

(with copious examples) are assigned to stylistics. The lexicon is, of course, of great importance as a repository of external influences operating on the language through borrowings. In Polish, there is the Czech influence on religious terminology, the German influence on the vocabulary of the arts and crafts, the profound Latin influence on all intellectual discourse, and the Italian influence (the court of Bona Sforza) which left its permanent mark on the language of the fine arts, as well as others. The social, religious, and other forces are well-chronicled by Klemensiewicz, and justly so; for example, Poland had a long struggle with the influence of the Latin language in medieval times, during the Renaissance, and again during Saxon times when the spread of Latin within the nobility was abetted by the Jesuit school system. In his sections on stylistics, Klemensiewicz traces the changing language sensibilities through every literary period from the Renaissance to the avant-garde currents between the two World Wars.

But there is still more. Smaller sections are devoted to the development of the orthography, historical surveys of the evolution of Polish grammatical thought, dissemination of the written word (periodical publication, book production), and pertinent developments within the Polish educational system. Klemensiewicz also (unlike his predecessors—Brückner, Słoński, Lehr-Spławiński) has the merit of increasing both the depth and breadth of his narrative as he approaches the modern period, rather than the other way around. This is the kind of comprehensive survey that Vinogradov could have done for the Russian literary language, had he not chosen to limit himself to the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. The 137 black-and-white illustrations are largely reproductions of title pages and selected pages from manuscripts and printed books.

When one reviews a major work by a major scholar, there is little temptation to quibble, but something must be said about the format Klemensiewicz used. He provided analytical tables of contents, but there are no indexes of any kind. Furthermore, he chose to relegate a great deal of discussion (and a great many examples) to the footnotes. There are a total of 1,915 footnotes in the three volumes, spread over 221 pages of fine print. As a result, the overall size of the work is significantly reduced, but the reader's task is increased enormously, especially in the sections on stylistics where the footnotes contain the bulk of the illustrative citations.

LAWRENCE L. THOMAS

University of Wisconsin, Madison

THE TRADITION OF CONSTRUCTIVISM. Edited by *Stephen Bann*. The Documents of 20th-Century Art Series. New York: The Viking Press, 1974. xlix, 334 pp. \$16.50.

This volume joins the very useful series, *The Documents of 20th-Century Art*. Under an umbrella title, Stephen Bann has collected a varied selection of texts, some translated into English for the first time, which are thematically Constructivist.

Nearly two-thirds of the book is devoted to items which appeared between 1920 and 1930, and many of them relate to Soviet Russia, the birthplace of Constructivism. The book is not put forward as a history, nor does Bann, in his introduction or in brief expository passages interjected throughout the texts, attempt to unravel the problems of defining Constructivism, except by indicating what it was not. He has rationalized his approach by identifying his role as that

of a “collator of documents” and has purposely offered no precise view of the origin of the movement. When the texts are read as a connected narrative, however, a conflict begins to emerge as early as the 1920s among those who were seeking to establish an “Art International.” The texts give ample evidence of the disagreements between those in Western Europe who believed that a new form of art might produce a new form of society and those in Russia who were trying to produce a new form of art fully expressive of the new Soviet form of society.

As an enduring art form, Constructivism owes more to Gabo’s ideas than to the five artists whose 1921 exhibition, “ $5 \times 5 = 25$,” firmly established Constructivism as an art movement. These artists (Popova, Stepanova and Rodchenko working for Meyerhold; Vesnin and Exter for Tairov) pioneered Constructivism in the theater, and the omission of a specific text on Constructivist theater is surprising, especially since cinema and architecture are included.

The documentation of Tatlin’s shift in position—from the initiator who designed *Monument to the Third International* (which almost defines a Constructivist style even though, in 1919, the label had not yet been attached to an art movement) to the creator of the glider *Letatlin* (criticized as Khlebnikovian as early as 1932)—points to complex conflicts within the Soviet Union. The juxtaposition of texts by Gabo, Tatlin, Rodchenko, and Stepanova may imply an affinity between the artists which is unwarranted when their art works and writings are viewed in proper perspective.

This book is a very useful reference work (though, sadly lacking an index) and may serve to provoke a reexamination of the complexities and contradictions which today are all labeled “Constructivism.”

(I have been asked by Mr. Gabo to point out that part of the caption to the photo of his sculpture reproduced on page 5 is false. The “Head” was never in the Arensburg Collection; the recent reconstruction is in the Tate Gallery in London and is six feet high; the original [eighteen inches high] is in Mr. Gabo’s possession.)

SUSAN COMPTON
London

THE POET AS FILMMAKER: SELECTED WRITINGS. By *Alexander Dovzhenko*. Edited, translated, and with an introduction by *Marco Carynnyk*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press, 1973. lv, 323 pp. \$8.95.

In a speech at an international gathering, Charlie Chaplin once declared that in the cinema, the Slavs had given the world one artist—Alexander Dovzhenko. Ukrainians, attending the meeting as part of the Soviet delegation, reacted to the praise of their countryman not with pride and enthusiasm but with embarrassment. For at that time, Dovzhenko was out of favor in the USSR and his work was severely criticized, censored, and even removed from circulation.

Acclaimed as a genius abroad, Alexander Dovzhenko (1894–1956) lacked the support, understanding, and freedom to give vent to his creative genius. As a filmmaker he was able to complete only eight feature films. Among the best known are his early ones: *Zvenyhora* (1928), *Arsenal* (1929), and *Earth* (1930). Bound by the narrow confines of the Soviet view of art, Dovzhenko had to endure constant