

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

Would you allow me to add a brief note to Kathryn B. Feuer's excellent review of V. S. Pritchett's book, *The Gentle Barbarian: The Life and Work of Turgenev* (*Slavic Review*, 37, no. 1 [March 1978]).

Pritchett's work is a veritable gold mine of misprints, some of them not only amusing, but also misleading. Take, for instance, the sentence "He even dictated a little story called *The Quail* for Countless Tolstoy's children . . ." (p. 241), instead of "Countess Tolstoy's children." Or "the only contributions Russia had made to civilization were 'the best shoe, the shaft yoke and the knout—and hadn't even invented them . . .'" (p. 179). No encomium is intended by "best," which stands instead of the correct "the bast shoe," the simplest type of shoe made of willow or birch bark. Pritchett has also coined some neologisms, such as "duologue" (for "dialogue," p. 172), and "Bildingsroman" (for "Bildungsroman," p. 88).

FELIX J. OINAS
Indiana University

TO THE EDITOR:

I would like to point out an error that occurred in my review of *East Central and Southeast Europe: A Handbook of Library and Archival Resources in North America*, edited by Paul L. Horecky and David Kraus, appearing on page 146 of the March 1978 issue of the *Slavic Review*. In the first line of my review I made this statement: "This commendable HEW-sponsored reference work. . . ." In fact, it should have been noted that the work was *supported* by HEW, through a contract with the Office of Education, but the *sponsor* was the Joint Committee on Eastern Europe of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. These organizational names should have appeared along with the "Joint Committee on Eastern Europe Publication Series" in the heading.

PATRICIA K. GRIMSTED
Harvard University

TO THE EDITOR:

I usually consider rebuttals of book reviews by authors of the books under consideration to be petty. However, I must respond to Esther Kingston-Mann's review of *Peter Arkad'evich Stolypin* (*Slavic Review*, 37, no. 2 [June 1978]: 294–95) because I believe it totally distorts the contents of the book.

First, she makes it appear that the book is a collection of trivial descriptions and anecdotes.

Second, she states that the book should have concentrated upon Stolypin's peasant reforms because in her view these were all-important and it was Stolypin's economic policies (read agrarian) which set him apart from reactionary governmental officials. This view incredibly simplifies the situation in Russia during the late tsarist period and the problems confronting Stolypin. I did not dwell upon the agrarian reforms for several reasons. First, they have been rehashed innumerable times—that is, the policy commonly associated with Stolypin's name by anyone even remotely familiar with Russian history. Second, as with many of the reforms which Stolypin attempted to implement, the agrarian policies were not created by or unique to him, although Richard Hennessy in *The Agrarian Question in Russia, 1905–1907* (Geissen: Wilhelm Schmitz Verlag, 1977) argues convincingly that Stolypin changed the course