

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 limited to one paragraph; comment on an article should not exceed 750 to 1,000 words. The editor encourages writers to refrain from ad hominem discourse.

D.P.K.

To the Editor:

The reviewer of my *Czechoslovakia between Stalin and Hitler: The Diplomacy of Edvard Beneš in the 1930s* (*Slavic Review* 56, no. 3), Professor Gregory C. Ference, likes the book and predicts that it "will serve as a classic study" of this topic. Rather than feeling flattered, I regret that he does not engage—or at least mention—the major themes of the book. These include, for instance, my new interpretation of the Tukhachevskii affair, the May mobilization, Beneš's desire that the Czechoslovak-German crisis result in an all-out war, Iosif Stalin's behavior in 1938, and Soviet plans for the future. Instead Professor Ference devotes most of his review to a summary of Czechoslovak politics between the wars. In doing so, he makes some surprising errors. For instance, there was no *trilateral* Czechoslovak-French-Soviet agreement; as I show, Beneš and Maksim Litvinov had hoped to achieve one but failed because of French reluctance. They had to accept two bilateral agreements instead. Nor is it true that these agreements were "masterminded" by Beneš; he knew little about Franco-Soviet dealings. I am also puzzled by the claim that Czechoslovakia was a starting point, unwitting or otherwise, for the Red Army purge; in chapter 4, I show that the starting point was in Stalin's Kremlin. Finally, Professor Ference points out a "minor error." I was supposed to have claimed that Adolf Hitler marched into Prague on 14 March 1939. In reality I state that on that date officers from the Czechoslovak Military Intelligence escaped to England, "only hours before the Wehrmacht occupied the country" (170). The occupation occurred "hours" later, that is, on 15 March 1939. That date is unforgettable.

IGOR LUKES  
Boston University

Professor Ference does not wish to reply.

To the Editor:

Readers who are, like myself, puzzled by the hostile tone of Michael R. Katz's review of my *Literary Translation in Russia* (*Slavic Review* 57, no. 1) may be interested in a likely reason for his ire. On pp. 148–49 of my book, I make a few uncomplimentary remarks about his own pioneering study and, to add insult to injury, do not even mention his model bibliography.

MAURICE FRIEDBERG  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Professor Katz replies:

Maurice Friedberg's response to my review of his new book on translation sent me scurrying back to pp. 148–49. Surely I would have noticed a "few uncomplimentary remarks" about my own work. There I found merely a completely inoffensive reference to my study of the literary ballad in one footnote. What a relief!

I regret that Professor Friedberg considers the tone of my review "hostile" and feels that he has to search for the reason for my "ire." Unlike him, I try not to personalize such matters. I merely reviewed his book, describing both its contribution to the field, as well as its shortcomings.

MICHAEL KATZ  
Middlebury College

*Slavic Review* 57, no. 4 (Winter 1998)