

ticipating disciplines in the AAASS and to the Russia, Soviet, and East European (North, Central, and South) areas would be impossible. But inasmuch as history is the one common denominator, this at least can and should be emphasized.

Four out of the twelve June contributors are historians. Most of the editors of the *Slavic Review* have been historians. This is as it should be.

At the Denver annual meeting the inappropriateness (as well as awkwardness) of the name AAASS was successfully raised. Should an appropriate change be voted, will there not also be a change in the name of this journal, which is neither a "Slavic Review" nor a "Quarterly of Soviet and East European Studies"?

JAMES F. CLARKE
University of Pittsburgh

Editor's Note: I am sure Henry Roberts joins me in thanking Professor Clarke for his expression of confidence in historians as editors of the *Review*. In fact, however, the other three of the five professors who have edited the journal were not historians; S. H. Cross and Ernest J. Simmons were specialists in literature, John N. Hazard a political scientist and specialist in law, and their terms total twenty out of the thirty-one years the *Review* has been published.

TO THE EDITOR:

I was taken aback when I found that Professor Zbigniew Folejewski in his review of Roman Pollak's book *Od Renesansu do Baroku* (September 1971, p. 710) reproved the author for dealing in some of his papers with "chiefly political writers (S. Herakliusz Lubomirski)." There is a queer misunderstanding in such an exemplification. True, Lubomirski wrote some politicophilosophical treatises (incidentally, not devoid of literary significance), but he was also a dramatist of interest (as was brilliantly proved by Wanda Roszkowska's monograph, one of the best books in the field of Polish baroque literature) and, above all, a major baroque poet. From among his enthusiasts I would like to quote two non-Polish voices. For Andreas Angyal he is a "genius" ("dieser sonderbare aber geniale Mann," *Die slawische Barockwelt*, Leipzig, 1961, p. 189), while Dmitry Čiževsky writes of him as one of the best Polish baroque poets in his article "Zu den polnisch-russischen literarischen Beziehungen" (*Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie*, 23, no. 2 [1955]). "Genius" or not a genius, S. H. Lubomirski certainly is a major literary figure.

WIKTOR WEINTRAUB
Harvard University

PROFESSOR FOLEJEWSKI REPLIES:

I agree that my term "chiefly political writer" in reference to Lubomirski was not quite accurate. However, thinking of him as a chiefly nonpolitical writer, especially in the context of Pollak's essay, devoted to some aspects of Lubomirski's biography as a historical and political figure, typical of the mentality of his time, would not be very accurate either. He was a political writer of importance, and I do not think I did him any injustice. Need I point out the obvious, that far from "reproving" Pollak, I paid him the highest compliment, stating that even in the essays of limited general interest (and such is the essay on Lubomirski) "the author displays an ability to point out the often unexpected wider significance of the discussed phenomena, and his comparative skills are truly impressive."