Progress, Coexistence, and Intellectual Freedom. In Sakharov (p. 55) we read, "In 1936–39 alone more than 1.2 million party members, half of the total membership, were arrested. Only 50,000 regained freedom; the others were tortured during interrogation or were shot (600,000) or died in camps." This comes out in Rothberg as the following: "Moreover, Stalin had in the period 1936–39 slaughtered half of the total membership of the Communist party; of the 1.2 million members, only 50,000 survived." And if Zoshchenko was "destroyed" during the Stalinist purges, it was only in a figurative sense; he was not literally killed, as were the other three persons with whom he is grouped (pp. 179–80). Finally, Rothberg repeats the widely held misconception that Zhores Medvedev's first name is a Russian form of Jaurès. I. Michael Lerner has noted in a letter to the *New York Review of Books* (March 23, 1972) that Zhores was originally called Reis and that the current form of his first name is actually an acronym.

More general objections include the occasional failure to probe beneath the surface of various issues. Sholokhov has certainly experienced a crisis in his creativity, but there have been other reasons for it besides the one mentioned in Lidiia Chukovskaia's statement (referred to twice)—that it was the price he had to pay for his political orthodoxy. Also, it would have been interesting to explore the reasons Galina Serebriakova, a woman who suffered greatly during Stalinist times, emerged as one of the leading hard-liners against the liberals. Most important, however, is the lack of discernment between the various kinds of dissent. The classification into "artistic," "political," and "scientific" dissidence which is employed to describe the situation in the 1960s does not take into account the wide range of views held by those who have expressed opposition to various aspects of the regime. On page 149 there is the comment, "Unlike most other dissidents, Volpin did not make a fetish of proclaiming his pro-Soviet loyalties." This remark, and similar ones, ignore the fact that many of those discussed *are* pro-Soviet; this point, though sometimes noted, is more often blurred. In general, there is a tendency to create a monolithic picture of today's conditions—with a small group of dissidents on the one hand and a large group of hard-line bureaucrats, fearful of exposure as the heirs of Stalin, on the other. This picture does contain a grain of truth, but the status of both camps is more complex than Rothberg would have us believe.

In sum, *The Heirs of Stalin* contains a wealth of material and information that will be of great interest to everyone who follows Soviet affairs. But it is often best to approach the author's opinions and generalizations with caution and take the time to arrive at one's own conclusions.

BARRY SCHERR
University of Washington

SOVIET PRISON CAMP SPEECH: A SURVIVOR'S GLOSSARY. Compiled by *Meyer Galler* and *Harlan E. Marquess.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972. 216 pp. $10.00.

Professor Marquess defines Soviet prison camp speech as "essentially Russian, but tainted by legal and administrative jargon, borrowings from non-Russian soviet nationalities, criminal argot, obscenities and frequently by elements of uneducated peasant speech," which is not altogether surprising in a microcosm of society like a

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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 *mast'* 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 Poles[10] [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.

https://doi.org/10.2307/2494136 Published online by Cambridge University Press