

ANTHONY PARTON

Goncharova's Rayism



Dr. Anthony Parton is a lecturer in the History of Art at Durham University. During the past 30 years he has researched the life and work of Mikhail Larionov and Natalia Goncharova. He is the author of *Mikhail Larionov and the Russian Avant-Garde*, and the editor of *Women Artists of Russia's New Age*. His monograph, *Goncharova: The Art and Design of Natalia Goncharova*, appeared in October 2010, from which this article and the illustrations come.

26

Mikhail Larionov had always feared subservience to any one school or style and it was for this reason that in 1912 he pioneered his own style of abstract painting which he called Rayism. Although Rayism shared certain characteristics with French Cubism and Italian Futurism, the style was essentially innovative and was championed as such by contemporary critics. V. Mak, for example, claimed "Rayist painting was born in Moscow; it is an entirely home-grown product as opposed to the French Cubism and Italian Futurism imported from abroad"¹

Rayism was based upon a theory of perception, which Larionov first published in his manifesto *Rayism (Luchizm)* of 1912. Here he argued that the task of the artist was to render that immaterial world beyond the range of the human eye, by representing those "intangible spatial forms" created by the intersection of light rays reflected from objects in the material world.

There were two stages in the development of Rayism.

The first was called Realistic Rayism (*realisticheskii luchizm*) and is exemplified by a series of still-lives such as *Rayist Glass* (Guggenheim Museum, New York) and *Rayist Sausage and Mackerel* (1, Ludwig Collection, Cologne), and a series of portraits such as *Portrait of a Fool* (Private Collection) and a *Rayism (Portrait)* that were executed in 1912. In works such as these the subjects appear to reflect coloured rays of light, which fracture and break up the picture surface.

By 1913, however, Larionov's Rayist theory and practice had undergone a rapid evolution. In this second phase, which he called Pneumo-Rayism (*pnevmo-luchizm*), Larionov abandoned the representation of the objective world and either decomposed the object, as in *Sea Beach and Woman* (2, Ludwig Museum, Cologne), or removed it from the picture altogether, as in *Rayist Composition*.



1 • M. Larionov, *Rayist Sausage and Mackerel*, 1912
Oil on canvas, 46 x 61 cm.
Ludwig Museum, Cologne



2 • M. Larionov, *Sea, Beach and Woman (Pneumo-Rayism)*, 1913
Oil on canvas, 52 x 68 cm.
Ludwig Museum, Cologne

Goncharova's role in the development of Rayism was pivotal. She subscribed to Larionov's views, illustrated his manifestos and subsequently extended the possibilities of the style in a highly innovative manner. Her first work in the style comprised drawings which are somewhat awkwardly worked with thick ray lines and dense planes (*Rayist Construction*, 1912, 3) but she quickly moved beyond this approach to embrace a more elegant and visually engaging style. In *Electricity* (4) Goncharova employed sleek lines, 'open' forms, delicate fans of rays, star-bursts and floating grids of hatched lines which create a rich optical picture space and a rhythmic composition that possesses an almost choreographic quality.

In terms of full-scale easel painting, however, Goncharova focussed principally on the subject of the forest and explored the theme in an extensive series of works executed in the style of Realistic Rayism. These early works included *Study for Green and Yellow Forest* (5), *Rayist Forest*, and *Brown and Yellow Forest* (7). Step by step, however, Goncharova moved from a relatively naturalistic palette of greens, yellows and blues to an almost monochrome palette that emulated Analytical Cubism. In addition her work exhibits a gradual progress towards abstraction until Goncharova broke through into non-objectivity in a series of Pneumo-rayist works such as *Rayist Perception in Blue and Green* (6), and *Rayist Perception in Brown and Orange* (Museum of Modern Art, New York). Here she finally dissolved the image of the forest into a welter of criss-crossing lines and liberated the expressive qualities of colour, line, shape, and texture from their traditional mimetic function.

The creation of a 'pure', autonomous art was a key feature of Rayist theory. The manifestos argue for an art which expresses "the qualities peculiar to painting alone"² and, hence, "the true liberation of painting and its own life according to its own rules".³ In scores of non-objective drawings and several magnificent oils such as *Rayist Construction* (Private Collection, USA) Goncharova abandoned mimesis altogether and dissembled the traditional Renaissance picture space in favour of a purely optical space traversable only by the eye. Contemporary critics such as Rostislavov advised Goncharova's public to abandon their "realistic and photographic yardstick" for Goncharova was "moving towards the pure sources of autonomous art—colour, form and, integrally related to them, compositional tasks".⁴ Goncharova was increasingly discussed as a 'pure painter' and enjoyed success as such, for as Rostislavov wrote of her Rayist works: "It is not their principles which charm us but the astonishing skills and artistic combinations of colours, lines and planes".⁵



3 • *Rayist Construction*, 1912
Pencil on paper, dimensions unknown.
Reproduced in M. Larionov, *Rayism*, 1912



4 • *Electricity*, 1913
Ink on paper, 23.3 x 29.1 cm.
The Collection of Jon P. & Pamela J. Dorsey, USA



5 • *Study for Green and Yellow Forest*, 1912
Oil on canvas, 58.4 x 40.6 cm.
Collection of Professor Stavrovski, New York



6 • *Rayist Perception: Blue and Green / Rayism: Blue-Green Forest*, 1913
Oil on canvas, 54.6 x 49.5 cm.
The Riklis Collection of the McCrory Corp.,
The Museum of Modern Art, New York

Goncharova's example was a potent stimulus not only for male colleagues in her immediate circle, such as Shevchenko, who also practised Pneumo-rayism at this time, but also for women artists, such as Rozanova and Popova, whose Suprematist and Constructivist work was to move the debate about a 'pure art' into new realms.

And the Fourth Dimension

Paintings such as *Rayist Construction* (Private Collection, USA), however, were not simply a celebration of autonomous pictorial values, but were also intended to serve an expressive purpose that bordered on the mystical. In the manifestos, Larionov explains that Rayist paintings evoke a sensation of 'the fourth dimension', a dimension beyond that of our daily experience and in which our ultimate reality is located.⁶ Popular mathematicians at this time such as Charles Howard Hinton described 'the fourth dimension' as a real space lying at right angles to our existing three dimensions and sought to prove its existence mathematically.⁷ Philosophers and mystics, on the other hand, such as Claude Bragdon in America and Petr Ouspensky in Russia, gave this concept a Theosophical twist by suggesting that only in this new dimension, could the enigmas of the human condition be understood and resolved.⁸

The concept of the fourth dimension was much studied by the wider European avant-garde at this time. Apollinaire, for example, wrote of: "those new dimensions of space that are collectively designated, in the language of modern studios, by the term fourth dimension ... it represents the immensity of space eternalized in all directions at a given moment. It is space itself, the dimension of infinity; it is what gives objects plasticity".⁹ Gleizes and Metzinger discussed 'the fourth dimension' in their pioneering book *Du Cubisme*, which was translated into Russian by Max Voloshin.¹⁰ In Russia too artists such as Mikhail Matiushin also explored the concept at length.¹¹ For Larionov, the existence of rays outside of the visible spectrum provided evidence of the world of the 'fourth dimension' in which "the ceaseless and intense drama of rays constitutes the unity of all things".¹²

Despite Larionov's insistence that Rayism was essentially an autonomous form of art it is equally clear that autonomy was never an end in itself for his intentions were always to use abstraction as a means of moving beyond the phenomenal world of light and objects to embrace the noumenal world of the spirit. Indeed, Larionov makes this explicit in a letter to Alfred Barr, in which he confirms that Rayism addressed "the materialisation of the spirit".¹³

Goncharova's Rayist work may also be understood as a means by which the spectator might "glimpse the famous fourth dimension".¹⁴ Colour was integral to her approach for "colours have a strange magic quality. There are sad colours and gay colours, sweet harmonies, calm colours.... Colours affect the mentality, they are closely linked to a state of mind or of morality, towards which they can direct a person and at the same time they express an atmosphere, an environment".¹⁵ This view recalls not only that of Larionov but also that of Kandinsky, who employed the expressive qualities of colour for the purposes of spiritual transformation.¹⁶ In short, Goncharova invites us to contemplate her Rayist works, as one might contemplate a Kandinsky, and to undergo a similar experience of transcendence, which is effected through the formal characteristics of her art.

Transcendental, Mystical

Although Goncharova does not speak openly of the transcendental function of her Rayist work, her critics do. Propert, for example, writes: "The Cubist will leave you an odd feature here and there by which you can identify a face. The *Rayonnist* will have none of that. His is a new world where the mysterious fourth

dimension crops up to the upsetting of the other three.... It is a stimulating thought that a new world awaits us if we but train our eyes to see it; though possibly, a *Rayonnist*, like a Medium, is born and not made. However that may be, we must be grateful to this pair of visionaries for the many things of beauty (on the lower plane) that they have set before our untrained eyes, and wait patiently and cheerfully for the day, when we too shall be counted among the Illuminati".¹⁷

The mystical intent of Rayist theory had much in common with Ouspensky's views. These were well known to Goncharova and Larionov, since Ouspensky was the editor of the Russian newspaper *Nov*, which not only serialised Ouspensky's writings but also published apologetic articles in support of the Russian avant-garde and gave its pages over to the debate about Marinetti's visit to Russia in 1914. Rayism also betrays a debt to Theosophy, which attempted to explain the enigmas of life through a system of belief that synthesised Eastern mysticism, philosophy, religion and science. We know that Theosophy interested Larionov since in some of his texts he quotes Mme. Blavatsky, writing under her pseudonym of Radda-Bai.¹⁸

Sources such as these inspired Goncharova's rejection of personal individuality. Both Ouspensky's writings and those of the Theosophists were based upon the Hindu view that the diversity of the objective world, known as *Maya*, is merely the temporary materialisation of a universal continuum known as *Brahma*. In Hinduism life is like a droplet of water, thrown up by an ocean wave. For a short while it possesses an individual existence but soon falls back into the ocean from which it came. We may argue that, for Goncharova, Rayism was a means of expressing this very point, since in her Rayist forests aspects of the material world are deprived of their apparent individuality and are fused into an abstract pictorial equilibrium by means of ray lines and planes that "constitute the unity of all things".

Nature is central to Eastern mysticism, being the object of contemplation for the Buddhist and the locus of worship for animistic religions such as Shinto. Nature also plays an important role in Theosophy and European mystical traditions. Ouspensky, for example, discusses the soul and life-force of the forest as an example of the noumenal world, which presents an anodyne face at the phenomenal level.¹⁹ Goncharova, therefore, selects Nature as the medium through which to explore her view of a spiritually cohesive world that exists beyond the veneer of difference that is presented in its material manifestation. For Goncharova, the natural world is a gateway to the world of the *au delà* and in this she shares an affinity with the German painter Franz Marc, whose paintings of animals trapped in the interface between



7 • *Brown and Yellow Forest*, 1913
Oil on canvas, 130 x 97 cm.
Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid



8 • *Rayist Sea*, 1913
Oil on canvas, 49 x 67.7 cm.
N. Khardzhiev Bequest
Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam

the material and spiritual worlds express the indivisibility of all being.²⁰

It is significant that it is the natural world that is the one recurrent subject of Goncharova's Rayist paintings. It appears not only in the forest paintings but also in a series of works on the theme of exotic flowers such as orchids and lilies.

Parks and gardens with their ornamental fountains were also a favourite theme. Indeed, *The Fountain* (9) one of Goncharova's most important paintings of the Rayist period, provides an excellent example of the essential unity that she perceived in the natural world as the sprays of water break open the apparent solid forms of the surrounding



9 • *Rayist Fountain*, 1914
Oil on canvas, 140.6 x 87.3 cm.
Sam and Ayala Zacks Collection
The Israel Museum, Jerusalem

environment and even break the light itself, refracting it to create a rainbow. The hard and fast boundaries of the world are dissembled and amidst the roar of the water (signified by the Russian word *Rev*) Goncharova contemplates a world in which forms interpenetrate, partake of each other and are linked in a noumenal reality of four-dimensions. There is a metaphysical process at work here since Goncharova represents a world in continual and vivid transformation. *The Fountain* posits the natural world as a place of spiritual transformation and thus operates as a kind of alchemical garden recalling the allegorical gardens of Renaissance art. In two other masterpieces of the Rayist period, *Rayist Sea* (8) and *Evening (Rayist)* *Red and Blue* (Private Collection) Goncharova represents the same theme of the natural world transfigured under Rayist perception. These works represent the culmination of her Rayist practice and they placed Goncharova at the very forefront of avant-garde practice in Europe on the eve of the war.

Everythingism

By 1914 Goncharova's work presented a complex and divergent profile to both public and critics alike. The sheer variety of her work suggested that she lacked the intellectual rigour to pursue one particular style to its ultimate conclusion. Stark, for example, wrote that "she tosses art works at the market like a pancake vendor with a frying-pan".²¹ In an attempt to counter the claim that the diversity of her work was logically inconsistent, Goncharova employed the rhetoric of Everythingism. She explained that: "there can be an infinite number of forms to express an object and they can all be equally beautiful"²² for all styles were now declared to be qualitatively equal.

Everythingism viewed the practice of art as a vibrant continuum and explained stylistic diversity as its constant and varied materialisation. Just as the droplets of water thrown up by a wave possess no qualitative difference, all being of the same essence, so the practice of art continually threw up new styles, which could not be qualitatively judged since they proceeded from a common source. As Goncharova put it: "A spark of the spirit lives in us, it is connected with all spirit. It is divine. It is drawn to other, similar sparks. This is the urge to creation".²³ This holistic view of art practice challenged the popular, evolutionary view, which judged the quality of an art work by reference to its location in the scale of historical development and which regarded ancient and outmoded styles as somehow inferior, because they had outlasted their usefulness and had been surpassed by more fitting forms of expression. Everythingism, on the other hand, proclaimed that all styles in all periods were equal in expressiveness and significance because they all possessed that 'spark of spirit'. It argued that a linear, sequential understanding of time, which relegated apparently defunct art to the museums, was misconceived.

Larionov wrote: "It is possible to link the most surprising, the most up-to-date doctrine, futurism, with the Assyrian or Babylonian epoch, and Assyria with its cult of the goddess Astarte and the teaching of Zarathustra, exists in what we call 'our times'... in essence, development and movement, epochs are equal; to consider them from the point of view of time is to be narrow minded in the extreme... He who claims to look to the future, believing in a linear development of time is consigning himself to insignificance and is completely blind".²⁴

Views such as these are grounded in fourth dimension theory. Ouspensky had already demonstrated that our conventional understanding of time is flawed since it arises from the incorrect sensation of the effects of four-dimensional motion upon three-dimensional space and contemporaries confirm Goncharova's and Larionov's debt to such philosophical

sources. Livshits, for example, wrote that “Everythingness was extremely simple: all ages and movements in art were declared equal. Each of them served as sources of inspiration for the Everythingists who had conquered time and space”.²⁵ The newspaper *Birzheviia vedomosti* noted that Everythingism sponsored “a form of craftsmanship free from time and space”²⁶ whilst *Utro Rossii* wrote of a Zdanevich lecture: “the public learned that not only had Futurism died but with it even time and space, so that everyone sitting in the room ran the serious risk of finding themselves imminently suspended outside of time and space”.²⁷

It was this mystical understanding of time that provided Goncharova and Larionov with the means to finally divorce themselves from Futurist ideology and aesthetics, since Marinetti’s temporal view of Futurism had little in common with the views of Goncharova and Larionov who “proposed to suspend any differentiation between past, present and future”.²⁸ The popular press, however, was sceptical of Everythingism and blamed society for the sorry state into which contemporary art had fallen. Nakatov noted: “The motto of *Mishen*’ [Target] is ‘art beyond time’. Yet the representatives of *Mishen*’ are undoubtedly a product of our banal times – times in which great meanings and great artistic ideals have been lost”,²⁹ whilst Stark wrote that, if Goncharova’s art appeared ambivalent and uncertain, then she could not be blamed since this was the spirit of the age.³⁰

These critics regarded Goncharova as a passive artist, a mere conduit through which the confusion of the early-20th century found expression. Benois, on the other hand, caught up in the mysticism that he perceived in Goncharova’s work, wrote of her as an active agent in social change, and not merely as a passive reflector of it. For Benois, the most important aspect of Goncharova’s work was her ‘clairvoyant’ vision, her ability, especially in the abstract works, to look beyond surface appearance, to glimpse the essence of things and to reveal the world beyond.³¹ In saying this Benois probably had in mind a series of works on the theme of transparency that were executed in the summer of 1913 of which *Still-life with Watermelon* is typical example. It was painted in the style of Everythingism for the bright colours, decorative fabrics and plates, and crudely printed wrapping-paper in the top-right hand corner all recall Neo-primitive practice whilst the abstract pictorial space, overlapping forms and multiple contours are Cubist and Futurist devices. Particularly interesting is the way in which the fruit of the still-life is rendered transparent: the stones of the plums and apricots and the pips of the pears can clearly be seen and through the flesh of the melon we can see the decorated plate on which it sits. A similar resolution, but on a less grand scale, is found in *Still Life with Bottle, Jar of Fruit, Fish* (10).



10 • *Still Life with Bottle, Jar of Fruit, Fish*, 1913

Oil on canvas, 71 x 53 cm.

Courtesy Gimpel Fils

Transparency

This then is the ‘clairvoyant’ vision of which Benois spoke. When these works were exhibited in her One-Woman Exhibition of 1913 Goncharova listed them in the catalogue as being based upon the theory of Transparency as advocated by Ivan Firsov, one of the members of The Target group who had collaborated with Goncharova, Larionov and Bolshakov on the publication of the book *Le Futur*.³² We know little more of Ivan Firsov’s theory than Goncharova’s application of it in her paintings but it was evidently based on sources such as fourth dimension theory and ‘X’-ray photography. Ouspensky had always argued that the three-dimensional world would appear transparent from a four-dimensional perspective. Transparency then was associated with four-dimensional vision or, as Claude Bragdon called it, ‘clairvoyant sight’.³³ The discovery of ‘X’-rays and the development of ‘X’-ray photography was also inspirational. Larionov had discussed the importance of ‘X’-rays in his Rayist manifestos and had mimicked the effects of X-ray photographs in paintings such as *Boulevard Venus* (Musée d’art moderne de Paris). Not only did ‘X’-ray photography offer the modern artist a range of novel pictorial ideas but it also seemed to provide a

scientific confirmation of the existence of the 'clairvoyant sight' of which fourth-dimension theorists spoke.

Benois believed that this innate mysticism which seemed to permeate Goncharova's work sprang from a clear-cut and well-developed aesthetic ideology which opposed the materialism of "American devilry" which increasingly enveloped the epoch. By this Benois seems to mean the materialistic and industrial aspects of modernity for which modern America seemed to stand and against which there was "no better means of attack than this searching for God in everything, the renunciation of superficial stagnation and the persistent enquiry into the essence of things" that was to be found in Goncharova's abstract work.³⁴ For Benois, Goncharova specifically challenged the banality of which Nakatov and Stark spoke. In this sense, Goncharova's abstract work, in ideological terms at least, appeared to Benois as profoundly national and profoundly spiritual and hence completely in line with her Neo-primitive views.

For Goncharova, then, abstraction represented a search for a world beyond that of material reality, an attempt to access the spiritual, to understand the contradictions of her times and to bring a measure of resolution to them: "to herald the unknown, to rearrange life, and to bear man's multiple soul to the upper reaches of reality".³⁵ Goncharova's Rayist work represents an attempt to peer through 'the veil' and when we look at her Rayist paintings, we peer through with her eyes. Her paintings, like those of Kandinsky, possess a transcendental quality, which invites contemplation. Goncharova peers through 'the veil' but never lifts it for: "if the Cherubim consents to lift the veil, then you learn everything, there would be neither past nor future! It's terrifying! I too was tempted to ask it for a vision of the world beyond that of appearances. But in the end I decided against it.... I could have discovered the future and found out many things I prefer not to know them".³⁶ It was not the lifting of 'the veil', after all, which was important, but, rather, the continual

process of 'peering through', for Goncharova, like Wagner's Kundry, found salvation in that search, through her art, for a spiritual balsam, which would heal the decaying world of which she herself was a part.



12 • Catalogue of Natalia Goncharova 1900-1913
Moscow, 1913
Private Collection, UK

From Anthony Parton, *Goncharova – The Art and Design of Natalia Goncharova*, Antique Collectors' Club, 2010.. Reprinted by permission of the publishers.

Footnotes

- [1] V. Mak, 'Luchizm', *Golos Moskvy* (Moscow), 14 October 1912, No. 237: 5.
- [2] M. Larionov, *Luchizm*, Moscow: Ts. Miunster, 1913.
- [3] Ibid., 21.
- [4] A. Rostislavov, 'Vystavki i khudozhestvennyia dela, Petersburg: *Apollon*, April 1913, 55-56.
- [5] Ibid..
- [6] For a full discussion of the role of 'the fourth dimension' in early-20th century art see Henderson, L. D., *The Fourth Dimension and Non-Euclidean Geometry in Modern Art*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- [7] See Hinton, C. H., *A New Era of Thought and The Fourth Dimension*, both London & New York: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1888, 1904, respectively. Also, see Manning, H. P., *The Fourth Dimension Simply Explained: A collection of essays from those submitted in 'The Scientific American's' prize competition*, New York: Munn & Co., 1910.
- [8] See Bragdon, C., *A Primer of Higher Space, the Fourth Dimension, to which is added 'Man the Square', A Higher Space Parable*, New York, 1913. Also Ouspensky, P. D., *Tertium Organum: Kliuch k zagadkam mira*, St. Petersburg, 1911.
- [9] See Apollinaire, „The New Painting: Art Notes“, *Soirées de Paris*, April-May 1912 in Apollinaire, *Apollinaire on Art: Essays and Reviews 1902-1918*. Edited by L. C. Breunig and translated by S. Sulieman, London: Thames and Hudson, 1972: 222.
- [10] Gleizes & Metzinger (1913), *Okubizme* (Trans. Max Voloshin), Moscow, July 1913. A second translation by Ekaterina Nizen was published in St. Petersburg in November 1913.
- [11] Matiushin, M., "O knige Metzanzhe-Gleza: *Du cubisme*", *Soiuz molodezhi* 3, St. Petersburg, March 1913: 25-34.
- [12] M. Larionov, 'Le Rayonnisme pictural', *Montjoie!*, Paris, April/May/June, 1914, Nos. 4/5/6: 15.
- [13] M. Larionov, Letter to Alfred Barr, "A propos du Rayonnisme", 1936. National Art Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.
- [14] M. Larionov, 'Le Rayonnisme pictural' [12].
- [15] N. Goncharova, 'The Metamorphoses of the Ballet, Les Noces', *Leonardo*, Vol. 12: 141.
- [16] See Kandinsky, V. *Über das geistige in der Kunst*, Munich: Piper Verlag, 1912/1913.
- [17] W. A. Propert, *The Russian Ballet in Western Europe 1909-1920*, London: John Lane/The Bodley Head Ltd., 1921: 43-45.
- [18] In Larionov's foreword to the catalogue of the exhibition *Original Icon Paintings and Lubki*, 1913, he quotes from the author Radda Bai, the Russian pseudonym of Mme. Blavatsky.
- [19] P. D. Ouspensky, 1911. In *A New Model of the Universe: Principles of the Psychological Method*, (1922), Chapter XVII.
- [20] Eganbiuri (1913) records that by early-1913 Marc had acquired at least one of Goncharova's gouache illustrations to the Gospels.
- [21] E. Stark, 'Natalia Goncharova', *Peterburgskii Kurer*, 1 April 1914, No. 71, 4.
- [22] N. Goncharova, 1912, in T. Durfee, 'Natalia Goncharova: Two Letters', *Experiment A Journal of Russian Culture*, Los Angeles: Institute of Modern Russian Culture, Vol. 1, 1995, 163.
- [23] Letter from Goncharova to Mary Chamot 8 Dec 1954.
- [24] M. Larionov, 'Predisolvie', *Vystavka kartin gruppy khudozhnikov 'Mishen'*, Moscow: Khudozhestvennyi Salon, 1913: 6.
- [25] B. Livshits, *The One and a Half-Eyed Archer* (1933), translated by John E. Bowlit, Newtonville, Massachusetts: Oriental Research Partners, 1977: 165.
- [26] Anon., 'Zametka', *Birzheviia Vedomosti*, 29 November 1913, No. 13881, 4.
- [27] S., 'Vsechestvo', *Utro Rossii*, 6 November 1913, No. 256, 4.
- [28] M. Tupitsyn, 'Collaborating on the Paradigm of the Future', *Art Journal*, Winter 1993, 21.
- [29] I. Nakatov, 'Osei iskusstva', *Moskovskaia gazeta*, 26 March 1913, 244.
- [30] E. Stark, 'Natalia Goncharova', *Peterburgskii Kurer*, 1 April, 1914, No. 71, 4.
- [31] A. Benois, 'Dnevnik khudozhnika', *Rech*, 21 October 1913, No. 257, 3.
- [32] K. Bolshakov, *Le Futur. Stikhi K. Bolshakova. ris. Nat. Goncharova, Mikhaila Larionova*, Moscow, 1913.
- [33] See Bragdon, C., *A Primer of Higher Space, The Fourth Dimension, to which is added 'Man the Square' a Higher Space Parable*, New York: Khnopff, 1913. It is now widely thought that copies of this book were circulating in Russia in the years before the war and a great deal of scholarly attention has focussed upon the impact that it may have had not only upon Larionov but also upon Malevich and Matiushin. See, for example, Henderson, 1975-1976 and Parton, 1983.
- [34] A. Benois, 'Dnevnik khudozhnika', *Rech*, 21 December 1913, No. 288, 4.
- [35] M. Larionov and I. Zdanevich, 'Pochemumyraskrashivaemsia Manifest futuristov', *Argus*, Christmas, 1913, 118.
- [36] N. Goncharova in Tatiana Loguine, *Gontcharova et Larionov: Cinquante ans `a Saint Germain-des-Près: Témoignages et documents recueillis et présentés par Tatiana Loguine*, Paris: Editions Klincksieck, 1971: 211.