

### Viewing the Elephant Man

To the Editor:

While I enjoyed *PMLA*'s recent article on *The Elephant Man* (104 [1989]: 868–81), I was dismayed—and, in the context of professional standards, surprised—that its authors had failed to acknowledge, or perhaps simply to discover, a review I wrote during the movie's initial release; indeed, the only contemporary reviewer they listed in their bibliography was John Simon. My 1981 article, published in *Film Quarterly*, anticipated several of their arguments and paid special attention to the nature of the demands placed on the spectator by the theatrical and cinematic versions of the history of the Elephant Man. Perhaps someone at *PMLA* ought to have caught the omission.

BRUCE KAWIN  
*University of Colorado, Boulder*

### Reply:

Regrettably, it is not possible to acknowledge the scores of reviews a major motion picture receives, even very fine and generally relevant ones like Kawin's. We therefore cited only those reviews that seemed especially germane to our argument, John Simon's attack on the structure of Bernard Pomerance's play and Tracy Biga's discussion of the oedipal dimensions of Lynch's film, *Blue Velvet*.

WILLIAM E. HOLLADAY  
STEPHEN WATT  
*Indiana University, Bloomington*

### *PMLA*'s New Cover

To the Editor:

At first glance, rubbing my eyes, I said: It can't be. Then, like the rube in the presence of the giraffe, I said, in utter disbelief: There ain't no such thing as an attractive cover of *PMLA*.

Now, upon reflection. . . .

Thank you for attempting to make not only the wrapper but also the worthwhile contents more attractive, inviting, and tempting to the generalist as well as the specialist.

E. LEO MCMANNUS  
*Miami-Dade Community College*

To the Editor:

The new cover is ugly.

CRAIG S. ABBOTT  
*Northern Illinois University*