

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" (*glupyi*), "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