

From the Editor:

*Slavic Review* publishes letters to the editor with educational or research merit. Where the letter concerns a publication in *Slavic Review*, the author of the publication will be offered an opportunity to respond. Space limitations dictate that comment regarding a book review should be restricted to one paragraph; comment on an article should not exceed 750 to 1,000 words. The editor will not publish ad hominem discourse.

E.D.M.

To the Editor:

We were grateful for Zvi Gitelman's detailed and sympathetic review of *Jews in Eastern Poland and the USSR, 1939–46* (*Slavic Review*, Spring, 1993). But we should like to correct one misapprehension. Professor Gitelman writes of our Introduction that its "author is unidentified but seems to be Antony Polonsky." In fact, the introduction was written by both of us and we both take responsibility for the opinions expressed in it. Naturally, as in any joint work, parts were written initially by one of us and parts by the other. We then discussed the whole and created an agreed final version. Ironically, the three sentences quoted by Professor Gitelman were initially written by Norman Davies.

NORMAN DAVIES  
University of London  
ANTONY POLONSKY  
Brandeis University

Zvi Gitelman chooses not to reply.

To the Editor:

Mit Verspätung habe ich von der in *Slavic Review* (1993) erschienenen Rezension meines Buchs *Dante in Rußland* Kenntnis genommen. Der Rezensionsartikel von A. Kahn gibt Anlaß zu einer kurzen Stellungnahme. Einerseits kann die Leistung meines Buchs, die in der internationalen Fachwelt unbestritten ist, offensichtlich nicht in Frage gestellt werden. So nimmt der Rezensent Zuflucht zu einer malevolenten Reserve gegenüber "viktorianischer" (!) Literaturgeschichtsschreibung und einigen kuriosen Urteilen. Unter ihnen findet sich eine groteske Fehlleistung: Herr Kahn wirft mir den "bizarre claim" einer Identifikation von Sologub's *Nedotykomka* mit Dantes Beatrice vor—ein komplettes Fehlverständnis der Ausführungen zum "Komplementärphänomen" auf S. 214 u. 303 meines Buchs. Im übrigen handelt es sich um das *Zitat* der wohl berühmtesten Textstelle aus dem Werk Aleksandr Bloks (*Ironija*, in SS V, S. 346). Herrn Kahn ist der Text Bloks offensichtlich unbekannt, wie er auch sonst nicht gut instruiert erscheint, Gabriele Rossetti und Dante Gabriel Rossetti verwechselt und die Namen einiger deutscher Philosophen entstellt. Ich hoffe, daß Sie diese eklatante Fehlleistung in *Slavic Review* korrigieren, und wünsche Ihnen für die Zukunft kompetente Rezensenten, die den russischen Symbolismus kennen und Deutsch verstehen.

W. POTTHOFF  
University of Bonn

Andrew Kahn chooses not to reply.

To the Editor:

Your reviewer [Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak] of *Women in Polish Society* (*Slavic Review* 53, no. 4) devotes more space to explaining what the volume should have been about than to conveying the content of its articles. I think it is inappropriate for reviewers to ride their own hobby horses; instead their task is to accept the parameters set by those who did the work and evaluate how well that work was accomplished. As one *Slavic Review* 54, no. 4 (Winter 1995)

of the contributors to this volume, I am fully aware that the area of Poland was multinational and would like to see work done on non-Polish women within those territories, but I am not doing it and neither I nor my fellow contributors should be faulted for the “exclusively Polish” nature of our work. That is what we know and it is what we are writing about. If I live long enough and have learned enough about the subject matter of women within Polish territories, perhaps I can expand my work. But, for the time being, I would like it considered within my own framework and not someone else’s.

BOGNA LORENCE-KOT  
*California College of Arts and Crafts*

Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak chooses not to reply.

To the Editor:

I am writing to state my objections to Michael Katz’s review of Robin Miller’s excellent book on *The Brothers Karamazov* (Winter 1994). Professor Katz opens by stating that the book’s intended audience “is high school students and undergraduates coming to Dostoevskii’s novel for the first time,” a statement that would undoubtedly surprise the Twayne series editors and may mislead the review audience into believing that it is not intended for us—college teachers, graduate students and Dostoevskii specialists. As a Dostoevskii specialist, I do not think it hyperbolic to claim that this small book will be on reading lists and in the bibliographies of major scholars for as long as serious scholarship on Dostoevskii continues. Professor Katz next disregards the series format and criticizes the book’s first three sections for their brevity and content without, however, tackling Miller’s claims about the role of Russian censorship in the history of this and other great Russian works, her argument that the debate between writers and radical critics over the topicality vs. the universality of literature is part of an ongoing debate about Russia’s future and identity that could not be discussed openly in the press, and her argument in defense of the canon: “I suspect that certain works, among them *The Brothers Karamazov*, will continue to be read, not because they subtly support the existence of certain reigning power structures, but because of their aesthetic qualities, their passion, and the frisson of recognition they incite in their readers.” Most seriously, Professor Katz neglects any mention of Miller’s discussion of Dostoevskii’s reader as an *implicated* reader, who, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, is confronted time and again with the problem of evil. Finally, he criticizes the author for a fault of the publisher’s—the omission of dates on one page of the chronology. This latter criticism especially bespeaks a bias that must be addressed.

DEBORAH MARTINSEN  
*North American Dostoevsky Society*

Michael Katz replies:

Deborah Martinsen misreads my review, which was largely positive. Some clarifications: although the “Guidelines for Authors” of the series claim that the studies are “intended, first, for college and university students,” the glossy brochure contains the following quotation from the *School Library Journal*: “These studies are well written and readable, and provide more depth than Cliff’s Notes ... [and] will be useful in all high school libraries.” As for the reading lists and bibliographies of major Dostoevsky scholars, I suspect that they are more likely to include Victor Terras’s *Karamazov Companion* (1981) and Robert Belknap’s *Genesis of the Brothers Karamazov* (1990). Re: my “bias that must be addressed.” I made no accusation. I merely pointed out that the dates on p. xii were missing.

MICHAEL KATZ  
*University of Texas, Austin*

To the Editor:

Alfred Rieber’s review of *The Secret World of American Communism* is both gratuitously nasty and filled with factual inaccuracies. He accuses us—with no evidence—of “frequently” engaging in “the notorious tactic of guilt by association.” When he does get around to discussing the documents in our book, he commits so many mistakes that we cannot respond to all of them in the one paragraph the editor has allotted us to reply. We will be pleased to send interested readers a more detailed response but, for now, let us note that Rieber confuses the CPUSA with the CPSU, confuses the Com-