

Yet Dr. Spector's remark (he quoted from the conclusion) that I failed to analyze American and British efforts at Teheran and Yalta to stop the Russians from taking over the Balkans is erroneous and hardly justified in light of the overall material presented. Actually, at both conferences Rumania was hardly mentioned. Important decisions on the Balkans as a whole emerging from those conferences which indirectly concerned Rumania were explained. Perhaps I should have provided more details on overall Allied Balkan policies, even though much of this can be found in most general diplomatic studies of the war. Nevertheless, chapters 4 through 6 extensively analyzed Anglo-American policies toward Rumania, including Western efforts to stop the Russians, which after all was what I was trying to do.

PAUL D. QUINLAN  
Warwick, Rhode Island

TO THE EDITOR:

I wish to correct the factual errors which appeared in George M. Young's review of my *Five Russian Poems* (*Slavic Review*, 38, no. 3 [September 1979]: 530–31). I refrain from commenting on Mr. Young's evaluative statements, except to say that it would take more than his one-page review to reconcile "absurd conclusions" (p. 530) with "brilliant moments" (p. 531).

The first error of fact concerns Young's statement that "Laferriere tries to prove that Mme. Kern (*genii chistoi krasoty*) represents a 'phallic mother,' and that the hidden purpose of the poem's form is to shield Pushkin from latent homosexual and Oedipal feelings" (p. 531). What I said, in fact, is the following: "There is not the slightest hint of an Oedipal triangle in the poem itself" (*Five Russian Poems*, p. 60), and "the poem not only provides the addressee with the defensive shield of poetic form . . . , but it also manages to distill away all the homosexual and Oedipal associations that contaminate the letters, and thereby makes the female persona a partner in a much more private or intimate kind of relationship than Puškin had ever had with Anna Petrovna" (p. 75). If there is a "hidden purpose" to the poem's linguistic structure, it is to shield Pushkin (and his reader) from specifically *pre*-Oedipal feelings about a phallic mother. By placing *genii chistoi krasoty* in parentheses after "Mme. Kern," Mr. Young shows that he has disregarded my statement that ". . . it is not possible to say that they [Anna Petrovna and the woman in the poem] are one and the same person at all levels" (p. 75).

The second factual error appears in the statement that Laferriere's theory "turns the reading of any poem into an exercise of how to get from a given starting point to uterine regression" (p. 531). It is true that uterine regression operates in three of the five poems I analyze. But one will search in vain for any mention of a uterus or womb in my analyses of Pushkin's "Ia pomniu chudnoe mgnoven'e" or Mandelstam's "Tristia." Psychoanalysts are careful to distinguish between Oedipal, homosexual, *pre*-Oedipal, and uterine regressive fantasies. They are not all the same atavistic thing, and any Slavist who presumes to say something about their relevance to poetry should be just as careful about distinguishing them as about distinguishing, say, an anapestic poem from a dactylic poem, or a poem in Russian from its Ukrainian translation.

DANIEL RANCOUR-LAFERRIERE  
University of California, Davis