

The Field of Cultural Production in Russia in the Last Third of the 19th Century: to the Context of the Creation and Development of the Abramtsevo Circle

Veronika Nikiforova

Phd Student

School of Art and Design, HSE University

Moscow, Russia

Abstract

The article explores the field of cultural production in Russia in the last third of the 19th century. By virtue of the conceptual heritage of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (forms of capital, the field of cultural production), the context in which the Abramtsevo circle (a colony of Russian artists) arose and developed was revealed. Various types of creative associations that existed in the field of cultural production in the period are considered under review: salons, creative evenings, interest clubs, official creative associations, magazines, etc. A study and identification of the habitus of agents-participants of the field was carried out.

Key Words: Art History, Russian Art, Abramtsevo circle, Field of cultural production, Pierre Bourdieu

Introduction

Despite the fact that the study of Russian art of the last third of the 19th century is mostly based on the analysis of art objects and the study of biographies of individual artists, we find it important to focus on the field of cultural production, i.e. the agents participating in the field and their relationships, because it allows us to understand the social prerequisites for the formation and popularization of new trends in art. The activity that unfolded in the Abramtsevo estate was largely determined by the moods that existed in Russia at that time, as well as the conditions of the field of cultural production in Russia in the last third of the nineteenth century.

The article presents a study of the socio-cultural field of cultural production in Russia in the last third of the 19th century in order to identify the prerequisites for the development of the Abramtsevo circle. Different types of organizational forms of artistic activity that existed in the field of cultural production in the period under consideration are considered: salons, creative evenings, hobby clubs, official creative associations, magazines, etc. Part of the work is devoted to the identification of the characteristic features of these associations, a comparison of the Abramtsevo circle with the well-known associations of this historical period: the Society for Travelling Art Exhibitions, the magazine and association "Mir Iskusstva" ("World of Art") is carried out.

The phenomenon of the Abramtsevo circle is conceptualized with the help of the conceptual heritage of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (concepts of the form of capital, the field of cultural production). This approach seems interesting for several reasons: firstly, Bourdieu's works are currently attracting considerable attention in a number of disciplines, including social sciences, cultural studies and art history. Secondly, approaching various topics and issues from Bourdieu's perspective provides insights that are not always available using traditional methods.

Abramtsevo circle: characteristics of the association and history of its emergence

In 1870, Russian industrialist Savva Mamontov purchased the Abramtsevo estate, located about 70 kilometers (~ 43 miles) northeast of Moscow. Mamontov, who had made his fortune through Russia's nascent railroad industry, was an admirer and patron of the arts, and decided to use some of his capital to establish and support an artists' colony on his estate, which later became

known as the Abramtsevo Circle. The patron of the arts and his wife contributed to the development of the circle's interest in amateur theatrical performances, in which relatives, friends and artists-participants of the circle were involved: at different times the participants were such artists as Ilya Repin, Vasily Polenov, Viktor Vasnetsov, Mark Antokolsky, Valentin Serov, Konstantin Korovin, Mikhail Vrubel, Elena Polenova, Mikhail Nesterov, Apollinariy Vasnetsov, Ilya Ostroukhov and others [1, p. 11-14].

The feature of the circle was the desire of its members to level the distinction between high and low genres of art, painting and decorative art, promoting the latter as accessible to people and carrying practical benefits for society, which should be understood as an opportunity for ordinary townspeople to decorate their everyday life, and for craftsmen to sell their products. The Mamontov family created workshops on the territory of the estate, aimed at revival and popularization of traditional Russian crafts. Both artists-participants of the circle and technologists, familiar with craft techniques, and their apprentices — pupils of the homestead school organized in the early seventies by the Mamontovs — took part in the activities of the workshops.

The study of the circle as an association can begin with the study of the social and political environment in which the circle existed as a phenomenon. The activities that unfolded in the Abramtsevo estate were largely determined by the mood that existed in Russia at that time. Natalia Polenova, the first historiographer of the Abramtsevo circle and a member of it, recalled that the Mamontovs were greatly influenced by the Narodnik movement (Narodniks). She briefly explains that the Mamontovs absorbed the spirit of the Narodnik movement, which was popular in Russia during their youth. It is likely that the Narodnik's ideas influenced their interest in the life of the people and their desire to explore their historical past.

No evidence has survived as to which of the concepts of the Narodniks were closest to the Mamontovs. We can assume, based on the activities of the Abramtsevo circle and the peasant school, that the idea of artels was important to the Mamontovs because it echoes the organization of workshops in which artists, masters and apprentices worked together.

Materials and Methods: Exploring the field of cultural production in Russia in the 19th century in the context of Bourdieu's analysis

The paper intends to analyze the field of cultural production in Russia in the nineteenth century, as well as to identify possible prerequisites associated with the creation and flourishing of the Abratsevsky circle. According to Bourdieu's logic, any field is a space of struggle for domination within this field between its participants. The field of cultural production, which will be discussed in this article, belongs to the fields of symbolic production. In other words, the struggle within the field acquires the character of a game, the winners of which acquire the right to symbolic violence, which is legitimate within the field and which is expressed in the establishment of one's own method of play as the correct one, allowing other participants in the field to succeed. Applying Bourdieu's logic to the material of this article, the artistic milieu of the last third of the nineteenth century, we can say that the winning agents have the power to establish which objects can be considered works of art and have financial and symbolic value.

Within the field of cultural production, art objects are fetishes whose inner meaning is either secondary or has no meaning at all. What becomes significant is the perception of this object by the participants of the field - they must consider it worthy, i.e. a cultural object of value. It turns out that, on the one hand, art objects are the main product of production of the cultural field under study. On the other hand, their role is secondary, as they are not capable of acting as genuine agents, i.e. as active participants in the field. Critics of Bourdieu's method rely on this contradiction, claiming that the French sociologist did not pay due attention to aesthetic forms and how they are embedded in the context of the epoch [2, p. 241]. While Bourdieu's sociological methodology is poorly suited to analyzing specific works of art, it is indispensable when it comes to the social aspects of the functioning of the cultural environment — the field of cultural production.

Thus, we have come to the realization that in order to study the field of cultural production and relations within it, it is necessary to focus on agents. To the agents (participants) of the field of

cultural production in Russia in the last third of the nineteenth century we can include both individuals (critics, collectors, patrons, artists) and associations (Academy of Arts, Artels, Creative Associations).

We will take the field of literature as a model for analyzing the field of cultural production, the example of which can be used as an example for analyzing any field of culture according to Bourdieu's methodology [3, p. 112-144]. Such an analysis can be presented as a sequence of steps (stages):

1. analyzing the position of the literary (and the like) in relation to the field of power, to which it occupies a subordinate position.

2. analyzing the internal structure of the literary (and the like) field, a world subject to its own laws of functioning and transformation. In other words, Bourdieu proposes to analyze the structure of relations between the positions of individuals or institutions competing for the right to dictate the conditions of the field.

3. analysis of how the habitus of agents occupying significant positions within the field has been formed - the French sociologist proposes to analyze the formation of dispositions, which, being the product of a certain social trajectory and a certain position within the literary (and similar) field, find in these positions a more or less favorable opportunity for realization.

Study of the social space of the field of cultural production in Russia of the XIX century

Based on Bourdieu's methodology, the primary task for analyzing the field of cultural production in Russia of the 19th century is to identify the social space in which the field operates, including the answer to the question of whether a separate social field of cultural production in Russia of the 19th century is formed or whether its practices are parts of other fields, for example, political or economic [3, p. 162-163].

In answering this question, we cannot avoid the issue of the participation of state mechanisms in the field. The ideas of state domination were most clearly manifested in art through the activities of the Academy of Arts. A glance at any list of Russian artists from the middle to the last third of the nineteenth century reveals that all of them, with few exceptions, were graduates or students of academic training programs, whether in St. Petersburg or Moscow. Even such "dissidents" as the Peredvizhniki (Wanderers) were products of the academic studios, as were their successors (Korovin, Serov, Vrubel) [4, p. 21-33]. One of the reasons for the absolute dominance of the Academy of Arts as an educational institution was the absence of authoritative independent alternatives during this period, since each of the "independent" studios or artels, which are usually referred to as pockets of implicit or explicit opposition to the academy, was in fact closely linked to the Academy of Arts in Saint Petersburg, the Stroganov School and the School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture in Moscow. In this respect, it is important to mention the unofficial character of the Abramtsevo Circle as a creative association, which contributed to the possibility for both artists and workshops to hide from the dictates of the Academy and the Schools in the Abramtsevo estate, thus becoming independent agents of the field.

Agents participating in the field: creative associations

It is equally important to pay attention to the issue of interaction between the participants of the field within it. We plan to begin our analysis by examining the organizational forms of creative activity that existed in the period under consideration: salons, creative evenings, hobby clubs, official creative associations, and magazines. It is equally important to understand what distinguishes the Abramtsevo circle from other forms in order to identify the prerequisites that contributed to the flourishing of the circle in the period under consideration.

Bourdieu states that because of the hierarchy established in the relations between the various types of capital and their holders, the fields of cultural production occupy a politically and economically subordinate position in the field of power [3, p. 40-41]. Despite the conditional independence and autonomy of the field of cultural production, they are nevertheless still subject to

the laws of the surrounding field, and seek profit, economic and political. Consequently, in the field of cultural production, there is a constant struggle between two principles of hierarchization:

- The heteronomous principle, which favors those who economically and politically elevate themselves in the field. In our case, these are the commercially successful and well-known "itinerant artists" or the state-supported Academy.
- The autonomous principle (such as "art for art's sake"). The most cardinal adherents of this type see failure as a sign of chosenness, and short-term success as a symbol of compromise with the "age of sim". Adherents of this type include both the Decadents and "Mir Iskusstva" ("World of Art") movement.

The Abramtsevo circle occupies an intermediate position between these two principles, which is due to the diverse composition of its members, some of whom were professionals recognized by the field, while others were unknown young artists, "swimming against the current" decadents. Such heterogeneity is due to the fact that the circle was never an official creative association, such as the Artel, created in St. Petersburg by Kramskoi and his colleagues after the "The Revolt of the Fourteen " in 1863, or the Association of Itinerant Art Exhibitions, and did not publish any programs or manifestos. The artist simply received an invitation to the estate, and, from the moment he arrived, he became a member of the circle. Once there, however, a new member of the circle would notice that his older fellow artists at Abramtsevo had already created a strong group image, an identity that emerged from a complex web of causal relationships. These causes included shared foreign experience, common interests in pre-Petrine images, concern for the preservation of peasant craft culture, and strong territorial proximity to the Russian countryside. The artists found all this in Abramtsevo, where they united under the patronage of Mamontov.

The artists were bound together not by stylistic homogeneity, nor by heteronomous or autonomous principles, but by a common interest in "Russian antiquity," and by a friendly atmosphere, evidenced by the artists' portraits of each other. In addition, the presence of a patron in the person of Savva Mamontov ensured that the young decadent members of the circle could maintain a detached autonomous position (at least as long as they received support from Mamontov), since they received economic and political benefits from the patron's support, and could not worry about profitability as long as they were on the Abramtsevo estate. Their older colleagues, artists with Peredvizhniki (The Wanderers or The Itinerants) roots, were already adherents of the heteronomous principle, since in their formative period economic and hierarchical success was necessary to occupy a significant disposition in the aftermath.

It can be summarized that the Abramtsevo circle is not an official artistic association, which is characterized by the presence of a charter, and the conduct of financial and economic activities by the participants. It is known that the artists of the Abramtsevo circle were not much concerned about commercialization of the art they created, as they relied in this matter on financial assistance from Mamontov. However, the commercial side, developed through the efforts of the Mamontov family, was still present in the activities of the circle: it is known that the couple was engaged in the sale of decorative and applied products created in the workshops of Abramtsevo.

The Abramtsevo circle was closely connected with the first issues of the magazine "Mir Iskusstva" ("World of Art"), which was published in St. Petersburg from 1898 to 1904, and, in turn, was one of the products of the Miriskusniki movement ("World of Art movement"). The founders of the new movement considered art to be subjective, individual, expressing personal feelings and thoughts. The Miriskusniki believed that art had no purpose other than the above, and critics or artists who insisted on any further function of art were considered by them to be anti-artistic. Wishing to defend their principles, most of the Miriskusniki were unable to graduate from the Academy, but neither could they find common ground with the Peredvizhniki. The only one from whom they managed to find support was Savva Mamontov [5, p. 23-25].

"World of Art" magazine, the first issues of which were sponsored by Mamontov, found itself in a dual situation. On the one hand, the magazine reflected the aesthetic ideas of the World of Art movement, which, however, were not a completely new phenomenon in Russian art and were not a

rejection of the Russian artistic heritage. Neither can "World of Art" be called a decadent movement, although some of the works exhibited and some of the artists it praised were decadent.

On the other hand, the first issues of *The World of Art* were almost entirely devoted to Russian national art, with the exception of a few essays on Western European movements. In these issues one can sense patronage on the part of Mamontov and a focus on artists associated with the Abramtsevo circle. There were sections with more than a dozen reproductions of such artists as Viktor Vasnetsov, the Finnish painter Gallen, Ilya Repin, the early 19th century portraitist Kiprensky, Elena Polenova, Konstantin Korovin and others. For the Abramtsevo circle the magazine became a platform to publicize the achievements of the circle and the ideas of the association.

Nevertheless, from the very beginning of the interaction between the circle and the "World of Art", there was a tension associated with the conflict between the Miriskusniki "art for art's sake" and Abramtsevo's utilitarianism and practicality. Thanks to Mamontov, the World of Art movement received the necessary financial support to publish a magazine with the motto "art for art's sake".

Probably wishing to satisfy their patron's expectations, despite the magazine's motto, Diaghilev and its other authors set out to publicize the legacy of the Russian national art school. They can be said to have created a theoretical foundation for the study of the Russian school, thus continuing the work of patrons such as Mamontov, Tretyakov, Morozov, and other patrons. Moreover, the magazine had influenced Mikhail Larionov, Natalia Goncharova, and Kazimir Malevich, providing them with the basis for shaping what would become distinctive and great Russian art.

One of the magazine's goals was to provide the public with a comprehensive understanding of Russian art. By the end of the nineteenth century, artists felt that they were insufficiently familiar with the Russian artistic heritage, and in general, as if "Russian art" had begun with the Peredvizhniki. Without an understanding of basic things about Russian art, it was difficult to make judgments as well as to criticize. It was unclear whether what claimed to be new and deep-rooted was a good subject, or was just a poor copy of something already done. The magazine sought to write a history of Russian art and make it known to the public for two reasons. The first reason was nationalistic - it was necessary to show that Russia had an art history to be proud of. The second was to give Russian artists the tools to work. The "World of Art" authors were also trying to bring professionalism to art history and not condemn a work just because it did not meet contemporary critical standards or tastes.

The magazine also paid attention to arts and crafts and folk crafts. For these areas of creative endeavor, the authors considered two things essential: that they be sincerely national and that they be functional. For example, Alexandre Benois (Artist and art critic) criticized the furniture on display at the Russian exhibition at the 1900 World Exhibition in Paris for being "heavy, crude, and uncomfortable," in other words, inapplicable to everyday life and slightly grotesque. He expressed fear that such a "Russian style" in arts and crafts would not survive long and predicted that when the public saw that these crafts were more attractive than mass-produced goods, they would demand more of them. This would inevitably lead to commercialization and academization, hence the drying up of sources of creativity. Two years later, at a craft exhibition in Moscow, Benois discovered that his predictions had been correct and that the works on display were in no way examples of folk art or craft, but failed copies.

It can be said that "The World of Art" in its first issues was closely connected programmatically with the activities of the Abramtsevo circle and the ideas disseminated in it. The magazine gave the ideas of the circle due publicity and created a theoretical basis for the Russian school, while the circle was focused more on the practical realization of the same ideas. Although the influence of the Abramtsevo circle's ideas is well felt in the first editions, the magazine gradually drifted away from the Abramtsevo line, not least because of the end of funding from Mamontov, who realized that the magazine was less practical than he had hoped.

In the field of cultural production in Russia in the last third of the 19th century, secular chamber events occupied a significant place. Salons and creative evenings are more regulated

secular associations that follow formal rules and have clear social boundaries within themselves. In art circles the formal boundaries are much more shaky, which contributes, according to the memories of the circle participants, to the feeling of freedom and disposes to experiments in the field of creative self-realization. The main difference of the circle from the "evenings", "creative Thursdays", is the absence of a rigid schedule determining the order and frequency of meetings. Both in salons and at creative evenings the art of words, discussion through exchange of opinions prevails. The art circle by its structure assumes a greater emphasis on creative activity, on the creation of art objects.

So, the main differences of the art circle from the above-mentioned organizational forms of creative activity can be called the following characteristics: the absence of formal organization, charter, periodicity, a fixed number of participants, the obligation to pay membership fees, orientation on creative, practical and utilitarian activities. For the participants of an art circle it is important not to belong to a particular field of art, but rather to follow common goals, to focus on common interests. It turns out that the art circle can be defined as a creative union of like-minded people who realize artistic tasks together through not limited to a single field of art search, participation in the activities of the circle and other matters related to its activities. The circle included artists who followed both heteronomous and autonomous principles of hierarchization in the field of cultural production, and this heterogeneity is symptomatic: the younger generation of artists could afford not to worry about the profitability of their activities as long as they were under Mamontov's private patronage.

Identification of habitus of artists of Abramtsevo circle participants

No less significant for analyzing the field of cultural production in the last third of the 19th century is the identification of the habitus of the agents participating in the field. The term "habitus" appears already in Bourdieu's early studies, and was of key importance throughout his scientific career. Bourdieu gave many definitions of habitus depending on how he used it. We can quote a long passage from Practical Sense where he offers the most comprehensive definition: "The determinations associated with a special class of conditions of existence produce habitus — systems of stable and transferable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, i.e. as principles that generate and organize practices and representations that may be objectively adapted to their purpose, but do not presuppose a conscious orientation towards it and the indispensable mastery of neo-practices and perceptions" [6, p. 47].

Bourdieu saw field and habitus as mutually constitutive, and spoke of an "ontological complicity" between the two, meaning that both are involved in the creation of what we take to be existence. On the one hand, there is the cognitive construction of reality (i.e. habitus) by those whose cumulative actions constitute the field. On the other hand, there is the structured world of meaning and significance that presents itself to this cognitive construction and which already explains the necessity of the field. For Bourdieu, what happens in the field is essentially arbitrary, and this must be understood symbolically: it has no value in itself, but gains value because it is assigned a certain meaning according to the logic of the field [7, p. 28-30.].

Returning to the analysis of the field of cultural production in Russia in the last third of the nineteenth century, it is necessary to dwell on artists. The artists came from the middle of the social ladder, and often owed their social advancement to the academy. For example, the painter Ilya Repin came from a poor military family in Kharkov province, Nikolai Ge and Konstantin Korovin came from merchant families.

The significance of this fact for the social history of art is not insignificant. Russian artists as a group were much closer to state structures than in any Western European country. In different periods such members of the Abramtsevo circle as Ilya Repin, Vasily Polenov, Valentin Serov, Konstantin Korovin were members of the Academy of Arts and often carried out teaching activities within its walls.

Teachers, academicians, and professors of the Imperial Academy of Arts were given the class rank of civil servant, and their students' stipends were considered practically as state salaries.

Accordingly, both academy and university students were expected to behave like civil servants. Separately, art itself was a low-profit endeavor, so the best most artists hoped to achieve was a safe niche in a state-sponsored cultural institution, such as the Imperial Academy of Arts, which also sponsored medal-winning artists' stays abroad. Understanding these circumstances is important for further research: artists could not carry out their professional activities in isolation from official institutions such as the St. Petersburg Academy or the Moscow colleges, as only they provided social guarantees and a reliable support.

We can speak of scholarship in the St. Petersburg Academy as a form of state patronage, in which case it is interesting to consider the Abramtsevo circle as a form of private patronage that most closely mimics state patronage. In contrast to one-off orders and the purchase of finished paintings, as Tretyakov or the Morozovs did, Savva Mamontov not only provided artists with space for creative activity (workshops in Moscow, houses on the estate), but also provided financial support. For example, there are letters from painter Mikhail Vrubel in which he asks to send him money [8], and it is obvious from the context of the letter that this is not payment for a painting, not money in debt, but simply an amount that Mamontov could allocate to the artist so that he could carry out his professional activities without embarrassment, a quasi-salary. Moreover, the patron of the arts also sponsored artists' stays in Italy and France, thus imitating the Academic Fellowship, and often hired artists of the Abramtsevo circle to make sets and costumes for theatrical productions of his Private Opera, as well as recommended them to his acquaintances merchants and industrialists, was an intermediary in the execution of orders.

From the mid-1870s Savva Mamontov invited some artists to live at his expense and work at the Abramtsevo estate at his pleasure. The first guests of the estate (or, in modern parlance, residents.) were artists who had already gained public recognition before their participation in the patron's initiative. Such artists were Ilya Repin, Mikhail Nesterov, Nikolai Ge. It is not difficult to notice that these names are also familiar to us from the "Association of Traveling Art Exhibitions". Probably, starting with Eleonora Paston these artists, who became famous as itinerant artists and strengthened their position as members of the Abramtsevo circle, are called the older generation of Abramtsevo artists.

It is interesting to pay attention to the younger generation of artists of the Abramtsevo circle, among them we can name Valentin Serov, Konstantin Korovin, Mikhail Vrubel and many others. Before participating in the Abramtsevo circle, these artists were little known, or not recognized by society as participants in the field of cultural production. For them, participation in the circle played a significant role, and Savva Mamontov's patronage allowed them to receive favorable orders and participate in Russian and international exhibitions.

Let us turn to the figure of Savva Mamontov, who came from the family of the wealthy merchant and industrialist Ivan Mamontov, and try to identify the habitus of Moscow merchants. In contrast to the plight of the nobility, by the last third of the 19th century, merchants were beginning to acquire wealth and influence, especially in Moscow. Despite this, merchants were still effectively excluded from government circles at the highest levels due to state policy. The world of Moscow commerce was still rather closed and traditionalist; the older generation of merchants were Old Believers and arrogantly wrapped themselves in their caftans, despising the alien cultural tokenism of the nobility, who wished to shut the merchants out.

There are three main forms of capital in Bourdieu's analysis: cultural, social and economic capital [9, p. 241–58]. Cultural capital refers to the possession of symbolically valuable cultural attributes and attitudes. These can be material in nature — books, paintings, clothing — or symbolically prestigious — for example, a "good" accent, an educational qualification, refined manners. Thus, capital can be expressed materially, bodily, or through gestures, but in each case it is symbolic because it has a recognition of value primarily on the part of those who occupy the same positions in a given field.

Economic capital is perhaps the most tangible form of capital; it is traditionally understood as financial well-being or ownership of certain property such as land, buildings, etc. It is, in a sense, the kind of capital that is recognized as valuable by those in the same position in the field. In a

sense, it is the form of capital that speaks for itself — it need not be symbolic. However, if we pay attention to the Abramtsevo estate as a property, i.e. a component of economic capital, we can notice that it also has elements of cultural capital — before the purchase of the estate by the Mamontov family, it belonged to the Aksakov family and was a literary center in the middle of the XIX century. The literary and Slavophile past of the estate had a certain significance for the members of the circle, primarily expressed in the belief that the area was conducive to creativity and could serve as a source of inspiration in its own right.

Savva Mamontov, a Russian entrepreneur, acquired his fortune from the nascent railroad industry in Russia, and decided to use his economic capital to support artists through various forms of patronage, including both material support and the use of his social capital (connections, acquaintances, and reputation) for the benefit of artists. Thus, in the Abramtsevo circle, the artist's relations with viewers and customers acquire an intermediary — a double agent (in the person of the patron Savva Mamontov), thanks to whom the "economic" logic penetrates into the very core of the field of cultural production. Savva Mamontov combined two completely opposite dispositions: economic, which was alien and incomprehensible to the artists, and intellectual, close to the artists themselves. The latter refers to the ability to appreciate their labor and give it value.

Social capital refers to the network of personal relationships that a person builds. Such networks are symbolic - a person is valued by those who know him or her - but these networks can indeed provide an advantage similar to monetary capital: what matters is not what a person knows and can do, but who he or she knows and who knows about him or her. Social capital enhances the effectiveness of both economic and cultural capital. Familiarity with Moscow businessmen with the help of Savva Mamontov allowed many figures of the Abramtsevo circle to build new chains of relations, receive orders and become known in certain circles. Artists received orders: Mikhail Vrubel made panels for estates and mansions, Alexander Golovin made ceramic architectural panels for public buildings and profitable houses, Valentin Serov and Konstantin Korovin created panels with motifs of the Russian north for the waiting room of the Yaroslavl railway station, Viktor Vasnetsov's designs were used to create majolica friezes for the facade of the Tretyakov Gallery. It is important to note that many orders were related to the activities of the Abramtsevo ceramic workshop. Architectural ceramics from the 1890s began to rapidly gain popularity, and the artists' familiarity with production technologies, as well as close cooperation with this ceramic workshop played not the least role in the fulfillment of these orders.

One of the characteristics of different forms of capital is the transformation of one type into another. Thus, different types of capital can be derived from economic capital, but only at the cost of greater or lesser efforts to transform it. There are some goods and services to which economic capital gives immediate access, but some can only be obtained by virtue of social capital (ties or social obligations). The latter cannot be obtained instantly, "on demand", but often require engagement over a long period of time [9, p. 252].

However, it would be a mistake to consider the phenomenon under study (in our case, the Abramtsevo Circle) based primarily on economic capital. In other words, to rely only on the financial side of the issue. Bourdieu does not deny that economic capital underlies all other types of capital and that they are transformed, disguised forms of economic capital, which, nevertheless, are never completely reduced to it alone. But cultural, social, and symbolic capital produce their most characteristic actions only to the extent that they conceal (not least from their owners) the fact that economic capital underlies them.

Capital for Bourdieu works through processes of recognition and identification. Capital can only have value, especially in its most symbolic form, if it is recognized as such by the field [9, p. 252-253]. This brings us back to the concepts of field and habitus, since the processes of recognition and identification are provided by the social reproduction of the symbolic manifestations of the logic of individual fields. In other words, since the generative logic of any individual habitus is saturated by subsequent symbolic valuation, it is unlikely that the logic and value will not be recognized by others. Thus, we can say that in the field of cultural production in Russia in the last third of the nineteenth century, the Abramtsevo Circle gained a certain recognition

both because of the social capital of the older generation of artists recognized by the field (who were already famous thanks to the Society for Travelling Art Exhibitions) and because of the recognized value of the Circle's cultural capital (their creative search for an appeal to the pre-Petrine tradition). No less important was the economic capital of the circle, provided first of all by Savva Mamontov, who created for the artists the possibility of choosing between public and private patronage in conditions when it was practically impossible to carry out independent professional activity in the field of cultural production due to the underdeveloped art market.

Conclusion

The unofficial nature of the Abramtsevo Circle and its indirect interest in profit were the main differences between it and the Association of Traveling Art Exhibitions. Nevertheless, the activities of the circle were oriented towards practicality and applicability in everyday life, which strongly distinguished it from the association and the magazine "World of Art", the first issues of which were sponsored by Savva Mamontov in order to give publicity to the activities of the circle.

Savva Mamontov, the patron and founder of the Abramtsevo circle, played an undeniably important role in the formation and establishment of the Abramtsevo circle in the field of cultural production. Mamontov was an intermediary between artists and customers, as well as a double agent, possessing, on the one hand, "economic" thinking and, on the other hand, a genuine interest in art. The present article has not paid due attention to the formation of Mamontov's tastes, as well as to some other aspects, the study of which is planned in further works.

Thus, the article solved a number of tasks related to the characterization of the field of cultural production, as well as the identification of its participants - private individuals and institutions. The context of the emergence of the circle as a form of private patronage contrasting with the state patronage was revealed, which allowed us to look at the activities of the Abramtsevo circle from a new angle. The main conclusions and provisions of the present study can serve as a basis for further research work on the phenomenon of the Abramtsevo Circle.

References

1. Gray C (1970). *The Russian experiment in art, 1863-1922*. New York: H.N. Abrams. 296 p.
2. Tanner J (2010). Michael Baxandall and the sociological interpretation of art // *Cultural Sociology*. Volume 4, Issue 2. pp. 231–256
3. Bourdieu P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: essays on art and literature*. New York: Columbia University Press. 322 p
4. Jackson D (2006). *The Wanderers and critical realism in nineteenth-century Russian painting*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 202 p.
5. Haldey O (2010). *Mamontov's Private Opera. the search for modernism in Russian theater*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 355 p.
6. Bourdieu P (1982). *Leçon sur une leçon*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit. 60 p. (In French)
7. Grenfell M., Hardy C (2007). *Art Rules: Pierre Bourdieu and the Visual Arts*. Oxford, New York: Berg. 256 p.
8. Vrubel M (1963). *Perepiska. Vospominaniya o khudozhnike (Correspondence. Memories of the artist)*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1963. 362 p. (In Russian)
9. Bourdieu P. *The forms of Capital* (1986) // Richardson J., *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, pp. 241–58