

# Objectless in Vitebsk: Reflections on Kazimir Malevich, Architecture, and Representation

## A Conversation with Elitza Dulguerova

*Scapegoat* posed the following questions to Elitza Dulguerova, Assistant Professor in Art History at the University of Paris I, Panthéon—Sorbonne, who works on the social history of the Russian avant-garde. We are interested in Kazimir Malevich's claim that "Suprematism is the new realism." Additionally, we want to clarify the relationship between this claim and what happened to Suprematism when it confronted the built environment, namely during Malevich's tenure (1919–1922) in the then Soviet town of Vitebsk.

**Scapegoat Says** What led Malevich to proclaim that "Suprematism is the new realism?" What, for Malevich, is the real in realism, and why does this necessitate an attack on representation?

**Elitza Dulguerova** To my knowledge, Malevich first used the concept of "realism" in 1915 within his performative declaration on the birth of Suprematism. His announcement of the new art was staged both visually, through an ensemble of 39 mostly unseen paintings, and as a discursive event, through several writings and declarations. The paintings were exhibited at the group show *The Last Futurist Exhibition of Paintings 0,10 (Zero-Ten)* (Petrograd, December 19, 1915 to January 19, 1916). According to the well-known and infinitely reproduced photograph of Malevich's works at 0,10, the display in itself acted as a visual manifesto for the advent of a new art of non-representational—almost geometrical—forms floating in space. But Suprematism also came into being through a series of written and spoken texts. In addition to the short, hand-written statement hung on the wall of the Suprematist room, Malevich published a longer essay, "From Cubism to Suprematism: The New Painterly Realism," which was on sale during the 0,10 group show. Its second edition, based on a public talk from January 1916, expanded the lineage of Suprematism to Italian Futurism without altering the emphasis on realism: "From Cubism and Futurism to Suprematism: The New Realism in Painting."<sup>1</sup>

*Živopisnyi*, the adjective translated into English as "in painting," or sometimes as "painterly," was not a mere epithet for Malevich but an important part of how he conceived of "realism" at this moment. It could even be argued that "realism" was but the predicate of "painterly": if Suprematism was realistic, it was by being true to painting. Malevich was not the first artist who paired a term strongly associated since Courbet with commitment to everyday reality, with a non-mimetic painterly technique (in his case, *bespredmetnoe iskusstvo*, or "objectless art").<sup>2</sup> By 1915, this shift in the notion of "realism" away from mimesis was already a major stance in the writings of the French Cubists, which were quickly translated to Russian, thoroughly discussed at the futurist public debates in Moscow and Petrograd and sometimes directly "imported" by the Russian artists who lived and worked in Paris.<sup>3</sup> The 1912 treatise *Du Cubisme* by Albert Gleizes and Jean Metzinger

had already emphasized the distinction between a "superficial" and a "deep" realism, the first being solely concerned with meaning and granting little consideration to the means of reaching it (Courbet), while newer art such as Cubism was filed under the label of "deep" or "true" realism. One of the closing sentences of their text sums up quite clearly Gleizes and Metzinger's understanding that "realism" was not a reflection of reality but rather a means of transforming it. In doing so, the subjective vision of the Cubist painter had to become an objective truth for every viewer: "A realist, he [*the new painter*] will shape the real in the image of his mind, for there is only one truth, our own, when we impose it on everyone."<sup>4</sup> Fernand Léger was another active proponent of "réalisme de conception" over "réalisme visuel," arguing that, "The realist value of a work is perfectly independent of any imitative quality. [...] Pictorial realism is the simultaneous arrangement of the three great plastic quantities: lines, forms, and colors."<sup>5</sup> Redefining realism stood for more than a new technique: Léger believed that it had an emancipatory value for the artist as well as for the beholder, freeing them from the submission to the normative realm of bourgeois appearances. Malevich's emphasis on "realism" in 1915–1916 can thus be seen as a symptom of his urge to maintain a tie with Cubism and European modern art, while defending the novelty and ultimate difference of Suprematism. In his interpretation, realism in painting was a means to make "living art," to go beyond representation and into creation:

In the art of Suprematism forms will live, like all living forms of nature. [...] The new realism in painting [*živopisnyi, painterly*] is very much realism in painting [*painterly*], for it contains no realism of mountains, sky, water. [...] Until now there was realism of objects, but not of painted units of colour, which are constructed so that they depend neither on form, nor on colour, nor on their position relative to each other. Each form is free and individual. Each form is a world.<sup>6</sup>

It seems to me that this understanding of "realism" does not outlive the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution. Instead, Malevich's writings from the early 1920s dwell on the concept of "objectlessness" (*bespredmetnost*) both as the ultimate goal of art and as the condition of the world that Malevich longs for. I would not ascribe this semantic shift



Malevich's panels decorated several buildings in Vitebsk, including the White Barracks (above), where the Committee for the Struggle against Unemployment had its workshops (December 1919).

to political conjuncture alone, insofar as the political appropriation (and approval) of realistic painting and sculpture as the only "appropriate" art for a communist state was not yet dominant, at least not until the end of the Civil War in 1921. The Vitebsk years in the life of Malevich—from late 1919 to mid-1922—were years during which the political uncertainty and precariousness of everyday life left room for intense experiments with future modes and possible forms of art.<sup>7</sup> This was the case not only in Vitebsk, at the Free State Artist Studios under the direction of Malevich, but also at the Moscow Institute of Artistic Culture (INKhUK), first under the direction of Kandinsky, and then, from 1920 on, within the framework of the Constructivist circle. I would rather guess that the move from "realism" to "objectlessness" allowed for a more accurate definition of the reality that Malevich was trying to conceive—both philosophically, as a way to overcome not only imitation but also any dependence on established objects or rules, and politically, as a state of rest and peace beyond conflicts, struggles and divisions.

A recently published transcript of "Note on the Limits of Reality," a lecture that Malevich delivered to his fellow UNOVIS members in Vitebsk in 1921, can be used to introduce his conceptual framework.<sup>8</sup> Malevich argues that the need to represent phenomena or things belonged to a foregone conception of art, where art was seen as a means to grasp and understand the "real" world. This could no longer be the case, he adds, as we now know that such an understanding cannot be objective: we perceive not one but multiple "realities" smoothly sliding into each other. Arguing that reality has to be thought of as something that happens as a representation, Malevich gives the example of a child who would alternately define his father as a "big person" when in the company of other adults, and as a "small person" when they play together. Malevich concludes that when we experience the world we do not single out things or elements: "no dishes, no palaces, no chairs."<sup>9</sup> The existence of the latter divides the world into parts and thus betrays both our experience and the demonstrations of contemporary science. This search for an experience that is both relative (free, not obeying predefined rules) and unified (not divided) motivates the anti-utilitarian stance of Malevich's writings in the 1920s.

In the aftermath of the Bolshevik revolution, Malevich reconsidered the other major premise of Suprematism by stating that "painting was done for

long ago" and bequeathed the task of developing architectural Suprematism to the young architects in somewhat vague terms, as the "era of the new system of architecture."<sup>10</sup> Such a stance was not surprising in 1920, when the Moscow INKhUK was debating the definition and rules of construction as an alternative to easel painting.<sup>11</sup> El Lissitzky certainly also played a part in this shift towards architecture. Lissitzky had been a member of the Vitebsk branch of Narkompros [People's Commissariat for Education] since May 1919, and a teacher at the People's Art School of Vitebsk under the direction of the People's Commissar Marc Chagall. It was under these circumstances that Lissitzky convinced Malevich in late 1919 to leave his teaching position at the Free State Artists' Studios in Moscow and join the Vitebsk team.<sup>12</sup> As is well known, Lissitzky was trained as an architect, and his Suprematist-inspired "Prouns" [Projects for the Affirmation of the New]<sup>13</sup> were attempts to correlate the exploration of the pictorial space in Suprematism to the space of the viewer, thus going beyond painting and into the three-dimensional realm. However, even though Malevich started considering architecture as a potential field for Suprematism and even qualifying it—in a still unspecific phraseology—as the ultimate art, he would not achieve the shift from painting to architecture, or even from two-dimensional to three-dimensional forms, during his stay in Vitebsk.

**SS** Why and when was Malevich in Vitebsk? Can you briefly explain the situation there?

**ED** Malevich moved from Moscow to Vitebsk in November 1919. The UNOVIS (Exponents or Champions of the New Art)<sup>14</sup> group was officially created in February 1920 and became dominant at the Vitebsk Free State Artist Studios after the departure of Chagall in May of the same year. In the following two years, UNOVIS organized exhibitions, conferences, and theatrical representations, published a series of books, including several treatises by Malevich, and took part in the life of the city of Vitebsk. Through its ramifications, the UNOVIS ideas spread out to the cities of Smolensk, Orenburg, and Perm; its works were shown in exhibitions in Moscow and displayed at the 1922 First Russian Art Exhibition in Berlin. For a number of reasons, including severe financial cuts, administrative reorganization and increasing intolerance towards "formalist" art





Photograph from Aleksandra Shatskikh, *Vitebsk: The Life of Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 82.

practices, in the summer of 1922 Malevich and most of his students left Vitebsk for Petrograd, where the UNOVIS project was carried on at the State Institute of Artistic Culture (GINKHUK).<sup>15</sup>

### SS Did the school have a presence in the town? Can you describe Malevich and UNOVIS' projects there?

ED The activities of the UNOVIS group within the city of Vitebsk did not involve the building of new architectural forms nor did they redesign its urban plan. In most cases, they expanded and translated Suprematism's compositional and formal characteristics to larger, two-dimensional surfaces. As Aleksandra Shatskikh has summed it up in her study:

Suprematism's vast decorative potential was unleashed in a variety of ways: in the signboards created for the stores and shops of the EPO (United Consumer Association); in the propaganda panels that decorated the sides of streetcars; in the drawings for murals on buildings and interiors; and in the decorations on the ration cards used during the period of War Communism.<sup>16</sup>

And while for a year the streetcars in Vitebsk were covered with Suprematist designs, the only three-dimensional projects were the monuments to Karl Marx and Karl Liebknecht by one of Malevich's colleagues, the sculptor and teacher David Yakerson.<sup>17</sup> Unveiled in Vitebsk in 1920, the monuments combined Suprematist-inspired foundations of differently sized rectangular blocks, asymmetrically balanced together, with geometrically simplified yet representational busts. For Shatskikh, the lack of architectural experiments in Vitebsk was due to "material constraints," material shortages and poverty.<sup>18</sup> The term "super-grafics" [*super-grafika*], used by some Russian scholars to depict the urban projects of UNOVIS in Vitebsk avoids classifying them in pre-established categories such as "decorative." However, in underscoring the graphic aspects of Suprematism, it dismisses the ambition of spatial exploration and projection into the three-dimensional realm.<sup>19</sup>

Most projects were commissioned for celebratory occasions (1st of May, the anniversary of the Vitebsk school of art, Karl Liebknecht's and Rosa Luxemburg's deaths). An interesting collabora-

tion stemmed from the invitation of the Vitebsk Committee for the Struggle against Unemployment to celebrate its second anniversary. In December 1919, Malevich decorated the exterior of the White Barracks building that housed the workshops of the Committee, and with El Lissitzky re-designed the interior of the Vitebsk theatre for the festivities. While there is little visual evidence of most UNOVIS projects—except for some studies and sketches—this collaboration with the Committee for the Struggle against Unemployment was rather well documented. The photograph of the workshop building is particularly revealing. The Suprematist panels by Malevich are spread over the façade both horizontally and vertically. Most of the horizontal elements are painted compositions, while some of the central figures seem to be shaped panels. On the first row, at the level of the street, large, human-sized panels containing simple compositions of triangles, squares and circles alternate with the windows and doors of the building. The two entrances—to the building and to the adjacent enclosure—seem to be framed by single-shape compositions: two full-sized squares for the former, two decentred circles for the latter. An upper level comprises a series of smaller and more complex compositions, each of which stands on the cornice of one of the street-level panels. Their display is symmetrical on both sides of the main entrance. Above the squares and the front door rises the central part of the decoration. It consists of two monumental vertical compositions of dynamically distributed, mostly rectangular forms of various sizes. Between these two elongated panes stand two shaped panels: a big dark circle in the middle, similar in size to the squares on the first level and, immediately below it, a smaller dark diamond. The upper half of the window behind the circle remains uncovered. It bears a strong resemblance to another basic Suprematist form: the black square. The balance between symmetric and dynamic positioning of shapes testifies to Malevich's desire to restructure the rigid solidity of the original building while creating a feeling of harmonious lightness.

### SS What was the reception of the work in the town?

ED Documents on the reception of UNOVIS projects in Vitebsk are quite scarce. One of the most often quoted depictions is Sergey Eisenstein's account of the transformation of this "sooty and cheerless" provincial city, typically "built of red brick": "But this city is especially strange. Here the red brick streets are covered with white paint, and green circles are scattered around this white background. There are orange squares. Blue rectangles. This is Vitebsk in 1920. Its brick walls have met the brush of Kazimir Malevich. And from these walls you can hear: 'The streets are our palette!'"<sup>20</sup> It is unclear whether this depiction of the filmmaker's visit to Vitebsk in June 1920, probably written in 1940, refers to the Suprematist-decorated trains or to buildings such as the one discussed above.

It seems to me that the urban projects of the UNOVIS group can be read in at least two different ways. On the one hand, as a non-representational response to the post-Revolutionary brief to

decorate the urban environment and translate revolutionary ideas into visual form. This would explain why both Chagall's and Malevich's works could peacefully coexist in the city of Vitebsk during the 1st of May celebrations in 1920, despite their theoretical differences.<sup>21</sup> On the other hand, these projects were also attempts towards a weightless, "objectless," restful architecture as theorized in Malevich's writings.

### SS What is the relationship between Malevich's realism (largely expressed through painting) and the urban projects in Vitebsk? What is at stake in the transition from painting to architecture?

ED Malevich's own experiments in architecture—his *architecton* models and *planit* drawings—date from the period between 1923 and 1927, after his move to Petrograd and before his retrospective shows in Warsaw and Berlin in 1927. During this period Malevich discussed architecture in a series of texts and sometimes considered it as the ultimate end of creation which reaches beyond the three realms of religion, civic life, and art.<sup>22</sup> Architecture cannot be dissociated from Malevich's more global quest of a "reality beyond image" towards which "the bullet and the aeroplane fly, the train rushes by, man runs, the bird flies, the planets and the sun move, for only there, in the ideal state, does the world end, as an image, as will, as imagining, and the world draws as objectlessness."<sup>23</sup>

In his fascinating 1924–25 text on the ideology of architecture Malevich does not reject technology, science, or utilitarianism per se. He concedes that inventions like "aeroplanes, ships, trains, radios, and electricity" were partly driven by the desire to "sweep" away obstacles such as "water, space, hills, and time" on man's way to peace.<sup>24</sup> However, "utilitarian technology" keeps architecture subordinated to objects and tools as divided parts of the whole, and to ideas and images (such as expediency) that were meant to introduce order into what used to be chaos. Malevich disagrees with this dependence, as for him "life wishes to be expedient, whereas art has parted with the image of an aim [...] it has no beginning or end, it has no 'whither' or 'whence' [...] consequently it is without idea because it is already reality beyond image."<sup>25</sup> In contrast to the propensity of Constructivism to shape life by introducing new functional forms, Malevich considers that art should not give form. As he would demonstrate later in a 1928 text, our belief that "art is something that gives form to the functional side of life" is inaccurate, "since it is impossible to form any function of life: forming it we do not really form it but merely place it in an order established by some form of art."<sup>26</sup> Architecture doesn't have to create a new form of order but a state of restfulness, unity, and spaciousness. To do so, it has to be freed from the object-like characteristics of matter and of the divided things, namely weight (*ves*), so as to achieve balance and equilibrium (*ravnovesie*), as "weight is born in utilitarianism, outside utilitarianism I do not know whether weight exists."<sup>27</sup> Malevich coins the neologism "*ut-grazhdanin*" [ut-citizen] for the citizen submitted to the utilitarian needs of

daily life who has been granted palaces, gardens, and monuments created for a specific, temporary, and utilitarian need.<sup>28</sup> In contrast, the art of architecture is "eternally beautiful in its equilibrium" and bears an "architectuality" that resists social or ideological contingencies: "Pagan temples also serve as temples for Christians because they are architectually [*sic*] beautiful."<sup>29</sup>

The "1/48" essay contains a precious—and rare—depiction of objectless architecture which brings to mind Malevich's *architectons*, on which he was working at that time. If architecture should give rise to the feelings of spaciousness, emptiness, and restfulness ("in eternal beauty there are no horizons"<sup>30</sup>), it had to be freed from all obstacles and limits, both material and conceptual. Walls, floors and ceilings are designed to delimitate space, to create horizons, to host tools. Malevich starts by suggesting to move apart the six sides of the basic structure of a cube (a room) to create more empty space but quickly objects that a full liberation from any limit is not possible, as "no matter how I shift the walls, I am always surrounded by walls, my sight meets an obstacle but senses space."<sup>31</sup> He then considers a path opposite to this infinite openness: confinement within a cube as a safe and concealed place to rest, as a refuge from life's adversities. This double bind seems to depict his own architectural experiments, as the *architectons* allow for a variety of points of view and perceptions of space instead of a predetermined notion of horizon, and yet offer the possibility to alternate between openness and inner retreat.

Christina Lodder has argued that Malevich was interested in "architecture as a problem" rather than a solution, which might explain why, even in his *architectons*:

The precise function of the elements in each structural ensemble is not identified [...] There are none of the usual features you might expect in an architectural model; there are no indications of windows, doors, entrances, or exits. The models were not conceived in response to the needs of particular architectural briefs, or intended to answer the highly specialized, practical requirements of specific building types, such as hospitals, communal housing, or schools. They were also not related to any particular structural system of building. Indeed, how they were to be built and function was left pretty vague. Even their scale is not really indicated. None of them has an identifiable façade, but exist in the round, fully in space. If architecture is the way space is enclosed for a given purpose, then Malevich's structures are not architectural. They exist in space, but do not define space, or contain space within them.<sup>32</sup>

Going back to Malevich's Vitebsk projects such as the 1919 façade for the Committee for the Struggle against Unemployment, one notices that while it has departed from objects and utilitarian expediency, while it creates a dynamic yet harmonious feeling of space, it persists in creating an image instead of being a "reality beyond image"—an objectless image but an image nonetheless. ×

### Notes

1. Malevich, K. S. "From Cubism and Futurism to Suprematism: The New Realism in Painting" in *Essays on Art 1915-1928*, vol. 1, ed. Troels Andersen, trans. Xenia Glowacki-Prus and Arnold McMillin (Copenhagen: Borgen, 1968), 19-41. Both the 1915 and 1916 essays have been reprinted in Russian in Kazimir Malevich, *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected Works], vol. 1, ed. Aleksandra Shatskikh (Moscow, Gileia, 1995), 27-34, 35-55.
2. Following scholars like Christina Lodder and Charlotte Douglas, I prefer "objectless" to "non-objective" (the term used in the English edition of Malevich's writings). The problem with "non-objective" lies in its philosophical undertones hinting at oppositions such as objective/subjective. This is not the framework Malevich is working with. Furthermore, the Russian terms for these philosophical categories are *ob'ektivnyi*, *sub'ektivnyi*, that is, Latin-based words, while Malevich uses *bespredmetnyi*, a neologism based on the Russian word for object, *predmet*. "Objectless," on the other hand, should not convey connotations of "pointless" or "purposeless." As used in recent scholarship on Malevich, it is first and foremost a literal translation of *bespredmetnyi*, "without an object," without the qualities of a material object, mainly its materiality, its reference to the everyday, its weight. However, on a more theoretical level Malevich does suggest that "objectlessness" has to do with a certain degree of aimlessness as well. His writings in the 1920s look forward to a state of rest (or "laziness," as he would phrase it in another text from the Vitebsk period). Rest is a state devoid of purpose or aim, it is the state of unity that Malevich is looking for. To follow any aim

- or purpose would mean dissolving this unity.
2. Two of Fernand Léger's seminal essays, "Les origines de la peinture et sa valeur représentative" (1913) and "Les réalisations picturales actuelles" (1914), were initially delivered as lectures at the Académie Vassiliev in Paris, whose owner, the Russian artist Marie Vassiliev, was also one of the fourteen participants in the 0,10 exhibition.
3. Albert Gleizes and Jean Metzinger, *Du "Cubisme"* [27 December 1912] in *A Cubism Reader. Documents and Criticism 1906-1914*, eds. Mark Antliff and Patricia Leighton (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2008), 435.
4. Fernand Léger, "Les origines de la peinture et sa valeur représentative," *Montjoie!* (May 1913), english translation in Antliff & Leighton, *Cubism Reader*, 535-6.
5. Malevich, "From Cubism and Futurism to Suprematism," 38.
6. On the relation between modernity and contingency, see T.J. Clark, "God Is Not Cast Down," in *Farewell to an Idea: Episodes from a History of Modernism* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1999), 225-297.
7. "Zapiska o granitza real'nosti" [Note on the Limits of Reality] in *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected Works], vol. 5 (Moscow: Gileia, 2004), 191-194.
8. Malevich, "Zapiska," 193.
9. Malevich, "Suprematism. 34 risunka" [1920], in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 1, 189; "Suprematism. 34 drawings," in *Essays on Art*, vol. 1, 127-128 (translation modified).
10. See Maria Gough, *The Artist as Producer: Russian Constructivism in Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).
11. Unless otherwise noted, all the factual and archival information related to the city of Vitebsk, its art school, teachers

- and projects is strongly indebted to Aleksandra Shatskikh's extraordinarily well-documented book, *Vitebsk: The Life of Art*, trans. Katherine Foshko Tsan (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2007).
12. See Nancy Perloff and Brian Reed (eds.), *Situating El Lissitzky: Vitebsk, Berlin, Moscow* (Los Angeles, Getty Research Institute, 2003).
13. "Exponents" is the translation adopted in the English version of Shatskikh's book, while the more affirmative "Champions" is suggested by Christina Lodder in her inspiring article, "Living in Space: Kazimir Malevich's Suprematist Architecture and the Philosophy of Nikolai Fedorov," in *Rethinking Malevich. Proceedings of a Conference in Celebration of the 125th Anniversary of Kazimir Malevich's Birth*, eds. Charlotte Douglas and Christina Lodder (London: The Pindar Press, 2007), 172-202.
14. Shatskikh, *Vitebsk*, 220-224.
15. Ibid., 117. The projects mentioned by Shatskikh were realized by different students and teachers from the UNOVIS circle.
16. Ibid., 169-183.
17. Ibid., 117.
18. Selim O. Khan-Magomedov, *Suprematism i arhitektura: problemy formoobrazovaniia* (Moscow: Arkhitektura-S, 2007).
19. Sergey Eisenstein, "Strannyi provintsial'nyi gorod" [A Strange provincial city] (1940), quoted and translated in Shatskikh, *Vitebsk*, 118.
20. Ibid.
21. Cf. the ending of his 1924 essay "Arhitektura kak stepen' naibol'shego osvobodheniia cheloveka ot vesa" [Architecture as a degree of the greatest liberation of man from weight], in *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected Works], vol. 4 (Moscow: Gileia, 2003), 285.
22. Malevich, "1/48. Mir kak bespred-

- metnost' (ideologia arhitektury)" in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, 216, translated as "1/48. The World as Non-Objectivity," in *Essays on Art*, vol. 3, ed. Troels Andersen (Copenhagen: Borgen, 1976), 290 (translation modified).
23. All quotes from "1/48" in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, 205; in *Essays on Art*, vol. 3, 276-7.
24. "1/48" in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, 216; in *Essays on Art*, vol. 3, 290 (my emphasis).
25. "Zhivopis' v probleme arhitektury," in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 2, ed. Aleksandra Shatskikh (Moscow: Gileia, 1998), 135-136; translated as "Painting and the Problem of Architecture" in *Essays on Art*, vol. 2, ed. Troels Andersen (Copenhagen: Borgen, 1968), 14.
26. "1/48", in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, 205; in *Essays on Art*, vol. 3, 277.
27. "1/48", in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, 211; in *Essays on Art*, vol. 3, 284.
28. "1/48", in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, 209; in *Essays on Art*, vol. 3, 282.
29. "1/48", in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, 215; in *Essays on Art*, vol. 3, 289.
30. "1/48", in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 4, 215; in *Essays on Art*, vol. 3, 288.
31. Lodder, "Living in Space", 192.
32. Elitza Dulgerova is Assistant Professor at the Université de Paris I-Panthéon-Sorbonne. Her research interests include the social history of art in Russia/USSR and the study of exhibitions in/as twentieth-century art practices. In 2010, she guest-edited the special issue "Exposer/Displaying" for the scholarly journal *Intermedialités* and is now finishing a book drawn from her thesis, *Usages et utopies: l'exposition dans l'avant-garde russe pré-révolutionnaire* (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel).