

TO THE EDITOR:

I was surprised by A. M. Kleimola's recent review of my annotated translation of Jacques Margeret's *The Russian Empire and Grand Duchy of Muscovy* (*Slavic Review*, 43, no. 3 [Fall 1984]: 471–72)—not so much because Kleimola did not like the book (that is her privilege) but because she failed to describe it adequately and made false and misleading statements. In fact, the review makes me wonder just how carefully Kleimola studied Margeret's text or my work. Why, for example, did she neglect to mention that this translation is the first critical edition of the text available in any language? And why did she refer to Margeret's important description of Muscovy merely as an account of his "Russian experiences" when Margeret barely mentioned his own activities in Russia?

I was puzzled by Kleimola's strong criticism of me for including "surprisingly few remarks dealing with unclear passages in Margeret's original text." I cannot comment upon the passages she considers unclear because she failed to mention even one. I challenge her to do so. Margeret's prose is really quite clear (if somewhat colloquial) Renaissance French, and I am confident that my translation is accurate. I was equally puzzled by Kleimola's criticism of my comments about errors in N. G. Ustrialov's Russian translation of Margeret's book (published in 1830). Her assertion that I failed to note "corrections made in later editions" of the translation is not supported by a single example. That is because it cannot be supported. There were no corrections in later editions! In fact, students of Professor R. G. Skrynnikov recently produced a new Russian translation to replace Ustrialov's.

Kleimola commented that "probably the most serious flaw" in my book "is the absence of any analysis of the relationship between Margeret's work and other historical sources." I strongly disagree. The notes to Margeret's text are designed to give the reader direct access to the most up-to-date scholarly usage of Margeret and other contemporary sources on virtually every subject discussed in his book. What specific issues did Kleimola raise in support of her sharp criticism? She referred only to a claim made years ago by M. N. Tikhomirov that Margeret borrowed information from an earlier account written by Sigismund von Herberstein. In fact, Tikhomirov merely repeated an unsubstantiated statement made by Friedrich von Adelung in 1846; and Adelung was definitely wrong. It is curious that Kleimola chose to resurrect that particular accusation when M. A. Alpatov in the most recent Soviet study of Margeret's work (which is quite critical of the Frenchman) did not even bother to repeat such a groundless assertion.

CHESTER DUNNING
Texas A & M University

PROFESSOR KLEIMOLA REPLIES:

I regret that my comments appear to have so disturbed Professor Dunning. One might almost conclude that he was the work's author, not its translator.

Clearly Dunning and I have very different visions as to what constitutes a Weberian "Ideal Type" critical edition. More to the point, however, one wonders why he is surprised at my comments. They recapitulate many of the issues raised with regard to an article that he submitted to another journal covering much the same ground as his introduction to the Margeret translation. In response to those criticisms, Dunning prepared a revision that provides a more satisfactory treatment than is found in the present volume. I can only suggest that interested readers consult the article when it appears in a forthcoming issue of *Russian History*.

A. M. KLEIMOLA
University of Nebraska, Lincoln