Notes on the texts and translations

Translations comprise a substantial proportion of the documents in this collection. Many of the translations were made for the present edition. Some documents, however, are preserved in the archive in several languages. The notes below attempt to explain our policy in selecting or producing versions for this edition, and the coding accompanying each document.

If we give no indication of the language of a particular document, it is to be understood that that document appears in the archive in English and no other language.

If we indicate that a document is present in more than one language, including English, we have reproduced that English version, whether or not that version is the original. If that version is a translation in which obvious faults distort or obscure the meaning, we have used the other versions to effect small corrections. Where this has not been possible we have resorted to sparing use of [sic].

If a document is our translation, there being no other English version in the archive, we indicate the language from which it is translated. We have thought it prudent to avoid the word 'original', since in certain cases it is clear that the version we are translating is itself a translation. For example, it is known that Peter Simonoff (Petr Simonov) did not write in Polish, but in one case the only available version of a document by him is in that language. We are fairly sure that Paul Freeman, Jock Garden and Bill Earsman did not write in Russian, but when their documents exist in the archive in Russian only we have little choice but to supply a back-translation, however unsatisfactory this procedure may be.

Many small typographical errors have been corrected in the English-language documents, without special note being taken of them. Likewise, punctuation has occasionally been modified for clarity, and inadvertently repeated words deleted. In no case has this affected the meaning of any document. The layout of the documents in this book is not identical to the typescripts and manuscripts, but nothing is thereby lost.

There are inconsistencies of spelling within and between documents. We have not attempted to impose complete uniformity. Odd or awkward formulations, some no doubt introduced by rapid typing, translation or dictation at the time these documents were drafted, have been left as they are.

Treatment of Proper Names

Russian personal names are usually given in modified Library of Congress transliteration. Exceptions are made where the owners of the names used other forms in non-Russian environments (e.g. Rosenberg), and for names widely

known in other guises. 'Modified' means that we have ignored the hard and soft signs and written *-sky* rather than *-skii*.

Non-Russian names occurring in Russian documents present their own problems. Some of the typewritten documents are in poor condition and difficult to read, while those in handwriting add a further level of difficulty. Where typewritten and handwritten versions of the same document appear, it is clear that on occasion the typists were baffled by the handwriting. Where the discrepancies are substantial we have indicated these in footnotes. The cause of the typist's difficulty may be the author's insertion in the Russian text of a non-Russian personal name or place-name written in its original form, in Latin script (not transcribed into Russian Cyrillic). The unsuspecting typist, perhaps knowing no English, thus produces 'Gon Velkech' in Cyrillic script for what is clearly 'Tom Barker' in Latin script, and 'Velassy' for [Guido] Baracchi. The latter appears in a Polish document as 'Barecki', and *Brisbane* in the same document becomes 'Gryzben'.

Unfortunately, not all such riddles are so easily solved, and some documents appear in single copies only, whether in typed or handwritten form, so no cross-checking is possible.

Non-Russian names clearly caused difficulties not only for the typists, but also for the authors, who in any case treated names in cavalier fashion. Zuzenko's travels in the cause of world revolution can mostly be traced, but some smaller localities defy positive identification. He tells of being transferred by the British authorities from Brixton Prison to 'Vleit' or 'Vleis' in Scotland for deportation to Petrograd. Since 'Vleit/Vleis' is clearly a port with a prison close at hand, it is likely that Leith is meant.

Even where the Russian transcription of names is accurate, the original English form often cannot be accurately reconstructed. *Maclean*, *McLean*, *MacLean* and *Macklin*, for example, will all assume the same Cyrillic form. An Australian whose name occurs in various Cyrillic guises, as *Ganet*, *Gannett*, *Khannet* and *Khennett*, appears to be *Hannett*, though we cannot exclude *Hannet*. When the form of a name is derived from a Russian transcription, we have indicated this by [phon.], meaning that we have produced a phonetic reconstruction taking into account known English forms and the laws of probability.

In documents written in English, as in those in Russian, names are casually treated and it is common to find a name either consistently misspelt or spelt in a variety of ways. In some cases the correct form cannot be re-established from the documents themselves, but may be known from other sources (e.g. *Norman Jeffery*, often appearing as *Jeffries* or *Jeffrey*). Names which cannot be verified have been left in the forms given, which may not necessarily be correct.