

the need for similar expositions of the vocabulary structure of other Slavic languages, and provides a useful tool for pinpointing translator's "false friends"—for example, Russian *otperet'* (to unlock), Polish *odeprzeć* (to repel), Czech *odepřítí* (to refuse), Serbo-Croatian *odaprijeti* (to open)—for linguistic study of the routes of semantic or phonetic change, or for moments of pleasant and useful browsing.

PHILIP J. REGIER

*University of Southern California*

RUSSIAN CUBO-FUTURISM, 1910–1930. By *Vahan D. Barooshian*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1974. 176 pp.

Literature on Futurism—as a movement both in literature and in the other arts—has grown considerably during the last decade. While Russian Futurism was virtually unknown to Western readers (except a small group of specialists) some ten or fifteen years ago, they now have available a number of monographs, translations, reproductions of original materials, and so forth. Vladimir Markov's *Russian Futurism: A History* has competently documented and put in perspective the main phenomena of the movement in Russia, and thus has laid the groundwork for further studies of specific groups, or of individual contributions.

Barooshian's study, entitled *Russian Cubo-Futurism, 1910–1930*, is, in effect, a presentation of the five major members of the so-called "Gileia" group. That these members were Khlebnikov, Mayakovsky, Burliuk, Kruchenykh and Kamenskii should not be questioned, although it might be noted that contributions by some other artists, especially Benedikt Livshits and Elena Guro, could have been afforded at least a brief subchapter to make the picture more complete.

The presentations of the five artists are quite lucid and well documented. They are preceded by a brief introductory chapter, "The Background of Early Russian Cubo-Futurism in Brief Historical Perspective." Perhaps because the perspective is so "brief," the triangle Symbolism-Cubism-Futurism appears a little too idyllic and too "equilateral." It is true that Cubism made itself felt in Russia earlier, but the question of the role of Cubism in the program of the Russian Futurists could have been afforded a little more discussion. On the other hand, the chapter entitled "French Surrealism and Russian Futurism" tends to concentrate, at times, on some less "intrinsic" aspects; it assigns too much importance to the French artists' ideological declarations. The interesting chapter on "Futurism in the Post-Revolutionary Period" contributes some valid remarks, although in some places a slight uncertainty in delineating the subject is evident. At one point, for example, the author speaks of "the avant-garde which included the Russian Cubo-Futurists" (p. 116), and on the next page of "the avant-garde and the Cubo-Futurists" (p. 117).

On the whole, this study is a valuable piece of research. It is a welcome addition to the body of "Futurisiana."

Z. FOLEJEWSKI

*University of British Columbia*