

PROFESSOR CLEMENTS REPLIES:

Professor Page points out that I did indeed misdate Lenin's interview with Klara Zetkin, and while I do not feel the error vitiates the argument in that footnote (p. 323), I thank him for his correction.

Regarding his further comments I regret that they do not address the thesis of the article, an interpretation of Kollontai's ideology, but instead take issue with two brief references to Lenin and Trotsky. I do not understand his charge that I have "stood Deutscher on his head," since as evidence he offers a sentence that does not differ substantially from my offending parenthetical. The question of Lenin's anarchism or lack thereof is not of central concern to a discussion of Kollontai, thus my footnote referring those interested in this debate to the authorities on the question.

TO THE EDITOR:

I have read Professor Thomas F. Magner's review of the new *Oxford Russian-English Dictionary* in your number of June 1973 with interest, and would certainly agree that this dictionary is superior to Smirnitsky in completeness and clarity of presentation.

A welcome feature of Wheeler's dictionary is that he includes much Imperial Russian administrative and ecclesiastical terminology which one seeks in vain in Soviet sources. He is also good (as Professor Magner points out) on technical terminology, although there are gaps in information science and in library science, for example, *bit*, *otladka* (debugging), *informatsionno-poiskovaia sistema* (information retrieval system), *komplektator* (acquisitions librarian), *mezhdubibliotchnyi abonement* (interlibrary loan), *topograficheskii katalog* (shelflist).

One is glad to see also that Wheeler departs from the customary Soviet lexicological puritanism with respect to Russian obscenities. However, some of the most common are omitted, such as *zhopa* and *zhopochnik*, *khuëvina* (although the base word is given), as well as that meaning of the word *iaitsa* around which revolves one of Bulgakov's most famous stories.

The dictionary has two important drawbacks to which I should like to draw attention. The first is the consistent neglect of American usage, although the dictionary is intended (see p. ix) for the use of "native speakers of English"—without qualification—and probably the majority of copies will be sold in North America. It is easy to convince oneself of this neglect by examining the glosses for *avtomobil'*, *avtostrada*, *apteka*, *bagazhnik*, *banka*, *benzin*, *tovarnyi vagon*, *vkliuchitel'no*, *gruzovik*, *zaniaty* (*zaniato*), *zapolnit' blank*, *kamera khraneniia*, *koloda*, *krainii srok*, *mashinist*, *mostovaia*, *musornyi iashchik*, *otpusk*, *pelënka*, *perekrestok*, *petlia*, *pozhaluista*, *poka*, *ptichka*, *polutonka*, *rublehoe miaso*, *tochka*, *tramvai*, *khailo*, *shpala*, *shtany*, *étazh*. One consequence is that the dictionary ignores vivid American colloquial equivalents of Russian expressions, such as *bit' baklushi* (goof off), *drandulet* (jalopy), *viazat'sia s chem-nibud'* (jibe with), *zagadit'* (foul up), *zamai'* (hush up), *zakholust'e* (boondocks), *zashibit' den'gu* (make a pile, clean up), *kaliakat'* (yak), *otshchelkát'* (cuss out), *perestrakhovka* (buckpassing), *rasrugat'* (chew out), *skol'ko let*, *skol'ko zim* (long time no see), *smutit'* (faze), *sniukhat'sia*, *s kem-nibud'* (be in cahoots, with someone). It is regrettable that

unlike the great *Oxford English Dictionary* the *Oxford Russian-English Dictionary* apparently had no Americans among its compilers.

The second unfortunate feature of the dictionary is the prevalence of obscure English idioms which contribute little to the elucidation of the Russian. Some examples would be: "to be whipping the cat" (under *lokti*), "an inch breaks no square" (*lyko*), "muggins!" (*strelochnik*), "a Johnny-head-in-air" (*vorona*), "you must spoil before you spin" (*pervyi*), "mill the wind" (*perelivat'*) "bad cess to him" (*dno*), "daft as a brush" (*glupy*), "your boots are agape" (*kasha*). Would it not have been better to explain the meaning of the Russian idiom than to render it by an obsolete English idiom—delightful though the latter often are?

I note that in the concluding sentence of his review Professor Magner refers to the price of the dictionary. One does indeed wonder how the Oxford University Press justifies a markup of 50 percent compared with the U.K. price (£5).

The *Oxford Russian-English Dictionary* is a conscientious and valuable work which will undoubtedly find a place on the shelves of Slavists, but it is to be hoped that revisions will be made before it undergoes a second edition.

KEITH ARMES
University of Minnesota

TO THE EDITOR:

In his review of Carl Max Kortepeter, *Ottoman Imperialism During the Reformation: Europe and the Caucasus*, in the June 1973 *Slavic Review* (pp. 416–17), Stephen Fischer-Galati makes two statements that require clarification. First, he implies that Professor Kortepeter is primarily a linguist. Although he is not directly in a history department, this is not the result of his training, which was historical, nor of the nature of the courses that he teaches, which are Ottoman history, but rather because in most American universities there are no positions in Ottoman history. Historians trained in Ottoman studies most usually are forced to find employment in other departments. If their training was good, and included the requisite languages, they are often qualified to teach in language and civilization departments if there is no place for them in history. This is true of such institutions as Princeton University and Indiana University, as well as New York University.

Second, Professor Fischer-Galati writes that Turkish "sources, at least with respect to Ottoman imperialism in Eastern Europe, provide only footnotes to our historical knowledge. This is true also, albeit to a lesser extent, with respect to Tatar-Ottoman relations." It is important to remember that an enormous amount of scholarship has appeared in the last twenty years on Ottoman administration in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, particularly by Turks, but also emanating from Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Poland, much of it based on archival research in Turkish sources. There are scarcely any books on Balkan history, written more than twenty years ago, which purport to discuss Ottoman imperial administration, whose main theses now stand unchallenged. I hope that his statement will not discourage students from undertaking Ottoman language study, and I am sure that this was not Professor Fischer-Galati's intention.

ALAN W. FISHER
Michigan State University