New data about the literary legacy of Marx and Engels (report of Comrade Ryazanov made to the Socialist Academy on Nov. 20, 1923) IN Pulletinb of Socialist Adademy. Rook 6, Oct.-Dec. 1923, (State Publishing House, Moscow and Petrograd, 1923).

(Pages 351 to 369, after which discussion begins with Ryasanov mainly answering, pp. 369-376; the paragraph I am quoting is pp. 368-369, i.e. last para, of p. 368.)

"This Ryazanov: KINE methodical and systematic way of working Marx retained until the end of this life. If in 1831-82 he intensive, independent lost his ability for INTENES intellectual creatives, he nevertheless never lost the abblity for reasarch. Sometimes* efter reconsidering these Notebooks the question arises: Why did he waste so much time on ENEME systematio, fundamental summary, Whynglexes or expend so much labor as he spent XXXX as late as the year 1881, of one solid book on geology, summarising it chapter by chapter. Newskianastruckyskubsie- In the 63rd year of his life -- that is INSX NEW Pedantry. Here is another inexcusable example. Marks He received, in 1878, a copy of Morgan's work. On 98 pages on his very miniscule handwriting (you must know that a single page of his equals a minimum of 2 and 2/10 Ir of print) he does a detailed summary of Morgan. In such manner does the old Marx work."

*At this point Krader does not quote. In a word, he stopped only at the point that Marx had lost the ability for mental creativity but not for research, and left out Ryazanov's gratuituous remark that that was inexcusable pedantry. He did, however, reveal that 1) the year is wrong, since it isn't 'in or around 1881 or 1882'; the excerpt notebooks were made 1880-1881. Furthermore, when Ryazanov said that Marx received the Morgan book IMXIEX 'in the second half of the 1870s was much occupied with the history of feudalism and land ownership. Krader mentions that the reference "to the year 1878 had no bearing on the chronology of the notebooks."