

write about them. They can also claim truth does not exist, and all interpretations are the same. But, if they do and are reviewed by those who do not share their preconceptions, they should expect to be taken to task. Those who disregard such criticism as “rant” are merely locking themselves into their subdisciplinary ghetto.

Finally, Thompson did not correctly summarize my remarks on Fanon or the Enlightenment. Only Bolsheviks, like Fanon but unlike Marx, considered the *lumpenproletariat* “bearers of liberty.” Nor did I write that colonized Africans and Asians rejected the Enlightenment. I wrote that postcolonialist litcrits did. The question of eastern European intellectuals, the Enlightenment, and colonialism does deserve attention but cannot be adequately covered in a letter.

STEPHEN VELICHENKO
University of Toronto, Canada

To the Editor:

In her review of my book, *Russian Monastic Culture: “Josephism” and the Iosifo-Volokolamsk Monastery, 1479–1607* (*Slavic Review*, vol. 67, no. 2), Gail Lenhoff criticizes its social analysis by stating that, “This model, based on criteria singled out as significant for pre-Petrine society in Boris Mironov’s social history of the imperial period, is anachronistic and misleading because the distinguishing characteristics of separate categories . . . overlap” (485). If in order to avoid being “anachronistic and misleading” a historian must find non-overlapping “distinguishing characteristics” for social groups, then no competent historian of any culture at any time can ever avoid this criticism. My book clearly explains its intention to reach broad general conclusions within the limits of the available data: “It is not my intention here to write a social history of sixteenth-century Russia, only to give a general impression of where monks fit into that social environment. . . . I am consciously and deliberately joining that great class of historians who according to Reddy do not attempt to apply ‘great precision’ to the definition of classes” (102–3).

Lenhoff alleges that “references to secondary sources” include “inaccurate claims” and “frequently lack page numbers.” As an example she says that I attribute to Ludwig Steindorff an inaccurate claim that Iosif of Volokolamsk “pioneered” the practice of charging for liturgical commemoration of the dead. The sentence in my text is “Iosif pioneered an especially lucrative monastic enterprise: charging for liturgical commemoration of the dead” (35). The footnote reads: “The standard works on this topic are by Steindorff (1995, 1995a, 1995b, 1999, 2000a, 2000b).” This is not a quotation but a list of references for further inquiry. Nor is “pioneered” here a misstatement of fact. Whether someone prior to Iosif ever charged for commemoration is beside the point; the fact remains that Iosif’s monastery brought this practice into common usage.

I invite readers to compare Lenhoff’s review with that of T. Allan Smith in *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 50, nos. 1–2 (March–June 2008).

TOM DYKSTRA
Bellevue, Washington

Professor Lenhoff chooses not to respond.