

found themselves among people with an ancient civilization, particularly among those with some literate tradition, as for example in Central Asia, Persia, the Ottoman Empire, China, and Japan, they discovered that local acceptance could be gained through use of local language.

Il'minskii, therefore, can be better understood when seen in the wider context of nineteenth-century mission activities. In this context, his language policy is not unique or original but has antecedents in the work of Western missionaries in areas contiguous to the tsarist empire.

EDEN NABY

East Asian Research Institute, Harvard University

TO THE EDITOR:

The interesting article by Russell Zguta, "The Ordeal by Water (Swimming of Witches) in the East Slavic World" (*Slavic Review*, June 1977), prompts a brief comment. In a lengthy footnote (p. 222) the author states that in Russia, in contrast to Western Europe, men were the victims of witchhunts as often as women. As evidence, court records are cited showing that in the seventeenth century there were more men than women tried for witchcraft. The difference between Russian and Western attitudes is attributed to a Western scholastic tradition which held that "as members of the 'weaker sex,' [women] were far more susceptible to Satan's wiles." In medieval Russia, the author argues, "no such distinction between the sexes existed, except in cases of drought and famine."

The contrast is arresting, but the implication that Russian women were relatively better off in this connection (with respect to either Russian men or Western women) appears questionable. In fact, the documentary testimony is open to quite another interpretation: namely, that women had less opportunity than did men for legal defense against a charge of witchery. According to the *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* article, "Zhenshchina," medieval specialists have estimated that for every male accused of witchcraft there were ten thousand women accused. The judicial records complement the author's own evidence on the ordeal by water to suggest in fact that Russian women were not treated more leniently than men, but on the contrary were subject to more summary forms of "justice."

There appears to be a stronger parallel here than a contrast to Western experience. And perhaps the parallel can be explained by the presence of a Russian strain of that same "scholastic tradition" found in the West. In some quarters at least, a distinction relating to witchcraft did indeed exist between the sexes. The Russian Primary Chronicle (p. 153 of the Cross translation cited by the author) counseled and cautioned Russians most explicitly on this point: "Particularly through the agency of woman are infernal enchantments brought to pass, for in the beginning the devil deceived woman, and she in turn deceived man."

DOROTHY ATKINSON
Stanford University

TO THE EDITOR:

Will you kindly allow me a few paragraphs concerning Professor Winters's review of my latest book, *The Masaryks* (*Slavic Review*, June 1977, pp. 337-38)?

I should say straightaway that I wrote *The Masaryks* as an intermediate book: intermediate between years of research and writing on subjects closely connected with the lives of the Masaryks on the one hand and, on the other, a full-length, detailed

biography, of either Thomas or of both Thomas and Jan Masaryk. Whether this biography will be written by me or someone else is immaterial.

I did not think that it was necessary to make this point in the book, because I assumed that it would be obvious to anyone acquainted with the historiography of the subject. I did not then know who would review the book.

It is, for instance, clear to your reviewer that "Jan Masaryk's career, which takes up a quarter of the book, is irrelevant to 'the making of Czechoslovakia.'" Many historians, myself included, would beg to differ. By 1947, the state had a different shape, different ethnic structure, different foreign policy from the Czechoslovakia of 1918; Jan Masaryk was a member of the government which supervised the transformation.

Later, Professor Winters complains that I provide "no coherent psychological understanding of the wellsprings of their [the Masaryks] outlook and behavior." This is a matter of opinion. I should only like to claim to have pushed our understanding of the two men slightly further, if only by contrasting their totally different characters. There are other points the book makes concerning the Masaryks' outlook and behavior, and they have been picked up by other reviewers.

The "deft handling of T. G. Masaryk's World War I adventures, especially those involving Russia" with which the reviewer credits the book, is another questionable statement. Masaryk's political work in that period has been examined often enough; but there are still inconsistencies, I would venture to suggest, between the documentary material and its historiographical surface. For instance, Beneš and Štefánik, in Paris, gave their consent, it seems, to the use of the Czechoslovak Legion in Russia in the Allies' war of intervention, at a time when Masaryk was far away and advocating a policy of strict neutrality. I should have liked to have had more time, when writing the book, to examine that point. It is one of crucial importance.

Your reviewer clearly finds it difficult to avoid making snap, easy judgments; to an author who has been around the ambiguities of his subject several times, the reviewer's judgments sound rather like the pronouncements of the pope on the day after the proclamation of his infallibility.

Z. A. B. ZEMAN
University of Lancaster

Professor Winters does not feel it necessary to respond.

TO THE EDITOR:

In his review of G. Maude's *The Finnish Dilemma* (*Slavic Review*, June 1977) Thede Palm gives, I believe, too negative a picture of Finland's position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. He was right to note the caution with which Finns deal with anything Soviet, but his statement that "some authors (Solzhenitsyn, for example) are not printed—but are sold—in Finland," is not totally accurate. While it is true that the first volume of Solzhenitsyn's *Gulag Archipelago* (parts 1–2) was printed in its Finnish translation in Sweden (Wahlström & Widstrand, 1974), because of political considerations in Finland itself, the second volume (parts 3–4) was published in Finnish in Finland (Tampere: Kustannuspiste OY, 1976). Mr. Palm seems to have given too much credence to articles appearing in the Swedish press (which undoubtedly had the best coverage of Finland anywhere), particularly to those by Andres Küng whose long article in *Svenska Dagbladet* ("Why is the publication being stopped?" November 27, 1975) suggested that a creeping "Finlandization" was stopping the publication in Sweden of the second volume of the Finnish translation. Küng detailed some interesting facts of the controversy over this second volume. The real reasons