy: Twenty Three Tales W. C. 72, 250072. c. c. contracts File. (12 October,1905)

164. folios 151, 161, 162. Mss 56746, folios 32, 34, 37, 38, 47, 48, 54, 56, 64, 73, .Mss 56747, The Society of Authors papers.

165. O. U. P. Letter to Williams, (29.2.1924).

166. G/ 91 (2nd March,1925). Letter to Maude from Robert Thring of the Incorporated Society of Authors, Playwrights and Composers. Archive.

167. G/36, Archive. Clause 2 of the "Memorandum of Agreement" between Maude and Duff reads like this

If Mr.Maude signifies his approval then Mr Duff undertakes to assign to Mr.Maude the copyright in that translation, Mr.Maude undertakes to incorporate the said translation, with due acknowledgement of Mr Duff's authorship, in a volume of the World's Classics series of translations of Tolstoy, edited by Mr. Maude.

168. folio 183 (25 June,1928). MSS, 56748, Society of Authors papers.

169. O. U. P. folios 117, 118, 119. (n. d.) Letter to Maude. Mr Milford's Letter Book, no. 128. From (part of) November 23, 1927 to (part of) February 10, 1928.

170. Leo Tolstoy, *Anna Karenina*. tr. by Louise and Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition.(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936), p. xviii.

171. folios 137, 138, (6 May 1937) MSS 56749, Society of Authors papers.

172. Add/ 15,16, (27 February,1925) Archive. Maude wrote to Alexandra when he was still preparing for the edition that: "If the thing can be managed and produces a profit, I should like to share it with you and other members of your father's family who were deprived by Tchertkoff of your literary inheritance "

173. Tolstoy, *Nine Stories*. p. xiii.

174. Tolstoy, *Ivan Ilych and Hadji Murad*. pp. xxiii-xxv.

175. "The Moralist Tolstoy", *The Times Literary Supplement*. (29 May,1937), p. 408.

176. Leo Tolstoy, *What is Art? and Essays on Art*. tr. by Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929), p. 66.
177. Dorothy Brewster, *East -West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships* (London: Allan and Unwin, 1954), p. 174.
178. J. A. Smith, *Tolstoy's Fiction in England and America* Ph.D. thesis. Urbana, Illinois , 1939. p. 261.
179. Ibid., p. 320.
180. Ibid., p. 322.
181. A. V. Knowles, ed., *Tolstoy: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), p. 41.
182. Ibid.
183. Leo Tolstoy, *The Kingdom of God is Within You* tr. by Aylmer Maude (Oxford:Oxford University Press, 1936).
184. *The Times Literary Supplement* (16 June 1932), p. 445.
185. Holman, "Half a Life's Work." p. 40.
186. "Obituary", *The Times*. (26 August, 1938), p. 12.
187. *The Times Literary Supplement*. p. 566.
188. "The Bibliographies of Tolstoy", *Nation* (New York), xciv (7 March, 1912), pp. 237-38.
189. M. J. de K. Holman, "Unpublished Letter", *Journal of Russian Studies* 36, 1978. p. 5.
190. Tolstoy to Aylmer Maude (16 March, 1910)
191. *The Times Literary Supplement*. P. 566.
192. Ap/13 A.B. (23 October, 1903).Archive.

193. *The Times Literary Supplement*. (5 June, 1930), p. 478.

194. *The Times Literary Supplement*. (13 November, 1930), p. 942.

195. Leo Tolstoy, *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth*. tr. by Louise and Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928)

196. Leo Tolstoy, *Nine Stories*. tr. by Louise and Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. xiii. In the Maude Archive can be found some of Maude's lecture notes. In "Tolstoy and His Aims" Maude sums up the writer's life, his conversion, and speaks about his works and finally his death. (Ap/3) [neither the date or the location of the lecture is given.] "Reading and Translation" giving Maude's criticism of Tolstoy's translators was given for the National Book Council at Martimier Hall, London in 1927. (Ap/4). For other references to Maude's other lectures and his lecturing tour to the United States which never materialized see the Maude Archive, D/198; G/44, 77, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 87; I/228, 229, 231, 234, 246, 254.

197. E. B. Greenwood, *Tolstoy: The Comprehensive Vision* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1975). pp. 150, 153.

198. Ruth Hall, *Marie Stopes: a Biography* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1977), p. 145. According to Hall, Maude's volunteering to take part in the Russian Expedition was related to Stopes' second marriage which put an end to their platonic love affair. He quotes a letter Maude sent to Stopes before his departure to Russia. "It would be a much greater wrench for me to go to Russia if it were not that your marriage has cut us apart to an unexpected painful extent." See Keith Briant, *Marie Stopes: a Biography* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1962), and also the Society of the Authors Papers, Marie Stopes collection, which contain Maude's and Stopes' correspondence for more details of the kind of relationship they had.

199. Holman, *Sbornik*. pp. 120-21.

200. *Ibid.*, pp. 109-39.

201. *Ibid.*, p. 134.

CHAPTER FOUR

S. S. Koteliansky (1880-1955)

1. Background and Education

This chapter is indebted to Geraldine Louise Conroy's thesis *A Study of the Life and Works of S. S. Koteliansky* (1977) and to George Zytaruk's *The Quest of Rananim: the Letters of D. H. Lawrence to S. S. Koteliansky* (1970).

Samuel Solomonovich Koteliansky, the Russian born translator, will be always remembered for his translations - which constituted his major contribution to the literary world - as much as for his friendships with famous literary figures like D. H. Lawrence, John Middleton Murry, Katherine Mansfield, Leonard Woolf, H. G. Wells, Mark Gertler, James Stephens and many others. His productions in the field of translation may not have been considered as outstanding as those of Garnett or Maude. Nevertheless, they were influential enough to affect the trend of enthusiasm for the Russian cult. The collaboration of some of these literary figures on his translations comes as a live demonstration of the significance of the part he played in arousing more interest in the treasures of Russian literature.

Koteliansky was born at Ostropol, the small village in Volhinia province in the Ukraine, on 1 April 1880. The second son of a family of four, Koteliansky had two brothers and one sister. His parents were owners of a flour mill, and were well off. His father was Arzum Shloima Koteliansky; his mother, Beila Geller, came from a rich family. Kot (as he was known to his friends) was always proud of his ancestors, particularly on his mother's side. Her family "claimed descent from a celebrated talmudic [sic] scholar of the seventeenth century called Yomtob Limpman Heller." ¹

There is no available record of Koteliansky's early education. It is probable that he attended the village school in his town. Koteliansky went to the University of Odessa where he obtained a qualification in law. During his University years he was involved in revolutionary

activities prior to the Russian Revolution. As a consequence he was obliged to live under police surveillance from 1900 to 1906. Like many intellectuals of his time, he was involved in revolutionary actions. Nevertheless, "he was never an active revolutionary." ²

The stories behind Koteliansky's reasons for coming to England were diverse. Dilys Powell and Leonard Woolf suggest that he came to England from Kiev with a University grant.³ Gransden also mentions a three month University grant. ⁴ This assumption, however, has been denied by Mrs Esther Salamon. Mrs Salamon was one of Koteliansky's friends. According to her, Koteliansky was sent to England by his mother who also supported him at the beginning of his stay. ⁵

Koteliansky left Russia on 23 June 1911; he arrived in England on 7 July 1911. ⁶ His decision to stay in England for the rest of his life was related to political reasons in connection with the revolutionary actions going on in Russia.⁷ He used to say, "I came for three months, I stayed for ever." ⁸ Indeed, once he came to England, he stayed for the rest of his life and never went back to Russia. Although he contemplated visiting Russia more than once, his plans never materialized. Nonetheless, he was in close contact with members of his family in the Ukraine and Canada. One of his brothers was killed by the Cossacks, and he helped the second brother to move to Canada. He kept up a correspondence with his mother and with his niece, whose father was killed by the Cossacks. His correspondence with his mother is kept at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. So we may presume that Koteliansky came to England with the intention to settle in the country.

In appearance Koteliansky was described a Russian Jew of the Trotsky type. He had "thick hair going straight up in the air, eyes looking at, through, and over you with a look in them of desperate and yet resigned intensity." His "integrity and intensity" prompted many who knew him to liken him to the prophets of Old Testament. According to Leonard Woolf, to have known him well was like understanding "what a major Hebrew prophet must have been like." Woolf likened him to the Hebrew prophets Elijah and Isaiah.⁹ To Lawrence he was "Old Jehova." James Stephens, who dedicated a poem to him, referred to him as the "Lion of Judah," ¹⁰ while J. M. Murry described him as an Assyrian king. These characteristics bestowed on Koteliansky a sense of strength and authority. However, there was also the other side of his personality which manifested itself in his friendships. This side reveals the good-natured, ever caring and loving person who was full with affection and concern for his friends. The characteristic that most appealed to Lawrence in him was his "passionate approval of what he thought good, particularly in people; his intense hatred of what he thought bad; the directness and vehemence of his speech; his inability to tell a lie - all this appealed strongly to Lawrence." ¹¹

Although he made many friends in England, Koteliansky suffered, all his life, from black fits of depression which had their toll in ending his life. He suffered feelings of disappointment and frustration during the Russian Revolution; he was very anxious about the fate of his family in Russia. His depression intensified in the early thirties and was aggravated following the death of two of his close friends; D. H. Lawrence and Mark Gertler. The coming of World War II left a scar on him very badly. His letters to his niece show the intensity of his suffering.¹² He also wrote letters to Lady Ottoline Morrell when he was in some of these black moods.¹³ Accordingly his health suffered and it became the main concern of his friends. They wrote to him encouragingly, tried to pull him out of his depression; they also visited him in nursing homes.¹⁴ However, the frequent recurrence of these black moods had its effect on his health which deteriorated as a result. His heart became weak and was more vulnerable to troubles; Koteliansky had more than one heart attack. From the final one he never recovered. He died in 1955.¹⁵ We turn now to the story of Koteliansky's arrival in England and his means of earning a living.

His first job in London was a clerk in a small office which came to be known as the Russian Law Bureau, as located at 212 High Holborn, was "a pretentious name for a law office."¹⁶ It was run by a Russian, R. S. Slatkovsky and was involved in issuing and translating certificates and legal papers for Russians in England. The exact nature of the job Koteliansky did at the bureau remains a matter of speculation. For its activities were something of a mystery. Owing to Koteliansky's knowledge of both Russian and English his job might have been that of a secretary or a translator. However, Koteliansky never seemed to do much work at the bureau. The place served sometimes as a meeting point for the Lawrence circle which included the Murrays and Mark Gertler. Katherine Mansfield recollects, in a letter she wrote to Koteliansky in 1921, the times they spent at the bureau. She remembers the "inkstand with an elephant on it", the pictures of the little kittens and that of Christ which used to hang on the wall in Koteliansky's room, the statue on the stairs, and the caretaker cleaning the stairs. Her reminiscences extend to the room above the office where Koteliansky lived, with its tiny mirror and the broken window, together with the "very nice - teacups - thin - a nice shape-" and Slatkovsky and his black beard.¹⁷ Mark Gertler commented on Koteliansky's job which he describes as concerned with blackening his boss's beard. Frieda Lawrence reminisces about their times at the bureau also by remarking that,

He [Koteliansky] was supposed to be in a law office but he would take us there and bounce his boss out of the place and mix up sour herring and mashed potatoes for us on the spot with any old plates and then sing for us.¹⁸

It seems that Koteliansky was not happy at the Law Bureau. Despite his dislike of the bureau he did not try to leave his job and look for another somewhere else. His dissatisfaction with the bureau is much in evidence in the correspondence of his friends. Mark Gertler's concern about Koteliansky's feelings prompted him to write: "I would like you to be happier but your case seems beyond comprehension to me. You hate the Bureau, yet you make no effort to get out of it." ¹⁹ Lawrence, who also realized Koteliansky's feelings of dissatisfaction, wrote encouraging him to look for another job: "I shall be glad if you can get a decent job and leave the dirty Bureau & the obscene Slat [sic]. It has lasted long enough."²⁰

Koteliansky must have spent five years as an employee at the Russian Bureau. He joined the bureau in 1911 and left it in 1916. Although there is no reference to the exact time when he did actually quit his job, it can be said that his decision to leave coincided with his change of accommodation. For Koteliansky left the room when he took lodging with the Farbmans - a Jewish family - at 5 Acacia Road, St John's Wood. The news of his leaving was surprising to Lawrence; "Now you have some news, and do not tell me. Why are you leaving the Bureau, and What are you going to do? Is it merely that you have had enough Slatkovsky, or is it something better?" ²¹

What made Koteliansky leave the bureau is not clear. This could be attributed to his decision to make translation his means of earning a living. He had already produced his first translation, a volume of Chekhov's short stories that was published in 1915. Besides, he did not seem to have been involved in other jobs, and he did take up translation as a career, a thing which he continued to do till late in life. There is another probability; his leaving of the Bureau might have been instigated by Slatkovsky's death which could have put an end to the activities of the Russian Law Bureau. Lawrence's letter to Koteliansky may be indicative of the end of the bureau's activities: "alas, the bureau - alas, Slatkovsky [sic]. Alas, that one cannot hang a wreath of thin cheap sausages over the mantelpiece of his room in 212, in memoriam." ²²

2. Joining Literary Circles

It was during his employment at the Law Bureau that Koteliansky made his first contacts with the literary world of the period. His meeting with D. H. Lawrence in 1914 was the keystone for his connection with other literary figures. Through Lawrence he came to meet the Murrays who later introduced him to the Woolfs. The circle of literary friends and acquaintances became wider and wider.

One of Koteliansky's earliest and most lasting relationships was his relationship with

Lawrence. He met Lawrence through Gordon Campbell whom he met while he was still employed at the Russian Law Bureau. Campbell, a barrister, was a friend of both Murry and Lawrence.²³ Koteliansky and Lawrence were among a group of four who went on a walking tour in the Lake District; the other two were Horne, an employee at the Russian Bureau and Lewis, a Vickers engineer. The trip had been originally planned by Horne and Koteliansky, and was intended to last longer than the four days they spent on the falls.²⁴ Their tour ended the day World War I broke out. But a very strong relationship developed between the two men, lasting for life. Lawrence's correspondence with his new friend dates from that day. It continued till Lawrence's death in 1930. Their friendship was only marred by Koteliansky's dislike of Frieda Lawrence.²⁵

The two men's friendship was a prized relationship, particularly on Lawrence's part. Of all his relationships, Lawrence's friendship with Koteliansky was the most lasting. Koteliansky was the only person with whom Lawrence "never fell out." Moreover Koteliansky's "independence was without doubt one of the qualities Lawrence most admired in him."²⁶ Gransden believes that in spite of the contrast between their characters - Lawrence being "the self-exiled, moving restlessly about the world," set against Koteliansky the "symbol of permanence and reliability."²⁷ - some sort of spiritual bond must have been responsible for strengthening their association.

Lawrence not only borrowed the name of the Utopian state from Koteliansky. But, Koteliansky "remained one of the very few people always worthy to become one of the founding pioneers",²⁸ particularly after Murry's refusal to join in. Gransden relates the origin of the word "Rananim" to the Hebrew root of the phrase "rejoice O ye righteous (bis) in the Lord" in the first verse of Psalm 33 which Koteliansky used to amuse Lawrence with by chanting.²⁹ Thus, Koteliansky was a possible participator in the ideal state after Lawrence's rejection by Murry; his letters to him speak about the dream and the best ways to achieve it. At one stage Russia was the place for Rananim and Lawrence asked Koteliansky to send grammar books as he wanted to learn the language. Moreover, Lawrence borrowed from Koteliansky's personality to model Mr.Kangaroo of the short story by the same title.³⁰ Koteliansky's friendship with Lawrence opened the way to new friendships.

The year 1914 witnessed the beginning of the expansion of Koteliansky's circle of friends. Through Lawrence he came to meet the Murrys. They were introduced to each other in October 1914. The Lawrences who had moved to Chesham, Buckinghamshire, were later joined by the Murrys who came to live nearby. Koteliansky met the couple while visiting the Lawrences one weekend accompanied by Horne. But unlike his relation with Lawrence, his friendship with them went through ups and downs. On the one hand, his relation with

Katherine Mansfield was broken for a short period only of two years between 1916 and 1918.³¹ However, once they were reconciled their relation continued till her death. On the other hand, his relation with Murry was never easy, and had always been marred with arguments over translations. The tension started in 1917 by Murry, however, reconciliation was achieved as a result of Katherine's influence. The permanent breach in their relationship, which was never mended, took place in 1924 over the *Adelphi* issue.

The Murrays introduced Koteliansky to Leonard and Virginia Woolf in 1917.³² Their friendship lasted for almost thirty-five years till Koteliansky's death. Likewise and by means of his new contacts he extended his circle of friends and acquaintances to include Lady Ottoline Morrell, Lady Glenavy, H. G. Wells, J. W. N. Sullivan, James Stephens.

Koteliansky's acquaintance with this circle of literary contemporaries proved useful. A handful of them including Lawrence, Katherine Mansfield, J. M. Murry, Leonard and Virginia Woolf, in addition to James Stephens and Philip Tomlinson became his co-translators. Their job was to polish his English, to present a better and more readable version of his numerous translations. Their help, however, was not confined to his work in the translation field. Had it not been for Woolf's and Gertler's backing of his application for naturalization, Koteliansky might not have ever become a British citizen.

Koteliansky was suspected of having contacts with the Bolsheviks on the grounds of his political views. This fact hindered his naturalization as a British subject. His first application was rejected in 1925. His decision to settle in England, as indicated earlier, was due to political reasons. "England was an asylum for Kot as it was for a great number of Russian emigres."³³ Besides, his political views were progressive. Although he was overjoyed by the revolution that had brought Kerensky to power, nevertheless, almost from the beginning he had been appalled by the ascendancy of Lenin, Trotsky, and (worst of all) Stalin. He later became disillusioned by the revolution and attacked the policy of the Bolsheviks. As early as 1922 he was sending Leonard Woolf cuttings from *Pravda* illustrating "the criminal policy of indiscriminate requisitioning on the part of the government" and "Soviet guilt for the present states of the famine-stricken provinces." His second application for naturalization was backed by Woolf and Gertler, and he became a British citizen in 1929.³⁴

Koteliansky's adaptation to his adopted country was quick. He took to Britain. "He felt in love with the temper, the way of thinking and feeling of this country." He was described as "more English than the English." "No more patriotic refugee ever came to this nation."³⁵ His thank-offering to this country was the bequest of ten volumes of correspondence, between him and many famous literary figures, to the British Museum. The correspondence is considered as

"the most notable collection of letters by modern writers which the Department of Manuscripts has yet acquired." ³⁶ The first three volumes contain Koteliansky's correspondence with D. H. Lawrence, while the next three comprise his letters to Katherine Mansfield, Mark Gertler and Lady Ottoline, the sixth and seventh volumes include Koteliansky's letters to H. G. Wells, J. W. N. Sullivan, James Stephens, whereas the ninth volume has miscellaneous letters with T. S. Eliot, E. M. Forster, Virginia Woolf and some papers related to the Russian revolution, and the tenth volume, which is no longer reserved from public use, contains Koteliansky's correspondence with Frieda Lawrence, Aldous Huxley, J. W. N. Sullivan, Catherine Carswell, and members of the Lawrence family.

Koteliansky's kind personality made him the close friend of many outstanding men and women. His women friends can be classified in two groups. To the first he was the adviser, supporter and father-figure. These women found in him the safe and perfect shelter in their time of trouble. He offered them advice, kindness, affection and a sort of paternal love. Among this group were Katherine Mansfield and Dorothy Brett. As for the second group, the roles were reversed. For they offered him the affection, help and understanding he needed. Within this group come his relationships with Lady Ottoline Morrell and Marjorie Wells.

Katherine Mansfield's "feeling for Kot is clearly shown in her letters and journals; he was the only person whom she trusted and respected completely." ³⁷ After meeting in 1914 Mansfield started a correspondence with Koteliansky; their friendship dated from then. Although there were periods of misunderstanding between them, their friendship remained strong. Koteliansky was "Katherine's friend-for-life - her refuge in time of trouble, and the one person she could always trust." ³⁸ To him she turned for comfort and understanding, especially during her periods of estrangement from Murry. Antony Alpers stresses the importance of Koteliansky in her life; he became "a most important figure in her life - not as a lover, but in an oddly paternal way as a sort of father-figure, admirer- from afar, and frowning disapprover." ³⁹ However, Carswell believes that out of his first meeting with Katherine there developed "the great, unrequited and often regretted passion of his life. His lasting love made him able to forgive all her faults, though he understood them profoundly." ⁴⁰

Dorothy Brett's relation with Koteliansky was very short. Their correspondence lasted for nearly four years from 1921 to 1924. For Brett, Koteliansky was a sort of father-figure with whom she shared her private thoughts and to whom she turned for advice in time of trouble. To her father she wrote about him; "I found a man now = a Russian Jew [Koteliansky] who will help me = not with money = but with advice = I had no grievance = I simply wanted help =. . ." Like Mansfield, Brett confided in him, to him she wrote about her deepest emotional life. Their connection, however, did not last long. Koteliansky was the one to blame

in this concern, Brett always wanted to maintain good relations with him, but he refused. ⁴¹

Lady Ottoline Morrell was in some respects a mother-figure for Koteliansky. She met him in 1915, when Lawrence took her to see him at the Russian Law Bureau. ⁴² Lady Ottoline kept up a correspondence with him. Although he was not close to her, Koteliansky was invited to her weekly gatherings which she held either at Garsington, Oxford or Gower Street, London. Nevertheless, it seems that she was like a mother to him; she "would act like a mother to him and he told her 'your severity is helpful.'" ⁴³ He wrote to her often, particularly during his days of black depression. While Lady Ottoline was like a mother to him, Marjorie Wells was his "most devoted nurse and care-taker." She was H. G. Wells's daughter-in-law. She developed affectionate ties with him, and he described her as "his tower of strength." She looked after him when he had his heart troubles. She continued to do this for years and kept nursing him till he died in 1955. ⁴⁴ Koteliansky also maintained a good relation with Katherine Mansfield's close friend Ida Baker. Baker was an important friend to Koteliansky, particularly during the last thirty years of his life. "You know, without saying it, how very grateful I am . . . for your unfailing friendship," Koteliansky wrote to her in September 1936. ⁴⁵

3. Koteliansky's Position in English Literary Life

What gave Koteliansky his distinguished place in English literary life - besides his friendships with the major literary figures of the day - was his contribution to the Russian cult and his wide knowledge of both Russian and English literature. According to Lady Glenavy's memoirs, literature was Holy writ to him. He greatly admired the old generation of Russian writers. J. M. Murry is reported to have said that Koteliansky "had pathetically extravagant notion of the power and prestige of literature: which . . . were derived from his worship of the great Russian figures when he was a Jewish boy." ⁴⁶ Unequivocally his knowledge of English literature was so vast that James Stephens told Lady Glenavy that "the greatest book on literature that has never been written is by Koteliansky."⁴⁷ In addition to his sense of both English and Russian literatures, his contribution to the post-war Russian cult was considerable, first, because his achievements were remarkable, particularly his introduction, for the first time in English, of new material in translation, and second, because of the collaboration of the literary figures in his translations which can be taken as a further indication of the presence of a cult for all things Russians. For those who collaborated with him were part of the cult themselves. Their involvement in translating Russian works is yet more evidence of the translator's role in evoking feelings of enthusiasm and admiration for Russian fiction. Koteliansky's reputation as a translator was partly due to the literary figures' collaboration, since the process of translating and editing in which they involved themselves - as will appear

shortly - was the main reason behind the existence of Koteliansky's translations in English.

Before we proceed to discuss the nature of Koteliansky's translations and the role of the co-translators, it is important to note when Koteliansky became a translator. There is a strong probability that the idea of becoming a translator sprang from the necessity of earning a living. It is true that he started the business of translation when he was still employed at the Russian Law Bureau. His first attempt was the translation of Chekhov's *The Bet, and Other Stories* which appeared in 1915.⁴⁸ We know that he left the bureau some time in 1916. Since he was unhappy at the bureau he must have contemplated leaving it at some stage. The quitting of his job at the bureau came suddenly as indicated in Lawrence's letter quoted earlier. In fact, he might have been encouraged into this decision by Lawrence himself. In an attempt to make him leave the bureau Lawrence wrote to him in 1916: "*Devise some job that will let you out of the Bureau.*"⁴⁹ Whether it was Lawrence who suggested that he should take up translating as an alternative to his job at the bureau is not quite clear. The indication is not explicit. The idea certainly appealed to Koteliansky who must have been induced to accept it on the basis of his experience as a translator at the bureau. Without doubt his past experience provided the adequate background, in addition to his knowledge of both Russian and English.

Koteliansky's reputation as a translator was overshadowed by the fact that his translations did not constitute major works. Besides his translations were diverse in the sense that they did not belong to one particular author or literary genre. They were rather minor works largely made up of memoirs, letters, short stories, few plays, but no major novels with the exception of Rozanov's two novels: *Solitaria* and *Fallen Leaves*. Nevertheless, the credit was all his on the grounds of his introduction of new material. Two major factors determined his choice of material. The first was the fact that other translators preceded him in the field. Definitely Constance Garnett's translations offered a kind of threat to him; moreover, he was distressed by her success. The second, according to Conroy, had something to do with the nature of his character. Koteliansky was an idle person by nature. She believes that his choice of short works was intentional in order to suit his life style. A long novel would need long periods of concentration unlike the short stories or memoirs which could be done in instalments. Conroy added Koteliansky's conscientiousness as another reason for his choice of short works. Leonard Woolf reported Koteliansky's spending quarter of an hour to chose the exact word. In Conroy's view, this way of translation might be suitable for short works but definitely not for longer ones. Besides, there was his reliance on the help of the literary figures for matters of modification and polishing of his English, which left him with no other choice.⁵⁰ "It is interesting to note, too, that he was a 'freelance' translator; not for him an obligation to a publisher with deadlines to meet and contracts to honour!"⁵¹ His range of writers varied from Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov; writers of the older generation, to

Bunin, Shestov and Rozanov; writers of post-revolutionary Russia. By means of his contacts with Russia he was able to bring to light a good deal of new material. In this respect he was not only a translator, but a finder of new material. It is said that he was in contact with Maxim Gorky who was starting a new magazine. Koteliansky secured comments from a few Liberal and Socialist British figures for Gorky's newly founded *New Life* in 1917. He obtained comments from W. C. Anderson, Ramsay Macdonald, Philip Snowden - Massingham, Arnold Bennett, Mary R. Macarther, and H. G. Wells. ⁵²

The originality of Koteliansky's translations did not lie so much in his introduction of new authors, as in his making accessible new resources of material about some of those authors whose works were already available in translation. Through his connections with Russia he was able to acquire the latest publications of the Soviet Government concerning unpublished material about Tolstoy, Dostoevsky and Chekhov. It is believed that Gorky was the one who supplied Koteliansky with some of the new material. Whether Gorky was the actual supplier of all the new material is not clear. This is because there is no reference to any correspondence between the two men. He certainly gave Koteliansky his reminiscences of Tolstoy, with the English copyrights of the book, and the new Dostoevsky material.

Koteliansky's new material included Gorky's *Reminiscences of Leo Nicolayevitch Tolstoi* (1920), *The Autobiography of Countess Sophie Tolstoy* (1922), Tolstoy's *Love Letters* (1923), Dostoevsky's *Stavrogin's Confession* (1922) - which contained three unpublished chapters of *The Possessed* and a plan of a new novel entitled *The Life of a Great Sinner- The Grand Inquisitor* (1930) being part of an unpublished chapter of *The Brothers Karamazov*, *New Dostoevsky Letters* (1929) and *The Reminiscences of Mme F. M. Dostoevsky* (1929), in addition to Chekhov's *Notebooks*. The significance of these translations sprang from their revelation of new and previously unpublished material. In this sense Koteliansky was the finder of new material. However, there was one other writer whose works he introduced though he did not admire him: V. V. Rozanov.

Koteliansky can be credited with having introduced Rozanov's works in English translation for the first time. However, his choice of the writer did not spring from admiration as much from a desire to show the degenerating quality of modern Russian literature. He wrote to Sydney Waterlow about his reasons for translating him:

I dislike the man intensely, and I am at the same time very much intrigued by him, If there ever was a Smerdyakov, born and gifted writer, it is Rozanov. His paramount interest, to me, lies in his Smerdyakovdom. . . . Perhaps my justification in making him known to English readers is this: to show what a real big Smerdyakov can do, and how insignificant and tiny jugglers the native Murryesque Smerdyakovs are. Rozanov, to me, is also

one of the biggest symptoms of the disintegration of literature.⁵³

Whether his reasons for translating Bunin were any similar to those of Rozanov is not clear. Bunin was also a post-revolutionary writer, who was living in Paris at the time. Koteliansky first introduced a translation of his short story "The Gentleman from San Francisco" which *The Dial* published in 1922. A volume of short stories carrying the same title was published a year later. He did not attempt any more Bunin. Other works of the writer were available through different translations: Bernard Guilbert Guerney did *The Dream of Chang* and *The Elaglin Affair* in 1923; Isabel Hapgood translated his novel *The Village*, and also *Mitya's Love* which appeared in 1926.

It appears that Koteliansky benefited from the absence of copyright in the light of Russia's not being a member of the Berne Convention. Some of his translations were thus non-copyright. Gorky gave him the English rights of his *Reminiscences*. However, Bunin and Hippus complained for receiving nothing from him concerning the publication of *The Gentleman from San Francisco* (1922) and *The Green Ring* (1920).⁵⁴

Conroy indicates that Koteliansky's translations were recycled in the sense that some of his translations appeared as parts of different books,⁵⁵ and that in some cases, they were serialized in periodicals before their issue in a book form. Koteliansky's friends were of great help to him. Their fascination with Russian literature led to their collaboration with him on improving his translations. Furthermore, their status in the literary world was an additional advantage for him as a translator. Their post as editors of various periodicals and magazines was a godsend gift. The larger part of his translations appeared in these periodicals which were edited by Murry, Eliot and others. F. A. Lea mentions Koteliansky's embarrassment to Murry, the editor of the *Athenaeum*, with the amount of translations he offered for publication.⁵⁶ The *Athenaeum* published instalments of Koteliansky's translation of the "Letters of Anton Tchekhov" from April to October 1919. The periodical published as well extracts from his translation of Shestov: "The Russian Spirit" appeared in November of the same year, while "Leo Shestov: Chapters from a Book" appeared in 1920, in addition to his translation of Gorky's preface to the first catalogue of the publishing house which he had recently founded.⁵⁷ The *Athenaeum* published fragments from his translation of *Dostoevsky Portrayed by his Wife*: "A Practical Joke" appeared in the January issue of 1926.⁵⁸ The *Adelphi*, under Murry's editorship, also published a few of Koteliansky's translations. Had it not been for the final breach between Murry and Koteliansky more translations could have appeared in the magazine.⁵⁹ *London Mercury*, which J. C. Squire was editing, published Koteliansky's translation of a one act-play by Chekhov in 1925, in addition to "Two Jewish Stories," in

February 1937. ⁶⁰ *The Calender of Modern Letters* published extracts from Koteliansky's translation of Dostoevsky's love letters and five instalments of his wife's reminiscences in 1925. A translation of *The Wood Demon* appeared in two parts in the December issue of 1925, and the January issue of 1926. Extracts from Rozanov's *Solitaria* and Koteliansky's autobiographical account of the author appeared in 1927.⁶¹ More of Koteliansky's translations appeared in T. S. Eliot's *Criterion*. When Eliot established the magazine he looked out for material, and Koteliansky's translations proved an asset. The *Criterion* published the new Dostoevsky material that Koteliansky translated. This included the new Dostoevsky letters, the plan of the unpublished novel, in addition to some material related to Tolstoy (see periodical survey). It seems that Eliot was eager for material and he offered to publish Koteliansky's translations.

Dear Mr. Koteliansky

I have just heard from Murry, telling me about some Dostoevski letters you have just translated, and recommending me to try to get them if you are willing for the "Criterion." I should very much like to publish them, and hope you will consent. The letters he mentions are

1. Full text of letter of D. to his brother after his reprieve.
2. D's letter to Maikov outlining a scheme for a great poem on Russian history.
3. D's letter to Pobiedmozov (No 3) from Bad Inns, 24 Aug. 1922 explaining part of "Brothers Karamazov."

I should use them in the no. of July 1st
(In case like this, of translation of a dear author we can pay at the rate of £10 per 500 words). I hope you have no objection, as it would be a great honour for the paper. I understand from Murry that the letters have never been translated before.⁶²

The letters referred to in the correspondence were published in the April volume.

Koteliansky sent more translations of Dostoevsky's letters to Eliot. The *Criterion* also published extracts from letters relating to Dostoevsky. Koteliansky's translation of the new material regarding *The Brothers Karamazov* appeared the following year. Having read the manuscript Eliot was willing to publish it. ⁶³ "They seem of great interest and I should like to use them. The July number is already filled to overflowing. Would October suit you."⁶⁴ However, the Dostoevsky material did not appear in 1925; it was not until the end of 1927 that it was eventually published.⁶⁵

Eliot contemplated an idea of publishing some of Tolstoy's letters in the magazine in the January issue of 1924, before their appearance in a book form. ⁶⁶ The reference is probably to

Tolstoy's love letters which were done with the collaboration of Virginia Woolf; the book was published by the Hogarth Press. Eliot was also considering the publication of a Tolstoy story that Koteliansky translated provided that it had never been published in English. He later changed his mind and offered to publish either the story or the Dostoevsky letters. ⁶⁷ The letters in the tenth volume of the Koteliansky papers denote that Koteliansky approached Eliot with his translation of Rozanov, but the latter declined to print it. ⁶⁸

4. Collaborators

Had it not been for the help of the co-translators Koteliansky's translations might not have seen the light. Hence the significance of the collaborators' role. Koteliansky's English was not perfect. His awareness of this fact prompted his quest for assistance with the translations. For this end he turned to the literary figures who began to befriend him. Although they knew no Russian, with the exception of Virginia and Leonard Woolf, the role of these collaborators was to put his translations into better English. In almost all his translations, with the exception of the works of Rozanov, there is an acknowledgment to the co-translators. The list included the names of more than seven collaborators. However, emphasis will be put on the collaboration of the literary figures. Their act is a further manifestation of their involvement in the Russian cult. J. M. Murry was one of Koteliansky's first co-translators. Koteliansky's association with Murry must have led to Katherine Mansfield's collaboration.

(a) The Murrys

Both J. M. Murry and Katherine Mansfield collaborated with Koteliansky over the production of Russian translations. Since neither Murry nor Mansfield knew any Russian their collaboration was mainly confined to the polishing of Koteliansky's peculiar English. Murry was one of Koteliansky's first co-translators. The latter had met the Murrys in 1914. Shortly afterwards, both he and J. M. Murry were engaged on translating some Chekhov short stories. *The Bet and Other Stories* (1915) was the outcome of their cooperation; it was also Koteliansky's first translation ever to be published. ⁶⁹ Murry's collaboration continued for the next eight years, and it produced translations by Kuprin and Dostoevsky. In 1916 they worked together on producing two translations: Dostoevsky's *Pages from the Journal of an Author*, and Kuprin's *The River of Life and Other Stories*. Murry's contribution to the translations culminated in 1923 when he helped Koteliansky in translating Dostoevsky's *Letters and Reminiscences*. The dispute between the translator and Murry over the *Adelphi*, as will appear later, put an end to their friendship, and therefore to any further collaboration on the translations. Murry's collaboration extended beyond the editing job; he provided prefaces to some of the translated works as was the case with the Dostoevsky journal.

Katherine Mansfield was also Koteliansky's co-translator. Their collaboration ran to a few translations, and was carried on till one year before Mansfield's death in 1923. Their official involvement was duly acknowledged in 1919. They were then translating Chekhov's letters. The *Athenaeum*, under J. M. Murry's editorship, published instalments of their translation regularly from April to October 1919.⁷⁰ Mansfield, however, started working on translations with Koteliansky earlier than 1919. In 1915 while she was still living at Acacia Road, she collaborated with him on translating Kuprin's story "Ribnikov".⁷¹ The remaining stories were done by Koteliansky in collaboration with Murry. The latter's name appeared as co-translator only. Prior to the Chekhov letters Mansfield collaborated as well in translating Gorky's *Journal of Revolution*. Although no volume with this title could be traced among Koteliansky's translations, it is thought that Mansfield worked with him on Gorky's *Reminiscences of Andreyev* which was published after her death in 1931.⁷² She also helped in translating Dostoevsky's letters to his wife which appeared under the title *Dostoevsky: Letters and Reminiscences* (1923).

It is interesting to note that Mansfield's part of the translation was mostly done alone. Because she was always on the move, travelling between London, Paris and Italy, Koteliansky and Mansfield did not go over the translations together. The translations were sent to her, even when she was not abroad, and the corrected proofs were usually sent back to Koteliansky. Living in Hampstead at the time, she edited Chekhov's letters alone. She seemed rather discontented about the nature of their collaboration. Having turned Koteliansky's version into a better English, she wrote him of these feelings of dissatisfaction

I dislike IMMENSELY not going over the letters with you. I dont [sic] want you to rely on me and M.[Murry] I have long finished all that you gave me - But I feel Tchekov would be the first to say we must go over them together. However, dear Kotelianski [sic], I dont [sic] want to worry you. ⁷³

During the last phase of their collaboration on Chekhov's letters, she had to leave for Italy. She wrote to Koteliansky from San Remo to send her "as soon as possible some more Tchekov, as much as you can - I will work fast here - and anything else." ⁷⁴ Again she was not very satisfied with the nature of their collaboration. She wrote to Koteliansky in the summer of 1919 expressing her feelings about the situation: "I wish our collaboration were closer. However, I do my very best always with these wonderful letters & can do no more." ⁷⁵ Their final collaboration on Dostoevsky's letters was done while she was staying in Paris in 1921: "I shall read the M.S. on Friday, as much as I have done. Now that I do not go over it with you first I feel the changes look very drastic in ink. But you will understand." ⁷⁶

(b) The Woolfs

Koteliansky's collaboration with the Woolfs was fortunate. For Leonard and Virginia Woolf not only edited his translations, but also published them through the Hogarth Press. Their press also benefited from this collaboration.

In 1920 Koteliansky approached Leonard Woolf with the recently published volume of Gorky's *Reminiscences of Tolstoy*. They soon started to work on it. The volume was later published by the Hogarth Press, and it appeared as No.3 in the press's check-list. Moreover the volume determined the press's transference to a commercial business, whereas it had originally been established as a hobby.⁷⁷ The Woolfs started the press in 1917 to fill their leisure time, and "to produce and publish short works which commercial publishers could not or would not publish."⁷⁸ The need to print 1,000 copies of the Gorky volume made them turn to professional publishers. The Pelican Press had the copies printed for them. "It was our first commercial venture. It was an immediate success and we had to reprint another 1,000 copies before the end of the year."⁷⁹ The press's other three commercial books were also Russian. These were; *Stavrogin's Confession*, *The Autobiography of Countess Sophie Tolstoi* and Bunin's *The Gentleman from San Francisco*. The Bunin volume of short stories was the outcome of Koteliansky's and Leonard Woolf's collaboration. The title story of the volume was translated with the collaboration of D. H. Lawrence, while its three remaining stories were done with Leonard Woolf's help. 1,000 copies of each book were printed. All three books were very successful, selling between 500 and 700 copies in a year. They also made a small profit for the press.⁸⁰

Virginia Woolf wrote about their involvement in translating these books in 1922; "Countess Tolstoi has written an autobiography which Leonard is translating. Dostoevsky has written 2 new chapters to The Possessed which I am translating!"⁸¹ In spite of the fact that both Leonard and Virginia Woolf learned enough Russian, at Koteliansky's hands, as to enable them to read a few passages from Aksakov's works in the original, yet their role in the translation was confined to editing, rather than direct translation from the Russian.⁸²

Our actual procedure in translating was that Kot did the first draft in hand writing, with generous space between the lines, and we then turned his extremely queer version into English.⁸³

The Woolfs' modification of Koteliansky's translation did not go beyond the process of

editing, despite Virginia Woolf's reference to 'translating.' In 1923 she wrote to Roger Fry explaining how "the press takes up all my time, and I ought to be translating Kots [sic] Russian." 84

(c) D. H. Lawrence

Lawrence's collaboration on the translations was different from Koteliansky's other co-translators. Lawrence was not only an editor, but also a writer of prefaces and introductions to some of the translations. Unlike Koteliansky's other collaborators Lawrence's co-operation was strongly motivated by his personal relationship rather by a desire to make Russian fiction popular in the light of the great enthusiasm for the Russian cult. In this concern, Lawrence's help in the translations sprang from his desire to be useful to a close friend, and his wish to show feelings of gratitude for Koteliansky's abundant help in times of need. Their special kind of friendship accounts for their concern for each other's welfare. Just as Koteliansky was ready to give his time, to type manuscripts, to lend money, to find accommodation, and to do other sorts of small favours to help Lawrence, so was the latter to help Koteliansky. In fact, Lawrence returned all Koteliansky's favours in one way or another, and offered him all the help he could give. He lent him money, he helped him in translating Russian authors, moreover, he tried to find publishers for his translations.

Lawrence collaborated with Koteliansky on two translations: Shestov's *All Things are Possible* and Bunin's "The Gentleman from San Francisco." In 1919 - while translating Chekhov's letters with Katherine Mansfield - Koteliansky was working at the same time with Lawrence on the Shestov book. Lawrence worked at the book for the whole month of August that year. At the beginning of the month he wrote to Koteliansky, "I have done a certain amount of the translation - *Apotheosis*." 85 By August 8, he had nearly done half of the correction ; "I've done 71 of the Shestov paragraphs - more than half." 86 After two days he asked for Shestov's introduction to be sent for him. By the end of the month he managed to finish his editing of the book:

I have finished Shestov - have compressed him a bit, but left nothing out - only "so to speak" and "as all know" and many such phrases and volatile sentences - so *substance* at all.- Sometimes I have added a word or two, for the sake of the sense - as I did in "Russian Spirit." What I leave out I leave out deliberately.⁸⁷

Lawrence's second collaboration came in 1921, when he translated Bunin's story "The

Gentleman from San Francisco." He had the M.S. in June 1921, and wrote to Koteliansky: "I will soon get it written over: don't think your text needs much altering. I love a "little carved peeled-off-dog " - it is too good to alter." ⁸⁸ Lawrence's help did not cease at this stage. After the editing was done he tried to secure the publication of the story in the *Dial*. For this purpose he wrote to Scofield Thayer, the editor of the magazine, offering the story for publication in his paper, or to anyone else in America if he would not publish it himself. ⁸⁹ The paper published the story in January 1922.⁹⁰

Lawrence's services extended to finding publishers. Due to his efforts Koteliansky's translation of the works of both Shestov and Rozanov were published. Martin Secker and the Mandrake Press respectively published *All Things Are Possible* and *Fallen Leaves*. Lawrence wrote to Martin Secker and P. R. Stephens offering the manuscript of the two books; he pursued the matter himself till his aim was achieved and the books appeared in publication. At the beginning Secker's terms were unsatisfactory. However, Lawrence managed to reach an agreement with him, on Koteliansky's behalf, where he secured the book's publication on a royalty basis instead of agreeing to Secker's demand to sell the book for £20. The book was published in 1920. On Secker's initiative the American publication of the book was secured as well. A deal was arrived at with Robert Macbrid Company to publish the book on a royalty basis, and to pay the translator 10% of the profit. ⁹¹

Similarly Lawrence ensured the publication of Rozanov's *Fallen Leaves*. Through his contacts with P. R. Stephens, the editor of the Mandrake Press, he arranged for the publication of the Rozanov book. Having met Stephens while on a visit to France he wrote to Koteliansky of the press's proposal as regards the publication of *Fallen Leaves*.⁹²

They are starting a new Press in [sic] New Year - The Mandrake Press - & are going to publish ordinary books, . . . - & say they will be glad to do *Fallen Leaves*. He said he'd write you: but if he doesn't, say nothing, and remind *me* to nudge him when the time comes.⁹³

The Mandrake Press published a special edition of 750 copies of the book in 1929. Lawrence also wrote a foreword to the book.⁹⁴

Lawrence's collaboration on the Shestov book was one way of repaying his numerous debts to Koteliansky's. John Worthen believes that Lawrence's consenting to become a co-translator was the first way of being able to repay some of his debts to Koteliansky's. He not only revised the translation, but wrote a foreword to the book, and insisted on Koteliansky having two thirds of its profits. He also refused to let his name appear as a co-translator. His

refusal is attributed to the fact that he wanted Koteliansky "to appear responsible for the book, because he did not want to have to pay Pinker 10% on it (or to lose Koteliansky any bit of his advance), as he would have to do if he appeared as co-author or co-translator." ⁹⁵ Due to Lawrence's continuous efforts Koteliansky's translation of Zinaida Hippus's play *The Green Ring* was published by Huebsch. On December 6, 1919 Lawrence wrote to Koteliansky about this: "- I wrote to Huebsch & everybody about the *Green Ring*." By the beginning of next year he wrote; "*The Green Ring* will be published, anyway." ⁹⁶

Lawrence's collaboration in the translation of Russian authors was by no means confined to his editing of the Bunin and Shestov translation. According to George Zytaruk, Lawrence had a hand in editing Koteliansky's translation of Gorky's *Reminiscences of Andreyev* which he translated with Katherine Mansfield's help. The *Reminiscences* had already appeared in the *Adelphi* between February and April 1924. Koteliansky had also sent the manuscript to the *Dial* for publication. Lawrence obtained the manuscript from the *Dial* and went through it as he wrote to Koteliansky; "I went through your Gorky MS. and returned it to *Dial*. I made the English correct - & a little more flexible - but did not change the style since it was yours and Katherine's."⁹⁸ So, the *Dial* version of the *Reminiscences*, which were serialized (June-August 1924), contained Lawrence's revision and editing of Koteliansky's and Katherine's edition.⁹⁷

There was no end to the flood of Lawrence's favours. For he remained loyal and helpful to his friend till the last days of his life. The last two pieces that he wrote, before his death in 1930, were for Koteliansky. They were a review of Rozanov's *Solitaria* and an introduction to his translation of *The Grand Inquisitor*. Lawrence also edited Koteliansky's translation of some Yiddish stories in English, which the latter published in a book form later.⁹⁹

Among Koteliansky's other collaborators were Gilbert Cannan and Philip Tomlinson. The former worked with him on two translations of Chekhov: *The House with the Mezzanine and Other Stories* (1917), and *The Life and Other Stories* (1920). Tomlinson helped him with the translation of *The Life and Letters of Anton Tchekhov* (1925).

It should be noted that Koteliansky paid his co-translators for their collaboration in the translations. In most cases he paid almost half of the proceeds of publication. Murry is said to have paid Koteliansky £3 for each instalment of the "Letters of Anton Tchekhov" as they were published in the *Athenaeum*. Katherine Mansfield, who contributed on the translation, "received 50 per cent or thirty shillings an instalment."¹⁰⁰ When *Dial* published Koteliansky's and D. H. Lawrence's translation of "The Gentleman from San Francisco" Lawrence received

a cheque of £12, being payment for his contribution to the translation. ¹⁰¹

5. The Reception of Koteliansky's Translations

As mentioned earlier in his choice for material Koteliansky must have depended on what was already available. Garnett's translations, in particular, hindered Koteliansky's activities. Her renderings covered the works of almost all the Russian writers. Koteliansky's sources of original material were thus limited. His only choice was unpublished material, and the works of new authors. His connections with Gorky proved fortuitous. The latter is thought to be responsible for most of the new material Koteliansky's translations represented. Gorky supplied Koteliansky with the latest publications of the Soviet government and provided him with some of his own writings. That is how Koteliansky came across the new Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and other material.

According to Conroy, Koteliansky produced thirty-one translations over a period of twenty-eight years. His translations covered the works of eight authors, old and new. Among these were Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Bunin, Shestov and Rozanov. The major characteristic of the translations was their length. They were mainly short works; "only few of these works are of any great length." The bulk of the translations consisted of "short stories, letters & reminiscences, philosophical & autobiographical musings."¹⁰² Besides, most of Koteliansky's translations appeared in periodicals before they were published in a book form. Sometimes Koteliansky recycled the translated material by using parts of already published material for incorporation in new translations.

Chekhov had the lion's share, as ten of the translations were devoted to his works. Koteliansky's credit in this concern was that he introduced Chekhov before Garnett. His translation of *The Bet and Other Stories* appeared in 1915. Koteliansky might have anticipated translating the complete works of the writer had not Garnett made this impossible when she signed an agreement with Chatto and Windus. Garnett presented a real threat to Koteliansky. For when in 1919 he started translating Chekhov's letters, Garnett blocked the way once again. After finishing the translation of the short stories she turned to Chekhov's letters. Katherine Mansfield, who was collaborating on the translation with Koteliansky, tried to encourage him into challenging Garnett by publishing the book before her: "In Heaven's name why do we not prepare the book immediately & race Mrs G?" However, Garnett managed to publish her version of the letters in 1920, while Koteliansky's version did not appear in a book form till 1925. His only credit was that the letters appeared serialized in the *Athenaeum* during 1919. The new material that the book contained was, nevertheless, appreciated by the press.

a cheque of £12, being payment for his contribution to the translation. ¹⁰¹

5. The Reception of Koteliansky's Translations

As mentioned earlier in his choice for material Koteliansky must have depended on what was already available. Garnett's translations, in particular, hindered Koteliansky's activities. Her renderings covered the works of almost all the Russian writers. Koteliansky's sources of original material were thus limited. His only choice was unpublished material, and the works of new authors. His connections with Gorky proved fortuitous. The latter is thought to be responsible for most of the new material Koteliansky's translations represented. Gorky supplied Koteliansky with the latest publications of the Soviet government and provided him with some of his own writings. That is how Koteliansky came across the new Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and other material.

According to Conroy, Koteliansky produced thirty-one translations over a period of twenty-eight years. His translations covered the works of eight authors, old and new. Among these were Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Bunin, Shestov and Rozanov. The major characteristic of the translations was their length. They were mainly short works; "only few of these works are of any great length." The bulk of the translations consisted of "short stories, letters & reminiscences, philosophical & autobiographical musings."¹⁰² Besides, most of Koteliansky's translations appeared in periodicals before they were published in a book form. Sometimes Koteliansky recycled the translated material by using parts of already published material for incorporation in new translations.

Chekhov had the lion's share, as ten of the translations were devoted to his works. Koteliansky's credit in this concern was that he introduced Chekhov before Garnett. His translation of *The Bet and Other Stories* appeared in 1915. Koteliansky might have anticipated translating the complete works of the writer had not Garnett made this impossible when she signed an agreement with Chatto and Windus. Garnett presented a real threat to Koteliansky. For when in 1919 he started translating Chekhov's letters, Garnett blocked the way once again. After finishing the translation of the short stories she turned to Chekhov's letters. Katherine Mansfield, who was collaborating on the translation with Koteliansky, tried to encourage him into challenging Garnett by publishing the book before her: "In Heaven's name why do we not prepare the book immediately & race Mrs G?" However, Garnett managed to publish her version of the letters in 1920, while Koteliansky's version did not appear in a book form till 1925. His only credit was that the letters appeared serialized in the *Athenaeum* during 1919. The new material that the book contained was, nevertheless, appreciated by the press.

Reviewing Koteliansky's translation of Chekhov's letters Leonard Woolf acknowledged the Garnett translation of the letters and expressed a desire for the translation of the whole bulk of his letters which amounts to 2,000 in the Russian edition. Despite his criticism of the overlapping of contents in Garnett's and Koteliansky's version, he welcomed the publication of this collection of letters:

Up to the present, English readers have had to be content with the selection which Mrs. Garnett published. It whetted the appetite for more, although it is true, perhaps, that she skimmed off the best of the cream. Now a new and larger selection has been translated by Mr. S. S. Koteliansky and Mr. Philip Tomlinson and published under the title "The Life and Letters of Anton Tchekhov". . . It makes a most interesting reading.¹⁰³

Moreover, the *Times Literary Supplement* praised Koteliansky's efforts in producing what the reviewer called a supplementary material to the Garnett version of the letters.

Mr. Koteliansky and Mr. Tomlinson are not the first in the field - Mrs. Garnett's excellent translation of a selection of the letters appeared a few years ago. But the present translators have done their work extremely well, and possibly with an eye to supplementing what has hitherto been available to the English reader. There are some eighteen hundred letters in the six volumes of the Russian edition. About one-sixth are reproduced here, together with a biographical note by E. Zamyatin and two articles by Michael Tchekhov, the artist's brother.¹⁰⁴

Koteliansky, as already mentioned, turned to unpublished works, and works not intended originally for publication for the sources of his material. Nevertheless, his translations were appreciated for the new insight they stimulated into the art or personality of different writers. The translation of *The Wood Demon*; an early version of *Uncle Vanya* was welcomed. "The history of the Wood Demon is very interesting. There are few people who will find it possible to share Mr. Koteliansky's implied opinion of it, but nobody will fail to be grateful to him for translating it." ¹⁰⁵

The *Saturday Review* reviewed Koteliansky's translation of Chekhov's literary and theatrical reminiscences. The book contained an account of Chekhov's life and work, stories of the writer's early life, notes, recollections and comments by some of Chekhov's literary contemporaries, fragments from his diary, an unpublished play, and some unpublished sketches. Despite this collection of scraps, the book was found to be interesting due to Chekhov's genius. "Tchekhov's personality has a lustre about it which no book about him can fail to reflect. This one is radiant." Koteliansky's editing of it was praised too;

It is the common fate of greatness to have its littleness exhumed, mummified, and put on view. But there is nothing of the new pieces from which we are glad to look away. The short play was a private joke and is scarce actable, but it is genuine in its playfulness and not to be blushed for. Some of the articles, dug from the newspapers in which they were planted early and for small rewards largely needed, are of the highest quality. 'At the Cemetery' and 'A Moscow Hamlet' may have been back-work done to pay the rent of hold the grocer at bay. Yet in them the fire burns with that double flame which warms to compassion and then spurts up to wound, softening again to the gentler radiance.¹⁰⁶

The *New Statesman* welcomed the issue of Koteliansky's translation of *Anton Tchekhov: Literary and Theatrical Reminiscences*. In the wake of the latest production by Komisarjevsky of Chekhov's plays the publication of a volume of his life and letters was timely. Koteliansky's selection of material was praised, in spite of the reviewer's first impression as regards the collection which "sounds most unpromising."

A collection of memorial tributes runs the risk of being as rigid and metallically lifeless as a wreath of everlasting flowers, and when the twenty people say what a man was like they often cancel him out. Both these disasters are avoided: in its total effect, this book is not scrappy and it is very far from dead. It contains a thoughtful analysis by Sobolev of how Tchekhov raised the very short story, "no longer than a sparrow's nose," to classic form in a literature which had never boasted the virtues of brevity and restraint. Efros and Danchenko describe how the Moscow Art Theatre, by the happy chance of getting itself established at the moment took "The Seagull," and by sheer hard work understood it, seized the logic of the new stage technique which it demanded, and so turned its failure into success and paved the way for "The Three Sisters" and "The Cherry Orchard."¹⁰⁷

Koteliansky's translation of Chekhov's notebooks was also original in its presentation of new material. The volume comprised of early unpublished works, in addition to thoughts and drafts of material not intended for publication. However, the reception of the book in the press varied. J. M. Murry attacked and denounced vehemently the publication of such a book and likened it to a murder act; his argument was that he was,

old-fashioned enough to believe that it is almost a crime to make public fragments of an author's manuscripts which he obviously did not mean to show the world. I am convinced that Tchekhov never intended that these notebooks should appear. The rest are notes which suggested their context of actual

memories to Tchekhov, and are all but meaningless to ourselves. I regret that they have been published- partly for the sake of Tchekhov; whom I revere, but much more because they will strengthen a deplorable tendency that is already much too prevalent among those who meddle with letters- the tendency to approach an author by the backstairs.¹⁰⁸

On the other hand the *Spectator* saluted the publication of the book. "It is extraordinary how interesting these notes on human nature are, though they are brief and their point sometimes vague."

The charm of this book is that the reader has the sensation of perfectly intimate, easy intercourse with Tchekhov himself. While that intercourse lasts the reader himself feels observant, gentle, disillusioned, humorous and wise. It appears from Gorki's description of him, which is also translated, that to meet Tchekhov was to meet an unusually natural¹⁰⁹

The publication of *Tolstoi's Love Letters* was "a little disappointing." "There are only fourteen "love letters," which even when helped out by comments, barely cover some fifty pages." The larger part of the book consisted of autobiographical material. The book was criticized for containing little slips, and the quality of the translation raised scepticism.

As to the quality of the translation we have occasional doubts: as when, quoting Tolstoy's "Confession," the present translators say (p. 120) - "There was not a crime that I did not commit, and *for this* I was praised . . . "; which seems less likely than the "World's Classics" version (p. 9) - "There was no crime I did not commit, and *for all that* people praised me."¹¹⁰

The issue of *Solitaria* was greeted with much enthusiasm for the new vistas the translation opened in the understanding of the art of the new generation of Russian writers. The reviewer shared Koteliansky's view about the writer's art which he described as "perverse."

There have been signs of late that Rozanov is destined to be the newest discovery in England of that popular conception of the Russian genius which runs to physical eccentricity and spiritual paradox. A "curious" writer he certainly is; his originality, indeed, is now and again embarrassing in the extreme. But he is far too extravagant and grotesquely perverse to merit the laudatory titles his admirers have conferred on him.¹¹¹

Nevertheless, Koteliansky was credited for having introduced the writer in English and the quality of the translation was mentioned at the end. "The English does not offer an altogether fair conception of Rozanov's morbid and unashamed intensity of thought, not so much through Mr. Koteliansky's fault as because Rozanov's meaning is made up of shades and niceties and subtleties of Russian speech." 112

Koteliansky's introduction of the new Dostoevsky material, which the Mandrake Press published in book form in 1929, was highly acclaimed:

These letters of Dostoevsky's, all of which have been published for the first time in Russia during the last few years, are of considerable interest. Mr. Koteliansky, who has translated them very well, has performed the further service of prefacing each of the letters with a useful little note on the circumstances in which it was written and on Dostoevsky's relations with his correspondent. The letters bear on Dostoevsky as both man and artist. 113

Koteliansky's inadequate knowledge of English was his main problem as a translator. He had to rely on his friends to improve his "strange English." In addition to this shortcoming there was the fact that all his co-translators knew no Russian. This applies to all his collaborators; Lawrence, J. M. Murry, Katherine Mansfield and the Woolfs. Although the latter learned Russian at the hands of Koteliansky, their knowledge was by no means adequate. Under these circumstances Koteliansky's translations sometimes suffered from severe criticism. Nevertheless, Conroy believes that "Koteliansky was a very conscientious translator who sought a high degree of accuracy." 114 His keenness to choose the exact English word at the expense of time was reported by Leonard Woolf. At times it took them a quarter of an hour to pick a suitable word. However, Conroy, who examined the quality of some of his translations by comparing them with the original Russian, found his translations to be rather literal at the expense of clarity in the English version. Koteliansky admitted that he was indeed more concerned with preserving the style of the original. To Sydney Waterlow he wrote: "In fact I don't mind very much if the English is not excellent. The translation is correct, and that is all I care for." 115

It has been noted that Koteliansky "relied to a great extent on the assistance of his English friends to produce translations of a 'finished' quality." As a result the process of editing in which Koteliansky's co-translators were involved left its marks on the translations. For the co-translators would not only modify Koteliansky's Russianized English, but would also leave their personal impressions on the revised work. Lawrence is said to have retold Shestov's preface of *All Things are Possible* in such a way as to suit his own views. Mansfield's poetic and artistic creativity is discerned in the translation of *Reminiscences of*

Tolstoy, Chekhov and Andreev. The influence of the co-translators was very often discernible in the text. In spite of their ignorance of the Russian language, their mark on the translation came through the process of Anglicising which resulted in the translations being "'embroidered' in a literary fashion." 116

The *Reminiscences* mentioned Koteliansky and Leonard Woolf as translators, but the last part of it was translated with Mansfield's collaboration. When examining passages from the book Conroy reached the conclusion that a few of the expressions could have been contributed by Mansfield. The mention of the title of a common English school book; *Hall and Knights's Arithmetic* gave Conroy the basis for her assumption. She quoted also other phrases which she suspected to be Mansfield's such as "is very small beer." Conroy believes that "Mansfield's influence extends further than this, but such identifiable cases help to illustrate the kind of 'Anglicising' effect her collaboration had on Koteliansky's work." 117

Likewise Lawrence's influence is discerned by Hyde in his study *Lawrence and the Art of Translation*. This is particularly obvious in the preface Lawrence provided for Shestov's book *All Things Are Possible*. Lawrence twisted Shestov's ideas to suit his own views as regards the effect of European civilization on Russian literature. Hyde believes that Lawrence took the gist of the preface from Shestov's text and wrote in a way to accord with his own critical opinions. He exploited Shestov's idea concerning the reaction of nineteenth century Russian literature to the inoculation of Western culture to advocate the notion that the Russians were swallowing poisons.

Lawrence, in other words, has found an authentic Russian authority to strengthen and support his unfashionably negative attitude to Russian literature. And in Lawrence's translation, the terms in which Shestov continues his argument have a remarkably Lawrentian ring.¹¹⁸

Thus, Lawrence's involvement was not bound to his role as a co-translator which was "very considerable." Hyde demonstrates that in addition he wrote his own preface to take the place of Shestov's "as a way of providing more effective advocacy for an author he greatly admired." Koteliansky expressed his objection to Lawrence's preface on the grounds that it did not seem truthful to the author's intentions and was damaging to the cause of Russian literature. "Now look here, I think all this about the "Preface" is perfectly nonsense. What I say can't hurt Russian literature - nor even Shestov; much more likely to *provoke interest*. You are being unnecessarily fussy," Lawrence wrote to Koteliansky. ¹¹⁹ Lawrence's motives behind this rendering can be best understood in the light of his hostile attitude towards Russian literature and writers and his impatience with the English Russianists. This point had already

been referred to in the first chapter of the thesis. Koteliansky's other translations, we may presume, suffered from similar failings. The collaborators' sense of Anglicizing would be strongly felt due to their ignorance of the Russian language.

6. The Other Koteliansky

Translation was Koteliansky's means of earning a living, after quitting his job at the Law Bureau. However, as a source of income it was probably not very rewarding. This necessitated the search for other activities; he went into editing and, at one stage, wanted to be a publisher. The literary circle which befriended him was of great help to him.

Koteliansky's acquaintance with Lawrence and Murry resulted in a different sort of collaboration from translation. This association enabled him to play a major role in the foundation of the *Signature* and in becoming a business manager of the *Adelphi*.

The *Signature* was founded by Murry and Lawrence in 1915. The original idea of the paper was to prepare the way for a moral and spiritual "revolution." The paper was intended to express the individual ideas of Lawrence, Katherine Mansfield and J. M. Murry. In a letter to a friend about it Lawrence wrote that he was going to "do the preaching", Murry would do "his ideas on freedom for the individual soul", and Katherine would do "her little satirical sketches." Koteliansky, it seemed, was the one with whom the idea of the paper originated.¹²⁰

Lawrence, the Murrays and Koteliansky thought of issuing a series of pamphlets. The idea arose in the light of Lawrence's choice of England to be "Rananim." He was living in Cornwall at the time. However, when the idea of Rananim was fading due to the inconstancy of the suggested plans, the desire to issue pamphlets remained paramount. With Koteliansky's "enthusiastic aid" the idea was crystallised, and they were able to achieve their dream in the autumn of that year. Koteliansky found a Jewish printer who agreed to print 250 copies for £5. The leaflet was supposed to run to six issues, but due to shortage of money, and lack of subscribers it ran only to three. They hoped to get £30 for the subscription fee of half a crown for the whole series. In the end only £15 were collected. Koteliansky was also responsible for sending copies of the paper to the subscribers and kept an account of the money spent. The venture was unsuccessful and it was not until nearly eight years later that Koteliansky was able to engage in a similar undertaking successfully. Murry's launching of a new magazine in 1923 provided Koteliansky with better opportunities to satisfy his desire for work in the publishing field.¹²¹

When the *Adelphi* was established Koteliansky became its business manager with a salary of £200 a year. ¹²² However, the opportunity to become its editor was lost through the contributors' refusal to collaborate with him after Murry's decision to quit its editorship. After the death of the *Athenaeum*, the idea for a new magazine was suggested by Sullivan. Koteliansky supported the venture, together with Locke-Ellis (who contributed £400 for the scheme) and Lawrence's blessing from Mexico. The magazine was edited by Murry, and Koteliansky became its business manager. Among its contributors were Lawrence, Tomlinson, J. W. N. Sullivan, and Koteliansky. (The first issue of the *Adelphi* published a translation by Koteliansky of Chekhov.) ¹²³

The difference in the attitudes of the editor and the business manager regarding the policy of the magazine led to the final breach between Murry and Koteliansky. Two accounts of the story were provided by F. A. Lea and John Carswell.

The magazine's policy in producing quantities of Katherine Mansfield's posthumous works, in addition to Murry's emphasis on the re-examination of Keats aroused protest from other contributors, particularly the business manager, who thought the periodical was diverting from its original aim. ¹²⁴ For when it was first founded, it was agreed that the periodical would have "a life of its own, irrespective of the views, beliefs and convictions of anyone of its contributors." ¹²⁵ According to Koteliansky the magazine changed to be representative of Murry's voice only. Koteliansky's criticism of the magazine's policy led to a rift between him and the editor. The only way out of the tense situation was the resignation of one or other of them. Murry consented to quit his job, and he offered the *Adelphi* to Koteliansky. But the other contributors disagreed; "it was Murry's organ or nobody's, they said - and the exchange fell through." As a result Koteliansky "retired in a dudgeon - to remain for the rest of his days Murry's most tireless traducer." ¹²⁶ John Carswell's account of the reasons for the disagreement was different. He indicated that Murry changed his mind later and withdrew his offer to hand over the magazine to Koteliansky.

From the beginning Koteliansky and Murry did not see eye to eye about the *Adelphi*. The magazine achieved great success; the sales of the first number reached 15,240 copies. But by October of 1923 financial problems arose and the fund was not enough to pay the contributors and Koteliansky's salary. As a business manager Koteliansky made a complaint regarding a certain contribution and suggested measures to improve circulation. Murry disliked Koteliansky's interference "I want the A (sic) to be successful of course - and I fancy that in the long run it will be successful - but it must be successful on my own terms. I am not going to change myself to suit the A(sic). The A will have to change to suit me." When the financial situation prompted the need either to stop or reduce the magazine's publication, Murry offered

Koteliansky the editorship and promised to contribute each month without payment. Koteliansky accepted Murry's terms, but Murry changed his mind later and withdrew his offer to contribute. At the same time he offended Koteliansky when he refused to work under his editorship: "I am sorry you won't understand this feeling. I wish you could. But imagine it to be something like your feeling of the impossibility of even indirectly serving the Soviet Government." Murry's analogy offended Koteliansky's pride. The incident put an end to Koteliansky's association with the magazine and its editor: "our friendship too must end." Although Murry regretted his act and asked Koteliansky to stay and become his personal manager, Koteliansky's decision remained unchanged.¹²⁷ Koteliansky wrote to Murry, "I declare again and finally that I have nothing more to do with the *Adelphi* in any way whatever, nor with you personally. Finis." ¹²⁸

Had Koteliansky become the editor of the *Adelphi* he would have achieved one of his big dreams, i.e. to be a publisher. But the opportunity was denied him when Murry went back on his decision to hand over the magazine to him.

Thus, Koteliansky's interest in the publishing business was obvious through his attempts to make both the *Signature* and the *Adelphi* work. He was one of the trio who founded the former; and the business manager of the latter. Moreover, there were other occasions when he tried to become a publisher himself. His first attempt came in 1924. The scheme constituted in starting a publishing business which would include him, Lawrence, Murry and Schiff, and to which each of the participants would contribute a sum of money. The idea of the venture must have been Koteliansky's. Lawrence wrote to Frederick Carter about Koteliansky's publishing scheme.

Koteliansky has a scheme - you remember Kot is the busy bee of the *Adelphi*, . . . - to become a small publisher of special books. He thinks that by May he should have some five or six books ready: The *Adelphi* Press, with Murry and myself and Kot and two other partners in the company. ¹²⁹

Vivian Locke-Ellis, who was one of the two partners, was reluctant in offering money for the scheme. For this purpose they turned to Schiff. As for the three of them, Murry was to put £500, Koteliansky £200, and Lawrence £300. ¹³⁰ At the beginning the scheme was going as planned: "very good, go ahead with the publishing scheme. I'll be in London before long; and we can settle it all up." By March 1924, the project had fallen apart.

My dear Kot, it's no good thinking of business unless you will go at it like a lion, a serpent, and a condor. You're well out of publishing. The world is a very vast machine, that grinds the bones of the good man gladly, if he's fool enough to let it. ¹³¹

The implication in Lawrence's letter is to the fact that Koteliansky's lack of enthusiasm and his reliance of the support of others were the main reasons behind the failure of the publishing scheme. Or it might be that Schiff had not provided the money needed for the scheme.

Money worries prompted Koteliansky to think of becoming a publisher once again. Financial trouble was the main motivation for his looking for a job in 1927. His failure to get one turned him to the old idea of publishing. "The reason why I want to become a publisher is quite simple: for the last two or three years it has been more & more difficult to make a living by translating," he wrote to Sydney Waterlow

Last summer I felt so depressed on that account that I decided to look for a job. I did a bit of looking, distressingly, and realised that it was just impossible, that I must try to do something which eventually may turn out useful in the way of giving me some sort of income. And I turned to my old idea - publishing.¹³²

The scheme he had in mind was the issue, in a limited and expensive edition, of an "intimate series." Lawrence, to whom Koteliansky wrote asking for help, wrote, "your letter about your scheme came on today. I am a useless person to consult commercially."¹³³ Despite his conviction of the impossibility of such a series, Lawrence was ready to offer help and advice in this respect. He suggested few names for Koteliansky to contact: E. M. Forster, A. E. Coppard, Osbert Sitwell, Edith Sitwell, Gerhardi, Dos Passos, Sherwood Anderson - Gertrude Stein, Robert Graves. He also promised to approach some of his friends;

I can more or less see the possibility of your "intimate series," if you can get hold of MSS. that are in any way really intimate. But as far as I now authors, it's next door to impossible. . . . and you'd need six genuine good MSS. before you start. I shall see Douglas & Huxley in Florence.¹³⁴

As he predicted in his letter, Lawrence's attempt to procure some material met with failure. In a letter to the Huxleys he wrote about Koteliansky's disappointment once he heard the news: "Poor Kot, he'll be depressed about his 'scheme' I haven't heard from Douglas yet - . . . I've not much hope of him. Poor Kot - I do what I can for him - but why should anybody want to be a publisher?"¹³⁵ Nevertheless, Lawrence was ready to give Koteliansky one of his manuscripts to start the project with; he was reluctant to give him "The Man Who Loved Islands." Lawrence indeed promised to give Koteliansky any of his manuscripts but at the same time he found it difficult to comply with Koteliansky's wish to "write *intimately*."¹³⁶ Koteliansky was hoping to get "Jimmy and the Desperate Woman." But Lawrence had already

arranged with Secker for its inclusion in a volume of short stories.¹³⁷ Koteliansky's own efforts to secure some MSS for the scheme failed. E. M. Forster also found it difficult to comply with his request for this sort of intimate writing. "I have hunted well, both in my drawers and my heart, and can find nothing, nothing, that will do. I am very sorry indeed."¹³⁸ Notwithstanding the negative responses, Koteliansky was still optimistic about becoming a publisher as he told Waterlow: "My publishing scheme is still a scheme. The first attempts to get manuscripts turned out a failure. I must change the original plan: perhaps, after all, I may succeed in becoming a publisher."¹³⁹

Koteliansky might have not become the publisher he would like to be. Nevertheless he achieved part of his dream when he worked as a reader for the Cresset Press. Koteliansky was employed at the press during the thirties. "He was a reader and took great pleasure in patronising the work of a new generation of talent." Dilys Powell, May Sarton and Ruth Pitter were among his discoveries. He was pensioned off. The press later pensioned him off, "because his tastes were too literary and good books did not always sell."¹⁴⁰

Of his experience at the press Hilary Pyle, James Stephens's biographer, left this account

He was a natural critic with a sixth sense for good literature and excellent judgement, but in the end this critical faculty was his undoing, because he tended to choose books that were excellent literature but which did not sell easily, so the Cresset Press pensioned him off.¹⁴¹

One of Koteliansky's many unrealized dreams was the idea of translating into Russian English children's books. Lawrence thought the idea good and suggested the names of a few books and authors for the purpose. He also encouraged him to do the translation:

I must tell you we have a beautiful literature for boys, adventurous and romantic. I can read it now, when all other books seem rather tiresome. Fennimore [sic] Cooper is lovely beyond words *Last of the Mohicans*, *Deerslayer*. Do you think they are done into Russian? Then Herman Melville [sic] Melville's *Moby Dick* (everyman 1/-) is a real masterpiece, & very good is Dana's *Two Years before the Mast*. These are books worth preserving in every language. My dear Kot, translate them at once.¹⁴²

There was a plan to produce Lawrence's *Women in Love* in Russian translation; the translation never materialized. Furthermore, there was the idea of collaborating with Katherine Carswell to write a memoir about Lawrence in 1930. The book was to be called "Lawrence was Right."

Though I still feel that I have not the time or strength to collect or edit such a book of Lawrence reviews as you suggest, I still think the idea a sound one and hope you, will carry it out. . . But . . . I'd love to collaborate with you in the book, or you would do the commentary part. But it is your idea & you are the disposer thereof. ¹⁴⁴

Likewise both Koteliansky's attempts for publishing Katherine Mansfield's correspondence proved unsuccessful. In May 1937 he wrote to J. M. Murry for permission to publish some of her letters. Although he received a positive reply from Murry, the project never materialized. ¹⁴⁵ He returned to the same idea almost twenty years later. This time he hoped to publish Ida Baker's letters to Mansfield. "If you can bring yourself into the mood of typing K's [sic] letters to you, please do so, as soon as you can. I have an idea of what can be done with the typescript, but the exploration of the idea can wait until you manage to come to London."¹⁴⁶ However, his dream for publishing his letters from Lawrence in the Huxley edition of *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence* was destroyed by Frieda's disapproval. Koteliansky's antipathy towards Frieda increased after Lawrence's death. She was aware of this fact; she accused Koteliansky of betraying Lawrence because of his attitude to the Lawrence family in their handling of Lawrence's works. Frieda refused to accept Koteliansky's terms when Huxley was arranging the matter of publication. Her attitude had to do with Koteliansky's belief that she was not suitable to take care of Lawrence's papers.

About your letters being published or not published what the hell does it matter we shall all be dead before long. For the love of power you persecute me, Kot, always have done so, I dont know why! I have never done *you* any harm & dont want to! For Lawrence's sake I would *help* you if I could! ¹⁴⁸

Despite her promise to help, Lawrence's letters to Koteliansky were not published in the Huxley edition.

Koteliansky might have owed his place in the British literary world to his acquaintance with Lawrence and the other members of the literary circle of the period. His translations, however, secured him a more remarkable place. Despite the fact that his translations have been criticized on the basis of the quality of their English, Koteliansky's contribution to the literary world was through the production of more translations of Russian fiction. Through his friendships with contemporary literary figures he made Russian fiction and authors more familiar and known; his translations served as another means of kindling the interest of the English public in Russian literature. Moreover, Koteliansky was an intellectual with a very

different personal interest and a wide knowledge of English and Russian literature, which made his position in the literary world more significant.

Koteliansky did not see himself as a man with a mission to make Russian literature available in English; he saw himself as a man with a living to earn, and translating as a source of income.

Because he became involved with Murry, Mansfield, the Woolfs he contributed to the selling of the Russian cult by satisfying their desire to achieve access to Russian culture. They could not achieve their aim alone. They did not have sufficient Russian between them, but by standing on Koteliansky's shoulders (polishing his translations and getting them published) they could feel they were contributing. This translation work was published and became widely known because he had the right friends, the Bloomsbury group and their satellites.

His contribution to the availability of Russian works in English was not usually the introduction of new authors to the British reading public, but of new material, frequently other than fiction, from names already known. Some of this material had not even published in Russia.

Notes

1. John Carswell, *Lives and Letters: A. R. Orage, Beatrice Hastings, Katherine Mansfield, John Middleton Murry, S. S. Koteliansky* (London: Faber and Faber, 1978), p. 89.
2. Dilys Powell, "Mr.S.S. Koteliansky", *The Times* (27 January 1955)
3. Leonard Woolf, "Kot", *The New Statesman and Nation* XLIX (5 February 1955), p. 171.
4. Powell, "Mr.S.S. Koteliansky."
5. George J. Zytaruk ed., *The Quest for Rananim: D. H. Lawrence's Letters to S. S. Koteliansky 1914 to 1930* (Montreal: Queen's University Press, 1970), p.xvi.
6. Ibid. p.xvii.
7. Ibid.
8. Powell, "Mr.S.S. Koteliansky."
9. Woolf, "Kot." p. 171.
10. Hilary Pyle, *James Stephens: His Work and an Account of His Life* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), p. 134.
11. Woolf, "Kot." p. 172.
12. George Zytaruk read some of these letters when he was preparing *The Quest for Rananim*.
13. Sandra Jobson Darroch, *Ottoline: The Life of Lady Ottoline Morrell* (London: Book Club Associates, 1976), p. 277.
14. Such was the intensity of these black moods that Koteliansky attempted to commit suicide; he tried to cut his throat. Carswell, *Lives and Letters*. p. 267.
15. The state of his depression was intensified during the late thirties; his friends were concerned for his sanity. " His 'state' is increasing so rapidly, and his despair becoming so intense that it really is no exaggeration to say that if it isn't interrupted, he will be out of his

mind." The black moods coincided with Gertler's death. The previous quotation is part of a letter from Ruth Marty to Lady Glenavy. The letter, as a whole, shows his friends' deep concern for him and their efforts to help him out of depression. Marty postponed a journey to think of a solution to his problem. See Koteliansky papers, B L, Add MSS 48971, folios 14-15.

16. Zytaruk, *Quest.* p. xvii.

17. J. M. Murry, ed., *The Letters of Katherine Mansfield*. Volume II. (London: Constable & Co, 1928), pp. 94-95.

18. Witter Bynner, *Journey with Genius: Recollections and Reflections Concerning the D. H. Lawrences* (New York: John Day Company, 1951), p. 201.

19. Noel Carrington, ed., *Mark Gertler: Selected Letters* (London: Rupert Hart Davis, 1965), p. 119.

20. Zytaruk, *Quest.* p. 87.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 93.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 130.

23. Carswell, *Lives and Letters*. p. 88.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 96.

25. Zytaruk, *Quest.* pp. xviii-xix.

26. G. M. Hyde, *D. H. Lawrence and the Art of Translation* (London: the Macmillan Press, 1981), p. 14.

27. K.W.Gransden, "Rananim: D. H. Lawrence's Letters to S. S. Koteliansky", *Twentieth Century* CLIX (January 1956), p. 23.

28. Hyde, *Art of Translation*. pp.15-16.

29. Gransden, "Rananim." p. 23.

30. Hyde, *Art of Translation*. p. 16.

31. For a detailed study of Koteliansky's relationship with Katherine Mansfield see Geraldine L. Conroy, "Our Perhaps Uncommon Friendship", *Modern Fiction Studies*, 24 (1978-9), and Sally Brown, "'Hundred of Selves': The British Library Katherine Mansfield Letters."

John Carswell, *Lives and Letters*. pp. 138, 151, 261-2.

32. Leonard Woolf, *Beginning Again: An Autobiography of the Years 1911-1918* (London: Hogarth Press, 1964), p. 205.

33. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p. xvii.

34. Carswell, *Lives and Letters*. p. 259.

35. Powell, *The Times*.

36. K. W. Gransden, "The S. S. Koteliansky Bequest", *The British Museum Quarterly* Vol. XX: 1955-56. pp. 83-84.

37. Woolf, "Kot." p. 172.

38. Antony Alpers, *The Life of Katherine Mansfield* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1980), pp. 170-71.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 168.

40. Carswell, *Lives and Letters*. p. 101.

41. Sean Hignett, *Brett: From Bloomsbury to New Mexico*. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984.) p. 117. When Brett was depressed suspecting that she was pregnant, she wrote to Koteliansky unburdening herself: "I have tried not to burden anyone with this, but I can't bear it alone any longer and it's useless to tell Murry until I know for certain." by Zytaruk in ed., "Dorothy Brett's Letters to S.S. Koteliansky", *The D. H. Lawrence Review* Vol. 7, No. 1, 1974.

42. In her memoirs Lady Ottoline notes that D. H. Lawrence took

me to see a Russian Jew, Koteliansky, and Murry and Mrs Murry - they were sitting together in a bare office high up next door to the Holborn Restaurant, with the windows shut, smoking Russian cigarettes without a minute intermission, idle and cynical. I thought Murry *bestly* and the whole atmosphere of the three dead and putrefying.

43. Darroch, *Ottoline Life*. pp. 277-8.

44. Beatrice Lady Glenavy, *Today We Will Only Gossip* (London: Constable, 1964), pp. 189-190.

45. Conroy, *Life and Works of Koteliansky*. p. 133.

46. F. A. Lea, *The Life of John Middleton Murry* (London: Methuen & Co, 1959), p. 44.

47. Pyle, *James Stephens*. p. 118.

48. Carswell, *Lives and Letters*. p. 27.

49. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p. 92.

50. Geraldine Louise Conroy, *A Study of the Life and Works of S. S. Koteliansky, with Particular Reference to Unpublished Correspondence at the Alexander Turnbull Library* (Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, 1977), MA thesis, pp. 161-2.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 136.

52. B.L. Add Mss. 48,974. folios 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 61, 64.

53. Conroy, *Life and Works of Koteliansky*. p. 100.

54. John W. Dickinson, "Katherine Mansfield and S. S. Koteliansky: Some Unpublished Letters", *Revue de Litterature Comparee*, 45, 1971. p. 93. Or see Letters vol. II (25 may 1922).

55. See Conroy's thesis for diagram.

56. F. A. Lea, *The Life of J. M. Murry*. p. 66.

57. *The Athenaeum*, (2 January 1920), (4,11 June 1920)

58. *The Nation and Athenauem*, (16 January 1926)

59. See Appendix I, Zytaruk, *The Quest* for a list of Koteliansky's contribution to the magazine.

60. *The London Mercury* No. 72, (February 1937) p.578, pp. 362-70.

Koteliansky sent the two stories, which has been recorded by his mother in Yiddish, to Lawrence in 1926 or 1927 to edit.

61. *Calendar of Modern Letters*, (March, June, August, October, November, 1925).

62. B. L. Add Mss 48,974. folio. 77, (7 February 1923).

63. *The Criterion*, published Koteliansky's translation of two unpublished letters written by Dostoevsky in relation to *The Brothers Karamazov*. (Vol.Iv, No. III, June 1926), in addition to plan of the novel *The Life of a Great Sinner*, (Vol. I, No. 1, October 1922), the full text of Dostoevsky's letter, written on the day he was sentenced to death to his brother Mikhail, and some letter from Dostoevsky: *Letters and Reminiscences* (Vol. I, No. 3, April 1923), and extracts from letters exchanged between Tolstoy relating to Dostoevsky. (Vol.III, No. x, January 1925).

64. B.L. Add Mss 48,974.folio. 93,(24 April 1925).

65. B.L. Add Mss 48,974. folio. 86, (21 September 1924).

67. B.L. Add Mss 48,974. folio. 96, (3 February 1926).

68. B.L. Add Mss 48,974. folios 102, 107, (3 February, 23 May 1927).

69. F. A. Lea, *The Life of J. M. Murry*. p. 44.

70. The first instalment of the " Diary" was published on April 4, 1919. No translators' names were mentioned. " I was as much surprised as you to find we were nameless. no reason was given." Thus Katherine wrote to Kot. Subsequent contributions had both Mansfield's and Koteliansky's names. Vincent O' Sullivan, ed., *Katherine Mansfield: Selected Letters* (Oxford:

Clarendon Press, 1989), p. 118.

71. Vincent O' Sullivan, Margaret Scott, ed., *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield Vol. II 1918-1919*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), p. 348.

72. Mansfield told Lady Ottoline of her translation of Gorky

I Have been translating Maxim Gorki's Journal of Revolution all past week. I find Gorki wonderfully sympathetic - This journal is dreadful. It makes you feel - *anything anything* rather than revolution.

O'Sullivan, *The Collected Letters*. p. 291.

73. J. M. Murry, ed., *The Letters of Katherine Mansfield Vol. I*. p. 242.

74. O'Sullivan, *Katherine Mansfield: Selected Letters*. p. 118.

75. Dickinson, *Revue De Litterature Comparee*. p.88.

76. Ibid., p. 99.

77. Leonard Woolf, *Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919-1939* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1967), p. 67.

78. Ibid., p.66.

79. Ibid., p. 67.

80. Ibid., p. 74.

81. Nigel Nicolson, *The Flight of the Mind: The Letters of Virginia Woolf Volume I. 1888-1912* (London: the Hogarth Press, 1975), p. 616.

82. The Woolfs started to learn Russian in February 1921. By March that year Virginia wrote to Saxone Sydney-Turner about it

I have just done my Russian lesson, and can read one page of Aksakov in 45 minutes. There are 3 clusters of words which I know, and these bear me in hope. Otherwise I have to look out each one, and what is worse, forget them by the time I reach the

end of the sentence. But we say we have broken the back of the language.

Nicolson, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf* Volume I. p. 463. See also Woolf, *Beginning*. p. 248.

83. Nicolson, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf* Volume I. p. 573.

84. Woolf, *Beginning*. p. 248.

85. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p. 184.

86. *Ibid.*, p. 185.

87. *Ibid.*, p. 188.

88. *Ibid.*, p. 224.

89. In July 1921 Lawrence wrote to Thayer offering the story for publication; "if you don't want the story, do you think anyone else in America might consider it? I want to help Koteliansky if I can."

James T. Boulton, ed., *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol. IV: June 1921-March 1924 (Cambridge: University Press, 1987), p. 58.

90. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p.227.

91. *Ibid.*, pp. 206-211.

92. D. H. Lawrence played a role in the formation of the Mandrake Press. The Press grew out of the Fanfrolico Press. P. R. Stephens, who was the business manager of the press, founded the new press with the financial help of Edward Goldston, the London book-seller. The first book published by the press was a reproduction of D. H. Lawrence's paintings; *The Paintings of D. H. Lawrence* (1929). R. P. Carr, *The Mandrake Press 1929-30: Catalogue of an Exhibition, Cambridge University Library, September-November, 1985*. (Cambridge: University Library, 1985), pp. 1-7.

93. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p. 370.

94. The foreword and review are included in *Phoenix*.
95. John Worthen, *D. H. Lawrence: A Literary Life* (London: Macmillan, 1939), pp.81-82.
96. Zytaruk, *Quest*. pp. 200, 202.
97. Zytaruk was the first person to draw attention to this new fact in his introduction of Lawrence's letters to Koteliansky: *Quest*, p. xxix.
98. *Ibid.*, pp.256-259.
99. *Ibid.*, p. xxxv.
100. Carswell, *Lives and Letters*. p. 158.
101. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p. 231.
102. Conroy, *Life and Works of Koteliansky*. p. 161.
- John W. Dickinson, "Katherine Mansfield and S. S. Koteliansky: Some Unpublished Letters", *Revue De Litterature Comparee*. p. 87.
103. Leonard Woolf, "Chekhov's Letters", *The Nation & The Athenaeum* (21 February 1925), p. 717.
104. *The Times Literary Supplement* (12 March 1925) p. 169.
105. *The Times Literary Supplement* (11 November 1926) p.790.
106. "The Lustre of Tchekhov", *The Nation and Athenaeum*, p.566.
107. Barrington Gates, "More about Tchekhov", *The Nation & The Athenaeum*.
108. J. M. Murry, "The Notebooks of Tchekhov", *The Nation and The Athenaeum* (4 June 1921), pp.365-66.
109. "The Harvest of an Artist's Eye", *The Spectator* (6 July 1921), p. 320.

110. *The Times Literary Supplement* (July 19, 1923), p. 490.
111. *The Times Literary Supplement* (4 August 1927), p. 530.
112. Ibid.
113. *The Times Literary Supplement* (3 October 1929), p. 764.
114. Conroy, *Life and Works of Koteliansky*. p. 161.
115. Ibid., p. 125.
116. Ibid., p. 180.
117. Conroy, *Life and Works of Koteliansky*. p. 183.
118. Hyde, *Art of Translation*. p. 21.
119. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p. 202.
120. A. Alpers, *The Life of Katherine Mansfield*. p. 181.
121. Edward Nehls, ed., *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography, Volume One, 1885-1919* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), pp. 322-323.
122. Carswell, p. 190.
123. Lea, *The Life of J. M. Murry*. p. 105.
124. Ibid., pp. 112-113.
125. Ibid., p. 132.
126. Ibid., p. 134.
127. Carswell, pp. 199-205.
128. Ibid., pp. 206-208.

129. Boulton, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol.IV. pp. 556-7.
130. Ibid., p. 579.
131. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p. 372.
132. Conroy, *The Life of S. S. Koteliansky*. p.113.
133. Zytaruk, *Quest*. p. 324.
134. Ibid., p. 236.
135. Aldous Huxley, *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence* (London: Heinemann, 1932), p. 348.
136. Zytaruk, *Quest*. pp. 325-328.
137. Ibid., p. 329.
138. Conroy, *The Life of S. S. Koteliansky*. p. 50.
139. Ibid., p. 117.
140. Ibid., p. 154.
141. Pyle, *James Stephens*. p. 134.
142. Zytaruk, *Quest*. pp. 80-81.
143. Catherine Carswell, *The Savage Pilgrimage: A Narrative of D. H. Lawrence* (London: Martin Secker, 1932), p. 86.
144. B.L. Add MSS 48975. folios 184-185, (14 January 1931)
145. F. A. Lea, Conroy, *The Life of S. S. Koteliansky*. pp. 156-157.
146. Ibid., p. 156.

147. Zytaruk, *Quest.* pp. xxiv-xxv.

148. B.L. Add MSS 48975. folio 12, (1931)

Conclusion

The writers who are the subject of this thesis are well-known figures in the process of transmission of Russian literature into Britain. They are responsible for making Russian masterpieces available in England.

The merits of their achievements marked a new era in the field of translation from the Russian. Their translations were done directly from the Russian rather than at second-hand from the French or third-hand from German by way of French versions. In this respect their translations were more reliable and more accurate than earlier translations. The appearance of their translations put an end to the intellectuals' and men of letters' preference to the French translations of Russian works. Both the public and men of letters turned then to their productions. What is more, their translations contributed to weaving the influence of the Russian novel into contemporary English fiction.

It is well-known that the beginning of British concern for Russian literature was strongly motivated by political issues. However, there were other factors that stimulated the great enthusiasm for Russian literature. The growing interest of scholarly studies manifested itself with the publication in France of De Vogue's *Le Roman Russe* (1886). The book assessed the Russian novel, appreciating its moral sense, which was appreciated by the English and stood in contrast to the art of the French novel. The influx of Russian translations into English coincided with the debate over Naturalism, which, helped to diminish the effect of the French novel, and gave way to the introduction of Russian Realism. The interest in the Russian novel at this stage also came out as a result of the dissatisfaction with the English novel.

The story of the effect of Russian literature in Britain has often been told. Virginia Woolf's remark that the modern English novel could not have become what it was without the Russian influence is an acknowledgement to the role the Russian novel played in the evolution of English fiction. This influence could be discerned in the indebtedness of some English writers to the Russians. Chekhov's technique had a profound influence on Katherine Mansfield. It is said that the stories of A. E. Coppard and H. E. Bates could not have been written without Chekhov. Critics studied the influence of Russian writings on George Moore, George Gissing, D. H. Lawrence and Joseph Conrad and many others.

Constance Garnett was, by far, the most eminent translator of Russian literature. Garnett saw herself as a person with a mission. She was so immersed in Russian life and literature and felt the need to bring its treasures to the English public. She considered it her

business not merely to translate what came her way, but to make available the works of the most important Russian authors to the English readers. In this sense she was considered as more influential than the other two translators. Her translations covered more than five authors. Moreover, her merit was that she introduced in full the works of Turgenev, Dostoevsky, and Chekhov for the first time in English. In this respect she not only fed the general interest for things Russian, but also contributed to initiating the "Russian cult". Her translation of Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* was responsible for the origination of the cult as one of the important literary phenomenon of modern times. Her second major contribution was to keep the public's enthusiasm for Russian literature glowing. This she achieved through her translation of Chekhov's. Garnett's efforts in presenting the complete works of Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, and her translations of Gogol and Herzen guaranteed her status.

Unlike the other two translators Aylmer Maude was committed to translating one Russian writer's works, rather than feeding the general appetite for all things Russian. Moreover, his concern was philosophical and political rather than literary. Although Maude came late to the field of translation, his merit was that his Centenary Edition of Tolstoy's works became the standard, scholarly translation of Tolstoy in English.

Translation was Maude's life's career, but unlike both Garnett and Koteliansky he did not turn to it in order to make a living. He took up translation out of a desire to make Tolstoy's works intelligible and available to the British reader. His realization of the lack of a complete edition in the English language of Tolstoy's works prompted him to fight hard to achieve his aim. His intention was not primarily with profit, but with the final outcome: the presentation of Tolstoy's works in a definitive edition for the British public. What added to Maude's credibility was that he was regarded as an authority on the writer in England.

In this sense Maude played an influential role in the propagation of Tolstoy in Britain. When he settled in England he allied himself with Chertkov, who wanted to publish Tolstoy's ethical, social and religious works. Chertkov's efforts made England the chief centre of Tolstoyan publishing activities. Maude had a brief encounter with the Free Age Press, to which he translated a few of Tolstoy's recent works that reflected on such issues, and also contributed to marketing kindred literature. His other channel of propagating Tolstoy came through his joining of the Tolstoyan community in England which professed to put into practice Tolstoy's non-resistance doctrine.

S. S. Koteliansky's position in English literary life was enhanced by the many friendships he made with the creative people of his day, as much as through his translations. He was caught up in the general atmosphere of providing things Russian to feed the appetite of

the enthusiastic British public. In this respect he was seen as a supplier and finder of new material. His translations may not have consisted of major works; nevertheless, he presented additional biographical or literary material of Dostoevsky, Tolstoy and Chekhov. Koteliansky updated Russian literature through his translations of Rozanov, Kuprin, Shestov and Bunin. Although he translated to make a living, it is interesting to know that Koteliansky was never tied by publishers' demands. He was an honourable free-lance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVES

Abbreviations

This index of reference codes shows location of material. Code is followed by location and this is followed by place in primary source list below.

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 1. Archive | The Aylmer Maude Archive, Sheffield University. |
| 2. E. R. O. | Essex Record Office, Chelmsford. |
| 3. R. C. C. | Wakefield Papers, Wakefield Record Office. |
| 4. O. U. P. | Oxford University Press Papers. |
| 5. B.L. Add MSS. | The S. S. Koteliansky Correspondence, the British Library. |
| 6. B.L. MSS. | The Society of Authors Papers, the British Library. |

1. Aylmer Maude

i. The Papers of Aylmer Maude, Archive Copies.

Aylmer Maude's papers, copies of which are kept at Sheffield University library, are replicas of the original archive which was entrusted by the Maude family in the care of Professor M. J. de K. Holman of Leeds University.

The size of the archive is enormous. In quantity it amounts to almost three thousand letters. The body of the archive covers a large period which stretches back as far as the closing years of the 1890s, and which continues up till the end of the 1930s. The contents of the archive have been arranged according to their original grouping. The papers have been assembled in nine boxes from A to I. Classification of the papers has been done by the present author. Each paper has been given a number. The reference At / 1 for instance means that 'A' is the box number, the letter 't' denotes one of the different subheadings within the same box, while '1' is the number of the reference. Each of the nine boxes contains miscellaneous letters, belonging to different periods of time. The letters are not in chronological order.

The subject matter of the letters and papers in Box A varies. Papers concerning translation as well as business, financial and everyday matters are combined. There are some letters in Russian, addressed to, or written by figures like P. I. Biryukov, P. Boulanger, V. G. Chertkov, I. Nazhivin, L. O. Pasternak and others. Some of the letters are in French. There are also letters from Tolstoy, dealing with matters of translation, and involving the request for omissions or alterations in the text. The process of the publication of *Resurrection* features in the letters, which cover the arrangements with the many problems arising in relation to copyright and the novel's different publications, in addition to some papers related to the business of the Resurrection Fund Committee and all the financial matters it involved from payment of cheques to receipt of royalties. Copies of the Centenary Edition Appeal - as written by G. B. Shaw - are retained with the attached signatures of many prominent literary figures and critics. There are also copies of particulars of the Tolstoy Society which were sent in order to interest people in the Centenary Edition. Besides there are copies of the letter written in appeal for a Civil List Pension for Maude's wife. There is also a copy of Maude's letter of request to N. Gusev for the provision of 400 autographs in Tolstoy's handwriting to American subscribers of an early attempt to secure a collected edition to Tolstoy's works. (The reference is to the Unwin and Doubleday project of 1927). The box also contains some of Maude's lecture notes in addition to rough notes for translations. Besides, there are relevant translation matters constituting of the business of receipts of royalties, balance on sales of translations by different publishers. Letters in connection with strictly business matters as well as personal and everyday life issues form a great part of the contents of this box. These include the transference of shares, dividends, statements, and income tax matters. Some of the letters in this section deal with Maude's transference of his shares in the Russian Carpet Company to England. There are also letters from members of the Tolstoy family regarding personal and translation matters. The Tolstoys were kept informed with all the development of the Centenary Edition campaign and its progress. Maude's interest in translating Tolstoy's wife's *Diary* features here. A handwritten copy of G. B. Shaw's review of Maude's translation of *What is Art?* can be found.

Campaigning for the Centenary Edition is the theme of most of the letters of the second box. Maude's correspondence with different theatre managers - particularly Robert Atkins - in relation with the production of Tolstoy's plays on the English stage make up the main part of the contents of Box B. The letters also throw some light on the publication of Maude's early translations and his dealings with different publishers. A great part of the letters form Maude's correspondence with J. D. Duff concerning the translation of "Family Happiness" and its inclusion by Maude in a volume of short stories. The Memorandum of Agreement between Maude and Dr. Marie Stopes as regards the publication of *The Life of Marie Stopes* forms part

of the contents of this box, in addition to a few letter by Stopes about general matters and her *Married Love*. The box has some letters in Russian.

The great number of letters in Box C are in relation to the publication by Oxford University Press of Lady Sybil Smith's *The Tree of Knowledge*. There are also various letters dealing with different topics manifesting Maude's other engagements such as his membership of the Fabian Society, and the National Liberal Club, his support of women's suffrage, his engagement on a scheme with other scholars to improve the Russian-English Dictionary, his correspondence with Bernard Pares about matters of Russian transliteration and other matters, besides some private and personal business matters. A large portion of the letters is concerned with the long and delayed negotiations of Heinemann's project for publishing a Collected Tolstoy in 1913 and the failure of the venture due to complications of copyright. Another part of the letters focuses on the agreement with Methuen to write a short life of Tolstoy: *Life of Tolstoy* and the difficulties over its publication. Centenary Edition issues occupy a good deal of the letters as well, in addition to royalty payments on translations particularly in relation to Funk, the American publisher and *Resurrection*.

Jane Addams's letters to Maude constitute a part of the letters in Box D. The letters deal with non-resistance and the example followed by enthusiasts at Hull House, Chicago. As part of Maude's campaign for the Centenary Edition, the box includes Maude's letters to prominent literary figures and critics, as well as others, to interest them in the project and urge them to join the Tolstoy Society. There are letters in this concern to Addams and to Maurice Baring who refused Maude's invitation to be the president of the Tolstoy Society. There are few letters from Prince Kropotkin about Tolstoy and his lecturing for Maude's Socialist group, in addition to invitations to Maude to lecture on Tolstoy for different groups and societies. Some of the letters are from G. B. Shaw; they deal mainly with Shaw's advice against the staging of Tolstoy's plays and his refusal to lecture for the Tolstoy Society as well as his involvement in the prospect of Maude's applying for Civil List Pension. Sydney Webb's letters are related to Fabian Society issues. There are also other letters from P. Vinogodoff, Bruce Wallace, Hugh Walpole and H. G. Wells.

The contents of Box E is a copy of *The New Order* for the years 1895-1897 and 1898. Much communitarian and Tolstoyan news features in its pages. The periodical reported news of the plight of the Doukhobors, and their settlement in Canada. It also carried on the task of publicizing and advertising the publication of Tolstoy's ethical and social works.

Two books of bank statements make up the contents of Box F.

Box G shows Maude's engagement on translation of screen-plays and other relevant material in connection with cinema adaptation. There are letters that deal with the business of the Society of Authors, of which Maude was the treasurer and on the Committee of Management. His correspondence in this respect reveals his involvement in financial and other issues in addition to his seeking advice in regard to the legal status of his translations. The letters highlight some of the issues of the publication of *Tolstoy on Art*. There is also the correspondence with Charles Reid over the prospect of a lecture tour to America.

Box H is on the wholly devoted to invoices, and investment matters. There is also an invoice file.

Box I contains more correspondence with Robert Atkins in relation to his production of *The Power of Darkness*, and Maude's untiring endeavours to secure the performance by a theatrical group of Tolstoy's play *The Fruits of Enlightenment*, and his success in doing so. Some of the letters reveal other business matters concerning the Society of Authors. The letters in connection with the Centenary Edition campaign deal with Maude's provision of introductions to the volumes, a process which involved writing to writers. There are also letters dealing with general business matters.

ii. Oxford University Press Papers Oxford University Press Headquarters

The Maude material in the Oxford University Press papers constitutes mainly of the World's Classics files, and of the letterbooks of the publisher Humphrey Milford.

The files in the World's Classics collection amount to three in number. They cover different periods of times and discuss matters of first publication, request for republication of Maude's translations in new editions, and other financial issues. The World's Classic file for the period 1938-39 is related to the distribution of royalties after Maude's death and the payment of any procurable profits on the sales of the translations to Maude's sons. The C. C. Contract File (W. C. 72, 250072) deals with the matters of publication of *Twenty-Three Tales*. The letters during the year 1905 are concerned with Maude's efforts to have his translations published in the World's Classics series after the press took over the series from Grant Richards. They also refer to Maude's arrangements to include Tolstoy's best works in the series and the settlement of copyright matters and terms of publication. The reprint of *Resurrection* and *Anna Karenina* by an American publisher during 1965-66, in addition to the the arrangement for publication of earlier volumes; *The Cossacks*, *Resurrection* and *Anna*

Karenina make up the contents of the *Resurrection* file (W. C. 209). The settlement of other matters of publication in regard to previous publication of translations by different publishers feature in this volume.

The letterbooks of Humphrey Milford cover the period from 1906 to 1948. Nevertheless, some of the volumes in this collection are inaccessible at the moment. (the volumes 129 to 171 contain only few letters from Milford to Maude.) The volumes checked belong to the period between 1918 to 1936. The letters here relate to Milford's early refusal to comply with Maude's proposal to publish a library edition of Tolstoy's works. There are also letters dealing with the press's terms of agreement as regards the publication of new volumes in the series and and payments on sales.

iii. Wakefield Papers

(West Yorkshire Archive Service)

The Maude material here consists of records relating to the Russian Carpet Company as part of the huge Crossely Carpets collection under the reference number C 300. This includes correspondence related to the Russian Carpet Company from 1895 to 1903, and from 1911 to 1919, in addition to memos concerning Anglo-Soviet trade between 1899 and 1933. There also survive some late nineteenth century accounts.

Box 12 in the collection contains papers and correspondence regarding the Russian Carpet Company. The related Maude material is available in this box. There are letters from Maude to G. Marchetti, who was the chairman of John Crossley & Sons, and director of the Russian Carpet Company, with respect to the payment of shares due to Maude from the company. There are six letters altogether (Letters 1889). Under Russian Carpet Correspondence (1895-1899), (1900-1903) Private Letters, there are few letters from Maude. The earliest of the letters, however, dates back to 1872. All the letters deal with business matters and provision of material for the company. The letters continue after Maude's resignation from business and return to settle in England. The letters during 1905 and 1906 are about the transference of shares to Marchetti and his firm and Maude's selling of shares in the company.

iv. Essex Record Office

In the index under Maude's name in this collection there was reference to the following material:

1. "Recollections of Tolstoyan Colony of Russian Refugees at Purleigh."
2. Newspapers cuttings compiled in 1971 and some extracts from the *Essex Chronicle* (E.R.O. T/P 181/8)
3. "The Tolstoyan Colony" (E.R.O.P.1). This consists of a brief history of the colony's foundation, growth and collapse.
4. "News of the Doukhobors" by V. Tchertkoff.

There are some items in the Maude section of this archive which are not unique to it, so these appear in the general biography.

v. The Incorporated Society of Authors, Composers and Playwrights Department of Manuscripts, the British Library

The relevant Maude material in this collection is to be found in the volumes 56746-56749. The first volume deals with Maude's correspondence with Thring concerning translation matters in general, in addition to Maude's post as a Treasurer of the Society and a member of the Committee of Management and the duties related. He served for twenty-one years. Maude became a member of the Committee in 1911 and remained till 1931. Maude always sought Thring's advice in translation matters such as having the proposals of publishers sent for him for approval or revision. (the publication of *Leo Tolstoy* by Methuen, the collection of royalties in the case of the Walter Scott publication of *What is Art?*). The drafting of the memorandum of agreement with J. D. Duff and the problems with T. Y. Crowell of America in regard to the publication of *Tolstoy on Art* constitute the major part of the contents of the second volume. The letters in the third volume are largely concerned with Maude seeking advice regarding the legal position of reprints and publication of old and new material, besides the preparation for Maude's American lecture tour. Queries about copyright matters in relation to translations and the performance of Tolstoy's plays in addition to Maude's resignation from the Society Committee of Management and his application for a Civil List Pension make up the contents of the last volume.

2. Constance Garnett

Chatto and Windus Stock ledgers, Department of Manuscripts, Reading University.

The Garnett material consists of Garnett's correspondence with Chatto and Windus' consecutive heads over two decades of time beginning in 1919 and culminating in 1939, of albums of reviews maintained since 1900 which contain pieces from national and provincial newspapers, in addition to figures of print runs on the sales of Chekhov.

The number of the letters in the correspondence amounts to one hundred eighty nine. The correspondence covers a period of sixteen years. The first of the letters was written in March 1919. The second is dated April 1920. There are altogether five letters in that year, twelve in 1921, seventeen in 1922, thirty two in 1923, twenty in 1924, twenty in 1925, eighteen in 1926, fourteen in 1927, twelve in 1928, five in 1929, three in 1930, six in 1937. Between 1931 and 1936 there are no letters. The correspondence continues in 1936 with two letters only, followed by nine in 1937. The collection is completed by thirteen letters in 1938.

During the whole period letters were exchanged between Garnett and four consecutive heads of Chatto & Windus. These were Percy Spalding, Charles Prentice, J. W. McDougall and Herald Raymond.

The letters in 1919 and 1920 are concerned with the publication of Chekhov's works; tales, and letters and some financial matters. Garnett received payment for her translation of the tales. Throughout 1921 the letters continue to deal the issue of the tales and the idea of extending the series to thirteen volumes. The letters also discuss Garnett's proposed translation of Gogol and her plan to do Chekhov's plays. The letters in 1922 handle different matters - the translation of Chekhov's last volume of tales, the work on his plays, arrangement to translate Gogol and her desire to translate Herzen. The difficulties that Garnett encountered over the translation of the plays of Chekhov form the larger part of the contents of the letters in 1923, jointly with other matters of translation such as securing the American rights with regard to Gogol, Herzen and Chekhov's plays. The publication of the American edition of Herzen and its threat to put an end to her work on Herzen form part of the pressure she was under and her anxiety to get the first two volumes out before the American edition. Matters of translation over Herzen, Gogol and Chekhov feature in the letters of the following years. The question of reprinting Chekhov's stories, a new edition of Gogol's works, of translating a play by Turgenev, in addition to readers' enquiries for permission to use Garnett's translations for inclusion in books or anthologies.

3. S. S. Kotliansky

The Manuscript Collection, the British Library

Add Mss. 48966-48975.

In 1958 Kotliansky bequeathed his ten volumes of correspondence to the British Library. The tenth volume (Add Mss. 48975) of the correspondence was reserved from public use till 1980. No reason for reserving the final volume is given. The entry in the 'Reserved Manuscript Register' states that this volume is to be reserved for twenty-five years. It is thought that the D. H. Lawrence material that it contains was considered sensitive in some way.

The volume contains 246 letters to Kotliansky from different figures Catherine Carswell, Aldous Huxley, and J. W. N. Sullivan. The larger part of the volume is dedicated to Frieda Lawrence's letters and to other members of the Lawrence family. In general the letters handle the issue of the executorship of Lawrence's works. Some of the letters are concerned with Kotliansky's failure to collaborate on Carswell's book about Lawrence. The Huxley letters deal with the attempts to persuade Frieda to give up the control over Lawrence's literary remains, in addition to the publication of his edition of Lawrence's letters. Sullivan's letters are mainly concerned with his health condition. The letters show also these friends' concern with Kotliansky deteriorating health condition. As for Frieda's letters, they deal with the problem over the will business and her struggle with the Lawrence family in this respect. Some of the letters are reminiscent of Lawrence and old times. Moreover, the letters reveal the fluctuation in Frieda's relation with Kotliansky, the fact that Kotliansky's enmity for her did not change over the years, and its effect on Frieda's decision not to publish his letters to Lawrence in Huxley's edition.

PERIODICALS

All sources are given in the end notes to each chapter of material from periodicals and the periodicals surveyed are listed in the periodicals bibliography below, but not all the individual items are listed in the General Bibliography as this is not primarily a reference work.

The Adelphi

The Athenaeum

The Bookman

The Calendar of Modern Letters

The Criterion

The Edinburgh Review

The Egoist

The English Review

The Fortnightly Review

Life and Letters

The London Mercury

The Nation and Athenaeum

The New Statesman

The Nineteenth Century and After

The Quarterly Review

The Review of Reviews

The Saturday Review

The Spectator

The Times Literary Supplement

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Aldanov, M. A. "Some Reflections on Tolstoy and Tolstoyism", *The Slavonic Review*.7, (1928-29),482-491.

Alpers, Antony. *The Life of Katherine Mansfield*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1980.

Armytage, W. H. G. *Heavens Below: Utopian Experiments in England, 1560-1960*. London: Routledge, 1961.

The Russian Influence on English Education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969.

"J. C. Kenworthy and the Tolstoyan Communities in England", *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* XVI, 1965-7, 391-406.

Arnold, Armin. "D. H. Lawrence, The Russians, and Giovanni Verga", *Comparative Literature Studies* 2, 3, 1965, 249-257.

Aubry, G. Jean. *Joseph Conrad; Life & Letters*. Volume Two. London: William Heinemann, 1927.

Baker, Denys Val. *Little Reviews 1914-1943*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1943.

Baring, Maurice. *Landmarks in Russian Literature* . London: Methuen, 1910.

"Tchehov", *The New Statesman*. (21 February 1920)

Bartlett, J. Neville. *Carpeting the Millions: The Growth of Britain Carpet Industry*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers,1977.

Bates, H. E. *Edward Garnett*. London: Max Parrish & Co, 1950.

Bennett, Arnold. *Books and Persons: Being Comments on a Past Epoch 1908-1911*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1917.

"Some Consequences of Tolstoy's Vanity: Wanted, A Translators' Trade Union", in Andrew Mylett, ed. *Arnold Bennett: the Evening Standard Years 'Books and Persons 1926-1931'*. 127-129.

Bergonzi, Bernard, ed. *The Twentieth Century*. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1970.

Birrell, Francis. "Chekhov Arrives at Hammersmith", *Nation and Athenaeum* XXXVII, 1925, 267.

"The Seagull", *Nation and Athenaeum* XXXVIII, 1925, 180.

"Chekhov Well Produced", *Nation and Athenaeum* XXXVIII, 1926, 583.

Bond, Richard P. ed. *Studies in the Early English Periodical*. Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina Press, 1957.

Boulton, James T. ed., *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol.I: September 1901-May 1913. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Boulton, James T. and Robertson, Andrew. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Volume III: October 1916-June 1921. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Social Context of Modern English Literature*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.

"The Calendar of Modern Letters", *London Magazine* 1, 7, (October, 1961)

Brewster, Dorothy. *East-West Passage: A Study in Literary Relationships*. London: Allan and Unwin, 1954.

Briant, Keith. *Marie Stopes: a Biography*. London: the Hogarth Press, 1962.

Brock, Peter. *Pacifism in Europe to 1914*. Princeton: Princeton university Press, 1972.

Brown, Ivor. *The Way of My World*. London: Collins, 1954.

- Burke, Thomas. *Son of London*. London: Readers Union with Herbert Jenkins, 1948.
- Bynner, Witter. *Journey with Genius, Recollections and Reflections Concerning the D. H. Lawrences*. New York: John Day Company, 1951.
- Carr, E. H. "Dostoevsky and A Russian Minx", *The Fortnightly Review* CXXVI, (October 1929), 525.
- "Two Russians", *The Fortnightly Review* CXXVI, (December 1929), 832.
- Carr, R. P. *The Mandrake Press 1929-30: Catalogue of an Exhibition, Cambridge University Library, September-November, 1985*. Cambridge: University Library, 1985.
- Carrington, Noel. ed., *Mark Gertler: Selected Letters*. With an Introduction on His Work as an Artist by Quentin Bell. London: Rupert Hart Davis, 1965.
- Carswell, Catherine. *The Savage Pilgrimage: A Narrative of D. H. Lawrence*. London: Martin Secker, 1932.
- Carswell, John. *Lives and Letters: A. R. Orage, Beatrice Hastings, Katherine Mansfield, John Middleton Murry, S. S. Koteliansky*. London: Faber and Faber, 1978.
- Ceadal, Martin. *Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: the Defining of a Faith*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Clyman, Toby W. ed. *A Chekhov Companion*. London: Greenwood Press, 1985.
- Conroy, Geraldine Louise. *A Study of the Life and Works of S. S. Koteliansky, with Particular Reference to Unpublished Correspondence at the Alexander Turnbull Library*. Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, 1977.
- "Our Perhaps Uncommon Friendship", *Modern Fiction Studies* 24, 1978-79, 355-367.

- Cournos, John. "Feodor Sologub", *The Fortnightly Review* XCIII, (September 1915), 480.
- "Aleksai Remizov", *The Egoist* (February, 1916), 28-29.
- "Sologub's "Created Legend", *The Egoist* (November 1916), 167-168.
- Cohen, J. M. *English Translators and Translations*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1962.
- Crankshaw, Edward. "Work of Constance Garnett", *The Listener* (30 January 1947), 195-196.
- Darroch, Sandra Jobson. *Ottoline: The Life of Lady Ottoline Morrell*. (London: Book Club Associates, 1976.
- Davie, Donald. ed., *Russian Literature and Modern English Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- De la Mare, Walter. "Tchehov's Letters", *Westminster Gazette* (28 February 1920)
- Decker, Clarence. " Zola's Literary Reputation in England", *P.M.L.A.* XLIX, 1934, 1140-1153.
- Desmond MacCarthy, *The New Statesman* (March 1926)
- Dickinson, John W. "Katherine Mansfield and S. S. Koteliansky: Some Unpublished Letters", *Revue De Litterature Comparee* 45, 1971, 79-99.
- Dobree, Bonamy. "Chekhov Letters", *Nation and Athenaeum* XXXVIII, 1926, 814.
- "More about Tolstoy", *Nation and Athenaeum* XL, 1927, 512.
- Dudek, Louis. *Literature and the Press: A History of Printing, Printed Media, and their Relation to Literature*. Toronto: the Ryerson Press, Contact Press, n.d.

- Edgerton, W. B. "The Artist Turned Prophet: Leo Tolstoy after 1880", *American Contribution to the Sixth International Congress of Slavists II*, 1968, 61-85.
- Eliot, T. S. "Turgenev", *The Egoist* (December, 1917), 167.
- Eliot, Valerie. ed., *The Letters of T. S. Eliot*. Vol. I: 1898-1922. London: Faber, 1988.
- Emeljanow, Victor. *Chekhov: the Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.
- Fausset, Hugh I'A. "Tolstoy in the Fifties", *The New Adelphi* I, 1927-28, 180-1.
- Flower, Newman. ed. *The Journals of Arnold Bennett, 1911-1921*. London: Cassell and Company, 1932.
- Ford, Boris. *The Modern Age*. Volume 7 of the Pelican Guide to English Literature. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1961.
- Fritschner, Linda Marie. "Publishers' Readers, Publishers, and Their Authors", *Publishing History* VII, 1980, 45-100.
- Gardner, Brian. *The Public Schools: An Historical Survey*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1973.
- Garnett, David. *The Golden Echo*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1953.
- The Flowers of The Forest*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1955.
- Garnett, Edward. *Tolstoy; His Life and Writings*. London: Constable and Company, 1914.
- Turgenev*, With an introduction by Joseph Conrad. London: Clear-Tyne Press, 1917.
- "A Literary Causerie: Dostoevsky", *The Academy* (September 1906), 202-203.
- "The Contemporary Critic", in *Friday Nights, Literary Criticisms and Appreciations*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1922.

- Letters from John Galsworthy, 1900-1932*. London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- Garnett, Edward and Constance. "Tolstoy and *Resurrection*", *North American Review* CLXII, (April 1901), 504-519.
- Garnett, Richard. *Constance Garnett, A Heroic Life*. London: Sinclair - Stevenson, 1991.
- Gifford, Henry. "On Translating Tolstoy", in ed. Malcolm Jones, *New Essays on Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Leo Tolstoy: A Critical Anthology*. London: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Glenavy, Beatrice Lady. *Today We Will Only Gossip*. London: Constable, 1964.
- Gransden, K. W. "Rananim: D. H. Lawrence's Letters to S. S. Koteliansky", *Twentieth Century* CLIX (January 1956), 22-32.
- "The S. S. Koteliansky Bequest", *Twentieth Century*, CLIX (January, 1956), 83-84.
- Greenwood, E. B. *Tolstoy: The Comprehensive Vision*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1975.
- Hahn, Beverly. *Chekhov, A Study of the Major Stories and Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Hall, Ruth. *Marie Stopes: a Biography*. London: Andre Deutsch, 1977.
- Hardy, Dennis. *Alternative Communities in Nineteenth Century England*. London: Longman, 1979.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn G. *The Garnett Family*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961.
- Hepburn, James. ed., *Letters of Arnold Bennett*. Volume II: 1889-1915. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

- Holman, M. J. de K. and Collins, David. eds. "Aylmer Maude's Letters from Archangel: 1918-1919." *Sbornik*. No 6-7 (Papers of the Sixth and Seventh International Conferences of the Study Group on the Russian Revolution.) Jan.1980-Jan.1981, 108-153.
- "The Purleigh Colony: Tolstoyan togetherness in the late 1880s", in ed., Malcolm Jones, *New Essays on Tolstoy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1978.
- "Translating Tolstoy for the Free Age Press: Vladimir Chertkov and his English Manager Arthur Fifield", *Slavonic and East European Review* 66, No 2, (April, 1988),184-197.
- "L. N. Tolstoy to Aylmer Maude: An Unpublished Letter", *Journal of Russian Studies* 36, 1978, 3-9.
- "L. N. Tolstoy's *Resurrection*: Eighty Years of Translation into English", *Slavonic and East European Review* 61, No. 1, (January 1983),125-138.
- "Half a Life's Work: Aylmer Maude Brings Tolstoy to Britain", *Scottish Slavonic Review* 4, 1985, 39-53.
- Huxley, Aldous. ed. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. London: William Heinemann, 1932.
- Hyde, G. M. *D. H. Lawrence and the Art of Translation*. London: the Macmillan Press, 1981.
- Hynes, Samuel. *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Jefferson, George. *Edward Garnett : A Life in Literature*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1982.
- John, St John. *William Heinemann: A Century of Publishing 1890-1990*. London: Heinemann, 1990.
- Karl, Frederick R. and Davies, Laurence. eds. *The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad*. Volume I: (1861-1897) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

- Knowles, A. V. ed. *Tolstoy: the Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Kaye, Peter Paul. *A Monster in the House of Fiction: Dostoevsky and Modern English Novelists*. P.hD. thesis, Stanford University, 1989.
- Lavrin, Janko. "Aylmer Maude", *Dictionary of National Biography*. 1931-1940.
- Lea, F. A. *The Life of John Middleton Murry*. London: Methuen & Co, 1959.
- Lloyd, J. A. T. "The Russian Novelists of the Nineteenth Century", *The Fortnightly Review* CVIII, (November 1920), 854.
- "Dostoevsky and Flaubert", *The Fortnightly Review* CX, (December 1921), 1017.
- "The Russian Dream of Freedom", *The Fortnightly Review* CXVI, (December 1924), 830.
- Lubbock, Percy. "Chekhov Translated", *The Nation and Athenaeum* 34, (December, 1923), 378-9.
- Lynd, Robert . *The New Statesman*. (November 1917).
- Lyon, Mary. ed. *Books and Portraits*. London: the Hogarth Press, 1977.
- Mansfield, Katherine. "Some Aspects of Dostoevsky", *The Athenaeum* (November 1919),
- Martin, Oliver and Warner, Wilson. *Chatto and Windus: a Brief Account of the Firm's Origin, History, and Development*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1973.
- Marrot, H. V. *The Life and Letters of John Galsworthy*. London: William Heinemann, 1935.
- Maude, Aylmer. *A Peculiar People: the Doukhobors*. London: Richard Constable and Company, 1905.

The Life of Tolstoy: First Fifty Years. London: Archibald Constable and Co., 1908.

The Life of Tolstoy: Later Years. London: Constable and Company, 1911.

Leo Tolstoy. London: Methuen & Co. 1918.

Life of Tolstoy: Later Years. Oxford: the Oxford University Press, 1931.

Family Views of Tolstoy, transl. Louise and Aylmer Maude. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1926.

The Private Diary of Leo Tolstoy: 1853-1857, transl. Louise and Aylmer Maude. London: William Heinemann, 1927.

The Authorized Life of Marie C. Stopes. London: William & Norgate, 1924.

"The Right and Wrong of Non-Resistance", ***The Human Review*** (April, 1905), 24-35.

"Tolstoy's Place in Literature", ***Fortnightly Review*** CXXX, 1928, 325-333.

"Tolstoy's Mistake", ***The Bookman*** (August 1922), 208-209.

"Recollections of Tolstoy", ***The Slavonic (And East European) Review*** 7, (1928-29), 475-481.

"Tolstoy and Russia", ***The Times Literary Supplement*** 1918, 445-446.

McDonald, Edward D. ed. ***Phoenix, the Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence.*** London: William Heinemann, 1936.

Meister, Charles. "Chekhov's Reception in England and America", ***The American Slavonic and East European Review*** XII, 1953, 109-121.

Mirsky, D. S. "Chekhov and the English", in Donald Davie, ed. ***Russian Literature and Modern Fiction: A Collection of Critical Essays.*** Chicago: the University of Chicago Press, 1965.

- The Intelligentsia of Great Britain*, transl. Alec Brown, London: Victor Gollancz, 1935.
- "Chekhov and the English", *Monthly Criterion* VI, 4 (October, 1927), 292-304.
- "The Literature of Bolshevik Russia", *The London Mercury* V, 1922, 276.
- "Some Remarks on Tolstoy", *The London Mercury* XX, 1929, 167.
- Moore, Harry. ed. *The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol. II. London: Heinemann, 1962.
- Muchnic, Helen. *Dostoevsky's English Reputation (1881-1936)*. New York: Octagon Books, 1969.
- Muir, Edmund. "Contemporary Russian Literature", *Nation and Athenaeum* 39, (August 1926), 533-534.
- Mumby, Frank Arthur. *Publishing and Bookselling: A History from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1930.
- Murry, J. M. ed. *Journal of Katherine Mansfield*. London: Constable & Co., 1927.
- The Letters of Katherine Mansfield*. Volume I. London: Constable & Co, 1928.
- The Letters of Katherine Mansfield*. Volume II. London: Constable & Co, 1928.
- Aspects of Literature*. London: W. Collins Sons & Co., 1920.
- Between Two Worlds: An Autobiography*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1935.
- Discoveries: Essays in Literary Criticism*. London: W. Collins Sons & Co., 1924.
- Fyodor Dostoevsky: A Critical Study*. London: Martin Secker, 1916.
- "The Method of Tchekhov", *The Nation and the Athenaeum* (April 1922)

- "Thoughts on Reviewing", *The Times Literary Supplement* (September 1938), 597-598.
- "Tolstoy", *The Athenaeum* (September 1920), 297.
- Nabokoff, Charles. "Chekhov on the English Stage", *Contemporary Review* 129, 1926, 754-762.
- Nehls, Edward. ed. *D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*. Volume 1: 1885-1919. Madison: the University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.
- D. H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*. Volume.2: 1919-1925. Madison: the University of Wisconsin Press, 1958.
- Nicolson, Nigel. *The Flight of the Mind: The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. Volume I: 1888-1912. London: the Hogarth Press, 1975.
- Nowell-Smith, Simon. ed., *Edwardian England 1901-1914*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- O' Sullivan, ed., Vincent. *Katherine Mansfield: Selected Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- O' Sullivan, Vincent. and Scott , Margaret. eds *The Collected Letters of Katherine Mansfield*. Volume Two: 1918-1919. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Page, Frances M. *Christ's Hospital Hertford: A History of the School against the Background of London and Horsham*. London: G. Bell & Sons, 1953.
- Phelps, Gilbert. *The Russian Novel in English Fiction*. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1965.
- "The Early Phases of British Interest in Russian Literature", *The Slavonic Review* 38, 1959-60. 418-433.
- "Russian Realism in English Fiction", *The Cambridge Journal* III, (February 1950), 277-291.

- Pitcher, Harvey. *When Miss Emmie Was in Russia: English Governesses Before, During and After the October Revolution*. London: John Murray, 1977.
- Powell, Dilys. "Mr.S. S. Koteliansky", *The Times* (January 1955).
- Pyle, Hilary. *James Stephens: His Work and an Account of His Life*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.
- Roberts, Warren and Boulton, James T. eds. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol. IV: June 1921-March 1924. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Rose, William. and Isaacs, Jacob. *Contemporary Movements in European Literature*. London: 1928.
- Rubenstein, Roberta. "Genius of Translation", *Colorado Quarterly* xxii, 3, 1974, 359-368.
- Scott-James, R. A. "Edward Garnett", *The Spectator* (26 February 1937), 362.
- Seaman, C. M. E. *Christ's Hospital: The Last Years in London*. (A Fragment of Victorian History). London: Ian Allan, 1977.
- Smith, J. A. *Tolstoy's Fiction in England and America*. Ph.D. thesis. Urbana, Illinois, 1939.
- Strachey, Lytton. "A Russian Humorist", *The Spectator* (April 1914).
- Sullivan, Alvin, ed. *British Literary Magazines: The Modern Age, 1914-1984*. Historical Guides to the World's Periodicals and Newspapers. London: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Sutherland, John. "Publishing History: A Hole at the Centre of Literary Sociology", *Critical Inquiry* Spring, 1988, 574-583.
- Szamuely, Helen. *British Attitudes to Russia 1880-1918*. D. Phil. Oxford University, 1982.
- Swinnerton, Frank. *An Autobiography*. London: Hutchinson, 1937.

- Background With Chorus: A Footnote to Changes in English Literary Fashion Between 1901 and 1917.*** London: Hutchinson, 1956.
- The Georgian Literary Scene: A Panorama.*** London: William Heinemann, 1935.
- Tedlock, E. W. ed. ***Frieda Lawrence, the Memoirs and Correspondence.*** London: Heinemann, 1961.
- Thompson, Denys. "A Hundred Years of the Higher Journalism", ***Scrutiny*** 4 (June 1935)
- Tolstoy, ***Anna Karenina***, transl. Louise and Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1936.
- Childhood, Boyhood and Youth***, transl. Louise and Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928.
- Nine Stories***, transl. Louise and Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- On Life, and Essays on Religion***, transl. Louise and Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. Oxford University Press, 1934.
- What is Art? and Essays on Art***, transl. Aylmer Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929..
- What Then Must We Do?***, transl. Aylmer and Louise Maude. Tolstoy's Centenary Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- Essays and Letters***, transl. Aylmer Maude. second edition. London: Henry Frowde, 1904.
- Turgenev, Ivan. ***A Lear of the Steppes***, transl. Constance Garnett. London: William Heinemann, 1922.
- The Jew and other Stories***, transl. Constance Garnett. London: William Heinemann, 1922.

- Turton, Glyn. *Turgenev in the Context of English Literature, 1850-1900*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Warwick, 1984.
- Wallace, Frances J. "Notes and Quotes", *Wilson Library Bulletin* XXI, (February 1947), 400.
- West, Sackville V. "Tolstoy", *Nation and Athenaeum* XLIII, (September 1928), 729-730.
- "Two Russian Novels" *Nation and Athenaeum* 35, (April, 1924), 56.
- Weissbort, Daniel. "Garnett, Constance Clara", in Harry B. Webber, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet Literatures*, Vol. 8, 1987.
- Woodcock, George and Avakumovic, Ivan. *The Doukhobors*. London: Faber and Faber, 1968.
- Woolf, Leonard. "Kot ", *The New Statesman* XLIX (February 1955), 70-71.
- "A Fly is Struggling in the Web", *The Nation and Athenaeum* XLIV, 1928,
- "Short Stories", *The Nation and Athenaeum* 1927, 481.
- "Tolstoi's Plays", *The Nation and Athenaeum* XXXIV, 1924, 766.
- "Tolstoy Again". *The Nation and Athenaeum* XLVII, 1930, 219-220.
- "Chekhov's Letters", *The Nation and Athenaeum* XXXVI, 1925, 717.
- "Russian Literature", *The Nation and Athenaeum* XLVI, 1929, 318.
- "Tchehov", *The New Statesman* (11 August 1917).
- Beginning Again: An Autobiography of the Years 1911-1918*. London: the Hogarth Press, 1964.
- Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919-1939*. London: the Hogarth Press, 1967.

Woolf, Virginia. "The Russian Point of View", *The Common Reader*. London: the Hogarth Press, 1951.

"Modern Fiction", *The Common Reader*. London: the Hogarth Press, 1951.

"Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown", *Collected Essays*. Volume One. London: the Hogarth Press, 1966.

"The Novels of Turgenev", *The Captain's Death Bed, and Other Essays*. London: the Hogarth Press, 1950.

"More Dostoevsky", *The Times Literary Supplement*. (22 February 1917)

Worthen, John. *D. H. Lawrence: A Literary Life*. London: Macmillan, 1939.

Zytaruk, George J. ed., *The Quest for Rananim: D. H. Lawrence's Letters to S. S. Koteliansky 1914 - to 1930*. London: Queen's University Press, 1970.

D. H. Lawrence's Response to Russian Literature. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

"Dorothy Brett's Letters to S. S. Koteliansky", *D. H. Lawrence Review* 7, 1974, 240-274.

Zytaruk, George, J. and Boulton, James T. *The Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Vol. II: June 1913-October 1916. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.