

opment of Marxist-Leninist theory. In any case, we all hope to uncover bits and pieces of reality, and any methods that contribute to that objective are to be appreciated.

Some of his remarks, however, might create the impression that my preparation of the article on *State and Revolution* made little use of the most important primary source on the subject, namely Lenin's own writings. In fact, my essay was based on an extensive reading of Lenin's works, including a particularly careful examination of all his writings of 1916, 1917, and early 1918. The central arguments in the essay are supported by frequent and detailed references to Lenin's *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*.

The specific questions of translation raised by Page are open to debate among reasonable persons. The use of "to wither away" to render *otmirat'* in translating Lenin's works into English is a common practice, as reflected in selections of Lenin's writings in English translation edited by such distinguished scholars as Robert V. Daniels and Robert C. Tucker. Nevertheless, the distinction between the language of "withering away" and "dying off" has long been familiar to me, and I ought at least to have acknowledged in a footnote the alternative of a translation of *otmirat'* other than that which I used, since Page's choice in that case is closer to standard Russian usage than are the usual translations of Lenin's writings.

As far as the other points in Page's letter are concerned, it may in general be left to the readers to compare his interpretation of the purposes of Lenin's major work on the state with my interpretation, since a restatement of the themes of my article would be superfluous. I do think it significant that Lenin considered it important, both before February 1917 and after July of that year, to publish his theoretical treatise on the state; the readers of my essay can discern the motivation I attribute to Lenin's stress on the value of that theoretical exercise.

As usual, Stanley Page offers simulating insights into Lenin's outlook at particular points in time. I would agree with him that it is essential to bring knowledge of European history to bear in interpreting Lenin's writings. It might be added that training in the systematic analysis of political theory can also produce worthwhile results in advancing our understanding of those works.

Let me reemphasize that I am grateful for his observations and note that criticisms and suggestions from other scholars would also be most welcome.

#### TO THE EDITOR:

Professor Zoltán Tar is in error in his response to Professor Martin Jay's letter to the editor (*Slavic Review* 46 [Spring 1987]). He states, in reference to a review by Jay of Tar's book *The Frankfurt School in Central European History* 12 (March 1979), that "after my refuting his distortions, he was dropped from the editorial board of CEH, a position he abused." There is no substance to this statement. Tar did write a response to the review; I decided, as editor, against publishing it, and therefore did not communicate it to Jay. This had nothing to do with Jay's tenure on the editorial board, which expired in the normal course of rotation, and his position on the board had no connection of any sort with the incident.

DOUGLAS A. UNFUG  
 Editor, *Central European History*  
 Emory University