

sozialökonomischen Politik der Gruppe Mao Tse-tungs." PART III: G. Apalin, "Die ideologischen Grundlagen der maoistischen Aussenpolitik." M. Kapica, "Die nationale Befreiungsbewegung und die Spaltertätigkeit der Gruppe Maos." F. Burlackij, "China unter dem Druck des Maoismus." Der Maoismus und die imperialistischen Mächte (D. Danilov, "Die chinesischen Provokateure und der westdeutsche Militarismus." S. Sergeev, "Der britische Partner." A. Vasil'ev, "Die Politik Pekings gegenüber Japan."). "Pseudorevolutionäre ohne Maske" (*Pravda*, May 18, 1970). Literaturhinweise. Register.

LETTER

TO THE EDITOR:

In reference to Professor Riasanovsky's letter in the March 1973 edition of *Slavic Review*, I wish to express my agreement with his statement concerning the importance of the matter of terminology in the history of the East-Slavs. However I must confess to some bewilderment at Professor Riasanovsky's expressed dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs yet his simultaneous defense of it.

In the passage which he cites from his *History of Russia* he refers to a "Lithuanian-Russian principedom" and a distinct "southwestern Russian literary language." He also makes implicit reference to the existence of a Russian Orthodox church which was "united" before 1687, the date of the incorporation of the Kievan Metropolitanate; he makes a statement to the effect that the Russians were unable to maintain the unity of the Kievan state; and finally he refers to a division of the Russians into the "Great Russians, the Ukrainians, and the Belorussians"! Is this not the terminology which Professor Horak criticizes in his essay?

Professor Riasanovsky will no doubt agree that if names are not correct, language will not present a valid objectification of reality. Accepting this, can one refer to the East-Slavs as part of the Russian nation? Or, for that matter, as a part of Rus'? It seems to me that the problem lies in the rather loose and most imprecise translation of "Русь" (Rus') to read "Russia" (Россия), when in fact "Русь" should be translated as "Ukraine," and understood in reference to the territory of the present-day Ukrainian SSR.

In the Third Lithuanian Statute of 1588 we read: "A pysar zemski mayet' po rusku . . . pysat'" (pt. 4, art. 1). If "Rusku" is translated as "Russian" here, then what language did the people in Russia speak? If the Rus' language and the Russian language were the same, why did Hetman Khmelnytsky require the services of a translator at the negotiations in Pereiaslav in 1654?

A final example of the non sequiturs which result from the careless habit of reading Russia for "Русь" may be shown in the following passage taken from the *Istoriia Rusov*, written in the nineteenth century in the Ukraine. We read, "Izvestno, pered tym my buly shcho teper moskali: mynule, i sama nazva Rus' pereishlo vid nas do nikh."

S. VELYCHENKO

Postgraduate, S.S.E.E.S., University of London