

and fills much of the text with citations from published works. In this context, one is tempted to accuse the author of referential ambiguity, even of plagiarism, since in some places she gives the impression of having gained access to archival materials in the USSR, whereas in fact she quotes excerpts already published—without direct acknowledgment. For example, the second Diaghilev statement concerning Chekhov on page 108 comes, allegedly, from the Manuscript Department of the Lenin Library, although this exact quotation appeared in Lapshina's recent article on the World of Art (see *Russkaia khudozhestvennaia kultura kontsa XIX–nachala XX veka*, Moscow, 1969, bk. 2, p. 139). Such parallels may be coincidences; in any case, the author's aspiration to scholastic grandeur can be forgiven, whereas her not infrequent factual mistakes and omissions cannot. In this context mention should be made of the wrong sequence of the first series of World of Art exhibitions (the Moscow session of December 1902 to January 1903 and the highly important session of 1906 are ignored); the last numbers of the *Golden Fleece* appeared not at the end of 1909 but in the spring of 1910, despite the date of 1909 on the covers (a fact which betrays Mme Marcadé's superficial reading of its later contents); much could have been written on the irrationalist and intuitivist aspects of the Union of Youth—its chief theoretician, V. Markov (W. Matvei) is not even mentioned. But such failings aside, there are certain features of the book which are praiseworthy. Sensibly, Mme Marcadé emphasizes the influence of the Munich colony on the evolution of the Russian avant-garde, something which Camilla Gray tended to underrate. Among the other valuable aspects of the book are the section on the rise of P. M. Tretyakov and the formation of his collection, the data on the Moscow capitalist Maecenates, the detailed information on the illustrated Futurist booklets, and the long overdue attention given to Matiushin.

The illustrations are mainly from book reproductions, so the general quality is poor; this defect is quite uncalled for, since there are numerous originals in public and private hands in the West. In many cases dates and locations of works are not given, and occasionally dates are wrong. It is hard to agree that Malevich's *Black Circle* should be dated as early as 1913, despite Mme Marcadé's argument in the text; the Kliun graphic piece is obviously postrevolutionary; the Pougny design is clearly one of the Vitebsk series of 1919 and not 1912. Matters are not helped by the mistake in coordination between numbers of illustrations in the text and those in the index (see nos. 73–101).

In brief, if the book could be reissued without its factual errors, with its gaps filled by appropriate additions, and with a better selection of reproductions (including the jacket one, which is out of focus), then a serviceable reference manual—which does not exist yet on this subject in any language—would be the very welcome result.

JOHN E. BOWL  
University of Texas

IVAN MEŠTROVIĆ. By *Duško Kečkemet*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney: McGraw-Hill, [1971]. 39 pp. + 42 color plates and 168 black and white illustrations. \$17.95.

This monograph offers a full description of the life and work of the artist whom Rodin called "the greatest phenomenon among sculptors." In his commentary

Kečkemet traces Meštrović's life (1883–1962) from his childhood as a poor Croatian shepherd who taught himself to read, through his youth when he was influenced by the legendary motifs of his folk heroes, to his adult years of work in his own country, various cities of Europe, and finally the United States. In 1900 Meštrović went to Vienna to work and study, and it was there he joined the Secession. During visits to Paris he found himself strongly attracted to the Greek, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Egyptian art at the Louvre. His sculpture, however, remained original and his horizons broad. His magnificent plan for the Vidovdan Temple (*Vidovdanski hram*), and the statues he completed for it, brought him esteem and fame.

The events of the First World War influenced Meštrović deeply, as is clearly seen in the changed symbolism of his art. His major work of this period, the *Crucifixion*, was carved in wood, and in its form (tormented body) reminds one of Gothic sculpture. During the same period he created a series of wooden panels picturing scenes from the life of Christ. These panels suggest graphics rather than sculpture. Belonging in the same style, according to Kečkemet ("more engraved than carved"), are the bronze reliefs in the Račić family memorial chapel, which stands high above the bay at Cavtat (in Dubrovnik), a lyric song of death. Kečkemet is well acquainted with Meštrović's work, and the discussions he had with the artist concerning his creativity furnish a personal touch to the commentary.

Besides the masterpieces mentioned above, Meštrović completed numerous sculptures in wood, bronze, and stone, including representations of several famous persons from Yugoslavia, Europe, and America. During the final years of his life he produced many paintings reminiscent of the last phase of Michelangelo's creativity and the art of the baroque period.

One misses, in this otherwise excellent commentary, a more precise explanation of Meštrović's relation to architecture and to the basic materials he used.

VOJESLAV MOLÉ  
Eugene, Oregon

POZAPOMENUTÁ TVÁŘ BOŽENY NĚMCOVÉ: VZTAH BOŽENY NĚMCOVÉ K MYŠLENCE SLOVANSKÉ VZÁJEMNOSTI A KULTURÁM SLOVANSKÝCH NÁRODŮ. By *Zdeněk Urban*. Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica monographia 30. Prague: Universita Karlova, 1970. 144 pp. Kčs. 20, paper.

Božena Němcová (1820–62) is one of the foremost Czech writers, as her bibliography of 1962 spells out with eloquence. The present monograph approaches her work from the perspective of the Slavic *Wechselseitigkeit* preached by Jan Kollár, the prophet of Pan-Slavism. This idea had wide currency among the Czech patriots, and Němcová was no exception. She was not an intellectual, as Urban himself lets his readers guess between the lines, nor did she have the kind of education of which intellectuals are made. But she had a keen, receptive mind and knew how to make an aspect of Kollár's ideology come alive. A competent ethnographer and folklorist, she established contact in this field with other Slavs—Slovaks, Yugoslavs, Bulgarians, and Russians. She put into literary practice the brotherhood between Czechs and Slovaks, and she was the first who used her art to familiarize Czechs with the Slovak country and its people. This monograph gives an amply documented and well-analyzed account of those activities.