empathy for simple people still close to the land, and a sense of a more uncomplicated historical past. At greater length he compares Fathers and Sons and The Sun Also Rises and finds the common themes of defeat, first love, death, unhappy love, social alienation, and dissolution together with a masculine vision and a prevalent pathos stemming from a conflict between the individual's need for self-definition and its social impossibility.

An epilogue briefly discusses some similarities between Hemingway and Anton Chekhov as well as what are acknowledged as marginal likenesses with Dostoevskii and Tolstoi. Three appendices contain notes toward a comparative study of Hemingway and Isaac Bable, Hemingway's borrowing cards from Shakespeare and Company Bookstore, and a list of the works by Turgenev which Hemingway read.

This study contains much worthwhile material. Its brevity does not allow discussion on the body of Turgenev's work read by Hemingway as possible sources of influence, and perhaps for students of the two writers confining the study to one volume of stories and one novel from each writer is inadequate. Nor does the study resolve the issue of literary influence, since the theory utilized is ultimately rejected for broad applicability. This fact minimizes the validity of the study's subtitle. Nonetheless, the work is a good compilation of points of similarity and further establishes the fact of Hemingway's utilization of ideas and techniques from Turgenev.

Richard L. Chapple
Florida State University


Nikolaj Gumilev 1886-1986 is a volume of papers from the first international conference devoted to the Acmeist poet and critic Nikolai Gumilev. The volume itself, edited by Sheelagh Duffin Graham, is beautifully bound in softcover and fronted by a reproduction of Natalia Goncharova's 1917 "Portrait of Gumilev": the poet composing "Kitaiskaia devushka" in an "Oriental" setting worthy of the Persian miniature he dreamed of becoming.

The volume is not simply a collection of diverse studies: the articles illuminate each other, and the conference appears to have been fruitful for the authors, who acknowledge the suggestions as well as the papers of their colleagues. This is a symposium in the best sense: it is a joint effort, a meeting of minds.

The papers represent a variety of critical perspectives. Some authors investigate the genres in which Gumilev worked: Louis Allain explores the evolution of the "long form" in his verse; Jean Bonamour considers Gumilev as a critic of French poetry, and Earl Sampson—as a writer of imaginative prose. Others contemplate themes: Ben Hellman writes about the reception of Gumilev's "war" poetry, and Eulalia Papla about the theme of the journey; Ewa Thompson examines Gumilev's attitude towards contradictory images of Russia's historical role, and Elaine Rusinko compares his model of the relation between the poet and the reader with Mukařovský's. Four authors concentrate on Gumilev's lyrics:
Eshelman and Denis Mickiewicz offer close readings of individual poems; and Michael Basker and Samuel Schwarzband each analyze one of Gumilev's verse collections. Two authors approach Gumilev less directly. Anthony Parton discusses Gumilev's lyric "Goncharova i Larionov," investigating the relationship between Gumilev and the eponymous expatriate artists; Inna Chechelnitsky follows the "Gumilev line" in Akhmatova's Poëma bez geroia.

Among the most interesting essays are those that concern a text or group of texts. While Chechelnitsky's focus is not Gumilev himself but his reflection in the work of another poet, the author points to Gumilev's own place in the Acmeist tradition of memory and prophecy. Basker argues that the later shift towards mysticism is anticipated in Gumilev's early work: the poems of Romanticheskie tvety, with their exotic landscapes, represent an inner realm, and reveal the poet as a magus, a healer restoring connections to a forgotten primitive nature. Schwarzband suggests that the unity of Kolchan is not sequential but "systemic," based on a series of "eights" that describe smaller circles within the large circle of the volume, as it moves from "Pamiat' Annenskomu" to "Oda d'Anuntsio" (the author might have noted the confirming consonance of those poets' names). He justifies an analysis of the volume in terms of a series of oppositions (for example, an alternation of lyric and epic narration), with reference to Gumilev's discussion of the possibilities of the "octave" (vos'mistishie)—a form, Gumilev suggests, conducive to the representation of "antinomies of consciousness."

The essays by Eshelman and Mickiewicz, both close readings of individual lyrics, give antithetical accounts of Gumilev's poetics. Mickiewicz suggests that for Gumilev meaning is located first of all on the sub-lexical level. But the elucidation of the poem "Pered noch'iu severnoi, korotkoi" is overburdened by theoretical discussion. Indeed, Mickiewicz aspires to prove that in his later verse Gumilev rose to the standards he had established in his critical prose—a rather artificial criterion of analysis. The poem is more than the sum of its devices, as Mickiewicz might have shown had he allowed full range to his very rich material. He might, for example, have elaborated on his discussion of Gumilev's characterization of love as a "witch": note the implications of the references he observes to Akhmatova—who represents herself as a sorceress, her poetry as incantation or exorcism. Moreover, in considering the nature of the journey undertaken here, the author might usefully have placed this poem—in trochaic pentameter, with the line "I ne budet zhalko nichego"—in the tradition going back to Lermontov. Mickiewicz's meticulous work deserves a proper setting. Eshelman provides a counterweight, tending towards the opposite extreme. Discussing "Dusha i telo" as a mystical allegory, he distinguishes Gumilev's verse as active principally on "higher" levels of analysis: Gumilev anticipated and reversed the structuralist design, presenting, in thematic terms, oppositions already resolved. Eshelman makes a case of his reading, but more consistent attention to the text seems warranted. Thus, Eshelman discusses the fact that the soul questions the protagonist (III. 1); but the body too participates—and something of the relation between body and soul might be deduced from the way the body is presented as questioner: "Dusha predstala predo mnoi i telo." Surely this is not a matter of indifference for interpretation.

Among the other papers, those by Rusinko and Hellman have problems of focus. Rusinko's valuable comments on the close relation of the Acmeist reader and the poet do not seem to justify a reference to Gumilev's "creative personality": the theoretical problem of the interlocutor and the practical problem of the poet's