

yond graduate studies in 2001. More problematically, Pető mischaracterizes the volume's substance and scope. She describes it as comprising ten "national" case studies, ignoring Alon Rachamimov's study of aristocratic Habsburg nurses tending prisoners of war from Austria-Hungary's *multinational* army. Readers of the review also would not know that the volume addresses both world wars.

Pető deplores the volume's lack of discussion of masculinity, but that is in fact the subject of Maureen Healy's contribution and masculinity forms an integral part of Benjamin Frommer's chapter as well. Since the reviewer finds the "most painful" aspect of the book to be its relativist approach to the Holocaust, we encourage her to reread the introduction.

The most painful aspect of Pető's review is her false assertion that Eliza Ablovatski's chapter on Hungary "does not use any original sources and is limited to sources available in English and an illustration taken from a web site in Argentina." A simple look at that chapter reveals primary sources in Hungarian as well as German.

Reviewers can—and do—provide useful criticisms. The egregious errors made by this reviewer, many of which we have not even mentioned, are astonishing. Worst of all, her groundless and gratuitous attack on Ablovatski calls into question her professional judgment as a historian.

NANCY M. WINGFIELD  
*Northern Illinois University*  
MARIA BUCUR  
*Indiana University*

To the Editor:

I am writing in response to Andrea Pető's review of Nancy Wingfield and Maria Bucur's edited collection, *Gender and War in Twentieth-Century Eastern Europe* (*Slavic Review*, vol. 66, no. 4).

I am prompted to write because the review contains numerous factual errors. I am particularly disturbed by these errors because the review contains such strong criticism of the scholarship of an untenured professor, Eliza Ablovatski. I do not know Ablovatski, but I know something of her work and was thus surprised by the review.

Pető asserts that a supposed lack of Hungarian-language sources in the essay indicates that Ablovatski does not read Hungarian. A more careful reading of the footnotes would prove the error of this assertion. Seven different notes offer sources in Hungarian. Pető also chides Ablovatski for using German-language sources rather than Hungarian ones. To do so would have required Ablovatski to use Hungarian translations of the German-language originals, since the sources cited appeared first in German (because the authors were in exile). Finally, Pető criticizes Ablovatski for using a web site based in Argentina, as though this were somehow an example of substandard research practice. The web site in question is based in Argentina because the person on whom the text focuses emigrated to Argentina and thus posted material online there rather than back in Hungary. For all these reasons, the negative review of Professor Ablovatski's scholarship is unwarranted.

MILLS KELLY  
*George Mason University*

Professor Pető chooses not to respond.