

the cultural orbit dependent on the accident of birthplace but on the specific contribution to an ethnic or territorial unit. This seems to me the only sensible procedure in an empire where a continuous migration of intellectuals from east to west occurred, particularly in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Constantin Daicoviciu and Miron Constantinescu refer in their standard history of Transylvania to the specific extraordinary impact which Odobescu's archaeological studies had on Transylvania.

There seems to be little point in getting into a discussion of Professor Hitchins's ruminations about so complex a subject as the social and political problems of the Habsburg Empire as a whole. Judging from his publications this is patently a rather secondary interest for him. Accordingly, I won't contest observations on this score. On the contrary, I will confess to a so-called hidden crime which, as any student of criminology knows, may be far more serious than the comparably petty offenses for which a defendant will be tried in public. Even an eagle-eyed, Rumanian-oriented observer like Professor Hitchins may have overlooked that, because of strict limitations of space, I was unable to list his valuable study, *The Rumanian National Movement in Transylvania, 1780-1849* in the bibliography of my book which, incidentally, is not confined exclusively to works in English, French, and German. This omission will be corrected in a slightly revised and enlarged German edition to be published within the next few months.

ROBERT A. KANN
University of Vienna

Professor Hitchins does not feel that a response is necessary.

TO THE EDITOR:

I must object to Colette Shulman's comment on my "selection" of materials in her review of my *Soviet Women* (*Slavic Review*, June 1976). I deliberately made no selection whatever among data casting a *negative* light on the status of Soviet women, incorporating everything I could find, including personally-transmitted information no other foreigner seems to know. This was an attempt to falsify my own hypothesis.

I fail to understand her denial that "obstacles" in "the simplest tasks of everyday life . . . have been lessened." All the following data pertain to a single decade, 1965-74. Families with refrigerators have risen from 11 percent, meaning that only the elite had them, to 55 percent (a majority of families). Washing machine ownership rose from 21 percent to 62 percent of families. Vacuum cleaner output rose fourfold, and is in the millions. Production of women's ready-to-wear dresses doubled. Meat convenience-food manufacture increased by nearly half. Retail store floor space rose 50 percent. Places in preschool child-care facilities rose by more than the total number now available in the United States.

Regarding the relative status of U.S. women, how does one get round the fact that the USSR is alone in the world in having women comprise a majority of persons in the combined employment of all professions requiring higher education? Regarding upward mobility, the percentage of women among Soviet factory managers has risen 50 percent in the decade. Female Party membership is climbing at the fastest rate in history.

That I sought to popularize: most certainly. But the level of the research is suggested by the fact that my bibliography of Russian and English books on the sub-

ject is the fullest in print. And two of the authors of forthcoming academic books on the subject have borrowed Russian volumes, whose existence they learned of only through that bibliography, from me.

WILLIAM M. MANDEL

Highgate Road Social Science Research Station, Berkeley

Ms. Shulman does not feel that a response is necessary.

TO THE EDITOR:

Sidney Monas's recent essay entitled "Fourteen Years of Aleksandr Isaevich" (*Slavic Review*, September 1976) is unquestionably one of the more thoughtful reviews of Solzhenitsyn's provocative thought. Despite the general high quality of Mr. Monas's analysis, one error is particularly jarring to a Solzhenitsyn reader: Mr. Monas contends that in all of the many pages of Solzhenitsyn's *oeuvres* there appears no genuine sexual encounter, and that the reason for this paucity of literary eroticism is Solzhenitsyn's extreme suspicion of "intoxication of any kind." Solzhenitsyn's works, however, are laced with both implicit and explicit sexual scenes, many of which are profoundly moving and evocative.

One of the most subtly erotic moments in all of Solzhenitsyn's published fiction takes place in *The First Circle* between the pursued, distracted Innokenty Volodin and his estranged wife, Dotty. Intuitively sensing his impending destruction by the masters of the Gulag Archipelago, Innokenty unexpectedly rediscovers the great enveloping security and power of his wife's tender sexuality. In a lyrical passage of striking simplicity, Innokenty is seduced by his own wife:

It was easier to talk lying down—for some reason he could say much more, the most intimate things, if they were lying in each other's arms under the blanket rather than sitting opposite each other in armchairs.

He took a couple of steps toward the bed, then hesitated.

She lifted the edge of the blanket for him to come under it.

Unaware that he'd stepped on the book that had slipped from her fingers, Innokenty lay down and everything closed behind him.

Gleb Nerzhin of the same novel is forever luring "Simochka" into an acoustical booth for surreptitious petting, while Ruska is engaged in a love affair with Clara, an MGB employee at the *sharashka* whose job it is to spy on the *zeks*.

Solzhenitsyn deals with youthful sexual naïveté in a tongue-in-cheek episode in *Cancer Ward* (unfortunately, the extensive treatment of *eros* in *Cancer Ward* has been largely ignored by literary scholars) when Dyomka comforts a distraught Asya, who has just learned that she must undergo a radical mastectomy. Passionately flinging her robe apart and demanding that he kiss her "doomed" breast, Asya dramatically exclaims that at least Dyomka will be able to appreciate her "marvel" before it must be removed and thrown into the garbage pail.

In Solzhenitsyn's works, *eros* constitutes the renewal of the elements of physical sustenance, the rebirth of the ecstasy of sensual existence. Nevertheless, sensuality for Solzhenitsyn is only the first tier of the upward spiral of self-realization of the individual personality, and thus is not a theme he feels called upon to elaborately develop.