

MEMORY AS THE SUBJECT AND INSTRUMENT OF ART STUDIES





STATE INSTITUTE OF ART STUDIES

MEMORY AS THE SUBJECT  
AND INSTRUMENT  
OF ART STUDIES

Moscow 2016

Published by resolution  
of the Academic Council,  
State Institute of Art Studies

Reviewed by:  
A.V. TOLSTOY, Doctor of Art History  
N.Y. MOLOK, Candidate of Art History

**Memory as the Subject and Instrument of Art Studies.** Collected articles / Compiled by E.A. Bobrinskaya, A.S. Korndorf – Moscow: State Institute of Art Studies. Moscow, 2016. 346 pp.

ISBN 978-5-98287-104-6

The collection of articles entitled 'Memory as the Subject and Instrument of Art Studies', like the conference held in October 2014 at the State Institute of Art Studies, was largely inspired by the works and ideas of Dmitri Vladimirovich Sarabianov (1923–2013). His book 'Russian Painting. The Awakening of Memory' (Moscow, 1998) and the idea expressed therein of profound or hidden traditions in art that 'may be characterised as an awakening of memory that most often occurs unconsciously' have become the point for departure for discussing a broad range of important problems in the culture of the early modern and contemporary age in an interdisciplinary context. These collected articles by Russian, European and American academics touch upon very significant issues linked to the problem of memory in culture: memory and the mechanisms by which art functions; archives, museums and collecting as strategies of memory; etymology, migration and the transformation of subjects and images in Russian art of the early modern age; amnesia and the destruction of tradition; the theory of memory as a philosophical concept and its influence in art; memory and the methodology of art studies.

© Portrait of Dmitry Sarabianov made by Tatiana Ignatova-Vesel (begining of 2000s)  
is used in the design of the frontispiece.

ISBN 978-5-98287-104-6

© Authors' collective, 2016  
© State Institute of Art Studies, 2016  
© I.B. Trofimov, design, 2016

## CONTENTS

Aby Warburg THE ABSORPTION OF THE EXPRESSIVE VALUES OF THE PAST	8
Donald Preziosi MEMORY AND AMNESIA: THE ESSENTIAL INTERRELATION OF ART AND RELIGION	18
Valery Podoroga EXPLOSION AND CUTTING EDGE NEED FOR KAIROS	26
Konstantin Shevtsov REMEMBRANCE AS INTERPRETATION OF THE PAST	48
Claire Farago THE FUTURE OF WORLD ART HISTORY AS CULTURAL MEMORY	56
Silvia Burini CULTURAL MEMORY AS SEMIOTIC MECHANISM IN ART	64
Giuseppe Barbieri AT THE THEATRE WITH MEMORY: UNCERTAINTY AS A RESEARCH CANON	74
Stepan Vaneian BRUEGEL – SEDLMAYR – IMDAHL: THE BLIND SPOT OF INTERPRETATION	80
Marina Toropygina ICONOLOGIST IN CINEMATOGRAPHY. FANTASIA AND STYLE AS SEEN BY E. PANOFSKY	93
Lev Lifshits ON STYLISTIC REPLICATIONS IN EARLY AND LATE 12 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY BYZANTINE AND RUS' PAINTING	102

Lev Maciel Sánchez RUSSIAN MEDIEVAL ARCHITECTURE IN THE 18 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY: SURVIVAL AND REVIVAL	115
Alla Aronova “FORGETFULNESS” IN PETRINE ARCHITECTURE: THE CHURCH OF THE NATIVITY OF THE VIRGIN IN THE VILLAGE OF PODMOKLOVO	128
Sergey Karp TRAVELS OF COUNTS NIKOLAI PETROVICH AND SERGEI PETROVICH RUMYANTSEV AND FRIEDRICH MELCHIOR GRIMM IN ITALY IN 1775–1776: FROM ROME, THE SYMBOL OF DECLINE, TO ROME, THE CENTRE OF THE NEW WORLD	142
Mikhail Sokolov IMAGES OF RUINED MEMORY. DISPUTE BETWEEN MEDIEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY IN RUSSIAN ICONOLOGY OF RUINS	150
Anna Korndorf MNEMONIC PROGRAMMES OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN IMPERIAL RESIDENCES. MEMORY METAMORPHOSES	157
Natalia Sipovskaya SOUVENIR IN SENTIMENTALIST TOPOGRAPHY	175
Tatiana Yudenkova RUSSIAN GENRE PAINTING OF THE 1860S IN THE LIGHT OF CHRISTIANITY	183
Tatiana Karpova NIKOLAI GE IN THE 20 <sup>TH</sup> CENTURY	196
Vladimir Petrov “MEMORY OF GENRE” AND “MEMORY OF THE HEART” IN KUZMA PETROV-VODKIN’S WORKS	211
EKATERINA VYAZOVA MEMORY OF GESTURE: ICONOGRAPHY OF MELANCHOLY IN EUROPEAN AND RUSSIAN CULTURE OF MODERN TIMES	248
Ilia Doronchenkov “STORM GATHERING OVER RUSSIAN ART”: FROM THE HISTORY OF POLEMICS ON IMPRESSIONISM IN RUSSIAN CRITICISM OF THE EARLY 1890S	277

Jean-Claude Marcade THE RUSSIAN AVANT-GARDE OR AVANT-GARDE ART OF RUSSIA?	303
Nina Gourianova THE TRADITION OF OLD BELIEF IN THE CONTEXT OF CULTURAL MEMORY OF THE AVANT-GARDE	310
Ekaterina Bobrinskaya CULTURAL MEMORY AND ANTI-WESTERN UTOPIAS OF RUSSIAN FUTURIANS	321
Anna Chudetskaya MEMORY RESET: "FORMALIST" EXPERIENCE ACTUALISED BY YOUNG PAINTERS OF THE THAW PERIOD	333
ABOUT THE AUTHORS	378

Lev Maciel Sánchez

## **RUSSIAN MEDIEVAL ARCHITECTURE IN THE 18<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY: SURVIVAL AND REVIVAL**

Russian architecture of the 18<sup>th</sup> century is not associated with the Middle Ages. During the one hundred years that the best European masters worked in St Petersburg it became a full-fledged part of European Baroque and then neo-Classicism.

However, the vast Russia is not confined to St Petersburg. The architecture of Moscow, the old capital, retained many late medieval forms up to the 1750s<sup>1</sup>. Much more of medieval architecture remained in other regions of Russia, to which European forms seeped through, as a rule, through Moscow<sup>2</sup> and with great delay. Medieval Russian architecture of the 18<sup>th</sup> century is yet to be comprehended as a phenomenon, but studies and publications of landmarks made in the past decades provide sufficient material for preliminary conclusions about its nature. This phenomenon is not specifically Russian: it just manifested itself with greater prominence by dint of huge distances. Similar processes occurred in all European countries, as can be illustrated by the architecture of Lower Brittany, Lecce, etc<sup>3</sup>. English historiographers were the first to ponder on the

<sup>1</sup> Sedov, VI.V. "Elizavetinskoye barokko v Moskve, ili V teni Rastrelli" (Elizabethan Baroque in Moscow, or in Rastrelli's Shadow) // *Project Klassika*, No. 8 (2003), pp. 155–61.

<sup>2</sup> Pluzhnikov, V.I. Sootnoshenie ob'yomnykh form v russkom kultovom zodchestve nachala XVIII v. (Correlation of Dimensional Forms in Russian Religious Architecture of the Early 18<sup>th</sup> Century) // *Russkoye iskusstvo pervoi chetverti XVIII v. (Russian Art of the First Quarter of the 18<sup>th</sup> Cent.)*. Moscow, 1974, pp. 81–108.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, Fréal J. *Calvaires et enclose paroissiaux de Bretagne*. Paris: Garnier Frères, 1981; Danieli F. *Fasti e linguaggi sacri: il Barocco leccese tra riforma e controriforma*. Lecce: Edizioni Grifo, 2014; *Le gothique de la Renaissance* / M. Chatenet, K. De Jonge, M. Kavalier, N. Nußbaum ed. Paris: Picard, 2011

existence of medieval forms in the stylistic environment of New Europe and to name the trend Survival in contrast to Revival, the deliberate replication of medieval forms in the period of Romanticism and Historicism<sup>1</sup>. I deemed it pertinent to use the existing English terms to describe Russian processes in order to stress their universal nature.

This text is about medieval forms in regional architecture of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, their latent survival and purposeful revival. Before passing on to examples illustrating the various aspects of the above processes, a brief survey of the general situation is called for.

St Petersburg was the indisputable centre of construction from the 1710s: a 1714 decree banned the construction of stone buildings outside the new capital. Although it was not enacted immediately and there were numerous exceptions, it did break the masonry tradition in Moscow and the rest of Russia. After it was rescinded in 1728–9, the tradition was revived everywhere in a different way. A new European type of building that presupposed a detailed plan and, consequently, the creator architect started spreading in Moscow and nearby provinces. In this case architecture could be (and more often than not was) a modest provincial replica of that of St Petersburg. Medieval forms *per se* did not survive in it. The old medieval method of building “after a fashion” survived and thrived in the remote regions, where the influence of Moscow and even more so of St Petersburg took time to reach. It did not presuppose any precise design, and the building was born from the interaction of the client, contractor, artel foreman and master builders, each adding something of his own to the image of the building under construction<sup>2</sup>. Such an approach did not make for any stylistic unity of the building, which could take on diverse stylistic forms. The present study aims to determine which of them go back to the medieval tradition and to trace the ways of their combination with one another and with new European forms.

As stylistic descriptions of forms of Russian architecture are ambiguous and at times controversial, it is necessary to briefly review terminology. Four basic styles can be singled out, whose forms are found in Russian regional architecture after its revival in the 1730s. Forms of the so-called *uzorochye* (patternwork), the leading style of suburban architecture of the 1630s–1680s, will be referred to as pre-Petrine. Architectural forms of Left-bank Ukraine that came to Russia in the 1680s and different variations of the emergent Naryshkin style are classified as medieval. Although the name of the latter and its stylistic essence

<sup>1</sup> Gothic Survival // *The Grove Encyclopedia of Medieval Art and Architecture*. Vol. 2. Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 205–8.

<sup>2</sup> Buseva-Davydova, I.L. *Spetsifika arkhitekturnoi deiatelnosti v Drevnei Rusi i v pervoi polovine XVIII v.* (Specifics of Architectural Activity in Old Rus and in the First Half of the 18<sup>th</sup> Cent.) // *Slovar arkhitektorov i masterov stroitel'nogo dela Moskvyy XV – serediny XVIII veka* (Glossary of Moscow Architects and Builders of the 15<sup>th</sup> – mid-18<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Ed. I.A. Bondarenko. Moscow, 2008, pp. 667–85.



The Church  
of the Troitse-Scanov  
Convent, 1795–1808  
Photo: Lev Maciel,  
2004.



The Church of St  
Basil of Caesarea,  
Derevni, 1797, 1837  
Photo: Nikita Rybin,  
2012.

are a subject of debate<sup>1</sup>, its distinction from the subsequent Baroque is fundamental to the present paper. The Baroque is usually divided into Petrine and that of Empress Elizabeth's period, but the exquisite forms of the latter rarely reached the provinces. The distinction between the different variants of classicism is even less pertinent to them.

Studies have been confined mostly to stone churches as the only fairly numerous and reliably dated type of buildings. As far as geography is concerned, regional architecture developed longer and most successfully in Northern Russia, along the Vyatka River, in the Urals and in Siberia, that is, in lands where nobility domains and hence estate culture were nonexistent. Distinctive regional schools also formed around ecclesiastical and administrative centres of Central Russia even in the immediate vicinity of Moscow (Suzdal, Yaroslavl, etc.). After summarising the vast empirical material, the paper cites cases illustrating obvious trends. The amassed material is, however, insufficient for a statistically precise analysis (including frequency and regional specifics), which is a job for the future.

The main survival mechanism is preserving the old spatial composition while renovating some of the décor. In general, spatial composition is the most conservative element of medieval architecture, whereas décor is more responsive to stylistic innovations. Thus, the type of church with piers and five domes modelled after the Moscow Cathedral of the Dormition (1475–9) survived successfully throughout the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries almost unaffected by patternwork, and on to the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. True, almost no church with piers was built after the 1710s (the Church of the

<sup>1</sup> "Severnii manierizm" kak forma khudozhestvennogo myshleniya perekhodnogo vremeni. K voprosu ob osobennostyakh "naryshkinskogo stilya" ("Northern Mannerism" as a Form of Artistic Thinking in the Transition Period. On the Problem of Naryshkin Style Specifics) // *Iskusstvoznanie*, No. 2, 2002, pp. 334–73.



Dormition in Kineshma, 1745, was the last large church with six piers<sup>1</sup>), and their reappearance in the 1740s was a conscious Revival of that type sanctioned by a special decree of Empress Elizabeth<sup>2</sup>. A noteworthy fact is that this Revival was embodied not only in the forms of the Elizabethan Baroque (the St Nicholas Naval Cathedral of St Petersburg, 1753–62, S.I. Chevakinsky), but also in traditional forms (see below). The type of a five-domed parish church without piers (with a cloistered vault) that evolved in the 1630s proved just as lasting<sup>3</sup>. It successfully acquired first

The Church  
of Archangel  
Michael, Tobolsk,  
1745–1749  
Photo: Lev Maciel,  
2003.

<sup>1</sup> Vdovichenko, M. V., *Arkhitektura bolshikh soborov XVII v.* (The Architecture of Large Cathedrals of the 17<sup>th</sup> Century). Moscow, 2009, pp. 334–6.

<sup>2</sup> Fedotova, T. P., *K probleme pyatiglaviya v arkhitekture barokko pervoi poloviny XVIII v.* (On the Problem of Five Domes in Baroque Architecture of the First Half of the 18<sup>th</sup> Cent.) // *Russkoye iskusstvo barokko. Materialy i issledovaniya.* Moscow, 1977, pp. 70–87.

<sup>3</sup> Tarabarina, Iu. V., *Russkaya arkhitektura pervoi treti XVII v.* (Russian Architecture of the First Third of the 17<sup>th</sup> Cent.) Extended abstract of dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Arts. Moscow: MGU Publishers, 1999.

the Naryshkin<sup>1</sup> and then Baroque décor and remained in use up to the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The Troitse-Scanov Convent outside Narovchat was a graphic example of the combination of the traditional church type with new décor. Built to a single plan, it comprises a five-domed church surrounded by an irregular square of the convent walls with built-in structures, three corner towers and a bell-tower standing on the church axis. The two-storied church was built in 1795–1808 and is one of the largest Russian churches of the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is of the traditional type with four piers, but its apses are visually balanced out by a tall western narthex with a Baroque semi-circular gable. The presence of a tall narthex throughout the width of the church was quite uncharacteristic of the church type and was evidence of the influence of new architecture. The church has a wonderful décor of a spectacular, yet provincial version of early Classicism (which became outdated in St Petersburg by the early 1780s). The ground floor is decorated with fanciful rustication while the upper floor is nearly entirely covered with light décor. Wide and flat pilasters are especially outstanding with panels with representations of cherubim for capitals. The arrangement of windows does not correspond to the structure (four rows with two piers), which was already typical of 17<sup>th</sup>-century churches. That placement made it possible to liken the two central parts of each of the façades to a two-columned portico with a gable put on a cornice and squeezed in between the side drums.

<sup>1</sup> Merzliutina, N.A., *Traditsionnye besstolpnye khramy naryshkinskogo stilya* (Traditional Naryshkin Style Churches without Piers). Extended abstract of dissertation for the degree of Candidate of Arts. Moscow: GII Publishers, 2002.



The Church of the  
Transfiguration,  
Rogozha, 1756–1770  
Photo: Lev Maciel,  
2008



The Church  
of the Ascension,  
Saviour-Sumorin  
Monastery, 1796–1801  
and 1825  
Photo: Lev Maciel,  
2015.

Overall, the church of the Troitse-Scanov Convent is a graphic example of provincial architecture trying to keep up with the metropolitan fashion.

The Church of St Basil of Caesarea (1797) in the village of Derevni near Rostov Veliky is a colourful example of a five-domed parish church with a new décor. It has a vertically elongated quadrangle typical of the Yaroslavl school and large onion domes (newly restored). Despite its late date, its décor has even pre-Petrine forms, including an arcature belt in imitation of *zakomar* gables and ogee architraves of the skylight windows. The faceted drums, the apse and architraves with a broken pediment of the lower tier are all typical of the Naryshkin style. A panel over the doorway and round window-like panels between the lower and upper rows of windows bespeak Baroque influence. Only the bulky six-tier bell tower, built in 1837, reflects the influence of Classicism with its pilasters, semi-columns and flat pediments. The Derevni church thus combined all the stylistic layers possible in provincial architecture of that period.

Combinations of new compositions with elements of décor of the preceding style are rarer, yet not infrequent either. The Church of Archangel Michael (1745–9) in Tobolsk, the then capital of Siberia, is a good example. It is a two-storeyed church with one dome, a refectory and bell tower on its axis, the so-called “ship design”, which developed at the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The church and the bell tower are crowned with typically baroque forms. The quadrangle has a high vault with the so-called *poluglavie* (semi-circular pediments over the central wall segments) and the bell tower has a vault with lucarnes. These compositions associated with the early Baroque buildings in Russia (from the late 1690s) took final shape in the architecture of the Church of St John the Warrior on Yakimanka, Moscow (1709–17). Given its Baroque spatial composition, the Tobolsk church comprises numerous Ukrainian elements in the upper tier and pre-Petrine

The Church of the  
Transfiguration,  
Vladimir, 1779–1811  
Photo: Lev Maciel,  
2015.



The Church  
of St John the  
Precursor,  
Shirokovskoye,  
1784–1793  
Photo: Lev Maciel, 2002.



panels in the lower tier. The combination of motifs so heterogeneous in time is explained by the replication of the forms of the neighbouring Church of the Epiphany, the ground floor of which is of the pre-Petrine period (1690–1) and the upper floor dates from the time when Ukrainian masters were active in Tobolsk (1737–44)<sup>1</sup>. Each tier of the Church of Archangel Michael has retained “genetic memory” of the original combinations of forms, while overall the church turned out to be an unexpectedly modern “stylisation” of historical stratification for the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century.

Another bright example is the Church of the Transfiguration in Rogozha (1756–70) outside Ostashkov. It is of the “octagon-on-quadrangle” type, which was most common in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and whose origin is associated with the Naryshkin style. However, the octagon is crowned with five domes, not cross-shaped (oriented with respect to the cardinal directions) as is occasionally encountered in the Naryshkin style, but diagonal, which is almost mandatory for *uzorochye*, with befitting onion domes and *zakomars* at the base of the side domes. The bell tower is also archaic with its wooden tent-like top. The architraves are even more remarkable: pre-Petrine on the octagon and the ground tier and baroque in the

<sup>1</sup> Maciel Sánchez. L. Svet Lavry in partibus infidelium: “ukrainizmy” v arkhitekture Sibiri XVIII v. (The Light of the Lavra in partibus infidelium: Ukrainisms in Siberian Architecture of the 18<sup>th</sup> Cent.) // *Arkhitekturnoye nasledstvo*. Issue 54. Moscow, 2011, pp. 144–57.



The Church of St John the Baptist, Kargopol, 1751  
Photo: Lev Maciel, 2007.

middle tier and on the windows of the central tholobate. Overall, Rogozha is the opposite of Tobolsk: in the latter the combination of forms of different styles was genetically justified while in the former all ties are, on the contrary, broken: Baroque architraves decorate the pre-Petrine drum, the pre-Petrine architraves, conversely, the Naryshkin quadrangle, and so on. At the same time the details are expressive quality work, all proportions are well coordinated and in general the building produces a harmonious impression.

There are curious examples of an approach when a church that is completely new in form actually reflects archaic architectural ideas. One such example is the Church of the Ascension of the Saviour-Sumorin Monastery outside Totma (1796–1801 and 1825, attributed to V.M. Kazakov). Scholars cite this church as an example of Moscow Classicism<sup>1</sup>, which is well justified as far as its main structure is concerned. From the point of view of Survival the refectory is noteworthy for its unusual height compared with the main structure: its double-floor height area was superposed on a semi-basement. The refectory has an elegant neo-Classical décor in the spirit of Quarenghi, along with an unusual composition of the side façade: the narthex incorporated into the refectory structure is singularised by an additional Italian window, which makes the façade asymmetrical. The rather unusual forms for neo-Classical refectories can be supposedly explained by the local tradition of building two-storeyed churches of ship design with their tall two-storeyed refectories. The asymmetric façade may be the result of the custom to visually single out the refectory part below the bell tower (e.g., in the village of Tsareva, 1779). Customary spatial thinking is thus “articulated” here in the neo-Classical architectural language.

<sup>1</sup> Bocharov, G.N., Vygodov, V.P. *Solvychegodsk. Veliky Ustyug. Totma*. Moscow, 1983.



The Church of SS  
Peter and Paul  
in Severouralsk,  
1767–1798  
Photo: Lev Maciel,  
2002.

In rare cases archaic forms survived practically in full with but a minimum of contemporary architectural forms. Some churches of Kargopol and its environs exemplify such archaism. A spectacular example is the Church of St John the Baptist (1751), a monumental five-domed church looking like 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>-century churches. It has a two-pier structure, low narthex, three semi-circular apses, relatively small windows and other features that are little different from those of 17<sup>th</sup>-century cathedral type churches. The octahedral windows topping the quadrangle typical of Naryshkin style churches are the only element of the Petrine period (but not Baroque!). As for the Ukrainian form of the domes, it is not clear whether they were original. This rejection of innovations by Kargopol clients and builders may be explained by the nearly complete absence of contacts between the Kargopol masonry tradition and other centres (Vologda, Ustyug and Arkhangelsk are hundreds of kilometres away from Kargopol) and, consequently, contemporary architectural trends.

Russian architecture also saw Revival, and even more than one. To begin with, a “Gothic taste”<sup>1</sup>, sometimes referred to as pseudo- or false Gothic, appeared in the time of Catherine the Great in imitation of the English Gothic Revival. Although it could also be interpreted as reference to medieval Russian architecture<sup>2</sup>, it had nothing in common with its forms. The distinction between native and West European Gothic was eventually drawn by the 1830s, when two Revivals – neo-Gothic *per se* and Russian

<sup>1</sup> Khachaturov, S.V. *Goticheskiĭ vkus v russkoi khudozhestvennoi culture XVIII v.* (Gothic Taste in Russian Artistic Culture of the 18<sup>th</sup> Cent.). Moscow, 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Kirichenko, E.I. *Russkii stil* (Russian Style), Moscow, 1997; Lisovskii V.G. *Arkhitektura Rossii XVIII – nach. XX v. Poisk natsionalnogo stilya* (Russian Architecture. 18<sup>th</sup> – Early 20<sup>th</sup> Cent. Search for a National Style). Moscow, 2009.



style – began to take shape and develop. The latter, which contemporaries sometimes called Moscow-Yaroslavl and pseudo-Russian in the Soviet period, is often referred to as Russian Revival by English-speaking historiographers. None of them is in any way related to the Survival processes considered above.

I have a hypothesis that the above medieval tradition, which “survived” in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, had its own Revival. I mean the conscious recourse of church builders to forms that had already ceased to be used in their region, a phenomenon yet to be understood by historiographers. The so-called Pokhodyashin churches of the North Urals constitute short of the only example described so far. Three stone churches – of St John the Precursor (1754–76) in Verkhoturys, of the Presentation of the Virgin (1767–76) in Karpinsk and of SS Peter and Paul (1767–98) in Severouralsk – were commissioned by the conservative merchant Maksim Pokhodyashin. They successfully reproduced the forms of local Naryshkin style churches of the early 18<sup>th</sup> century (above all, of the Church of St John the Precursor (1721–8) in Krasnoye already after the Baroque forms had become common there in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century<sup>1</sup>.

Analysis of various regional traditions makes it possible to presume that the above phenomenon was common and could take different forms.

On the one side, it could have been dictated by the desire to reproduce some admired specimen. Thus, a small church of St John the Precursor built

The Church  
of the Meeting  
of the Lord, Zaostrovie,  
1808–1878  
Photo: Lev Maciel,  
2007.

<sup>1</sup> Kaptikov A. Iu., “Pokhodyashinskie tserkvi Urala” (Pokhodyashin Churches of the Urals) // *Arkhitekturnoye nasledstvo*. Issue 38 (1995). Moscow, pp. 374–8.



The Church  
of the Presentation  
of the Virgin,  
Kargopol, 1785–1802  
Photo: Lev Maciel,  
2007.

in the village of Shirokovskoye beyond the Urals in 1784–93 in minute detail reproduced the unique forms of the finishes of the nearby Cathedral of the Dormition of the Dalmatov Monastery (1707–20). These forms, which have not survived to our day, were the result of Naryshkin style masters' experiments with the cross-in-square five-domed church: the lucarnes serving as the base for the lateral domes were placed at the centre of the broken pediments stretched throughout the width of the quadrangle walls<sup>1</sup>. Despite the spread of exquisite forms of Tobolsk Baroque in the region in the 1770s (the Cathedral of the Transfiguration in Shadrinsk, 1771–7)<sup>2</sup>, the builders of the small church in the village belonging to the monastery deliberately reproduced the archaic forms of the admired halidom.

There are even more specific examples. The Church of the Transfiguration (1164) built in Vladimir by Andrei Bogolyubsky was pulled down after a fire in 1778. Its foundation was soon used to raise a new church (the exact date of its construction is unknown<sup>3</sup>) with a quadrangle typical of the period topped with a small octagon on a high vault. Some details are provincial Baroque. The builders also wonderfully reproduced some features of 12<sup>th</sup>-century Vladimir-Suzdal architecture, most likely guided by

<sup>1</sup> Maciel Sánchez L.C., "Artel Dalmatova monastyrya i arkhitektura Sibiri XVIII v." (The Dalmatov Monastery Artel and 18<sup>th</sup>-century Architecture of Siberia) // *Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitelstvo*. No. 4, 2012, pp. 21–8.

<sup>2</sup> Maciel Sánchez L.C., "Tobolskoye barokko" (Tobolsk Baroque) // *Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitelstvo*. No. 3, 2013, pp. 46–51.

<sup>3</sup> *Svod. Vladimirskaya obl.* Part 1. Moscow, 2004, p. 428.

the forms of the burnt-out church. Although reproduced not quite exactly, they are still recognisable. The band of blind arcades is not below the windows, but at their level, most likely due to lack of space. By analogy with Vladimir-Suzdal churches, the portal is a rowlock arch, keel-shaped as typical of the 15<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries, instead of the semi-circular one. As a result, the Church of Transfiguration in Vladimir is in spirit attuned to Gothic Revival in reproducing an old church as a fact of venerable age rather than an extratemporal thing of worship.

Another Revival version is oriented to old fashion as such, to some archaic architectural image. That tendency grew stronger as regional architectures came to the end of their development as a sort of defence reaction of the outgoing medieval world outlook (and construction method) in the face of stifling neo-Classicist regulation.

A good example is the Church of the Meeting of the Lord in Zaostrovie not far away from Arkhangelsk. It was founded in 1808, the upper floor altar was consecrated in 1827, and work on the church was completed in 1878. Despite its modest status of a parish church, it is of the five-domed piers cathedral type. Such parish churches were built in the environs of Kholmogory in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century<sup>1</sup>, the last one of this type being the Trinity Cathedral of Arkhangelsk (1708–43). Later on churches topped with a small octagon typical of Northeastern Russia became common there. At the very end of the century the local church builders all of a sudden reverted to the extremely conservative type of building<sup>2</sup>. In the environs of Arkhangelsk they built the Church of the Epiphany in Emetsk (1792–1808, has not survived) after the Trinity Cathedral of Arkhangelsk and the Trinity Cathedral (1800–17, has not survived) in Pinega, in which Classicist features were more manifest. The Zaostrovie church is emphatically monumental: its décor (primitive Baroque and Classicist architraves) is fine and light, merely emphasising the might of the cubic space. The sanctuary apses are absent and the placement of the main altars on both floors (there are six of them) is uniquely designated with a narrow portico on paired columns. The domes have a spectacular exaggeratedly bulbous shape. Overall, despite somewhat coarse details, the builders managed to convey the image of an old northern church, impressive in its might. Due to the late date of its foundation and extremely protracted construction the Revival of medieval architecture merged in it with the Russian Revival of modern history: the church itself epitomizes the close of a long medieval tradition while its tent-like bell tower already reflects the influence of the Russo-Byzantine style projects of K.A. Thon.

<sup>1</sup> Vdovichenko, M.V., *Arkhitektura severnykh soborov XVII v.* (Architecture of Northern Churches of the 17<sup>th</sup> Cent.) // *Pamyatniki russkoi arkhitektury i monumentalnogo iskusstva XVI–XX vv.* (Monuments of Russian Architecture and Monumental Art of the 16<sup>th</sup> – 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries). Issue 7, Moscow, 2006, pp. 27–62.

<sup>2</sup> Maciel Sánchez, L.C., *Khramy arkhangelogorodskoi shkoly* (Churches of the Arkhangelsk School) // *Arkhitekturnoye nasledstvo*. Issue 55. Moscow, 2011, pp. 77–87.

It is worth citing one more specimen of even greater archaicism. The Church of the Presentation of the Virgin was built in Kargopol in 1785–1802. It has nothing but Naryshkin (“ship design” and the faceted skylight windows) and pre-Petrine (“crown” architraves at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> century!) forms without any reference whatsoever to Classicism or even Baroque. Its appearance should not be surprising given the special conservatism of the Kargopol school. However, a close look at the dates of the landmarks will show that starting from the 1770s many of them featured both Baroque and schematised Classicist elements, to say nothing of the spectacular cathedral bell tower in early Classicist forms built by visiting masters (1772–8)<sup>1</sup>. In this context the pointedly archaic forms of the Presentation Church a mere 50 m away from the aforementioned bell tower can be interpreted not as latent Survival, but as intentional Revival.

The fact of Survival was on the whole never called in question, yet this vast realm of architecture represented by thousands of landmarks deserves more extensive and in-depth research. As for Revival, the above arguments attest to the need to ponder at length on this little known and fairly rare phenomenon. Its specimens are evidence that the ability to differentiate between layers of the historical past and interest in doing so began to spread from the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century also in the conservative and in fact still medieval environment of Russian regional clients and builders.

<sup>1</sup> Maciel Sánchez, L.K., Kamennaya arkhitektura Kargopolya kon. XVIII v. (Stone Architecture of Kargopol of the Late 18<sup>th</sup> Cent.) // *Academia. Arkhitektura i stroitelstvo*. No. 3, 2015. P.58–65.

## **ABOUT THE AUTHORS**

### **ALLA ARONOVA (RUSSIA)**

Candidate of Art History, Senior Researcher in the Sector of Modern and Contemporary Russian Art at the State Institute of Art Studies. Field of academic interest: comparative research in the history of Russian architecture of the late Medieval and early modern periods, the study of architectural book collections in Russia of the 17th–18th centuries, the study of forms of ephemeral architecture for public and court festivities in 18th-century Russia.

### **GIUSEPPE BARBIERI (ITALY)**

Professor of the History of Modern Art at Ca'Foscari University, Venice. Field of academic interest: art history and theory of the Renaissance era, Renaissance iconography, architecture and urbanism in the modern age, problems of artistic and cultural heritage, contemporary art, multimedia and modern technologies in exhibition practice.

### **EKATERINA BOBRINSKAYA (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Art History, Head of the Sector of Modern and Contemporary Russian Art at the State Institute of Art Studies. Field of academic interest: Russian and European art of the 20th century, the Russian avant-garde, Italian Futurism; unofficial art in the USSR; Conceptualism, contemporary art.

### **SILVIA BURINI (ITALY)**

Professor of Russian Art History and Russian Cultural History at the Ca'Foscari University in Venice, Director of the Centre for the Study of Russian Art (CSAR). Field of academic interest: 20th-century Russian and European art, comparative studies of semiotic systems (art and literature), the semiotics of art.

**ANNA CHUDETSKAYA (RUSSIA)**

Candidate of Art History, Senior Researcher at the Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts. Field of academic interest: 20th-century Russian art, the 'artist book'.

**ILIA DORONCHENKOV (RUSSIA)**

Candidate of Art History, Professor of the European University in St. Petersburg, Dean of the Department of Art History. Field of academic interest: the reception of foreign art in Russia (second half of the 19th – first half of the 20th century), the history of literature about art, the artistic identity of the Russian emigration, applied art and Russian philology.

**CLAIRE FARAGO (USA)**

Professor of Art History of the Renaissance Era, Art Theory and Criticism at the University of Colorado, Boulder (USA). Field of academic interest: Renaissance art theory, cultural exchanges between Europe and the rest of the world, globalization processes, the critical historiography of art studies.

**NINA GOURIANOVA (USA)**

Professor of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Northwestern University, Chicago. Field of academic interest: the literature and art of modernism and the avant-garde, the mutual influence of aesthetics and politics, the interrelation of literature and fine art.

**SERGEY KARP (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Sciences, Senior Researcher at the Institute of World History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Centre for Study of the 18th Century, Professor of the School of Sciences at the National Research University Higher School of Economics. Field of academic interest: Russo-Western European cultural ties in the 18th century, the Age of Enlightenment, world history, the history of culture.

**TATIANA KARPOVA (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Art History, Chief Researcher in the Sector of Modern and Contemporary Russian Art at the State Institute of Art Studies. Deputy Director General on Scientific Affairs at the State Tretyakov Gallery. Field of academic interest: Russian fine art of the 19th–early 20th century.

**ANNA KORNDORF (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Art History, Senior Researcher in the Sector of Modern and Contemporary Russian Art at the State Institute of Art Studies.

Field of academic interest: Russian and European architectural graphics of the 17th–18th century, theatre architecture, scenography of court theatre during the baroque and Enlightenment era, architectural theory, garden and glass architecture of the 17th–18th century.

**LEV LIFSHITS (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Art History, Head of the Sector of Old Russian Art at the State Institute of Art Studies. Field of academic interest: Old Russian and Byzantine art including monumental painting, icon painting and plastic arts of the 9th-15th centuries.

**LEV MACIEL SÁNCHEZ (RUSSIA)**

Candidate of Art History, Associate Professor of the Faculty of Humanities at the National Research University Higher School of Economics. Field of academic interest: Russian architecture in the 17th–18th centuries, historicism in 20th-century architecture, colonial and post-colonial architecture (Ibero-America, the Islamic world, South Asia).

**JEAN-CLAUDE MARCADÉ (FRANCE)**

Art historian, literary specialist and curator. Director Emeritus of the Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS), France. Field of academic interest: the Russian and Ukrainian avant-garde, the work of K. Malevich and Russian literature.

**VLADIMIR PETROV (RUSSIA)**

Candidate of Art History, author of books and articles on Russian artists of the 19th-20th centuries. Field of academic interest: Russian painting in the second half of the 19th to first half of the 20th century.

**VALERY PODOROGA (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Senior Researcher, Head of the Analytical Anthropology Department at the Institute of Philosophy, Russian Academy of Sciences. Field of academic interest: philosophical and political anthropology, the history of philosophy, the philosophy of art, psychoanalysis.

**DONALD PREZIOSI (USA)**

Professor of Art History at the University of California, Los Angeles. One of the pioneers of visual semiotics in the USA, theoretician of art history and museology. Field of academic interest: culturology, intellectual history, critical theory, museology.

**KONSTANTIN SHEVTSOV (RUSSIA)**

Candidate of Philosophy, Senior Lecturer at the Institute of Philosophy, St. Petersburg State University. Field of academic interest: philosophy of language, cognitive philosophy, mediaphilosophy.

**NATALIA SIPOVSKAYA (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Art Studies and Director of the State Institute of Art Studies. Field of academic interest: Russian decorative and applied art and interiors of the 18th-20th centuries, European interiors and occasional art of the 18th century, Russian porcelain and European porcelain in Russia of the 18th century.

**MIKHAIL SOKOLOV (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Art History, Leading Researcher of the Research Institute of the Theory and History of Fine Arts at the Russian Academy of Arts. Field of academic interest: theory of art, iconography, West European and Russian art of the Medieval and early modern periods.

**MARINA TOROPYGINA (RUSSIA)**

Candidate of Art History, lecturer at the Gerasimov Institute of Cinematography (VGIK). Field of academic interest: theory of art and methodology of art history, iconology, history of cinematography.

**STEPAN VANEYAN (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Art Studies, Associate Professor of the History Faculty at Lomonosov Moscow State University (Department of the World History of Art). Field of academic interest: theory of art, methodology of art studies, theory of architecture, psychology of art.

**EKATERINA VYAZOVA (RUSSIA)**

Candidate of Art Studies, Senior Research Fellow at the Sector of Modern and Contemporary Russian Art at the State Institute of Art Studies. Field of academic interest: 19th-century – early 20th-century Russian and English art, Russo-English artistic ties and parallels, Russian and European art of the 20th century.

**TATIANA YUDENKOVA (RUSSIA)**

Doctor of Art History, Academic Secretary of the State Tretyakov Gallery. Field of academic interest: the history of Russian art and artistic culture of the 19th – early 20th century, problems of collecting in Russia from the 19th – early 20th centuries.

Scientific publication

MEMORY AS THE SUBJECT  
AND INSTRUMENT  
OF ART STUDIES

COLLECTED WORKS

Translation

LYUDMILA LEZHNEVA

Editor

PATRICIA DONEGAN

Design by

IVAN TROFIMOV

Layout

NATALIA MELKOVA