Robert Curtius, the editor Herbert Steiner, the writer Bernt von Heiseler, the philosopher Hans Vaihinger, and the socio-political critic and theoretician Erich Muller-Gangloff. Each section is prefaced by an introduction which explains the nature and significance of the relationship. The collection provides useful information about intellectual and literary matters as well as biographical material.

The second part contains Ivanov's own translations of his Chelovek, Svetomir, and poetry into German. Wachtel's objective in including these selections is to provide further insight into the poet's manner of translation. He regarded it not as a skill but as its own genre which is even more demanding than composing an original piece. In essence, it is a process of transformation in which the final product bears little resemblance to the original on the surface but yet conveys the message. This technique is also apparent in the renderings of his own work into German. Comparing them to the originals, one notes how frequently he deviates, adds, and elaborates. In the process they become independent productions. The texts included here offer the scholar a great deal of material that clarifies Ivanov's creative process.

In sum, Wachtel's books are fine pieces of scholarship which enhance our appreciation and understanding of an important but neglected poet. They are thoroughly researched, copiously documented, and written in lucid, jargon free prose.

John Simons


Finally, an analysis of Russian Acmeism as an integrated literary movement. One's first reaction is to wonder why such a book has been so long in coming. While there have been numerous full-length studies of individual Acmeists, the diffuse and elusive nature of Acmeism itself has bedeviled would-be historians and analysts. Such seemingly simple facts of definition as membership and the dates of its active existence are problematic, not to mention its poetic doctrine. How does one circumscribe a movement that defined itself in such vague terms as "an equilibrium of forces" and "a yearning for world culture?" Such problems have long discouraged scholars from attempting a detailed overview of Acmeism's history, theory, and practice. In this modified version of his doctoral thesis, Justin Doherty grapples with these enigmatic issues and largely succeeds in filling this notorious gap in Russian literary scholarship. At the outset, Doherty faces up to the problems inherent in any general study of Acmeism. He proposes not an absolute, fully articulated theory, but "a fairly abstract general model of Acmeism," derived primarily from an analysis of the critical discourse of its practitioners. Thus, he isolates organicism, equilibrium, a sophisticated visual approach to reality that stresses clarity of imagery and logic of thought, and an emphasis on linguistic and poetic laws as substantive features of an Acmeist poetics. Although none of this is new to our understanding of Acmeism, Doherty goes beyond the ambiguous clichés of the well-known manifestos to ground his analysis in the Acmeists' criticism.
of their own and others' poetry, in Gumilev's notes for an *ars poetica* that remained unfinished, in his correspondence, and in the poetry of Gumilev and Mandel'shtam in which meta-poetic statements are discernible. Moreover, he extends his analysis to deal in a more thorough way than has been done before with the critical and theoretical writings of less well known Acmeists and the writers close to them, including Sergei Gorodetskii, Vladimir Narbut, Mikhail Lozinskii, and Georgii Ivanov. He utilizes the repetition of general principles, the similarities with Gumilev's critical approach, and, even more important, the divergences from Gumilev's views to amplify and flesh out the desultory manifesto maxims about such idiosyncratic literary qualities as equilibrium, chastity, and *akme*. This inclusive approach also allows the author to tie up with the theoretical statements of other concepts related to Acmeism, such as "literary taste," culture, and conscience, to explore their significance to the Acmeist world-view and their implications for Acmeist poetry.

Nonetheless, as all scholars of Acmeism have found, there remain unresolved contradictions that resist simplification to suit any prescribed theory. Instead of glossing over or denying them, Doherty exploits these incompatibilities to reveal more about the totality of Acmeist thought. Appearances of internal contradiction (concreteness/fantasy, culture/nature, inspiration/craftsmanship, rules/taste) often reveal individual differences in interpretation (e.g., Gumilev vs. Gorodetskii's understanding of "equilibrium") or complementary aspects of a unified poetics (e.g., Gumilev's "feeling for laws" vs. Mandel'shtam's "feelings of taste"). After all, in a poetics which exalts the notion of balance, contradiction easily fades into complementarity. The reader notes many instances of such blurry distinctions, qualification, and modification in Doherty's work, and many a "thus" is followed by "however." This is not a weakness, but a looseness of definition demanded by the topic under discussion and the approach of the analyst. Starting from the assumption that a fully articulated theory of Acmeism is problematic (and probably undesirable), Doherty aptly characterizes his book as "a study of how Acmeists thought about their art"; and he thoroughly accomplishes this goal, which is more satisfying and useful to the reader of Acmeist poetry than a strict coherent model.

As the author's characterization indicates, his book emphasizes Acmeist poetics, rather than Acmeist poetry. The next step, to correlate the general model proposed here with the poetic production it generated, is barely begun and begs further study. Doherty devotes separate chapters to the poetic persona in Acmeism and to Acmeist "philosophy," where he pays more attention to individual poetic texts. Like the general model he proposes, these central issues of Acmeist poetics reveal uncertainties and inconsistencies, but the author's exploration of their ambiguity is thoughtful, well-grounded, and stimulating. His treatment of the history of Acmeism as an evolving phenomenon resolves many of the questions about the various guilds, groups and personalities involved, with new information about the lesser known Acmeists. The introductory chapter on Russian Symbolist theory is valuable for its emphasis on the contribution of Innokentii Annenskii to Acmeism, although its elaboration of the distinctions among abstruse systems of poetics seems excessively protracted. In general, the author's writing is characterized by "dissertation style," which makes it rather te-