

**The Spectacle of Russian Futurism:
The Emergence and Development of Russian Futurist Performance,
1910–1914
Vol. II**

Sarah Julie Dadswell

**Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies,
The University of Sheffield**

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

January 2005

Chapter 5

Transgression: The Futurist Challenge

The Futurists constituted a heterogeneous amalgam of artists whose identity transcended contemporary boundaries of artistic style, education, social and financial status and nationality. Artists from wealthy backgrounds such as Natal'ia Goncharova, the Burliuks and Aleksandra Ekster collaborated with and exhibited alongside impecunious and naïf artists, including Pavel Filonov, Velimir Khlebnikov and Niko Piroshmanashvili. Journalists and critics were often challenged by the heterogeneity of the movement, and only a select few (including Iakov Tugendkhol'd, Petr Iartsev and Aleksei Rostislavov) were able to analyse Futurist art and performance in a meaningful way, setting it within the context of Russian and European art and cultural history. The majority of journalists, however, interpreted Futurism from a purely melodramatic or sensationalist perspective, viewing the Futurists and their audience as a symptom of the declining standards of city and cultural life. This chapter explores much of this negative criticism in the context of Futurist attitudes toward the disenfranchised sections of and perceived negative elements in society, including questions of gender, hooliganism and fear, madness and laughter, and the lower classes. Again, in view of the scarcity of direct Futurist written or oral commentary on these issues, a visual analysis of selected Futurist paintings is used to explore the question of the Futurists' attitude toward the public and to argue the possible existence of an underlying socio-political agenda in their work.

Gender Relations

Gender is a factor which clearly distinguishes the development and reception of the Russian avant-garde from the European avant-garde, including Italian Futurism. As Griselda Pollock and others have observed, the general art historical perspective of early modernist movements is both elitist and masculine. 'As a result', writes

Pollock, 'any attempt to deal with artists in the early history of modernism who are women necessitates a deconstruction of the masculine myths of modernism'.¹ Unlike their European counterparts, many Russian women Futurists were acknowledged in their own time as major artists and influential figures within the realm of the Russian avant-garde. These women included renowned artists such as Natal'ia Goncharova, Elena Guro, Ol'ga Rozanova, Nadezhda Udal'tsova, Aleksandra Ekster and latterly Liubov' Popova and Ksenia Boguslavskaia, but also the well-connected gallery owners Nadezhda Dobychina and Klavdiia Mikhailova, and the fashionable socialite, A. D. Privalova, who participated in Futurist body painting and, according to Anthony Parton, 'followed all the latest trends'.² The acclaimed pre-Revolutionary Futurist women artists were typically educated, financially independent women from upper-class family backgrounds. Through their social status, education and artistic experimentation they successfully and collectively renegotiated gendered social and artistic boundaries and conventions. Undoubtedly their publicly acknowledged status within the Russian avant-garde encouraged the reportedly predominantly female audience to attend Futurist events, creating what Jane Sharp identifies as a 'newly "feminised" sphere of popular culture'.³ This argument accords with the relatively widely held view that mass culture is conventionally gendered feminine.

In socio-economic and cultural terms women of this period were generally considered to fall into one of four main categories. The lowest and largest category included the unskilled workers who worked in shops, factories, as maids and domestic servants, and in the service industry in restaurants, popular entertainment and so forth. Laura Engelstein's seminal work *The Keys to Happiness* has provided us with a wealth of information and analysis which reveals the often exploitative, prejudiced, squalid and unjust conditions which this category of typically young, single, illiterate, provincial women had to face in the cities.⁴ The second category refers to the next class of women who belonged to the *poluintelligentsiia*,

¹ Griselda Pollock, 'Modernity and the Spaces of Femininity', in *Modern Art and Modernism: A Critical Anthology*, edited by Francis Frascina and Charles Harrison with the assistance of Deirdre Paul (London: Harper and Row in association with the Open University, 1982), pp. 121–35 (p. 121).

² Anthony Parton, *Mikhail Larionov and the Russian Avant-Garde* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1993), p. 67.

³ Jane A. Sharp, 'The Russian Avant-Garde and Its Audience: Moscow, 1913', *Modernism/modernity: Politics / Gender / Judgement*, vol. 6: 3 (1999), 91–116 (pp. 104 and 95).

⁴ Laura Engelstein, *The Keys to Happiness: Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-De-Siècle Russia* (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1992).

intelligentsia and the *raznochintsy* (typically educated women who were daughters of the provincial middle classes, civil servants, doctors, lawyers, etc.). Such women often participated in metropolitan social and cultural life. They had an active interest in a broad range of the arts. In view of ticket prices, location and openness to new artistic trends, it is most likely that the majority of women who attended Futurist events belonged to this category. The third category comprises the wealthier bourgeoisie and merchants' wives who had in many ways purchased their social status through their husbands' finances. Highly aware of etiquette and decorum which could one day grant them acceptance to the next social layer, there is little evidence to suggest that women of this third category would have risked their reputations by attending Futurist performances before late 1913, when the Futurists had gained a wider popularity. The final category of women came from the elite and aristocratic classes. Once again, it is very unlikely that such women would have attended any Futurist performances, although there is a possibility that a degree of interaction took place within the private circles of salons and literary and artistic clubs (see fig. 185 for a humorous slant on this notion).

Women constituted a very visible part of the Futurist audience. As I have noted in previous chapters, Il'ia Zdanevich was keen to emphasise the prominent and physical role which women had played during the *Mishen'* debate in Moscow, 1913. Kruchenykh referred to the presence of female students at the *Vecher rechetvortsev* [Evening of Speech-Creators].⁵ Livshits constantly referred to the often intimate relationship between females in the audience and male Futurists, and also recorded instances where the Futurists organised events for a female student audience or as a benefit for their courses.⁶ One journalist reported how a 'young lady' [*baryshnia*] sat on the stage during David Burluk's lecture in the Tenishevskii Hall, 3 November 1913,⁷ while over the following two days, Chukovskii read another lecture *O futurizme* [Concerning Futurism] at the Women's Medical Institute and the Psychoneurological Institute.⁸ In her research into the Futurist public, Jane Sharp

⁵ Alexei Kruchenykh, *Our Arrival: From the History of Russian Futurism*, edited by Vasily Rakitin and Andrei Sarabianov (Moscow: RA, 1995), p. 57.

⁶ Benedikt Livshits, *The One and a Half-Eyed Archer*, edited by John E. Bowlit (Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1977), pp. 167–69.

⁷ E. Adamov, 'Na Burliuke', *Den'*, No. 299, 4 November 1913, p. 2.

⁸ Andrei V. Krusanov, *Russkii Avangard: 1907–1932 (Istoricheskii obzor) v trekh tomakh*, 3 vols, vol. 1, *Boevoe desiatiletie* (St. Petersburg: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 1996), p. 136.

draws attention to the issue of increased female engagement in the post-1905 metropolitan cultural environment and highlights the dominant participatory role which women played during Futurist events, including art exhibitions and public debates:

[I]t was the women from the provincial intelligentsia, the *damy iz mysl'ashchikh*, who especially attracted attention, dominating the lecture halls of 1913 in greater numbers than the young men, often overwhelming the invisible 'middle bourgeoisie' who so often seem to constitute the "public" that is disparaged in avant-garde manifestoes or parodied in the contemporary press.⁹

Evidence from contemporary reviews and social commentaries supports Sharp's claim that Futurist debates (to which I would add all Futurist events) were predominantly attended by women.¹⁰ Sharp is justified in stating that '[w]omen were probably the largest disenfranchised group among the urban population', so that 'artistic debates and other cultural events were among the more visible arenas in which women could express their views as a collective group'.¹¹ By contrast, Mark Steinberg notes how the 'world of [working]clubs and organized self-education was overwhelmingly male' and that 'few women attended the many activities of these organizations except the dances'. He explains how '[t]he scarcity of women was due partly to the lower levels of female literacy and interest in self-education but also to deliberate exclusion – or at least women's justified sense that they were less welcome.'¹² Sites of Futurist performance, therefore, afforded women a rare public arena in which their presence, their voice, and according to Zdanevich, their fist could be felt and then recorded in the press. Most importantly, in terms of the evaluation of the transition of social conventions 'women managed to achieve a type

⁹ Sharp, 'The Russian Avant-Garde', p. 95. This claim is supported by a citation from Ser Referi, 'O lektsiakh i disputakh', *Almanakh verbnogo bazara: Moskovskii sezon* (Moscow: A. A. Levenson, 1913), pp. 13–15, cited in Sharp, footnote 14. In addition to 'the strong presence of the provincial female student population [...], he writes, 'It is difficult to identify the rest of the public: there are not that many young men at the lectures. Neither are there many "middle class" people, the complacent bourgeois, the well-intentioned man. It is the woman of the intelligentsia who attends in significant numbers.'

¹⁰ Sharp, 'The Russian Avant-Garde', p. 104. See also the press coverage of all major Futurist events in Krusanov, *Russkii avangard*.

¹¹ Sharp, 'The Russian Avant-Garde', p. 104. The disenfranchisement of women is made explicit in Engelstein's work, and through sociological information in James H. Bater, *St. Petersburg: Industrialisation and Change* (London: Edward Arnold, 1976).

¹² Mark D. Steinberg, *Proletarian Imagination: Self, Modernity and the Sacred in Russia, 1910–1925* (Ithaca, New York and London: Cornell UP, 2002), p. 43. It is also quite possible that urban women had less leisure time than the male urban population.

of representation and accountability from the artist that was denied them elsewhere' through their repeated presence, heckling and occasional physical contribution to the participatory nature of the performances.¹³

For many years, the conservative guardians of public morals in this male-dominated society had preached on the issues of female virtues and the negative effects which exposure to the 'wrong' sort of art might have on an impressionable female mind.¹⁴ Contemporary critics were equally dismissive of this 'newly "feminised" sphere'.¹⁵ The engagement of women in the Futurist movement, both as artist and audience, flew in the face of the contemporary discourse regarding self-betterment and the increasing proliferation of 'fallen women'.¹⁶ However, public opinion was not static, and as Futurist popularity increased in the wake of the Luna Park performances of December 1913, one cartoon, figure 185, even suggested (somewhat tongue-in-cheek) that Futurist female supporters, 'Dearest sisters! Street-girls and hooligans [...] be allowed to enter prestigious social salons. But the audience retorts that it is more fun at the *burlukan'ie* [Burluk-style event].

As Natal'ia Goncharova was probably the best known and most respected Russian woman avant-garde artist in the period 1910–14, let us consider her impact on the development and reception of Russian Futurism. Goncharova was at the very heart of Russian Futurism from its early impressionist roots (she exhibited in the 1906 *Salon D'Automne* exhibition), through the first recognisable exhibitions of Russian avant-garde art (a whole room was devoted to her work in the 1909–10 *Zolotoe runo* exhibition, Moscow),¹⁷ and her presence was noted at innumerable Futurist performances and events. For many critics, Goncharova was an enigma. She embodied the judgement of the two men expressed in the cartoon of figure 186: the social demise of a young girl from a respectable family who entered Art School and

¹³ Sharp, 'The Russian Avant-Garde', p. 104.

¹⁴ One caricature in the newspaper *Iskra*, 1860, depicts two well-dressed young ladies at an art exhibition. One is gazing at a painting of a female nude, the other turns away from the painting and exclaims 'Let's go Sophie. We shouldn't be looking at such indecent paintings. If Mama were to find out, she would be angry.' See Russian Visual Arts, <http://hri.shef.ac.uk/rva/images/iskra1860/292a.html>, accessed 10.01.05.

¹⁵ Sharp, 'The Russian Avant-Garde', p. 104.

¹⁶ See, for example, Steinberg, pp. 78–79 and 85, and Engelstein, 'From Avant-Garde To Boulevard: Literary Sex', *The Keys to Happiness*, pp. 359–420.

¹⁷ Mary Chamot, *Goncharova: Stage Designs and Paintings* (London: Oresko Books, 1979), p. 42.

became independent-minded. Her personal conduct, theoretical writings and artistic success soon earned her a reputation as a motivating force within Futurism who was not afraid to speak her mind. In January 1914 the newspaper *Moskovskaia gazeta* ran an article on the theme of ‘the eternal feminine’ under the title ‘From Turgenev to Tango’. As Elena Basner notes, ‘Goncharova’s response is distinguished by its non-banality’. Goncharova’s article was a rebuke to conservative exhortations that women should remain in the past, in traditional gender roles, and an encouragement to the striving woman of modern times:

If men still dream of Turgenevesque young ladies, then they should completely give it up. All the charm of these young girls comes from their unconscious simplicity, whereas in modern life, simplicity can only be conscious. In this case a conscious non-simplicity is preferable. Life as it is unfolding nowadays must develop someone who is fiercely rapacious and [at the same time] not rapacious enough, who will then easily turn into one who is simply rapacious, not very appealing. [...] The very sincere dreams of Turgenevesque women are directed more by feelings than by real life, they have created a complete fiasco, and in our time, as a reaction, one has a very pleasant decadent type of person with an element of insincere sentimentality and genuine mawkishness. [...] Moreover, these same decadent Turgenevesque women only exist within a very narrow circle of people – nobles, and as time wends its way, these same decadent girls of our era will only exist in a small aestheticizing circle and will not have any influence on the general course of life in which workers of all social categories will participate.¹⁸

Goncharova put her principles into practice and, according to Sharp, hosted a group of workers in her studio in 1913. The fact that the *Moskovskaia kopeika*, a top-selling daily of the Penny Press, reviewed avant-garde exhibitions, including *Mishen*, also demonstrates the Futurist potential to reach a broad audience within the lower classes.¹⁹

The greatest justification of Goncharova as an icon of Futurism was her phenomenal work-rate and the size of her oeuvre, which was surely incomparable to that of any other Futurist (despite David Burliuk’s claim of a personal output of 10,000

¹⁸ Translated from the French translation of the original Russian, ‘ “De Tourgeniev au tango. Essai d’enquête sur ‘l’éternel féminin’ ”’, *Moskovskaia gazeta*, No. 297, 27 January 1914. Cited in Elena Basner, ‘La fortune critique de Nathalie Gontcharova dans la presse russe des années 1909–14’, in *Natalie Gontcharova, Michel Larionov*, edited by Nicole Ouvrard, with the assistance of Martine Reyss (Paris: Editions du Centre Pompidou, 1995), pp. 188–94 (193–94).

¹⁹ Sharp, ‘The Russian Avant-Garde’, p. 94.

paintings between 1910 and 1918: see Chapter 1). Significantly, Larionov, the male figurehead of *Oslinyi khvost*, was always keen to market Goncharova's work, including her solo exhibition of October 1913 which featured 761 works from 1900 to 1913.²⁰ As we have seen in Chapter 4, Goncharova's exhibition attracted a wealth of analytical art criticism. The volume of her work created such an overwhelming experience for the viewer that even Aleksandr Benua felt obliged to adopt a new position and declare her rightful place among the canon of master painters.²¹ Interestingly, other critics, such as F. Mukhortov, recognised that Goncharova was interested in provocation.

In general, however, Goncharova remained a problematic figure for the contemporary press. On the one hand, Goncharova's output was as prolific as it was contentious. Her social status, association with *Mir iskusstva* and use of strong colour, coupled with her folkloric and Primitivist genre scenes, endeared her to more conservative critics. Many critics admired her for her instinctive understanding of the colour and decorative motifs derived from provincial arts and crafts and expressed in her religious and Primitivist paintings (see fig. 187).²² Others felt that she degraded herself with scandalous behaviour (see fig. 188) and too close a relationship with the 'barbarians' of the avant-garde. The young *Apollon* critic, Iakov Tugendkhol'd, wrote the following in response to Goncharova's solo exhibition:

Such is Goncharova's talent: the receptivity of a woman; the expressiveness of a man; the broad sweep of a Russian; and an intellectual's tendency to break down into small details.²³

²⁰ See, for example, commentary by F. M. [Mukhortov], 'Vystavka N. Goncharovoi. 1913', *Moskovskaia gazeta*, No. 276, 30 September 1913, p. 6, and 'Iz pisem N. V. Denisova (syna khudozhnika V. I. Denisova) – V. V. Voinovu', 10 October [1913], GRM f: 149; d: 21; ll: 5–6; both documents are cited in *Nataliia Goncharova: Gody v Rossii*, edited by E. B. Basner et al. (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Russkii muzei, 2002), pp. 296–98. The exact number of works featured at Goncharova's Moscow solo exhibition vary in different versions of the exhibition catalogues, from 761 to 769.

²¹ Collected commentary from Ia. A. Tugendkhol'd, A. N. Benua, Rosstsi [A. M. Efros], F. M. [Mukhortov], Iu. Bocharov, N. V. Denisov, and A. Rostislavov can be found, cited in full in Russian, in *Nataliia Goncharova*, edited by E. B. Basner et al., pp. 291–300.

²² See for example excerpt from a letter from N. V. Denisov (son of the artist V. I. Denisov) to V. V. Voinov, dated 10 October [1913], and A. Rostislavov, 'Sverkaiushchii talant (Vystavka kartin N. S. Goncharovoi). 1914', *Rech'*, No. 80, 23 March 1914, p. 5. Both articles are cited in *Nataliia Goncharova*, edited by E. B. Basner et al., pp. 297–99.

²³ 'Таков талант Гончаровой, по-женски восприимчивый, по-мужски – выразительный, по-русски – размашистый и по-интеллигентски – разменивающийся на мелочи.', Ia. T-d

Contrary to the stereotypical interpretation of a ‘feminised sphere’ as inferior, Goncharova exuded a sense of authority and control in her conduct, theoretical writings and artistic endeavours and represented a positive role model for Futurism’s female followers. She challenged conventional views of femininity in a diverse range of contexts. In February 1912, Goncharova appeared, unannounced, dressed in black, at the Futurist debate in the Polytechnical Museum, Moscow. According to one critic, the rowdy audience drowned out the official speakers. Goncharova declared that henceforth all of her art would be associated with Oslinyi khvost alone. The audience burst out laughing, but Goncharova is said to have silenced them with the following declaration: ‘Don’t laugh at the name. There will be an exhibition, laugh then, but never laugh at the name.’ The same critic wrote, ‘there was something in her tone that turned the public serious’.²⁴ Livshits confirms Goncharova’s dramatic appearance and commanding bearing. Goncharova then explained the aesthetic position of Oslinyi khvost in relation to Bubnovyi valet. When she had finished, Larionov stepped up to take her place but the noise from the crowd increased, insults, laughter and whistling filled the auditorium and Larionov, who was unable to exert the same degree of control on the crowd as Goncharova, was forced to leave the stage.²⁵ Goncharova reinforced her aesthetic position through a letter which expanded upon her declaration at the debate, and was later published in *Protiv techeniia*.²⁶

Other masculine strategies which Goncharova adopted and used to her advantage included publicly offering to take Larionov’s place in a duel,²⁷ dressing in masculine

[Tugendkhol’d], *Apollon*, No 8, 1913, pp. 71–73. Cited in *Nataliia Goncharova*, edited by Basner et al., pp. 292–93.

²⁴ B. Sh[uisikii], ‘Moskva, Khudozhestvennyi Disput’, *Protiv techeniia*, No. 22, 18 February 1912, p. 3.

²⁵ See B. Sh[uisikii], ‘Moskva, Khudozhestvennyi Disput’, and Livshits, *The One and a Half-Eyed Archer*, pp. 82–84.

²⁶ N. Goncharova, ‘Pis’mo N. Goncharovoi’ (Letter to the editor), *Protiv techeniia*, No. 23, 3 March 1912, p. 3. Goncharova was not the only female who used the press as a medium for public debate. In response to Benua’s scathing attack on David Burluk and other Futurist ‘ignorant violators of art’ (‘Kubizm ili kukushizm?’, *Rech’*, 23 November 1912), Ol’ga Rozanova wrote an essay entitled ‘The Bases of the New Creativity and Reasons Why It Is Misunderstood’ [Osnovy novogo tvorchestva i prichiny ego neponimaniia], *Soiuz molodezhi*, St. Petersburg, No. 3, 1913, pp. 14–22. Cited by John Bowlt in Livshits, *The One And A Half-Eyed Archer*, p. 94, footnote 14.

²⁷ Sar., ‘V “Rozovom fonare”’, *Stolichnaia molva*, No. 333, 21 October 1913, p. 6. ‘Goncharova then appears on the stage, “I gave this man a slap (gesturing toward Shreider). And I challenge him to a duel. I will take Larionov’s place!”’ An anonymous journalist explained that Shreider made the

clothing (see fig. 189) and challenging gender boundaries by encouraging the Futurist fashion manifestoes and participating in body-painting. Such actions invited harsh criticism, humorous caricatures (fig. 190) and, most of all good marketing. One critic seemed particularly shocked that Goncharova, an intelligent woman, could carry out a vengeful act against a man, by painting his face (see fig. 9).²⁸ The same deep-seated fear that women were gaining the upper hand and were subjecting male models to acts of female vengeance had been expressed by the critic Breshko-Breshkovskii in April 1911 against the artist Anna Zel'manova:

[I]n 'Le Fauconnier style' she has painted the *Portrait* of a young man. It turns out that this is a real person for his initials are noted. But Ms Zel'manova has taken fierce revenge on the young man who so trustfully, suspecting no treachery, posed for her.²⁹

These comments by Breshko-Breshkovskii and Korch demonstrate the challenge which women Futurist artists presented to the specifically gendered set of art practices which had been established in Russia, through the system of Academies and the politics of provision of funding and exhibition space, and which limited women's role within art. Most importantly, many of the women artists were both talented and financially independent. Secondly, gallery owners such as Dobychina and Mikhailova played a pivotal role in promoting and selling all avant-garde art. Thirdly, what distinguishes Russian Futurist art of this period from the European avant-garde is the fact that women Futurist artists depicted urban spaces traditionally gendered masculine; a reversal of the general European modernist practice in which men artists would frequently depict women at work in the countryside, or in places of entertainment, as waitresses, dancers, or prostitutes.

mistake of referring to Goncharova as Mrs. Larionov. Goncharova was clearly offended and slapped him across the face. Schreider then demanded satisfaction from Larionov. See Anon, 'Ochevidtsy o skandale (Iz besed)', *Rannee utro*, No. 243, 22 October 1913, p. 6.

²⁸ E. Korch [sic], 'Vystavka N. S. Goncharovoi', *Golos Moskvy*, No. 225, 1 October 1913, p. 6. Cited in Basner, 'La fortune critique de Nathalie Gontcharova', p. 188.

²⁹ N. Breshko-Breshkovskii, 'Vystavka soiuz molodezhi', *Birzhevye vedomosti*, No. 12268, 13 April 1911, p. 6. Cited in Jeremy Howard, *The Union of Youth: An Artists' Society of the Russian Avant-Garde* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1992), p. 89. Anna Zel'manova was married to the writer Valerian Chudovskii. She contributed to *Soiuz molodezhi* exhibitions and according to Livshits 'was a woman of uncommon beauty' and a 'born salon hostess'. See Livshits, *The One and a Half-Eyed Archer*, p. 223. If this were true, then, one imagines that Breshko-Breshkovskii would have felt more comfortable had Zel'manova acted as the model, rather than the artist of the painting.

Goncharova, for example, not only painted religious and provincial scenes such as *Kosari* [Scythers] (1911 – fig. 192), which depicted three men striding along with their scythes across their shoulders, or *Sbor plodov* [Fruit Picking] tetraptych (1908), depicting women dressed in colourful provincial attire harvesting apples, but she also painted scenes such as *P'iushchie vino* [Wine Drinkers] (1911, fig. 191) and *Kuril'shchik (stil' podnosnoi zhivopisi)* [Smoker (in the style of tray-painting)] (1911, fig. 193). The final two paintings depict men in masculine settings and are both characterised by Goncharova's monumental style. *P'iushchie vino* depicts five men seated around a long table with white tablecloth, hams, possibly fruit and enormous flagons of wine. Goncharova used crude brushstrokes and a palette of primary colours to bring the painting to life. The red curtain in the background emphasises the theatrical setting and attracts the spectator's eye. These men are clearly figures to be viewed, in this case by the female gaze. However, the subjects avoid the eye of the viewer (with the possible exception of the man to the far right) and continue in their animated conversation, moving within the constraints of their heavy golden outline. Perhaps because Goncharova used the same artistic style to paint religious scenes during this period, *P'iushchie vino* seems to suggest a reference to *The Last Supper*, a truly masculine environment which was hidden from the female gaze.

The subject of Goncharova's *Kuril'shchik* fills the picture space of the canvas (100 x 81 cm). Again the female gaze has entered into masculine territory. The man sits at a table with white tablecloth, probably in a café or a bar, with a pipe in his heavy sculptured hand. Like the subjects of *P'iushchie vino* the man has been sculpted from geometric shapes, although the pale tones and smooth surfaces suggest a likeness to stone, rather than wood. Crude brushstrokes and strong lines and contrasting shades produce a lasting impression on the viewer. Unlike, say, Edgar Degas's depiction of women in bars including *L'Absinthe* (1876) or *Les Femmes devant un café, le soir* (1877), where the women are being spied upon and are not aware of the artist-spectator, Goncharova's male subject challenges the artist-viewer with large dark eyes and a direct stare. Goncharova is fully engaged with her subject. Her presence is felt in the painting, not as flaneuse but as the absent collocutor or 'Other'.

Ol'ga Rozanova's *V kafe* [In a Café] (fig. 194) also takes us into the perceived masculine territory of a café. The viewer is presented with a Matisse-like decorative backdrop in bright, cheerful colours and the two-dimensional figures of a man and woman at a green table. The figures are painted with fluid curves and crude brushstrokes reminiscent of children's drawings. Rozanova's interpretation of the café scene debunks the myth of the location as a predominantly masculine territory. Although the depicted woman with red hair, red scarf, and elaborate hat is likely to be a prostitute, Rozanova has painted her as a strong, happy, upright figure with a smile on her face and a glass in her hand, comfortable in her surroundings. The bowl of fruit and plate of food which separates the couple symbolises the many 'fruits' on offer at this establishment. The man, however, seems utterly lost, defenceless in his shirtsleeves and waistcoat. He sits with his head in his hands, shielding his face from the viewer. This is not Larionov's self-assured 'Provincial Dandy' nor the male customer from *Kel'nersha* but a display of male impotence in the presence of female confidence.

Through paintings such as these, women Futurist artists opened the door of traditional male-gendered public spaces to the female gaze. In the nineteenth century, women in metropolitan Europe were often restricted to the private domestic sphere, and men, generally, populated the public sphere. As Pollock notes, '[a]s both ideal and social structure, the mapping of the separation of the sphere for women and men on to the division of public and private was powerfully operative in the construction of a specifically bourgeois way of life [...]'. She notes how it was both unfamiliar and morally dangerous for bourgeois women to mingle with the crowds in town and 'it had been argued that to maintain one's respectability, closely identified with femininity, meant *not* exposing oneself in public.' In essence, a single woman seen in public on her own, especially in the evening, would often be taken for a prostitute.³⁰ For the first time, St. Petersburg and Moscow were populated by a large number of single, working females. Whilst a gender imbalance remained in Russian metropolitan life and culture, many perceived social and artistic boundaries and encouraged their female audience to do the same. Futurist women artists challenged

³⁰ Pollock, 'Modernity and the Spaces of Femininity', p. 130.

their subject matter through artistic technique, personal conduct and influence within the Russian avant-garde.

In 1914 Goncharova produced her series of *Misticheskie obrazy voiny* [Mystical Images of War] in which she appropriated the ultimate masculine nationalistic artistic role, the depiction of Russia at war. The images were a response to the horrors of the First World War. Whilst the Italian Futurists celebrated the war as the definitive expression of the power and dynamism of the machine, the Russian Futurists suffered personal loss through active service. Basing the images on traditional Russian icon and *lubok* practices, Goncharova successfully integrates Futurist elements of dynamism with a nationalistic sentiment of Mother Russia as protector and fighter. The powerful impression of the fourteen lithographs confirms Goncharova's enormous talent as a graphic artist. The choice of subject matter reflects her awareness of the power of technology in the modern world, but this dynamism is balanced with iconic nationalist symbols which are drawn in a Neo-Primitivist manner where strong lines complement the contrast of black and white. Thus guardian angels intermingle with aeroplanes (fig. 195a), lines of flying angels accompany marching soldiers (fig. 195b), soldiers are greeted with an apparition of the Madonna and Child (fig. 195c), and the double-headed white Imperial Eagle kills the German black eagle (fig. 195d).

Contemporary newspaper articles and caricatures (see fig. 126) record the many ways in which 'young ladies and hysterical women' became actively involved in the Futurist fashion of body painting.³¹ Interviews by Larionov also describe the ways in which anyone, but particularly women, it would seem, could be a 'walking' or 'mobile' object of Futurist art. The whole concept of the Futurists joining art with life in this manner fed the prevailing contemporary culture of fear for moral standards and particularly female virtues. The public exposition of body-painting was carried out in defiance of this dominant discourse. On 2 April 1913, for example, a public lecture took place entitled "The Keys to Happiness" by A. Verbitskaia and the Contemporary Ethics of Feminism'.³² This lecture included 37

³¹ Anon, ' "Raskrashennye Moskvichi" ', *Moskovskaia gazeta*, No. 274, 16 September 1913, p. 5.

³² TsGIA f: 569: op: 13; d: 1032, ll: 133–34. This is advertising material which was cleared by the *gradonachal'nik*.

separate points for discussion, from ‘Evolution and anarchy in the sphere of ethics and ugly forms’, ‘Egoism as the basis of dissonance in life’, ‘The reason for the offensive [*opolchenie*] against Verbitskaia and the struggle with the feminist movement’, to ‘The beauty of good and the beauty of evil’. Susan Bennett’s explanation of the concept of ‘frame-breaking’ may further explain the horror which was felt by many critics towards acts which could only be interpreted as overtly sexual, and therefore degrading. Unlike reading, which ‘is the most private of pleasures’, or the cinema, where ‘the product of consumption remains at a distance’, in performance ‘little overt sexuality is permitted on stage because the audience knows that what happens to the character also happens to the actor.’³³ So when the Russian public exploited this rupture of traditional proxemic relations and painted itself or ‘offered up their chests to Larionov’ as one critic put it, the audience essentially became performers in the most active, potentially provocative and liberating manner; liberating because the body-painting constituted an explicitly public, almost carnivalesque act, rather than a fetishistic practice carried out in private. Many critics, however, considered those who practised body-painting to have severely degraded themselves. For them, the public’s association with Futurism represented the negative connotations of prostitution, debauchery, hooliganism, fear of breaking away from societal cultural norms.

Hooliganism and Fear

As identified in Chapter 4, critics had been quick to couple Futurism and its followers with pejoratives. In the sensitive political era which proceeded from the events of 1905, the Futurists and their supporters were frequently perceived in the press as rebels, debauched anarchists, and barbarians who represented the lower depths of civilised society and the fear of the middle classes. Jeremy Howard writes that by the fourth exhibition of *Soiuz molodezhi* in January 1912, ‘[m]ost [critics] took the view that the exhibits were united by their dullness and immaturity,

³³ Susan Bennett, *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 152–54. Some of the quotation cited above includes Bennett’s own citation of the work of Richard Schechner.

interpreting coarseness as an attempt to shock that was already outdated'.³⁴ However, a public lecture by Dr. E. P Radin, scheduled for 21 January 1914, was entitled 'Futurism and Madness' and indicates the impact that Futurism had exerted on metropolitan society in the intervening years (fig. 196).³⁵ As Futurism reached its peak in the 1913–14 season and drew audiences from a wide cross-section of the public, many critics were fearful of its far-reaching, negative influence.

Hooliganism and theatre had enjoyed a long association in the spectacle of Russian carnival. However, the perception of Futurist-related theatrical hooliganism also had its precursors in the Tsarist institution of the Imperial theatres. Murray Frame's description of the Imperial theatres at the turn of the century cites the theatres as positive targets for demonstrations. According to Frame, these symbols of Tsarist power provided the perfect conservative targeted audience and a relatively safe environment, which was 'safer than parading through the streets, especially after Bloody Sunday'. In addition, Frame notes how 'there always remained the possibility of spontaneous, unplanned demonstrations in the auditoria, particularly during moments of high drama both on stage and in the streets', a practice which contributed to the later audience participation during Futurist performance.³⁶ In accordance with government initiatives to monitor and quell any potential subversive elements in society, the secret police, the Okhrana, had always maintained a presence in the theatres. 'Most of the seats reserved for the Okhrana were located in the upper reaches of the theatre where radicals were more likely to be, that is, in the cheaper, non-subscription seats frequented by students, some workers, and members of the intelligentsia' (see fig. 197).³⁷ In this highly segregated public arena, each section was clearly on display to its 'Other'. In another move which pre-empted later Futurist strategies, representatives of students of the Conservatory presented a socialist manifesto to the authorities of the Mariinskii Imperial Theatre. When the demands of this manifesto were dismissed, the students created a full-scale scandal in the auditorium nine days later. After the second act, someone shouted 'Down with the autocracy!' According to Frame, this caused an uproar and chaos ensued. Fear of

³⁴ Howard, *The Union of Youth*, p. 104 and footnote 2.

³⁵ TsGIA, f: 569; op: 13; d: 1030; l: 247. Incidentally, the tickets for this lecture were not cheap at 50 kopeks to 5 rubles, suggesting that the lecture was aimed at a broad middle-class audience.

³⁶ Frame, p. 122.

³⁷ Frame, p. 123.

a violent demonstration caused panic, the audience tried to exit, officers drew their sabres, and then bombs and grenades were spotted in the stalls and fighting broke out.³⁸

Dissent in the theatrical environment was not the territory of students alone. Outraged by the offensive decision to open the Imperial theatres on the evening of Bloody Sunday, 1905, the writers Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, Zinaida Gippius and Dmitrii Filosofov approached Petr Gnedich, artistic director of the Aleksandrinskii Theatre, on behalf of their Religious Philosophical Society. Their request to stop the performance was refused. However, heckling and shouting from the auditorium had the desired effect. V. A. Teliakovskii, Director of the Imperial Theatres, 'decided it was impossible for the performance to continue and money was refunded to patrons'.³⁹

Expressions of political and personal opinion characterised the reception of performances in all theatres. Anthony Swift records the impact of current affairs on theatre performances: 'With applause, whistles, hissing, and booing, audiences sanctioned or condemned the texts that were being performed, turning theatre auditoriums into symbolic parliaments and sometimes provoking the police to intervene.'⁴⁰

These few examples demonstrate the theatrical and social context in which Futurism emerged. In order to appreciate why Futurist performance was so appealing to a relatively broad section of society and why it gained such rapid popularity, it is essential that we understand the considerable and recent theatrical heritage which identified theatres as urban spaces of personal expression, potential political and social subversion, and public debate.

The problem of hooliganism was debated through the press and public lectures and was chiefly associated with the peasantry, the flood of urban migrants and the young. The cartoon (fig. 200) 'In the Country' illustrates the division between the peasantry

³⁸ Frame, pp. 126–27.

³⁹ Frame, pp. 124–25.

⁴⁰ Anthony E. Swift, *Popular Theater and Society in Tsarist Russia* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2002), p. 95 and footnote 21.

and the governmental representatives. It portrays the ignorant masses of the bourgeois dark fear. The caption reads, ‘They drink vodka, they demand schools, they [even] reject automo-bi-les! What sort of culture is accessible to these hooligans? Whipping, whipping, and whipping!!’⁴¹ The Futurists were soon labelled as hooligans as a result of their seemingly uncouth art and behaviour and their appeal to the youth. The Futurists had encouraged this public opinion from the outset by adopting the insignia of the Jack of Diamonds playing card, which had associations with prisoners and denoted an outcast or low-life.⁴² The caricatures of David Burluk and Larionov in figures 6, 14 and 15 interpret both men as militant thugs. The artist has coloured his depiction of Larionov at the *Mishen*’ debate, March 1913, with piggish character. Another article suggested that when the audiences were bored with the Futurist aesthetic in question, Larionov ignited the crowd with his weightiest argument, in other words, his fist.⁴³ The humorous cartoons of figures 121, 198 and 199 align the Futurists with the lowest elements of society. Figure 121 shows a snub-nosed socially upwardly-mobile peasant in his straw hat and checked jacket, who declares his feeling of status since he became a Futurist. The caption of the cartoon of figure 198 from the conservative paper, *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, suggests that the concept of Futurism was borrowed from the lower classes. However the two rough-looking men state that although the Futurists may be imitating them, it does not suit them. Figure 199 also shows two men, dressed in rags and one in ladies footwear. They are leaning against an advertising poster for a Futurist debate. The caption reads as follows

-Эй, Митюха, бросай, брат, стрелять,-
 поступим лучше в футуристы:
 говорят — прибыльнее!
 -Так-то так, да больно уже оно зазорно!

Hey, Mitia, mate, give up that begging,
 We’d be better off with the Futurists:
 They say it’s more profitable!
 -That’s as may be, but that would really
 be hitting rock bottom!

Joan Neuberger has written at length on the parallels between Futurism and hooliganism. According to Neuberger:

⁴¹ Anon, ‘V derevne’, *Stolichnaia Molva*, No. 333, 21 October 1913, p. 4.

⁴² See G. G. Pospelov, *Bubnovyi Valet: Primitiv i gorodskoi fol’klor v moskovskoi zhivopisi 1910-kh godov* (Moscow: Sovetskii khudozhnik, 1990), pp. 99–102, and Chapter 2.

⁴³ N., ‘Khudozhestvennye vesti. Disput “Mishen”’, *Utro Rossii*, No. 70, 24 March 1913, p. 5.

[t]he hooligans' and Futurists' outrageous behaviour attracted attention specifically because their exhibitions were *public* phenomena and because they used public space in new ways. They adopted street theatre as a medium because they understood (though again not necessarily consciously) the ways in which public performance (like style, clothing, and manners) defined people and identified them with a set of values.⁴⁴

The newspaper *Peterburgskaia gazeta* 'told the story of a drunkard who broke a shop window with his walking stick and when taken to the police station and charged, pleaded that he was a futurist! The report concluded that it didn't much matter whether or not he really was a futurist because "Hooligans and futurists are one and the same!"'.⁴⁵ Hooliganism was witnessed in the destructive force of Russian and European Futurism, which, according to the critic Suddukei, destroyed everything [in artistic terms] but did not offer anything in return to fill the gap.⁴⁶ Richard Stites highlighted the shared 'theatricality and socially iconoclastic energies' of street hooliganism and [Russian] 'avant-garde provocations in café performances'.⁴⁷ The most theatrical of Russian Futurist icons was surely Vladimir Maiakovskii, the archetypal young rebellious provincial who had come to Moscow and whose antics seem to cause controversy and scandal wherever he went. Sharp writes, 'he was a dangerous parody of the youthful provincial viewers who were his public – and he was their idol, their role model'.⁴⁸ Whilst the spread of hooliganism was perceived in the Futurist supporters who participated in face and body painting, one feuilletonist suggested a darker side, that Rasputin himself was at work among the art of Bubnovyi valet and Oslinyi khvost.⁴⁹

The most notorious act of hooliganism, which some blamed on the influence of Futurism, occurred when a man called Abram Balashev slashed Il'ia Repin's painting, *Ivan the Terrible and His Son Ivan*, at the Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow. The event attracted a plethora of artistic and social commentary. The newspapers

⁴⁴ Joan Neuberger, 'Culture Besieged: Hooliganism and Futurism', in *Cultures in Flux*, edited by Frank and Steinberg, pp. 185–203 (p. 186).

⁴⁵ 'Prodelka futurista', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, No. 41, 11 February 1914, p. 5, cited in Parton, p. 74.

⁴⁶ Saddukei, '“Budushchniki”', *Moskovskaia gazeta*, No. 243, 25 March 1913, p. 3.

⁴⁷ Richard Stites, *Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society Since 1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992), p. 10.

⁴⁸ Sharp, 'The Russian Avant-Garde', p. 108.

⁴⁹ An eight-verse rhyme by Ara which mocked Bubnovyi valet and Oslinyi khvost was published as 'Oslinokhvestie' in *Golos Moskvy*, 15 February 1912. Cited in full in Evgenii Kovtun, *Mikhail Larionov, 1881–1964* (St. Petersburg: Avrora, 1998), pp. 55–56.

featured commentaries on the event, Repin's reactions, photographs of the slashed painting with Repin standing by, and psychiatric analyses of the perpetrator. One interview with Repin, however, ignited a fervent and hard-fought debate. Repin stated, categorically, that his painting was slashed as a result of the influence of Burliuk and his new art, Burliuk's whipping up of a social frenzy, calling the ignorant masses to war, and his declaration of the need to destroy old art. Repin declared, in the words of Shchedrin, ' "There are dirty goings-on, a barbarian walks on, who has no God, no religion, no counsel, who will destroy paintings, statues and other valuable works of art on his path [to his new art]"'.⁵⁰ Although one report stated that Balashev had been certified as a psychiatric patient, and Maksimilian Voloshin published an article which discussed the extreme and adverse psychological effects of Repin's painting on [the victim] Balashev,⁵¹ a public debate was organised in which Repin and Burliuk could both put their own cases forward. This took place on 12 February 1913 at the Polytechnical Museum, Moscow, and attracted a large crowd.⁵² This episode is significant to the development of Russian Futurism because it brought the artistic movement to the public's attention at a pivotal moment, at the beginning of Futurism's most popular year. The event attracted opinion from all quarters of the public. Although interest in Futurism was motivated through an act of hooliganism, rather than a positive art review, the incident proved that 'there is no such thing as bad publicity'. Through a stroke of luck, as some would perceive it, the Futurists found themselves at the centre of the public agenda.

The Repin incident, as with all references to contemporary hooliganism, fanned the fears of the middle classes. During a period of intense competition for public space the middle classes feared the influx of debauched, drunken, loutish provincials into the city centres, particularly at the weekend, for two main reasons: the social unrest and upheaval which they caused on the one hand, and on the other the instability of the social status of the middle classes and the thin boundaries that separated some of the them, the *poluintelligentsiia* for example, from this provincial 'Other'.

⁵⁰ This article, 'Beseda s I. E. Repinym', was one of a clutch of articles published under the title 'Neschact'e v Tret'iakovskoi gallerii', *Utro Rossii*, No. 15, 18 January 1913, p. 2.

⁵¹ Maksimilian Voloshin, 'O smysle katastrofy, postigshei kartinu Repina', *Utro Rossii*, No. 16, 19 January 1913, p. 2.

⁵² See Krusanov, pp. 76–77 for press commentary this event.

Petrovskaja notes how office workers, civil servants and their families, students and the military frequented the theatre on weekdays. The pattern of leisure of the lower classes, servants and the working classes, however, was more restricted by the long working day, so they would usually visit the theatre on holidays and Sundays. She also notes how up to 10,000 people would congregate for a *gulian'e*, whereas Swift notes how the St. Petersburg Governor-General N. V. Kleigels alluded to an 'invasion' of up to 30,000.⁵³ It is possible, therefore, that the advertised Futurist weekend lectures drew more people from the working classes than their weekday public lectures.

People's Houses had been established to educate and civilise the lower sections of society, and indeed many preferred this setting as a place where they felt at home and did not have to put on the airs and graces which were required for other theatrical establishments. However, People's Houses were often criticised as dens of iniquity where the debauched patrons indulged in alcohol and raucous behaviour and women's virtue was at risk. Swift cites one journalist, N. Shebuev, who stated that the rowdy and anti-social behaviour of those who frequented the People's Houses was due to the people's custom of drinking heavily before their arrival, or smuggling in vodka for more lethal alcoholic concoctions.⁵⁴ There is no reason to believe that some members of the Futurist audience, that 'thousand-eyed monster',⁵⁵ did not indulge in the same custom, particularly those members of the audience who had come specifically for the spectacle of scandal. One humorous anecdote entitled 'Future Russia' referred to Futurism's far-reaching influence. The journalist O. Savinich writes how Futurism has transformed men:

They are no longer content to build their own dachas and cottages in the countryside, but instead embark on skyscrapers. They have exchanged their cow, dog, chicken, and so on, for the purring of the automobile so that they can enjoy its charming symphony. Their plain traditional clothing has been replaced by a shiny top hat, yellow jacket and sandals. Their necks are painted a canary yellow and their cheeks, foreheads, etc., have all been individually painted. Only one thing has not changed in the Russian man – he doesn't pay his taxes and he complains about his lack of

⁵³ I. Petrovskaja, *Teatr i zritel' Rossiiskikh stolits, 1895–1917* (Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1990), p. 73; and Swift, p. 159.

⁵⁴ Swift, p. 174.

⁵⁵ Sharp, 'The Russian Avant-Garde', p. 95.

land. Futurism is powerless to change this element of the Russian muzhik.⁵⁶

The fear of pornography, which was associated with hooliganism, underpinned much criticism of Futurist work. In August 1913 Goncharova and Larionov illustrated the poet Bol'shakov's long poem *Le Futur*. However, it 'was subsequently confiscated by the police on account of its pornographic imagery', namely the representation of prostitution.⁵⁷ Larionov's *Venus Series*, including *Boulevard Venus* (1913, fig. 201), drew frequent negative critical responses. *Boulevard Venus* is a complex painting which not only demonstrates Larionov's engagement with the dynamism of Italian Futurism, Cubism and his own Rayonist style, but also reveals his interest in new forms of visual perception, scientific experimentation and the invention of the x-ray. A similar interest in dynamic movement, visual perception and artistic representation is witnessed in Marcel Duchamp's *Nude Descending a Staircase, No. 2* (1912, fig. 202) which also shocked audiences when it was exhibited in New York in 1913.⁵⁸ In Larionov's *Boulevard Venus* the movement of the prostitute is shown through her multiple legs, some spread-eagled, and multiple perspectives. Her semi-transparent clothing reveals a corset, undergarments, naked breasts and suggestions of her vagina, the symbol of her trade. She appears to be hurrying down the street, in a determined manner, perhaps even going to the shops, rather than plying her trade. As in the rest of the *Venus Series*, Larionov refuses any moral judgement on his subject. The over-riding fear for the painting's spectator is that this painting with its bright cheerful primary colours might represent the hidden trade of many supposedly respectable women who occupied the urban streets and perhaps visited a Futurist lecture. Pavel Filonov's drawings in the Futurist publication *Rykaiushchii Parnas* [Roaring Parnassus] in 1913 also attracted the eye of the censor, and the publication was 'confiscated as soon as it appeared'.⁵⁹

The Futurist film *Kabare Futuristov No. 13* provided another format of perceived Futurist pornography. The film, which unfortunately no longer exists, depicted a day

⁵⁶ O. Savinich, 'Futur-Rossii', *Utro Rossii*, No. 236, 13 October 1913, p. 5.

⁵⁷ Parton, p. 63.

⁵⁸ Philadelphia Museum of Art, Modern and Contemporary Art, http://www.philamuseum.org/collections/modern_contemporary/1950-134-59.shtml, accessed 13.01.05.

⁵⁹ Livshits, *The One and a Half-Eyed Archer*, p. 169.

in the life of Futurists. The still of figure 203 shows one of the last scenes of the film. According to Camilla Gray, '[t]his picture shows Larionov, his eyes painted with green tears and his hair combed over his face, with Goncharova in his arms, hair flowing and with a bawdy face drawn over her face and breast'.⁶⁰ The still alone provokes multiple readings concerning gender, ritual, power, superstition and contemporary philosophical trends, the status of artists in society, the transgression of class and gender boundaries (particularly in view of Goncharova's status as educated, successful female artist who could trace her family heritage to Pushkin), and so on.

Again, it is essential that we understand this perceived pornography in its contemporary context. As in most European cities, there was a thriving trade in 'suggestive' and 'erotic' postcards in the 1910s. In theatre, Stites points to the popularity of gypsies and of *tsyganshchina* [gypsy song] which were played in the intimate setting of the cabaret. He describes how 'the gypsy idiom contained violent and rhythmically exotic flourishes of uncontrolled passion – intimations of sex, hysteria, flights of fancy, and floods of champagne'. He also makes reference to 'foreignism' and 'pornography' in 'Estrada' as early as 1908, which became 'a hallmark of [contemporary] urban popular culture'.⁶¹ At the same time, in his discussion of the contemporary cinema, Yuri Tsivian refers not only to the "Parisian genre" film (or pornographic pictures, to be frank)', but also gives detailed descriptions of the architecture of the cinema which promoted a highly-charged intimate environment, in addition to a section which focuses on the association of the cinema with the prostitute.⁶²

If the Futurists were creating pornography, they were only contributing to an established market. The authorities objected to the way in which perceived Futurist pornography transcended class and social boundaries and appeared within the lofty realms of high culture, namely art exhibitions and literature, which were also openly accessible to any buying public. Furthermore, the graffiti and profanity of Futurist

⁶⁰ Camilla Gray, *The Russian Experiment in Art, 1863–1922* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986), p. 116.

⁶¹ Stites, pp. 13 and 21.

⁶² Yuri Tsivian, *Early Cinema in Russia and Its Cultural Reception*, edited by Richard Taylor (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 24–25, pp. 35–38.

art had found its way onto people's faces, their bodies, and even their breasts. The moral guardians' fear increased as these mobile art subjects were then able to cross physical boundaries, and by their very presence, cause havoc in and defile specific locations.

Public fear is reflected in the severe criticism which the art and antics of the Futurists provoked. Breshko-Breshkovskii wrote of the "misshapen figures" deformed "by some kind of malignant boil and loose-hanging stomachs and breasts".⁶³ In 1911, M. P-rov wrote of the 'complete unbridledness in the absurd daubs of paint and the disfigurement of depiction'.⁶⁴ And Bowlt cites one anonymous correspondent who wrote that a 'disgraceful, brazen, and talentless can-can reigns dissolutely in the temple of art, and grimacing and wriggling on its altars are these shaggy young guys in their orange shirts and painted physiognomies'.⁶⁵

Futurism embodied so many fears for conservative sections of society. In addition to those already mentioned, public fear also manifested itself in the Futurist association with Jews, both through its own members and Goncharova's paintings, which, according to Mary Chamot, reflected her fascination with their clothing and the 'solemnity of their bearing' in comparison to the 'carelessness of the Russians' (see fig. 204).⁶⁶ Futurism also preyed on public fears of the profanation of religion and religious references. As noted in Chapter 4, the temporary confiscation of Goncharova's paintings was motivated by audience reaction, not direct censorship from the authorities. Of course social boundaries of etiquette existed which should never be crossed, and in the wake of the Futurist disruption of Marinetti's visit to the *Literaturno-artisticheskii kruzhok* [Literary Artistic Circle] in Moscow in February 1914, Larionov was permanently banned from attending any future meetings. 'Moreover', according to Parton, 'the Circle introduced a new rule whereby, with the

⁶³ N. Breshko-Breshkovskii, 'Soiuz molodezhi', *Birzhevye vedomosti*, No. 11612, 13 March 1910, p. 6. Cited in Parton, p. 30.

⁶⁴ M. P-rov, 'Mir Iskusstva', *Moskovskaia gazeta*, No. 163, 5 December 1911, p. 5.

⁶⁵ Anon, 'Opiat' futuristy (vmesto peredovoi)', *Akter* (Moscow), No. 4, 1913, pp. 1–2, cited in John E. Bowlt, 'A Brazen Can-Can in the Temple of Art: The Russian Avant-Garde and Popular Culture', in *Modern Art and Popular Culture: Readings in High and Low*, edited by Kirk Varnedoe and Adam Gopnik (New York: Museum of Modern Art, Harry N. Abrams, 1990), pp. 135–58 (p. 142).

⁶⁶ Chamot, p. 40.

exception of masquerade balls, anyone wearing “fancy dress costumes and with drawings on their faces should be barred from entering the premises!”⁶⁷

Laughter and Madness

The riotous actions of the Futurists and their increased public appeal led to a fear in some quarters that a general madness was taking hold. Madness and its exterior manifestation, laughter, were commonly associated with the theatrical events of the Shrovetide carnivals. The carnivals, in turn, were predominantly associated with the low grotesque ‘Other’ of bourgeois fear. Laughter was an omnipresent element in all Futurist performances. Either the Futurists, or the audience, or both would resort to laughter, whistling and heckling. Mocking, ironic, light-hearted or raucous laughter underpinned performances, much Futurist art, and audience and critical reception. As we mentioned earlier, the critics were quick to underline the ignorance of the gathered Futurist crowd and highlight those occasions when it was not clear why the audience was laughing, or who was laughing at whom and why. Laughter was so prevalent at Futurist events that Gleb Pospelov cites a perceptive observation by the critic, Tugendkhol’d:

Paris, in essence, has already laughed itself out – nothing can surprise her now, Petersburg does not like to laugh loudly out of consideration for good taste; Moscow, though, is the opposite, [she] loves it when they make her laugh and ‘shock’ [*épater*] her.⁶⁸

The Futurists employed carnival antics to publicise their events. Vladimir Markov notes how the Futurist contributors to the *Večer rechetvortsev* ‘walked with painted faces among the crowds’ of Kuznetskii Most in Moscow, ‘reciting futurist poetry’. ‘Even the introverted and shy Livshits paraded with an outlandish necktie and handkerchief’. Maiakovskii ‘paraded along Kuznetskii in a new yellow blouse, made by his mother, with a wooden spoon in the button-hole (like the others) and read his

⁶⁷ Parton, p. 73.

⁶⁸ ‘Париж в сущности уже отсмеялся – его теперь ничем не удивишь, Петербург не любит смеяться громко из соображений хорошего тона; Москва же, наоборот, очень любит, чтобы её сместили и “эпатировали”’. Ia. Tugendkhol’d, ‘Moskovskie vystavki’, *Apollon*, No. 3, 1913., cited in Pospelov, pp, 113–14.

own poetry in a pleasant, velvety bass voice'. Markov also noted the audience reaction.

The passersby were naturally curious; some of them followed the Futurists and spoke to them. One little girl gave Maiakovskii an orange, which he began to eat. The crowd, astonished, whispered 'He's eating, he's eating.'⁶⁹

On another occasion, during their tour of the Provinces in January 1914, Maiakovskii, Kamenskii and David Burluk 'hired fifty little boys to run through the city and shout, "The Futurists have come!"'⁷⁰ However, the boys replaced the unfamiliar *futuristy* with *futbolisty*, that is the 'footballers'. By appropriating carnival performance and marketing strategies, the Futurists maximised their potential public, engaged any onlookers or passers-by directly, and added a lightness of touch and humour to their sometimes shocking antics.

Let us turn briefly to the cartoon of figure 134 which satirised the scandalous meeting that took place between Larionov and Konstantin Bal'mont in the Rozovyi fonar' café in October 1913.⁷¹ The cartoon was printed in the liberal Moscow paper, *Ranee utro*, and exploits the carnival strategies of debunking religion and hierarchy to humorous effect. The Symbolist poet is portrayed as a well-groomed and rotund dandy. In his left hand he holds the reins of his hobby horse who is crying, whilst a young ruffian, Larionov, is shown riding off on his donkey, waving the donkey's tail in Bal'mont's direction. The cartoon is entitled '*Pozhelal osla blizhnego svoego...*' [He covets his neighbour's ass]. This is a reference to one of the Ten Commandments, a jibe at the religious aspect of Russian Symbolism, and, of course, a reference to *Oslinyi khvost*.⁷² The cartoon records Bal'mont's (who was, of course, a respected cultural figure) address to Larionov on entering the Rozovyi fonar', 'Everything you do is beautiful. Everything you paint is excellent!'.⁷³ As discussed in Chapter 3, Larionov did not return the compliment, but instead is reported as

⁶⁹ Markov, p. 133.

⁷⁰ Markov, p. 137.

⁷¹ Cartoon printed in *Ranee utro*, No. 250, 30 October 1913, p. 5.

⁷² Book of Exodus, chapter 20, vs 17: 'Не желай дома ближнего твоего; не желай жену ближнего твоего, ни раба его, ни рабыни его, ни вола его, ни осла его, ничего, что у ближнего своего.' I am grateful to Nigel Gotteri for alerting me to this reference.

⁷³ Another article 'Orozovevshii Bal'mont', *Ranee utro* No. 243, 22 October 1913, p. 6, recorded that Bal'mont added how Larionov's painting reminded him of ancient Maoris.

‘proudly’ declaring, ‘I was Bal’mont’s enemy, but now I consider him something else altogether’, and in response to the indignant cries ‘Larionov grabbed a bottle of champagne with a view to throwing it into the audience’. Various journalists recorded the ‘vulgarity’ of the evening, including the audience, who are described as either all of gilded Moscow’ [*vsia pozolochennaia Moskva*] (denoting the vulgar petit-bourgeoisie) or as low-lives, part of the concealed vulgarity which had crawled out and returned in its full glory [*spriatavshaiaia poshlost’ vpolzala i razvernulas’ vo ves’ svoi rost*]. The sound of breaking crockery was heard. The audience jostled, heckled, whistled and generally caused chaos in what Molot termed a ‘fourth-rate canteen’.⁷⁴

Underneath the sketch the cartoonist penned a rhyme which he ‘attributes’ to Bal’mont: ‘Alas! Pegasus is getting old. | He has had the decadent stuffing knocked out of him...| Oh, Futurist, spite your fate| Change places with me...’ In this carnivalesque cabaret setting, Bal’mont is ridiculed as an outmoded figure with a pitiful wooden hobby horse who longs for the public acclaim and dynamism of the arrogant and scandalous, yet popular Larionov on his charging donkey.

The importance of laughter in performance was made explicit in 1914. In addition to the aforementioned lecture on ‘Futurism and Madness’, the famous Russian clown Anatolii Durov applied to the *gradonachal’nik*’s office for permission to give a public lecture on 5 January 1914 in the Chinizelli Circus, entitled ‘On Laughter and the Pagan Priests of Laughter’.⁷⁵ The first part of the programme offered information concerning the physiological nature of laughter, its individuality and dependence on each person and their relative surroundings, various qualities of laughter, and so forth. The second half of the programme offered an analysis of specific types of laughter, from spontaneous laughter, the role and meaning of laughter in different areas in life, and a detailed description of the different types of laughter to be found

⁷⁴ For this and the preceding quotations, see Molot, ‘Moskovskii den’, and Doble., ‘Shabash Futuristov. Skandal v kabare ‘Rozovyi fonar’, Larionov vyzvan na duel’, both in *Rannee utro*, No. 243, 22 October 1913, p. 6.

⁷⁵ TsGIA f: 569; op: 13; d: 96 ‘Perepiska s prosheniiami i zaiavleniiami raznykh lits o razreshenii ustroistva lektsii vechera i sobranii’, ll: 26–29. Another clown from the State Circus, Lazarenko, worked closely with the Futurists in many productions. RoseLee Goldberg notes how Maiakovskii worked with Lazarenko in the film *I Want to Be a Futurist*, which was the Futurist sequel to *Drama in Cabaret No. 13*. See Goldberg, *Performance Art: From Futurism to the Present* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988), p. 33.

in the arts.⁷⁶ I would suggest that the Futurists were acutely aware of the manipulative power of laughter and therefore frequently employed it to great effect, in their use of double-entendres in their writing, performance and the paintings discussed. One should not forget Velimir Khlebnikov's famous *zaum'* poem, *Zakliatie smekhom* [Incantation of Laughter], 1909. These twelve lines included many real and *zaum'* variations on the root of the word for laughter, *smekh*.⁷⁷

Laughter, of course, is dependent upon the mutual capacity of artist and audience to read specific codes. The enjoyment of these semiotic symbols not only forms a relationship between artist and audience, but also specifically excludes the other, unenlightened members of the audience. The ability to understand the humour of Futurism, whether it be referenced in art or performance, created a cult following among a section of the public. The cult was encouraged through Larionov's invitation to the public in the autumn of 1913 to engage with the fashion for Futurism of clothing, face and body-painting, shaving one's beard and even Futurist food! An article published in *Den'*, 1 December 1913, on the eve of the first Futurist Luna Park production testifies to the cult following which Futurism was enjoying at the peak of its popularity. The article is in fact a skit based on the unexpectedly banal fates of leading Futurists. The skit is entitled '*Poslednii futurist. (Stsenka zavtrashnego dnia)*' [The Last Futurist: A Scene from Tomorrow]. The author describes how a small man in the frockcoat of the Ministry of Public Education tapped him on the arm and asked, somewhat offended, 'Do you not know me? Kruchenykh. Remember?' The author searches his memory and Kruchenykh reminds him, that he [Kruchenykh] was the former leader of Ego-Futurism, which, in its time, thundered [*gremel*] across the whole of Russia.' The journalist, O. L. D'Or, indeed remembers and recites a parodied *zaum'* poem. Kruchenykh is delighted and says yes, it is his poem. He then reminisces about the seemingly

⁷⁶ The second half of the programme reads as follows: 'Смех случайный и смех, вызванный известным искусством смешить.

Роль и знание смеха в различных областях жизни и искусства. Сатира, насмешка и их влияние на вкусы, понятия и настроение толпы. Искусство вызывать, творить смех. Различие между обыкновенным весельчаком и комиком-артистом.

«Лаборатория смеха». Как работают «Жрецы смеха» в цирке и на театральной сцене.

Сценические приемы комиков.

Общий закон созидания смеха на всех ступенях комического искусства. Почему «Жрецы смеха» утрачивают иногда способность смеяться? Заключение', p. 28.

⁷⁷ Velimir Khlebnikov, *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*, 3 vols, vol. 1, *Stikhotvoreniia* (St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2001), pp. 115–16.

innocent times when they [the Futurists] declared hatred toward Pushkin and threw frightening looks at the audience. D'Or asks after the fate of Kruchenykh's Futurist colleagues. Khlebnikov is described as not being the same person and is now working for the [illustrated magazine] *Niva*. He was struck with a feeling of growing indifference. He painted his face in seven colours, wore his boots on his arms, put his feet in baskets and set off to the theatre, looking everyone in the eye. However nobody paid him any attention and he realised that the game was up. As for Maiakovskii, he had been duping the Futurists the whole time and sending his verses to *Sovremennyi mir* and *Vestnik Evropy* among others. His verses were not published. When they eventually were, Maiakovskii left his friends, claiming that he wanted to become a respectable person [*Khochu poriadochnym chelovekom sdelat'sia*]. The thick journals did not print any more of his poems, but, instead, installed him as an office clerk, as he is good at writing receipts. The Burliuks' fate was equally parodied: one was working in a bank and was very happy with his situation of one hundred rubles a month; the other, the Cubist, uses his speciality to prepare the wooden paving blocks for the roadway, so as it turns out, Cubism brought him luck. Finally, Kruchenykh says that he was left on his own, without his army, like a herdsman without his cattle... it was a difficult time. D'Or concludes, 'At this moment, as I write these lines, the names of the Futurists resonate across all of Russia. But I have written "A Scene for Tomorrow".'⁷⁸

The parody is amusing — but only to those readers with a knowledge of individual Futurists and their antics. The existence of the article confirms the Futurists' public identity. One imagines the theatricality with which one reader might have read the skit aloud to a group of illiterate listeners. Undoubtedly laughter and uproar would have prevailed.

Despite this genre of articles and those which recorded the audience's bawdy reaction to Futurist events, Futurist laughter was rarely characterised by the catharsis of the carnival. The subversive element of Futurist laughter was evidenced in the fear of critics. Subversion was not restricted to the venue of the performance alone, but had been spreading to the streets with potentially negative social consequences. I

⁷⁸ O. L. D'Or, *Den'*, No. 326, 1 December 1913, p. 5. See Appendix for full Russian text.

believe that the combination of humour and Futurist depictions of the lower classes, particularly in urban settings, points towards a politicised Futurist aesthetic which underpins, consciously or otherwise, the breadth of the Futurist oeuvre.

The Reinvention of the Futurist Audience

The emergence and evolution of an audience and critical discourse in parallel to the emergence and development of Futurism was crucial to the success and sustainability of the artistic movement. Although Futurist performance, like so many European avant-gardes at the turn of the twentieth century, was dependent upon the strategy of *épater les bourgeois*, equally essential to the success of the performance was the contribution of an open-minded, versatile and dynamic section of the audience who were able to keep pace with the linguistic gymnastics of Futurist language and the Futurist aesthetic. Had the Futurists only performed to a homogeneous or unreceptive audience, then their performances would have surely been an utter disaster and the Futurists would have been rapidly dismissed as nothing more than incomprehensible, clueless clowns – an opinion fervently maintained by some conservative critics. Vladimir Markov's description of the Futurist tour of the provinces in the winter of 1913–14, for example, describes a number of performances which demonstrate how Futurist success and failure was predicated on the audience's preconceived expectations.⁷⁹ Futurist theatrical success and the development which we have plotted from 1910–14, from street antics to the Luna Park performances and a tour of the provinces, was the result of the Futurists' ability to engage a section of the audience and maintain their interest over this period. In essence, the dialogic nature of the Futurist performance was only fully realised with the interjection of the audience's wit and humour. The exchange of satirical banter, offensive and often explicit language, aesthetic comment and humorous riposte between Futurist and audience served to cement the audience-artist relationship, which then drew in other members of the audience and contributed to the recognition of Futurist performances as fashionable events.

⁷⁹ Vladimir Markov, *Futurism: A History* (London: MacGibbon and Gee, 1968), pp. 134–39.

So when a certain Mr. Shatulov laid down the following challenge to Aristarkh Lentulov at a debate — ‘if Mr. Lentulov [could] explain the meaning of his painting *Patriotic War*, then he, Shatulov, was prepared to go to jail for six months’ — he was pressing many contiguous issues which demonstrate Shatulov’s understanding of Futurist artistic and marketing initiatives. If the Futurists had convened the meeting with the genuine intention of communicating their aesthetic perspectives, as they claimed, they should do so in plain Russian. Failure to fulfil one’s objectives had severe consequences, including police intervention and jail. Shatulov had challenged Futurism and the authority of the Futurists. He had appropriated the Futurist strategy of challenging boundaries and self-imposed authorities and used it against the Futurists themselves. In fact, according to Pospelov’s account of the incident, Lentulov turned up at the exhibition the following day only to find no trace of Shatulov.⁸⁰ It is an extreme example of how some Futurists responded to the audience’s increasing authority.

By 1913 the Futurist audience had become so well versed in the etiquette of Futurist performance that their participatory role assumed an increasing influence on the outcome of the event. The rhetorical strategies which were adopted by both the audience and the artist during Futurist debates reflect similar discussions which took place in the theatrical auditoria and political arenas. Sharp and others, such as Steinberg, have contextualised the increasing self-assertion of the audience during public debates, within the broader framework of the unstable and dynamic lower classes who, having been denied the opportunity to actively engage in the political process, sought public platforms from which they could express their own sense of identity and position within their social, cultural and economic environment.⁸¹ As Futurist popularity grew, so did the public’s misconception of the Futurist aesthetic. It is quite clear that some sections of the audience attended Futurist performances as sources of popular entertainment alone and failed to recognise the events as displays of a developing avant-garde aesthetic agenda.⁸² According to much contemporary

⁸⁰ For commentary on this incident and Lentulov’s record in his memoirs, see Pospelov, pp. 111–12 and footnote 133.

⁸¹ See Sharp, ‘The Russian Avant-Garde’, p. 93, and Steinberg, pp. 62–102.

⁸² It is worth remembering the four dominant themes of the contemporary Penny Press and popular fiction, identified by Jeffrey Brooks and set out in the Introduction: ‘self-betterment; science and superstition; national identity; and freedom and rebellion, including the most popular bandit

criticism and Futurist memoirs, this section of the public were quick to express themselves, indulge in violent behaviour and bad language and were over-zealous and overbearing. The Futurists only had to appear on stage to feel the full force of a 'thousand-eyed monster' which was already stirred up, in expectation of physical antics and empty farce. In such instances, the audience prevented the Futurists from performing, as on the evening of the *Mishen'* debate which descended into chaos. This is what Sharp terms the reversal of agency, which is, of course, related to a sense of power. The Futurists, in turn, were forced to adopt new strategies to reclaim the upper hand, outwit or outmanoeuvre their audience and challenge them afresh. Larionov and Il'ia Zdanevich, for example, adopted an absurdist approach to the traditional structure and logical purposes of an interview, which also highlighted the criticisms and charges of their many detractors. An extract from their interview in *Teatr v karikaturakh* reads as follows:

Are you Futurists?

Yes, we are Futurists.

Do you deny Futurism?

Yes, we deny Futurism. May it disappear from the face of the earth!

But aren't you contradicting yourselves?

Yes, our aim is to contradict ourselves.

Are you charlatans?

Yes, we are charlatans.

Are you untalented?

Yes, we are untalented.

It is impossible to speak to you?

Yes, it is.

But what are your New Year resolutions?

To be true to ourselves. (Parton's translation)⁸³

It is difficult to say who exactly constituted the core Futurist supporters. Patrons and those with a vested interest and certain sections of the intelligentsia were present, as were the indulgent bourgeoisie, as described above. For the purposes of attempting to identify a socio-political subtext to Futurism during this period, I am more interested in the classes of skilled labourers and worker intellectuals [working classes and lower echelons of the *poluintelligentsiia*] who could potentially save up

characters'. See Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861–1917* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985), and the Introduction of this thesis, pp. 24–25.

⁸³ 'Nashe prazdnichnoe interv'iu s futuristami', *Teatr v karikaturakh*, Nos. 1–2, 1 January 1914, p. 19, cited in Parton, p. 74.

for tickets to Futurist performances and who were sufficiently literate to avail themselves of Futurist publications and read or listen to newspaper commentary. Steinberg describes this section of the increasing metropolitan population as a people who 'reflected the flux of their times'. They were quick to adapt to the ever-changing environment and wished to participate in cultural, artistic and political life.⁸⁴ This class of people were highly motivated and through their ability to adapt to the ever-changing circumstances of metropolitan life, showed enormous potential for upward social mobility. In so doing, they entered into the familiar cross-class phenomenon of adopting strategies to conceal their origins, a practice which would, in turn, give them greater accessibility and participation in public life. These strategies included the adoption of manners and etiquette which were appropriate to different social situations. For example, spitting was not allowed in museums and galleries.⁸⁵ Increasing literacy among this class meant that they had increasing access to contemporary newspapers, feuilletons and journals that were also packed with advice and guidelines on personal conduct in the modern metropolis.⁸⁶

The introduction of mass-manufactured clothing enabled many members of this class to save up for one outfit which could be reserved for weekends and holidays, the equivalent of one's 'Sunday Best'. Although mass-manufactured clothing in St. Petersburg and Moscow had not assumed the large-scale industry of other European capitals, figures 205 and 206 illustrate that ready-made clothing was widely available in the Russian capitals.⁸⁷ Goncharova's painting *Vesna v gorode* [Spring in the City] (1910, fig. 207) also depicts people in mass-produced clothing (similar to that used in the cartoon of figure 149). Here, people are queuing to buy daffodils in a display of patience and good manners. It is most likely that the people are middle class. However, their fashionable clothing adds a sense of anonymity and it is

⁸⁴ Steinberg, pp. 23–28. Steinberg bases much of his discussion on the presence of proletarian writers.

⁸⁵ See Tony Bennett's discussion of the same phenomenon in the British context, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 28, 100 and 169.

⁸⁶ See, for example, Louise McReynold's description of the journalist as 'escort-around-town' which helped new arrivals to the city through 'the transition phase of urbanisation by [...] making their environment less intimidating through familiarity'. Louise McReynolds, *The News Under Russia's Old Regime: The Development of a Mass-Circulation Press* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991), p. 55.

⁸⁷ Tatiana Strizhenova observes how the garment industry in Russian was 'one of the most backward branches of the economy in pre-Revolutionary Russia. The proportion of clothing that was industrially produced by 1917 did not exceed 3 percent'. Instead, the garment industry relied predominantly on a cottage industry system. See Strizhenova, *Soviet Costume and Textiles 1917–1945* (Moscow, Paris, Verona: Flammarion, 1991), pp. 9–14.

impossible to know whether the clothing is being used to mask the 'true' identity of the subjects. Swift's discussion of audience participation in popular theatre emphasises the use of fashion by the lower classes as a means to conceal their true identity across traditional class boundaries. Satirical excerpts from contemporary newspapers underline the purported surprise of the observer at the true identity of some members of the audience.⁸⁸ This use of fashion was an obstruction to any critic's ability to discern the true nature of a Futurist audience, and therefore a further obstruction to us for our retrospective analysis.⁸⁹

This period in Russian history witnessed the emergence of the phenomenon of disposable income, with record numbers of single men and women who had the capacity to earn their own money in the city, albeit with a strong bias in favour of men. These people, particularly those who were involved in the cultural activity of workers, took pride in the relative sophistication which such restricted income afforded. Evidence from the work of Swift and Worrall not only emphasises this pride and sophistication, but also identifies an emerging critical perspective within this section of the public. Swift, for example, cites one worker's dissatisfaction with a variety show which was sponsored by the Riazan Society in 1899: 'The gentlemen performers are mistaken in thinking that if it's a *narodnoe gulian'e* then critical evaluation is out of the question.' Swift also gives an example of workers who refused free tickets to a performance by Russia's premier singer, Fedor Shaliapin, on the grounds that 'they earned enough to pay for the tickets and found the idea of a free performance offensive and condescending'. In addition, it would appear that many factory workers were only too keen to become involved in theatrical performances as actors and felt that they could do at least as good a job as the amateurs from the intelligentsia.⁹⁰ What is clear, then, is that here was a large section

⁸⁸ Swift, pp. 144–45.

⁸⁹ A point echoed by Tony Bennett, p. 170, in the context of industrial Britain.

⁹⁰ For all three examples, see Swift, pp. 218–19. Nick Worrall also noted in relation to the breakdown of ticket prices at the Moscow Art Theatre, when it was located in the Hermitage on Carriage Row, that five morning productions were offered to local factories at a reduced rate, but that the take-up was not very high. The 58 seats in the Gallery were usually priced at 20 kopeks, so any reduction would have been well within the worker's budget. Of course, the long day-shift would not have facilitated the worker's ability to attend, irrespective of hurt pride.

of the public who were alert to theatrical and cultural trends, who had some money to spend but who were also sensitive to their own social and cultural public status.⁹¹

I would argue that because this section of the public originated, predominantly, from the provincial peasant classes, they were able to 'read' or 'decode' the Futurist performative and painterly language on a particular level that was inaccessible to many members of the higher and privileged classes. It would then follow that familiarity of subject matter, linguistic register and carnival modes of performance would have promoted recognition, comfort and laughter, rather than fear. This laughter is a reflection of the pleasure of the inclusivity of attending the event, and the added intimacy of a familiarity and recognition of a mutual understanding between Futurist and audience. Encapsulated in this ability to comprehend and laugh, rather than feel offended or ignorant, is a sense of identity, power and value. Futurism was dependent on a core public who were modern and adaptable. Futurist theatre, possibly more than all other Futurist arts, was premised on the comprehension of the here and now with a projection into the future, and was explicitly not reliant upon a knowledge of an Epic Past. Paul Schmidt's description of the transformation of Futurist poetry during the moment of public performance serves to reinforce the Futurist emphasis of the present:

[Futurist performance] situates the text firmly in the here-and-now, with all its complexity, its ambiguity, its multiple meanings, its many-voicedness. Futurist performance transforms readers into those-who-are-present, those who hear and see, and increases the space that the poetic text occupies in the encounter.⁹²

The ability of the lower classes to decode Futurist language (linguistic, artistic and performative) and feel comfortable in the Futurist performative environment inverted the usual social order and encouraged confidence in a section of the public which was so frequently condescended to in public cultural contexts. When related to this section of the public, Futurist performance had the potential to be subversive.

⁹¹ In her analysis of the metropolitan theatre audience, Petrovskaia also referred to the desire of the workers to engage in theatre. She highlighted the work of the commentator Arabazhin who defines the spectators of the Open-Accessible Theatre as 'more or less a cultural part of the working-class population'. The broadest cross-section of the public could be seen there and at the People's Houses. Petrovskaia, p. 83.

⁹² Paul Schmidt, 'Some Notes on Russian Futurist Performance', *CASS*, vol.19: 4 (1985), 492-96 (p. 495).

With its iconic gestures, bombastic manifestoes and memorable catch-phrases and maxims, in addition to personal examples of combining Futurist art and life (see fig. 208), Futurism encouraged an adaptable, rapidly modernising section of the public to challenge accepted societal boundaries on multiple levels.⁹³

Liubov' Gurevich, for example, concludes her review of *Pobeda nad solntsem* with a description of the mixed audience who were keen to show their allegiance to Futurism, or at least Futurist fashion:

At the end, the people are calling ceaselessly for the author. Everyone is standing up, waiting for him: elegant ladies, imperious elderly ladies [*velichavye starukhi*] in the boxes, military, members of the intelligentsia. Young girls with painted faces passionately applaud. The students rave [*neistovstvuiut*]. But those who are shouting louder than everyone else are those who provoked scandals during the performance: if the author comes out [on stage], they will whistle. But on this occasion, [...] he did not come out.⁹⁴

Consciously or otherwise — and I would suggest consciously when related to theatre — the Futurists were encouraging individuals to take charge of their own destiny, rather than be imprisoned by imposed boundaries and social, cultural, and economic structures. This aesthetic, of course, has a strong political subtext. There is evidence that this transition was witnessed within the Futurist audience, even during the few years in question. As the Futurist audience became more confident with practice and learned and understood the method and function of Futurist rhetorical strategies, its participatory role increased to such an extent that the Futurists ceased to be the sole focus of attention. As Sharp and many contemporary critics have noted, the models of discourse evolved to such a degree that internal discussions took place within the auditoria, between audience members alone, in addition to the heckling and interaction which took place between artist and audience. Performance intervals provided opportunity for audience members to express themselves more fully and discuss the performance, thereby reasserting themselves in preparation for the continuation of the entertainment. The majority of reviews of the Luna Park productions concentrated on the public's reaction and the level of 'intra-audience'

⁹³ Parallels can be drawn with Augusto Boal's later practices of the Theatre of the Oppressed.

⁹⁴ Liubov' Gurevich, 'Teatr futuristov', *Russkie vedomosti*, No. 287, 13 December 1913, p. 6.

relations. Many of the sensationalist reviews concentrated on specific intra-audience dialogue and heckling.⁹⁵ The audience's reversal of agency was not restricted to the Futurist performance. Contemporary commentators and Futurist memoirists alerted the public to a number of Futurist imitations and hoaxes, such as the previously-mentioned case of the Kalashnikov Exchange in St. Petersburg (see Chapter 3).⁹⁶

We have already discussed the personal conduct of the Futurists and members of their audience in terms of challenging and redefining acceptable codes of conduct and artistic expression. Face-painting, for example, can be viewed either as an act of hooliganism or an expression of high fashion, depending on the viewer's perspective, the intention of the 'actor', and the context of the action. However, having established the mixed and frequently negative reception which the Futurists' anarchic art and behaviour received, in the context of the social, artistic and economic dynamism of the period, one is faced with the following question: To what extent were the Futurist acts politically motivated and what were the Futurists' opinions of the members of the public who supported their movement, who emulated them, engaged in face-painting and other acts of social transgression?

One must approach a retrospective political investigation of Futurism 1910–14 era with caution, being careful not to impose arbitrarily a political agenda on the Russian avant-garde that was non-existent, simply because of the Revolution in 1917 and the Futurists' participation in public art post-1917. However, I do believe that it is possible to identify a political subtext, or more accurately, an egalitarian agenda, which characterised much Futurist art and personal conduct of the period in question. There is a paucity of printed material from 1910 to 1914 in which the Futurists explicitly express any political opinion, or comment on humanitarian issues, such as the desperate living and working conditions of the majority of city inhabitants. This lack of printed statements is not surprising given the authorities' sensitivity to political subversion. Through their perceived anarchy and provocation of social unrest, the Futurists were already in a vulnerable position and attracted the attention of the police. However, I would argue that an analysis of contemporary

⁹⁵ See, for example, R. "Opera futuristov". Muzyku zamenial svist publiki', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, No. 333, 4 December 1913, p. 5, and Gurevich, 'Teatr futuristov', p. 6.

⁹⁶ See, for example, Markov, *Russian Futurism*, p. 132.

Futurist art can illuminate the Futurists' attitude to the lower classes and marginal figures in society, and by extension point towards a socio-political Futurist agenda. To conclude this chapter, let us consider one aspect of Futurist art, populated urban landscapes and depictions of the lower classes and marginal figures in society.

Urban Landscapes and Futurist Political Discourse

In her theoretical notes "*Ob izmakh*" [On '-isms'], 1914, Goncharova defined three elements which characterised the expression of Futurism in daily life: political (evidenced in the nationalistic agenda of the Italian Futurists), aesthetic (a dynamic art which is motivated by a feeling of modernity, and will bring about a rejuvenation and new perspective in all aspects of human activity); and in social attitudes, daily life (the continual struggle with philistinism).⁹⁷ All three elements are clearly expressed in the Futurist depiction of scenes of daily domestic, working and public life. I would argue that the political component of Futurism is as evident in Russian Futurism as in Italian, and becomes clearer if one compares Futurist depictions of the lower classes within urban landscapes with paintings of a similar subject matter by non-Futurist and nineteenth-century artists.

Late nineteenth-century depictions of the lower working classes in an urban context, such as the market, frequently portrayed a busy environment which was populated by stock figures of the lower classes. If we take Petr Vereshchagin's *Tolkuchii rynok v Moskve* [Flea Market in Moscow] (1868) and Vladimir Makovskii's *V polden'. Tolkuchii rynok v Moskve. Etiud* [Midday. Flea Market in Moscow] (1875, fig. 209) as examples, we are shown sellers of all types of wares, including groups of people caught in lively conversation, musicians, an Old Believer with his charity box, women and children, prominent standing figures in the bottom left corners with arms laden with textiles to sell. Vereshchagin's urban landscape is almost claustrophobic to the viewer. It is densely populated and the faceless figures in their drab colours pour out into the alleyways and arches. Both paintings communicate a sense of permanence of a status quo which has always been and which will always be, locked

⁹⁷ N. S. Goncharova, 'Ob "izmakh" (1914)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 37–38. See also the Introduction of this thesis.

within these market walls. In other words, the artists have fixed the subjects into their living and working conditions, with no potential for change.

Boris Kustodiev's interpretation of a market environment depicts a contrasting ambience in *Iarmarka*, (1906, fig. 210). In typical Kustodiev style, the viewer is presented with a romanticised idyll in which peasants are clothed in crisp, clean, bright, colourful, traditional dress. The inquisitive children survey the arrangement of traditional toys, whilst the adults are occupied, negotiating the price of traditional birch domestic products. The men wear bast shoes and nearly all sport the same bobbed hair-cut and groomed luxurious beard. This is not reality as we know it, but more akin to an illustration for a children's book, a visual harmonious delight of the friendly good cheer of the peasantry. The photograph of Sukharevskii Market in Moscow on Easter Saturday 1905 (fig. 211) falls somewhere between these three paintings. The photograph reveals a surprisingly well-ordered space of neatly displayed goods. There is ample room for everyone and even the arrival of a horse and cart does not appear to disturb the peace. Although the market is exclusively populated by the lower classes, there is no hint of the grotesquerie which many commentators associated with the market environment. Instead, the atmosphere is characterised by a sense of peace and order and everyone simply going about their business. The ground is so clean that individual cobble-stones are clearly visible, sales are being made, conversations are taking place, but this is not the scene of debauched drunkenness and hooliganism.

It is precisely this ordinariness of the lower classes going about their everyday business which typifies much Futurist art of 1910–14. Throughout the rapid metamorphosis of Futurist art from Neo-Primitivism, to Russo-Cubism, Rayism to a more abstract art form, a sense of the ordinary, the everyday, the 'un-exoticised' cycle of routine of daily-life infuses a major portion of Futurist urban art. These Futurist subjects are neither romanticised, nor vilified.

As John Bowlit has observed, '[t]he heroes of the Russian avant-garde pictures of around 1910–15 [were] not the paramours and art dealers of Cubist Paris but the floor polishers, streetwalkers, barbers, washerwomen, barmen, and knife grinders of

Russia's new masses'.⁹⁸ Futurist paintings of this era are infused with a deep-seated sensual pleasure in the onslaught of contemporary signs on the senses, mixing the excitement of modern technology with an appreciation of Russian cultural traditions and the value of the lower-class Russian's position within that modern progressive environment. The mixing of the traditional and provincial with modern urban motifs has been summed up in the appropriate term 'urban folklore' or *gorodskaiia fol'klornaia kul'tura*.⁹⁹

To explore the meaning of this term 'urban folklore' and its relevance to the Futurists' attitude to its subject matter, let us first consider three contrasting contemporary Futurist depictions of the fishing trade: *Rybnaia lovliia* [Fishing] (1908) by Goncharova (fig. 212), *Rybnoe delo* [The Fishing Trade] (1910) by Vladimir Tatlin (fig. 213), and *Rybach'ia shkhuna* The [Fishermen's Schooner] (1913–14) by Pavel Filonov (fig. 214). All three canvases are united by common features of theatricality, narrative and dynamism. In Goncharova's Neo-primitivist painting men and women are occupied with the process of sorting through the fishing nets. All are presented with characteristic dignity, rather than a coarse interpretation of 'fish wives' and foul-mouthed sailors. The decoratively dressed women bend and kneel to scoop up the fish for the men and boys in their brilliant white tunics who are waiting patiently with buckets. There is a sense of community about the painting which is conveyed through the implied movement within the daily routine in a provincial setting: the fishermen's work is complemented by the figures in the top right corner who walk alongside the water in which their silhouettes are reflected. Strong lines and primary colours infuse the painting with a sense of movement and energy. Tatlin's watercolour sketch reflects his close relation to Cubism and early Suprematist experimentation. Although the picture presents us with the everyday scene of a single man with his basket inspecting fish at the quayside the viewer is struck by the dynamism of the painting which has been achieved through the combination of multiple planes, strong lines and geometric shapes and the solid curved forms of the man at the centre. The modernity of the picture is expressed through its form. Filonov's depiction of the fishermen is also

⁹⁸ Bowlt, 'A Brazen Can-Can', p. 138.

⁹⁹ See, for example, Bowlt, 'A Brazen Can-Can', p. 139 and Pospelov, p. 13. Pospelov describes the longevity of the application of this term which can be applied to Russian art of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

characterised by multiple planes and a sense of movement and industriousness. We are presented with a busy, bustling scene of fishermen, hard at work, in constant communication with each other. As Elena Basner observed, Filonov has employed Cubo-Futurist strategies of blurring the contours of the figures and fragmenting the painterly space in order to communicate a sense of continually changing reality. This potential for continual change within the ordinary and non-urban, pre-industrial setting of fishermen at work is, in turn, infused with a sense of universality.¹⁰⁰ Universality and modernity, therefore, combine in the depiction of the seemingly ordinary.

Compare Filonov's fishermen with his painting *Burzhu v koliaške* [Bourgeoisie in a Carriage] (1912–13, fig. 215). Unlike Larionov's ludic and satirical depictions of the bourgeoisie, Filonov expresses his contempt for the maligned class. Here the bourgeoisie are literally riding on the backs of the poor. Filonov's presentation of the spectacle of the public sphere is a powerful statement: the vulgar, lecherous bourgeoisie exist only to the detriment of the poor.

Significantly, when Larionov painted his own self-portrait c.1910, he chose to align himself with peasantry rather than the urban elite (fig. 216). Employing a Fauvist style and a palette of white and rich saffron tones which were associated with the warm South, Larionov painted himself in a peasant's shirt, using strong lines and angular features akin to children's drawings.¹⁰¹ The volume of his broad chest fills the picture plane and he appears with a big smile on his face, happy and relaxed in the freedom and earthiness of the warm South, with the *lubok*-style labelling of 'Self-Portrait' and 'Larionov' printed above his left shoulder.

Although they used social networks to facilitate the dissemination of their aesthetic and the publication and exhibition of their work, the Futurists continually chose not to position themselves publicly within the urban elite. The combination of their anti-social behaviour, face- and body-painting, rebellious rhetoric and carnivalesque

¹⁰⁰ Commentary from Elena Basner in *Russkii Futurizm i David Burliuk 'Otets russkogo futurizma'*, edited by Evgeniia Petrova (St. Petersburg: Palace Editions, 2000), p. 54.

¹⁰¹ Larionov employed the same palette and similar Fauvist style in his portrait of Velimir Khlebnikov during the same period. Khlebnikov was also depicted in a peasant's shirt, but also deep in thought as he leafs through a book.

costume flew in the face of accepted codes of conservative civilised social etiquette. In a class-ridden society, if the Futurists were not associated with polite society, then it follows that in certain quarters, they were associated with society's lower ranks. The Futurists, like their European avant-garde contemporaries, indulged in this identity as outsiders and did little to dispel this social judgement. But judgement is always cast by the dominant culture and hegemonic forces, including art critics, journalists, self-appointed moral guardians and the wealthy middle classes. Newspaper cartoons, such as figure 9 and most press articles fail to communicate the reactions of the lower classes to Futurist depictions. Although a few individuals, such as Tugendkhol'd, bring a positive analytical and informative eye to the importance of the Moscow Futurists, even he fails to comment on or draw conclusions regarding the lower-class subject matter and the reaction of lower-class spectators.¹⁰²

The Futurist practice of focusing attention on the ordinary and unglamorous, that substance which constituted the urban wallpaper, served to raise the profile of its subject within the social sphere. Fishermen, low-ranking soldiers, washerwomen, factory workers, knife-grinders, waitresses and floor-polishers were rarely recognised as having a positive participatory and valued role in modern society, at least outside the discourse of the growing proletarian classes, but instead were the subject of contemporary moral and social concern. It seems to me that taken as a whole, the Futurist depictions of this class of people serve two main functions: firstly, to announce the existence of the lower classes, and secondly to state quite clearly that they are acceptable as they are, and this egalitarian stance is supported through the Futurists' own alignment with lower-class practices and characteristics.

In his essay 'On National Culture' Franz Fanon argued that the identity of a national culture reflects the very existence of its people and should be 'at the very heart of the struggle for freedom' which is carrying on in the country in question.¹⁰³ To support this struggle, he describes a model by which native intellectuals rediscover their own culture, over and above an imposed hegemonic culture. Although Fanon's argument

¹⁰² Ia. Tugendkhol'd, '“Mir Iskusstva” v Moskve', *Rech'*, No. 356, 30 December 1913, pp. 4–5.

¹⁰³ Frantz Fanon, 'On National Culture', in *The Wretched of the Earth* (London: Penguin, 1990), pp. 166–99 (p. 188).

is couched in colonial terms, parallels can be drawn with the development of the Russian avant-garde. As Fanon describes, first there is an alignment of the intellectual with the thought of the imposed culture; in the Futurist case this can be paralleled with their interest in European modernism and avant-garde artistic practices. After a time the intellectual realises the limitations of such thinking when applied to his/her own culture; we see this in Oslinyi khvost's explicit rejection of western artistic practices. Finally, the intellectual begins a process of 'returning to one's own people' and celebrating one's own culture, and the self-assertion of national identity is then channelled into the discourse of revolution;¹⁰⁴ this stage is seen in the Futurists' celebration of Eastern art, provincial arts and crafts, *luboks* and icons, and an egalitarian attitude toward their chosen artistic subject.

Of course, Russian Futurism needs to be considered in its civic, as well as ethnic context. Although I have no wish to impose a purely political reading on Futurist art, one cannot ignore the historical relevance of the failed 1905 Revolution and its consequences for the public psyche. Goncharova's previously mentioned feminist writing on Turgenevesque women, her invitation to the working classes to visit her studio, the general Futurist anarchic behaviour and refusal to position themselves publicly with the urban elite, their depictions of the bourgeoisie, which starkly contrasts with their artistic treatment of the lower classes are all factors which, when considered as a whole, I would argue, point to a particular political agenda. I would also suggest that the Futurists, consciously or otherwise, created a new artistic language and new performative practices to express this viewpoint.

Let us consider Larionov's treatment of the low-ranking soldier in *Bliz lageria* [Near Camp] (1910–11, fig. 217) and *Otdykhaiushchii soldat* [Resting Soldier] (1911, fig. 218). Our previous examples of paintings which included portraits of soldiers in a leisurely setting have tended to depict officers in full uniform, hardly the type of dress which one associates with leisure. However, at the turn of the twentieth century it was still mandatory for all military ranks to dress in uniform when displayed in any public setting. Larionov's starkly contrasting pictures from the series of 'Soldier' paintings, which he completed during his military service, reveal a

¹⁰⁴ Fanon, 'On National Culture', p. 175.

strikingly different understanding of the soldier at leisure. Larionov's pictures are essentially very human portrayals. In *Bliz lageria*, Larionov has used a gentle palette of blues, yellows and greens and a neo-impressionist style to communicate the lyrical beauty and scale of the camp's setting. The white tents are pitched towards the horizon. One lone soldier in uniform is positioned at a distance from the camp and the immediate centre of the viewer's focus, in the bottom right corner of the picture. His distance from the tents is reinforced by the tree on the left of the painting which emphasises the soldier's association with the foreground. The soldier appears to be resting on his side, possibly reading a letter. His identity is concealed through the lack of detail in the brushstrokes. From the viewer's perspective, this solitary occupation suggests an intimacy, which is reinforced by Larionov's harmonious palette. The viewer experiences this private sentiment of intimacy, which contrasts with the more usual depiction of soldiers as 'one of the riotous boys'. Larionov's view is non-judgemental: perhaps the soldier is happy to be serving, perhaps he is longing to go home.

The second soldier painting (fig. 218) presents us with quite a different picture. This painting has received considerable commentary, both contemporary and modern, relating to the flat plane, the stylised *balagan* figuration of the soldier, and of course the graffiti in the background. For our purposes of exploring the Futurists' attitude to their subject matter, I shall deal with the elements of social semiotics alone. Larionov had first-hand experience of the basic living conditions and culture of the military. Here a soldier relaxes with a cigarette, either in contemplation or perhaps watching a card game or another activity. He is leaning against a fence next to a spade. The spade and the brown earthy square below suggest the presence of a dug latrine. Hardly the motif of shining military sophistication. The uncouthness of the subject matter is exaggerated through Larionov's use of broad brushstrokes reminiscent of children's art. The grey fence is decorated with the types of motifs and graffiti which constituted the subject matter of other Futurist and shamanistic paintings. From left to right, the first words read *srok sluzhby* or 'period of service' (frequently taken as 'national' or 'military' service). This is followed by a childlike drawing of a horse, a popular figure in Futurist 'military' paintings, annotated with the dates 1910, 1911 and 1909, as if various people have added their own time signature to the drawing. To the right of the horse is the crude black drawing of a

female figure in the style of some aboriginal sculpture. Feet and arms and part of the head are absent, whilst the proportion of the shoulders or breasts [it is ambiguous] and thighs have been exaggerated. This figure is similar to contemporary crude shamanistic or ethnographic Futurist paintings. Above the soldier are the words 'poslednii ras sra-'. John Malmstad's analysis of this phrase identifies the common error of the semi-literate in the second word which should be spelt *raz*, giving the meaning 'the last time'. The final word is more ambiguous. If, as Malmstad has written, Larionov had supplied the letter 'l', giving *sral*, we would read the past tense of the very common vulgar form of defecate, i.e. 'the last time I shat'.¹⁰⁵ This of course would have provoked censorship and the removal of the painting from any gallery. David Shepherd has suggested another ambiguity in the letters *sra*. The initial three letters could be supplied with any variant on *-zhat'sia*. Using the verb *srazhat'sia* 'to go to fight' would then offer all manner of possibilities, such as 'the last time I fought' or 'this is the last time I fight', which of course would suggest an anti-patriotic artistic statement, which would also provoke censorship.¹⁰⁶ Dmitrii Sarab'ianov observed the 'peasant aesthetic' which prevailed in Larionov's *Soldier Series* and through which Larionov was able to equate binary opposites of important and unimportant, high and low, and incorporating the principles of 'squaddies' painting' [*printsipy* [...] "*kazarmennoi zhivopisi*"].¹⁰⁷

The subject of Larionov's painting and the crude graffiti would have been offensive and incomprehensible to many spectators of the educated middle classes. Unlike the lower classes, they would not have had the low-ranking military experience which formed the context of the painting. Larionov has therefore reversed the usual centre-periphery models of painterly semiotics. He has sided with the lower classes and has produced a painting, to hang in an urban gallery, which has been painted in a specific linguistic and artistic register so as to exclude the comprehension and comfort of a large number of the viewers. Larionov has not depicted a drunken,

¹⁰⁵ John E. Malmstad, 'The Sacred Profaned: Image and Word in the Paintings of Mikhail Larionov', in *Laboratory of Dreams. The Russian Avant-Garde and Cultural Experiment*, edited by John E. Bowlt and Olga Matich (Stanford, California, Cambridge: Stanford UP, 1996), pp.153–73 (p. 159).

¹⁰⁶ David Shepherd's comment was offered to me at the annual post-graduate seminar, Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies, University of Sheffield, 23.05.02.

¹⁰⁷ D. V. Sarab'ianov, 'Neoprimitivizm v russkoi zhivopisi i poezii 1910-kh godov', in *Mir Velimira Khlebnikova: Stat'i issledovaniia 1911–1998*, edited by Viacheslav Ivanov, Zinovii Papernyi, and Aleksandr Parnis (Moscow: Iazyki Russkoi Kul'tury, 2000), pp. 619–36 (p. 622).

malevolent figure, but a man at rest. Contemporary reviews would suggest, however, that many viewers could not separate the human qualities of the soldier from his 'sordid' setting and only saw ugliness and deprivation in the style and content of the picture.

Where peaceful contemplation and a moment of rest was common to the two soldier paintings, movement, energy and dynamism is the unifying characteristic of a multitude of Futurist populated urban landscapes. The blacksmith in Ol'ga Rozanova's *Kuznitsa* [The Smithy] (1912, fig. 219), Malevich's *Naterateli parketa* [Floor Polishers] (1911, fig. 220) and the street-sweeper in Aleksandr Shevchenko's *Gorodskoi peizazh (Dvornik)* [Urban Landscape (The Street-Sweeper)] (1913, fig. 221) are all engrossed in their daily tasks. All three artists depict their subjects caught up in the rhythm of their work. Malevich's monumental figures seem engaged in the 'dance of the floor polishers', whilst energy bursts forth from the strong curved lines, confident broad brush strokes and compartmentalised colour scheme of Rozanova's portrayal of blacksmiths at work. Shevchenko has employed a strong geometrical style showing reference to Cubism and Rayonism to depict his street-sweeper. The street-sweeper in his pinky-red jacket and black hat is the only figure to populate the streets, as he strides confidently along, consumed by the action of his work.

Goncharova's subject in *Mal'chik s petukhom* [Boy with a cockerel] (1911, fig. 222) also strides along purposefully. Both Rozanova and Goncharova have depicted male figures in their urban working and domestic environments and fixed them in a dynamic moment of motion, purpose and rhythm. Goncharova's boy dominates the picture. His broad figure, dark clothes and downward gaze add a solemnity to his purpose which contrasts with the bright segmented colours of the houses in the background. The curved lines and downward gaze of the cockerel are echoed in the boy's posture, his strong bent arm which carries the weight of the cockerel in the boy's monumental hand. The solid forms of Goncharova's boy, Larionov's resting soldier, and Rozanova and Malevich's figures all contrast sharply with the insubstantial, fragile forms of Larionov's depictions of the bourgeoisie as discussed in Chapter 4.

The Futurists were not afraid of depicting marginal or controversial figures in their works, including Jews. We have already mentioned the quiet dignity of Goncharova's *Evreskaia sem'ia* (1912, fig. 204), who are represented with strong iconic symbolism. Chagall's painting of his grandfather *Miasnik* [The Butcher (The Grandfather)] (1910, fig. 223) combines the everyday action of a butcher (here with a comical expression), with a circus-like cat, Chagall's alter-ego in the background in the form of the green goat, and the star of David which is given a prominent position on the wall.

Prostitutes and working women from the lower classes who were frequently perceived as potential prostitutes were also treated with quiet dignity and a lightness of touch by the Futurists. Larionov, for example, reveals the human side to the young girl in his *Tsirkovaia tantsovshchitsa* [Circus Dancer] (1911, fig. 224). The girl, who bears a strong resemblance to the figure in *Kel'nersha* (1911, fig. 184), appears to be taking a cigarette break in between acts. Dressed in a short red dress and pink stockings, she stands with good posture, taking a moment's rest, rather like the *Otdykhaiushchii soldat*. Also, like the *Otdykhaiushchii soldat*, her quiet dignity as she simply gets on with her job is contrasted with the farcical pornographic circus image behind her. The painting within the painting depicts a man in a suit (the assumption being from the middle or upper classes) chasing after a seemingly naked woman who is either dancing with or defending herself with the cane, or possibly enticing the man with it. Is this the real-life bourgeois circus?

Larionov's *Venus Series* places the figure of the prostitute at the centre of public attention. However, despite the women's profession, he treats them as nothing less than bona fide artistic subjects, extolling their beauty without moralising on the ethics of their profession. Larionov painted many different variations on the Venus theme, including the *Katsap Venus* and the *Jewish Venus*.¹⁰⁸ According to Evgenii Kovtun, Il'ia Zdanevich remarked that Larionov had wanted to offer a representation of the beauty that was typical of [different] nationalities, which were not suitable for

¹⁰⁸ Chagall also painted playful parodies of reclining nudes, including *The Odalisque* (1913–14) (a parody of Manet's famous *Olympia* 1863) and *Nude with a Fan* (1910) (which seems to be closely related to Larionov's *Venus Series*).

any Greco-Roman canon [of beauty].¹⁰⁹ Although the *Venus Series* is related to the European model of Olympia, the Venus shown in figure 225 *Venus (Venus and Mikhail)* (1912) is more closely related to Larionov's *Season Cycle* (see figs. 57 and 58). Here, a young Venus reclines on a white sheet and pillows. Her saffron-coloured skin and gypsy features and jewellery suggest that she is from the South. There is nothing lewd about this Venus. In fact, Larionov has infused the picture with a light-hearted ludic quality. Painted in a childlike or lubok style, Larionov provides us with a tree in blossom and a fresh red flower to greet the awakening Venus. A cupid (or is it the Archangel Mikhail?) has come to wake her, whilst a bird delivers a message. The only sexual feature is the girl's budding breasts. It is a picture of innocence, a picture lacking in moral judgement. Compare Larionov's handling of the prostitute with the proletarian commentary of figure 226 which was published in *Satira*, 1906. The latter is a picture of excess, where the 'ruling class feast and whore while the people (in the corner drawings) suffer and toil'. The picture is obviously brimming with political, moral and social comment.

My final comments on the presence of the lower and working classes in Futurist art are directed towards examples of art which use modern avant-garde styles (such as Rayism or Russo-Cubism) and/or depict the lower classes competently engaged with modern technology. Larionov, for example, made the modern motif of an electric tram the focus of his *Gorodskaiia ulitsa* [City Street] (1911, fig. 227). It is a somewhat Neo-Impressionist piece in which horse-drawn carts are seen alongside the tram. Faceless, featureless grey figures inhabit the tram, possibly on their way to work. One is reminded of Livshits's reported shame when he departed from the *Brodiachaia sobaka* early one morning with painted cheeks, following a full night of entertainment. He describes the shame which he felt when he came face to face with the hardened features of an old man on his way to work.¹¹⁰

Camilla Gray declared Malevich's *Tochil'shchik* [Knife-Grinder] (1912, fig. 228) 'the outstanding example of the few first-class paintings which belong to this "Futurist" movement in Russia'.¹¹¹ By this, she meant that it was an excellent

¹⁰⁹ Kovtun, p. 98.

¹¹⁰ Livshits, *The One and a Half-Eyed Archer*, p. 230.

¹¹¹ See Gray, pp. 198–200, for a focused critical analysis of Malevich's painting.

example of the ‘analysis of the movement of man and a machine’ where it is the man who dominates the machine and not the reverse. It is notable that Malevich did not chose to illustrate his theory with a highly technological piece of machinery, but rather chose the everyday elementary street object of the knife-grinder. Although quite different in style to Goncharova’s *Velosipedist* [The Cyclist] (1913, fig. 230) both pictures seem to extol the virtues of the ordinary man who has total control over his technological environment and has earned his place and self-respect in the city. Gray describes Malevich’s interpretation of the ‘super-man, man-become-machine’ as ‘an order-creating force in a world of chaos’.¹¹²

Goncharova’s *Tkatskii stanok + zhenshchina* [Loom + Woman] (1913, fig. 229) and *Velosipedist* portray the relationship between people, modern machinery and their environment. Unlike Malevich’s *Tochil’shchik* it is the machine and not the person who dominates *Tkatskii stanok + zhenshchina*. In fact this picture has been alternately named *The Weaver* and *The Machine’s Engine*.¹¹³ Like the knife-grinder, the woman’s body is depicted in refracted, geometrical shapes which harmonise with the dynamism of her surroundings. Unlike the knife-grinder, her body, dressed in light blue material, is semi-transparent. Her head and scarf, however, are opaque and we watch as the woman concentrates on her work. There is a fascinating tension between the identity of the woman and her technological surroundings. On the one hand, her long blue garment, white headscarf and golden coloured hands and face are reminiscent of Goncharova’s provincial, religious and Madonna paintings; on the other, the woman is so engrossed in her command of machinery that her fingers and body are absorbed into its workings.

I do not think that the semi-presence of the weaver herself should be interpreted as a negative reflection on the female subject, or that Goncharova is suggesting the weaver is somehow unreal or unsubstantiated in the way in which Larionov made puppets out of his bourgeois figures. Instead, I would argue that Goncharova’s interpretation of a woman at work in a factory is a positive statement. The woman is not depicted in a stereotypical female environment (in the home as mother or

¹¹² Gray, p. 199.

¹¹³ Chamot notes that the picture figured in Goncharova’s Moscow exhibition, 1913 (no. 765) under the title *Loom + Woman*. Gray, however, has named the painting *The Machine’s Engine*, p. 140.

daughter, or in a bar or on the street as prostitute). Instead she has made the successful transition to the typically masculine territory of the modern machine. She is not portrayed as a vulnerable peasant girl, but rather as a woman who is in control of her fate, earning her salary and sure of her place within the industrial process which is rotating all about her. Her success is reflected in the crisp whiteness of the cloth which she is weaving. The repetition of the hanging lights suggest that other people, possibly women, are lined up beside her. It is significant that Goncharova chose to depict a piece of machinery which was traditionally associated with women, thereby reinforcing the contribution which women were making to industry. Possibly, through choosing a loom in a textile factory (as opposed to heavy industry), Goncharova is suggesting how women have successfully adapted, and will continue to adapt, their traditional provincial skills in order to become self-sufficient in the city. The loom is pictured here in its full rhythmic glory, and although it is an inanimate object Goncharova has drawn out the decorative qualities in the geometric shape of the turning cogs and the rail of threads. It is a typical Goncharova painting in which the decorative is contrasted with the refracted Rayonist motifs which add a sense of movement, resulting in a colourful, decorative dynamism.

Velosipedist contrasts motifs of modern technology, with traditional industries and leisure. A man of indeterminable class¹¹⁴ is depicted on his bicycle as he pedals along the cobbled street in a purposeful manner, showing indifference to the seductive shop-signs for drink or entertainment, retailers of silk and wool, and hats.

Futurist depictions of the lower classes are often lively, playful or sophisticated. The figures frequently assume a quiet confidence which is communicated through strong painterly lines, brush strokes, geometrical shapes, simple palettes of bright colours, and the way in which the figures occupy the field. Most important of all is the fact that the scenes are never static, but always dynamic. There is always the potential for change and a projection into the future. The canvases reflect energy, movement and life, even when the subjects are depicted in a provincial context. The photograph of

¹¹⁴ It is difficult to pass judgement on the class of the male subject. On the one hand he does not appear to be wearing a suit and is dressed a shirt or jacket and trousers and flat cap, possibly suggestive of a member of the lower classes or lower-middle classes. On the other, a bicycle would have been an expensive item and no doubt a symbol of independence, unaffordable to the working classes.

the Goncharova and Larionov room in the State Russian Museum shows how this energy and dynamism was intensified when the Futurist canvases were shown together, and one can only imagine the impact of, say, Goncharova's 1913 solo exhibition.

Although the Futurists rarely spoke publicly about politics or a social agenda, I believe that their collected artistic oeuvre speaks volumes. Where Futurist art mocks or vulgarises the bourgeoisie, it highlights the achievement of the lower classes, the working classes and the marginal figures of society in adapting to city life successfully. By identifying the positive and dynamic existence of these ordinary figures going about their daily task in their art (as seen in figures 212-229), I would argue that the Futurists are creating a new artistic language which is capable of describing the entire spectacle of modern life in a more inclusive manner than other contemporary artistic tendencies. If the Futurists intended to integrate art in life, they also depicted all aspects of life in art. Perhaps as a result of their own need to negotiate obstacles of poverty, gender and social background in order to succeed in the competitive artistic environment, they were able to represent a more comprehensive picture of modern life in their art, more effectively, objectively and dynamically than their Russian contemporaries.

The analysis of selected Futurist art has been used in these final two chapters in an attempt to identify the Futurist attitude to the public, in order to grasp the meaning or function of Futurist performance in modern society. The artistic analysis supports the argument that Futurism interacted with different sections of society on different levels, for different reasons, possibly according to a Futurist socio-political agenda. For example, graffiti and bad language is offensive to some but a source of entertainment to others. The versatility of an artistic movement which transgressed traditional artistic boundaries, enabled the broad spectrum of lower-class subjects of Futurist art to become references in Futurist public debates and other forms of Futurist performance. The heroes of the Luna Park productions were not aristocrats, or doctors or industrialists, but ordinary, everyday city inhabitants: an old man, a young man, a fat man, a mugger, sportsmen, an attentive worker and newspaper sellers (in addition to the carnivalesque deformed characters).

Through their transgressive acts of perceived pornography or hooliganism, the Futurists were often associated with subversive elements of the lower classes. However, through the discourse of their art, I would argue that the Futurists attempted to redefine this working lower class. In the flux of modern life most interpretations of the public sphere were defined by the presence of the middle classes, for the consumption of the middle classes. Disenfranchised members of society, including the lower classes, peasants, Jews, women, were either marginalized, or subjected to romantic or vulgar interpretation. Futurism of this era presents a more inclusive picture of modern life where all classes interact and the potential of the disenfranchised to make a valuable contribution to future modern life is revealed. It is possible, therefore, that the disenfranchised represent the 'true' Futurist audience. It is, of course, this relationship to the future proletarian class which represents one of the over-riding elements of continuity between the pre- and post-1917 eras of Russian Futurism, which became explicit in wake of the Revolution.

Conclusion

The Street Enters the House¹

Throughout this thesis I have considered Futurist performance in the wider context of the emergence and development of the Russian Futurist movement. Futurism emerged at a time of increasing commodification and diversification within the arts. New commercial enterprises, private art galleries, publishing companies and the arrival of cinema, combined with a growing urban population and expanding middle class who sought new forms of leisure activities, provided fertile ground for new artistic ventures. As such, Futurism constituted a part of the newly forming art and entertainment market.

Russian Futurism was a particularly modern phenomenon which reflected the contradictions and tensions of modern urban life. It mixed the modernity of new technology, new theories of visual perception, and recent socio-political discourses on self-betterment and the place of the individual within modern society with interpretations of a more generic national identity which was witnessed in the inclusion of references to traditional Russian art forms (including icons, *lubki*, textiles and painted shop-signs) and a constant reference to Russian provincial life.

The spectacle of Futurist performance needs to be understood on two levels: firstly, as an expression of a specifically Russian context, drawing upon established modes of performance, including the carnival and advertised public debates; secondly, appropriating European avant-garde models of provocation and spectacle, especially those of the Italian Futurists and British Vorticists. To a large extent, Futurism comprised the Russian element of the broader European avant-garde which had also developed in the wake of an era of intense industrialisation, in an increasingly capitalist urban environment, populated by the growing middle-class. Russian

¹ The title is that of a painting (1911) by the Italian Futurist, Umberto Boccioni.

Futurists drew on their association with, or declared rejection of, the European avant-garde either to legitimise their status as a recognisable artistic group within a wider European movement, or to define their aesthetic in contrast to the European discourse. The visit of the Italian Futurist patron and impresario, Filippo Marinetti, to Russia in January 1914, when Russian Futurism was experiencing unprecedented levels of popularity, did much to enhance the Russians' public image as bona fide artists.

Crucial to Futurism's survival in the new competitive market was its need to secure a guaranteed source of funding and, to a large degree, the early phase of Russian Futurism, 1910-14, can be interpreted as a struggle to use all means and all artistic creativity possible to secure that funding. Although the Futurists did not achieve this goal, they were successful in creating a public image and acquiring a visible and quantitative level of popularity. By autumn 1913 articles were dedicated to Futurist-related issues on an almost daily basis and in a broad section of the press; the press had identified a cult following, typically of young women and students who had adopted the latest Futurist fashions; Natal'ia Goncharova was declared 'the most gifted, able and cutting-edge of all Russian Modernists'² in the wake of her seminal solo exhibition; and members of the middle classes, military officers, members of the Duma, and intellectuals paid nine rubles to attend the sell-out Luna Park productions.

Part I described the competitive artistic situation of the 1910s. It identified the key figures who helped to shape Futurism's development, from patrons and impresarios to artists and critics, and analysed the various marketing strategies which they employed to engage an audience. Part II then examined the interaction between Futurist and audience. It focussed on the sites of Futurist performance, the public's perception of and associations with these sites, and questions of affordability and accessibility. The final two chapters dealt specifically with the critical reception of Futurism: the public's attitude to the Futurists; the critics' interpretation of the Futurists and the public; and the Futurists' attitude to different sections of the public.

² Rosstsi [A. M. Efros], 'Vystavka kartin N. S. Goncharovoi', *Russkie vedomosti*, No. 225, 1 October 1913, p. 3, cited in *Nataliia Goncharova: Gody v Rossii*, edited by E. B. Basner et al. (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Russkii muzei, 2002), pp. 295-96.

In short, this thesis has explored the issues surrounding the contemporary socio-economic and cultural conditions in which Russian avant-garde theatre was produced and consumed at the turn of the twentieth century. Based on a combination of this exploration and an analysis of Futurist aesthetics in art and performance, I have argued that the initial era of Russian Futurism can be characterised by an identifiable socio-political element, which later became more explicit in the wake of the 1917 Revolution. A rejection of perceived values and vacuous lifestyles of the dominant middle classes, and a celebration of the valuable contribution of the lower working classes and the disenfranchised sections of society in modern urban and provincial life were central to this socio-political view.

Provocation and audacity were constituent elements of Futurism's aesthetic during this period. Futurism sought to challenge people's perspectives on all aspects of life, to encourage them to see the ordinary from a new perspective and therefore effect a qualitative difference in the everyday experience of living. Provocation was at the heart of all Futurist performance, but also Futurist literature, art, personal conduct and even social networking. This anarchic element of Futurism was made explicit through the title of the Oslinyi khvost exhibition and event, *Mishen'* [Target].

If Futurism took art out onto the street, it also represented many aspects of the street in its art. Futurist art depicted colourful Neo-Primitivist scenes of life in the provinces which attracted positive critical reception. These were juxtaposed with 'crudely' painted scenes of the disenfranchised sections of the community (prostitutes and so-called pornographic images, members of the lower-ranking military, the working and lower classes, washerwomen, floor-polishers, barbers, waitresses, Jews and so on) and deformed parodies of the parading bourgeoisie, which provoked outrage from the conservative moral guardians of society. This art celebrates the ordinary, the everyday, the unglamorous: members of the disenfranchised sections of society who perform the routine services which maintain the workings of the city for the enjoyment of the middle classes. It is a celebration of the self-sufficient productive process, like the dynamism of a well-oiled machine. By contrast, the bourgeoisie, who profit from the capitalist climate, are generally portrayed as deformed, insubstantial or powerless in some way. Futurist art represents a more subtle inversion of social hierarchy than momentary Futurist

performative rhetoric, which often failed to go beyond the traditional avant-garde practice of *épater les bourgeois*. As such, I would argue that Futurist art exposes and records its subjective identification of the fragility of the middle classes within the context of the public sphere. It suggests that the *nouveaux riches* are yet to feel comfortable with their new social status, which they only recently assumed through the acquisition of new money.

This thesis has illustrated how Russian Futurism of 1910 to 1914 was synonymous with the concept of transgression. Transgression of perceived social, economic, gender and aesthetic boundaries was crucial to Futurism's development on two levels: firstly, it enabled them to pursue new aesthetic forms; and secondly, on a practical note, Futurism's transgressive nature enabled the movement to adapt to contemporary dynamic circumstances, to reach a wider audience, and, ultimately, to survive as a recognisable artistic movement.

Futurism employed multiple strategies of provocation and exploited the diversity of its artistic forms and media (artistic, linguistic, literary, performative and musical) in a variety of sites and locations in order to engage the maximum audience possible. The heterogeneity which existed among Futurist members (in terms of social, financial, educational, geographical and artistic backgrounds) enabled them to transcend established social and artistic boundaries. This meant that the Futurists and their work could be found in fashionable art galleries and salons, at the residences of wealthy Moscow merchants and art patrons, and in celebrated city cabarets but they could equally be found in flea markets in search of painted shop-signs and traditional arts and crafts, in the Dostoevskian slums of St. Petersburg, in a canteen of dubious reputation or in the countryside.

If, as I am suggesting, Futurism was underpinned by an identifiable socio-political aesthetic, how did it manifest itself in performance? Firstly, as I have illustrated, the collective analysis of all four forms of Futurist performance (street 'happenings', spontaneous cabaret performances; advertised public lectures and debates; and theatre performed in a traditional setting, that is, the Luna Park performances) recognises the adaptability, creativity and transgressive nature of the Futurist to pursue theatrical experimentation and reach a maximum audience. The Futurists'

ability to transgress artistic, social, spatial and gender boundaries meant that they were able to address a wider audience than, say, the stars of the Imperial theatres and the Moscow Art Theatre, or those who found themselves on the lowest rung of the entertainment ladder: storytellers or provincial artists who generally worked in lower-class taverns or appeared in provincial *balagany* [fairground booths]. By charging nine rubles for a ticket to a Futurist opera at the Luna Park Theatre one day, but then appearing in full Futurist garb on the streets of Moscow or in the Café Filippov, which was frequented by the lower classes, for free another day, the Futurists were undermining the system of production and consumption of art. Whilst many members of the lower classes would have felt uncomfortable in or could not afford the entrance fee to a Futurist art exhibition, through performative acts of street 'happenings' and manifestoes which invited the public to join in the Futurist fashions, the Futurists broadened the potential access to art and took the art to the people.

The Futurists appropriated traditional Russian carnival strategies of humour, brightly coloured costume, offensive rhetoric, plays on gender and inversion of hierarchy which enticed the bourgeois paying public. This behaviour was deemed acceptable as long as it was restricted to the appropriate location, such as the fashionable Brodiachaia sobaka cabaret in St. Petersburg, with its mixture of bohemian and middle-class audience. However, when such performative strategies spilled onto the streets and became accessible to a wider public who indulged in the Futurist scandals and acts of alleged hooliganism, the same moral guardians felt threatened and decried the 'performance' as profane and inciteful to more acts of hooliganism among the lower classes.

If we consider such public acts of alleged hooliganism or displays of transsexuality within the context of increased levels of State-imposed social censorship (in the wake of the failed 1905 Revolution), or the new culture of adoption of correct manners and decorum by the lower-rungs of the upwardly mobile middle classes, who attempted to conceal their provincial or lower-class origins, then one can sense how the concept of exposure underpinned much Futurist work. Futurist art, of all mediums, presented a picture of life as it is, 'warts and all'.

The question of a targeted audience is crucial to an analysis of Futurist performance and any suggestion of a socio-political agenda. The issue of a targeted audience has formed a central theme of this thesis and has been discussed in terms of marketing strategies, associations with specific sites of Futurist performance, the audience's reception of Futurism and the critic's impression of the audience, and finally an interpretation of the Futurist attitude to the public, largely formulated through an analysis of selected Futurist art. We must not forget that in the absence of any guaranteed form of patronage, the Futurists relied on the public to buy their art and pay to attend advertised Futurist events. In other words, the very existence of the artistic movement was at the mercy of its paying consumers. The analysis of financial documents and a comparison of ticket prices and art prices in Chapters 2 and 3 illustrated how difficult it was for an independent artistic group without secure patronage to organise an art exhibition, and that it was much more profitable for all concerned to arrange a public lecture or debate. Chapters 1-3 described how the Futurist impresarios collaborated with other artistic groups to share the financial burden and thereby make it possible to mount a public exhibition. In view of the ticket and art prices, it was argued in these chapters that it was most likely the majority of the audience or art patrons of Futurist events would typically come from the middle classes and the *poluintelligentsiia*. As the development of the Russian avant-garde, like that of many of its European counterparts, relied on the finances and therefore participation of the bourgeoisie, Futurist performance needed to employ familiar modes of carnival practice to attract the middle classes.

Futurist performance was restrained by two major factors: by State censorship and financial constraints. Both factors affected Futurist performance in that it restricted the Futurists and their audiences from going to extreme forms of behaviour. Many of the attending middle classes, as we have seen in Chapters 4 and 5, are reported as going to a Futurist event, simply to indulge in the temporary profanity of a scandal or 'rhetorical' Futurist abuse, which is similar to the catharsis of the carnival. Some spectators, of course, were truly offended and denounced the morals of the Futurists in the press. Others attended Futurist events out of a genuine interest in the Russian avant-garde. The Futurists had to conduct themselves in such a way as to encourage the attendance of the first and third categories. Failure to do so would result in total loss of patronage and possibly the end of the Futurist movement altogether. If the

Futurists did pursue a particular socio-political aesthetic, consciously or otherwise, censorship prevented them from being too explicit both in their performance and their literature (including all marketing literature, art exhibition catalogues, and so on). Both attracted the eye of the censor who was sensitive to anything deemed to be politically subversive. Art, therefore, represents a more discreet platform from which the Futurists might communicate a socio-political agenda.

Futurism did effect change through performance. The Luna Park productions, with their experimentations with costume and set design, and the incorporation of innovative use of lighting, not to mention the almost absurdist narrative represented a pivotal moment in Russian theatrical history. By analysing the reception of all four categories of Futurist performance, we can see how the Futurists educated the audience so that a decorative device, such as face-painting or a striped jacket, was considered a sort of mobile costume design, marking the wearer out as a performer, rather than a threatening hooligan. The Futurists' ability to transcend social, spatial and artistic boundaries encouraged the relatively rapid creation of a recognisable public image among a cross-section of the public. Their success in fulfilling their Futurist aesthetic of bringing art into life and effecting a change is reflected in the number of people who adopted the Futurist fashions, or learned to decode Futurist rhetoric, appropriate it and subvert it through heckling or the audience's own physical reaction. In other words the new theatrical praxis of audience participation is testament to the audience's engagement in city life and exploration of their own place within that public sphere. The sketch by A. Lebedev (fig. 185) points, albeit satirically, to this reassessment of one's place in society. The sketch refers to the supposed influence of the Futurist opera *Pobeda nad solntsem* [Victory Over the Sun] in which N. B. Nordman-Severova announces to the assembled nouveaux riches in the Tenishevskii Hall, 'Dear sisters! Girls of the street and hooligans – these are the children of the sun, let them have a place in our salons!'

Russian Futurism demonstrated how the artistic could be found in all aspects of daily life. It demonstrated that artistic expression was dynamic and adaptable within the flux of modern life. It could incorporate the modern, the provincial, the religious and the seemingly profane and could appear at any moment and in any guise. Under the umbrella of Futurism, factory workers, street-sweepers and hairdressers could be

celebrated in the bastions of high art; equally, people could paint the tree-trunks purple or wear wooden-spoons in their button holes and parade down Nevskii Prospekt.

Performance, more than any other art form, has the potential to incorporate all modes of artistic practice and transgress all artistic boundaries in order to communicate with its audience and effect a change of perspective. Having given a comprehensive assessment of the socio-economic and cultural context in which Futurist performance was produced and delivered, and argued the socio-political subtext of Futurism of this early period, I hope that this thesis will serve to promote further research into specific areas of Futurist performance including narrative, set design, recitation, modes of performance, role of the director and role or participation of the audience. I hope that my research will prompt further consideration of individual Futurist art forms in the context of the development of the movement as a whole, and that it will facilitate an understanding of the emergence of Futurism both as a significant phenomenon in the history of Russian theatre, and as a reflection of the burgeoning artistic possibilities which existed during the dynamic period of Russian urban cultural life at the beginning of the twentieth century.

APPENDIX

Information taken from the exhibition catalogue of the 2nd Soiuz molodezhi Art Exhibition, 1911. The catalogue is housed in the Russian State Museum, St. Petersburg (f: 121, 'Soiuz Molodezhi'; ed. kh: 9 'Katalogi vystavok "Soiuz molodezhi" na 12 ekz; l: 6)

[information which is written in pencil appears in this list in italics. All prices and hand-written notes in ink have been under-lined. All remaining information has been printed in the catalogue]

[Katalog] 2nd Выставки картин общества художников "Союз Молодежи" 1911

[p. 2] *Кунс – портрет – 50*

[p. 3] Балльер А. И.

100-1 Autre Hollande

40-2

50-3 } Пейзажи

40-4

25-5 } Рисунки

25-6

40-7 } Эскизы } Крестьянин (Бессарабия)

40-8

25-9 } Этюды

50-10

[p. 4] Балльер Лидия

11 Портрет

12 Пейзаж

[p. 5] Бодуэн-де-Куртенэ И. С.

100-13 Часть фриза

100-14 Цена в кабачке

75-15 Белый Олень

75-16 Портрет

75-17 Девушка

75-18 Мылостыня } Рамы работв Ел. Шрам

75-19 Миниатюра

50-20 } Миниатюры

50-21

150-22 Анжелика

100-23 Этюд

Лошади 300

[p. 6] Белкин

20[sic] 24

150p

	25	Nature Morte	100p
100	26		100
?[sic]	27	Пейзаж	200p
	276	Пейзаж	150p
		Этюд	100p
	246		200p

[р. 7] Верховский Г. Е.

28	Даная [sic]	
29	Скульптура из сикаморрового дерева	100
30	Этюд [sic]	
31	Портрет [sic]	
32	} Рисунки [sic]	
33		
34		

[р. 8] Воленкова С. Н.

35	Nature morte
36	Nature morte

[р. 9] Зельманова А. М.

37	Портрет Г. Р.
38	Портрет Н. З.
39/40	Этюды
41	Зима
42	Усадьба зимой
43	Дворики
44	Nature Morte с Гвоздниками
45	Крышка для ящика
46	Наброски

[р. 10] Кончаловский П. П.

47	Матадор
48	Исптнский Мальчик
49	Пей в Испании
50	Комната
51	Испанский танец
52	Зима
53	Nature Morte

[р. 11] Леваковска Я.

54/55/56 Этюды (*I have not noted the stated price)

[р. 12] Львов П. И.

Утро – Моз?? 75-?55

- ?150 57 Двор 100-75-50
[?100] 58 Сибирский пейзаж 100 75
59 Тобольск 75-50-40p 100?
60 Овраг 75-50-30 75?
61 Этюд 50-25
62 Женщина с ребенком [sic]
63 Лежадка [sic]
64
65 }
66 } *Рисунки по 25p-20p до 15p*
67 }
68 }

[р. 13] Машков И

- 69
70 } *Натурицина*
71/2 *Nature Morte*
73 *Портрет*

[р. 14] Нагубников С.

- 74 *Портрет от 250-200p*
75 *Мальчики не продается*
76 *Цыганка 150p*
77 *Окно 100p*
78 *Розы не продается*
79 *Nature Morte [sic]*
Женщина с ребенком 150p

[р. 15] Розанова О. В.

- 80 *Nature Morte*
81 *Ресторан*

[р. 16] Сагайдачный Е. Я.

- 82 *Свадьба (Декоративный Фриз) 50*
83
84 } *Пейзажи*
85 } *40*
86 }
87 } *продан*
88 } *продано*
89 } *Эскизы для Народного Театра 60*
90 }
91 *Портрет 65*
свадьба рис. от 5p-30

Детск рис. от 5p-30

[р. 17] Спандиков Э. К.

93 Голуби 75-50

94 Гарем[?] 300

95 Апаши 50

кардая два бодыише ¹⁰⁰ 75 ка????

96 Лошади } 50 ~~75~~ 75-50

97 Баржа }

98 На диване 100-75

99 Маска 100-75

100 Цветы 75-50

101 Церков 50-35

102 Скэтинг 100-75

103 набросок Трона Венеры к постановке «ЦМ»

104 Мос[?] Я. лично. 50-35

[р. 18] Челнокова Т. М.

105 Виноградники

[р. 19] Школьник И. С.

106 Цветы 100

107 Вечер 100

108 Nature Morte 100

109 Город 100

110 Сумерки 75

111 Кукла 50

112 Этюд окно 50

113 Interieur 75

продан 114 Закат 100

115 }
116 } Пейзажи } 100
117 }
118 }

119 Весна 75

[р. 20] Шлейфер Ц. Я.

120 Пастушок 75р

121 Nature Morte 45

122 Любовь 150

123 Портрет 100

124 Этюд 50

125 Стокгольм (Этюд) 50

126 } Этюд панно }
127 } Для театра } 300р

[р. 21] Барт В. С. (Москва)

128 Мальчик и дискобол	300
129 Натущина	300
130 Акварель	300

[р. 22] Бурлюк В. Д. (Москва)

131 Портрет поэта	300
132 Портрет поэта Хлебников	
133 } Пейзаж	250
134 }	
135 Морской залив	250
136 Крестьянка	300
137 Этюд головы	200
138 Девушка	300

[р. 23] Бурлюк Д. Д. (М)

139 Фрукты	150
140 Цветущия деревья	250
141 Полдено на Днепре	200
142 Nature Morte	200
143 Барышня	300
144 Зима	} 150
145 Конюшня	
146 Днепр	
147 Полдень	
148 Порт [sic]	
149 Повар	

[р. 24] Фон-Визен А. К. (М)

150 В Алжире	500
151 Акробаты	300
152 }	} Эскизы 300
153 }	
154 }	
	200

[р. 25] Гончарова Н. С. (М)

155 Иней	1000
156 Вечер	1000
157 Религиозная композиция	1500
158 Религиозная триптих	3000
159 Весна в городе	500
160 Пейзаж	300
161 В церкви	400
162 Дровокол	400

[р. 26] Куприн (М)

163 Nature Morte 150

[р. 27] Ларионов М. Ф. (М)

164 Хлеб 1000

165 Солдаты 1500

166 Собственный портрет (не продается)

167 Этюд 300

168 Nature Morte 2000

[р. 28] Малевич К. С. (М)

169 Человек в острой шапке

170 Человек с зубной болью

171 Массажист в бане

172 Парники (землю возять)

173 Дама

} 200-150

(** some writing in pencil and initials MS?? Underneath)

[р. 29] Моргунов А. А. (М)

174 В ресторане 200

Зимной 175 Пейзаж 200

176 Дом 300

177 Пейзаж 300

178 В трактире 300

[р. 30] Роговин Н. И. (М)

179 } Театральные

180 } Декорации (к Русскому Театру)

Страшун[?] 100р

[р. 31] Татлин В. Е. (М)

181 С город 250

182 Натурщица 300

~~183~~

~~184~~ } проданы

185 } Рисунки по 30р

186

187



191

~~192 Портрет~~

Филонов К??????? 800р

***Stamped dates in the back of the catalogue 13 Апр. – 10 Мая 1911 show [the sale of] 862 catalogues

Listings from the Soiuz molodezhi Exhibition Catalogue, 10 November 1913 – 10 January 1914, St. Petersburg. The catalogue is housed in the Russian State Museum, St. Petersburg (f: 121 'Soiuz Molodezhi'; ed. kh: 9 'Katalogi vystavok "Soiuz molodezhi" na 12 ekz; s: 12)

- | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|-----------------|------------------|
| Наташъ Альтманъ. <i>Алтайская гора</i> | | 27. Саран. | } 100р | |
| 100 1. Мѣстечко. | } 1911 г. | 28. На палубѣ. | | |
| 200 2. Еврейскія похороны | | 29. Сумерки. | | |
| 100 3. Окраина Парижа | | 30. Ямъ-Тесово (Новгород. губ.) (собств. В. Н. Гордина) | } не проданы | |
| В. Д. Бурлюкъ. | | 31. Ночь. | | |
| 4. Автопортретъ съ двухъ точекъ зрѣнія (выявленіе оранжеваго и синяго цвѣтовъ). | | 32. Амбары. | | |
| 5. Георгій Побѣдоносецъ (мѣдь) живописный барельефъ; случайная раскраска (смотримъ на разстояніи шести аршинъ). | | 33. Монастырская хлѣбопекарня (Череменицъ). | | |
| 6. Проектъ портрета; реальный принципъ. | | 34. Пейзажъ. | | |
| 7. Чукурюкъ. | | 35. Деревенская баня. | | |
| Д. Д. Бурлюкъ. | | 36. Въ саду. | } 100р | |
| 8. Дирижеръ оркестра Большого Московскаго театра (оп. „Лакма“). | | А. М. Зельманова. | | |
| 9. Бѣгущая лошадь (примитивъ). | | 37. Этюдъ. | | } 200р.
150р. |
| 10. Изображеніе съ 3-хъ точекъ зрѣнія. | | 38. Натурщица. | | |
| М. Бѣженцевъ. | | 39. Портретъ С. Р. | | } 200р. |
| 11. | | 40. Автопортретъ. | | |
| 12. | | X 41. Калужскій переулочъ въ Петербургѣ. | | } 100р |
| Екатерина Васильева. | | X 42. Крыши Ревеля. | | |
| 13. Клеѣ. | | 43. Старый вѣтъ. | | } 45р.
50р. |
| 14. Р. В. Воиновъ. = 2к. | | 44. Рѣка (вскивъ). | | |
| А. В. Грищенко. | | X 45. Оврагъ (вскивъ). | } 100р. | |
| 15. Дворъ. | | X 46. Годгофа (повраженіе, Сенской школы). | | |
| 16. Натурщица. | | X 47. Гора. | } 200р.
100р | |
| 17. Улица. | | X 48. Набережная. | | |
| 18. Basilica S. Francesco } въ Assisi (Italia). | | И. В. Клюнокъ. | | |
| 19. Piazza | | 49. Пильщикъ. | } 50р. | |
| 20. Nature morte (съ черепами). | | 50. Кувшинокъ. | | |
| 21. Кувшинъ и помидоры. | | Т. В. Лабунская. | | |
| 22. Nature morte. | | 51. Маленькая усадьба. | } 50р. | |
| К. В. Дыдышко <i>Дорога, н. 579-17</i> | | 52. Бесѣдка. | | |
| 23. Деревня (масло). 350р | | 53. Мое окно. | | |
| 24. Жатва. 100 | } 100р | 54. Часовня. | } не проданы | |
| 25. Ожиданіе. 100 | | Н. Н. Любавина. | | |
| 26. Дорога. 100 | | 55. № 1. | | } 50р. |
| | 56. № 2. | | | |
| | 57. № 3, сѣнее и зеленое. | | | |
| | | Э. А. Ласонъ-Спирова. | | |
| | | 58. | } 50р. | |
| | | 59. | | |
| | | 60. | | |

К. С. Малевичъ.

1912 г.

- 61. Крестьянка съ ведрами.
- 62. Лицо крестьянской дѣвушки.
- 63. Крестьяне на улицѣ.
- 64. Утро послѣ вьюги въ деревнѣ.
- 65. Усовершенствованный портретъ Ивана Васильевича Кляукова.
- 66. Точильщикъ.

45
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ЗАУМНЫЯ РЕАЛИЗМЪ

1913 г.

- 67. Жница.
- 68. Керосинка.
- 69. Стѣнные часы.
- 70. Лампа.
- 71. Самоваръ.
- 72. Портретъ помѣщика.

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

КУБО-ФУТУРИСТИЧЕСКАЯ РЕАЛИЗМЪ

А. А. Моргуновъ. Москва Волынка

- 73. Цвѣты. 150
- 74. Дубъ. 100
- 75. Сосны. 100
- 76. Въ паркѣ. 150
- 77. Парижъ. 175
- 78. Подъ розовой тѣнью. 175
- 79. Мужъ и жена. 75
- 80. Пейзажъ. 75
- 81. Пляска. 75
- 82. Молотильщики. 75
- 83. Въ чайной. 75
- 84. Видъ съ балкона. 100
- 85. Кабинетъ авиатора. 100

2100
2100

Н. В. Матюшинъ.

- 86. Красный звонъ.
- 87. Прощенный звонъ.

С. Подгаевскій. Зенковъ Плати

- 88. Конекъ. 50
- 89. Поутъ. 100

И. Д. Потыпака.

- 90. Заратустра. 1000р - 800р
- 91. Плясунъ. 100р - 75р
- 92. Юноша.
- 93. Игрушки. 150р 100р
- 94. Шуты. 300р 250р

- 95. Яблоки. 100р 75р
- 96. Стрѣльба въ цѣль. 75р 45р
- 97. Прекрасная выдумка. 500р
- 98. Точильщики. 150р - 100р

И. Пуши.

- 99.
- 100.
- 101.

О. Н. Розанова.

- 102. Постройка дома. 100
- 103. Портъ. 150
- 104. Набережная. 500
- 105. Человѣкъ на улицѣ. 100
- 106. Городъ (эскизъ). 100
- 107. Портретъ поэта А. Е. Крученыхъ.
- 108. Мертвая природа. 200
- 109. 250
- 110. 100
- 111. 100
- 112. 100
- 113. 200
- 114. Циркъ. 300

Пути-инженера душевныхъ движеній (опытъ анализа собственнаго творчества).

- 115. Диссонансъ.
- 116. Безъ названія.
- 117. Пейзажъ-инертность.
- 118. Эскизы и рисунки.

Н. М. Сивикова. Москва, Уланскій пер 19 и ул Чубинской

- 119. 150
- 120. 150

Э. К. Снабдикова. Тегеранъ, Р. Шонгу 25 кв. 12 Тел. 442-1

- 121. Пасха. 300р
- 122. Время. 100
- 123. Мотивъ фриса. 300р
- 124. О пейзажѣ. 200 - 100 пейзажъ 200
- 125. О прѣтахъ. 100
- 126. Рисунки. 75 маселомъ и акварью 40

Владимиръ Емрафовичъ Татликиъ. Москва, Остоженка кв. 3

- 127. Композиціонный анализъ (масло). 400-350
- 128. Тушь. 75-60.

129. .
130. .

И. Н. Филоновъ.

131. Картина. 2400 р.
132. Полукартина. 800 р.
133. Картина. 200 р.
134. 6 раскрашенныхъ рисунковъ (принципъ картины).
135. Проектъ лубочной картины.
136. Рисунокъ.
137. Эскизъ. 300 р.

В. М. Ходасевичъ.

138

И. С. Школьникъ.

139. Цвѣты. 100
140-139. Nature morte. 100
141-140. . . . 100
142-141. . . . 100
143-142. . . . 100
144-143. . . . 100
145-144. . . . 100
146-145. . . . 100

147-146. Провинция. 100
148-147. . . . 100
149-148. . . . 125
150-149. . . . 100
151-150. Пейзажъ. 100
152-151. Вечеръ. 100
153-152. Эюль. 100

Вѣра Шехтель.

154-153. Балалайка.
155-154. Орфеистическая картина.

И. Я. Шлейферъ. Седьмъ 15 и 5.

156-155. Крыши. 725 р.
157-156. Вечеръ. 700 р.
158-157. Nature morte. 100 р.
159-158. Бахчисарай. 100 р.
160-159. Выѣзка кузнеца. 25 р.
161-160. Въ провинци. 80 р.

А. А. Экстеръ.

162-161. Кюль.
163-162. Фундуклевская вечеромъ.
164-163. Оксфордъ въ Голланди.
165-164. Лигурійское побережье.

Transcription of the Soiuz molodezhi manifesto which was distributed at the public lectures which were organised by Soiuz molodezhi, 23 and 24 March 1913.

С.-Петербург, 23 Марта 1913 г.

Устраивая раньше художественные выставки, рефераты и чтения по Искусству, Мы, Общество Художников “Союз Молодежи”, хотели тем самым дать возможность интересующейся искусством публике ознакомиться с состоянием Современной Молодой Живописи и раскрыть перед ней свое техническое Credo.

Этот практический путь выступления мы оставляем за собой и на будущее время, все более и более расширяя и углубляя его.

Устраивая сегодня уже диспут, а не реферат искусству и привлекая к участию на нем всех наших противников, мы объявляем наше боевое художественное Credo.

Мы выявляем себя в необыкновенное, исключительное время!

Весь нервный характер жизни Искусство нашего времени, с убедительностью, несомненною, доказывает, что Искусству, живописи в настоящий момент принадлежит Доминирующая роль!

Оно привлекает всеобщее внимание, как никогда!

И, близкое уже к освобождению, Новое Искусство имеет столько врагов, как никогда!

Кто они, наши враги, которым мы объявляем борьбу, и в чем нас обвиняют?

Не является ли то, в чем упрекают нас наши противники – залогом нашей победы и силы!?

Или наша любовь к Искусству, заставляющая нас жаждать видеть его освобожденным, заслуживает те комья грязи, которыми бросают в нас!

Мы объявляем борьбу всем тюремщикам Свободного Искусства Живописи, заковавшим его в цепи повседневности: политики, литературы и кошмара психологических эффектов.

Мы объявляем, что живописец может говорить только на языке живописных творческих переживаний, не залезая в чужие карманы.

Мы объявляем борьбу всем культивирующим сентиментальность личных переживаний самовлюбленным Нарциссам, для которых нет ничего дорогого, кроме собственного, без конца ими отражаемого, лика!

Мы объявляем борьбу Уголковому Творчеству “Мира Искусства”, смотрящему на мир через одно окно.

Этот мир мы желаем видеть широко раскрытым!

Вот вызов всем тем, кто нас обвиняет в теоретичности, в декадентстве, в отсутствии непосредственности!

В чем полагают непосредственность эти господа?!

В низменной тирании душевных переживаний!—всегда одних и тех же!

Тем хуже для них!

Мы объявляем, что ограничение творчества есть отравка Искусства!

Что свобода творчества — есть первое условие Самобытности! Отсюда следует, что у Искусства путей много!

Мы объявляем, что все пути хороши, кроме избитых и загрязненных чужими несчетными шагами и мы ценим только те произведения, которые новизной своей рожают в зрителе нового человека!

Вот вызов тем, кто нас обвиняет в неустойчивости, кто соблазняет нас приютом миролюбивого сна,—общим дортуаром, в котором безпробудно покоятся Передвижники, Мир-Искусственники, Союз Русских Художников и прочие и прочие любители душных помещений, атмосфера которых уже убаюкивающе действует и на Бубновый Валет.

Мы не завидуем их единодушному храпению!

Солнце Искусства светит слишком ярко, чтобы мы могли преступно спать.

Мы объявляем борьбу всем опирающимся на выгодное слово “устой”, ибо это почтенное слово хорошо звучит лишь в устах тех людей, которые обречены не поспевать за стремительным бегом времени!

Этому ветхому слову мы противопоставляем слово, “обновление”.

Вот наш девиз:

“В непрерывном обновлении Будущее Искусства”!

Мы широко открываем двери всем молодым, кому девиз наш дорог, чьи руки сильны чтобы высоко держать наше знамя, и оставляем за дверью всех сомневающихся, расчетливых, не знающих куда пристать, ибо этим растерянным, недоуменным отбросам Искусства дан только один рабский удел: чинить чужие дырявые знамена!

Мы презираем слово “Слава”, превращающее художника в тупое животное, которое упрямо отказывается ступить вперед, даже тогда, когда его погоняют кнутом.

От беспрестанных поворотов в сторону прошлого не мало людей вывернуло себе шею.

Нет чести для нас обратиться в подобный нелепый призрак прошедшего, в бесплодный вымысел того, чего уже нет!

Мы не добиваемся того, чтобы нас помнили даже после смерти.

Достаточно Культа кладбищ и мертвецов.

Но мы не дадим забыть себя, пока мы живы, ибо бодрствующие, мы будем без конца тревожить сон ленивых, увлекая все новые и новые силы, к вечно новой и вечно прекрасной борьбе.

“Союз Молодежи”.

Ticket Prices and details for selected Futurist art exhibitions, public lectures, cabarets and theatres and comparable entertainment venues, 1910-14

Venue	Event	Date	Lowest Price Rbs.kpks	Highest Price Rbs.kpks
St. Petersburg/Petrograd				
Passazh department store, Nevskii Prospekt, 48	<i>An Exhibition of Modern Trends</i> , inc. Mir iskusstva, Treugol'nik and Venok groups	26 April 1908		
Morskaia, 28, corner of Gorokhovaia	<i>Soiuz molodezhi</i> art exhibition	1910	0.20	0.40
Corner of Admiralteiskii and Voznesenskii Prospekts	<i>Soiuz molodezhi</i> art exhibition	1911	0.20	0.50
Troitskii Theatre, Troitskaia, 18	Public lecture <i>What is Cubism</i> by David Burluk	20 Nov 1912	0.50	2.50
Nevskii Prospekt, 73	<i>Soiuz molodezhi</i> art exhibition	4 Dec 1912-10 Jan 1913		
Troitskii Theatre, Troitskaia, 18	<i>Soiuz molodezhi</i> debate <i>On Modern Painting</i>	Saturday 23 Mar 1913		
Troitskii Theatre, Troitskaia, 18	<i>Soiuz molodezhi</i> debate <i>On the Newest Russian Literature</i>	Sunday 24 Mar 1913		
Concert Hall, Swedish Church of St. Ekaterina, Malaia Koniushennaia, 3	<i>Bubnovyi valet</i> art exhibition	3 Apr 1913 – 1 May 1913	0.25	0.50
Troitskii Theatre, Troitskaia, 18	Public lecture by A. V. Grischenko's	2 May 1913	0.50	3.00
Tenishevskii Hall, Mokhovaia 33	Public lecture, <i>Concerning the Futurists and Pushkin and Khlebnikov</i>	Sunday, 3 Nov 1913		
Nevskii Prospekt, 73	<i>Soiuz molodezhi</i> art exhibition	10 Nov 1913-10 Jan 1914		
Troitskii Theatre, Troitskaia, 18	Public lecture by Vladimir Maiakovskii, Aleksei Kruchenykh and David Burluk	20 November 1913	0.60	3.00
Luna Park Theatre, Ofitserkaia, 39	Performances of <i>Victory Over the Sun</i> and <i>Vladimir Maiakovskii: A Tragedy</i>	2-5 Dec 1913	9.00	
Concert Hall, Swedish Church of St. Ekaterina, Malaia Koniushennaia, 3	Futurist public lecture, <i>Our Answer to Marinetti</i>	11 Feb 1914		
Concert Hall of the Petropavloskii School	Public lecture <i>On Natal'ia Goncharova</i>	31 March 1914		
Marsovo Pole [Field of Mars], Dom 7	<i>The Last Futurist Art Exhibition, "0.10" (Zero-Ten)</i>	19 Dec 1915	0.30	0.50
Brodiachaia sobaka,	<i>Evening of Lenten Magic organised by the fakir</i>	Sunday 23 Feb 1914	1.00	3.00

	<i>Khadzhi-Fezir</i>			
Brodiachaia sobaka	<i>Vecher Maiakovskogo</i>	Friday 20 Feb 1915	2.00	3.00
Tivoli Cinema, Nevskii Prospekt	General film showing		0.30	1.00
Mariinskii Imperial Theatre	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*	1914	2.85	27.10
Aleksandrinskii Imperial Theatre	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*	1914	1.50	13.80
Mikhailovskii Imperial Theatre	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*	1914	2.30	22.60
Nicholas II's People's House	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*	1914	1.55	3.40
	Concerts by Count Sheremeteev's orchestra	1914	0.20	1.50
Zoological Pleasure Gardens	Entrance ticket for Gardens (additional payment for venues located within the Gardens)	1914	0.32	
Ciniselli Circus	General advertised prices*	1914	2.60	4.10
Factories and Temperance theatres**		General year-round price	0.05	0.10

* Information about general advertised ticket prices for non-Futurist events is taken from Karl Baedeker, *Baedeker's Russia 1914* (London, Newton Abbot: George Allen & Unwin, and David & Charles, 1971)

** See E. Anthony Swift, *Popular Theater and Society in Tsarist Russia* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2002), p. 136.

Venue Moscow	Event	Date	Lowest Price Rbs.kpks	Highest Price Rbs.kpks
Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, Ulitsa Miasnitskaia, 21	<i>Oslinyi khvost</i> exhibition (shared with <i>Soiuz molodezhi</i> exhibition)	11 Mar-8 Apr 1912		
Society of Art Lovers, Bol'shaia Dmitrovka	<i>Bubnovyi valet</i> art exhibition	7 Feb-7 Mar 1913		
Polytechnical Museum, Ploshchad' Novaia	Second <i>Bubnovyi valet</i> debate <i>On Modern Art</i>	24 Feb 1913	0.50	3.00
Polytechnical Museum, Ploshchad' Novaia	<i>Mishen'</i> debate	Saturday, 23 Mar 1913	0.50	5.10
Society of Art Lovers, Bol'shaia Dmitrovka	First Evening of Speech-Creators	13 Oct 1913	0.75	3.00
Letuchaia mysh', Tverskaia	General opening to the public	From 1913	12.00 (public price)	
Polytechnical Museum, Ploshchad' Novaia	<i>Bubnovyi valet</i> debate <i>On Modern Art. The Public's Attitude to Art</i>	19 Feb 1914	0.30	3.00
Polytechnical Museum, Ploshchad' Novaia	Public lecture by Filippo Marinetti	27 Jan 1914	0.60	5.50
Small Hall of the Conservatory	Public lecture by Filippo Marinetti	28 Jan 1914	0.60	5.50
Great Imperial Theatre, Teatral'naia Ploshchad'	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*		1.10	15.00
Little Imperial Theatre, Teatral'naia Ploshchad'	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*		1.10	14.00
New Imperial Theatre (Nezlobin Theatre) Teatral'naia Ploshchad'	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*		1.50	10.00
Moscow Art Theatre, Kamergerskii Pereulok	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*		2.00	5.00
Letuchaia mysh' [The Bat] kabare, Miliutinskii Pereulok 16	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*		5.00	10.00
Polytechnical Museum	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*	Wednesday and Saturday (free at other times)	0.35	
Teatr Kontinental', Teatral'naia Ploshchad'	Film showing <i>Kabare futuristov No. 13</i>	29 Jan 1914		
Elektro-teatr "Uran", Sretenka 19	Film showing <i>Kabare futuristov No. 13</i>	29 Jan 1914		
Zoological Gardens	General advertised prices for advanced bookings*		0.35	

* Information of general advertised ticket prices for non-Futurist events is taken from Karl Baedeker, *Baedeker's Russia 1914* (London, Newton Abbot: George Allen & Unwin, and David & Charles, 1971)

Bibliography

The bibliography lists, in addition to works cited in the thesis, a number of works that are not cited, but that were referred to in the course of writing the thesis.

Abbreviations:

UP – University Press

CASS – Canadian-American Slavic Studies

[n.p.] – No publisher

Acton, Mary, *Learning to Look at Paintings* (London: Routledge, 1997).

Adamson, Walter L., 'Apollinaire's Politics: Modernism, Nationalism, and the Public Sphere in Avant-Garde Paris', *Modernism/modernity: Politics / Gender / Judgement*, vol. 6: 3 (1999), 33-56.

Apollinaire, Guillaume, *Apollinaire On Art: Essays and Reviews 1902-1918*, edited by Leroy C. Breunig (London: Thames and Hudson, 1972).

Avtonomova, N. V., D. V. Sarab'ianov, and V. S. Turchin, eds., *V. V. Kandinskii: Izbrannye trudy po teorii iskusstva: B 2-kh tomakh* (Moscow: Gileia, 2001).

Avtonomova, Natalia and Alla Lukanova, eds., *Neizvestnyi Konchalovskii: Zhivopis' iz sobraniia sem'i khudozhnika, chastnykh kolleksii i GMII im. A. S. Pushkina* (Moscow: Axiom Graphic, 2002).

Baal-Teshuva, Jacob, *Marc Chagall 1887-1985* (Cologne: Taschen, 1998).

Baedeker, Karl, *Baedeker's Russia 1914*, [1914] (London, Newton Abbot: George Allen & Unwin, and David & Charles, 1971).

Baer, Nancy Van Norman, *Theatre in Revolution: Russian Avant-Garde Stage Design 1913-1935* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991).

Bakhtin, M., *Mikhail M. Bakhtin: Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, edited and translated by Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

Bakhtin, M. M., 'The *Bildungsroman* and Its Significance in the History of Realism (Toward a Historical Typology of the Novel)', in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, translated by Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 10-59.

- , *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, edited by Michael Holquist, translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin and London: University of Texas, 1981).
- , 'Roman vospitaniia i ego znachenie v istorii realizma: k istoricheskoi tipologii romana' in *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva*, edited by S.G. Bocharov (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979), pp. 188-236.
- , 'The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology, and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis', in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, translated by Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 103-31.
- Bakhtin, M. M. and P. N. Medvedev, *The Formal Method in Literary Scholarship: A Critical Introduction to Sociological Poetics*, translated by Albert J. Wehrle (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1991).
- Bakshy, Alexander, *The Path of the Modern Russian Stage and Other Essays* (London: Palmer and Hayward, 1916).
- Balfour, Ian and Thomas Keenan, *Walter Benjamin*, Johns Hopkins UP, http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/walter_benjamin.html, April 2001.
- Barboi, Iu., 'O napravleniakh iskusstvovedcheskogo analiza spektaklia', in *Granitsy Spektaklia*, edited by E. I. Gorfunkel' (St. Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskaia gosudarstvennaia akademiia teatral'nogo iskusstva, 1999), pp. 9-16.
- Bart, V. S., 'Dva pis'ma k M. F. Larionovu (1911)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 19-21.
- Basner, E. B., et al., eds., *Nataliia Goncharova: Gody v Rossii* (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennyi Russkii muzei, 2002).
- Bater, James H., *St. Petersburg: Industrialisation and Change* (London: Edward Arnold, 1976).
- Bazarov, V., 'Misteriia ili byt?', in *Krizis Teatra. Sbornik Statei* (Moscow: Problemy iskusstva, 1908), pp. 54-81.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Printsip Formy v Estetike', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 11-12 (1906), 88-96.
- Benjamin, Walter, *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt (London: Fontana, 1992).
- Bennett, Susan, *Theatre Audiences: A Theory of Production and Reception* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).

- Bennett, Tony, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995).
- Bentivoglio, Mirella and Franca Zoccoli, *Women Artists of Italian Futurism - Almost Lost to History...* (New York: Midmarch Arts Press, 1997).
- Benua, Aleksandr, 'Novaia Akval'naia Vystavka v Parizhe', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 3 (1906), 94-95.
- Bliznakov, Mika, 'The City of the Russian Futurists', *CASS*, vol. 20: 1-2 (1986), 89-110.
- Blok, Aleksandr, 'Balaganchik', in *Sobranie Sochinenii v vos'mi tomakh*, edited by V. N. Orlov, A. A. Surkov, and K. I. Chukovskii, 8 vols, vol. 4 (Moscow, Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1961), pp. 7-21.
- Boal, Augusto, *Legislative Theatre: Using Performance To Make Politics*, translated by Adrian Jackson (London and New York: Routledge, 1998).
- , 'The Theatre as Discourse', in *The Twentieth-Century Performance Reader*, edited by Michael Huxley and Noel Witts (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 85-98.
- , *Theatre of the Oppressed*, translated by A. Charles and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride (London: Pluto, 1979).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, Alain Darbel, with Dominique Schnapper, *The Love of Art: European Art Museums and Their Public*, translated by Caroline Beattie and Nick Merriman (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).
- Bowl, John, 'David Burliuk', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 10.
- , *Exhibition Catalogue: Russkoe teatral'no-dekoratsionnoe iskusstvo 1880-1930: Iz kollektsii Nikity i Niny Lobanovykh-Rostovskikh*, translated by N.I Aleksandrova (Moscow: Sovietskii fond kul'tury, 1988).
- Bowl, John E., 'Cabaret in Russia', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 443-63.
- , 'David Burliuk the Father of Russian Futurism', *CASS*, vol. 20: 1-2, Spring-Summer (1986), 25-35.
- , 'Marc Chagall and Nadezhda Dobychina', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 251-54.
- , 'Mikhail Larionov and The Primitive', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 169-81.

- , 'The Moscow Art Market', in *Between Tsar and People: Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, edited by Edith W. Clowes, Samuel D. Kassow, and James L. West (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991), pp. 108-28.
- , ed., *Russian Art of the Avant-Garde: Theory and Criticism 1902-1934* (New York: The Viking Press, 1976).
- , *Russian Stage Design: Scenic innovation, 1900-1930. From the Collection of Mr. & Mrs. Nikita D. Lobanov-Rostovsky* (Jackson: The Mississippi Museum of Art, 1982).
- , *The Silver Age: Russian Art of the Early Twentieth Century and the 'World of Art' Group* (Newtonville, MA: Oriental Research Partners, 1979).
- , 'The "Union of Youth"', in *Russian Modernism: Culture and the Avant-Garde, 1900-1930*, edited by George Gibian and H. W. Tjalsma (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1976), pp. 165-87.
- Bowlit, John E. and Matthew Drutt, eds., *Amazons of the Avant-Garde: Alexandra Exter, Natalia Goncharova, Liubov Popova, Olga Rozanova, Varvara Stepanova, and Nadezhda Udal'tsova* (New York: Guggenheim Museum Publications, 2000).
- Brandist, Craig, *The Bakhtin Circle*, The internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <http://www.utm.edu/research/ie/b/bakhtin.htm>, November 2001.
- , *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics* (London and Sterling, Virginia: Pluto Press, 2002).
- , *Carnival Culture and the Soviet Modernist Novel* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1996).
- Braun, Edward, ed., *Meyerhold On Theatre* (London: Methuen Drama, 1998).
- Braun, Emily, 'Futurist Fashion: Three Manifestoes', *Art Journal*, Spring (1995), 34-41.
- Breward, Christopher, ' "As I walked along the Bois de Boulogne": Subversive Performances and Masculine Pleasure in Fin-de-Siècle London', in *Histories of Leisure*, edited by Rudy Koshar (Oxford: Berg, 2002), pp. 253-98.
- Briganti, Chiara and Robert Con Davis, *Psychoanalytic Theory and Criticism: 3. The Post-Lacanian*, Johns Hopkins UP,

http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/psychoanalytic_theory_and_criticism-_3.html, April 2001.

- Brooks, Jeffrey, 'Popular Philistinism and the Course of Russian Modernism', in *Literature and History: Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies*, edited by Gary Saul Morson (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986), pp. 90-110.
- , *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861-1917* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985).
- Brown, Edward J., 'Mayakovsky's Futurist Period', in *Russian Modernism: Culture and the Avant-Garde, 1900-1930*, edited by George Gibian and H. W. Tjalsma (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1976), pp. 107-31.
- Buckle, Richard, *Nijinsky* (London: Phoenix Giant, 1998).
- Bürger, Peter, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, translated by Michael Shaw (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).
- Burliuk, D. D., 'Dva pis'ma k M. F. Larionovu (1908)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 11-12.
- , 'Pis'mo k M. V. Matiushinu (1910)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 13.
- [Burliuk, David], 'Po povodu "Khudozhestvennykh pisem" G-na A. Benua', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 11-12 (1909), 90-93.
- Burliuk, Nicholas (as told to Henry Gilford), 'Memories of My Father, David Davidovich Burliuk, and My Mother, Marussia Elenevskaja, Who Was Always at My Father's Side', *CASS*, vol. 20: 1-2, Spring-Summer (1986), 15-23.
- Bykhovskii, V. V., '*Neskol'ko slov*': *O teatre i ego zadachakh (Rech', proiznesennaia v kruzhke liubitelei stsenicheskogo iskusstva)* (St. Petersburg: [n.p.], 1903).
- Cahn, Jennifer, 'Mikhail Matiushin and the Evolution of Simultaneous Dimensions', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 219-28.
- Calderon, George Leslie, 'The Russian Stage: A Sketch of Recent Russian Drama...' *Quarterly Review*, vol. 80: July (1912).
- Callinicos, Alex, *Against Postmodernism: A Marxist Critique* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989).
- Carden, Patricia, 'The Aesthetic of Performance in the Russian Avant-Garde', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 375-83.

- Castellano, Charlene, 'The Mystery Play in Andrei Belyi's Dramaturgy and Prose', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 399-411.
- Chamot, Mary, *Goncharova: Stage Designs and Paintings* (London: Oresko Books, 1979).
- Charskii, V., 'Khudozhestvennyi teatr', in *Krizis Teatra. Sbornik Statei* (Moscow: Problemy iskusstva, 1908), pp. 126-56.
- Chernian, Lord, 'Lev Bakst and Vaslav Nijinsky: The 1913 Production of *Jeux*', *Russian History/Histoire Russe*, vol. 8: 1-2 (1981), 53-68.
- Clark, T. J., *The Painting of Modern Life: Paris in the Art of Manet and His Followers* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984).
- Clowes, Edith W., *The Revolution of Moral Consciousness: Nietzsche in Russian Literature, 1890-1914* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1988).
- Compton, Susan, 'The Spread of Information Leading to the Rise of Abstract Art in Europe', in *Towards a New Art: Essays on the Background to Abstract Art 1910-1920*, edited by Tate Gallery (London: Tate Gallery, 1980), pp. 178-98.
- Compton, Susan P., 'Italian Futurism and Russia', *Art Journal*, vol. 41: 4 (1981), 343-48.
- Crow, Thomas, *Modern Art in the Common Culture* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1996).
- Davis, Chiara Briganti and Robert Con, *Irigaray, Luce*, Johns Hopkins UP, http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/luce_irigaray.html, April 2001.
- Demosfenova, Galina, *Nol'-desiat' "0.10": Nauchno-analiticheskii informatsionnyi Biulleten' Fonda K. S. Malevicha*, vol. 1: 1 (November 2001).
- Dobuzhinskii, Mstislav et al., '[“Golos khudozhnikov”]', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 1 (1906), 132-33.
- Douglas, Charlotte, 'Birth of a “Royal infant”': Malevich and *Victory Over the Sun*', *Art in America*, vol. 62 (1974), 45-51.
- , *Kazimir Malevich* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1994).
- , *Swans of Other Worlds: Kazimir Malevich and the Origins of Abstraction in Russia* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1976).

- , ““Victory Over the Sun””, *Russian History/Histoire Russe*, vol. 8: 1-2 (1981), 69-89.
- Duffy, Jean, ‘Narrative, Order, Frequency and Speed’, in *Structuralism: Theory and Practice* (Glasgow: Glasgow introductory Guides to French Literature, 1992), pp. 44-62.
- , ‘S/Z and Narrative Codes’, in *Structuralism: Theory and Practice* (Glasgow: Glasgow introductory Guides to French Literature, 1992), pp. 63-75.
- Duganov, Rudol’f, Iurii Arpishkin, and Andrei Sarab’ianov, eds., *N. I. Khardzhiev: Stat’i ob avangarde v dvukh tomakh*, vol. 1 (Moscow: RA, 1997).
- Dukov, E. V. et al., eds., *Vvedenie v sotsiologiiu iskusstva: Uchebnoe posobie dlia gumanitarnykh vuzov* (St. Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2001).
- Dumova, Natal’ia, *Moskovskie metsenaty* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1992).
- Durfee, Thea, ‘Natalia Goncharova’, *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 159-67.
- Eagleton, Terry and Drew Milne, eds., *Marxist Literary Theory: A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996).
- Edwards, Steve and Paul Wood, eds., *Art of the Avant-Gardes* (New Haven and London: Yale UP in association with The Open University, 2004).
- Efimova, Alla and Lev Manovich, eds., *Tekstura: Russian Essays on Visual Culture* (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 1993).
- Eichenbaum, Boris, ‘The Theory of the “Formal Method”’, in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, edited by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965), pp. 99-139.
- Eiges, K., ‘Krasota v Iskusstve’, *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 11-12 (1909), 61-68.
- Elam, Diane, *Feminist Theory and Criticism: 3. Poststructuralist Feminisms*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/feminist_theory_and_criticism-3.html, April 2001.
- Engelstein, Laura, *The Keys to Happiness: Sex and the Search for Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle Russia* (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1992).
- Erenburg, Il’ia, *Bubnovyi valet i kompaniia: Rasskazy* (Moscow, Leningrad: Petrograd, 1925).
- Erlich, Victor, *Russian Formalism: History, Doctrine* (New Haven; London: Yale UP, 1981).

- Evreinoff, Nicolas, *The Theatre in Life* (New York: Harrap, 1927).
- Evreinov, N., *Teatr dlia sebia: chast' pervaiia* (St. Petersburg: I. I. Butkorskoii, 1911).
- Evreinov, N., '*Teatr kak takovoi*': *obosnovanie teatral'nosti v smysle polozhitel'nogo nachala stsenicheskogo iskusstva v zhizni* (St. Petersburg: Sovremennoe Iskusstvo, 1912).
- Evseeva, Svetlana V., ed., *Faktura i tsvet: Proizvedeniia Davida Burliuka v muzeiakh rossiiskoi provintsii*, 2 vols. (Ufa: Bashkortostan and Bashkir State Nesterov Art Museum, 1994).
- Fanon, Frantz, *The Wretched of the Earth*, translated by Constance Farrington (London: Penguin, 1990).
- Fedorova, Irina, ed., '*Bubnovyi valet*': *Put' na Zapad? Put' k sebe* (Moscow: Komp'iuter Press, 2002), Exhibition catalogue.
- Fedotov, A. S., ed., *Moskva v nachale XX veka: Budni i prazdniki. Moskovskaia starina. Novoruskii stil'* (Moscow: Mosgorarkhiv, 1997).
- Filosofov, D. V., 'Iskusstvo i gosudarstvo', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 6 (1907), 31-39.
- , 'Khudozhestvennaia Zhizn' Peterburga: Pis'mo pervoe', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 1 (1906), 106-11.
- FitzGerald, Michael C., *Making Modernism: Picasso and the Creation of the Market for Twentieth-Century Art* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1995).
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan (London: Penguin, 1991).
- , *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, translated by Richard Howard (London and New York: Routledge, 1989).
- Frame, Murray, *The St Petersburg Imperial Theatres: Stage and State in Revolutionary Russia 1900-1920* (Jefferson, N. Carolina: McFarland, 2000).
- Frank, Stephen P. and Mark D. Steinberg, eds., *Cultures in Flux: Lower-Class Values, Practices, and Resistance in Late Imperial Russia* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994).
- Frascina, Francis and Charles Harrison, with the assistance of Deirdre Paul, eds., *Modern Art and Modernism: A Critical Anthology* (London: Harper and Row in association with the Open University, 1982).

- Friche, V., 'Teatr v sovremennom i budushchem obshchestve', in *Krizis Teatra. Sbornik Statei* (Moscow: Problemy iskusstva, 1908), pp. 157-?
- Fry, Edward F., *Cubism* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1966).
- Fry, Roger, *Vision and Design* (London and New York: Oxford UP, 1990).
- Gagnier, Regenia, *Value Theory*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/value_theory.html, April 2001.
- Garafola, Lynn and Nancy Van Norman Baer, eds., *The Ballets Russes and Its World* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1999).
- Garelick, Rhonda K., 'Electric Salome: Loie Fuller at the Exposition Universelle of 1900', in *Imperialism and Theatre: Essays on World Theatre, Drama and Performance*, edited by J. Ellen Gainor (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), pp. 85-103.
- Gee, Malcolm, *Dealers, Critics, and Collectors of Modern Painting: Aspects of the Parisian Art Market Between 1910 and 1930* (New York and London: Garland, 1977).
- Geldern, James R. Von, 'Festivals of the Revolution, 1917-1920: Art and Theater in the Formation of Soviet Culture', unpublished doctoral thesis, Brown University, 1987.
- Goldberg, RoseLee, *Performance Art: From Futurism to the Present* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988).
- Golovina, A. A. et al., eds., *Peterburg: Khudozhestvennaia zhizn' 1900-1916 Fotoletopis'* (St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo - STB, 2001).
- Goncharova, N. S., 'Ob "izmakh" (1914)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 37-38.
- , 'Pis'mo k B. V. Anrepu (1914)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 35-36.
- Gorbachev, Dmitrii, 'Exter in Kiev - Kiev in Exter', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 299-320.
- Gorlov, N., *Futurism and Revolution* (Letchworth: Prideaux Press, 1974).
- Gramsci, Antonio, 'A Letter to Leon Trotsky on Futurism', *Revolutionary History: Culture and Revolution in the Thought of Leon Trotsky*, edited by Al Richardson, vol. 7: 2 (1999), 118-29.

- Gray, Camilla, *The Russian Experiment in Art, 1863-1922* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1986).
- Green, Michael, ed., *The Russian Symbolist Theatre: An Anthology of Plays and Critical Texts* (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1986).
- Greenberg, Reesa, Bruce W. Ferguson, and Sandy Nairne, eds., *Thinking About Exhibitions* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).
- Gusarov, A. P., ed., *Moskva v russkoi i sovetskoi zhivopisi* (Moscow: Sovetskii khudozhnik, 1987).
- Habib, M. A. R., *Marxist Theory and Criticism: 1. Classical Marxism*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/marxist_theory_and_criticism-1.html, April 2001.
- Hamilton, George Heard, *Painting and Sculpture in Europe 1880-1940* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983).
- Harris, Jane Gary, 'Mandel'shtam's Aesthetic of Performance', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 426-42.
- Harrison, Charles, 'Degas' Bathers and Other People', *Modernism/modernity: Politics / Gender / Judgement*, vol. 6: 3 (1999), 57-90.
- Harrison, Charles, Francis Frascina, and Gill Perry, *Primitivism, Cubism, Abstraction: The Early Twentieth Century* (New Haven: Yale UP in association with the Open University, 1993).
- Harrison, Charles and Paul Wood, eds., *Art in Theory 1900-1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (Oxford UK and Cambridge USA: Blackwell, 1992).
- Harrop, Josephine, *Victorian Portable Theatres* (London: The Society for Theatre Research, 1989).
- Hayes, K. Michael, 'Photomontage and Its Audience: El Lissitzky Meets Berlin Dada', in *The Avant-Garde Frontier: Russia Meets the West, 1910-1930*, edited by Gail Harrison Roman and Virginia Hagelstein Marquardt (Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1992), pp. 169-95.
- Haynes, Deborah J., *Bakhtin and the Visual Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995).
- Hazard, Hannah, *David Davidovich Burluk (1882-1967), Russian/American*, media.dickinson.edu, <http://media.dickinson.edu/gallery/Sect21.html>, 17 06 2002.

- Hilton, Alison, 'Domestic Crafts and Creative Freedom: Russian Women's Art', in *Russia, Women, Culture*, edited by Helena Goscilo and Beth Holmgren (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1996), pp. 347-76.
- , *Russian Folk Art* (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1995).
- History: The Avant-Garde*, History of the Artistic Movements in Russia, <http://www.geocities.com/Paris/8182/history.htm>, 16 06 2002.
- Howard, Jeremy, *The Union of Youth: An Artists' Society of the Russian Avant-Garde* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1992).
- , 'Voldemars Matvejs', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 45-54.
- Jangfel'dt, Bengt, ed., *Iakobson-Budetlianin: Sbornik materialov* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992).
- Iliukhina, Evgeniia, 'Goncharova i moda', in *Nataliia Goncharova: Gody v Rossii*, edited by E. B. Basner et al. (St. Petersburg: Palace Editions, 2002), pp. 246-55.
- Imgardt, D., 'Zhivopis' i Revoliutsiia', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 5 (1906), 56-59.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav, 'O veselom remesle i umnom veselii', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 5 (1907), 47-55.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav, Zinovii Papernyi, and Aleksandr Parnis, eds., *Mir Velimira Khlebnikova: Stat'i issledovaniia 1911-1998* (Moscow: Iazyki Russkoi Kul'tury, 2000).
- Jakobson, Roman, *My Futurist Years*, edited by Bengt Jangfeldt with Stephen Rudy, translated by with an introduction by Stephen Rudy (New York: Marsilio, 1997).
- Jane Watkins, assisted by W. Douglas Paschall, eds., *Cézanne* (London: Tate Publishing, 1996).
- Janecek, Gerald, 'A Zaum' Classification', *CASS*, vol. 20: 1-2 (1986), 37-53.
- Jangfeldt, Bengt, 'David Burliuk on Velimir Khlebnikov', *CASS*, vol. 20: 1-2 (1986), 135-39.
- Jefferson, Ann, 'Structuralism and Post-Structuralism', in *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*, edited by Ann Jefferson and David Robey (London: Batsford, 1986), pp. 92-121.

- Jensen, Erik, 'Crowd Control: Boxing Spectatorship and Social Order in Weimar Germany', in *Histories of Leisure*, edited by Rudy Koshar (Oxford: Berg, 2002), pp. 79-101.
- Kandinskii, V. and F. Mark, eds., *Sinii vsadnik: Der Blaue Reiter*, translated and with notes by Z. S. Pyshnovskaia (Moscow: Izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo, 1996).
- Kandinsky, Wassily and Franz Marc, eds., *The Blaue Reiter Almanac* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1974).
- Karasik, I., ed., *Russkii avangard: problemy reprezentatsii i interpretatsii: Al'manakh* (St. Petersburg: Palace Editions, 2001).
- Kean, Beverly Whitney, *All the Empty Palaces: The Merchant Patrons of Modern Art in Pre-Revolutionary Russia* (London, Melbourne, Sydney, Auckland, Johannesburg: Barrie and Jenkins, 1983).
- Kelly, Catriona, *Petrushka: The Russian Carnival Puppet Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990).
- , ed., *Utopias. Russian modernist texts 1905-1940* (London: Penguin, 1999).
- Kelly, Catriona and Stephen Lovell, eds., *Russian Literature, Modernism and the Visual Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000).
- Kennedy, Janet, *The "Mir Iskusstva" Group and Russian Art 1898-1912* (New York & London: Garland, 1977).
- , 'The Triumph of Harlequin: Commedia Dell'Arte and its Significance in the work of the Mir Iskusstva Group', *The Silver Age: Russian Literature and Culture 1881-1921*, vol. 1 (1998), 33-66.
- Khlebnikov, Velimir, *Sobranie sochinenii v trekh tomakh*, 3 vols, vol. 1, *Stikhotvoreniia* (St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2001).
- Khrenov, N., 'Istoriia publiki kak predmet izucheniia', in *Voprosy sotsiologii teatra*, edited by N. Khrenov, pp. 123-47.
- Kirienko-Voloshin, Maksimilian, 'Individualizm v Iskusstve', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 10 (1906), 66-72.
- Kleberg, Lars, *Theatre As Action: Soviet Russian Avant-Garde Aesthetics*, translated by Charles Rougle (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1993).
- Kliunkova-Soloveichik, Svetlana, *Ivan Vasilievich Kliun*, translated and edited by Nicholas A. Ohotin (New York: Svetlana A. Soloveichik, 1994).

- Kodicek, Ann, ed., *Diaghilev: Creator of the Ballets Russes Art Music Dance* (London: Barbican Art Gallery and Lund Humphries, 1996).
- Kogan, L., 'Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura v sisteme kul'tury sotsialisticheskogo obshchestva' in *Voprosy Sotsiologii Teatr*, edited by N. A. Khrenov, pp. 5-22.
- Konecny, Mark, *The Bestiary of the Russian Cabaret: flying Mice and Blue Birds, Black Cats and Stray Dogs*, University South Carolina (USC) information Service, <http://www.usc.edu/isd/publications/now/photos/russcab/html>, 10 05 2002.
- , 'Mikhail Larionov: Futurist Performance in Moscow', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 183-99.
- Kostenevich, Albert and Natalia Semyonova, *Collecting Matisse* (Paris: Flammarion, 1993).
- Kovalenko, G. F., ed., *Natal'ia Goncharova, Mikhail Larionov: Vospominaniia sovremennikov* (Moscow: Galart, 1995).
- , ed., *Russkii Avangard 1910-kh–1920-kh godov i teatr* (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2000).
- , ed., *Russkii kubofuturizm* (St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2002).
- Kovtun, Evgenii, ed., *Pavel Nikolaevich Filonov: Zhivopis' Grafika iz sobraniia Gosudarstvennogo Russkogo muzeia* (Leningrad: Aurora Press, 1988), Exhibition catalogue.
- Kovtun, Yevgeny, *Mikhail Larionov 1881-1964*, translated by Paul Williams (Bournemouth: Parkstone Press, 1998).
- Kovtun, Yevgeny and Liudmila Rybakova, *Fantastic and Imaginative Works by Russian Artists*, translated by Margarita Latsinova and Thomas Crane (Leningrad: Aurora Art, 1989).
- Kruchenykh, Alexei, *Our Arrival: From the History of Russian Futurism*, edited by Vasily Rakitin and Andrei Sarabianov, translated by Alan Myers (Moscow: RA, 1995).
- Krusanov, Andrei V., *Russkii Avangard: 1907-1932 (Istoricheskii obzor) v trekh tomakh*, 3 vols, vol. 1, *Boevoe desiatiletie* (St. Petersburg: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 1996).

- Larionov, M. F., 'Pis'mo k A. E. Kruchenykh', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 32.
- , 'Pis'mo k N. S. Goncharovoi (1911)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 33-34.
- , 'Tri pis'ma k V. S. Bartu (1911)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 22-25.
- Larionov, Michel, *Une Avant-Garde Explosive*, edited by Michel Hoog and Solina de Vigneral (Lausanne: Editions L'Age d'Homme, 1978).
- Lawton, Anna, 'Futurist Manifestoes as an Element of Performance', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 473-91.
- , ed., *Russian Futurism Through Its Manifestoes, 1912-1928* (Ithaca, New York; London: Cornell UP, 1988).
- Leach, Robert, 'A Good Beginning: *Victory Over the Sun* and *Vladimir Mayakovsky: A Tragedy Reassessed*', *Russian Literature*, vol. 13 (1983), 101-16.
- , *Revolutionary Theatre* (London: Routledge, 1994).
- Le-Dantiu, M. V., 'Pis'mo k V. S. Bartu (1912)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 26-27.
- Lewis, Helena, 'Surrealists, Stalinists, and Trotskyists: Theories of Art and Revolution in France Between the Wars', *Art Journal*, vol. 52: 1 (1993), 61-68.
- Lista, Giovanni, *Futurism and Photography* (London: Merrell in association with Estorick Collection of Modern Italian Art, 2001).
- Livshits, Benedikt, *The One and a Half-Eyed Archer*, edited by John E. Bowlit (Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1977).
- , *Polutoraglaziyi strelets* (New York: Chekhov Publishing Corporation, 1978).
- Lodder, Christina, 'Art of the Commune: Politics and Art in Soviet Journals, 1917-20', *Art Journal*, vol. 52: 1 (1993), 24-33.
- Lomba, Ania, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (London: Routledge, 1998).
- Lukanova, Alla, 'Goncharova i Larionov', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 29-31.
- Lunacharskii, A. et al., *Teatr: Kniga o novom teatre* (St. Petersburg: Shipovnik, 1908).

- Lunn, Eugene, *Marxism and Modernism: An Historical Study of Lukács, Brecht, Benjamin and Adorno* (Berkeley, London: University of California Press, 1982).
- Lyon, Janet, *Manifestoes: Provocations of the Modern* (Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1999).
- MacLean, Gerald and Donna Landry, *Feminist Theory and Criticism: 4. Materialist Feminisms*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/feminist_theory_and_criticism-_4.html, April 2001.
- Maiakovskii, Vladimir, 'Otnoshenie segodniashnego teatra i kinematografa k iskusstvu: Chto neset nam zavtrashnii den'? (polezna i dlia kritikov)', in *Vladimir Maiakovskii: Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 3 vols, vol. 1, 1912-1917 (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1955), pp. 281-85.
- , 'Teatr, kinematograf, futurizm (1913)', in *Vladimir Maiakovskii: Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 3 vols, vol. 1, 1912-1917 (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1955), pp. 275-77.
- , 'Unichtozhenie kinematografom "teatra", kak priznak vozrozhdeniia teatral'nogo iskusstva (1913)' in *Vladimir Maiakovskii: Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 3 vols, vol. 1, 1912-1917 (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1955), pp. 278-80.
- , 'Zhivopis' segodniashnego dnia (1914)', in *Vladimir Maiakovskii: Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 3 vols, vol. 1, 1912-1917 (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1955), pp. 286-93.
- Makovskii, Sergei, 'Golubaia Roza', vol. 5 (1907), 25-28.
- , 'N. K. Rerikh', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 4 (1907), 3-7.
- Malevich, K. S., *Essays on Art, 1915-1933*, edited by Troels Andersen, translated by Xenia Glowacki-Prus and Arnold McMillin, 2 vols, vol. 1 (London: Rapp & Whiting, 1968).
- Mally, Lynn, *Culture of the Future: The Proletkult Movement in Revolutionary Russia* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press, 1990).

- Malmstad, John E., 'The Sacred Profaned: Image and Word in the Paintings of Mikhail Larionov', in *Laboratory of Dreams: The Russian Avant-Garde and Cultural Experiment*, edited by John E. Bowlt and Olga Matich (Stanford, California: Stanford UP, 1996), pp. 153-73.
- Markov, Vladimir, *Futurism: A History* (London: MacGibbon and Gee, 1968).
- , ed., *Manifesty i programmy russkikh futuristov* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1968).
- , [Matveis V. I.], 'Pis'mo k M. F. Larionovu (1910)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 14.
- Marquardt, Virginia Hagelstein, 'The Nexus of Art and Politics Seen through Political Journals, 1910-40', *Art Journal*, vol. 52: 1 (1993), 20-21.
- Marsh, Cynthia, *File on Gorky* (London: Methuen Drama, 1993).
- Marshall, Herbert, *The Pictorial History of the Russian Theatre* (New York: Crown, 1977).
- Martin, Marianne W., *Futurist Art and Theory 1909-1915* (New York: Hacker Art Books, 1978).
- Maynard, Solomon, ed., *Marxism and Art: Essays Classic and Contemporary* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1979).
- McLeod, John, *Beginning Postcolonialism* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000).
- McReynolds, Louise, *The News Under Russia's Old Regime: The Development of a Mass-Circulation Press* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991).
- Mersero, Aleksandr, 'Henri Matisse i Sovremennaia Zhivopis'', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 6 (1909), I-III.
- Messer-Davidow, Ellen, *Feminist Theory and Criticism: 1963-1972*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/feminist_theory_and_criticism-_1.html, April 2001.
- Misler, Nicoletta, 'David Burliuk and Pavel Filonov: An Uneasy Relationship', *CASS*, vol. 20: 1-2 (1986), 63-87.
- , 'Nina Kogan', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 241-48.
- , 'O Barte', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 15-18.
- , 'A Two-Way Performance: Pavel Filonov and His Leningrad Public', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 511-20.

- Morson, Gary Saul, 'Introduction: Literary History and the Russian Experience', in *Literature and History: Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies*, edited by Gary Saul Morson (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986), pp. 1-32.
- Murawska-Muthesius, Katarzyna, 'Socialist Realism's Self-Reference? Cartoons on Art, c. 1950', in *Style and Socialism: Modernity and Material Culture in Post-War Eastern Europe*, edited by Susan E. Reid and David Crowley (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2000), pp. 149-67.
- Murray, Alden, 'A Problematical Pavilion: Alexandre Benois' First Ballet', *Russian History/Histoire Russe*, vol. 8: 1-2 (1981), 23-52.
- Nakov, Andrei B., *Tatlin's Dream: Russian Suprematist and Constructivist Art 1910-1923* (London: Fischer Fine Art Ltd., 1973), Exhibition catalogue.
- Nelidov, V. A., *Teatral'naia Moskva: Sorok let moskovskikh teatrov [1933]* (Moscow: Materik, 2002).
- Nizhinskaia, Bronislava, ed., *Ballets Russes: Rannie vospominaniia*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Artist. Rezhisser. Teatr, 1999).
- Omuka, Toshiharu, 'David Burliuk and the Japanese Avant-Garde', *CASS*, vol. 20: 1-2 (1986), 111-33.
- Ortega, Carlos, ed., *Painters in the Theater of the European Avant-Garde* (Aldesa, Madrid: Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofia, 2000).
- Oslinyi khvost i mishen': Luchisty i budushchniki; manifest, [1913]* (Moscow: 1977)
- Oslinyi khvost i mishen': Sbornik, [1913]* (Moscow: 1970).
- Ouvrard, Nicole, with the assistance of Martine Reyss, ed., *Nathalie Gontcharova, Michel Larionov* (Paris: Editions du Centre Pompidou, 1995).
- Parton, Anthony, *Mikhail Larionov and the Russian Avant-Garde* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1993).
- Penrose, Roland, *Picasso: His Life and Work* (London, Toronto, Sydney and New York: Granada, 1981).
- Percival, John, *The World of Diaghilev* (London: Herbert Press, 1979).
- Perloff, Marjorie, *The Futurist Moment* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1986).
- Perron, Paul, *Semiotics*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/semiotics.html, April 2001.

- ‘Persidskaia zhivopis’’, *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 3-4 (1908), 38a-c.
- Petrov, Vsevolod and Alexander Kamensky, eds., *The World of Art Movement in Early 20th-Century Russia* (Leningrad: Aurora Art Publishers, 1991).
- Petrova, Yevgenia, ed., *Origins of the Russian Avant-Garde* (St. Petersburg: State Russian Museum, Trustees of the Walters Art Gallery and Palace Editions, 2003), Exhibition catalogue.
- , ed., *Russkii Futurizm i David Burluk, ‘Otets russkogo futurizma’* (St. Petersburg: Palace Editions, 2000).
- Petrova, [Y]evgenia, ed., *Russian Futurism and David Burluk, ‘The Father of Russian Futurism’* (St Petersburg: State Russian Museum, Palace Editions, 2000).
- Petrova, Evgenia et al., eds., *New Art for a New Era: Malevich’s Vision of the Russian Avant-Garde. From the collection of the State Russian Museum, St. Petersburg* (London: Booth-Clibborn in association with Barbican Art Gallery and The State Russian Museum, 1999).
- Petrovskaia, I., *Teatr i zritel’ rossiiskikh stolits, 1895-1917* (Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1990).
- Pike, Christopher and Joe Andrew, eds., *The Futurists, the Formalists and the Marxist Critique* (London: Ink Links, 1979).
- Plant, John, ‘Trotsky, Art and the Revolution: Some Cautionary Notes’, *Revolutionary History: Culture and Revolution in the Thought of Leon Trotsky*, edited by Al Richardson, vol. 7: 2 (1999), 108-17.
- Poggi, Christine in *Defiance of Painting: Cubism, Futurism, and the Invention of Collage* (New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1992).
- , ‘Mallarmé, Picasso, and the Newspaper as Commodity’, in *Collage: Critical Views*, edited by Katherine Hoffman (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989), pp. 171-92.
- Poggioli, Renato, *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*, translated by Gerald Fitzgerald (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1968).
- Pointon, Marcia, *History of Art: A Student’s Handbook* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1980).
- Pospelov, G. G., *Bubnovyi Valet: Primitiv i gorodskoi fol’klor v moskovskoi zhivopisi 1910-kh godov* (Moscow: Sovetskii khudozhnik, 1990).

- Povelikhina, Alla and Yevgeny Kovtun, *Russian Painted Shop Signs and Avant-Garde Artists*, translated by Thomas Crane and Margarita Latsinova (Leningrad: Aurora, 1991).
- Preobrazhenskaia, I. S., ed., *Putevoditel' po rukopisnym fondam Gosudarstvennogo tsentral'nogo teatral'nogo muzeia imeni A. A. Bakhrushina* (Moscow: Gosudartstvennyi Tsentral'nyi teatral'nyi muzei im. A. A. Bakhrushina, 2002).
- Prior, Nick, 'Museums: Leisure between State and Distinction', in *Histories of Leisure*, edited by Rudy Koshar (Oxford: Berg, 2002), pp. 27-44.
- Punin, N., *O Tatline* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Russkogo avangarda, 2001).
- Pynsent, Robert B., ed., *The Literature of Nationalism: Essays on East European Identity* (Basingstoke: Macmillan in association with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, 1996).
- Rabinow, Paul, ed., *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to Foucault's Thought* (London: Penguin, 1991).
- Radishcheva, O. A., *Stanislavskii i Nemirovich-Danchenko. Istoriia teatral'nykh otnoshenii: 1909-1917* (Moscow: Artist. Rezhisser. Teatr, 1999).
- Rakitin, Vasilii, 'The Artisan and the Prophet: Marginal Notes on Two Artistic Careers', in *The Great Utopia: The Russian and Soviet Avant-Garde, 1915-1932* (New York: Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, 1992), pp. 25-36.
- Rapp, Uri, 'Akter i zritel': Issledovanie teatral'no-sotsiologicheskogo aspekta chelovecheskoi interaktsii. (Glava "Teatral'naia analogiia")', translated by N. Aneichik, in *Granitsy Spektaklia*, edited by E. I. Gorfunkel' (St. Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskaia gosudarstvennaia akademiia teatral'nogo iskusstva, 1999), pp. 170-75.
- Rerikh, N, 'Na Iaponskoi Vystavke', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 1 (1906), 111-14.
- Rhodes, Colin, *Primitivsim and Modern Art* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1997).
- Richter, Hans, *Dada: Art and Anti-Art*, translated by David Britt (London: Thames and Hudson, 1997).
- Ripellino, Angelo Maria, *Maiakovski et le théâtre russe d'avant-garde*, translated by Mario Rossi and Antoine Vitez (Paris: L'Arche, 1965).
- Rivkin, Julie and Michael Ryan, eds., *Literary Theory: An Anthology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).

- Roberts, Graham, *The Last Soviet Avant-Garde: Oberiu — Fact, Fiction, Metafiction* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997).
- Robey, David, 'Modern Linguistics and the Language of Literature', in *Modern Literary Theory: A Comparative Introduction*, edited by Ann Jefferson and David Robey (London: Batsford, 1986), pp. 46-72.
- Rosenfeld, Alla, ed., *Defining Russian Graphic Arts 1898–1934: From Diaghilev to Stalin* (Piscataway: Rutgers UP and The Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, 1999).
- Rosenthal, Bernice Glatzer, 'Richard Wagner and the Modernist Theatrical Aesthetic', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 384-98.
- Rosenthal, Mark, ed., *Visions of Paris: Robert Delaunay's Series* (New York: The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, 1997), Exhibition catalogue.
- Rosenzweig, Katherine, 'The Memoirs of Mikhail Matiushin', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 211-18.
- Roshwald, Aviel, *Ethnic Nationalism and the Fall of Empires: Central Europe, Russia and the Middle East, 1914-1923* (London: Routledge, 2001)
- Rostislavov, A, 'Individualizm Rerikha', vol. 4 (1907), 8-10.
- , 'O Khudozhestvennom obrazovanii', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 2 (1907), 78-79.
- Rostislavov, A., 'Deiatel'nost' Akademii', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 6 (1906), 88-90.
- , 'Khudozhniki v teatre', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 7-8-9 (1909), 1-7.
- Rothschild, Deborah Menaker, *Picasso's 'Parade'* (London: Sotheby's Publications in association with The Drawing Center, New York, 1991), Exhibition catalogue.
- Rowell, Margit and Deborah Wye, eds., *The Russian Avant-Garde Book 1910–1934* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2002), Exhibition catalogue.
- Rudnitsky, Konstantin, *Russian and Soviet Theatre: Tradition and the Avant-Garde*, edited by Lesley Milne, translated by Roxane Permar (London: Thames and Hudson, 1988).
- Russell, Charles, *The Avant-Garde Today: An International Anthology* (Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press, 1981).
- Russell, Robert and Andrew Barrett, eds., *Russian Theatre in the Age of Modernism* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1990).

- Russian Stage and Costume Designs for Ballet, Opera and Theatre: Russian Stage and Costume Designs. A loan exhibition from the Lobanov-Rostovsky, Oenslager and Riabov* (Washington: International Exhibitions Foundation, 1967).
- Said, Edward W., *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (London: Vintage, 1991).
- Saiko, E. V., *Gorod i iskusstvo: sub''ekty sotsiokul'turnogo dialoga* (Moscow: Nauka, 1996).
- Salmina-Haskell, Larissa, *Catalogue of Russian Drawings: Victoria and Albert Museum* (London: Oxford UP, 1972).
- Salmond, Wendy, 'Mikhail Vrubel' and Stage Design: The 1900 Production of "Tsar Saltan", *Russian History/Histoire Russe*, vol. 8: 1-2 (1981), 3-22.
- Sarab'ianov, Andrei, ed., *N. Punin: O Tatline* (Moscow: Russkii avangard, 2001).
- Sarab'ianov, Andrei and Vladimir Semenikhin, eds., *Ol'ga Rozanova: "Lefanta chiol..."* (Moscow: Russkii avangard, 2002).
- Sarab'ianov, D., *Istoriia russkogo iskusstva kontsa XIX– nachala XX veka* (Moscow: Galart, 2001).
- Sarabianov, Dmitri V., *Russian Art: From Neoclassicism to the Avant-Garde, 1800-1917. Painting Sculpture Architecture* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1990)
- Schechner, Richard, *Performance Theory* (London: Routledge, 1988).
- Schmidt, Paul, 'Some Notes on Russian Futurist Performance', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 492-96.
- Scott, Bonnie Kime, *Feminist Theory and Criticism: 2. Anglo-American Feminisms*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/feminist_theory_and_criticism-2.html, April 2001.
- Sergeev, Anton Vadimirovich, *Problema tsirkizatsii teatra v russkoi rezhissure 1910-kh–1920-kh godov* (St. Petersburg: Teatral'noe iskustvo, 1998).
- Segel, Harold B., 'In Search of the New Russian: Gorky's Prerevolutionary Plays', in *Twentieth-Century Russian Drama: From Gorky to the Present* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993), pp. 1-28.
- , 'The Revolt Against Naturalism: Symbolism, Neo-Romaniticism, and Theatricalism', in *Twentieth-Century Russian Drama: From Gorky to the Present* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1993), pp. 50-146.

- , *Turn-of-the-Century Cabaret: Paris, Barcelona, Berlin, Munich, Vienna, Cracow, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Zurich* (New York, Guildford: Columbia UP, 1987).
- Senderovich, Savely, 'The Roman Legacy: The Circus and the Avant-Garde Theater', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 464-72.
- Senelick, Laurence, ed., *Cabaret Performance*, vol. 1, *Europe 1890-1920: Sketches, Songs, Monologues, Memoirs* (New York: PAJ, 1989).
- Severiukhin, Dmitrii, 'Vladimir Izdebsky and His Salons', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 57-71.
- Sharp, Jane A., 'The Critical Reception of the 0.10 Exhibition: Malevich and Benua', in *The Great Utopia: The Russian and Soviet Avant-Garde, 1915-1932* (New York: Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, 1992), pp. 38-52.
- , 'The Russian Avant-Garde and Its Audience: Moscow, 1913', *Modernism/modernity: Politics / Gender / Judgement*, vol. 6: 3 (1999), 91-116.
- Shervashidze, A., 'Vystavka Russkogo Khudozhestva v Parizhe', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 11-12 (1906), 130-33.
- Shervashidze, A., 'Individualizm i Traditsiia', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 6 (1906), 64-72.
- Shklovsky, Victor, 'Art as Technique', in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, edited by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Reis (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1965), pp. 3-24.
- , *Mayakovsky and His Circle*, translated and edited by Lily Feiler (London: Pluto Press, 1972).
- Shuliatikov, V., 'Novaia stsena i novaia drama', in *Krizis Teatra. Sbornik Statei* (Moscow: Problemy iskusstva, 1908), pp. 82-125.
- Sigov, S. V., 'O Dramaturgii Velimira Khlebnikova', in *Russkii Teatr i Dramaturgiia 1907-1917 godov: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov* (Leningrad: Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi institut teatra, muzyki i kinematografii im. N.K. Cherkasova, 1988), pp. 94-111.
- Simmen, Jeannot and Kolja Kohlhoff, *Kasimir Malevich: Life and Work*, translated by Paul Aston in association with Goodfellow and Egan (Cologne: Könemann, 1999).

- Siunnerberg, Konstantin, 'Khudozhestvennaia Zhizn' Peterburga', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 11-12 (1906), 134-36.
- , 'Khudozhestvennaia Zhizn' Peterburga: Vystavka "Soiuza Russkikh Khudozhnikov" v Peterburge', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 1 (1907), 75-76.
- , 'Parizhskie gazety o Russkoi Vystavke', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 11-12 (1906), 133-34.
- , 'Khudozhestvennaia Zhizn' Peterburga', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 4 (1906), 80-83.
- Slobin, Greta Nachtaier, 'The Ethos of Performance in Remizov', *CASS*, vol. 19: 4 (1985), 412-25.
- Smirnova, M., 'K voprosu o tipologii spektaklia', in *Granitsy Spektaklia*, edited by E. I. Gorfunkel' (St. Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskaia gosudarstvennaia akademiia teatral'nogo iskusstva, 1999), pp. 24-30.
- Sotheby's, *Catalogue of Ballet and Theatre Material* (London: Sotheby Parke Bernet Group, 1982).
- Stallybrass, Peter and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 1986).
- Stapanian, Juliette R., *Mayakovsky's Cubo-Futurist Vision* (Houston, Texas: Rice UP, 1986).
- Steinberg, Mark D., *Proletarian Imagination: Self, Modernity and the Sacred in Russia, 1910-1925* (Ithaca, New York and London: Cornell UP, 2002)
- Steklov, Iu. M., 'Teatr ili kukol'naia komediia?', in *Krizis Teatra. Sbornik Statei* (Moscow: Problemy iskusstva, 1908), pp. 3-53.
- Sternin, G. Iu., *Khudozhestvennaia zhizn' Rossii 1900-1910-kh godov* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1988).
- Sternin, Grigory, 'Public and Artist in Russia at the Turn of the Twentieth Century', in *Tekstura: Russian Essays on Visual Culture*, edited by Alla Efimova and Lev Manovich (Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press, 1993), pp. 89-114.
- Stites, Richard, *Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society Since 1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992).
- Stone, Norman, *Europe Transformed, 1878-1919* (London: Fontana, 1983).
- Strigalev, Anatolii and Jürgen Harten, eds., *Vladimir Tatlin Retrospektiva* (Cologne: DuMont, 1993).

- Strizhenova, Tatiana, *Soviet Costume and Textiles 1917-1945*, translated by Era Mozolkova (Moscow, Paris, Verona: Flammarion, 1991).
- Strutinskaia, E. I., *Iskaniia khudozhnikov teatra: Peterburg - Petrograd - Leningrad 1910-1920-e gody* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennyi institut iskusstvoznaniia, 1998).
- Swift, E. Anthony, *Popular Theater and Society in Tsarist Russia* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press, 2002).
- Sytova, Alla, ed., *The Lubok: Russian Folk Pictures 17th to 19th Century* (Leningrad: Aurora Art Press, 1984).
- Tarovaty, N., 'Na Akvarel'noi Vystavke v Moskve', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 1 (1906), 123-24.
- Tatlin, V. E., 'Pis'mo k M. F. Larionovu (1911)', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 5 (1999), 28.
- Terëkhina, V. N. and A. P. Zimenkov, eds., *Russkii Futurizm: Teorii. Praktiki. Kritiki. Vospominaniia* (Moscow: Nasledie, 2000).
- Tisdall, Caroline and Angelo Bozzolla, *Futurism* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977).
- Todorov, Tzvetan, *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle*, translated by Wlad Godzich (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).
- , *Literature and its Theorists: A Personal View of Twentieth-Century Criticism*, translated by Catherine Porter (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988).
- Tomilovskaia, E. P., ed., *Aleksandra Ekster: Eskizy dekoratsii i kostiumov iz sobraniia GTsTM im. A. A. Bakhrushina* (Moscow: GTsTM im. A. A. Bakhrushina, 1986).
- Toporkov, A., 'O Tvorcheskom i Sozertsatel'nom Estetizme (Po povodu vystavki Zolotogo Runa)', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 11-12 (1909), 69-74.
- Trotsky, Leon, *Literature and Revolution*, [1925], translated by Rose Strunsky (London: RedWords, 1991).
- , *On Literature and Art*, edited by Paul N. Siegel (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1970).
- Tsivian, Yuri, *Early Cinema in Russia and its Cultural Reception*, edited by Richard Taylor, translated by Alan Bodger (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

- Tucker, Robert C., ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader* (New York: Norton, 1978).
- Uhr, Horst, *Masterpieces of German Expressionism at the Detroit Institute of Arts* (New York: Hudson Hills Press in Association with the Detroit Institute of Arts, 1982).
- Uspenskii, Aleksandr, 'Bes: (Iz materialov dlia russkoi zhivopisi)', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 1 (1907), 21-27.
- Valkenier, Elizabeth Kridl, 'Il'ia Repin and David Burliuk', *CASS*, vol. 20: 1-2 (1986), 55-61.
- , *Valentin Serov: Portraits of Russia's Silver Age* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 2001).
- Varnedoe, Kirk and Adam Gopnik, eds., *Modern Art and Popular Culture: Readings in High and Low* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, Harry N. Abrams, 1990).
- Veis, Zoia and Viacheslav Grechnev, 'Tragediia 'Vladimir Maiakovskii'', in *S Maiakovskim po Sankt-Peterburgu* (St. Petersburg: Izdanie nauchno-populiarnoe, 1993), pp. 31-56.
- Vice, Sue, *Introducing Bakhtin* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997).
- Vitali, Christoph, ed., *Marc Chagall: The Russian Years 1906-1922* (Frankfurt: Schirn Kunsthalle, 1991), Exhibition Catalogue.
- Vlasova, R. I., *Russkoe teatral'no-dekoratsionnoe iskusstvo nachala XX veka: Iz naslediia peterburgskikh masterov* (Leningrad: Khudozhnik RSFSR, 1984)
- Volkov, V., 'Sistema "teatr-zritel"' kak ob'ekt sotsiologicheskogo issledovaniia', in *Voprosy Sotsiologii Teatr*, edited by N. Khrenov, pp. 43-58.
- Voloshin, Maks, 'Pervaia Vystavka Internatsional'nogo Obshchestva Akvarelistov', *Zolotoe runo*, vol. 3 (1906), 95-98.
- Voloshinov, V. N., *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard UP, 1973).
- Voloshinov, Valentin, 'Discourse in Life and Discourse in Poetry: Questions of Sociological Poetics', in *Bakhtin School Papers*, edited by A. Shukman (Oxford: RTP Publications, 1983), pp. 5-30.
- Wachtel, Andrew, *Petrushka: Sources and Contexts* (Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1998).

- Walker, Barbara, 'Kruzhok Culture: The Meaning of Patronage in the Early Soviet Literary World', *Contemporary European History*, vol. 11: 1 (February 2002), 107-23.
- Walker, John A. and Sarah Chaplin, *Visual Culture: An Introduction* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997).
- Walton, J. Michael, ed., *Craig on Theatre* (London: Methuen Drama, 1999).
- Webb, Jen, Tony Schirato, and Geoff Danaher, *Understanding Bourdieu* (London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage, 2002).
- Whitford, Frank, *Kandinsky* (London: Paul Hamlyn, 1967).
- Wihl, Gary, *Marxist Theory and Criticism: 2. Structuralist Marxism*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/marxist_theory_and_criticism-2.html, April 2001.
- Wilson, Sarah, et al., *Paris: Capital of the Arts 1900-1968* (London: Royal Academy of Arts and Guggenheim Museum, 2002), Exhibition catalogue.
- Winders, James A., *Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels*, Johns Hopkins UP,
http://www.press.jhu.edu/books/hopkins_guide_to_literary_theory/entries/karl_marx_and_friedrich_engels.html, April 2001.
- Wood, Paul, ed., *The Challenge of the Avant-Garde* (New Haven and London: Yale UP in association with The Open University, 1999).
- , 'The Politics of the Avant-Garde', in *The Great Utopia: The Russian and Soviet Avant-Garde, 1915-1932* (New York: Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, 1992), pp. 1-24.
- Worrall, Nick, *The Moscow Art Theatre* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996).
- Yablonskaya, M.N., *Women Artists of Russia's New Age 1900-1925*, translated by Anthony Parton (London: Thames and Hudson, 1990).
- Yudina, Ekaterin, 'Mikhail Le-Dantiu', *Experiment/Eksperiment*, vol. 1 (1995), 201-09.
- Zhadova, Larissa, ed., *Tatlin* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1984).

Archives Consulted

Archive of the *Gosudarstvennyi Russkii muzei* (GRM) [State Russian Museum], St. Petersburg

- Anon, *Address label for Neue Künstler-Vereinigung, München*, [undated]. f: 121,
'Soiuz molodezhi'; ed khr: 116; l: 2.
- , *Advertising fliers for the Neue Künstler-Vereinigung, München*, [undated]. f. 121;
d. 116.
- , *Advertising poster for art master-class in the Komissariat Narodnogo
Prosveshcheniia in the St. Petersburg District*, [undated]. f: 121; ed khr: 10,
'Raznye ob"iavleniia i afishi, [undated] 27.1.1911 - [not earlier than] 1917';
l: 9.
- , *Artists' contract for the art exhibition Turnus 1909-1910*, no date, but for the
exhibition 1. 09 - 14.09.1910. f: 121; ed khr: 116; l: 21.
- , *Catalogue and pricelist for Turnus 1909-1910, Munich*, [1909-1910]. f: 121; ed
khr: 116; ll: 14-20ob.
- , *Catalogue for the art exhibition Treugol'nik, Vilnius, 1909-1910*, 1909-1910. f.
121; ed khr: 9, 'Katalog vystavok 'Soiuz molodezhi' na 12 ekz'; d: 1,
'Catalogue for the art exhibition *Triuegol'nik*, Vilnius, 1909-1910'; ll: 1-15.
- , *D. D. Burliuk v gruppovoi fotografii*, [1928?]. f: 100, 'Fond tekushchikh
postuplenii'; ed khr: 815; l: 1.
- , *Delivery/address labels and headed paper bearing the Bubnovyi valet stamp, to
be attached to all BV works of art, for an exhibition 25 Jan - 26 Feb 1912*. f:
121; ed khr: 116; ll: 25-26.
- , *Document referring to the contract for the Soiuz molodezhi to rent rooms for an
exhibition, 5 April - 10 May 1911*, [no date noted by me]. f. 121; ed khr: 4.

- , *E. K. N. S. Goncharova i M. F. Larionov* [photograph], [1962]. f: 100; ed khr: 376; l: 3.
- , *Fotografiia N. N. Punin, K. S. Malevich i M. V. Matiushin*, [undated]. f:100; ed khr: 633.
- , *Group photograph of Futurist artists, Moscow, 1912 including I. Zdanevich*, [1912]. f: 158, 'Romanovicha Sergeia Mikhailovicha'; ed khr: 4, 'Grupповые фотографии художников 1912-1913'; ll: 1.
- *invitation card to Goncharova and Larionov's exhibition (Goncharova's 90th birthday)*, [1971]. f: 100; ed khr: 376; l: 4.
- , *M. A. Voloshin v gruppovoi fotografii*. f: 100; ed khr: 815; l: 2.
- , *M. F. Larionov* [photograph], 1916-18. f: 100; ed khr: 376; l: 1.
- , *Maket obiavleniia i afisha 'Soiuz Molodezhi'*, 1912. f. 121; ed khr: 12; l: 1.
- , *Moskovskoe Obshchestvo Khudozhnits - Declaration*, [undated]. f: 121; ed khr: 116; l: 4.
- , *N. S. Goncharova i M. F. Larionov* [photograph], [1962]. f: 100; ed khr: 376; l: 2.
- , *Photo prise a l'exposition "0.10" De g. à dr.: Rozanova, Bogouslavskaya, l'épouse de Pougny, Malévitch*. f: 100, 'Fotografii; ed khr: 821, 'Puni, I. A. Boguslavskoi, K. A., 1915-1952'; l: 10.
- , *Photograph of advertising poster of "0.10" exhibition*, [1915]. f: 100; d: 821; l: 15.
- , *Portret i model': R. Z. Petrova-Kocherchina u svoego portreta rab. D. D. Burliuka*. f: 100; ed khr: 815; l: 3.
- , *Programme for Troitskii Theatre, 13 January 1913, featuring Ia. V. Guretskii, I. S. Shkol'nik*, 13 January 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 116; ll: 27-30ob.

---, *Vystavka Mishen'*, *Moskva 1913. Salon Mikhailova* [photograph], 1913. f: 158; ed khr: 4; l: 2.

Burliuk, D. D., V. D. Burliuk, and A. V. Lentulov, *Pis'mo Burliuka, D. D. i V. D., Lentulov, A. V., khudozhniki - Benua Aleksandru Nikolaevichu*, 18 November 1909. f: 137, 'Benua, Aleksandra Nikolaevicha'; d: 767; l: 1.

Burliuk, David, *Disput publichnyi o sovremennoi zhivopisi. Iskusstvo Novatorov i Akademicheskoe Iskusstvo v XIX i XX vv - Repin i porezannaia ego kartina* [Handwritten lecture and printed programme], March 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 13; ll: 18-19.

---, *'V zashchitu iskusstva!' 'Vecher Sovremennoi Zhivopisi'* [Handwritten notes], [1913?]. f: 121; ed khr: 13; 9-10.

Burliuk, David Davidovich, *Letter to Dobychina N. E.*, 9.4.1910. f: 121; ed khr: 21, 'Burliuk, D. D. – pis'mo Dobychinoi, N. E', l: 1.

Ekster, Aleksandra, *Letter to 'Soiuz Molodezhi'*, 28.10.1913. f: 121; ed khr: 79, 'Ekster v "S. M."' [written in pencil]; l: 1.

Grishchenko, A. V., *Doklad A. V. Grishchenko. Russkaia zhivopis' v sviazi s Vizantie i Zapadom, 2 maia 1913* [Handwritten summary of programme], May 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 13; ll: 34-36.

Guro, E., Matiushin and R. Voinov, *Zaiavlenie E. Guro, Matiushina i R. Voinova o vykhode iz "Soiuza molodezhi"*. [undated]. f: 121; ed khr: 26; l: 1-2.

Khlebnikov, V., and B. Livshits, *Listovka V. Khlebnikova i B. Livshitsa po povodu priezda Marinetti*, [undated]. f: 121; ed khr: 88, 'Listovka V. Khlebnikova i B. Livshits po povodu priezda Marinetti'; l: 1.

Khudozhestvenno-Artisticheskaiia Assotsiatsiia, *Advertising poster for a public lecture by N. I. Kul'bin, 'Sovremennaia Zhivopis' i Rol' molodezhi v evoliutsii iskusstva'*, Advertised for 31 March 1912. f: 121; ed khr: 10; l: 4.

Larionov, Mikhail Fedorovich, *Doklad Larionova*, [1913]. f: 121; ed khr: 13; ll: 2.

---, *Pis'mo Larionova, Mikhaila Fedorovicha - Matveiu, Vladimiru Ivanovichu*, 1.3.1910. f. 121; ed khr: 38; l: 1.

---, *Three Letters to Shkol'nik, Iosif Solomonovich*, without date and 24.3.1913. f: 121; ed khr: 39, 'Pis'ma Larionova, Mikhaila Fedorovicha – Shkol'niku Iosifu Solomonovichu', ll: 1-3ob.

Maiakovskii, V. V., *Doklad Vladimira Maiakovskogo (o zhivopisi): Babushkam akademii*, no date. f. 121; ed khr: 50, 'Raspiska Maiakovskogo, V. V. v poluchenii deneg i programma doklada "Babushkam akademii"'; l: 2.

---, *Signed receipt of payment from the Soiuz Molodezhi*, [undated]. f: 121; ed khr: 50; l: 1.

Maiakovskii, Vladimir, *Vladimir Maiakovskii [notes]*, undated. f: 121; ed khr: 13; l: 40.

Malevich, Kazimir Severinovich, *5 Letters (postcards) to I. S. Shkol'nik*, [undated] 3 May, 30 October, 12 and 16 November 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 41 'Pis'ma Malevicha, Kazimira Severinovicha – Shkol'niku, I. S.'; ll: 1-5.

Malevich, Kliun, Men'kov, *Accompanying Programme for "0.10" exhibition*, [1915]. f: 100; ed khr: 821; l: 16.

Nizhegorodskoe obshchestvo liubitelei khudozhestv invitation (with terms and conditions) to contribute work for the Nizhnii Novgorod art exhibition, 5 December 1911. f: 121; ed khr: 116; ll: 22-23.

[Shklovskii, Viktor], *Mesto futurizma v istorii iazyka. 'Blagorodstvo' v iskusstve*, [undated]. f: 121; ed khr: 13, 'Programmy, tezisy dokladov i disputov, ustraivaemykh "Soiuzom Molodezhi"'; l: 1.

Shkol'nik et al., *Pravila vstupleniia v chleny Tovarishchestva khudozhnikov 'Soiuz Molodezhi'*, [undated]. f: 121; ed khr: 3, 'Pravila vstupleniia v chleny Tovarishchestva khudozhnikov 'Soiuz Molodezhi"'; ll: 1-3.

- Shleifer, Ts. Ia., *Request for a loan of 100 rubles from the committee of the Society of Artists, the Union of Youth*, 17 April 1919. f. 121; ed khr: 77; l: 1.
- Shperk, Gustav Eduardovich, *Letter from Gustav Eduardovich Shperk, on behalf of the Soiuz Molodezhi, regarding premises for the proposed exhibition of 1 Nov 1913 - 10 Jan 1914*, 24 October 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 4; ll: 4-5.
- Soiuz molodezhi, *1 disput publichnyi o noveishei russkoi literature* [Handwritten and printed programme], March 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 13; ll: 26-29.
- , *3 printed catalogues for the Soiuz molodezhi exhibition, Riga, 1910, 1910*. f: 121; ed khr: 9; ed khr: 2, 3, 4; ll: 1-32.
- , *Advertising flier for lecture by David Burluk, 'Chto takoe kubizm'*, Printed 13 November 1912. f: 121; ed khr: 10; l: 5-6.
- , *Advertising flier for the newly opened book warehouse 'knizhnyi sklad'*, [undated]. f: 121; ed khr: 116, 'Reklamy, prosylki, isveshcheniia, blanki (1909-1914)', l: 1.
- , *[Advertising flier] Disputy, ustraevaemye obshchestvom "Soiuz Molodezhi" v S.P.B.*, [Feb 1913]. f: 121; ed khr: 13; l: 3.
- , *Advertising poster for a Soiuz molodezhi art exhibition, St. Petersburg [1910?]*. f. 121; ed khr: 10.
- , *Advertising poster for Soiuz molodezhi exhibition of paintings, St. Petersburg [November 1913]*, Printed 11 Nov 1913. f. 121; ed khr: 10; l: 7.
- , *Advertising poster for Union of Youth production, Tsar Maksem'ian i ego nepokornyi syn Adol'fa [sic] and Khorovodnye prichudy s publikoi. 27 January 1911*, Printed 25 Jan 1911. f: 121; ed khr: 10; l: 3.
- , *Art exhibition catalogue, Soiuz molodezhi, 1910*. f: 121; ed khr: 9; d: 5.
- , *Catalogue for Soiuz molodezhi art exhibition, Moscow, 1912, 1912*. f: 121; d: 9; ed khr: 10.

- , *Catalogue for Soiuz molodezhi art exhibition, St. Petersburg, 4 December - 10 January 1913*, 4 December 1911-10 January 1912. f: 121; ed khr: 9; d: 8, 9.
- , *Catalogue of second art exhibition, Soiuz Molodezhi, 1911*, 1911. f: 121; ed khr: 9; d: 6, 7, 'Catalogue of second art exhibition, *Soiuz Molodezhi*, 1911.
- , *Catalogue of Soiuz molodezhi, 1912*, 1912. f: 121; ed khr: 9; d: 11, 'Catalogue of *Soiuz molodezhi*, 1912'.
- , *Catalogue, with price list, for Soiuz molodezhi art exhibition, St. Petersburg, 10 November 1913-10 January 1914*, 10 November 1913 - 10 January 1914. f: 121; ed khr: 9; d: 12, 'Catalogue, with price list, for *Soiuz molodezhi* art exhibition, St. Petersburg, 10 November 1913-10 January 1914'.
- , *Declaration from the Soiuz molodezhi*, 23 March 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 13; ll: 17-17ob.
- , *Doklad o noveishei russkoi literature* [Handwritten and typed programme], 1/2 March [1913]. f: 121; ed khr: 13; ll: 13-14.
- , *Exhibition catalogue for the Soiuz Molodezhi, 1912*, 1912. f. 121; d. 9.
- , *Exhibition pamphlet-catalogue for Soiuz molodezhi art exhibition, 1912*, 1912. f. 121; ed khr: 9; d: 10.
- , *Letter to G. E. Shperk*, 4 October 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 4, 'Dogovory na eksploatatsiiu pomeschenii dlia vystavok i veshalki. 4. 04. 1911- 24. 10. 1913'; l: 3.
- , *Programma referata Davida Burliuca, 20 November 1912, "Chto takoe kubizm" (Razgovor o zhivopisi)*, November 1912. f: 121; ed khr: 13; l: 6-8, 11.
- , *Raskhodno-prikladnaia kniga, 4 dek. 1912-13*, 4 December 1912-1913. f: 121; ed khr: 114; on 48 pages.
- , *Raspiski*. f: 121; ed khr: 111, 'Raspiski na 23 ll'; ll: 3-4, 7-15.

- , *Raspiski raznykh lits*, without date, 14.11.1912 - 4.3.1929. f: 121; ed khr: 132; ll: 1-11.
- , *Scheta i smety*, 1909-1913. f:121,; ed khr: 110; on 138 pages.
- , *Sokrashchennaia programma - Afishi dlia ulitsy - Publichnyi Disput. Po voprosam novogo iskusstva, ustraevaemyi obshchestvom 'Soiuz Molodezhi' v S.P.B. 1-go i 2-go marta 1913 goda*, [1-2 March 1913]. f: 121; d: 13; ll: 4-5.
- , 'Raznye finansovye dokumenty'. f: 121; ed khr: 113,; on 198 pages.
- , *Večer poetov futuristov* [Hand written notes], 20 November 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 13; ll: 39-40.
- , *Vystavka Kartin/O noveishei russkoi literature* [Double-sided advertising card], November 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 13; ll: 37-38.
- Spanidikov *intelligentnoe khuliganstvo*, [undated]. f. 121; ed khr: 84; ll: 1-2ob.
- [Spandikov?], *Small personal account/notebook*. [possibly belonging to Spandikov], 1910-1917. f: 121; ed khr: 112, ['Spandikov']; ll: 1-30.
- Troitskii Theatre, *Plan i rastsenki mest teatra miniatiur*, 23-e, 24-e - no year given. f: 121; ed khr: 16, 'Plan i rastsenki mest teatra miniatiur'; ll: 1-2.
- Urechin, L., 'Pis'mo L Urechina (kino-rezhisser) v "Soiuz molodezhi"', 27.9.1913. f: 121; ed khr: 58,; l: 1.
- Zdanevich, Il'ia Mikhailovich, *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 11 June 1913. f: 177, 'Zdanevichei, Il'i i Kirilla Mikhailovichei'; ed khr: 50, 'Zdanevich I. M. Chernovye pis'ma raznym litsam 25.02.1913 - 13.07.1913'; ll: 48-48ob.
- , *Draft letter to Aleksandr Nikolaevich Kul'bin*, 15 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 14.
- , *Draft letter to Mikhail Fedorovich Larionov*, 17 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 14ob - 15.

- , *Draft letter to Boris Lovovich Lopatinskii*, 12 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 12.
- , *Draft letter to Boris Nikolaevich Kurdinovskii*, 13 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 12ob.
- , *Draft letter to Boris Nikolaevich Kurdinovskii*, 29 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 22.
- , *Draft letter to Grigorii Vigalievich Sobolenskii*, 26 [May] 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 46.
- , *Draft letter to Grigorii Vigalievich Sobolenskii*, 23 June 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 48ob-49.
- , *Draft letter to his brother, Kirill Mikhailovich Zdanevich*, 7 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 7ob-8.
- , *Draft letter to his father, Mikhail Andreevich Zdanevich*, 25 February 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 2-3.
- , *Draft letter to his mother Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 30 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 22-23ob.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 12 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 12.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 9 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 10.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 26-28 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 18-21.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 1 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 4ob-5ob.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 5 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 6.

- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 20 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 16ob-17.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 19 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 15-16.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 8 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 9ob-10.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 15 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 13-13ob.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 1 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 24-25.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 3 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 25-26.
- , *Draft Letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 7 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 27.
- , *Draft letter to his mother, Valentina Kirillovna Zdanevich*, 9 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 29.
- , *Draft letter to Mikhail Fedorovich Larionov*, 8 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 28-28ob.
- , *Draft letter to Mikhail Fedorovich Larionov*, 8 March [1913]. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 8ob-9ob.
- , *Draft letter to Mikhail Fedorovich Larionov*, 11 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 29ob.
- , *Draft letter to Mikhail Fedorovich Larionov*, 12 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 11-11ob.
- , *Draft letter to Mikhail Fedorovich Larionov*, 6 March [1913]. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 7.

- , *Draft letter to Natal'ia Sergeevna Goncharova*, 8 April [1913]. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 28ob-29.
- , *Draft letter to Saloma Nikolaevna Andreeva*, [undated]. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 49ob-51.
- , *Draft letter to Sergei Vladimirovich Shtein*, 24 [May] 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 45ob-46.
- , *Draft letter to Valerii Iakovlevich Briusov*, 2 May 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 34ob-35.
- , *Draft letter to Vera Mikhailovna Ermolaeva*, 22 [May 1913]. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 39ob-45.
- , *Draft letter to Mikhail Fedorovich Larionov*, 4 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 26ob-27.
- , *Draft note to Evgenii Evgenievich Lansere*, 1 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 23ob.
- , *Draft note to Moris Al'fredovich Fabbri*, 6 March 1913. f: ; ed khr: 50; l: 6ob.
- , *Draft note to Nikolai Ivanovich Kul'bin*, 1 April 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; l: 24.
- , *Futurizm i Vsechestvo. Doklad I. M. Zdanevicha*, [January 1914]. f: 177; ed khr: 21, 'Zdanevich, Il'ia Mikhailovich – Rukopis' doklada, 'Futurizm i Vsechestvo''; ll: 23-23ob.
- , *Il'ia Mikhailovich Zdanevich - zapiska Valishevskomu na vizitnoi kartochke*, [undated]. f: 177; ed khr: 54, l: 1.
- , *Draft Letter to V. N. Kurdinovskii*, 17 March 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 50; ll: 14-14ob.
- , *Draft Letter to Salome Nikolaevna Andreeva*, 6 July 1913. f. 177; d. 50.
- , *Draft Letter to Vera Mikhailovna Ermolaeva*, 22. f. 177; d. 50.

---, *'O Natalii Goncharovoi'. Doklad na ee vystavke v Moskve. Rukopis'*. October 1913. f: 177; ed khr: 14; ll: 1-20.

---, *Rukopis' doklada, 'Futurizm i Vsechestvo'*, January 1914. f. 177; ed khr: 21.

---, *Zametki na obsuzhdenii doklada 'Poklonenie bashmaku'*, 1914. f: 177; ed khr: 28, 'Zdanevich, Il'ia Mikhailovich'; l: 1.

Zheverzheev, Levтин Ivanovich, Efrem Denisovich Selivanov, and Stepan Nikitich Dementev, *Contracts concerning the exhibition of the Soiuz molodezhi*, 24 October 1913. f: 121; ed khr: 4; l: 6.

Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii archiv [Central State Archive of History], St. Petersburg

_____, *Documents relating to the registering, opening and protocol of the theatre, Krivoe zerkalo, under the leadership of Leonid Nikolaevich Lukin, 1912-1914*. f; 569, 'Kantseliariia S-Peterburgskogo Gradonachal'nika'; op; 13; d; 739.

_____, *Kopii programm Ekaterinskii Teatr 'Krivoe Zerkalo', Ekaterinskii kanal, 90-2, 11.01 - 03.02.1917*. f: 569; op: 14; d: 229.

_____, *Advertising poster for Marinetti's lecture in Moscow (27 January 1914), submitted to the gradonachal'nik to support an application for similar lectures in St. Petersburg on 1 and 4 February 1914*. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.

_____, *Ob osvidetel'stvovanii uveselitel'nogo sada i teatra 'Luna Park' po Ofiterskoi ul. A. 39. kolomenskoi chasti 1 uchastka, 27 April 1917*. f: 513; op: 139; d: 180.

_____, *Perepiska s prosheniiami i zaiavleniiami raznykh lits o razreshenii ustroistva lektsii vechera i sobranii, 24.12.1913 - 31.1.1914*. f: 569; op: 13; d: 96.

- _____, *Permission from the gradonachal'nik's office for a public lecture, 'Problema pravil'nykh vzaimootoshenii mezhdru potrebleniem i trudom', proposed for 4 April 1913. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1032.*
- _____, *Application from the Russian Electro-technical Factory, Simens i Gal'ske to offer courses on rentogen [x-rays] for doctors who specialise in the field, 28 March 1913. f: 569; op:13; d:1032.*
- _____, *Application to the gradonachal'nik for Evgenii Grigor'evich Lisenkov and Sergei Andreevich Grek to read lectures on 'The role of breathing in poetry' and the reading of A. A. Belyi's 'Krest' i rozt', proposed date is 4 April 1913. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1032*
- _____, *Application to the gradonachal'nik to open the miniature theatre 'Satirikon', 14 October 1915 - 29 January 1916. f: 256; op: 33; d: 380.*
- _____, *Prosheniia i zaiavleniia raznykh lits o razreshenii ustroistva, vecherov, sobranii i lektsii za ianvar' mesiats (delo), 22-12-1914 - 23-01-1915. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1130.*
- _____, *Prosheniia raznykh lits o razreshenii otkryt' tipografii kn. Slkady i dr. (V prilozhenii imeiutsia gazety, zhurnal i reklamy)[sp?] (delo), 15 May - 16 November 1915. f: 706; op: 1; d: 1779.*
- _____, *Registratiia Obshchestvennogo sobraniia pod nazvaniem 'Kruzhok liubitelei stsenicheskogo iskusstva', 25 October 1912 - 7 January 1915. f: 287; op: 1; d: 244.*
- _____, *Request to Lt. Fon Fishbakh for police report concerning police presence at Marinetti's lecture on 1 Feb 1914, 7 March 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.*
- _____, *Ustav Obshchestva vzaimnogo vspomoshestvovaniia russkikh khudozhnikov, 1914-1915. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1130.*
- Burliuk, N. D., et al., *Advertising poster Nash otvet Marinetti, 8 Feb 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.*
- Chulkov, Gregorii, *'Are we waking up ['probuzhdaemsia'] or not (Art and Life)' - programme for public lecture, 16 January 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1030.*
- Dolidze, *Over 50 individual documents which relate to a lecture given by P. D. Uspenskii, 'V poiskakh chudesnogo: Poezdka v indiiu v 1914 godu', 03-20 February 1915. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1349.*

- Durov, Anatolii, *Application to the gradonachal'nik by Durov, to give a lecture in the Chinizelli Circus, 'On Laughter and the Pagan Priests of Laughter'*, 5 January 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1030.
- Fon-Fishbakh, *Official correspondence to the Mladshii Pomoshchnik Officer of the Gavinskii Station/District*, 30 January 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Gradonachal'nik, St. Petersburg, *Grants permission for V. I. Ivanov's public lecture, 'O granitsakh iskusstva'*, on 22 January 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1030.
- , *Note informing Puchkov of the gradonachal'nik's permission for him to stage his evening*, 13 February 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149. Petersburg,
- , *Request to Levashov for programme; refusal of permission*, 3 and 4 February 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- , *Advertising poster, Poeziia i perevorot Vinvzmystuianekra chempionata poetov*, Un-dated but proposed evening is 14 February 1914, f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- , *Advertising poster, Vecher Maiakovskogo*, 20 February 1915 - advertised date of lecture. F: 569; op: 13. d: 1349.
- , *Advertised programme, Vecher Poetov*, for proposed date of 14 Feb 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Iakobson, E. I., *Proshenie to gradonachal'nik for a public lecture, entitled, 'Concerning Modern Literature'*, to be held 20 January 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1030.
- , *Police report for lecture of 1 and 4 February 1914, 'O futurizme'*, 10 February 1914, f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Ivanov, *Decision from the Gradonachal'nik to Bubnovyi valet*, 29 March 1913. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1032.
- , *Note to police-officer (pristav) of the Spasskaia district, informing him that permission has not been granted for the Artistic Society of the intimate Theatre to hold their given programme in April*, 8 April 1913. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1032.
- Khudozhestvennoe obshchestvo intimnogo teatra - SPB, *Programme for Podval brodiachei sobaki*, 8 March 1913. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1032.
- Konchalov, Petr, *Application to gradonachal'nik to hold public lectures and debates by the Bubnovyi Valet*, 13 and 14 March 1913. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1032.

- Kurbakovskaia, Ol'ga Vladimirovna, *Application for a public lecture, for V. I. Ivanov to read, 'Novoe mirovozzrenie'*, 25 January 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1030.
- Kurbakovskaia, Ol'ga Vladimirovna, *Application to the gradonachal'nik to stage a public evening, 'Our reply to Marinetti'* f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Levashov, Valerin Dimitrievich, *Application to gradonachal'nik for a poetry evening*, 1 Feb 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Levashov, Valerin Dimitr., *Application to the gradonachal'nik for a lecture (with proposed programme) by A. I. Puchkov entitled, 'O dostizheniiakh v iskusstve vchera'*, 11 February 1914 (?). f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Maslov, I. S. and D. Mitlin, *Po prosheniiu vladel'tsev teatra miniatiura - I. S. Maslova i D. Mitlina o vydache svidetel'stva na otkrytie deistvii teatra po Petergofskomu shosse, N. 6.* f: 256; op: 33; f: 357
- Nar'slov, *Reply to Fon-Fishbakh letter of 30 January 1914, concerning the suitability of the French language for Marinetti's lecture*, 30 January 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Obshchestvo Vspomoshchestvovaniia nuzhdaiushchimsia uchenikam Chastnogo Kommercheskogo Uchilishcha i Torgovoi Shkoly S. A. Kholmogorova v S.-Peterburge, M. V. D. *Application for public lecture, 'The influence of alcohol on the human organism'*, by Dr. Romanov, 1 April 1913. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1032.
- Puchkov, Anatolii, *Application to the gradonachal'nik's office for his lecture, on the theme of 'O dostizheniiakh v iskusstve'* Tenishevskii Hall (date received -12 Feb 1914). f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Radin, Dr. E. P., *Futurism i bezumie*, 18 January 1914. f: 569; op: 13; d: 1030.
- Rapiufi?, I. P., *"Kliuchi schast'ia" A Verbitskoi i sovremennaia etika feminizma*, 30 March 1913. f: 569; op: 13; d:1032.
- Shishmnova, Dr. Irina Vasil'evna, *Application for a public lecture, 'Concerning the Balkan War and its Horrors': 'Dolzhen li zhit' tot, kotoryi vo vsekh proiavleniiakh svoego sushchestvovaniia dokazyvaet, chto on dostoen zhit'?'* f: 569; op: 13; d: 1149.
- Tasteven, G., *Application for the gradonachal'nik's office*, 20 Jan 1914. f. 569; op: 13; d: 1149.

Various, *Ob osvidestvovanii teatra i restorana "Letuchaia mysh'" v dome No 38-45 no Sadovoi ul. Snasskoi chasti [...] September 1916. f: 513; op: 139; d: 81.*

Materials have also been consulted in the following archives and Libraries:

Anna Akhmatova Museum in Fountain House, St. Petersburg

Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow

Central Archive of Document Collections (manuscript and photograph departments),
Moscow

Russian State Library, Newspaper Department, Moscow.