

“economy,” and transcendental philosophy encountered in Malevich’s writings. In this context it is particularly helpful to read of the philosophical, “theurgic” background against which Malevich moved (Berdiaev, Bulgakov, Chulkov, Viacheslav Ivanov, although Bergson is inexplicably omitted from the list). For it has become increasingly obvious to us that Suprematism for Malevich was a cosmic force going far beyond the mere aesthetics of nonfigurative art toward the total transformation of human life. Malevich’s constant emphasis on “intuitive reason” takes on, therefore, a broader meaning in the face of these philosophical references and should stir us to think more deeply about the whole interchange between Symbolist philosophy, God-searching, and theosophy and the development of Russian abstract art. It was this tension between the illogical and the logical, between the analytical and the mystical, which lay at the very heart of Kandinsky’s and Malevich’s worlds and which forced them to spend so long systematizing their thoughts—attempting to explain their irrational experience in rational terms. In this sense, Jean-Claude Marcadé was right to conclude, “Malévitch a quelque chose d’un chef de secte: prophétique, virulent, visionnaire, énigmatique, intolérant. . . . Il est à la fois Savonarole et Avvakoum.”

JOHN E. BOWLT
University of Texas, Austin

ANNA PAVLOVA. By *Oleg Kerensky*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1973. xvi. 161 pp. \$6.95.

Oleg Kerensky chose to write a biography of Pavlova because he had not found a single book that made him feel he *knew* the dancer. As the grandson of Alexander Kerensky, he did know many people in Russian émigré circles and elsewhere who had known Pavlova. After compiling information from many interviews and much reading, he has produced a volume in which Pavlova comes into focus as a woman eminently talented in portraying through dance the tenderest lyrical feelings, but who could also be as tough and determined as the occasion demanded.

Pavlova would find little in common with some present-day Russian socialist-realist ballets based on work or propaganda themes. She once wrote, “The purpose of dancing is not to show men as they look when they go about their work. . . . The function of dancing is to give man a sight of an unreal world, beautiful, dazzling as his dreams [wherein] . . . man sees himself . . . free, healthy, happy, carefree.” In her view, “Art is prayer, love, religion. Art expresses the need for greater freedom than mortals possess and greater goodness than is known to man.”

Yet she was never carefree about her performance as an artist. So that her concentration might not be disturbed, lesser dancers were forbidden to go anywhere near her in the wings before she glided onto the stage. One American dancer who dared linger too near her not only was suspended from solo roles for a month and forced to dance in the corps de ballet but as a special insult had to play in one ballet the part of a chained bear usually taken by an extra.

Kerensky does indeed make this great artist come alive as a person, and in the process reveals some new and interesting information about the fabled dancer.

MARY GRACE SWIFT
Loyola University, New Orleans