

into the historiography of the subject. But for such a reference work the major question must be: are there important omissions? N. P. Kondakov's masterly *Ikonografija Bogomateri* of 1914–15 is not found under "USSR, Paintings, Icons," where many a lesser work is listed. It can be expected in the next volume under general works on iconography, but the nonspecialist needs to be informed of its fundamental importance for the study of Russian icons. One must, of course, realize that the focus of *BZ* is the central lands of the Byzantine Empire, even if there is much helpful bibliography here also on the Byzantine tradition in later Russian art. One other minor caveat: readers of *BZ* are familiar with the numerous book reviews cited in every issue of the journal. The bibliography includes them only if they are of unusual length or if they are the only reference available for a particular book. This policy sacrifices some important reviews, such as Cyril Mango's essential contribution to the chronology of the Great Palace of Constantinople in the 1960 *Art Bulletin*.

When it resumed publication in 1950, *BZ* announced a policy of limiting its concern to the period 325–1453, but this has not meant the exclusion of slightly later Russian art. The collaborators have been organized to improve systematic coverage of scholarly publication in all nations, but it remains possible for important local publications to escape their search. For example, the substantial *Recueil de Travaux* published by the National Museum of Ohrid on the occasion of the International Byzantine Congress in 1961 is not mentioned. This means omitting Mošin's detailed catalogue of the manuscripts in the Ohrid Museum (mostly removed from Saint Clement) describing and occasionally illustrating eighty-nine Greek books (mostly from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries) and four Slavic books (of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) in sixty pages of fine print. Possibly some reference to this work will turn up in a future volume. Such invaluable local or occasional publications will be familiar to those fortunate enough to visit the site, but only rarely do they get into bibliographies, or, indeed, into regular libraries. One other repertory is worth consulting for such citations: the New York Public Library's *Dictionary Catalogue of the Slavonic Collection* under "Vladimir" includes a 1927 guidebook and two 1945 pamphlets by Voronin on local architecture which were never noted by *BZ*. But of course that catalogue is no help for the vast range of periodical literature so admirably searched and indexed in this bibliography.

DAVID H. WRIGHT

University of California, Berkeley

RUSSIAN FOR LIBRARIANS. By *G. P. M. Walker*. London: Clive Bingley Ltd., 1973. 126 pp. \$8.50. Distributed by Linnet Books, Hamden, Connecticut.

This book fills a need in library literature as a concise, well-organized survey for English-speaking librarians and staff who work with Russian materials.

Beginning with a review of Russian grammar, the author presents clear definitions, tables, and helpful exercises, using typical library words and phrases. Following this is a logical, although uneven, exposition on transliteration, cataloguing, acquisitions, standard reference books, and identification of East European languages. Logic is not always foremost, however. The listing of Russian book-dealers suffers from a British bias. I also find fault with the order and description of "Retrospective Bibliographies and Catalogues" (pp. 58–59). The New York

Public Library's *Dictionary Catalogue of the Slavonic Collection*, with its many unclear entries and inconsistent transliteration of citations, is certainly less useful and comprehensive than either the *National Union Catalog* or the *British Museum General Catalogue*. Other omissions are glaring, such as the *National Union Catalog pre-1956 Imprints* and the *Cyrillic Union Catalog*.

The handbook would be significantly improved by the addition of a section on encyclopedias under "Bibliographies and Reference Works" to include the three editions of the *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia*, *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* (Brokgaus-Efron, 1890-1904 and 1911-16), and the *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Russkogo bibliograficheskogo instituta Granat*, since these tools are necessary for library staff performing the most basic work. Additionally, a separate section on those firms handling exclusively reproductions and reprints would be an improvement.

Nevertheless, such gaps do not detract from the book's overall value, which is enhanced by its classified vocabulary listings, numbered entries, and readable format. It is a useful, convenient reference for the newcomer as well as the more experienced Slavic librarian.

DARLENE J. RÁCZ
University of Washington

DE CÉZANNE AU SUPRÉMATISME: TOUS LES TRAÎTES PARUS DE 1915 À 1922. By K. S. Malévitch [*Malevich*]. Translated by Jean-Claude and Valentine Marcadé with the collaboration of Véronique Schiltz. Lausanne: L'Age d'homme, 1974. 182 pp.

This is the first of a two-part collection of Malevich's principal published essays in French translation and marks another praiseworthy contribution by the Marcadés to our deeper understanding of modern Russian art. The volume contains Malevich's important articles of 1915-22, although, despite the subtitle, one or two valuable statements are missing, such as his untitled piece in *Tainye poroki akademikov* (Moscow, 1915). Malevich's essays are not new to the Western reader, thanks to the comprehensive two-volume anthology in English (*K. S. Malevich: Essays on Art*, edited by Troels Andersen, Copenhagen and London, 1968) and the numerous quotations from his writings which have appeared in Western and Soviet books and journals over the last decade, but the introduction and annotation in this volume do provide new food for thought. It is very fortunate that the Marcadés chose to translate *Ot kubizma i futurizma k suprématismu: Novyi zhivopisnyi realizm* using the late Mikhail Larionov's personal copy and preserving his prolific comments: while they are not always very sensible and are prompted more by professional jealousy than objective reasoning, they do provide a unique commentary on the relationship between two leaders of the Russian avant-garde and two pioneers of abstraction. If we can ignore remarks such as "He is not Napoleon because I am" or "Malevich was not a painter" (I translate from the original Russian), we can ponder more lengthily over Larionov's denial of the square as zero or his rejection of Malevich's alleged equation of painting and color.

Jean-Claude Marcadé's own very studious preface to the essays treats of ideas essential to Malevich's artistic and philosophical world view and helps the reader to understand more fully the frequent but cryptic references to "texture" (*faktura*),