

prison camp. The compilers pre-empt criticism about exhaustiveness by stating in their introduction that the glossary contains "only speech observed by co-author Galler" during almost twenty years (1942–58) of association with prison camps in Central Asia and Siberia, plus sixty-five extra entries from the works of Solzhenitsyn, on the grounds that the latter was imprisoned in the same area for part of the same period. The problems of researching this subject outside the Soviet Union are self-evident. Soviet scholars are inhibited by political fastidiousness as well as by the thought that with the advent of full communism everyone in the Soviet Union will be speaking the same jargon. Even so, it seems a pity that more effort was not made to produce a less individual account. With the use of more than one "survivor," the glossary's range would have increased, the registers of army slang, criminal argot, and so forth, could have been defined, albeit tentatively, and some light thrown on the etymology of Soviet prison camp speech.

The contents of the glossary accord substantially with terms I heard in Dubrovlag, Mordovian ASSR, between 1966 and 1969. We used the words *ment* (listed as "policeman") and *musor* for the warders, not the words mentioned in the glossary. There are some surprising omissions. So far as I am aware, the habit of tattooing has been widespread in the camps for many years, yet neither *nakolka* nor *nakolot'sia* is listed, nor is the word *masť* in the sense of an underworld grouping. *Khui* is quoted in the expression *khot' by khui* but not in *do khuia, idi na khui, po khui, khuëvina, khuëvii, khuinia*, and so forth—all used widely in my time. On the other hand, it seems odd to include *dognat' i peregnat' kapitalisticheskie strany* or *drykhnut'* (used by Zakhar in *Oblomov*) in a glossary of Soviet prison camp speech. Despite these shortcomings, the glossary is fuller and more up to date than anything published hitherto and should help the uninitiated reader to penetrate the camp subculture.

GERALD BROOKE

The Polytechnic of Central London

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

I read with interest in your last issue (December 1972) Professor Stephan Horak's article. It is Professor Horak's merit to bring a very important subject to the attention of his colleagues. I must object, however, to his references to my *History of Russia*. Professor Horak writes: "Nicholas Riasanovsky among others,⁹ [note 9: With the notable exception of Herbert J. Ellison, *A History of Russia* (New York, 1964), who is more aware of the complexity of the issues involved, including terminological difficulties] asserts, 'The territory inhabited by the Russians directly west and southwest of the Kiev area was divided into Volynia and Galicia. . . . Galicia became repeatedly a battleground for the Russians and the Poles¹⁰ [note 10: Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *A History of Russia*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1969), pp. 97–98].' Having populated the Ukraine with 'Russians' in the twelfth century, Riasanovsky, without any explanation, from the seventeenth century on distinguishes the Ukraine from Russia in all aspects, including literature, art, education, and religion (pp. 217 ff.). Thus Professor Riasanovsky's treatment amounts to the sudden birth of a nation—the Ukrainians—sometime in the seventeenth century.

Such a curiosity is the result of the improper periodization and terminology introduced by Russian historians for political reasons" (pp. 859–60).

I submit that this treatment of my *History* misrepresents its substance and structure. To cite only the most crucial passage neglected by Professor Horak, I write on page 154: "The Lithuanian-Russian principedom also attracts the attention of historians of Russia because of its role in the linguistic and ethnic division of the Russians into the Great Russians, often called simply Russians, the Ukrainians, and the White Russians or Belorussians, and its particular importance for the last two groups. While the roots of the differentiation extend far back, one can speculate that events would have taken a different shape if the Russians had preserved their political unity in the Kievan state. As it actually happened, the Great Russians came to be associated with the Muscovite realm, the Ukrainians and the White Russians with Lithuania and Poland. Political separation tended to promote cultural differences, although all started with the same Kievan heritage. Francis Skorina, a scholar from Polotsk, who, early in the sixteenth century, translated the Bible and also published other works in Prague and in Vilna, has frequently been cited as the founder of a distinct southwestern Russian literary language and, in particular, as a forerunner of Belorussian literature. The Russian Orthodox Church too, as we know, finally split administratively, with a separate metropolitan established in Kiev to head the Orthodox in the Lithuanian state. The division of the Russians into the Great Russians, the Ukrainians, and the Belorussians, reinforced by centuries of separation, became a major factor in subsequent Russian history."

Professor Horak, of course, does not have to agree with the scheme outlined in this quotation. Nevertheless, the quotation (which, incidentally, prominently concludes the entire third part of the *History*) should be sufficient to demonstrate that I do not give the Great Russians historical priority over the Ukrainians, that my Ukrainians do not appear in the seventeenth century out of nowhere, and that I have no desire to delete ancient Kiev, or ancient Galicia for that matter, from the rich historical heritage of the Ukrainians. As to the terminology used by scholars in this entire range of historical issues, I join Professor Horak in being dissatisfied with it and in hoping for improvement. Personally I opted in my *History* for the most readily understood and most readable English, with, as the quoted paragraph indicates, some necessary explanation.

May I conclude by again welcoming Professor Horak's efforts to achieve more clarity and precision in the very difficult field to which he addresses himself.

NICHOLAS V. RIASANOVSKY
University of California, Berkeley

TO THE EDITOR:

Dr. Jesse Clarkson's review of Richard Hellie's *Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy* (*Slavic Review*, September 1972, pp. 658–59) is inadequate in several respects. It hopelessly confuses Hellie's argument and, most important, fails to alert the reader that this is an important new book about a major subject. With this in mind I offer the following comments, not so much to rebut Clarkson, but to encourage others to read Hellie's book.

Hellie writes about the most momentous questions of early modern Russian history, the origins of serfdom and its significance in the emergence of Muscovite absolutism. Despite Clarkson, he is firmly in touch with the sources, both of legal