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ABSTRACT

Russian Baroque of the seventeenth century is one of the most controversial and unstudied phenomena of Old Russian art. Even the term "Russian Baroque" provokes debates and unfavorable criticism among some Russian art historians. Sometimes the existence of Baroque stylistic features in seventeenth-century Russian art is even called into question. There is no common opinion about the chronological framework of this artistic trend.

This thesis is an attempt to demonstrate the existence of Baroque stylistic elements in seventeenth-century Russian art and to argue that West European Baroque influence played a great part in the development of seventeenth-century Russian art.

One of the objectives of the thesis is to determine the sources of penetration of Western Baroque ideas into Old Russian icon-painting and painting, decorative and applied art.

Russian art historiography in Great Britain has not considered the problem of Russian Baroque within the whole spectrum of Old Russian art - in all its varieties and genres. Only in seventeenth-century Russian architecture have Baroque features been fully examined, notably in the work of Dr Lindsey Hughes. That is why
seventeenth-century Russian architecture has been excluded from this thesis.

The thesis is practically the first scholarly research of the genesis of Russian Baroque and the first comprehensive analysis of seventeenth-century Russian art (both the Moscow school and provincial art centres) from the point of view of its Baroque stylistic features.
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PREFACE

I first became interested in the Russian Baroque in 1984, when I was involved in the organisation of an exhibition in the Hermitage entitled "Russian Art of the Baroque Age". At the time I was working in the Russian Cultural Section of the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad as one of the curators of the Ancient Russian art collection. It was whilst compiling the catalogue for the aforementioned exhibition that I began to turn my attention to the important stylistic influence of the Western Baroque on late seventeenth-century Russian gold and silver items and utensils decorated with painted (usol'skie) enamel. I subsequently developed my thoughts and observations in a chapter of the book "Russkaia emal' 12-nachala 20 veka" (Russian Enamel from the Twelfth to the Beginning of the Twentieth Century). It then occurred to me that I might try and identify the traces of the Baroque stylistic influence on a wider range of Russian seventeenth-century art, including icons, oil paintings, frescoes and decorative-applied art. This I succeeded in doing at London University as part of MPhil research under the supervision of Dr Lindsey Hughes, without whose constant support and advise this work would never have been written. I would like to take this opportunity to express my profound gratitude to her.

I should also like to thank Nick Ukiah for his
outstanding translation of my dissertation.

My thanks also go to the administration of SSEES and the librarians of London University.

N.K.

May 1994, London
I. INTRODUCTION
1. AIMS OF THE WORK

The late seventeenth century was a period in Russian history which saw the beginnings of large-scale cultural changes, a time of formation in the national consciousness of a new paradigm of reality, a new "image of the world" and of man. In essence, this period saw the beginnings of the changeover from one epoch in Russian history to a new age, the transition from the Middle Ages to the Modern period, heralded by the radical reforms of Peter I. This transitional period is usually considered in Russian historiography to have begun in the mid-Seventeenth to early eighteenth centuries. Whereas in Western European history the transition from the Middle Ages to the Modern period took place over nearly three centuries (taking in its course the Renaissance and Reformation periods), in Russia this period of historical and cultural development lasted just over half a century. The accelerated pace of this process of transition from the Middle Ages to the Modern period, and the short period of time that the transition lasted, exerted a decisive influence on the character of Russian culture (in particular, Russian art) of this transitional period. The development of West European art of the time of transition into the culture of the Modern period was smooth and evolutionary in nature, whilst Russian art of the late seventeenth century developed in an atmosphere of spiritual and social crisis. Describing late
seventeenth-century Russian culture, the Russian cultural historian, B.I.Krasnobaev, writes that: "the Russian culture did not develop smoothly from that of the Middle Ages. On the contrary, its birth was the result of a crisis, that is, the development and sharpening of contradictions within the culture of the Middle Ages"[1]. This dramatic crisis in traditional Russian culture, caused by a socio-economic crisis, explains to a large extent the desire on the part of Russian artists of this time to use stylistic elements of the Baroque in their work - an artistic style always tending towards affectation, tragic exaltation and dramatic intensity.

Until recently, this period of Russian history and Russian art was not considered by analysts to be an independent cultural period, with its own characteristics (differing from the periods which came before and after it), manifesting its own unique philosophical system of viewing and understanding the world, which conditioned in turn its system of artistic symbolism and semiotics. More often than not, historians of Russian art of this transitional period have seen in it merely a somewhat weaker expression of artistic elements from the following period - the Modern period, which is bound up in Russia with the reforms of Peter the Great. This view of Russian culture (art) of the seventeenth century distorts and impoverishes our understanding of its characteristics and its place in the history of Russian art. For this very
reason it is difficult not to agree with S.A.Vaigachev that "the approach, whereby the philosophical content of aspects of cultural life in the transitional period is evaluated on the basis of the achievements of the cultural period which followed it, is, in our view, deeply mistaken, since...this approach in essence assigns to Russian seventeenth century culture nothing more than an auxiliary role, as the preparation for the so-called "new" ("secular") culture of the following period"[2].

One of the aims of this work is the substantiation of a definite autonomy for late seventeenth-century Russian art, and to define its specific characteristics in comparison with the preceding and following periods of Russian culture.

The other task of this research is a consideration of the stylistic renewal of seventeenth-century Russian art, against a broad socio-cultural background, and in the context of its correlation with the spiritual, economic and social changes of the time.

For obvious political reasons - those of censorship - Soviet historians of seventeenth-century Russian art were forced for decades to study it in isolation from the strong and fruitful influence of Western artistic ideas, in particular, stylistic elements of the Baroque. For this very reason, the genesis of the Russian Baroque has
been practically unresearched. The underestimation of the influence of Western art on seventeenth-century Russian art was widespread. The chief aim of the present work is to attempt, as far as is possible, to fill this gap in the history of Russian art, to research, re-consider and interpret the links between late seventeenth-century Russian art and the Baroque art of Western Europe at this time.

Whilst the art of Moscow, the largest cultural centre in seventeenth-century Russia, has been studied fairly fully, and the links between the master-artists of the Moscow School and Western art quite well investigated and explained, the art of Russian provincial artistic centres, in particular the cities of the Russian North, have not come under the attention of Russian and foreign investigators. An important part of this work is thus the consideration of the influence of the Western European Baroque style on seventeenth-century Russian art in all its fullness, both in the geographical sense (Moscow, Novgorod, Iaroslavl, Velikii Ustiug, Sol'vychegodsk, Vologda, etc) and in the sense of artistic genres, varieties of art and artistic crafts (icon-painting, portraits, mural decoration, various types of applied art). Naturally, only the art of those artistic centres and those varieties and genres are considered in which the stylistic influence of Western European Baroque art can be identified. For example, the fullest and clearest
Baroque influence in Russian decorative-applied art (jewellery, everyday and ecclesiastical utensils) is found in works from Moscow and Novgorod. The Baroque style in enamel work is found at its clearest in the art of the main centres where it was practised - Velikii Ustiug and Sol'vychegodsk. Seventeenth-century Russian mural decoration, on the other hand, demonstrates Baroque stylistic elements at their clearest in works from the Iaroslavl School. For the process of assimilation of the style and artistic principles of the Baroque in the late seventeenth century occurred in an extremely uneven fashion in the different regions of the country.

The only type of Russian seventeenth-century art which is not considered in this work is architecture. This is due to the full and multifaceted research into Russian architecture of the seventeenth century and its Baroque stylistic elements in the work of Lindsey Hughes, which scarcely needs amplification or elaboration [3]. The unavoidability of repetition, and the fact that this theme has been well worked, are the chief reasons that seventeenth-century Russian architecture is considered to be outside the scope of the present work.

One further methodological comment is necessary. When reading many works on the history of seventeenth-century Russian art (not only by Western, but also by Russian writers) one gains the impression that many artistic
ideas of the time are being reconstructed illegitimately, distorting the facts of everyday and artistic life in the seventeenth century. Many writers unconsciously apply modern-day aesthetic ideas to the art of that period. In studying the art of the transitional period from the Middle Ages to the Modern period it should be remembered that the medieval artistic consciousness, which reigned in Russian culture of the seventeenth century, did not in principle share the modern concept of beauty and of the artist himself. "The Middle Ages did not perceive the artist as he is perceived today, that is, as a person involved in the creation of works of art, which serve exclusively as the objects of artistic admiration"[4]. The lack of distinction between the artist and the craftsman which is maintained in this period is an important feature of seventeenth century Russian culture. In Russian art, the concept of beauty, an understanding of "that which has beauty" in a non-utilitarian sense, was only just beginning to free itself from the idea of "that which is blessed and sacred". Even the concept of the Russian state itself at this time is sometimes inadequately reconstructed by Western historians. Often, stereotypical ideas of Russia as a huge, powerful country with an enormous population, are transposed onto the Rus' of the seventeenth century. Incidentally, the population of many European countries was incomparably greater than that of the Russian state - from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean - in the seventeenth century. The
peripheral nature of Russian culture and politics in the seventeenth century corresponded to its peripheral demographics. At the end of the seventeenth century, Russia's population was approximately just 10.5 million; in comparison, France (whose territory was one thirtieth the size) had a population of 20.4 million, Italy - 13 million, Germany - 13.5 million [5]. Besides Moscow, which had a population of some 200,000 people, only a dozen or so of the settlements in Russia which carried the official title of "city" (gorod) in the seventeenth century had as many as 20,000-30,000 inhabitants [6]. This absence of large cities, and the fact that much of the country was in fact unpopulated, could not help but retard the development of art and crafts, since the development of professional ("high") art is, after all, directly linked to the development of an urban culture. In seventeenth century Russia processes of economic, political and cultural renewal occurred only in the relatively large cities. The artistic styles of these few (10-15) large Russian cities afterwards received the status of Russian artistic schools. An adequate portrayal of the actual social, demographic, political and cultural conditions in seventeenth century Russia - to put it simply, the following the historical truth - is a further, high priority aim of this work, and one that is essential if we are to have an adequate understanding of the peculiarities of Russian art of this period.
2. HISTORIOGRAPHY: THE EVOLUTION OF THE STYLISTIC CLASSIFICATION OF SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN ART

The Russian seventeenth-century Baroque is one of the most bitterly debated and least researched areas of Early Russian art. Even the term "Russian Baroque", to this very day, leads to argument and recrimination amongst researchers. Often the very existence of Baroque stylistic phenomena in Russian art of the late seventeenth century is called into question. Nor is there any agreement amongst historians of Russian art about the chronological boundaries of this artistic movement. The different varieties of Russian seventeenth-century art - painting, architecture, applied art - have also been identified with this style in different ways. For example, an acknowledgment of the presence of Baroque tendencies in Russian architecture of the last quarter of the seventeenth century has not always led to an acknowledgment of the presence of the same tendencies in painting. Nor is there any agreement amongst analysts of Russian art about the place and the significance of the Baroque in the artistic life of the Russian state of this period. Some consider the Baroque to be the main, dominant artistic style in Russian art of the late seventeenth century (eg A. Morozov [7], A. And'ev [8]; others suggest that the Baroque was simply one of the many artistic phenomena of this period (eg D. Likhachev [9], I. Golenishchev-Kutuzov) [10]. P.N. Berkov altogether
rejects the use of the term "Baroque" as applied to Russian art and literature of the seventeenth century [11]. And although the term "Baroque" was first applied to Russian architecture of the seventeenth century as early as the mid-nineteenth century (by I. Snegirev) [12], even a hundred years on there was the widespread belief amongst Russian art historians that "early Russian art does not fit within the boundaries of the range of classical Western European styles..."[13].

The argument about the presence of Baroque elements in Russian seventeenth century art flared up once again amongst the authors of the first serious works about the Russian Baroque, contained in the collection The Baroque in Russia (1926) [14]. Whilst V. Zguda wrote in his article about the presence of the Baroque style in Russian architecture as early as the mid-seventeenth century, and M. Alpatov and G. Khidkov identified clear traces of the Baroque in Russian painting from this period, A. Nekrasov and N. Brunov - other authors featured in this collection - disagreed with them, and refused to see traces of the Baroque in their descriptions of facets of Russian art. The view of the Russian Baroque for a long time dominating Soviet art history was that of F. Shmidt, who, in his work "Barokko kak istoricheskaia kategoriia", rejected the opinion that the Baroque style is found in seventeenth century Russian art [15].

Entering into a polemic with V. Zguda, Shmidt wrote that
the Baroque existed only in the "subconscious of the most advanced circles of artists in seventeenth-century Moscow"[16]. Shmidt considered the central stylistic elements of the Baroque to be "spaciousness" and "illusoriness" - elements which he did not find in Early Russian art. Olsuf'ev upheld practically the same opinion, maintaining that the concept of "the Baroque" and of "classicism" were applicable only to Russian art of the eighteenth century[17]. A.Nekrasov makes no mention of the presence of the Baroque in Russian art of the seventeenth century in his monograph Drevnerusskoe izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo[18]. The problem of the correlation of the style of Early Russian art to the styles found in Western European art was first returned to, after a long silence, in B.Mikhailovskii and B.Purishev's Ocherki istorii drevnerusskoi monumental'noi zhivopisi. Analysing the phenomenon of the "Moscow Baroque", they come to the conclusion that this style is far closer to the early European Renaissance style than to the Baroque style, and state that Russian seventeenth-century oil-painting represented a stage in the development of Russian art similar to that which, in Italian art, marked the early Renaissance between the end of the fourteenth and the mid-fifteenth centuries [19]. B.Vipper also disagrees with the use of the term "Baroque" as applied to Russian art of the seventeenth century. In his 1945 paper "Russkaia arkhitektura XVII veka i ee istoricheskoe mesto", later included in the
book *Arkhitektura russkogo barokko*, he states that "Russian seventeenth-century culture is not the culture of the Baroque, but the preceding developmental stage, the culture of what is known as mannerism" [20]. Neither does M. Alpatov apply the term "Baroque" to Russian art of the seventeenth century, in his book *Vseobshchaia istoriia iskusstv*, using exclusively the term "Naryshkin style" when describing Early Russian architecture of the end of the seventeenth century, and the term friaz' (Western European style) for fine and applied art [21].

The idea of the "Russian Baroque" was revived by D.S. Likhachev. In his book *Chelovek v literature Drevnei Rusi* he gives a detailed description of styles of Early Russian art: "Splendid examples of the style of the Russian Baroque can be found in architecture, applied art and in painting", he writes of late seventeenth-century Russian art, arguing that the Russian Baroque "assumed many of the functions of the Renaissance" [22]. Likhachev's idea of the Renaissance-like function of the Russian Baroque later (in the 1970s and '80s) became practically universally accepted amongst the vast majority of Russian experts on Early Russian art. Following Likhachev, A. Panchenko, an important figure in the study of Early Russian art, wrote that "All the countries of Europe had, sooner or later, to go through the Renaissance stage of development. It came to Rus''s turn, which was ordained to take on Renaissance ideas in
a Baroque guise" [23]. Later, Likhachev more than once defined more closely and expanded on his theory of the "Renaissance character of the Russian Baroque" [24]. Nevertheless, V.Lazarev, a major thinker on Early Russian and Western European art, did not agree with Likhachev, arguing that "the Renaissance" is not a stylistic concept, but a historical and geographical one, and, consequently, can only be applied to Italian art [25]. Other Russian art historians also became involved in the polemic which developed between Lazarev and Likhachev, many of whom linked the stylistics of Russian seventeenth-century art to analogous stylistic phenomena in Western European art. In particular, A.Rogov, M.Tikhomirov and G.Vagner wrote on this theme [26]. Incidentally, Western writers on Russian art as a rule never denied the influence of Western artistic styles, and in particular the Baroque, on the development of Russian art. Thus, the American historian Artur Voyce noted that "Russia, from its earliest history, was subject to the influence of Romance art (in Vladimir), the Italian Renaissance (the early buildings of the Moscow Kremlin) and the Italo-Germano-Polish Baroque..." [27]. There are no specialised Western studies of the Baroque in Russia, although there are a number of general studies of seventeenth-century Russian art in English.

Thus, weighing up the results of the history of the stylistic classification of Russian seventeenth-century...
art, three important points should be noted in the
evolution of the way its investigators related to the
Baroque in Russian art. It is quite clear that the use of
the term "the Russian Baroque" within the USSR was
affected by the political situation in the country. Over
the course of half a century, the ideas of isolationism
and autarky which found expression in the political
campaign against any foreign influence on the development
of Russian culture, did not allow objective research into
European links and influences in the history of Russian
culture. Another factor which influenced the complexity
of the stylistic evaluation of Russian art of the
seventeenth century was the lack of elaboration of the
very problem of the characteristics of the Russian
Baroque, the peculiarities of this national variant. For
this very reason, widely differing, often even
contradictory, terms - such as pre-classicism,
Renaissance, mannerism, realism, Baroque, pre-Renaissance
- were used to describe one and the same phenomenon in
late seventeenth-century Russian art. The above-mentioned
factors led G.Vagner to write of the "stylistic puzzle of
Russian art of the last third of the seventeenth century"
[28]. One further, significant obstacle in the scientific
exploration of the problem of the Russian Baroque was the
varying ways in which the term itself was understood, in
reference to artistic cultural phenomena. Russian art
historians often took the term "Baroque" as referring to
different stylistic and aesthetic phenomena. This
terminological muddle found its clearest expression in the polemic about the stylistic and philosophic-aesthetic peculiarities of the Baroque which was waged between A. Morozov and D. Likhachev [29]. The cause of the polemic was the statement by A. Morozov, a well-known Russian specialist in the culture of the Baroque, that "developing under the sign of rhetorical rationalism, the art of the Baroque gradually became secularised, and, in its last stages, not only began to come into line with Cartesian philosophy, but to actually merge with it" [30]. D. Likhachev hotly disputed this, denying in his reply to Morozov any link between the philosophy and aesthetic of the Baroque and the ideas of Descartes, which tended, in his opinion, towards Classical art. "The cult of reason is characteristic of Descartes," he wrote, "and opposed to the emotions, irrationality and 'disorder' of the Baroque" [31]. Indeed, the "metaphorical logic" of the Baroque aesthetic is scarcely compatible with rationalist Cartesian philosophy, for which mathematics were both image and method. It is thus difficult to agree with Morozov that classicism is a stylistic form of the Baroque. This obscurity in the aesthetic characteristic of Baroque culture, even for serious Russian analysts, was bound to have an impact on the study of the Russian variant of the Baroque style.

For this reason, an understanding of the aesthetic, philosophical and stylistic essence of the Baroque as an
artistic direction in European culture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and an examination of the peculiarities of its Russian variant, are essential prerequisites to an adequate understanding of Russian art of the seventeenth century.
3. EUROPEAN BAROQUE ART AND ITS SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN VARIANT

The Baroque is the most contradictory of the great styles in European art, and the least capable of being unambiguously defined. Its characteristics are difficult to classify. Essentially, the aesthetic, stylistics and world-philosophy of the Baroque can be considered as a wide range of oppositions: rationality versus irrationality, emotions versus spiritualism, asceticism versus hedonism, complexity versus simplicity, symbolism versus naturalism, tragedy versus buffoonery. Even the chronological location of this style, coming as it does between the Renaissance and Classicism, means that elements of both these styles are inevitably found in the Baroque. If one ignores the world-view, philosophical and ideological traits of the Baroque, and concentrates purely on its stylistic characteristics, then the most important of these can be classified as metaphor, dynamism, decorativeness, a formal overloading, allegory, grotesquerie, "emblematicism", and theatricality. Closely linked to these stylistic characteristics are the semantic and psychological effect of their use in art - essentially, as part of Baroque stylistics: exaltation, affectation, refinement, rhetoric, "polysematicism", exoticism, and, most importantly, paradox. It seems that the term "Baroque" was first used in the stylistic analysis of works of art (amongst Western European art
historians) by H. Woelflin. His definition of this concept is fairly broad and metaphorical. Woelflin identifies the characteristics of this style as including ecstasy, massiveness, and dynamism. He writes that "The Baroque is a search for the intimidating and overwhelming" [32].

If the Baroque is perceived as a reaction against the Renaissance, the artistic form of the Counter-Reformation movement, then one inevitably concludes that the Baroque contains stylistic elements from medieval art - hence its mysticism and spiritualism. But, at the same time, the structure of works of Baroque art tends towards its own, characteristic aesthetic of the "principle of wit", which finds its apogee in the theory of conceptism. On the basis of this, it is not difficult to conclude that the aesthetic of the Baroque tends towards "polystylistics" - more accurately, towards stylistic "polyphonicity". At the same time, all the elements of the Baroque style, all the various paradigms of the Baroque, are surprisingly formalised, and tend towards "formularity", "standardisation" and "aphoristicity". Of course, at the same time, all of this contrasts with the other quality of the Baroque aesthetic - its abstract "schematicism". Nevertheless, one must ask whether the Baroque indeed contains a dominant, transparent idea? A. Panchenko answers this question thus: "Perhaps this idea was the idea of movement..." [33]. He is clearly correct: dynamism,
changeability, stylistic and semantic mobility, and an "openness of form" are the main characteristics of Baroque art.

In order to understand the genesis of the Russian seventeenth-century Baroque, the unique character of its semantics and stylistics, it is essential to examine it in the socio-historical and socio-cultural context of the development of Russia at that time.

The seventeenth century was an important period in Russian history - an age which separated medieval Rus' from modern Russia. The culturally transitional nature of this period, and its position in history as a buffer and a border-point - where medieval ideological traditions collided with Renaissance influences - determined to a great extent the nature of Russian art of the seventeenth century. The century began with the so-called "Time of Troubles" - a period of severe state and dynastic crisis. The country was later shaken by prolonged wars and uprisings on the part of the peasants, city-dwellers and the streltsy, which were of a strength previously unseen in Russia. The strongest example of this popular unrest was the peasant war led by Stepan Razin (1670-1671). This century became known in Russian history as the "century of revolt" (buntashnyi vek). The late seventeenth century was the time of the formation in Russia of an absolute monarchy. "The zemskie sobory cease
to exist, the role of the boyar duma is reduced, and in 1682 the most important boyar institution, the code of precedence (mestnichestvo), is abolished. The transition from a monarchy with representation of the estates to absolutism was complete. This finds expression in the evolution of the systems of government, justice, and defence" [34].

The political and ecclesiastical reforms of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich (1629-1676) to a large extent prepared the country for the reforms of his son, Peter I (1672-1725). Division in the Church (1652), following the reforms of Patriarch Nikon (1605-1681), led to a theological and social battle of a violence that had never before been seen, between adherents of the traditional Russian forms, who found themselves opposed to the Government and the Church, and supporters of stronger absolutism and the new, Western cultural influences associated with it.

In the cities, the production of small goods developed rapidly, and a pan-Russian market grew up. The largest cities of the time - Moscow, Iaroslavl, Novgorod, Velikii Ustiug, Pskov - became major centres of craftsmanship, which was intimately connected with applied art. The social base of the consumer of "cultural items" widened; already, the consumers were not just the Tsar's court and the boyars, but also a growing artisan-trader class in the cities. "The social basis for the development of
secular cultural elements was the urban artisan-trader class; however, the actual vehicle of these elements, of course, representatives of various social groups and classes" [35].

An important political event, occurring in the reign of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, was the annexation by Russia of Eastern (levoberezhnyi) Ukraine, formerly part of Poland (1654). This event in no small degree led to growth in the strength of Western European cultural influences in the country. For the Baroque came to Russia basically via the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Poland. Baroque artistic ideas were promoted by authors such as Simeon Polotskii (1629-1680), Sil'vestr Medvedev (1641-1691), Karion Istomin (1640s-circa 1718), Andrei Belobotskii and others (educated in these formerly Polish provinces). With their help, new secular literary genres appeared in Russian in the seventeenth century, as well as syllabic poetry, dramaturgy, theatre, didactic and oratorical prose. Of course, the Baroque tendencies in artistic works by these authors, who were educated in the European (Polish) traditions, were of a fairly provincial character, and did not go beyond the limits of the aesthetic traditions of Scholastic Baroque; that is, they appeared not in a pure form, as, for example, with art of the "high Baroque", but in the form of eclectic didactic (pedagogical) systems of Scholastic rhetoric and poetics, which contained many elements of archaic
medieval scholasticism. Since the Baroque appeared in seventeenth-century Russia in this Scholastic variant, borrowed primarily from Polish-Ukrainian Jesuit Monastic schools, it appeared initially in Russian art not so much as an independent artistic trend, but rather in the form of literary genres, bound up with educational and morally didactic practices, such as panegyric poetry, dramaturgy and oratorical prose. This educational element in the initial stage of the development of the Russian Baroque was also caused by the fact that, as noted by D.S.Likhachev, "the Baroque in Russia took on the function of Renaissance" [36]. In another work, Likhachev expands this idea: "...Russia did not experience a proper Renaissance period. At the same time, the Baroque in the West neatly replaced the Renaissance, a fact which in many ways defined its traits. The Baroque in the West was a partial return to the Middle Ages. In Russia, however, the Baroque replaced the Middle Ages, and took on much of the function of the Renaissance. In Russia, it was linked with a secularisation of literature - the development of secular elements in it - and with education. Therefore, the purity of Western Baroque forms was lost when they were transferred into Russia. The Russian Baroque lapsed into decorativeness, its forms often became superficial, more florid. The tragic element in the Western Baroque was absent from its Russian variant; the Russian Baroque was full of joie de vivre. At the same time, the Baroque did not take in its grip
the whole of Russian art, as in the West, but was only one of the many artistic directions in Russia" [37].

It is clear from the above that, in comparison with Western Baroque art, the Russian Baroque was of a more superficial stylistic character, less deep and more eclectic, and that its hold over the actual practice of Russian art of the time was less total and more shallow. Thus, in comparison to the Western Baroque, the Russian Baroque was of a clearly provincial nature. "The Baroque culture of Russian syllabic poets is marked by clear signs of provincialism...Moscow poets preferred to avoid extremism, and to soften the Baroque rebelliousness and exaltation - partly because they had to take native traditions into account, which, in official and semi-official circles, were always moderate" [38].

A. Panchenko touches here on one of the most important aspects of the difference in content between the Russian and the Western European Baroque, which has to do with the differing social status of the artist in Russia and his counterpart in Western Europe in the Baroque period. This difference in status - and not just the difference in native artistic traditions, as is suggested by many Russian art historians - explains the "national" peculiarities of the Russian Baroque, such as its optimism, its greater joie de vivre when compared to the Western Baroque, its panegyric tone and its greater rationalism. The bearers of the "Baroque consciousness"
and Baroque artistic ideas in Russia were people who had the status of servants to the Tsar, dependent on the monarch in an almost slave-like fashion. In medieval Russia, which had no culture of chivalry, even the boyars were "slaves" of their sovereign (and, indeed, called themselves such). Western European artists in the seventeenth century (even those working in the courts of European monarchs) were immeasurably freer in their artistic and personal behaviour. For this reason, their art was more individualised, more psychological, and to a greater extent linked to their personal experience and the free expression of their will. The Renaissance concept of the prevalence of individual ideas over those of the patron was only just beginning to appear in the Russian artistic consciousness; Russian art was just beginning to discover the individual. For this very reason, the view of some Russian cultural historians that the seventeenth century was, as it were, a period of formation of secular culture is scarcely tenable. A far more satisfactory, and more justified, objective picture of the development of Russian culture in the seventeenth century is that suggested by S.Vaiigachev, who rejects "the idea that the specific gravity of secular elements in the spiritual life of seventeenth-century Russians grew in a logical, linear way, at the expense of formal religious elements; [I reject] the idea that secularisation was the basic, dominant element of the culturo-historical development of Russia in the
transitional period from the Middle Ages to the Modern period" [39]. Throughout the course of the seventeenth century, Russian art was of a clearly sacred character.

The artistic culture of Russia had always been closely linked with the peculiarities of its political culture. "One cannot fail to notice in this context that the unique position of the representatives of the Russian Baroque, as "slaves" of the Tsar - well provided-for, but entirely dependent on him - their strict duties of service and their ceremonial attitude (clearly this was purely official in the beginning, but, over the course of time, it became internal), did not in any way correspond to the typical attitude of many of the creators and adherents of the European (including the Polish) Baroque, attitudes such as "melancholy, mysticism and psychological introspection, spiritual duality, exaltation and emotional contrast" [40]. The differing subjective premises found in work from different artistic cultures explains to a large extent the typological differences between the Russian and the Western Baroque. This, incidentally, did not prevent Russian painters, architects and craftsmen from creating original and talented works of art.

The artistic and ideological moderation of the Russian Baroque -and the Slavonic Baroque in general - can be explained to a large extent by the socio-political
situation in which it arose. In contrast to the multi-layered Baroque of the West (consisting of "high", "middle" and "low" Baroque), the Russian seventeenth-century Baroque was courtly in character, being closely linked to the special features of court and feudal culture of the time. "The new culture had too narrow a social base, it engaged too small a circle of people, and scarcely touched the peasantry and other of the lower levels of society" [41]. The well-known Russian cultural historian, A.N. Robinson, maintains that the Russian Baroque was fundamentally conditioned by the peculiarities of the ceremonial aesthetics of the emerging Russian absolutism. Taking as an example his analysis of the official ceremonies, rites and rituals which developed at this time, and which affected practically all facets of court and societal life - in particular, the hunting ritual (or "chin") and Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's legal code (sobornoe ulozhenie) - Robinson shows that, in Russia, the concepts of "order and regulation" were linked with the idea of "beauty".36 He writes as follows: "...The aesthetics of order (uriazhenie), characteristic of Russian court activities, was quite close to those European aesthetic concepts which, a little earlier, had formed as part of the course of the Baroque" [43]. Thus, the metaphorical nature of Russian court ceremony, the minute detail of official rituals, which was turned in Russia into a great variety of "theatricalised", ceremonial activities, were related
to the aesthetic of the Baroque, and to a significant extent pre-determined not only the peculiarities of the Russian Baroque, but also the successful assimilation of Baroque style into traditional Russian medieval culture. "Scholastic Baroque could be accepted in Russia mainly because it was a very useful means of expressing the ideology of the emerging absolutism" [44]. The ideology of the new Russian absolutism needed an artistic formulation, which was borrowed by courtly feudal circles from Catholic Poland, whose art was linked in turn to Western European artistic culture. The Polish Baroque, both directly and via its Ukrainian and Byelorussian versions, had a decisive influence on the development and establishment of the Russian Baroque. The role of Polish culture in the development of Russian art of the late seventeenth century is often underestimated by researchers; its influence was both deep and all-encompassing. It is sufficient to note that, in the late seventeenth century, Polish was colloquial language of the Russian court and the educated part of society. The Polish language exerted an enormous influence on the development of the Russian literary language of the time; the role of the Polish language in the court of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich is comparable only with the role of French in the "Petersburg period" of early nineteenth century Russian culture. It was this Polish influence which facilitated the adoption of Baroque tendencies from other European national cultures - those of Germany,
Holland and Italy - by Russian art of the seventeenth century. But the Russian Baroque was in no way a copy of the Polish Baroque, neither stylistically, nor ideologically. The Polish cultural influence was adapted and altered to fit in with local artistic traditions. The main difference between the Polish and the Russian Baroque, in terms of their content (ie their style), has to do with the Russian Baroque's divergence from the characteristic Polish religious and mystic spirit, and the noticeable secularisation of its artistic system. In contrast to the Polish Baroque, the Russian variant was not so closely bound up with a system of theological ideas and metaphysical concepts. This secular aspect of the Russian Baroque is linked with its educational character, and with the fact that the Baroque in Russia took on many of the functions of the Renaissance, whilst the Baroque in Poland was an organic part of the Counter-reformation and was hence, to a great extent, a return to medieval ideas, and, artistically, an attempt to resurrect the Gothic aesthetic ideal. These secular tendencies in the Russian Baroque appeared clearly in the "Naryshkin style" of Moscow architecture, and in the use of naive, realistic elements and of landscapes in icon and wall-paintings. One of the "Trojan horses" of the European (ie Polish) Baroque in Russia was the appearance in the second quarter of the seventeenth century of the parsuna, related to the Ukrainian-Belorussian and Polish Sarmatian portrait. It should not be forgotten, or
course, that, despite the clear marks of the Baroque style in Russian art of the seventeenth century, artistic processes were also taking place that were in no way linked to the Baroque aesthetic and the continuing artistic traditions of the Middle Ages. Moreover, one of the most important methodological problems in the analysis of Russian art of the late seventeenth century remains to this day the problem of distinguishing and differentiating between Renaissance and Baroque tendencies and stylistic elements, since the two are closely interwoven and interconnected in Russian art from this period. The difficulty of differentiating between the two has also to do with the fact that, as correctly pointed out by D.S.Likhachev, "the role of Baroque elements, motifs and works in Russia was not essentially a Baroque one, and this is the main feature of the individuality of Russian seventeenth-century Baroque" [45].

A further problem which has not been finally solved by analysts of the Russian Baroque is its degree of originality; is the Russian Baroque a borrowed phenomenon, or one that sprung from the heart of native culture? One rarely encounters writers today who, like N.Voronin, consider the very idea of the Russian seventeenth-century Baroque to be far-fetched, arising from some "formalistic study of art" (existing only in the imagination of a particular art critic) [46]. More
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often, adherents of the idea of the native origins of the Russian Baroque draw attention to the existence of pure Russian and of borrowed elements in Russian seventeenth-century art. Sometimes one also encounters the theory that two Baroque styles existed in Russia: a native Baroque style, and one borrowed from Polish-Ukrainian sources. This view is taken, in particular, by the Czech historian of Russian culture, S. Matkhauzerova [47]. In a polemic with her, D. Likhachev finds logical defects in such theories: "if its [Russia's] own Baroque style was fairly well developed, then it would have no need of an alien one" [48]. In Likhachev's opinion, the Baroque style was borrowed by Russian art precisely because Baroque stylistic elements were not developing within itself. "There was only one Baroque style", he writes, "- borrowed, and at the same time, native. In seventeenth-century Russia, there was no, and could be no, spontaneously arising Baroque style, for there had been no preparatory stage - no Renaissance" [49]. It is this view of the origins of the Russian Baroque that seems to be truest to the reality of the historical and artistic processes which took place in Russia in the seventeenth century.
4. ARTISTIC SOURCES OF THE RUSSIAN BAROQUE

The "borrowed" nature of the Russian Baroque does not lessen the extent to which it is organic to Russian art of the late seventeenth century. The fact that Russian artists and writers turned to the Western art of the time was in no way due to fashion or a taste for the exotic. The reason they turned to Western art is to be found, first and foremost, in the social and spiritual prerequisites of the development of Russian culture, combined with the crisis in their medieval world-philosophy. Whereas, in the West, the Baroque was a reaction against the Renaissance, an attempt by the cultural Counter-reformation to resurrect the medieval aesthetic ideal, in seventeenth-century Russia, the acceptance of ideological and stylistic aspects of the Baroque was to a significant extent facilitated by Russia's living, active connection to the artistic tradition of the Middle Ages. This "ideological and stylistic compromise" in the Baroque world-philosophy (a yoking together of the artistic ideals of the Renaissance and those of the Middle Ages) softened the individualism of the Renaissance philosophy of life, which was extraordinarily radical for contemporary Russia. One could say that the Baroque itself was the "Trojan horse" of Renaissance world-philosophy, which infiltrated Russian art of the seventeenth century. If the Renaissance had been presented in a form "unsoftened" by
medieval artistic ideas, it could scarcely have been assimilated by Russian art of the time (however much Russia's medieval world-philosophy was in crisis).

The influence of Western Baroque art on Russian culture of the seventeenth century proceeded in both a direct and an indirect fashion. The direct influence of the Western Baroque can be seen in the appearance in Russia of examples of Western Baroque art, and of the bearers of the style themselves - artists, authors, architects. The indirect influence operated on two levels. First, Ukrainian and Byelorussian art was subject to Western aesthetic influence - due, first and foremost, to their closeness to Polish culture; polonised Ukrainian and Byelorussian art in turn influenced Russia art. Characteristically, the polonised Ukrainian influence preceded the direct influence of Polish art on the evolution of the style and genres of Russian art at this time. It cannot be disputed that the Ukrainian-Byelorussian influence to a significant extent prepared the way for the expansion of Polish culture in the westernmost regions of the Russian state. But, however important Polish culture was as the means of transmission of Western Baroque influence into seventeenth-century Russia, it was just one of many sources, many channels of Western European artistic expansion.
Typically, examples of both high and low Baroque style appeared in Russia at the same time, and gained popularity there concurrently. Alongside examples of oil-painting, engravings and collections of emblems, Western (ie German, Dutch, Polish, French) popular prints also gained wide circulation in Moscow. N.Snegirev writes as follows: "The German 'printed entertainment sheets' which appeared in Moscow in the mid-seventeenth century - humorous pictures which were sold along with printed books, manuscripts, writing paper, molotkovy and simple maps at the Ovoshchnyi riad market...These German entertainment sheets were undoubtedly reworked in Russia in particular, unique forms; they were redrawn in the Russian style, or, reproduced as popular prints using analogous scenes from Russian life; often traces of native superstitions and customs were put into a foreign framework, or sometimes scenes from German life were clothed in Russian forms and vice versa" [50]. But it was not only popular art which facilitated the spread of the ideas of the low Baroque; the leading artistic centre of Russia at this time, the Armoury (Oruzheinaia palata), became the breeding ground for Western Baroque artistic ideas. "Master-artists from abroad were also employed in the Armoury. Each of them enriched the practice of the Armoury with the artistic experience which he had acquired in his native country. From 1643 onwards, the Dutch master Hans Deterson worked there, followed by the member of the Polish szlachta, Stefan Loputskii, in 1655."
In the 1660's, the Greek Aloston Iur'ev worked in the Armoury; in 1667, the Armenian Ivan Saltanov and the Dutchman Daniil Wuchters arrived, joined in 1670 by the "master of the perspective style", Peter Engels. Over the many years of collaborative work with Russian masters, the majority of the foreign master-artists became so closely linked with them that works by these visiting artists becomes an integral part of the history of Russian painting in the seventeenth century" [51].

It is indisputable that the foreign artists who worked in the Armoury had a decisive influence on the stylistic transformation of Russian painting in the late seventeenth century. "At the end of the seventeenth century, a school of sorts was formed out of the apprentices there, who transferred the Western pictorial style even into icon-painting and ecclesiastical oil-painting" [52]. Moreover, A.B.Sterligov is undoubtedly correct when he writes that "alongside the new technique, there appeared in Russia the highly developed system of artistic devices which the foreigners taught their Russian assistants, and European artistic tastes characteristic of the Baroque, and, from the second quarter of the seventeenth century onwards, the Rococo. Russian culture was being drawn into the pan-European process of stylistic development" [53].

Around the same time, the genre of the secular (private)
portrait, new to Russian art, was rapidly developing. However, the portrait is clearly oriented towards the style and tradition of the Polish Sarmatian portrait. "We would maintain that this was not an internal analogy, but a direct transplantation from Poland of a characteristic type of image, conception of form, and means of presenting it" [54].

New Western tastes appear not only in Russian urban life, but also in the artisan (posadskaia) culture of the seventeenth century, in the form of the "Latin books with pictures", Western engravings and views, and other similar items of amusement favoured by the Russian enlightened masses. Western artistic tastes reached the Tsar's court; Western European pictures and engravings decorated the rooms of the Tsar's palace in Moscow. I.Zabelin, describing the internal decoration of these rooms, notes that the walls "were not decorated with paintings, but rather with pictures, foreign printed sheets, framed engravings..."[55]. He goes on to say that, in 1694, the Armoury artist Ivan Saltanov, with his apprentices, painted 23 battle scenes for Tsar Peter, "basing them on German pictures", and in 1697, a further eight pictures of naval battles were painted, "based on German pictures from overseas and foreign (friazhskie) printed sheets" [56].

The Tsar's library contained books on architecture
printed in the West, illustrated with descriptions of Western European cities and collections of etchings. Apart from the social and spiritual changes taking place in the country and in the fashions at court, the dispersion of the Western European artistic style in Russian art of the seventeenth century was also influenced by one further (more prosaic, and rarely considered) reason, to which I.A. Bondarenko draws attention: as the Russian economy flourished in the seventeenth century, a universal demand arose for higher quality works of art - "the growth in popularity of Western European items can be explained in part by the growth in the demand for quality, exactitude and subtlety of drawing in the subjects of wall-paintings, interior decoration, and engraved or embroidered design" [57].

But perhaps the main source of "Baroque ideas" in Russia in the seventeenth century were the collections of emblems. These compendia were an inexhaustible source of artistic motifs and stylistic ideas for the Russian master-artists of the time. And if one considers that the emblem was the genre in which the ideological and artistic tendencies of the Baroque were at their most concentrated, clearest, and most aphoristic, then it is difficult to overestimate the role of the emblem in the establishment of the Russian Baroque. Andrea Alciati's Emblematica, for example, was widely distributed, and was perhaps the most popular compendium of emblems in Europe
at the time. A copy of Alciati's compendium was found, significantly, in Sil'vestr Medvedev's library [58]. Compendia of emblems were also found in the libraries of Feofan Prokopovich (1681-1736), Stefan Iavorskii (1658-1722), and Epifanii Slavinetskii (?-beginning of 18th-century); practically all the major figures in Russian art of the time culled artistic ideas and decorative motifs from these Western collections of emblems.

Not only compendia of emblems, but also collections of etchings published in the West proved an inexhaustible source of subjects and stylistic devices for Russian seventeenth-century artists. What is known as the Piskator Bible played a particular role in this respect; this is a collection of 277 etchings on biblical themes by European artists, published in Holland in the mid-seventeenth century, and named for its author, Johannes Piskator (1586-1652). The first edition of Piskator's Theatrum Biblicum was printed in Amsterdam in 1650, but there were many later reprints. The Piskator Bible was a collection of 277 etchings on themes from the Old and New Testaments, the Acts of the Apostles and Revelation. Copies of this work have since been found in many artistic centres of seventeenth century Russia. Thus, one was found in Vologda, and another was acquired for Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich (1661-1682) in 1677 by one of the Armoury artists, Ivan Bezmin. It is interesting to note that when the Piskator Bible appeared in Russia, it in
fact no longer represented the contemporary state of European painting. Russian artists, who became familiar with it at the end of the seventeenth century, in fact saw before them examples of work by Dutch and Flemish artists of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. This means that Russian painters from the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were in fact familiarising themselves with the artistic style of the Italian Renaissance, in the transfigured form it acquired in the hands of Dutch and Flemish artists.

A typical example of the way the Piskator Bible inspired Russian painters of the late seventeenth century can be seen in the wall-paintings of the Church of Elijah the Prophet in Iaroslavl (1680). Practically all the subjects and compositions found in the wall-paintings - albeit in a fairly reworked version - were borrowed by the artists from this Dutch collection of engravings.

Original Russian Baroque characteristics appeared clearly in the architecture of new buildings in Moscow and some other cities at the end of the seventeenth century, and particularly in cathedral architecture. The first Russian churches with signs of the Baroque aesthetic are from the early 1680's. L. Hughes cites four possible sources for the Baroque influence on Russian architecture of this time: "the work of foreign architects and craftsmen in
Russia, journeys abroad by Russian master-builders and patrons of architecture, the architecture of the Moscow Foreign Settlement and Western European architectural treatises, pattern books and engravings" [59].

Evidently, the most reliable, and most widespread, source of Western Baroque influence was, nonetheless, Western architectural treatises, illustrated books and engravings. A typical example of the use of Western sketches and books in the building of Russian churches in the seventeenth century can be seen in the New Jerusalem Cathedral (1650s-1684), near Moscow, which was highly influential in the subsequent development of Russian architecture in the seventeenth century. The builders of this cathedral used Bernardino Amico's book, which contains descriptions and sketches of the churches and cathedrals of the Holy Land, and, in particular, of the twelfth-century church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem which serves as the prototype for the New Jerusalem Cathedral. Amongst the builders of the Cathedral, who devised the decorative details of its architecture, were Byelorussian master-builders. "In their sketches they also used Western European illustrated books, which were later...taken to the Armoury, and served the same purpose in the decoration of the Kolomenskoe palace" [60]. Byelorussian master-builders were, as a rule, familiar with Western European Baroque ornamentation, and actively encouraged the wide use of Baroque decorative devices,
known in the seventeenth century as "Byelorussian carving (rez')". "...In seventeenth-century Russian architecture, from the 1620's and 30's onwards, one sees ever more clearly close and consistent similarities with the Western style, with the pan-European stylistic evolution..."[61].

Russian decorative-applied art of the late seventeenth century was also stamped with the impression of the Western European Baroque. Here, too, the sources of Baroque motifs and stylistically defining features were, besides examples of Western applied art, reproductions of Western oil-paintings and etchings, as well as compendia of emblems and allegories. Sometimes Russian master-artists even went as far as using foreign coats of arms in the decoration of their gold and silver items (eg the GIM's late seventeenth-century silver charka from the Velikii Ustiug School, with an English coat-of-arms in the inside centre (mishen'). "The Piskator Bible captured the attention of the master gold and silver craftsmen....Their familiarity with it explains, to a important extent, the appearance on silver objects of new figure and subject compositions. Sometimes one finds single figures in the scenes on silver vessels copied from the pages of the Bible (for example, on the plate by M.V.Volkonskii, decorated with engraved episodes from the story of King David)" [62].
One further interesting nuance, to which Lindsey Hughes has perceptively drawn attention, concerns the way that seventeenth-century art borrowed Western artistic ideas. These borrowings were purely visual, and not intellectual. "There is no evidence that seventeenth-century Russian builders grasped the theoretical implications of the classical order system, still less the philosophical or mathematical aspects of Renaissance architecture, nor, indeed, is there much likelihood that they would have been able to read texts and captions in foreign languages. It is necessary to think in terms of the Russian craftsman deriving visual, rather than intellectual stimulation from the books and drawings that may have fallen into his hands..." [63]. At the same time, the "formularity" of style-determining and decorative motifs in art of the Baroque was considerably facilitated by the assimilation by Russian master-artists of Western examples. It is precisely this quality of Baroque art which makes its Russian variant part of the European style. However, the native originality of the Russian Baroque shines unswervingly through the universal aesthetic of European Baroque culture.
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II THE BAROQUE IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN PAINTING
1. SOCIAL BACKGROUND TO THE CHANGES IN TRADITIONAL PAINTING

Contradictions in the social and spiritual situation in late seventeenth-century Russia conditioned the contradictory nature of Russian painting in this period. This contradictory nature was partly connected with the opposition of two of its basic trends: that of the court, and that of the Church. Court art, which had to serve the interests of ever increasing Russian absolutism, and decorate the everyday life of the Russian monarch and the Russian aristocracy, was less conservative than ecclesiastical art, which tended towards the iconographic canon and religious dogmatics concerning art. Whereas court circles were open to the influence of Western art, tending towards a secular and realistic conception of art, ecclesiastical art fiercely opposed any deviation from tradition, fighting the appearance of Western realistic motifs in icon-painting and mural painting. Of course, the division of Russian art into court and ecclesiastical varieties is rather arbitrary. Court art also continued to use the traditional artistic language of icon-painting, but the demand for parsuna portraits of the Tsar and the boyars, for family-trees, and for palatial wall-paintings, forced Russian painters to seek out new technical and decorative devices. In this, the ideology of the Russian autocracy often suppressed the demands of the religious canon.
A significant peculiarity of seventeenth-century Russian art—a peculiarity whose consequences can perhaps be seen in Russian art till recent time—was its official, state character. In contrast to the West, art in Russia in the main formed part of the official state ideology. The development of seventeenth-century Russian art was regulated by the Tsar's decrees, the decisions of church synods, and the orders of the Patriarch. The Tsar's edict of 1669, for example, demanded that Russian artists maintained the traditional canon in their work. Also, the church synod of 1667 devised a precise typology of themes and iconography for painting, which artists were forbidden to alter. The above processes slowed down the transition of Russian painting from a medieval artistic way of thinking to the art of the Modern period, and delayed the assimilation of the experience of European art. This contradiction between the dogmas of the official, orthodox, autocratic ideology and the demands of the development of art itself, the assimilation of new genres, became particularly sharp in the mid-seventeenth century. By this time, Russian artists were already beginning to feel the strong influence of European Baroque and Renaissance art. Despite strong opposition from official circles they began, by degrees, to study and imitate Western artistic techniques, and, first and foremost, to master straight-line perspective.

Traditional Russian painting—icon-painting—was always
sacred, and closely linked with the state religion and official ideology. Therefore, purely artistic problems, questions of pictorial techniques, style and aesthetic influences, took on a political and doctrinal character in mid-seventeenth-century Russia. Controversy over the new style of painting was so stormy and passionate that not only were the Tsar and the Church drawn into the arguments, but also a wide section of Russian society. In Moscow, there were sharp conflicts between the proponents and opponents of the new style of painting. Patriarch Nikon (1605-1681) dealt severely with icons which, in his opinion, deviated from the traditional stylistic canon. In 1654, he ordered that all icons be collected, from private houses and state departments, which "some Moscow icon-painters have based on French and Polish pictures"[1]. Patriarch Nikon ordered that eyes of the saints depicted in these icons be put out, and the icons themselves smashed to pieces. It was announced that icon-painters who imitated Western European artists would be punished. The people of Moscow were greatly distressed, accusing the Patriarch of blasphemy, and threatening to take the law into their own hands in dealing with him. Fearing retribution from God, the people rose up. Thus, in 1654, the celebrated "Icon Revolt" took place in Moscow. This struggle for the purity of artistic style in icon-painting necessitated not only extraordinary police measures, but also a stream of governmental decrees and deeds on the condition of the art of icon-painting. The
Tsar and the Church vied with one another to teach artists their trade, and explain to them how to paint icons properly. It was in these circumstances that the first Russian theoretical treatise on art was written, by the major figure in seventeenth-century Russian icon-painting, Simon Ushakov (1626-1686), entitled "Words to the Admiring of Icon-painting" (Slovo k liubotshchatel'nomu ikonnogopismaniu) (1666) [2].

Consciously or not, Ushakov essentially develops the Aristotelian theory of mimesis in this treatise - the idea of art as the reflection of nature. "In icon-painting, the artist is God," he writes. He compares painting with a mirror, in which objects "draw their own image" [3].

This first theory of Russian art was born into a situation where Russia was being gripped by a violent battle of ideas, between the proponents and opponents of the ecclesiastical reforms of Patriarch Nikon, which had led to a division in the Church and the nation. The spiritual leader of the Old Believers, Archpriest Avvakum (1620/21-1682), also became involved in the polemic about the new style of painting; one of the sections of his "Book of Conversations" is dedicated to icon-painting [4]. Avvakum was a fierce opponent of innovation in icon-painting, linking it to the growing influence of Western art. Rounding on the pro-Western, realistic tendencies in icon-painting, Avvakum writes as follows:
That mad dog, our enemy Nikon, invented this life-like way of painting, of doing everything in a Western, that is a foreign, way. This is how these Westerners paint the image of the Annunciation to the Blessed Virgin..." [5]. Thus, the new trends in Russian painting met with violent opposition on the part of the State and the Church, provoking a fierce political and ideological battle.

In the mid-seventeenth century, Russia was undergoing a stormy process of transition; the ground was being prepared for the emancipation of artistic individuality from collective societal consciousness, for the acceptance of the new aesthetic ideas which came with Western art.

2. THE EVOLUTION OF ICON-PAINTING

If, as D.S.Likhachev states, the Baroque in seventeenth-century Russia took on the function of the Renaissance, then its influence on Russian seventeenth-century icon-painting should also contain both spiritual and psychological elements of the semantics of Renaissance art. First and foremost, this meant a rethinking of the meaning of icons. Traditional Russian artistic consciousness in the seventeenth century regarded the icon as a sacred object, a sort of totem, in which, it would seem, even secondary elements (such as the shape of
the icon, or its frame) bore a mystical significance. The slightest change in the icon or the iconographic canon was considered sacrilege. The icon was never considered as work of art. Therefore, any violation of the traditional iconographic canon was considered an insult to the divine order. It was for this reason that the influence of the so-called "foreign style of painting" (friazhskoe pis'mo) - that is, Western European painting - on the foremost Russian icon-painters of the 1660's and '70's, such as S. Ushakov, I. Vladimirov, F. Zubov, G. Zinov'ev and T. Filat'ev, was so revolutionary. From the mid-seventeenth century the Russian school of icon-painting began to move slowly away from the traditional Early Russian style. The major obstacle preventing icon-painting from totally accepting classical Renaissance artistic principles was the absence in Russian icon-painting of a tradition of purely aesthetic evaluative criteria for the icon, since it had never been considered as an original work, stemming from the imagination of artist, but rather as simply the anonymous reproduction of some "divine prototype". The treatises of Ushakov and Vladimirov were the first and still somewhat tentative attempts to correlate the icon content with the reality of surrounding life and nature. These artistic ideas, of a rather compromise nature, yet relating traditional links, of the two leading Russian icon painters, seemed at that time extremely revolutionary, for they introduced fresh criteria for evaluating icon painting mastery,
reducing the sacred significance of the icon and bringing it close to a work of art. This was the most important result of Russian icon-painters' familiarity with contemporary European art. Of course, one must not overestimate this influence; it was much less noticeable in icon-painting than in other genres of Russian painting of this time (for example, the parsuna), and there was a certain lack of correlation between theory and practice, even amongst the innovative Russian icon-painters. Therefore it is more accurate to speak of tendencies in the direction of realism in seventeenth-century Russian icon-painting, of the attempts of Russian icon-painters to convey the external phenomenon of physical beauty, and of the change of emphasis in the interpretation of the icon image, from a spiritual, to an emotional and physical one. "Naturally, following this approach to art, traditional devices in icon-painting became less and less satisfactory for the artistic innovators, and were gradually replaced with more realistic devices. This soon led to the icon losing by degrees those elements of religious and mystical symbolism which are essential and natural to every cult object. The icon gradually became simply a traditional background, onto which artistic principles were applied which were quite alien to the nature of icon-painting, and which essentially negated the existence of the icon itself. Of course, this contradictory situation could not survive for long. Over the course of the second half of the seventeenth century
a natural, although quite slow, process takes place of the "icon-painter" (ikonopisets) becoming an "oil-painter" (zhivopisets), and of icon-painting becoming oil-painting" [6].

Here, too, one of the fundamental problems of the history of Russian icon-painting arises: the problem of adequate evaluating the quality of Early Russian icons. It is indisputable that seventeenth-century Russian icon-painting, in acquiring the characteristics of oil-painting, gradually lost its emotional richness and the high degree of spirituality found in examples from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as it stressed the external details of the life of the saint and the decorative aspect of the icon subject; in the icons, the figures of saints are marked by their elegant proportions, their clothes are covered with refined designs, the figures are placed against backgrounds of seemingly three-dimensional landscapes, and the paint colours are also refined. Several icons by Simon Ushakov (1626-1686), from his later work, are outstanding examples of this "decorative style". such as the icons "Only Begotten Son of the Father" (GTG), and "Our Father" (GRM) from the church of Grigorii Neokesariiiskii in Moscow. Even more decorative are the icons of Nikita Pavlovets (?-1677/78), for example, "The Blessed Virgin of the Closed Garden" (Vertograd Zakliuchennyi) (c.1670), {ill.1}, "The Miracle of Saint George and the Dragon and
One of the masterpieces of Russian seventeenth-century icon-painting is the icon by an unknown master "Uar voin i Artemii Verkol'skii" or the border on the icon by Fyodor Zubov "Saviour Unmade by Hands" (Spas Nerukotvornyi) (1679). The domination of external decoration often becomes absurd, preventing the artistic content of the icon from being seen. Many icons began to be covered by basma decoration and gold and silver covers, which reveal only the faces of the saints. This makes many seventeenth-century icons examples of a certain type of gold and silver item, the value of which can be measured by the amount of gold and precious stones which are contained in its framework. Of course, this movement away from the ascetic spirituality of fourteenth and fifteenth-century icons, and towards decorative magnificence and refined pomposity, carries the hallmark of the pure Baroque aesthetic. Even in those icons which seem, at first glance, to be far removed from the Baroque aesthetic, such as icons in the "Stroganov" style of painting (from the end of the sixteenth-early seventeenth century, painted in Sol'vychegodsk in the workshops of the well-known merchants and patrons of the arts, the Stroganov brothers), one can already feel the mediated influence of realistic Western oil-painting. The main stylistic characteristics of Stroganov school icons are the miniaturistic filigree style, overloaded with finely painted details, and marked by ceremonial elegance and a
rather mannered arrangement of the figures. Of significant influence on the development of Russian icon-painting in the seventeenth century, these icons were a sign of the clear stylistic movement of Russian painting of this time in the direction of the parsuna. In works in the "Stroganov style" one already feels the desire of the artist to break away from the contemplative spirituality of Early Russian painting, and endow the icon with elements of real life and of the portrait.

If one bases the evaluation of seventeenth-century Russian icon-painting on the aesthetic canons of Early Russian painting, from the period of its flourishing, then the above-mentioned processes represent a certain degeneration of the art, a lowering of its artistic quality. On the other hand, the "painterly method" of Simon Ushakov and the artists of his circle, as well as the Baroque decorative elements which appeared in Russian icons of the seventeenth century, brought Russian icon-painters as a whole into the tradition of European artistic culture. "...The innovators tried to cross over to aesthetic criteria for evaluating the icon. In trying first and foremost to make the icon beautiful, they replaced the concept of "divinity" with the concept of "beauty" [7]. But one should not overestimate the importance of secular decorative elements in Russian icon-painting of the seventeenth century - as a whole, icon-painting remained a purely religious, ecclesiastical
art-form, with a strong element of medieval artistic thinking. But then, the Baroque in Western Europe also developed partly as a revival of elements of the medieval artistic conscience in Renaissance culture. It is perhaps for this very reason that the introduction of Baroque decorative and ornamental elements into Russian icon-painting is relatively organic - icon-painting being close to the Baroque aesthetic in terms of its mysticism, its spiritualism (in the content of the icon), and the immanent exalted nature of the icon image. One can trace the progress of Baroque metaphor, formal over-loading, allegory, and artistic rhetoric, as they seep little by little into Russian icon-painting in the late seventeenth century.

Already in the border subjects (kleimy) of the "Annunciation with Prayers" icon by Iakov Kazanet, Gavril Kondrat'ev and Simon Ushakov, from the church of the Trinity in Nikitniki in Moscow (1659), one sees an abundant use of Baroque architectural ornamentation. The overloaded, multi-figured composition of the border is also full of theatricality and tending towards artistic rhetoric. The same can be said of the "Trinity with scenes from life" icon from the same Moscow church, by an unknown artist from the Tsar's Icon-painters school. Here, too, the artist's predilection for metaphor, minute detail, and excessive overloading with ornamentation is evident.
One of the best icons by Simon Ushakov - without doubt the leading figure in seventeenth-century Russian icon-paining - is the "Saviour Unmade by Hands" (Spas nerukotvornyj) from the Trinity-St. Sergius monastery in Sergiev-Posad (1673); it is distinguished by clear elements of mystical exaltedness, underlining the deviation of the artist from the abstract convention of the iconographic canon of the past, and creating, with the help of chiaroscuro modelling, a corporeal image of a living human being [8], {ill.2}. The Moscow school icon "The bearing of the cross", from the Church of the Presentation in the Temple in Barashi in Moscow, is also fully Baroque in all respects {ill.3}. The mystical affectedness of the figure of Christ imprinted on the icon is combined with purely decorative Baroque stylistic elements in the clothes of the soldiers.

Characteristically, this icon is painted under the clear influence of European oil-painting, the artist using chiaroscuro modelling widely, and attempting to create straight-line perspective.

Clear traces of Dutch landscape painting and the "allegorical" Baroque landscape can be seen in the backdrops found in icons by Tikhon Filat'ev, who worked in the Armoury in Moscow from 1678 onwards. Typical, in this respect, are his icons "John the Baptist in the wilderness" (1689, GTG) and "John the Theologian" (1691,
Amongst late seventeenth-century icons one also finds direct compositional borrowings from Western European sources, stylistically linked with the Baroque. Thus, the compositions of the series of icons by Iosif Vladimirov which form the Festal Row of the iconostasis in the south end of the Church of the Trinity in Nikitniki (1660's) is practically "copied" from etchings contained in the Piskator Bible. The purely Baroque character of the architectural side-scenes found in these icons should also be noted [9].

The combination of mystical exaltedness and allegory with realistic tendencies and a secular treatment of landscape and human figures in late seventeenth-century Russian icon-painting is explained to a large degree by the enlightened nature of Russian painting, and the Renaissance function of the Russian Baroque. Until the appearance of secular painting in Russia, icon-painting had to fulfil secular painting's role in the evolution of the Russian artistic conscience in this critical period in its development at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
The late seventeenth century saw a gradual movement in Russian painting away from traditional Early Russian icon-painting. This movement occurred due, to a large extent, to the influence of Western European art.

"Contacts with the West are reflected in aesthetic tastes. In the Tsar's circle, there is a flourishing of the fashion of foreign artistic objects - utensils, clothes, carriages...Under Fyodor Alekseevich, in the words of one contemporary, "Polish-style etiquette" was introduced. The passion for the portrait also begins. Western ambassadors brought pictures of their monarchs as gifts for the Tsar, Russian envoys had their portraits painted in Warsaw, Paris and Venice. A still small number of Boyars (such as V.V.Golitsyn and Artamon Matveev) had the "personae" (ie portraits) of foreign sovereigns hanging in their chambers" [10].

Whilst the chief characteristic of Early Russian painting is its close links with sacred art and religious problematics, from the 1660's a firm interest in human personalities and secular artistic genres - above all, the portrait - appears. Evidently, the gravitation of Russian painting towards the portrait in particular is explained, to a certain extent, by the fact that the genre of the icon was itself basically a type of canonised image of the saint's face. It is with the...
parsuna, the genre of the portrait, that the appearance in Russia of easel painting (in oils) is connected. It is typical that the transition from the icon to the parsuna in Russian art occurred extremely slowly and with great difficulty. The secularisation of the icon image and the tendency towards realism were accompanied by the "sacralisation" of the image of the actually living person - the Tsar, the aristocratic boyar, the church.

Secular painting continues for several decades to use devices taken from sacred art. "A heterogeneity, a mixture of styles and the absence of any solid style of depiction or solid artistic tradition can be felt in seventeenth-century Russian parsuny. Technical devices drawn from icon-painting and oil-painting are artificially combined in them, not fused into a unified whole" [11]. This can be explained first and foremost by the fact that, for centuries in Russia no living object or person could be portrayed in an artistic work without its being sacredly and formally transformed. The realistic image did not have the right to exist in art, which was always considered to belong to a higher, spiritual plane. From the point of view of Early Russian poetics, all images had to be "animated" (ie given a soul) and "ennobled". The earliest Russian parsuny, for example the portraits of voevoda Prince Skopin-Shuiskii (GTG) and Tsar Fyodor Ioannovich (GIM), show the workings of this 'artistic law' of Early Russian painting particularly clearly. They clearly bear the stamp of
aesthetic and technical duality. Both portraits are painted according to the techniques of icon-painting, in egg-tempera on wood boards, with the typical icon indentation (kovcheq). At the same time, both these 'icon portraits' border on being secular portraits, almost passing the point where they leave the sphere of sacred, religious art. "Painted on lime boards, with raised borders, with the typical icon treatment of 'vokhrenie' (karnatsiia), they appear to us more as 'images of the time', than as portraits. In these attempts to depict 'secular' people who actually existed, undertaken entirely within the framework of the Early Russian icon-painting system, how strongly we feel the distance of centuries between us and the paintings, not only in the disparity between the appearance of the people in them and those found in the portraits we are used to, but also in the difference in the principles of the decoration" [12].

In the mid-seventeenth century, many portraits of private individuals appear in Russia; foreign paintings come into fashion at court, and many boyars commission portraits of themselves and their families. "It is quite natural that the portrait was born precisely at the time that a new cultural system was coming into existence - in response to strong social and psychological demand. Portraiture was established comparatively quickly, and, in the final account, led to a complete break with the obsolete
aesthetic canons" [13].

The portrait genre became firmly established Russia in the form of the parsuna. It was through the parsuna that the full-dress formal portrait, with the model life-size or on horseback, came to Russia. The high pathos of the ceremony links the Russian parsuna with the Western European Baroque. Nevertheless, the decorativeness and psychological style of the formal portraits by Van Dyke (1599-1641) and his English followers remained out of reach of Russian masters, to say nothing of the complex spiritual conception of portraits by Velasquez (1599-1660) or Rubens (1577-1640). The Russian parsuna painters saw their primary task the glorification of the model, the semiotic definition of his position in the social hierarchy. "The parsuna had not so much to depict a concrete figure, as to glorify the model, as the embodiment of ancestral qualities and characteristics, drawing attention to his high rank and position in the feudal hierarchy. Being fully subservient to the norms of this social class, anything personal and individual in the parsuna is pushed into the background, and swallowed up by the general typological principle, which reigns supreme in this type of portrait. The figure in the parsuna is not so much painted, as revealed" [14].

Polish culture and art gained enormous importance in the ever strengthening influence that European art was having
on Russian painting at this time, both directly from Poland, and via Ukraine and Byelorussia. "Whereas, earlier, the influence of Polish art was felt as a tendency, one of the strands in the general flow of local painting, now it appears as a direct orientation towards a particular genre, a definite scheme. This genre is the Sarmatian portrait. We can .....quote also found elsewhere" [15]. But the aesthetic of the Sarmatian portrait underwent a significant transformation in seventeenth-century Russia. In no way linked with imperial Byzantine tradition, it nevertheless possessed its own canon, which was of enormous significance for the representatives of the higher layers of the contemporary Russian boyar society, for whom (as for the Polish Shlachta) the portrait was a sort of genealogical and social self-affirmation. The majority of "private" Russian portraits from the end of the seventeenth century were painted according to the same scheme as is found in the Sarmatian portrait: see the portrait of the stolnik V.F.Liutkin (1698, GIM), the voevoda I.Vlasov (1695, Gorkii state art museum), the boyar L.Naryshkin (1690's, GIM), the stolnik L.P.Godunov (1686, GIM), amongst others {ill.5}. One is immediately struck by the Russian artists' striving to "animate" the technique of the Sarmatian portrait (the clear influence of icon portraiture). Russian portraits from this time tend not towards the genealogical informativeness of the Sarmatian portrait, but rather towards a "sacralisation" of the
image of the model. Whereas, in the Polish Sarmatian portrait, the system of emblems - coats of arms and inscriptions on the portrait - plays an enormous role (often no less a role than the model itself plays), in the Russian parsuny of the time, coats of arms and inscriptions look inorganic, and give way, in terms of their stylisation, to the "original". The reason for this is that Russia at this time did not have a system of heraldic devices which could be compared with those of Poland and Western Europe, which had particularly developed during the Baroque period. The fashion in the Russian court "everything Polish and the striving on the part of Russian boyars to resemble the European aristocracy also engendered the desire to imitate their coats of arms, as well as the whole scheme of portraiture. The emblematic character of the Sarmatian portrait, which was very close in spirit to the strict social hierarchy which existed in seventeenth-century Russia, is one of the main reasons for the success of this Western genre of painting in Rus', which adopted this canon wholesale. In many seventeenth-century Russian parsuny, the cartouche containing the coat of arms was simply filled with inscriptions in Latin and transcriptions of the names of the sitter, or with allegorical compositions linked with the merits of the sitter (as, for example, in the portrait of the stolnik V.F.Liutkin). In the portrait of Ordin-Nashchokin (GIM) there is a invented coat of arms, based on European
Baroque coats of arms. A similarly invented coat of arms is found in the portrait of the voevoda Vlasov (in the form of the symbol of his profession - the castellated walls of a fortress). Thus, the Baroque stylistic influence on portraiture took the form mainly of imitation of the Polish Sarmatian portrait. One of the differences between the Russian parsuna and the European portrait of the seventeenth century is the absence in the former of any attempt on the part of the artist to make the portrait look like the actual person. The main reason for this is the influence of the "icon conception" of the portrait, with its perception of the model as being above the level of the individual, and its idealisation of the image, demanding the elimination of anything concrete and realistic. Historical time does not exist for the icon-painter; the figure in the icon is immobile, stiff, eternal. This "icon tradition" is superimposed on the demand, which was appearing in Russia at the turn of the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries, for a portrait which was a socio-hierarchical characterisation based on prestige and status, of man in the age of the establishment of absolutism. For this reason, as noted by V.G.Chubinskaia, the man in the parsuna becomes a secondary part of the picture. "The leading role is played not by the face in the portrait, but by the attitude of the figure, the richness of the interior, the many meanings of the accessories, coats of arms, inscriptions, and everything which contains the basic
semantic weight of the parsuna. The person is put, as it were, in the framework of his rank, his chin, which is itself substantiated by the scheme of the ceremonially magnificent, bombastic ceremonial portrait. The stature of the figure is variable, but the frame is constant" [16]. This explains to a large extent the disdain, on the part of the artists of the parsuny, of painting a true likeness of the model of individualising the human figure. The "inadequacy as portraits" of the majority of parsuny is due to the mannequin-like quality of the models. In the ceremonial portraits the artists versify the pan-European seventeenth-century scheme, adapting it to their own level of maturity. In this particular situation it is important to note that the general principle of composition, the place of the figure in the interior and its pose are a sort of calque on the pan-European stereotype, and not always organically related to the Russian model. This latter characteristic unavoidably impoverishes the portrait in terms of its quality" [17].

In Russia, the establishment of easel painting is linked with the wide assimilation of mannerist and Baroque elements from European painting. "It is typical that Baroque stylistic elements - theatricality, magnificence, bombasity - occupy no small position in the actual everyday behaviour, court ceremony, the celebration of feast-days, and receptions for foreign ambassadors;
painters actually become involved in the last of these, devising and planning their form, and the spectacular side of the events" [18].

The extent of the European influence on Russian painting in the late seventeenth century can be seen from I.Zabelin's description of the building in the Kremlin, under Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, of a so-called "Golgotha" - a Baroque theatrical composition, containing a great number of works of art on gospel themes, which were called "tales" (pritchi), done in the "foreign style of painting". The painters of these "tales" - a characteristic genre of late seventeenth-century Russian painting - were mainly foreign artists working in the Armoury; they were also imitated by Russian artists of the time. The favourite characters for inclusion in painted "tales" of the time were Alexander the Great and the Emperor Constantine. "Tales of Tsar Constantine", by Karp Olsuf'ev, decorated the Tsar's palace. There are also well-known painted "tales" by I.Saltanov, entitled "The Tale about Emperor Dionysius, the Martyr", "The Birth of Emperor Alexander the Great", and "The Vision of Emperor Constantine" [19].

In 1684, Grigorii Adol'skii decorated one of the chambers in the Kremlin with "painted wall canvasses, containing various tales". In 1688, Anton Baikovskii painted "on the walls [in the Kremlin] the tale of the Prophet Moses and
Abraham the Righteous with Lot, and, under the tales, landscapes, with fruit around the windows" [20]. The above indicates that elements which are typical of the mythological and allegorical philosophy of the Baroque become part also of the Russian artistic conscience. At the same time, a subject is found in Russian painting which is highly characteristic of European Baroque painting - the personification of senses. In 1672, the artist Karp Zolotarev presented Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich with a picture entitled "The Sense of Touch". I. Zabelin reproduces in his book a document dated in 1682, which mentions paintings of "the five senses, painted on canvas, in the oil-painting style" [21].

Nevertheless, despite the clear dependence of the late seventeenth-century Russian genre of the pritcha on its Western European Baroque variant, the Russian "tale" is still tends too much towards a sacred nature, and a religious treatment of the subject, "animating" it excessively. The creators of the Russian painted "tales" practically never draw a parallel between contemporary events and the heroes of the mythology of antiquity, and they do not use characters from their own history. "In those cases where the subjects are analogous to those typical of Western European seventeenth-century painting, in contact with which - albeit at a distance - Russian fine art developed, the similarity is of a very arbitrary nature. In other respects, to judge by the frescoes and
icons which have survived, these painted scenes are very
distant from Western European canvasses of analogous and
similar content, in as much as they are interpreted in
forms which do not conform to the basic principles of art
of the Modern period" [22].

One further popular genre of seventeenth century Russian
painting are what are known as "painted sheets". Painted
on paper in richly-coloured water-colours, they gained
wide distribution from the 1670's to the 1690's. The
leading artists of this period, decorating to order the
Tsar's personal apartments, made use of this artistic
technique, new to Russian painting, which allowed
calligraphic devices to be combined with "monumentalism"
and laconicism. On these "painted sheets", I.Zabelin
writes, describing palatial interior decoration of the
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: "In the bed-
chambers, whose walls had been decorated with paintings,
these were replaced by pictures, parsuny or personae,
that is portraits, and foreign sheets, estampy in frames,
with or without glass...There were also pictures painted
on paper with richly-coloured paints and gold, which were
known as painted sheets" [23]. Describing the apartments
of the Tsarevna Sof'ia (1657-1704), and the Tsareviches
Aleksei Petrovich (1690-1718) and Pyotr Alekseevich (the
future Tsar Peter I), he often draws attention not just
to the titles of the painted sheets which decorated the
palace apartments, but also to the names of their
artists. "In 1679, the painter Karp Zolotarev painted for the seven-year old Tsarevich Pyotr Alekseevich, on large, alexandrine paper, in gold and juice-based paints, "The Twelve Months and Heavenly Constellations" [24].

Intended for the interiors of the private apartments of the Russian Tsars or Tsareviches, these sheets were often dedicated to military themes. "In 1694, Ivan Saltanov, together with other painters, drew for Tsar Pyotr Alekseevich twenty-three pictures of "field battles"..., basing them on German pictures..., and in 1697, a further eight pictures of 'naval military manoeuvres', based on foreign German pictures or foreign sheets"[25]. A similar description by I.Zabelin has survived of a "painted sheet" from the early 1670's, which contains the image of a division of streltsy setting off on their campaign against Stepan Razin. This is a multi-figured composition, which contains a depiction of river craft containing the streltsy troops and their arms and flags. "The painted sheet with the image of the detachment of streltsy is a clear example of the realistic tendencies in seventeenth-century art. We see before us a picture from Russian life, as seen by a contemporary witness" [26].

Russian painting had still not quite freed itself from the sacred, moralising style of icon-painting, and the need to "animate" all living objects represented on the canvas. Official "funeral" parsuny of the Tsar were
painted - immobile, archaic and monumental - in strict correspondence to the icon tradition; at the same time, however, these pictures were already full of attention to the character of the model, "in the foreign manner". In the later pictures, which already represent a transitional stage towards the European portrait, one is still struck immediately by the old traits which remain: the subjugation of the figure to flatness and the inability to convey distance, the woodeness of the pose, the naive naturalism of the details. But the most important thing has been achieved: the first secular genre in Russian painting - the portrait - has been born; the human being has become an important theme in art. Canonical images, estranged from the real world, have been replaced by "the living human face"[27].

4. THE HISTORICAL PORTRAIT: THE TITULIARNIKI

Written in 1672, the Koren' velikikh gosudarei (Roots of the Great Sovereigns) or Gosudarstvennaia kniga (State Book), or the Tituliarnik [28] as it came to be known, played a significant role in the further development of the historical portrait genre in Russia in the second half of the seventeenth century. This manuscript book was dedicated to the genealogy of the Russian tsars, and contained additionally portraits of contemporary Western and Eastern monarchs.
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There appears in the decoration of the Tituliarnik a clear tendency, characteristic of Russian art of this period, towards increased decorativeness; this distinctive characteristic can also be seen in two other works: the *Kniga ob izbranii na prevysochaishii prestol velikogo gosudaria i velikogo kniazia Mikhaila Fedorovicha* (Book of the Election to the Most High Throne of the Grand Sovereign and Grand Prince Mikhail Fedorovich) and the *Lekarstvo dushevnoe* (Spiritual Medicine), known for its many miniatures depicting scenes from everyday life [29]. This combination of decorativeness and interest in generic themes is also characteristic of certain manuscript works, such as the *Tolkovoe Evangeli* (Explanatory Gospel) (1678) [30] and the *Siiskoe Evangeli* (1693), containing around four thousand miniatures [31]. Nonetheless, the Tituliarniks occupy a special position amongst these luxuriously decorated illuminated manuscripts [32]. They contain portraits of all the leading State officials of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with particular place given to representations of all the Russian princes and tsars. The portraits were painted by Russian master miniaturists under the leadership of Ivan Maksimov and Dmitrii L'vov [33].

The 1672 Tituliarnik was made to Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's order by masters from the Armoury [34].
The huge pages of the manuscript are illustrated with the persony (i.e., the portraits), their heraldic device and seals, surrounded by a cartouche [35], {ill.6-8}. Amongst the 65 persony depicted in the Tituliarnik are the Russian princes and tsars from Riurik to Aleksei Mikhailovich, and likewise the leaders of Western and Eastern states. The Tituliarnik took five months to complete; when it was finished, it was transferred to the Posol'skii prikaz (Foreign office), where it was kept. In the same year, another analogous manuscript was ordered from the Armoury artists, two copies of which were to be made, and which, in contrast to the first Koren' velikikh gosudarei (Roots of the Great Sovereigns), was to contain portraits of all the tsareviches, that is, all the living sons of Aleksei Mikhailovich and also those who had died at the time of the manuscript's creation. Both of these new manuscripts were based on the example of the original book, and were likewise created in the Posol'skii prikaz. Masters from the Armoury were again the main artists involved in the drawing of the portraits [36]. In completing this second order for the Tsar, a total of 150 portraits (persony) were drawn, judging by surviving documents. The range of portraits in the Tituliarnik included in fact not only the numerous sons of Aleksei Mikhailovich, but also, on the Tsar's orders, the kings of Poland from Stefan Bаторi (1533-1586) onwards [37].

The very idea of such a work - secular by its very nature
- is evidence that a turning-point had been reached, not only in the Russian consciousness, but also in the artistic conceptions of the period. It incontrovertibly heralds not only the further secularisation of Russian art, but also the consequent individualisation in the consciousness of Russian leaders and Russian artists, under the influence of Western ideas and of Western art. Old, archaic ideas about the painted subject, which required that the scene, objects and characters depicted be portrayed as sacred, begin to give way to subjects which are drawn from everyday life, politics and history, or, indeed, are purely decorative. This change in consciousness in Russia, occurring in the last third of the seventeenth century, was also a much deeper result of Western influence than the immediately obvious borrowed decorative elements and pictorial techniques. Pictures of Russian and foreign princes and tsars, similar to the "portraits" in the Tituliarnik, were also widespread in the Tsar's palace themselves. "In 1681, Tsar Fyodor's mansions contained the portrait of the King of Poland and the King of France (possibly Louis XIV, the Tsar's contemporary), as well as various others whose names we do not know. In 1687, the Tsarevna Mar'ia Alekseevna's room contained the portrait of her brother, the late Tsar Fyodor, in a frame with flemovannyе dorozhники. In 1699, the Tsarevna Natal'ia Alekseevna's room had three gilded frames, containing the portrait of Tsar Peter Alekseevich, and the artistic representations of his
name-day saints, Peter and Paul...In the Armoury treasury in 1687 were housed the following: the parsuna of Tsar Mikhail Fyodorovich, painted on a board...the parsuna of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, painted on canvas...the portrait of the Kievan Metropolitan Pyotr Mogila..." [38].

E.S. Ovchinnikova, having studied all the extant copies of Tituliarniki, suggests that the two 1672 manuscripts mentioned above have not survived [39]. Two further analogous Tituliarniki, created later (seemingly 1673–1677), are preserved in the collections of the Hermitage and the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library in Saint-Petersburg. The existence of at least five copies of the Tituliarniki is supported by Ovchinnikova's belief that sketches (prorisi, ie tracings) existed for the portraits, which could be used by miniaturists working on the later copies of the Tituliarniki [40].

The portraits contained in the Tituliarniki vary in the manner and style of their painting, and were probably drawn by a large group of miniaturists. The chief unifying feature, however, is that they are not drawn from life. Various artistic and literary sources were used for the portraits of long-dead princes and tsars, such as the decoration of the Golden and Faceted Chamber in the Moscow Kremlin, and the manuscript by the boyar A.S.Khitrovo, then head of the Polish embassy, entitled
Vsekh velikikh kniazei moskovskikh i vseia Rossii
samoderzhtsev persony i titla i pechati (The Persony,
Titles and Seals Of All the Grand Princes of Moscow and
Autocrats of All Russia) [41]. Neither were the
portraits of people alive at the time drawn from life;
these could, however, be drawn from memory. It is these
portraits from the Tituliarniki, whose features doubtless
resemble those of the person portrayed, which allow us to
judge the artistic standard of Russian portrait painting
from the final third of the seventeenth century. Amongst
these are the portraits of Tsarevich Peter Alekseevich,
who, at the time of painting was around five years old
[42], and of Patriarchs Nikon [43] and Pitirim. The
portrait of Tsarevich Peter, believed to be by Maksimov,
is still fairly conventional in its representation of the
Tsarevich; however, it distinguishes itself from the
others by a certain realism in its portrayal both of the
boy's body, and of his face. The pictures of Patriarchs
Nikon and Pitirim, on the other hand, whilst clearly
portrait-style "likenesses", are nonetheless very close
to the icon stereotype. Their stiff, almost incorporeal
figures are dressed in colourful ornamental clothes,
preventing the feeling that there is any living flesh and
blood underneath them. The pictures are perhaps closest
in style to the icon Mitropolit Aleksei u Moskovskogo
oby
Kremlia (Metropolitan Aleksei in the Moscow Kremlin),
painted in the 1680's or 90's by Georgii Zinov'ev, where
the likewise fleshless figure of the metropolitan, draped
in richly ornamented clothes, appears against a background of the Kremlin as it was in the artist's day [44]. The same terse graphic style and naturalistic portrayal of the cloth and the gold and silver items in the portraits of the patriarchs in the Tituliarniki is also found in Zinov'ev's icon Tsar' Tsarem (Tsar of all Tsars) [45]. The new, secular character of the portraits from the Tituliarniks can be seen first and foremost in the treatment of the faces, where the artist is clearly trying to create an individual, close likeness of the person portrayed, in a way that is, of course, nearer to the Western tradition of portraiture than to that of icon-painting. The move in this direction also finds expression in the new way that the eyes are painted in these portraits, differing from established Russian practice of the time, and further developed in portraits from the closing decades of the seventeenth century.

The picture of Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich from the manuscript Chin venchaniia na tsarstvo [46],{ill.9}. (The Coronation Ceremony) can also be added to the so-called "portrait gallery" created by the miniaturists of the Tituliarniki. This portrait of Fyodor Alekseevich, crowned in 1676, is stylistically and compositionally close to the miniatures in the Tituliarniki, leading to suggestion that its author was, in fact, Ivan Maksimov. On the basis of studies of the water-marks in the paper used in the Chin venchaniia na tsarstvo, the miniature
portrait of Fyodor Alekseevich can be dated to 1676-77 [47].

The next stage in the development of the genre of secular portraiture in Russia occurred with the painting of 26 portraits of Russian tsars, which appeared in the book Vasilioqion, created in the Posol'skii prikaz in 1684 [48]. These portraits, as written sources confirm, were painted in oil on canvas, and then pasted into the manuscript of the Vasilioqion.

Twin portraits of Tsars Mikhail Fyodorovich (1596-1645) and Aleksei Mikhailovich (1629-1676), now in the GIM, were painted shortly after this [49]. Both tsars are depicted on horseback; these pictures can thus be called the first equestrian portraits in Russian art {ill.10-11}. In these portraits, traditional icon-painting techniques (such as the flat gold background, the grass motifs in the ornamentation, having the figures holding a cross) are found side by side with secular elements which are new to Russian painting. The secular influence can be seen above all in the variety of forms within the portrait genre - the fact that this is an equestrian portrait - as well as in the secular clothes which the tsars wear, and the fact that they are drawn without haloes (although they are depicted with cross in hand - the attribute of martyrs). One need only compare these equestrian portraits with those other well-known pictures
of actual figures from Russian history - the ancient Russian icons of the Princes Boris and Gleb on horseback - in order to see how far Russian painting has developed by the time the miniatures in the Tituliarniki and the portraits of the Tsars Mikhail Fyodorovich and Aleksei Mikhailovich are painted. The uncertainty, the incompleteness of the artistic style of these portraits, the mixture of icon-painting and non-icon-painting styles, of sacred and secular in the pictorial and compositional devices used by their creators, is accompanied by, as it were, an "interim" style of technical production: both portraits are painted, like icons, in tempera; unlike icons, however, they are painted on canvas (in the manner of non-icon-painting), rather than on boards. The transitional style of the portraits of Tsars Mikhail Fyodorovich and Aleksei Mikhailovich links them on one hand with the miniature portraits in the Tituliarniki (also painted in tempera), whilst on the other with the first Russian secular easel portraits, painted in oils on canvas.

This link with the Tituliarnik portraits can also be seen in other painting of Russian tsars. The half-length portrait of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich [50] with his regalia, in the full ceremonial dress known as the Bol'shoi nariad for example, is stylistically close to the miniature representation of Aleksei Mikhailovich in the Tituliarniki [51], {ill.12}. This similarity is
restricted, however, to the style and composition of the official ceremonial portrait. In artistic respects, the half-length portrait represents a further step in the direction of the secular ceremonial portrait in Russian art. Aleksei Mikhailovich's face is depicted in a more realistic and individualistic style than its predecessors - the portraits of Fyodor Ivanovich by Shkopina-Shuiskii, the twin equestrian portraits of the Tsars Mikhail Fyodorovich and Aleksei Mikhailovich, and the images in the Tituliarniki. The creation of a spatial background, when compared with the flat treatment of the backdrop in earlier portraits, is evidence of the further evolution of the Russian seventeenth-century portrait in the direction of the portrait tradition of friazhskoe pis'mo (Western European painting style). This is precisely the observation of the celebrated expert on ancient Russian painting V. N. Shchepkin: "the Western European tradition (friaz') made greater demands on the master painter than the old stylized painting tradition, which provided a ready-made symbolic style and did not call for individuality. It is the master painters who, most of all, suffer directly from the dawning of this new epoch of icon-painting; art is cut off even more sharply from handicraft. Talented master painters acquire the necessary means to portray the life of the nation in all its manifestations" [52].
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5. MASTER-ARTISTS OF THE ARMOURY

(1) SIMON USHAKOV

In the second half of the seventeenth century, the Armoury (Oruzheinaia palata) of the Moscow Kremlin, first mentioned in archive material from 1547 as the Arms Department (oruzheinvi prikaz), became the centre of fine and applied art in Russia.

Within the Armoury itself, a series of subsidiary artistic workshops were created during the seventeenth century, for the production of arms and flags, iron fretwork, icon painting, the gilding of wood, joinery, and many other crafts. The emergence of these workshops was linked with the significant growth in orders of high quality items of applied and fine art.

In the late seventeenth century, the Armoury and the Gold and Silver Chambers (Zolotaia i Serebrianaia palaty) were amalgamated under the leadership of the Head Armourer (Oruzhnichii). This post was filled from 1655 to 1680 by the boyar Bogdan Matveevich Khitrovo, during which time the Armoury flourished [53]. It was precisely in these years that the Tsar's best master-craftsmen were working there: artists such as Iakov Kazanets, Simon Rezanets, Iosif Vladimirov, Simon Ushakov, Nikita Pavlovets, Fyodor Zubov, Mikhail Miliutin, Ivan Maksimov, Georgii Zinov'ev, and Ivan Filat'ev (father of Tikhon Filat'ev).
The icon-painting workshop, founded in 1640-42 and also known as the icon-painting chamber (ikonopisnaia palata), held the foremost position amongst the Armoury's workshops. In the early seventeenth century, the very best master icon-painters from this workshop, together with other artists specially summoned from other artistic centres in the Russian state, carried out a series of grandiose works: the monumental murals which decorate the Moscow Kremlin cathedrals (the Cathedral of the Dormition - Uspenskii sobor, 1642-44); and in Zvenigorod (the Cathedral of the St.Sabbas-Storozhevsky Monastery, 1650).

The icon-painters, drawn together from various Russian towns to carry out these projects, created a school known as the Tsar's Icon-painters (tsarskiie izografiy), the foremost school of artists in the Russian state at that time [54].

The images appearing on seventeenth-century Armoury icons painted by members of this school are full of new political and historical ideas. A new genre also emerges in icon-painting: the historical portrait, where a portrait of a real historical figure is included in the icon, often, indeed, playing a leading role in the picture's composition. Thus portraits of historical figures often appear in the foreground, becoming, as it were, direct participants in the events occurring in the
picture on the icon or in its surround. This new approach to the portrayal of figures from various periods of Russian history represented an important step forward in the development of Russian icon-painting; in earlier works, a historical character may appear as a small figure (ktitora) in front of a huge representation of the saint - see, for example, the portraits of Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich and Patriarch Filaret in the icon of the Deposition of the Virgin's Robe (Polozhenie Rizy), circa 1630. This icon portrays a historical event, which occurred in the Cathedral of the Dormition (Uspenskii sobor) in the Moscow Kremlin in 1624 - the deposition of Christ's robe, brought to Moscow from Georgia and given as a gift to the Moscow patriarch by the Shah's ambassadors. In the icon, the historical event is shown against a background of the actual interior of the Cathedral of the Dormition, depicted with documentary-like exactness by the icon-painter, as is the clothing of the Tsar, the Patriarch and the boyars. Essentially, the icon is a historical portrait picture.

Another such historical picture is the mural group portrait of the Nikitnikovs, a merchant family, which forms part of the altar composition of the Church of the Trinity at Nikitniki in Moscow (tserkov' Troitsy v Nikitnikakh), 1652-1653. In the individual treatment of the faces, the depiction of everyday seventeenth-century clothes, and the expressive poses of the members of the
Nikitnikov family, the artist's attempt to reproduce in portrait the founders of the church (and sponsors of its murals) - the chief Moscow merchant (moskovskii gost') Grigorii Nikitnikov and his family - is clearly visible. E. Ovchinnikova, having studied the mural complex of this church, stated as early as the 1940's that the "Deposition of the Robe" (Polozhenie Rizy) icon was painted by the best Armoury-based Tsar's icon-painters of the time [55]. She was also the first to notice the innovatory tendencies in the attempt to create a secular group portrait in the composition, still drawing heavily on the devices of group representations in traditional icon-painting.

In 1664, Simon Ushakov became head of the Armoury icon-painting workshop, and formed a new school of Russian seventeenth-century icon-painting, tending in the direction of realism [56]. This new quest for realistic images, which is at the forefront of works by Ushakov and those who shared his views, also found expression in the theoretical writings of the time. Ushakov, with I. Vladimirov, belonged to the foremost enlightened and educated artistic circle of their time. Vladimirov's treatise on art dates from 1665-66; Ushakov's work Slovo k liubotshchatel'nomu ikonnogo pisaniia was completed in 1666. Both works argue the superiority of the new "light" (svetovidnyi), "life-like" style over the old dark-faced, conventional icon images, and call for the man to be
depicted in all his physical, earthly beauty. Ushakov's work in the representation of the human face was of great significance for the development of Russian seventeenth-century art. "The artist was attracted to European iconographic sources and the new European system of painting, with its straight-line perspectives, its volume-giving treatment of the model, and its use of chiaroscuro, the European iconographic sources" [57]. One of his incontrovertible achievements was to create new icon-painting types, with anatomically correct faces, given depth by means of chiaroscuro, with realistically shaped eyes and shining pupils. Seen in the context of this new direction in his work, the figure of Christ in the composition Christ Unmade by Hands (Spas Nerukotvorny) can be interpreted afresh, and becomes particularly significant (ill.2). "His many Spas Nerukotvorny icons appear to be 'portraits' of Christ, both in their depth, and in the way they have overcome the stale conventionality of earlier icon-painting. Likewise, the images of prelates painted on the walls of the Church of the Trinity in Nikitniki in Moscow seem like medallion "portraits". The artistic means of portraying a real human being is worked out and developed in Ushakov's work and that of his associates" [58].

Realising the need to generalise in order to pass on his personal experience, and to give practical leadership in painting, Ushakov now turned to the written description
of practical work, under the title Alfavit or Azbuka khudozhestva - "The ABC of art" [59].

The practical fruit of these theoretical investigations was the gallery of funeral portraits in the Cathedral of the Archangel (Arkhangelskii sobor) in the Moscow Kremlin, painted by Ushakov and other well-known Armoury icon-painters, such as S. Rezanets, F. Kozlov, F. Evtikheev and I. Filat'ev.

In 1668, Ushakov painted the group portrait of the icon Nasazhdenie dreva Moskovskogo gosudarstva (The Planting of the Tree of the Muscovite State), in the Church of the Trinity in Nikitniki {ill.13}. At the top of this enormous icon, on the branches of the tree which seems to be growing out of the walls of the Cathedral of the Dormition itself, Ushakov places, amongst the medallions, pictures of Russian princes, tsars and Moscow saints. Here, he is essentially continuing the same theme that is in the decoration of the Gold and Faceted Chambers (Zolotaia i Granovitaia palaty) of the Moscow Kremlin: the glorification of historical figures of the Russian state. "The Nasazhdenie dreva icon is a memorial to the transitional style, containing within itself, as it does, the struggle between two contradictory principles - one secular, the other sacred; it is characteristic not only of Ushakov's own work of this period, but also of all Russian art from the 1660's. The noticeable dominance of
the secular over the sacred principle in this work can be seen even in the pointed political subject of the painting; indeed the form of the work - an icon - seems to be merely a framework for this political subject. The portrait group which Ushakov paints is, despite the haloes, a painting from life of the Tsar's family, and thus represents a further stage in the development of secular portrait-painting. The portrait is not yet separate from the icon, but already occupies within it its own independent, isolated position, playing a leading role in the general composition. The dual nature of Ushakov's icon is seen also in its double title: the "Vladimir Mother of God or the Nasazhdenie dreva" (Vladimirskaiia bogomater'). In the second title, the secular, historical theme is the principal theme of the icon, forcing the sacred principal into the background. This icon's secular portrait group without doubt prepared the way for the appearance in the 1670's and 80's of genuine easel portraits, both by Ushakov and other artists working in the Armoury" [60]. Nevertheless, Ushakov's icons still show traces of stylistic duality. His icons become like portraits both in their style, and in their tendency towards a psychological portrayal of the image. "Whilst one must not exaggerate the radical nature of Ushakov's views, and those of this friends, apprentices and followers, subjectively, they remained entirely based on religion; one cannot doubt, however, the importance of the objective turn towards a secular
In the 1670's, the Armoury grew in its role as the artistic centre of the whole of Russia. As new churches and cathedrals were built, and the number of orders for icons and murals grew considerably, so too did the number of artists working in the Armoury's icon-painting workshop. Apart from Ushakov himself, his former apprentices and those who shared his views, the artists Ivan Bezmin, Dorofei Ermolaev, Karp Zolotarev and Ivan Saltanov were all working in the Armoury at this time. In Armoury documents of the time, however, they are all already referred to as painters (zhivopisets), and not, as formerly, as icon-painters (ikonopisets). I. Zabelin was the first to mention that "at the end of the seventeenth century the Russian apprentices [in the Armoury] constituted something rather like a school introducing the Western painting style into icon and church mural painting" [62]. Painters from the Armoury thus, without doubt, played the leading role in the development of the tendency towards realism and of Western European influences in Russian seventeenth-century art. This is noted also by G. Filimonov: "at the end of the seventeenth century, the painters from the Armoury represented a separate corporation; they, like the icon-painters, had their own master craftsmen, their own apprentices, and their own area of work" [63].

view of the world "[61].
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The Armoury, and the department (prikaz) that ran it, was charged first and foremost with the duty of fulfilling the needs of the tsar's palace by making virtually all the household articles it required. Various types of departments and workshops, employing hundreds of craftsmen and painters, took care of the interior decoration and artistic appointments of the tsar's chambers and palaces. For this purpose the Armoury had joiners', turners' and gilders' workshops, which were in charge of the production of furniture and wooden items. Gold and silversmiths, painters (both of icons and in oils - ikonopistsy and zhivopistsy) also worked there, creating decorative items, utensils and household articles. Over time many of the different production units diverged to such an extent that they were divided into separate specialised departments and "chambers": the Gold and Diamond department, the Gold and Silver chambers, the Icon-painting chamber, the Weapons department (Stvol'nyi prikaz). The largest of these was the Weapons department, where in 1671 113 people were employed. For comparison, in the Armoury as a whole there were 136 icon-painters, oil-painters, joiners, gilders and other master-craftsmen; in the Silver chamber, however, there were 39 people [64]. This makes sense, since the Armoury itself was created as the tsar's arsenal, for the production and storage of the tsar's
weapons and regalia for ceremonial occasions.

From the beginning of the 1670's, at the same time as the role of secular elements and the Western European influence on icon-painting increased, oil-painters become established as the playing the leading role in the Icon-painting chamber. The oil-painters, amongst whom were some foreigners, formed a sort of corporation; they are more and more often enlisted to paint portraits. By 1672 the icon-painting workshop consisted of 15 tempera icon-painters and two oil-painters; in 1674, 24 tempera icon-painters and four oil-painters; in 1675, 30 tempera icon-painters and, including apprentices, ten oil-painters; and in 1676-77, 15 tempera icon-painters (and two apprentices) and just two oil-painters - but 12 apprentices [65].

An important innovation, indicative of the new position of oil-painters in the Armoury, was their involvement in the welcoming of foreign ambassadors arriving in Moscow in 1679. Ivan Bezmin, Ivan Saltanov and Vasilii Poznanskii are mentioned as being amongst these oil-painters.

The growth in orders for oil-painting demanded not only the separation of the departments of oil-painters from icon-painters, and the creation of a workshop specially for the oil-painters, at the head of which was Ivan
Bezmin, but also the creation of special apartments for the oil-painters and their apprentices. Until 1681-82 there were no such apartments for them, and Bezmin and Saltanov had to carry out orders from the Tsar for oil-paintings and train their apprentices either in their own homes or in the workshops outside the Kremlin. A special Armoury workshop for oil-painters, run by Bezmin, appears in 1683, functioning in parallel with the Icon-painting chamber, headed by Ushakov. A further oil-painting workshop - Karp Zolotarev's Chamber - was founded in 1687 in the Palace of the Great Chancellery (Bol'shoi Posol'skii dvor) in the Kitai-gorod area of Moscow, to carry out orders for the court. In this workshop there are master gilders, carvers and joiners as well as the oil-painters themselves.

The increased importance of oil-painting in Russian art in the late seventeenth century can be seen in the projected (but unrealised) educational programme for children, created in 1682, which was to include oil-painting - called in the project "the science of oil-painting and perspective" (zhivopisnaia nauka i perspektiva) - alongside disciplines such as mathematics, architecture and training in the use of weapons [66].

At the beginning of the 1680's Bezmin himself had 16 apprentice oil-painters already, and Saltanov had a further 14. The first large order which was carried out by Bezmin's workshop, and which was the first in the
history of the Armoury not to use the skills of icon-painters, was the creation of icons and paintings for the palace Church of the Crucifixion (tserkov' Raspiatiia) in the Kremlin in 1681.

The official recognition of oil-painting as an independent genre, like icon-painting, demonstrates that there had been significant changes in the development of Russian art in the late seventeenth century. A new genre in Russian fine art - secular oil-painting - had freed itself from the fetters of the church's canons, and was accomplishing new tasks, opening up for Russian painters the path to the mastery of drawing (risunok), colour and perspective, and the possibility of openly becoming acquainted with the achievements of Western artists.

Apart from acquaintance with the works of Western European artists, which appeared in Russia mainly as prints, Russian oil-painters were able to have immediate contact with foreign artists. Thus, from the 1640's the staff of the Armoury included Hans Deters from Holland, Apostol Iur'ev from Greece, the Pole Stanislav Lopotkii, the Netherlander Daniil Wukhters (who worked in Russian from 1663 to 1667), and the Armenian Ivan (Bogdan) Saltanov [67]. Some of the very first Russian oil-painters worked in Bezmin's workshop, such as Erofei Elin, Luka Smol'ianinov, Dorofei Ermolaev and, until he opened his own workshop in the Palace of the Great 103
Chancellery (Bol'shoi Posol'skii dvor), Karp Zolotarev.

Ivan Bezmin, son of the master armourer (stvol'nogo dela) Artemii Bezmin, was head of the oil-painting workshop in the Armoury. He was taken on in the Armoury to study oil-painting with Stanislav Loputsky (from 1661-1667), and from 1667 with Vukhters. A master of many crafts, Bezmin worked in wood-carving/fretwork (for palace beds, sleighs, iconostases), the gilding of utensils for the use of the tsar, the painting of the tsar's standards (with S.Ushakov, I.Vladimirov, Gurii Nikitin, Stepan Rezanets) [68], including the famous standard of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich from 1665, the mural decoration of churches and the tsar's private chambers, carried out decorative paintings, painted the Tsar's parsuny and icons in oils (zhivopisnym pis'mom). From as early as 1670 he was himself training apprentices, and by 1677 his salary in the Armoury was equal to that of Ushakov [69].

Amongst Bezmin's most important works are the (oil) paintings of the "parables" of John the Baptist, Esther, and Moses, painted jointly with I.Saltanov and D.Ermolaev in 1674 for the tsar's mansion. In 1678 Bezmin decorated the Church of Evdokiia the Martyr in the palace, and in 1679 he took part in the mural painting of the churches at Izmailovo. In 1684, he painted the composition "Heavenly Constellations" (Begi nebesnye) in the private chambers of Tsarevna Sofia (1657-1704). In 1685 Bezmin
decorated Tsarevna Ekaterina Alekseevna's room with scenes from the gospels, including, around the windows, portraits of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and Tsaritsa Mariia Il'inichnya, Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich, Tsars Ioann (1666-1696) and Peter (1672-1725), Tsarevna Sofiia and Tsarevna Ekaterina Alekseevna herself (1684-1727). In 1686, Bezmin fell out of favour for his allegedly disrespectful portrait of the Tsar's cousin (the deceased son of Tsarina Nataliia Kirillovna Naryshkina's (1651-1694) brother), and his use of "unseemly language" in front of the court of Boyars, for which he narrowly escaped execution. He was sent into exile, and, on his return three years later, was not able either to resurrect his creative activities, or to regain his former position as a court painter.

It is highly likely that Bezmin was the painter of one of the best parsuny of Russian oil-painting of the late seventeenth century - the funeral portrait of Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich (1661-1682), commissioned in 1685 [70]. The composition of the portrait of Fyodor Alekseevich (GIM), on which work began three years after the Tsar's death, appears rather archaic {ill.14}. It is analogous to the composition of the well-known portraits of Tsars Mikhail Fyodorovich and Aleksei Mikhailovich in the Tituliarnik of 1672, who are shown with the attributes of the Tsar's power. Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich's portrait, however, which was produced in Bezmin's workshop, shows a noticeable
change in direction, aspiring to a realistic portrayal of a human personality. This is particularly noticeable when it is compared with the funeral portraits of Tsars Mikhail Fyodorovich and Aleksei Mikhailovich from 1677. Although in the portrait of Fyodor Alekseevich the arbitrary forms and devices of icon-painting portrait style are not fully dispensed with - see, for example, the treatment of the details of the clothes and the execution of the material, with its flatness and the inflexible straight lines of the pleats - the new devices of the "oil-painting style" are clearly seen in the soft modelling of the subject's face and hands.

The portrait is also significant for its fairly professional use of chiaroscuro (in the plastic modelling of Fyodor Alekseevich's face and hands), its use - the first time in the Russian portrait - of side lighting for the face, and the replacement of the usual solid background with a light blue backdrop, giving both depth and a light airiness to the figure's surrounding. Fyodor Alekseevich's face is painted not only with portrait-like physical resemblance [71], but is also endowed not with an aloof, distant expression (as in icons), but with a genuinely human expression, enlivened with a scarcely perceptible smile, and an look suggesting engagement with the viewer. The portrait-style physical resemblance to the subject of the funeral painting of Fyodor Alekseevich demonstrates the development of realistic tendencies in
Russian portraiture of the late seventeenth century, and the clear attempt of Russian artists to master the techniques of Western European painters. Of course, the painting before us is still stylistically a parsuna, and far removed from the fine Western European portraits, with their psychological qualities and refined chiaroscuro and colouristic nuances. But a clear move towards a new aesthetic understanding, and a new role of the artist and his work, can be felt in the portrait of Fyodor Alekseevich. The four cartouches in the portrait underline its link with the Baroque system of symbolic emblems found in the contemporary Western European full ceremonial dress portrait.

Another portrait produced in Bezmin's workshop is that of Patriarch Nikon with the Clergy (Moskovskii oblastnoi muzei) [72]. Alongside the traditional features of the icon-painting style - the disruption of perspective, the archaic composition - the portrait noticeably contains devices from the oil-painting style, such as those seen in the portrait of Fyodor Alekseevich {ill.15}. Here we find the same broad modelling the faces and the same physical resemblance of the figures to their models. As in the portrait of Fyodor Alekseevich, Patriarch Nikon is dressed in heavy, inflexible robes, without the slightest hint of a modelling of the figure itself. The same precision and attention to detail is found in the execution of the cloth from which the clothes are made,
and its decoration. And if this portrait is a hybrid in its technical and stylistic characteristics of the icon parsuna and oil-painting styles, then in its "ideological" content it is close to the didactic tendency of the Western European Baroque aesthetic — Patriarch Nikon is shown preaching to the clergy, and is depicted in the portrait first and foremost as the teacher and mentor of the Russian people.

In 1686 another portrait appeared from Bezmin's workshop, this time of the stolnik Grigorii Petrovich Godunov, in the service of Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich from 1678-79 (GIM). Here, too, it is undeniable that realistic tendencies prevail in the treatment of the subject. Particularities of the oil-painting technique used, the modelling of the figure's clothes, weapons and jewels — all these are close to the aesthetic of the Polish Sarmatian portrait, which served as a sort of intermediary between Western European portrait-painting and ancient Russian icon-painting styles.

After the death of Simon Ushakov, Fedodor Evstikheev Zubov (c.1615-1689), one of the most significant artists of the seventeenth century, became head of the icon-painting workshop of the Armoury. In documents which have
survived from the mid-seventeenth century, Fyodor Zubov is referred to as an icon-painter from Ustiug [73]. His early works already demonstrate his mastery of the genre, and an unquestionable closeness in terms of artistic style to the Stroganov style of painting (stroganovskie pis'ma). In later works, dating from his Moscow period, Zubov retains the unique style of painting the faces of saints, the fine treatment of clothing, and a tendency to use small details ornamentally, which he developed in his early years. It is possible that, thanks to his individual painting style, he was in greater demand than others of the tsar's icon-painters to paint the icons of saints whose names were linked with the names of the tsars themselves, and members of the tsar's family [74]. Not long before he was added to the ranks of the Tsar's icon-painters, paid to work in the Armoury, Fyodor Zubov was working in Iaroslavl. In 1660 he was asked to paint a series of icons for the Church of the Veil (tserkov' Pokrova) in Iaroslavl, all of whose icons, including the royal gates (tsarskie vrata) and the local icons, had been lost in the fire of 1658 [75]. Zubov paints a series of icons in which he breaks with the traditional treatment of canonical subjects, and demonstrates elements of Baroque stylistic attributes. The series includes the following icons: "The Acts of John the Baptist" (Ioann Predtecha v deianiakh) {ill.16}, "The Vladimir Representation of the Blessed Virgin" (Bogomater' Vladimirskaja), "The Fyodorov Representation
of the Blessed Virgin" (Bogomater' Fyodorovskaia), "The Smolensk Representation of the Saviour" (Spas Smolenskii s prepavshimi), "The Blessed Virgin Hodigitria" (Bogomater' Odigitriia), "The Prelates Stefan Surozhskii, Leontii Rostovskii, Metropolitans Filipp, Pyotr, Aleksei and Iona" (Sviatiteli Stefan Surozhskii, Leontii Rostovskii, mitropolity Filipp, Petr, Aleksei i Iona), "The Ascension" (Voznesenie). Analysing the artistic style of Fyodor Zubov's "Ascension" icon from the Church of the Veil in Iaroslavl, the renowned expert on Russian icon-painting G. Zhidkov describes it as "an example of the mature Baroque style in Russian seventeenth-century painting," drawing attention to the material quality of the figures, the swift and light rhythmicality of their movements, and the passionate and ecstatic expression of feelings in the picture [76].

Amongst the most important works from Zubov's Moscow period are his work in the Cathedral of the Archangel (Arkhangelskii sobor) in the Moscow Kremlin (1666-1668), the Church of Evdokiia the Martyr (tserkov' Evdokii muchenitsy) (1678), and the icons "Fyodor Stratilat" and "Centurion Longin" from the Church of the Saviour Unmade by Hands (tserkov' Spasa Nerukotvornyi) (1679-1680) [77], {ill.17-18}. In 1682 he contributed to the painting of the full-length icon "Fyodor Stratilat", in the Cathedral of the Archangel, and painted icons of the Blessed Virgin and John the Theologian (Ioann Bogoslov) (also in the
Cathedral of the Archangel in Moscow).

In 1683-1685, Fyodor Zubov led the work on the painting of iconostasis of the Sofia (Sofiiskii) and Prokhor (Prokhorovskii) side-chapels of the Smolensk Cathedral in the Novodevichii Convent.

One of the artistically most significant works in which Fyodor Zubov was involved was the Explanatory Gospel (Tolkovoe Evangelie) of 1678, written in the Foreign Chancellery (Posol'skii prikaz). Apart from Zubov, Ivan Maksimov, Sergei Rozhkov, Fyodor Iur'ev, Gurii Nikitin and other artists were also involved in this work. Zubov's characteristic artistic style allows the easy identification of his work in the decoration of the Gospel. His contribution are the compositions "The Parable of the Tree which Bore No Good Fruit" (Pritcha o dreve, ne prinosiashchem dobrykh plodov), "The Healing of the Sick" (Istselenie boliashchikh), and "The Shepherds" (Pastukhi) [78]. The miniature "The Family Tree of Jesus Christ" (Drevo rodoslovnoi Iisusa Khrista) is also his – a work close in style to the "Ascension" (Voznesenie) icon from the Cathedral of the Protection in Iaroslavl. The ecstatic expressivity in the dynamic of the poses of the figures in this drawing, and the highly decorative style of the ornamental frame, are without doubt influenced by the style of Western Baroque painting and engraving.
The 1680's were a period of intense creative activity for Fyodor Zubov. In 1681 he painted the side-chapel of Dmitrii Sõlunski in the Cathedral of the Dormition (Uspenskii sobor), and also carried out work in Kolomenskoe; in 1682 he collaborated with other icon-painters in the painting of fifteen icons for the mansion of Tsarina Natal'ia Kirillovna; in 1685, he painted the icon of Sofia the Martyr (Muchenitsa Sofia). Zubov's works in the Novodevichii Convent are also linked with Tsarevna Sofia (Alekseevna), who afforded him particular patronage and attention. It was under the Tsarevna Sofia that new buildings were constructed in the convent, the old walls and towers were rebuilt, and the side-chapel of Saint Sofia was created in the cathedral church of the Convent.

In 1684-1685 Fyodor Zubov and his colleagues carried out a complete restoration of the cathedral iconostasis in the Novodevichii Convent. The icons in the side-chapel of Saint Sofia, in whose painting Zubov took part, demonstrate a clear divergence from the old icon-painting tradition. They are related to traditional icons only inasmuch as both are tempera paintings. The composition, the choice of colours, and the perspective in the countryside which forms the background in these icons show the clear influence of the technique of oil-painting. This same "oil-painting" influence can be seen
in the "Smolensk Representation of the Blessed Virgin" (Bogomater' Smolenskaia) and "Saint Sofia" icons in the iconostasis of the side-chapel of Saint Sofia, which have been linked with the name of Fyodor Zubov [79]. Both these icons display Zubov's characteristic virtuoso painting-style - a plasticity in the drawing of the subjects' heads, with their expressive, individually characterised faces.

In 1688 Fyodor Zubov painted one of his best icons, "The Birth of the Blessed Virgin" (Rozhdestvo Bogomateri) (in the Andrei Rublyov Museum), evidently originally the patronal icon of one of the churches dedicated to the Birth of the Blessed Virgin in or around Moscow. Despite the popularity of the subject of the icon - many icon-painters from the Armoury painted "Birth of the Blessed Virgin" icons - Zubov's icon is remarkable for its compositional and colour systems, and the masterful painting-style of the icon itself {ill.19-20}. Zubov's study of oil-painting techniques, and his knowledge of the style of contemporary Western painting, is felt strongly in this work. Here, as in other works, Zubov employs devices from oil-painting whilst adhering to the technique of icon-painting. His palette of colours is more varied, and subtler, than that found in traditional icon-painting. "Capable of extracting the richest nuances pictorial shading and tonal relationships, and having mastered the great variety of pictorial devices, the
artist can avoid creating a confused mixed style
(prestrota), and achieve an organic inter-subordination of
the separate elements, binding them tightly together in a
unified, visual whole. This could be called a quality of
intellectual generosity, regulated by the eyes of the
artist" [80].

The style of Zubov's work differs from that found in
Simon Ushakov's icons (with their meticulous detail,
sometimes bordering on dryness), and from that of Gurii
Nikitin, which upholds in the composition of the icon the
same principles which are found in the composition of the
fresco, maintaining the asceticism of the traditional
style [81].

Zubov's last work was the wall-painting of the Cathedral
of the Saviour's Transfiguration (Spaso-Preobrazhenskii
sobor) in the Novospasskii Monastery, carried out in
1689. One of the most ancient of Moscow's monasteries
[82], the Novospasskii Monastery had been the Romanovs'
patrimonial monastery and site of their family burial-
vault since the marriage of Ivan IV (1530-1584) to
Anastasiia Romanova [83]. From that time on it is
referred to in documents as the court, tsar's or
komnatnyi monastery. The Monastery's stone cathedral
church was built in 1645, but work on its decoration with
painted murals began only in 1689 [84]. Fyodor Zubov
headed the team of master craftsmen from the artel of
Vasilii Kondakov who were engaged in the decoration of the Cathedral of the Saviour's Transfiguration. It is thought that Zubov was primarily involved in the devising of the composition of the murals, often also participating in the actual painting process. The Cathedral's decoration incorporates not only the traditional subjects found in Russian monumental painting, but also compositions on themes from Russian history, developing the idea of the direct lineage of the Russian princes and tsars from the emperors of Byzantium. Thus the central vault of the Cathedral is decorated with a painting of a tree of succession of the rulers of Russia, from Saint Olga down to Ivan the Terrible and his sons Fyodor (1557-1598) and Dmitrii (1582-1591), the last of the Rurikoviches. Nearby, also on the central vault, there is a family of Christ, the rulers of Israel and the prophets [85]. Apart from these subjects, the Cathedral's murals include compositions based around the ancient Greek philosophers, scientists and legislators, including Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Solon and Ptolemy [86]. The first representations of ancient philosophers in Russian painting are found in the murals of the parvis of the Cathedral of the Annunciation (Blagoveshchenskii sobor) in the Moscow Kremlin, dating from as early as the beginning of the sixteenth century; these paintings were linked with the contemporary increase in cultural links with the countries of Western Europe.
In 1680's, alongside tempera - the usual medium of icon-painting - oil-paints begin to be used, along with the palette and knife, previously unknown to the icon-painter [87]. On 16th June, 1682, Tsar Peter Alekseevich "ordered that various oil-paints on palettes be brought to the Armoury, and two palette-knives be made from buffalo bones, for the purpose of transferring these oil-paints onto other palettes" [88]. The artistic tastes of the court change noticeably around the time that the murals of the Novospasskii Monastery are being painted. The majority of court chambers are decorated now not with murals (стеннym pis'mom), but with canvasses (по полотну) painted with oils. For example, the mansion of Sofiia Alekseevna is painted by "the master of perspective" Peter Engels, who had been commanded by the Grand Princes in August 1686 to begin "painting in perspective style various parables on the ceiling for the mansion of the Most Faithful Grand Tsarevna and Grand Princess Sofiia Alekseevna" [89].

Fyodor Zubov's artistic style, like the style of all other icon-painters belonging to the tsar's Armoury, had to follow the artistic tastes of the court - the Armoury was created, after all, as a department for the provision of artistic services to the court. Court fashions, and new ideas at court about art, inevitably affected the style of Zubov's icons. But even Zubov himself - without doubt one of the most significant Russian icon-painters
of the seventeenth century, alongside Simon Ushakov [90] - clearly felt weighed down by traditional artistic ideas, and, like every serious artist, strove to extend the expressive and technical means available to him. The pressure from the court thus no doubt corresponded to the artist's personal inclination towards ideas that were innovatory for icon-painting. Western art was the main source of artistic information for the icon-painters of the Armoury. Fyodor Zubov captured clearly both the new tendencies in Western art and the new artistic ideas at court. Thus, amongst other things, Zubov was also, in his own way, an administrator, being in charge of the icon-painting workshop in the Armoury. He was personally responsible for making sure that the works of these Moscow icon-painters was suited to the tastes of the court and of the tsar. At the same time, as artistic head of the workshop, he had to devise and produce a "stylistic canon" which was acceptable to the client. Above all it is clear that Zubov's art reflects the most clearly the artistic and ideological compromise which was characteristic of the intellectual climate of the Russian court of the 1670's and 80's: the desire to retain the conceptual basis of the Byzantine orthodox religious world-view, and at the same time replace the stylistic formulation of the old conceptual content with the artistic and aesthetic principles of the West (meaning, to a large extent, those found in Poland). Fyodor Zubov's art is a clear example of the initial stage of change in
the artistic language of Russian icon-painting under the influence of the expansion of Western Baroque stylistic ideas into the country's artistic culture.

(4) Karp Zolotarev

In the 1680's and 90's, the boyar portrait begins to dominate Russian painting. This domination was so clearly expressed, becoming a true fashion, both in art and in everyday life, that it could not fail to influence artistic thought even amongst the creators of the most conservative and canonical type of Russian art, icon-painting; gradually, icon-painting draws closer stylistically to the secular portrait. This process of convergence was assisted to a large extent by the organisation of the Armoury painting workshop, headed by Ivan Bezmin, which produced portraits. Besides Bezmin's workshop, other workshops also appear at this time, which are involved in the production of portraits [91]. Such was the painting workshop of the gilder Karp Zolotarev, in the Bol'shoi Posol'skii palace in Moscow, whose existence is recorded in archive documents from 1687. A great variety of commissions were carried out for the court in this workshop, which employed painters, gilders, carpenters and many other specialists, producing not just painted portraits, but also church iconostases. The appearance of such painting workshops, which were headed by artists such as Bezmin, Saltanov and Zolotarev, is
explained by the significant increase in the number of orders for the various palaces, which were more than the one original workshop, headed by Ushakov, could now cope with. These new painting workshops employed not only Russian artists, but also Ukrainians, Belorussians and Poles [92]. Doubtless it was the presence of these artists that led to the appearance in Russian painting of foreign traditions of portraiture - not just from Poland, but from Western Europe. The presence of these foreign artists may explain many of the stylistic peculiarities found in portraits of the Tsar and boyars from the 1680's and 90's. Portraits of the Tsar are more traditional, and one still sees in them the link with Early Russian and even Byzantine artistic traditions [93]. The boyars' portraits, on the other hand, are more "popular" in nature, in as much as they are more closely linked with the contemporary European tradition of portraiture. Evidently, the person of the Tsar - the sovereign, anointed by God - was still closely associated in the consciousness of Russian artists of the time with figures from the holy pantheon - the saints of the Orthodox church; indeed, he even comes closely to resemble them physically in the portraits. The figure of the Tsar usually has an intermediate position in the Russian national consciousness, somewhere between the earthly and heavenly kingdoms; hence the stylistic "incompleteness" of portraits of him, the partially icon-like nature of the images. This "sacralisation" never stretched as far
as the boyars; in fact, quite the opposite is true.

In the 1680's, the leading role of oil-painters in Russian art is firmly established. They are drawn now not only to painting portraits, but also to painting icons. Thus, in 1681-82, a large group of painters, including Bezmin, Saltanov, Poznanskii and Zolotarev, work on the production of an iconostasis for the palace Church of the Crucifixion [94]. Karp Zolotarev stands out amongst them, as an artist who not only created a deeply individual style, but who also had a noticeable influence on the development of Russian painting in the last quarter of the seventeenth century.

Karp Ivanovich Zolotarev had been an apprentice of Bogdan Saltanov from 1667 to 1675 [95]. As early as 1678, he was given the task of painting the persona (portrait) of Patriarch Ioakim [96]. In 1680, he worked on the Tsar's new wooden mansion, painting "the ceilings on canvas, in the oil-painting style, and various parables". In 1681, he was sent to "draw up church plans" in Kiev, Pereiaslav', Nezhin, Baturin and Glukhov. In the 1680's he painted many icons, and gilded the iconstases in the Moscow Kremlin cathedrals. In 1695, he began work on the lower levels of the iconostasis of the Great Cathedral (Bol'shoi sobor) in the Donskoii Monastery [97]. Apart from working on the iconostasis frame itself, he painted, together with Evstafii Ivanov, the Festal and Local Row
icons for this iconostasis. In 1701, he received the order to paint the icons for the iconostasis of the Znamenskii Cathedral in Novgorod [98].

As head of the gilding workshop of the Posol'skii prikaz, Zolotarev carried out a great variety of orders: from the painting of parsuny and the decoration of iconostases, to the preparation of wooden easter eggs and the decoration with imitation marble sheets of trunks (sunduki) and chests (lartsy) [99]. In the 1680's, he also carried out the decoration of books, and the production of wooden furniture for the Tsar's family [100]. Under his leadership, the famous Baroque iconostases of the Church of the Dormition and the Church of the Transfiguration in the Novodevichii Convent were produced [101]. In the 1690's, he worked - as a carver and painter - on the decoration of the interiors of the Church of the Veil in Fili (tserkov' Pokrova v Fili akh) [102] and the Great Church of the Donskoi Monastery [103].

Despite his widespread and multifaceted activity, biographical information about Zolotarev is hard to find in seventeenth-century documents. Only indirectly, for example, from his petition to Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich of 27th September 1680 do we discover that his artistic activities began in 1668. He writes as follows: "...I, your servant, have worked unceasingly on all your artistic works for the palace and government offices, 0
Great Sovereign, for the last twelve years..."[104]. The text of this petition, in which the artist writes of his activity in the hope of obtaining an increase in his salary, demonstrates not only what a prolific artist he was, but also the multifaceted nature of his work:

"....I, your servant, can carry out icon and oil-painting, paint persony and biblical subjects better than any of my colleagues and also perspectives, and I can gild saddles and pommels in gold in the Turkish style, o Great Sovereign, in the Treasury of the Armoury there are flags on damask and biblical scenes on canvas made by my skill, and there are testimonials to my mastery in the hands of the masters of the Armoury" [105].

Apart from the types of work outlined in his petition, Zolotarev was also carried out the decoration of utensils for the Tsar's table. Thus, in 1677, he gilded and decorated two crystal glasses for the Tsar's mansion. He was so prolific, and his mastery of applied art was so complete, that, around 1683, he was not only transferred to the Posol'skii prikaz, but also made head of the gilding workshop in that department (a sort of branch of the Armoury).

Documents from the Posol'skii prikaz allow us to determine the range of the master's works from 1680 and 1690. In 1686 he led the gilding work on twelve windows and three doors for the mansion of Tsarevna Feodosiia.
Alekseevna. In his petition of 1694, addressed to Tsar Peter, A.A. Matveev (1666-1728) points out that the painter Karp Zolotarev is to paint the icons and carve the iconostasis of the Church of the Trinity in his Moscow estate. In 1692, on the orders of the Tsar, a newly printed Gospel is sent to him in the Posol'skii prikaz for decoration with images of the gospel-writers, gold and silver decorative illumination and decorated initial words. This Gospel, intended after its decoration for the Cathedral of the Dormition in the Moscow Kremlin, was decorated by Zolotarev, together with Matvei Andreev, Dmitrii Kvachevskii and Ivan Lopov.

Zolotarev's individual artistic style can be seen at its clearest in his work on the icons of the Church of the Veil in Fili. He participated in the decoration of this church in 1690-93, on the orders of Lev Kirillovich Naryshkin (1664-1705). Two of the icons from the Church - "The Apostles Peter and Paul" and "John the Baptist and Aleksei, Man of God" - and the carved wooden crucifix bear the inscription: "drawn by Karp Zolotarev". This, too, is another (not insignificant) detail of Zolotarev's artistic style, showing his break with Early Russian (essentially medieval) artistic tradition. In seventeenth-century Russia, where medieval philosophy still ruled (albeit slightly insecurely), the artist's signing of the icon was a revolutionary gesture, telling not only of the change in the understanding of the act of
artistic creation and the move away from medieval anonymity, but also of the clearly pro-Western orientation of the artist himself.

In the seventeenth century, a custom appears of including actual historical figures in the icons intended for iconostases, most often Tsars and other high-ranking individuals who had a direct relationship with the churches - for example through making donations towards their building and decoration. Thus, in the Church of the Veil in Fili, held in particular esteem by Peter I, many icons from the Local Row of the iconostasis are named in honour of the family of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and the Naryshkin family. It is beyond doubt that the prototype for the image of Archdeacon Stefan in the Church of the Veil in Fili is Peter himself [106], {ill.21}. This custom did not arise without the undermining influence on the "ideology" of icon-painting of the Western European tradition of portraiture. However, the cause of this phenomenon was not purely economic. The appearance of the 

ktitor (the customer or patron) in Russian icons - similar, incidentally, to the inclusion of members of the Medici family in paintings by Botticelli - was a sort of expression of gratitude on the part of the artist towards his patron (or customer). But, at the same time, one sees in this a clear indication of the weakening of the "sacred philosophy" of Russian artists - twenty years earlier such a relationship with the original (the image
of the saint) in Russian art would have been considered blasphemy.

In Zolotarev's work for the Church of the Veil in Fili, elements of the Early Russian artistic style are closely combined with elements from the Western European tradition. The figures in the icons are placed against a gold background, in a three-quarter face attitude typical of Early Russian icons. At the same time, Zolotarev was able to use the technical devices of Western painting. The figures and their faces are modelled in light and shade, with some of the attributes on the icons being drawn in straight-line perspective, and the traditional composition of the scenes from the life of the saint that surrounds the figure in the icon being turned into genre scenes. The pictorial treatment of the faces, the energetic attitude of the figures, the colours, made by combining rich "oil-painting" tones, the increased dynamism in the folds of the clothes, the attempt to convey the very texture of the cloth - all this is evidence of the eclectic (icon-oil-painting) treatment of the subject, and the noticeable deviation from the understanding of the world found in canonical icons. The deviation from the tradition of icon-painting is also felt in the construction of the compositions themselves, although, at first glance, these seem to be "ascetically" organised still. It is beyond reasonable doubt that Zolotarev had already assimilated many elements of the
organisation of compositional space from Western European painting. "In paintings by Karp Zolotarev features are closely interwoven from Early Russian and of Western European art" [107].

Amongst the nearly 50 icons of the iconostasis of the Church of the Veil in Fili, the composition Predsta Tsaritsa can be singled out as being close in style to Zolotarev's icons "The Apostles Peter and Paul" and "John the Baptist and Aleksei, Man of God". All three icons are similar, not only in the resemblance between the faces of the saints themselves, but also in the obvious attempt to translate the canonical Early Russian subject into the language of European painting. Many artists were involved in the decoration of the Church of the Veil in Fili; it is most likely that Zolotarev was the most experienced and most pro-Western in orientation amongst them. This can be seen first and foremost by the stylistic resemblance of many of the icons of the iconostasis of the Church of the Veil in Fili to the works that bear his signature - the icons "The Apostles Peter and Paul" and "John the Baptist and Aleksei, Man of God". Particularly notable, amongst the icons which seem stylistically close to those by Zolotarev, are the icons "The Birth of the Blessed Virgin", with its 'Europeanised' still-life on the table near Mary's bed, and "The Epiphany" (one of the most canonical subjects in Early Russian icon-painting) with its realistic landscape. Even the iconography of
many of the icons in the Church of the Veil in Fili, and in particular, the icons from the Festal Row of the iconostasis, demonstrate the interest of Russian master- artists in Western European engravings. Although the artist (possibly Zolotarev himself) considerably simplifies the compositions found in the iconographic sources for the images of "The Purification", "The Nativity", "The Annunciation" and "The Epiphany", nonetheless, one can clearly see in them the compositions found in their prototypes in the Gospel of Natalis and the Piskator Bible [108].

One would suggest that the overall conception for the composition of the carved iconostasis of the Church of the Veil in Fili is Zolotarev's, since, at the time of its creation, he already had considerable experience in such work, having drawn up the plans for the iconstases of the palace Church the Crucifixion and the Church of Joseph Prince of India. The stylistic resemblance between these iconostases is also obvious. It should also be noted that the wooden carving of the surround of the iconostasis of the Church of the Veil in Fili is done in the Baroque style, as distinguished from that of the strict iconostases from previous periods.

In 1688, Zolotarev started work on the iconostases of The Church of the Dormition and the Church of the Transfiguration in the Novodevichii Convent and that of
the Great Cathedral of the Donskoi Monastery. These grandiose projects, commissioned by Tsarevna Sofiia Alekseevna and Prince Vasilii Vasil'evich Golitsyn (1643-1714), lasted from 1688 to 1698 [109]. Zolotarev, in accordance with Sofiia Alekseevna's orders, not only took charge of the production of the iconostases and their icons, but also of the entire financial side of the project [110]; the Novodevichii project was evidently of very great importance for Tsarevna Sofiia herself.

It is known that Zolotarev painted the Festal Row icons of the iconostasis of the Great Church of the Donskoi Monastery, and that he also painted the North and South doors. Many of the icons in the iconostasis of the Great Church were restored in 1831, and, to this day, the nineteenth-century additions and alterations have not been removed. Nevertheless, even today one can see the closeness of the compositions of the Festal Row icons to their Western originals. Evidently, Zolotarev's primary source, as in the paintings of the Church of the Veil in Fili, was the Piskator Bible. Thus, his "Annunciation" is clearly influenced by the etching of the same title in the Piskator Bible, and his painting "The Purification" is based on the "Purification" contained in the 1650 Amsterdam edition of the Bible. All the Festal Row icons painted by Zolotarev for the iconostasis of the Great Church of the Donskoi Monastery are of a typically narrative nature, as is found in the etchings of the
Piskator Bible and other seventeenth-century Western European sources; they also show the typical love of a rich saturation of details, a variety of architecturally complex interiors, and a fixed attention to landscapes. Even compositions which are traditional for Early Russian icon-painting, such as "The Birth of the Blessed Virgin", the artist, carried away by the Western European original, fills with details from Western European sources, even locating the scene of the Birth in what looks like a Dutch domestic interior. The influence of Western European Baroque painting and etchings can also be seen in the attempt to use straight-line perspective (as in the compositions "The Epiphany", "The Resurrection" and "The Entry into Jerusalem").

In the 1680's, Zolotarev began work on the decoration of the new churches of the Novodevichii Convent, which were being built on the initiative of the Tsarevna Sofiia. It is known, from the decree of 18th September, 1684, that Zolotarev was invited by the head of the Posol'skii prikaz, Vasilii Golitsyn, to begin work on the new Church of the Dormition, for which he was to create the iconostasis and to paint a series of icons [111].

In 1687, Zolotarev headed the work on the decoration of the Church of the Transfiguration, which was in the process of being built above the entrance gates to the Novodevichii Convent. Amongst the icons of the eight-
tiered iconostasis in the Church of the Transfiguration, on which several master-artists worked, several compositions stand out as being close in style to works by Zolotarev in other churches and cathedrals. The individual style painting the saints' faces, first seen in the artist's compositions in the Church of the Veil in Fili, is also be seen in a number of icons in the Church of the Transfiguration in the Novodevichii Convent—namely, the icons "The Transfiguration", "Christ, John the Baptist, and the Apostle Peter", "Emperor Constantine and Prince Vladimir", and "The Blessed Virgin, Saint Sofia, Princess Olga and Saint Paraskeva".

The complete renewal of the art of the compositional structure of the iconostasis is intimately bound up with the name of Karp Zolotarev. Whereas before Zolotarev, as a rule, the general scheme and project of the ornamentation of the iconostasis was drawn up usually by one artist, and the icons were painted by others, Zolotarev, for the first time in Russian art, united the work on the project for the iconostasis ensemble, with the creation of its carved wooden frame, and the painting of the icons themselves.

Zolotarev was perhaps the first person in seventeenth-century Russian art to create complete iconostasis ensembles in the Baroque style: carved wooden iconostases, in the "Moscow Baroque" style, form the
framework for icon compositions, painted according to the traditions of Western European art. At the same time, Zolotarev's icons lose almost entirely the aesthetic characteristics of icons, retaining only their functional aspect; their status as icons is exploited only in as much as it provides him with a place - the church iconostasis - where his painting can be displayed.

Zolotarev's art was an outstanding achievement in Russian painting of the time, and was in many ways innovatory. He was one of the Russian artists who laid the foundation for Russian secular painting, which was finally established only in the eighteenth century. At the same time, Zolotarev's life and work is a clear expression of the general turning of Russian life and art towards European forms of existence.

6. THE PREOBRAZHSKII PORTRAIT SERIES

At the same time as the parsuna - the secular full-dress portrait - there existed in Russia in the 1680's and 90's another type of portrait. A significant place in portrait art of this period is occupied by portraits painted in the oil-painting workshop of the Armoury in the period between 1692 and the first years of the eighteenth century, intended for the decoration of the Preobrazhenskii Palace. The Preobrazhenskaia Series
(Preobrazhenskaia seria) portraits, ordered by Tsar Peter 1 for his residence on the outskirts of Moscow, consisted of a gallery of portraits of the people who formed the circle closest to the Tsar [112]. If the main aim of the parsuny, intended, like the Preobrazhenskaia Series, for the decoration of palatial buildings, was the creation of aristocratic ancestral galleries with the accent on the genealogical connections of the person who ordered the paintings (or the owner), then the portraits carried out on Peter's orders differed from these not only in their differing character from the parsuny, but also in the reason for their creation. "In every case these were true oil-paintings, remote from the arbitrary decorativeness or the parsuna (flat, Polish-style portraits), marked with the attempt to display human character. They differ sharply from the full-dress portraits painted by foreign artists in the severe simplicity of their composition, their use of colour, their oil-painting style and in their everyday details" [113]. The idea of the creation of the Preobrazhenskaia Series was born of social and cultural conditions differing from those into which the parsuna was born. Peter I, as is well-known, was consciously and rather actively trying to destroy not only the ceremonial structure of the court, but also the traditional structure of patriarchal Russia.

The Preobrazhenskii Palace, where Peter and his mother 132
moved after the events of 1682, became for a time the Tsar's residence and the place in which much is formed in Peter's character and aspirations for the future of that which breaks out stormily later. According to V.O. Kliuchevskii, "due to the force of circumstances he was left to his own devices too early in life; at the age of ten he went from the school-room straight out into the backyard" [114].

In the early 1690's the famous Most Drunken Synod of the Most Foolish Prince-Pope (Vsep'ianeishii sobor Vsekhuteiskogo kniaz'-papy) was founded. The members - the founders and organisers of this movement - also appeared in the portrait gallery which was later known as the Preobrazhenskaia Series [115]. The idea of founding such an organisation was doubtless simply the extension of one of Peter's earlier amusements, like the formation of the poteshny regiment (regiment of play soldiers). Peter's company consisted not only of foreigners, with whom he was very close during the frequent visits to the Nemetskaia Sloboda [116], but often also of lowly background [117]. It was amongst this company, where a chummy atmosphere of familiarity presided, and where representatives of the aristocracy and nobility had no advantage over those of humble origin or from the lowest classes of society, that the so-called College of Drunkenness (Kollegiia p'ianstva) or Most Raving, Most Foolish and Most Drunken Synod (Sumasbrodneishii,
The Synod was headed by a chairman, bearing the title Prince-Pope (kniaz'-papa), or the Most Noisy Most Foolish Patriarch of Moscow, Kokui and all the Yauza (vseishumneishego i vseishuteishego patriarkha moskovskogo, kokuiiskogo i vseia Iauzy). The Synod consisted of a conclave of 12 cardinals - inveterate drunks and gluttons - a great number of these being also bishops, archimandrites and other clerics. Each of them had a nick-name. Peter himself held the office of archdeacon: it was he who chose the members of the Synod. One of the most important precepts of the order was that one must get drunk every day and not go to bed sober. "The Synod, whose aim was to worship Bacchus by excessive drinking, had its own rules about how one should get drunk, "services to Bacchus and dignified treatment of hard liquor", its own vestments, prayers and canticles, and even Most Foolish Father Superiors and Reverend Mothers of the higher orders of clergy" [118]. V.O.Kliuchevskii comes to the conclusion that it was "a most improper parody of the church hierarchy and church services" [120]. The way of life of Peter himself, and his circle, during this Preobrazhenskii period was a sort of conscious challenge to the whole traditional system of customary ideas and foundations. The ceremonial order which had reigned for centuries in the Russian court, cultivated by Peter's ancestors, is now totally transformed. Instead of acting in a respectful,
deferential manner towards the holy sovereign, an attitude of familiarity was cultivated amongst Peter's circle. Even Peter himself often called Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii "your royal majesty" (vashe presvetloe tsarskoe velichestvo), and referred to himself as Petrushka Alekseev. Romodanovskii (c.1640-1717), head of the Preobrazhenskii department (prikaz), had the title "prince-caesar" (kniaz'-kesar'), and often carried out the Tsar's duties as his representative. It was he who was in charge of state affairs during Peter's visit to Western Europe as part of the Great Embassy (Velikoe posol'stvo) (1697-1698). In the opinion of one nineteenth-century historian, the members of the "synod" "seized on whatever foolish idea they could think of, not sparing ancient traditions, or national feelings, or their own dignity, like children parodying the words, attitudes and even the facial expressions of adults, without meaning in any way to condemn them" [121]. Be that as it may, many precursors of future reforms can be seen in this early period - the time of the creation of the Most Foolish Synod - clothed in the form of the monarch's entertainments. Further clear examples of his energetic, often impulsive nature can be seen in his rejection of the traditional style of life of Old Russia.

For a long time - nearly a century and a half - the Preobrazhenskaia Series paintings, that is, the portraits of the members, creators and organisers of the Most
Drunken Synod, were thought in fact to be portraits of court jesters. In recent years, however, the names of those depicted in the portraits have been investigated through archival research, and established as individuals from Peter's entourage [122]. The portraits of the Preobrazhenskaia Series are not of jesters, but of the representatives of eminent Russian families - such as the Naryshkins, Apraksins, Zasekins - people who brought about fundamental reforms in Russian society. These individuals were part of Peter's entourage and members of the celebrated Most Foolish Synod at the dawn of a period of far-reaching transformations in Russia; at the same time, they were part of the subculture born of the new Western influences and new human values which were appearing in Russian society.

The idea of the Most Foolish Synod is rooted in folk humour - an important layer in Russian comic culture - with its traditions of popular entertainments, and its highly developed system of folkloric forms and images [123]. This level of humour forms the basis of the Russian "democratic satires" of the seventeenth century.

Folk humour can be clearly seen in the genre of parody, used by Peter to ridicule everything that is old-fashioned and tawdry in Russian society. Many literary parodies form the seventeenth century, such as "A Service to the Tavern" (Sluzhba kabaku) [124], "Kaliazinskaia chelobitnaia" [125], "The Reveller's Tale"
"Povest' o brazhnike" [126], and "Verses on the life of the Patriarch's Choristers" (Stikh o zhizni patriarshikh pevchikh) [127] were performed at meetings of the Synod, where, according to D. Likhachev, "the entire organisation of the church and the State was shown, but, as it were, turned inside out" [128]. However, Peter and his associates subjected the traditional ceremonies of the Russian court to even greater ridicule. For example, the members of the Synod invented a ceremony of induction for the Prince-Pope, thus ridiculing the great respect in which titles and title people were held at the time. The memoirs of Peter's contemporary, Prince B. I. Kurakin (1676-1727), entitled "The Story of Tsar Peter Alekseevich", tell in particular of the social programme of the Synod: "...of the way the mock Patriarch was created, and metropolitans and distinguished figures of the other spiritual and courtly ranks which surrounded his Majesty, with the aim of abolishing these ranks...on this basis, distinguished figures and great houses, and particularly the princely houses of many old boyars were abused" [129]. The result of this "abolishing", "abuse", mockery, etc, was the liberation of the individual from the constraints of ceremonial and hierarchical prescriptivity, which was the norm of court etiquette. It is these people - Peter's comrades-in-arms - that form the majority of those portrayed in the Preobrazhenskaia Series. However, as time went on, the ceremonies of the Most Foolish Synod began to orient themselves more
towards Western ceremonies and rituals, becoming closer in their style to the aesthetic of Western court etiquette and Western public ceremonies, so different to the Russian cultural traditions and social norms which Peter ridiculed. "In Saint Petersburg, Peter I insisted that every participant acquired new clothes for each special occasion, thus making the ceremonies of the Synod ever closer to Western court masquerades and tournaments" [130]. The ceremonies of the Most Foolish Synod were thus one of the earliest channels by which the Western cultural influence was transmitted into Russia, at the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Naturally, the people depicted in the Preobrazhenskaia portraits could not help but exert a certain influence over the artists who painted them. Consciously or unconsciously, the artists reflect the fact that Peter's comrades have departed from the social conventions of life in the Russian court at the time, by likewise departing from the traditional artistic conventions of the parsuna/icon-school of Russian portrait painting of the 1680's and 90's. The aesthetic of unconventional behaviour, as demonstrated by these "foolish powerful men" (shuteinye vel'mozhi), clearly conditions the aesthetic and artistic devices which are found in their portraits. The artists clearly identify the "untraditionality" of the Synod's carnivalised ceremonies with the nemetskii or non-Russian, Western influence;
thus, in the stylistic peculiarities of their paintings, they are trying to underline this non-canonicity and "non-Russian-ness". Hence also the aesthetic similarity of the portraits of the Preobrazhenskaia Series to Western portraits of the time, and their divergence from the stiff parsuna-style typical of the contemporary Russian portrait. Of course, there is not a final and absolute rejection of the parsuna-style - this was not possible in the Petrine period, when the archaic parsuna style still remained; the final break with the parsuna-style came only in the post-Petrine period. "The genetic ties between the "fools" and the parsuna-style is obvious: both preserve the characteristic flatness, the rhythmic play of contour lines, the local understanding of colour, the inscriptions against abstract backgrounds, and the stiffness of the figures; but here the keen interest of the master-painters in the peculiarities of the human characters is expressed with such energy that, even today, one is struck by the almost frightening lifelike quality of the portraits" [131]. Naturally this was not achieved without the indirect influence of the customer himself - Peter I. Understanding well the tastes and social preoccupations of the young Russian Tsar, the artists, aiming to oblige the customer (the usual practice in Russian portrait painting at the time) carried out the work, orienting themselves towards what they thought to be his tastes. Thus the new artistic directions seen in the Russian portrait of the end of the
seventeenth century were conditioned by the new conditions of everyday life and of society. These new artistic and aesthetic directions can be seen at their best in the portrait of Iakov Fyodorovich Turgenev [132], {ill.22}. The occasion of the painting of this portrait was the Kozhukhov manoeuvres (Kozhukhovskie torzhestva) and the mock wedding which followed it, which was held in January 1694, in tents not far from the town of Preobrazhenskoe [133]. It is known, from the memoirs of Zheliabuzhskii, that Iakov Turgenev married a sacristan's widow; a great mock procession was organised, in which participated, as demanded by the rites of the Synod, "boyars, okolnichye, members of the Boyar Council (dumnye) and all ranks of people from the palace, riding on bulls, goats, pigs and horses, dressed in ridiculous garments, sacks made from bast, canvas hats, thick linen kaftans trimmed with cats' paws, and wearing boots made of straw and mittens made of mouse skins...Turgenev rode with his wife in the best State velvet-lined coach, followed by members of the Trubetskoi, Sheremet'ev, Golitsyn and Gagin families" [134]. The description of this marriage procession leads one to suggest that the person who ordered the portrait of Turgenev was himself most likely oriented towards low folk humour. If, to give D.Likhachev's definition, the function of humour is "to reveal and disclose truth, to undress reality" [135], then the portrait of Turgenev is a true example of this level of humour. In contrast to the images of the
parsuny, which always included the attributes of official position, that is, the rank of the model, Turgenev's portrait attempts to treat the model completely as an individual, with an array of eccentric characteristics. It is undeniable that one of the main qualities of the portraits of the Preobrazhenskaya Series, in comparison with the aesthetic of the parsuna, is their intimate nature, the status of the model as an individual character. The Turgenev portrait, although limited (technically it is close to the icon and parsuna styles), is linked genetically by its exceptionally expressive treatment of the face to the very best achievements of Russian portrait art.

Matvei Filimonovich Naryshkin held the rank of Most Drunken Patriarch in the Synod, and was known as "Milak"[136]. The portrait of an old man in the Preobrazhenskaya Series - in the words of Prince B.I.Kurakin, "the stupid, old, drunken man" [137] - is exceptional in the unconcealed violence of the expression on the face of its subject, and its elemental physical power. It was Naryshin who, according to the regulations of the Synod, had to pronounce the following words: "I, old and drunk, bless this inebriated fellow:
In the name of all drunks,
In the name of all tipplers
In the name of all gamblers,
In the name of all fools,
In the name of all buffoons,
In the name of all madcaps..." [138].

The influence of the fools' poetry, buffoonery, drunkenness and gluttony - the characteristic features of the Synod's celebrations - is particularly clear in the portrait of Ivan Andreevich Shepoteev [139]. Here, perhaps more clearly than in any of the other portraits in the Preobrazhenskaia Series, we see the tendency towards the grotesque. The clear sense of individuality which the author of this portrait has allows him to reach the very limit of authenticity, and to endow the image with a convincingly lifelike quality.

The departure from the artistic methods of the parsuna-style can equally be seen in the portrait of Aleksei Vasil'kov [140]. Alone amongst the Preobrazhenskaia portraits, A.Vasil'kov is depicted with the attributes of the drinking society: a cucumber on a dish, a wine-flagon, a goblet (charka) for strong spirits, and a glass; these form a sort of still-life, inside the boundaries of the portrait {ill.24}.

The portraits of the Preobrazhenskaia Series, painted by various artists, demonstrate not only the great variety of artistic devices which could be drawn on in portrait painting in Russia at the end of the seventeenth century, but also the various directions in which these diverse
stylistic approaches were moving. Incidentally, one of the unsolved questions of the Preobrazhenskaia Series is the authorship of the portraits; the artists of most of the portraits are unknown. A.B.Sterligov notes that "the enigma of the authorship has not, to this day, been finally solved, but art historians are these days agreed on one thing: the artists who worked on them were most likely Russian masters from the Armoury's oil-painting workshop, and the painting took place over a period of approximately fifteen years, the style of the portraits undergoing changes during this period" [141]. It is thought the well-known Armoury painters Grigorii Odol'skii, Ivan Arefusitskii and Mikhail Choglokov that were amongst the artists involved [142].

The Russian portrait of this period clearly attempts to equal Western fine art in its solving of stylistic riddles, and artistic achievement, although Western fine art had done this over the course of its three-hundred year development. A multitude of new ideas and pictorial devices had already appeared in Russian portrait art from the end of the seventeenth century. Yet the portraits of the Preobrazhenskaia Series offer a clear example of the immaturity, uncertainty, artistic duality and technical imperfection of portrait art in Russia at the end of the seventeenth century. The portraits nevertheless indicate a significant shift, not only in the artistic consciousness of their authors, but also in the tradition
of Russian oil portraits, towards the Western oil-painting tradition. Thus, in the portrait of Andrei Matveevich Apraksin, known as Besiashchii, the artist, with an honesty which is striking for the seventeenth century, portrays in minute detail the model's appearance: his hair-style, the features of his face, and even peculiarities of his skin [143]. For the first time in Russia, the artist pays particular attention to the hands of the model, meticulously recording every joint in the fingers. However, the "studying" of the model is restricted to these areas - in the treatment of Apraksin's face there is no hint of interest on the part of the artist in creating a psychological portrait of his contemporary {ill.24}. This style, which could be called "descriptive objectivity", appears to have attracted other artists too; in particular, the portrait of Prince Nikolai Mikhailovich Zhirovyi-Zasekin displays a similar distance from the model, combined with an authorial impassivity and a dry, descriptive style [144].

The portrait of Sergei Leont'evich Bukhvostov [145] occupies a special place amongst the Preobrazhenskaia Series paintings. The intimate basis of this portrait is immediately discernible, allowing one to talk of the way the portrait conveys the character of the person - a facet of portrait painting unknown to the parsuna, or indeed the other portraits from the Preobrazhenskaia Series {ill.25-26}. Here, for the first time in Russian
oil-painting, the artist uses the physical appearance of
the model to express the essence of his moral character.
The image aspect of the portrait is not separated off
from the picture of the model himself, as is typical of
the parsuna - rather it is based on his personal
characteristics. The dignity of the individual is
affirmed in the portrait of S.Bukhovostov - "the First
Russian Soldier" - where he conveys the individual's
personal and human characteristics, the genuine
characteristics of the model {ill.26}. "The style of the
portrait of Bukhvostov corresponds to the spirit of
Petrine regulations, military communiqués, and the dry
language, precise in its powerful conviction, of the
Table of Ranks (Tabel' o rangakh) {1722 - NK}. The
publiscistic feature, which distinguishes this portrait,
links it with the oratorical prose of the ideologue of
Petrine reforms, Feofan Prokopovich" [146]. In its style
and its choice of images the portrait of Sergei
Bukhvostov differs sharply from all the other portraits
of the Preobrazhenskaia Series; it marks, in fact, a new
stage in the development of the Russian portrait. It is
likely that this portrait - the last portrait in the
Preobrazhenskaia Series, drawn on the orders of Peter I -
was in fact painted at the beginning of the eighteenth
century. The approach to the model which is found in the
other Preobrazhenskaia portraits no longer corresponded
by the beginning of the eighteenth century to the social
and aesthetic tastes of Russian society, and the ideals
of citizenship and patriotic service to the mother-country. Even the Most Foolish and Most Drunken Synod was not perceived at the beginning of the Eighteenth Century as a means of socio-political struggle; it became one of a wide range of public spectacles which were part of the official programme of the building of the new state, or perhaps simply the light-hearted youthful playfulness of the young Peter. However, if the activity of the Most Foolish Synod is evaluated from a purely aesthetic point of view, then its influence was significant on the setting-up in Russia of Western-oriented spectacular, carnavalised public activities and festal ceremonies, as were characteristic of European Baroque culture at that time (particularly in its centres such as Paris, Vienna, Venice); this has not always been recognised by historians. Apart from this, one should not underestimate the influence of the portraits of the Preobrazhenskaia Series on the general development of Russian portraits from the end of the seventeenth century, and on the transition from the *parsuna* to the psychological portrait, that is, to a style which portrays the character of the model. "This was the reflection of the general process of re-evaluation of the individual which marks the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries, and in respect of which the link between the Preobrazhenskaia portraits and the Most Foolish Synod can today be considered simply the formal pretext for their origin" [147].
The paradox inherent in the study of Baroque stylistic elements in Russian mural paintings of the late seventeenth century consists of the fact that these elements must not be sought in the art of Moscow, the city that played the leading role in the development of Russian painting in the seventeenth century, but rather in the mural paintings of Russian provinces towns and cities. The problem is that incalculably fewer examples of late seventeenth-century monumental painting have been preserved in Moscow than in provincial Russia. Not only were a large proportion of the churches in Moscow dating from this period destroyed, but, in the remaining churches, the old frescoes were painted over with new ones.

It is the mural art of Iaroslavl - one of the largest artistic centres in late seventeenth-century Russia - which provides us with the most abundant and impressive examples of stylistic borrowings from Western European Baroque art. The flourishing of art in Iaroslavl in this period was assisted by several political and economic factors. One of the most important of these was the political role played by Iaroslavl in the "Time of Troubles", during the struggle with the Polish intervention, which provoked Russia's need to consolidate its territorial possessions. After Moscow had been taken
by Polish troops, it was Iaroslavl that became the provisional capital of Russia, and the residence of its new Tsar Mikhail, of the Romanov dynasty.

Located at the crossroads of the trade routes to the South and the North (and, via Arkhangelsk, to Western Europe), Iaroslavl became the largest centre of trade and crafts in Russia. The seventeenth century was a period of great flourishing of cultural and economic life in Iaroslavl. A powerful merchant class was concentrated in the city, representing roughly one sixth of the total number of merchants in Russia, and who controlled practically all trade with foreign countries. At the end of the seventeenth century, Iaroslavl was the second largest city in Russia in terms of the size of its population, smaller only than Moscow [148]. The rapid economic flourishing of the city led to a similar flourishing of artistic crafts, painting and church building. Many parish churches were widely built, their construction and decoration being funded by Iaroslavl merchants and artisan traders. The scale of building which took place in Iaroslavl, where, in under a century, around 40 churches were built, was not found in the seventeenth century even in Moscow [149]. Drawing on the means of the merchants and the traders of the city, the newly built churches and cathedrals were decorated with mural paintings and icons. Iaroslavl artists became widely known; they were often summoned to Moscow to
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decorate churches and cathedrals, some of them even joining the "Tsar's staff of architects" and settling in the capital. The beneficial influence of the merchants was felt not only in their development and patronage of the arts, but also in that it allowed the artists themselves to become familiar with examples of Western European artistic culture, which, due to the wide trade links of the local metsenatv, came without hindrance into the Iaroslavl artists' field of vision.

The late seventeenth century saw the greatest artistic activity in Iaroslavl, when, following the devastating fire of 1658, in the period from 1660 to the end of the 1690's, stone churches were built, one after the other, on the sites of the old wooden ones [150].

The few early seventeenth-century churches which remained intact in the city after the fire, and the newly built churches, were decorated in the late seventeenth century with mural paintings. Thus, in particular, mural paintings were used in the decoration of the Church of Nikola Mokryi (painted in 1673-74), the Church of the Prophet Elijah (1680-81), the Church of Christ's Nativity of Salonica (1683), and the Church of Dmitrii Solunkii (1686); in the 1670's the Church of John the Baptist in Tolchkov and the bell-tower of the Church of John Chrysostom in Korovniki were built and decorated with mural paintings. The constant migration of artists meant that these
enormous decorative projects in the Iaroslavl churches were undertaken not only by local, Iaroslavl master-artists, but also by artists from the other major artistic centres of Rus'. It is known, for example, that Fyodor Evstikheev Zubov, from Velikii Ustiug, worked in the seventeenth century in Iaroslavl, that the artist Gurii Nikitin, from Kostroma, worked on the icons of the celebrated Church of St. Theodore, and that a large number of particularly highly revered "local" icons were painted to the city's churches by Semyon Spiridonov, from Kholmogory [151]. Iaroslavl artists themselves also travelled widely, working in Vologda and Novgorod as well as Moscow, carrying out work for the Stroganov family of merchants from Sol'vychegodsk, and decorating the churches of the Troitse-Sergiev Monastery near Moscow.

The highly productive nature of Iaroslavl artistic life led not only to the formation of the Iaroslavl school of painting in the late seventeenth century, of unquestionable originality, and recognised as one of the leading artistic schools in Rus', but also to the appearance of a great variety of aesthetic and artistic movements within this school. On the one hand, this was caused by the individual artistic tastes of not just those who commissioned the artistic works, but also those who created them; on the other hand, the great number of commissions being carried out at practically the same time engendered an element of competition, forcing the
artists to seek out new artistic and technical devices in their pictures, to draw on subjects taken from Western European paintings and etchings, and to turn to themes, and innovative devices, which previously had either not been known, or had not been used by Iaroslavl painters. "Basically, the subjects and the structure of seventeenth-century mural paintings followed tradition, but, at the same time, they had in many ways a new artistic and stylistic character, as demonstrated by their deliberate decorativeness, and their rich colours, combined with the graphic nature of the drawing and a certain dryness. The so-called everyday style of painting (byteiskoe pis’mo) became ever more widespread, based primarily on illustrations of Western European origin" [152].

Semyon Spiridonov is representative of the most traditional tendency within Iaroslavl painting of the late seventeenth century [153]. The closeness of his style to that of the Stroganov school can be seen not only in the miniatures he includes in his paintings (he was known, with good reason, for his icons with scenes from the life of the saint (zhitiinaia ikona), where tiny compositions appear in the borders (kleima) which surround the central painting, demonstrating his mastery of the miniature style), but also in the technique of his painting of the image in the icon. The close relationship between Spiridonov's style and the Stroganov style is
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particularly clear in his icon of "Vasili the Great" (1674), where he uses the original technical device of "colouring gold" [154].

Another branch of the Iaroslavl artistic school in the last quarter of the seventeenth century is that represented by the decoration of the Church of John the Baptist in Tolchkov. The mural paintings in this church, dating from 1694-95, are unique in the quantity and variety of subjects on the walls of a single church. In the altar area of the church alone, which was usually decorated with scenes from the liturgy, there are 18 mural compositions - the fullest and most detailed exposition of the liturgy, not just in Russian art, but in all Eastern Christian art [155].

The Iaroslavl artists' artel, headed by Dmitrii Grigor'ev and Fyodor Ignat'ev, worked on the decoration of the Church of John the Baptist [156]. Grigor'ev is representative of the Iaroslavl painting school. The main artistic tasks which Grigor'ev undertook can all be seen as part of his attempt to create a decorative formulation of space. It is decorative elements (and not figures) that give the compositional form to the individual scenes and subjects of his mural paintings. It is possible that precisely this tendency towards decorativeness led to Grigor'ev's use of stylistic elements from Baroque ornamentation. These elements were used particularly
often by the artist in the treatment of architectural
details, and on items of furniture and utensils.
Grigor'ev's artistic style typically uses one
particular original compositional device: a majestic
figure of the saint, lacking the characteristic
individuality of the image, is surrounded by small
figures or placed amongst architectural side-scenes,
against a background which is highly saturated with
decoration. However complex the subject of the painting,
the artist does not seem to try to draw the attention of
the viewer to the content of the composition. This "total
decorativeness" in Grigor'ev's artistic style partly
reduces the sacred nature of his compositions on Biblical
themes.

In contrast to Grigor'ev's work, Fyodor Ignat'ev's
contribution to the mural paintings of the Church of John
the Baptist in Tolchков is characterised first and
foremost by a heightened attention to the human
personality [157]. Ignat'ev paints truly poetic images
of the saints and prophets, invested with an inner beauty
and spiritual elation. It is possible that the
combination of these two basic artistic methods in the
interior decoration of the Church of John the Baptist
created a unique artistic ensemble, reflecting the
aesthetic ideology of the artisan-traders of Iaroslavl at
the end of the seventeenth century, who "recognised that
they were the true custodians of traditional national
culture, and set themselves the goal of being worthy heirs of it"[158]. The people who initiated the construction of the Church and those who commissioned its interior decoration are enumerated on the walls of the vestry: amongst them are Metropolitan Ion, the deacon Rodion, the Leont'iev family, the Eremin family, and other inhabitants of the city.

Besides the subjects that were traditional for the mural paintings of Iaroslavl churches, the cycle of paintings in the Church of John the Baptist in Tolchkov also contains many new scenes and compositions which are influenced by Western European etchings. For example, the story of Christ contains additional scenes involving Pontius Pilate, and the story of John the Baptist includes scenes with King Herod and dancing Salome; the scenes depicting the beheading of John the Baptist are painted in great detail. The compositions telling the story of John the Baptist (the patron saint of Ivan the Terrible), the story of whose life was well-known to Russians of the day, give an elegant, poetic treatment of the ancient tale [159]. This cycle of mural paintings may be by Ignati'ev, since his artistic style is characterised by a profound treatment of human character, and an interest in the internal world of the figure on the one hand, and a poetic vision of the events on the other. The artist attempts to "ennoble" each of the characters and every detail in the story of the beheading.
of John the Baptist. This leads him to turn the simple peasant, who, according to legend, was ploughing a nearby field with a worn-out horse, into a gracious, smartly-dressed young man, leading a prancing thoroughbred stallion {ill.27}. This "gallant" transformation of the traditional subject is clearly the result of Western European artistic influences.

Motifs from the etchings of the Piskator Bible influenced the composition "The Choir of Jerusalem Virgins before Shulamite" from the cycle "The Song of Songs", on the West wall of the Church of John the Baptist. The composition of this painting is close in style to Western etching, but the "decorative canon" of Iaroslavl icon-painting of the end of the seventeenth century, deriving from refined Baroque ornamentation, leads the Russian painter to introduce, into the mural painting, luxuriant flower ornamentation in the form of flowering tulips, and to place the scene itself, in which the smartly dressed Virgins of Jerusalem extol the majestic beauty of Shulamite, against a background of a fantastic white-stone city {ill.28}.

In the mural paintings of the Church of John the Baptist in Tolchkov, the human figures, as a rule, do not take up as much space as in the works of Gurii Nikitin (for example, in his icon "Christ Pantocrator Enthroned" in the Church of St. in Iaroslavl, 1686 [160], {ill.29}
or the multi-figured compositions in the mural paintings of the Church of the Prophet Elijah in Iaroslavl, 1680-81). At the same time as the figures become smaller, more and more space is dedicated to architecture and landscapes. However, whilst the architectural elements have a clear native character (despite their Baroque decoration), the landscape backgrounds are unquestionably influenced by Western European art: see, for example, the compositions by Ignat'ev "David and Bathsheba", where the artist includes the half-naked figure of Bathsheba at the front of the picture; the scene dedicated to the Queen of Sheba; the picture of Rahab the Harlot, and others.

In 1681, the interior of the Church of the Prophet Elijah in Iaroslavl was decorated by an artists' artel headed by two master-artists from Kostroma, Gurii Nikitin and Sila Savin [161]. Fyodor Fyodorov, the father of Russian genre painting [162], participated in the mural decoration of this church, which had been built in 1647-50 (before the fire which destroyed many of Iaroslavl's wooden and stone buildings). It is thought that Nikitin painted the scenes from the life of the Prophet Elijah, whilst Savin painted those of Elias. However, the overall conception of the mural decoration was clearly Nikitin's, as head of the artel, a position he held for over thirty years.

Side by side with the striving towards realism, which is typical of Iaroslavl's monumental mural paintings from
the late seventeenth century, a purely decorative
tendency is also found in the mural decoration of the
Church of the Prophet Elijah. The monumentality of the
mural paintings from this time, close to the folk
artistic ideal, are found side by side with an
distinctive poetic sense of the beauty of the world and
its meaning. This combination of monumentality and
decorativeness, typical of the Iaroslavl school of
painting, creates an original variation on Western
European themes, in particular, on the engravings of the
Piskator Bible, which were the basis of the mural
decoration of the Church of the Prophet Elijah. The
Piskator Bible, the popular name for an album of etchings
by N. Visher, was used widely by Russian icon-painters of
the late seventeenth century as mentioned earlier.
However, the Russian master-artists were often simply
attracted to the subjects and the compositions of the
etchings, or architectural motifs which feature in them.
In the majority of cases, in using these Western European
artistic primary sources, Russian artists were still
being guided by medieval perceptions of artistic space
and form, an archaic understanding of the laws of the
decoration of compositions. Comparing the subjects from
the Western European original with their Iaroslavl
versions in the Church of the Prophet Elijah, it is soon
noted that, whereas the Western European artist creates
an enclosed and complete composition, his Russian
interpreter tries to widen the spatial frame of the
subject, introducing into the composition devices from epic narrative (a sort of "artistic chronicle" - khudozhestvennaia letopis'). Episodes with the same characters are constantly and incessantly being developed by the Russian artist, as if he is creating an endless ornamental design.

In the cycle of paintings dedicated to Elias (painted by Savin) from the Church of the Prophet Elijah, the artist borrows from the Western European original only those motifs and episodes which are closest and most familiar to him. At the same time, he constantly strives towards a "native" authenticity in the images, towards a unity of time and place, saturating his compositions with concrete (ie known to him and to the viewer) details and objects from everyday life. Often, in the mural paintings from the Elias cycle, one sees a combination of different spatial representations. For example, in one of the scenes from the life of Elias, he surrounds a plastically drawn figure of the prophet with flatly drawn figures of youths. This approach demonstrates, on the one hand, that the artist is interested in plastic representation - the influence of Western European aesthetic ideas. On the other hand, the very fact that he singles out the one, most important figure in the composition demonstrates his adherence to Early Russian artistic thinking. The device of singling out the figure of the hero by means of a plastic treatment, and surrounding him with flatly drawn
- ie in the icon style - figures who are secondary to the story is used by the artist in the majority of episodes which are borrowed from the Piskator Bible. The following scenes from the life of Elias are constructed in this way: "Elias Sweetens the Water in the Reservoir", "Elias being Told of the Death of the Shunammite Widow's Son", "The Resurrection of the Widow's Son", scenes from the Last Judgement, and others. All these scenes illustrate the duality of the artistic consciousness of Russian painters in the late seventeenth century; on the one hand, they are already "infected" with the Baroque "virus", on the other, they are still not free from the archaic icon-painting two-dimensionality and strict practise of "animation". In the etchings of the Piskator Bible, the Prophet Elias is drawn as a stocky, venerable old man, dressed carelessly. The painter of the Russian version of the scenes from the life of Elias in the Church of the Prophet Elijah presents the viewer with an exaggeratedly extended figure of the prophet, with an exalted, animated face, clothed in smoothly cascading robes in refined colours. Whilst following the subject of the Western original, the painter of the Iaroslavl murals nevertheless follows his own priorities in the choice of the main events in each episode from the life of the Prophet Elias. He does not attempt either to create a unified scale, or an arbitrary proportionality in the sizes of the figure and the background, which gives his compositions an ornamental, rather than subject-based,
nature (ill.30-31). The distinctive perception of the Russian artist about what is of primary and what is of secondary importance can be seen particularly clearly in his treatment of the scene "The Resurrection of the Widow's Son". In the original (the etching in the Piskator Bible), the composition is clearly divided into two parts, of equal subject and compositional status: the harvest scene, during which, according to legend, the son of the rich widow, who had previously given shelter to Elias, dies; and the resurrection scene itself, which takes place indoors. The Russian artist mixes up the significance of the different parts of the story. The harvest scene becomes the central scene in his interpretation of the subject, whilst the miracle of the resurrection, although placed in the foreground of the picture, is moved to the side, and does not carry the same semantic weight as it does in the literary legend, and in the etching in the Piskator Bible.

In histories of the Iaroslavl school in the seventeenth century there are two contradictory opinions about the artistic consciousness of Iaroslavl artists of this period. Many writers note the essentially secular nature of their approach to the depiction of sacred subjects. For example, N.E.Mneva writes that "seventeenth-century artists were caught up with the joy of earthly life, the material world with its great variety of objects and different phenomena...they do not stress the aspects of
life which are most important from a religious point of view, but rather those which are secondary in this respect. The architectural background, the world of flora and fauna, everyday genre scenes - these are what attract the basic attention of the artist" [163]. V.G.Briusova disagrees with her, seeing in the work of Iaroslavl artists not so much a heightened interest in the material world and in genre scenes, as their traditional interest in the spiritual content of the paintings. On this theme, Briusova writes of the mural paintings of the Church of John the Baptist in Tolchkov that "...the creators of the mural decoration of the Tolchkov church were perhaps also interested in Salome's fashionable clothes, heeled shoes and feminine figure, and were probably happy even to have the opportunity of painting the ploughman, showing their respect and love for him. But the most important thing for them was that the theme of King Herod should be heard as loudly as possible", "...one can hardly agree that the artists painted the story of the creation of man only so that they might have an excuse for showing how Adam dug the earth with a spade, and Abel tended his sheep..."[164].

The increase in the complexity of the landscape, its being made more realistic, as in the mural paintings of the Church of the Prophet Elijah, was doubtless due to the influence of Western European oil-paintings and etchings. It was under their influence that the landscape
and architectural backgrounds became more concrete, and gradually moved away from the generalised schematic forms they have in Early Russian painting. As part of this process of naturalisation, one finds a tendency to include details of local landscapes and architecture in the paintings. The stylised hillocks (gorki) of icon-painting are replaced by recognisable mountains and hills, and arbitrary lands and areas of water become forests and fields full of grasses and flowers, or deserts under burning suns, or the pale blue surfaces of rivers and seas. Even the way in which areas of water are represented changes. In Early Russian painting, water was represented in a purely conventional manner - mainly by the use of parallel or zigzag lines. In the Iaroslavl mural painting's scene of the healing of Nehemaiah, which shows Nehemaiah putting his legs in the water, the artist succeeds in conveying not only the actual feeling of the water - by drawing the waves in natural lines, organised according to a certain (natural) rhythm - but also the feel of the air around the figures. However, even this scene, for all its concrete and realistic qualities, is permeated by the feeling of being a fantastic invention, far removed from the style of the graphic original. This smoothness, and liveliness, in the narration brings Iaroslavl painting close to folk art, where invention and fantasy are often interwoven with reality. Yet the narrative basis of Early Russian art does not contradict the narrative principle of the illustrations of Biblical
stories in the etchings of the Piskator Bible. It is possible that it was precisely the narrative character (and saturation with details) of the etchings of the Bible which, in the first place, attracted the Russian artists. In turn, the re-working, the interpretation of the original, forced the artists responsible for the Iaroslavl mural paintings to modify traditional artistic and technical pictorial devices, and learn new aesthetic ideas and ways of portraying reality. Perhaps the greatest difficulty for the painters of the mural paintings of the Church of the Prophet Elijah arose when they tried to convey the dynamic of the figures' movements and gestures. This is particularly noticeable in the composition of the scene from Revelation "The Angel of Power". Neither gesture, nor movement, conveys here the internal tension of the scene. The Russian artist draws fairly freely here on the subject of the Western European engraving, making its content schematic. But the figure of the Angel in this composition is painted in such a flat manner, that it is reminiscent more than anything of applique work stuck onto a flat wall. The dynamic, tense composition of the etching is used merely as a scheme in the mural painting in the Church of the Prophet Elijah. Compositionally, its treatment is in the archaic, Early Russian style, and, if it were not for the colour balance of the fresco, the composition of the scene would simply collapse, having no unified overall principle to hold it together.
An analysis of the aesthetic peculiarities of the numerous cycles of frescoes on Biblical themes in Iaroslavl demonstrates quite clearly the eclecticism of their artistic style; it retains, to a massive extent, the traditional characteristics of Early Russian painting, but, at the same time, it is marked by the European Baroque influence. As noted by the American writer Arthur Voyce, "These prodigious cycles of frescoes - a mixture of Byzantine and Novgorodian traditions perpetuated by the obligatory use of the official pattern-books but greatly modified by the novelties borrowed from Western engravings - are the swan song of ancient Russian painting" [165]. And yet, analysing the aesthetic peculiarities and the painting technique of Iaroslavl artists from the last quarter of the seventeenth century, one cannot fail to conclude that, in contrast to the artistic production of the Moscow school, the artists, albeit held back, and burdened down by traditional artistic ideas, have grasped the essence of the European Baroque style. And, at the same time, it is no less evident that this very turning to Western European Baroque style and to examples of European art gives a fruitful artistic impulse to the whole Iaroslavl school of painting, engendering a series of outstanding works of art.
Notes


2. This work is traditionally attributed to Simon Ushakov. B.Puzikov, however, demonstrates fairly convincingly that its author was Simeon Polotskii. See Puzikov, V.M. "Novye materialy o nasledii Simeona Polotskogo", Vesti AN BSSR. Seriia obshchestvennykh nauk, Minsk, 1957, 4, p.71 (in Byelorussian).


5. Ibid., p.283.


8. For more details on Simon Ushakov see Part II "The Baroque in seventeenth-century Russian painting", Section 5, "Simon Ushakov".

9. Iosif Vladimirov was not only an innovator in seventeenth-century icon-painting, but also, alongside Simon Ushakov, one of the first art theoreticians in Russia. He is the author of the "Traktat ob ikonopisanii", in which he passionately defends Western art, and argues for the need for a coloristic and compositional renovation of ancient Russian icon-painting. See: Vladimirov I. "Traktat ob ikonopisanii", in the collection Mastera iskusstv ob iskusstve, vol.4, M., 1937, p.22.
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28. Dopolneniia k aktam istoricheskim (DAI), vol.4, Spb, 1857, p.188.


32. Several examples of Tituliarniki have survived, from 1672-73 and 1678, which are now kept in the Hermitage,
the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library and the Central State Archive of Early Documents (TsGADA, now RGADA).

33. Ivan Maksimov (?-1689), pupil of S. Ushakov; worked from 1666 in the Pushkarskii (Artillery) and Posol'skii prikazy; from 1678, employed as icon-painter in the Armoury. Painted icons (eg Blagoveshchenie (Annunciation) icon, 1670, GTG No.14482), illustrated manuscripts, books, decorated everyday items - see Uspenskii A.I.: Tsarskie ikonopistsy i zhivopistsy XVII veka. Slovar', M., 1910, p.166. Maksimov was of particular note as a miniaturist (cf the miniatures from the Tituliarnik of 1672, the Kniga izbraniia na tsartvo Kikhaila Fedorovicha from 1672, and the Tolkovoe Evangelie of 1678 - see Antonova V.I., Mneva N.E., Katalog drevnerusskoi zhivopisi XI-nach.XVIIIvv., M., 1963, tom II, p.388).


35. Technique of production: paper, egg-based tempera, gold, silver.
36. Ivan Maksimov, Dmitrii L'vov, Makar Potapov, Fyodor Iur'ev. The order was completed in the four months in 1672.

38. Ibid., p.199.


40. Ibid., p.71.


42. An analogous portrait of Tsarevich Peter is included in both copies of the Tituliarniki held in St.Petersburg.

43. The portrait of Patriarch Nikon appears in all surviving copies of the Tituliarniki, with slight, insignificant variations.

44. Georgii Zinov'ev, employed as one of the Tsar's icon-painters from 1670; pupil of S. Ushakov; taken to the Armoury in 1668, having been redeemed from the Moscow nobleman G. Ostrovskii. Works in the Ukraine and in Georgia. In 1687 painted icons on the order of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Amongst his pupils are Ivan and Aleksei Zubov. Further details on G. Zinov'ev in: 170
45. GTG, No.24390. Judging by inscription on icon, painted in 1694.

46. In Moscow, in the manuscript department of the Lenin Library.

47. Tromonin K.Ia., Iz"iasnenie znakov, vidimykh na pischei bumage, M., 1844.

48. The Vasilioaion has not survived.


50. In GIM, No.I-3462.

51. This similarity was first mentioned by I.E.Grabar'; it was later drawn attention to by E.S.Ovchinnikova - see Portret v russkom iskusstve XVII veka.

52. Shchepkin V.N. "Moskovskaia ikonopis'". See: Moskva v ee proshlom i nastoiashchem, #5, M., 1911, p.244.

53. Bogdan Matveevich Khitrovo (1615-1680), boyar and Oruzhnichii, head of the office of the Great Palace; art-
lover and expert; over the course of many years made rich endowments to the Trinity-St.Sergius Monastery. Amongst his donations to the Monastery are the icons Uspenie Bogomateri (the Dormition of the Blessed Virgin) (1671), and two Nikon Radonezhskii icons (Nikon of Radonezh) (1673, 1675) by Ushakov, now held in the Zagorsk (Sergiev Posad) Museum.


55. Ovchinnikova E.S. "Stenopis' tserkvi Troitsy v Nikitnikakh v Moskve serediny 17 veka", Trudy GIMa, #23, M., 1941, p.162-163

56. Simon Ushakov (son of Simon Fedorov, also known as Pimen) (1626-1686). 1648-1664: flag-painter in the Silver Chamber; 1664-1686: employed as icon-painter in the Moscow Kremlin Armoury.


59. This work evidently remained unrealised.

60. Ovchinnikova E.S. Portret v russkom iskusstve 17 veka, M., 1955, p.22.


66. Berkh V. Tsarstvovanie Fedora Alekseevicha, part 1, Spb., 1834, p.86.


68. Iakovlev L. Russkie starinnye znamena, M., 1865, 173

70. No documentary evidence has survived confirming Bezmin's complete output. E. Ovchinnikova, a researcher into Bezmin's works, comes to the conclusion that the portrait was either painted by the artist himself, or produced in his workshop. See: Ovchinnikova, op.cit., p.44.

71. It is known that Bezmin painted Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich's portrait in 1678, i.e. whilst the Tsar was still alive.

72. This portrait was formerly believed to be by D. Wukhters, and was thought to date from an earlier period. However, E. Ovchinnikova has convincingly proved Bezmin's involvement in the painting of this portrait, and dates it to circa 1686 - see: Ovchinnikova, op.cit., p.96.

73. Fyodor Zubov was born in Solikamsk in the Ural mountains; he later moved to Velikii Ustiug.


77. Fryoder Stratilats was considered the guardian angel of Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich; Centurion Longin was revered as the guardian of the Russian tsars.


80. Ibid., p.164.

81. Cf Gurii Nikitin's icon "The Birth of the Blessed Virgin" (Rozhdestvo Bogomateri), 1680, from the Church of Elijah the Prophet (tserkov' Il' i Proroka) in Iaroslavl.

82. The Convent was founded in the thirteenth century.

83. Snegirev I.M. Novospasskii stavropigial'nyi monastyr' v Moskve, M., 1843.

175
84. The order for the wall-painting was given to the Gurii Nikitin's artel in Kostroma. However, Nikitin was occupied at this time with work on the Spaso-Evfiemovyi monastery in Suzdal' for Archimandrite Tikhon, and evidently did not aspire to work under Archimandrite Ignatii in the Novospasskii Monastery, since his artistic views were closer to those of Archpriest Avvakum, than those of Ignatii's palace nearby. As a result, part of Nikitin's artel was sent to the Novospasskii Monastery, and part remained to complete the work in Suzdal under Nikitin's guidance.

85. The subjects of the mural decoration of the Cathedral are described in detail in the book: Ivanchin-Pisarev N. Utro v Novospasskom, M., 1841; Mneva N.E. Freski Novospasskogo monastyria v Moskve, M., 1940.

86. Part of the frescoes in the Spaso-Preobrazhenskii Cathedral were removed from the walls, and are now in the collections of various museums: GIM, the Tret'iakov Gallery, and others.

87. Tempera paints were traditionally kept in special earthenware pots, called gorshochki.

88. Ovchinnikova E.S. Portret v russkom iskusstve 17 veka, M., 1955, p.33.

90. Some even consider Zubov superior to Simon Ushakov. V.G.Briusova, for example, states that "as an artist, Fyodor Zubov is undoubtedly greater than Simon Ushakov..." see: Briusova V.G. *Russkaia zhivopis' 17 veka*, M., 1984, p.46.

91. The workshop (masterskaia svetlitsa) of Bogdan Saltanov, located in his own courtyard, where his numerous apprentices worked and learned the skills of painting.


93. The roots of Russian portraits of the Tsar are found in the sixteenth century, with early funeral portraits. The tradition of making funeral images began significantly earlier, when the role of such images was played by icons of the patron saint. The custom of revering icons of the patron saint, and their being put in the burial-vault after the death of their owner, is recorded from the beginning of the sixteenth century. See: Sorokatyi V.M. "Nekotorye nadgrobnye ikonostasy Arkhangel'skogo sobora Moskovskogo Kremlia", in *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo*, M., 1977, p.414.

95. In some documents he is referred to as Karp Ivanov.

96. Uspenskii A.I., 1910, op. cit., pp.91-93.


98. Tikhomirov P. Istoricheskoе opisanie Novgorodskogo Znamenskogo sobora, Novgorod, 1889.


100. Ibid., p.404.


105. Ibid.


110. After the coronation of Peter I as Tsar, work on the decoration of the Great Church in the Donskoi Monastery stopped, and began again only in 1692. In that same year, Lev Kirillovich Naryshkin donated a large sum to the Donskoi Monastery, headed at the time by Archimandrite Antonii.

111. The iconostasis of the Church of the Dormition of the Blessed Virgin in the Novodevichii Convent has not survived.


116. General Patrick Gordon (1635-1699), Franz Lefort
(1655/56-1699).

117. For example, Aleksandr Men'shikov (1673-1729).

118. Subsequently Peter I gave this idea, as it were, legal status, making it possible for people not of noble birth to become members of the aristocracy.


120. Kliuchevskii V.O. op.cit., p.40.

121. Kliuchevskii V.O. op.cit., p.41.


125. 1677. See ibid., pp.51-54.

126. The second half of the seventeenth century. See ibid., pp.85-86.


132. Iakov Fedorovich Turgenev (16??-1695), member of the Most Drunken Synod, held the rank of "old warrior and Kievan colonel". He led the company in the Kuzhukhov Campaign of 1694. The portrait is kept in the GRM, No.-Zh 4902. See Portret petrovskogo vremeni. Katalog ystavki, L., 1973, p.124.


136. Matvei Filimonovich Naryshkin ("Patriarch" Milak), 182
1677-1692. A relation of the Tsarina Natal'ia Kirillovna. From 1687 he was a Moscow nobleman (dvorianin), from 1686, a stolnik, from 1688, an okol'Nichii, and from 1690, a boyar. He held the rank of "first patriarch of the Most Drunken Synod". His portrait is located in the GRM, No.Zh 3935. See Portret petrovskogo vremeni. Katalog vystavki, L., 1973, p.125.


139. The stolnik Ivan Andreevich Shchepot'ev (1657-some time after 1700). In 1676 he was a striapchii, from 1678 a stolnik. He was particular trusted by Peter I. His portrait is kept in the GRM, No-Zh 20673. See Portret petrovskogo vremeni, ibid., p.129.

140. Aleksei Vasil'kov (dates unknown). From the end of the 1660's he was pod"iachii Prikaza stvol'nogo dela, from 1700 he served in the Armoury, from 1715 he was a scribe in the Armoury chancellery. His portrait is preserved in the GRM, No-Zh 7886. See Portret petrovskogo vremeni, ibid., p. 131.

141. Sterligov A.B., op.cit., p.18.

143. Andrei Matveevich Apraksin (1663-1731), brother of the Tsarina Marfa Matveevna, stolnik to Tsar Ioann Alekseevich, ober-shenk to Peter I, and, from 1724, count. He held the rank of Member of the College of Cardinals of the Most Drunken Synod. His portrait is in the GRM, No-Zh 3984. See Portret Petrovskogo vremenii, ibid., p.126.

144. Nikolai Mikhailovich (?) Zhirovoi-Zasekin (dates unknown). Stol'nik from 1686; komnatnyi stolnik to Tsarina Praskov'ia Fedorovna from 1693; in 1721 he is mentioned in the list of candidates for the post of gerol'dmeister and reketmeister. His portrait is kept in the GRM, No-Zh 6304. See Portret Petrovskogo vremenii, ibid., p.128.

145. Sergei Leont'evich Bukhvostov (1659-1728), "the First Russian Soldier", first mentioned in 1683 as a member of the Poteshny, subsequently Preobrazhenskii, regiment; in 1695 he took part in the Azov Campaign, and, for his part in the Northern War he was promoted to the rank of second lieutenant. His portrait is kept in the GRM, No-Zh 6341. See Portret Petrovskogo vremenii, ibid., pp.136-137.

147. Moleva, 1974, op. cit., p.211.


149. The inscription on the wall of the church of Nikola Nadein reads as follows: "...in memory of the eternal blessing and in eternal remembrance of his family...". This reveals the intentions of the merchants of Iaroslavl and its artisan traders, with whose money the city's parish churches were built.

150. A fire in the town destroyed around one and a half thousand homes, three monasteries, 29 churches, the ancient fortress walls of the Iaroslavl kremlin, a great number of trading rows, and even some bridges.

151. In 1676, S.Kholmogorets, as head of the the artel of Iaroslavl master-craftsmen, was sent to work in the in Moscow Armoury (Oruzheinyi prikaz). Despite the high regard in which his work was held by Ushakov, he was not taken on as a salaried icon-painter there, and later had to return to Iaroslavl, where he continued to paint church and local icons: see: Briusova V.G. Russkaia
Amongst the best known of his pre-Moscow works is the hagiographic icon "Vasilii Velikii" (1674), from the collection of the Iaroslavl Museum. In his second Iaroslavl' period he painted, in particular, the hagiographic icon "Elijah the Prophet" (1678, Iaroslavl Museum), "The Almighty Saviour (Spas Vsevedrzhitel'), with scenes from His life and passion" (1680's, GRM), the icon "St. Nicholas the Miracle-worker with scenes from his life" (Nikolai Chudotvorets v zhitiy) (1685, Iaroslavl Museum), the icon "The Blessed Virgin with the infant on the throne, with acanthus prayer" (Bogomater' s mladentsem na prestole v kleimakh akafista" (1680's, GRM).


154. The technique of "colouring gold" (tsvechenie zolota) was widely used in seventeenth-century icon-painting. Usually gold (very thin gold leaf) which was used for the background of the icon, items in the
interior and architectural details in the icon, was
coloured with a thin, translucent layer of red or yellow
paint.

155. Pokrovskii N.V. Ocherki pamiatnikov khristianskoi
ikonografii. iskusstva, Spb, 1900, p.328.

156. Full name - Dmitrii Grigor'ev Plekhanov (or
Plekhan), known as Kuretnikov. His father, the icon-
painter Grigorii Stepanov, contributed to the mural
decoration of the Armoury in 1642-43, as one of a team of
master-artists from Vologda. D.Grigor'ev was born in
1642. He trained as an artist in the 1650's and 60's. In
his youth he worked in Rostov (on the mural decoration of
the Church of the Dormition and the Church of the
Resurrection in the Rostov Kremlin), together with Gurii
Nikitin. In Iaroslavl he participated in the production
of painting ensembles for the Churches of Nikola Mokrii,
Dmitrii Solunskii, and John the Baptist in Tolchkov. He
painted the mural decorations of the Cathedral of the
Dormition in the Troitse-Sergiev Lavra (1684).

157. Fyodor Ignat'iev, born in 1649. Practically no
information about his life has survived. He was involved
in the mural decoration of the Church of the Resurrection
in Tutaev (1678-80). In 1715-16 he worked with Fyodor
Fyodorov in the mural decoration of the Fyodorovskii
Church in Iaroslavl.

159. The earliest scenes from the life of John the Baptist in Russian monumental painting are found in the mural paintings of the Church of the Annunciation in Novgorod (Twelth Century); in the sixteenth century they often appear both in easel painting and in mural paintings, since John the Baptist was the patron saint of Ivan the Terrible.

160. In the Iaroslavl Museum.

161. Gurii Nikitin (full name Gurii Nikitin Kineshemiitev) was born in Kostroma, the son of a merchant from that town. His earliest known work are the side panels of the folding icon "Blessed Virgin of Kazan" (1656-62), in the Kostroma Museum. He took part in the decoration of churches and cathedrals in Kostroma, the Spas Nerukotvornyii Church in the Moscow Kremlin (1676), the Church of St.Gregory of NeoCaesarea (Grigorii Neokesariiskii) in Moscow (1668), the Church at Pereislavl-Zalesskii in the Danilov Monastery (1668), and the Church of the Resurrection in Rostov (1675). In Moscow he was given the title of icon-painter of the first rank (ikonopisets I-oi stat'ii). He worked on the mural decoration of the Church of the Dormition in the
Moscow Kremlin. From 1660, he was the head of the Kostroma artists' artel.

Sila Savin was born in Kostroma. He worked under Ushakov in Moscow; he had the title of "salaried icon-painter" (kormovyi ikonopisets).

162. Fyodor Fyodorov, son of the painter Fyodor Karpov. In 1697, he took part in the mural decoration of the Chapel of the Veil (Pokrovskii predel) in the Church of the Prophet Elijah in Iaroslavl, together with Fyodor Ignat'ev and Ivan and Pyotr Averkiev.


III THE BAROQUE IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY RUSSIAN DECORATIVE-APPLIED ART
1. PECULIARITIES OF TRADITION AND STYLE

The different genres and varieties of art in Russia did not take on the features of the Baroque style equally. In fact, the process of assimilation of the Baroque style did not proceed in an even manner in different regions of the country. As traditional Russian culture assimilated the Baroque style, local varieties of the style were created, of differing conceptual and artistic significance. Examples of the elevated, courtly and aristocratic Baroque are found almost exclusively in Moscow, where not only the required social structures existed, but where also numerous western artists and craftsmen were working. The varying social stratification of the various regions of the country engendered differing, often unique versions of the Baroque style. This 'plasticity' of Baroque style, its ability to 'adapt and refashion' itself in the image of national, local or traditional cultures, its ability to appear, as Y. Kozlova writes, "in new forms, to express old ideas, but, using the language of accustomed images, to speak of new concepts" [1], enabled to a large extent the rapid universal Russian assimilation of elements of Baroque art. Indeed, in the West too, the Baroque clearly demonstrates its aesthetic universality, its ability to express and formulate differing ideologies: from counter-reformatory and feudal reactions, to popular cultural movements.
The geographic location of the main centres of Russian artistic culture - Moscow, Novgorod, Velikii Ustiug, Sol'vychegodsk - and the socio-economic situation of the local populations to a large extent conditioned the peculiarities of the assimilation process and the unique varieties of Baroque style which appeared in these regions. It should be noted, however, that even before the so-called Baroque expansion of the second half of the seventeenth century, these areas had enjoyed a long tradition of artistic craftsmanship.

Moscow remained the cultural centre of Russia throughout the seventeenth century. The best jewellers, armourers and painters were working in the Moscow Kremlin; here, too, worked foreign craftsmen who had been invited to Russia. It was from Moscow that new artistic trends, a new style and a new technique of production of works of applied art emanated, the best examples of which filled the Tsar's treasury. The craftsmen responsible for the Golden and Silver Chambers worked not only on the Tsar's palace, but also in the Patriarch's residence and its surroundings. As early as the mid-seventeenth century, Patriarch Nikon established workshops at the Patriarch's palace, where religious items were manufactured - crosses, panagias, mitres, church vessels, icon covers and liturgical books. Talented master armourers worked in the workshops attached to the Armoury, producing a large
number of decorated artistic carvings, ceremonial weapons in gold and enamel, hauberks and helmets. Decorated gilded glassware was being produced in the Izmailov and Podmoskov'ie glass factories in the 1670's.

Around the end of the seventeenth century, the bratina and kovsh, traditional Russian utensils, were displaced by new forms and types of tableware, in particular silver charki and stopy, and kubki; silver goblets, late seventeenth century (GE, GIM, GMMK); silver winebowl by Vasilii Andreev (GIM); silver beakers (GMMK). Both the choice of these new forms of ware, and their decoration, were the result of the influence from the West. Baroque stylistic elements also appeared in the ornamentation of other examples of Moscow applied art. Subjects from Western etchings and popular prints, and ornamental motifs from Italian embroidery appear in articles which were sold at the Silversmiths' Row in Moscow. Pictures of sibyls appear next to grass designs (clearly belonging to the Baroque tradition) on crockery, korchiki (small ewers), glasses and silver boxes from Moscow; brass doors, end seventeenth century (GE); silver charki (GE, GIM). Moscow enamel craftsmen, under the influence of western European models of applied art, began to change the style of the items they manufactured. Fantastic Baroque decorative patterns began to appear on their chashi and icon-covers, the enamel itself is illuminated, losing its traditional monotony and uniformity of colour.
At the end of the seventeenth century Moscow master metal engravers radically changed the style of their productions. They gradually moved away from images from icon-painting, and began to borrow subjects from Western European prints and the Piscator Bible, using stylized Baroque ornamentation (silver glasses with the subject "Samson and Delilah", "Susannah and the Elders" - GMMK). Even niello ornamentation on items of applied art produced by Moscow master craftsmen towards the end of the seventeenth century acquire a pictorial character, clearly under the influence of Western European engraving and etching (silver glasses - GIM, GMMK).

The importance of the Moscow School for the development of Russian art in the seventeenth century can be seen from the two following factors. First, Moscow was the most influential artistic centre in Russia, the works produced there, being of great artistic and technical merit, often consequently much imitated in the provinces. Second, thanks in no small respect to the presence of Western artists and master craftsmen in Moscow, as well as the concentration there of the best Russian craftsmen of the time and the consequent fund of artistic knowledge, works from the Moscow School distinguish themselves from provincial works by their
professionalism, and the absence in them of clearly expressed local folkloric elements.

As a rule, Baroque decorative elements found in works of the Moscow School are transformed in provincial Russian schools into a Baroque handicraft primitive. The "high", official Moscow artistic style, oriented to the tastes of the court, is unavoidably vulgarized and simplified under the influence of archaized local traditions and the demands of consumers belonging not to the courtly or high ecclesiastical layers of society, but rather to the merchant and petty bourgeois classes. Russian provincial art is thus, at the heart of its aesthetic, of a derivative nature in relation to artistic production in the Moscow School. At the same time, the Baroque artistic elements in art of the Moscow School itself are of no less a derivative nature than Spanish or French art of the time.

Icon-painters and artisan gold and silver jewellers in the north of Russia had incomparably greater opportunities for acquaintance with western examples of Baroque art than the master craftsmen of other Russian provinces. Besides the traditional Polish-Ukrainian sources of information, they had a direct link with the West via Archangelsk, and, moreover, local merchants traded widely with European states.
Apart from the original examples of European gold and silver artwork, reproductions of Western European icons and engravings also served as the sources for borrowing of Baroque motifs and stylistic elements. Local gold and silver craftsmen also drew widely on the later very popular collections of emblems (ie insignias) and allegories, for the decoration of their works. The Baroque metaphorical system of insignias was widely used for decorative purposes, due in no small respect to the gerbomania (as Academician V.N. Peretts has called it) or coat of arms craze - a new state coat of arms was assumed under Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich - which came into Russia from Ukraine, and which was the source of local exercises in insignia design. There are, however, even cases of the coats of arms of foreign governments being used to decorate works by Northern gold and silver master-craftsmen (silver charka from the Velikii Ustiug school, late seventeenth century - GIM - with English coat of arms on mishen'.)

The Baroque in Russian provincial gold and silver work of the seventeenth century reached its pinnacle in the so-called usol'skii or painted enamels, which show most clearly the stylistic characteristics of this artistic trend. Documentary evidence for the presence of Ukrainian master craftsmen (the primary means by which the Baroque style was brought into the provinces) in the coastal towns of the north of Russia, and their immediate
influence on the style of applied art there is found in the usol'skii works with inscriptions in Ukrainian and Polish which have survived (silver chasha, late seventeenth century, with Polish inscription "olen'" ("deer") - GIM; also silver chasha, late seventeenth century, with Ukrainian inscription "sroblena siia chasha..." ("this chasha was made..." - Zagorsk Museum).

Velikii Ustiug, the economic centre of the north of Russia at this time, was also a great centre for the production of enamel works at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries. Of no less importance for the development of artistic craft in the North of Russia was the town of Sol'vychevsk, located within the estates of the Stroganovs, a well-known merchant family. Workshops were established there which produced original enamel and silver works, and first-rate embroideries. It was here that one of the most individual schools of icon-painting was formed, reminiscent/similar in its technical style to that found in Western European miniatures. Here, too, at the end of the seventeenth century, what is known as usol'skii finiftianyi work was developed, an original school of enamel painting. The owners of these enamel workshops, the Stroganov merchant family, were well-known for their pro-Western inclinations. Numerous examples of Western European art were collected on their estates. The Stroganovs themselves traded intensively with European countries.
The Stroganov school of icon-painting is perhaps the sole Russian provincial school of the seventeenth century which created a style which is independent of the Moscow school.

Themes, images and artistic devices, originating in the high Baroque style and created by professional artists, spread through Novgorod and the towns of the North of Russia (Velikii Ustiug, Sol'vychegodsk) through different social circles - which, because of differing levels of education, and differing aesthetic demands, belonged to an intermediate layer of society, somewhere between the upper (courtly, aristocratic, noble) social echelons and the populace (predominantly peasants). The social base created by these circles of national artistic culture in the towns were former peasants (who had paid their redemption or were on quit-rent), craftsmen - either belonging to guilds or not - master-craftsmen, merchants, and small-scale traders - in other words, the tradespeople of the town. The aesthetic and social limitations of the culture of the tradespeople, linked in equal measures to professional art and to folklore, had a determining affect on the stylistic characteristics of the art which was created by it.

Research into the genesis of Russian seventeenth-century provincial art allows us to develop a clear picture of the transformation of images from high, scholarly art
(the initial artistic paradigm, as it were), according to the principles of the "lower cultural fund" - that is, their "primitivisation" and "folklorisation". In this way, works from Novgorod and the North of Russia can, as regards their artistic type, be ranked amongst works of art belonging to the primitive type - a "third culture" in the sense that is current in considerations of this problem in art criticism [2].

Russian provincial craftsmen belonging to guilds still retained in the second half of the seventeenth century the medieval type of artistic consciousness, with its orientation towards canonicity and a highly normative style of artistic representation, which remained entirely within the boundaries of popular aesthetic ideals and tastes. On the other hand, art of the primitive type is free from the strict canon, from the rigid stylistic norms of high art and, at the same time, free from the "collective censorship" of folklore. Baroque art exerted a decisive influence in the loosening of canonical aesthetic ideas amongst the master gold and silver craftsmen of the Russian provinces. The result of this is seen in the diversity of stylistic composition, characteristic of works from Novgorod and Northern Russia.

If one attempts to categorise seventeenth-century Russian gold and silver ware on a functional basis - decorative works, utensils, religious items - then a picture of the
Baroque influence emerges which is, so to speak, subject to a "law of distancing": the more utilitarian the function of the item - the closer (in a literal sense) it is to man - the more noticeable the effect of the Baroque style on its form and decoration. Thus the decoration, and hence the objects themselves (in particular utensils to be used at table), demonstrate a greater reliance on Baroque influence than do religious articles, in whose creation the canonicity of artistic ideas, closely connected with religious and ideological dogma, hindered the influence of new artistic tendencies.

The new themes and motifs of Baroque decoration are particularly noticeable in the stylistic evolution of Russian enamel painting. Here, craftsmen drew on both the metaphorical system of insignias (see the silver chalice chasha with the coat of arms of the Romodanovskii-Starodubskii's - GMMK), and purely Baroque themes, such as Vanitas (Vanity of the Vanities), the inconstancy of the world (see silver chalice with decoration depicting the seasons, late seventeenth century - GMMK), the imitation of nature motif, following on mimetic principles (see chalice with depiction of "the Five Senses" - GMMK) casket (larets) with hunting scene on lid - GIM), didactic and symbolic scenes taken from the Bible (see chalice with scene depicting "Joseph and Potiphar's Wife" - GE) and the mirror motif, representing the duality of all reality (see depiction on cover of small
Late seventeenth century Russian provincial gold and silver ware brings together the aesthetic of the primitive and a whole series of stylistic and structural peculiarities. First and foremost, like the art of the primitive, it is relatively independent of the stylistic evolution of so-called high art. Here, the artistic norm still dominates over individuality. The Western European influence on the aesthetic of seventeenth-century Russian provincial applied art should not be exaggerated. The main centres of applied art were still in many ways isolated from the art and culture of Western Europe, and artistic ideas were, for the most part, drawn from the Russian cultural tradition.

In Russian applied art of this period, a certain "inertia of form" is found side by side with the static solidity of the compositional schemes of the decoration and the statue-like, emotionless quality of the portraits decorating works which use enamel - portraits which show no psychological nuances. In these portraits and genre scenes there are, at one and the same time, elements of cheap popular prints, and of the parsuna, pointing once again to the aesthetic of the primitive, all the more so since it is difficult to get away from a certain idyllic quality in the artistic ideas of the authors of these representations (see chalices with male portraits, late 201...
One of the peculiarities of applied art is its fulfilment of a non-aesthetic function - the fact that it serves as part of everyday culture, as an item of everyday use. Russian gold and silver ware of the seventeenth century has, as it were, a dual functionality: an aesthetic functionality, deriving from its "folklorised" character; and an everyday functionality, linked to its artistic "genre". It has been noted that the non-aesthetic function plays an enormous role in the aesthetic of the primitive. In her work on the Baroque primitive, L. Tananaeva points out that this function frequently serves as the axis "around which the structural basis of the primitive is formed. In the poetics of the primitive," she continues, "it has an exclusive role. It organises a highly varied selection of stylistic components into a unified whole, which is sometimes artistic, and sometimes on the borderlines of art. For the very reason that here the aesthetic specialisation of the work - not the sum of its professional devices! - is weakly expressed, non-aesthetic factors are capable of being formally determinative" [3].

Of course, the aesthetic of the primitive is of the people, is popular, at its very roots, is close to classical (peasant) folklore; but it is, nevertheless, specific in its semantic content. "Between classical
folklore and the primitive", writes Prokof'ev, "there is an elemental kinship: both form part of the living, actually functioning cultural memory. The difference between the two is that folklore retains the memory of ancient times - the memory of myth and epos - and retains it in cultural isolation, whereas the primitive assimilates, retains and reworks near memory,...under constant pressure from both "higher" culture...and "lower" [culture], and in constant, active communication with both" [4]. Prokof'ev's thought can be corroborated if only by reference to a work of Rybakov's, in which he writes that, "even in the early twentieth century, Northern Russian embroidery retained images and representations dating from the Neolithic period, and thus served as a source for research into ancient mythologies" [5]. The subjects and decorative motifs of painted enamels are therefore linked with historical, not mythological, memory (compare the non-mythological character of the subjects), retaining the link with current aesthetic notions.

Thus the dynamic of the establishment and assimilation of Baroque tendencies in Russian provincial art was influenced by the aesthetic of town folk art of the primitive type. Precisely this meeting of two such disparate cultural formations created the specifics and individuality of the Russian Baroque, and in its "folklorised" character in particular.
One important reservation should be made here. In appraising its originality, applied art of the primitive type should be considered within the framework of folk art, and not as a copy of high art, distorted, as it were, by clumsiness. Only then, when seen in the corresponding cultural context, irrespective their dependence on high, scholarly art, do these works demonstrate both the originality and the true humanism of popular artistic consciousness.

2. Jewellery, Everyday and Ecclesiastical Utensils

(1) MOSCOW ART CENTRE

Russian decorative-applied art of the seventeenth century reaches the height of its success in the second half of the century. As before, Moscow retains throughout the course of the seventeenth century its position as the leading cultural centre of Russia. Besides the best painters and architects, who were drawn from all parts of the country, the best armourers, jewellers and gold and silver workers were also employed in the workshops of the Moscow Kremlin. They collaborated in the decoration of the palace chambers and the Kremlin cathedrals, being ordered to create a particular glory and magnificence for the "Tsar's Outings", feasts, secular ceremonial
receptions and church services. Around the beginning of the seventeenth century many ancient items of jewellery made from precious metals were lost as a result of the prolonged intestine wars, frequent fires, and the losses which came about as a result of the Polish-Swedish intervention. The loss of items of silver and gold intended for everyday and for ecclesiastical use was also caused by the lack of supplies of raw materials. Often, archival documents, and even inscriptions on the works themselves, indicate that many ancient silver items were melted down, and the precious metal used to make new objects. As early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, efforts began to be made to find silver ore in Russia. One of the first pieces of documentary evidence for this sort of activity is the Tsar's decree on the payment of a "state wage" by the Treasury (Prikaz Bol'shoi kazny) to "the English smelter, David Fonles..., and the foreigners Charles Jones and Daniel Chomlin, and, by the Apothecary Department, to the interpreter Samoil Volodimerov; these to be given for the investigation of and experimentation on silver ore" [6]. Nevertheless, in the seventeenth century, the base material for the creation of gold and silver items was foreign silver coins, brought into Russia but not legal tender there. Mention of this is often found in inscriptions on items made out of these foreign coins and other objects. For example, the inscription on the holy water chalice from 1695 [7], made by Matvei Ageev, master craftsmen of the
Silver Chamber, runs as follows: "...this was made by master Matvei Ageev, in the State Silver Chamber, from pure Joachimsthaler (efimki)" [8]. These foreign silver coins turned up in Russia not only as a result of the extensive trade links with Western countries, but also were brought into the country by the many immigrants from Ukraine, Poland, Germany and Holland. Amongst these were a significant number of artists, engravers and jewellers, who often made Russia their second homeland, converting to Orthodoxy and becoming Russian subjects. They worked together with Russian master artists, took part in joint projects in the decoration of Tsar's mansions and church interiors, taught Russians the Western crafts, and were often, in fact, the channel for the Western cultural influence on the national art of Russia. Jacob Reitenfels, one of the many foreign travellers in Russia in the seventeenth century, recorded his impressions of a trip to Moscow in 1671-73 in the accounts of his travels written for the Duke of Tuscany, an expert in culture and an art-lover. He writes as follows: "The number of master artists in Muscovy, formerly quite low, has greatly increased in our time, and the mastery of the arts has improved to a high degree. The Russians have achieved this thanks to the free contact with foreigners, a freedom which increases every day, and also to the natural understanding and ability of their minds. Indeed, not only do they joyfully welcome the foreign master artists, both European and Asian, who arrive of their own
accord, but they also invite such to visit their country, offering via their ambassadors, and in writing, great rewards, whereupon they imitate them so successfully, that they often in fact become superior to them, owing to their use of new inventions" [9].

Further evidence of the use of coins as raw materials for the preparation of silver items is found in the entries in the expense accounts of the Patriarchal Treasury, concerning the silver icon-lamp (vynosnaia lampada) made in 1692 by master craftsman Semyon Medvedev, employed at the Patriarch's Palace [10], {ill.32}. According to this document, the icon-lamp was made "from state efimki to the Patriarch's Sacrificial Treasury". The rich Patriarch's Treasury contained gold and silver crosses, potiry, diskosy, zvezditsi, ripidy, gospel books and icons with precious covers, as well as ceremonial robes and mitres, which were used for ceremonial services in the Kremlin cathedrals and churches. The number of orders emanating from the Patriarch's Palace in the second half of the seventeenth century was so high, that, apart form the master artists of the Gold and Silver Chambers, the Patriarch's Palace also had artists and craftsmen of various specialities, masters of gold and silver items, diamond-workers and other craftsmen, all working together to answer its needs in a special workshop at the Patriarch's Palace. The items produced by the workshops in the Kremlin Palace itself - the Gold and Silver
Chambers, the Armoury, the Sovereign's and Tsarina's Chambers - reach the pinnacle of artistic achievement in the late seventeenth century. It is in precisely these decades that the artistic culture of Moscow, having inherited the traditions of the various centres of the ancient apanage prinicipalities of Rus', occupies a supreme place in the development of Russian applied art.

Not only the style of applied art, but also the whole of Moscow day-to-day culture now begins to change form. Even the everyday behaviour at court, under the influence of Western Baroque aesthetics, becomes theatricalised, and acquires a playful character. All court intercourse becomes entangled in complex, ceremonial rhetoric. The tendency towards the theatricalisation of court life in the seventeenth century, the idea that "order" defines the value of "things occurring on the huge stage of life", whereby "the whole world is a great theatre, on whose stage mankind plays" [11], and that "life is not just a dream, but also a theatrical act" [12], is reflected in the cultivation of new elements of Russian court ceremonially. Court ceremony becomes more and more grand and pompous, and is inundated with new, complex semiotic systems. The formation of this new court ceremony demanded the creation of a large number of precious utensils, decorated with exceptional splendour and refinement. Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich himself showed a keen interest in the revival and elaboration of court
ceremony. "The Tsar and his assistants attempted, on the one hand, to equip the traditional ceremony of the Moscow court with various Western European courtly practices and forms - bound up with the Baroque style which reigned supreme in Europe - and, on the other hand, to decorate court ceremony with such images as could be culled from Biblical descriptions, considered authoritative at this time, of semi-legendary universal monarchies from the ancient world" [13].

The Russian court's magnificent, ceremonial interior decoration, the brightly-coloured attire, the precise order of the ceremonies and the solemn and metaphorical gestures and speeches used during them - these became the norm, which could not be violated. This ceremonially, initially established as the official ritual, now passes from the realm of the purely official into everyday life. The court's new way of doing things prepared the ground for the birth of new artistic genres (panegyrical or moralizing poetry, oratorical prose, the parsuna, courtly theatre). The same process also occurred vice versa, new varieties of art lending court culture an even greater magnificence and festivity. This new connection between art and surrounding life was one of the reasons for the artistic originality of Russian art in the late seventeenth century, which "had to unite their own traditions, traceable back to certain forms of Western European culture (the school Baroque, scholastic poetics, 209
poetry, drama, and the like), with the ideological and aesthetic demands of the Russian feudal environment" [14].

The norms of the new court ceremony not only led to the birth of new genres of art, but they also played a determining role in the aesthetic and stylistic peculiarities of traditional, established forms of Russian applied art. Not only the participants in the new court ritual, and their behaviour, but also the environment itself and their dwelling-places - from the interiors to the palaces themselves, as well as everyday items, in particular utensils and decorations - had to correspond to the new aesthetic norms. As early as 1656, under the supervision of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, a book was put together entitled "The Book, called the Uriadnik (rule-book), a new code and rearrangement of the order of the falconer's tasks" [15]; shortly before this, the well known "Assembly Law Code" (Sobornoe ulozhenie) or Russian Law Code of 1649 was written, which was also a sort of set of "regulations" (chin) about various facets of church and secular life [16]. The Uriadnik contains an attempt to explain not only the notions of "order and form", but also to define the idea of "beauty": "The honour and order and form found in all things, great and small, are established for the following reason: honour strengthens and underlines fortitude; order establishes and makes explicit beauty and wonder" [17]. These
qualities, found in all things - "beauty and wonder" - from this time onwards become the basis of all facets of life and official ceremonies of the Russian court. The whole sense of the new ritual is contained in the desire to create "wonder", to strike the imagination of the surrounding people, and to glorify the Tsar himself. In order to achieve this effect, in the opinion of the compiler and editor of the Uriadnik - Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich himself - order is essential - "rules", "the decent ordering of all activities" [18]. This demand for order, for "chin" and for hierarchy, was reflected in all court festivities, which were of particular magnificence in the court of Aleksei Mikhailovich: "From this time onwards, an unusual splendour and magnificence is seen in all the rites of the church and the Tsar of the time" [19].

In this order-serving aesthetic, and the gravitation towards a hierarchical structure of Russian culture in the late seventeenth century, one can see the most fundamental and essential influence of the European Baroque view and understanding of the world; it is at precisely this point that one notices the Baroque's philosophical view of reality, with its tendency towards a hierarchical reconstruction of life, being carried across into the aesthetic sphere. At the same time, one may draw the paradoxical conclusion that the Baroque appeared in Russia not only in the guise of purely
stylistic, external borrowings, but also in the form of structural changes in everyday behaviour, and often, indeed, in the form of the "unwitting supply" of raw materials for the creation of items of applied art - in as much as works of art in the Baroque style were cast and engraved from melted down Western European coins.

The clearest traces of the Baroque stylistic influence can be seen not so much in the form, as in the decoration, of Russian works of applied art from the seventeenth century. Never before had the character of decorative ornamentation undergone such fundamental changes, in the course of just half a century, as happened in Moscow art in the late seventeenth century. Already by the middle of the century, the ornamentation of Moscow applied art is dominated by a symmetrical surface distribution of plant designs, in the form of smoothly bending shoots with tripartite leaves, flower-buds, and stylised acanthus leaves. In this period, the ornamentation does not cover the entire item, but is combined with areas where the smooth, softly shining surface of the precious metal is left undecorated, underlining the strict rhythm and restrained character of the ornamental areas themselves {ill.33}. In the mid-seventeenth century, the ornamentation of silver items from Moscow begins to change. It loses its regular, rhythmic character, and the clarity of its construction, and becomes subject to the principle of decorating the
entire surface of the item. In works from this period there are practically no areas left where the smooth surface has not been covered with plant designs. The character of the ornamentation also changes. The plant shoots, formerly flowing and symmetrical, are lengthened, and seem, as it were, to enmesh the object, "moulding themselves" to the form of the object itself. Stems and shoots intertwine and are twisted into complex spirals, thus violating the principles of symmetry and destroying the clarity of earlier ornamental architectonics. The attempt to counterbalance this ornamentation by the introduction of new elements - more shoots, leaves and dots - leads to significant further complication; the whole decorated area, filled up with additional, secondary motifs, becomes highly complicated and difficult to read. Naturally, such ornamentation gives the impression of great emotional richness, of "irregular" (i.e., Baroque, in the literal sense) harmony. One cannot fail to see, in this heightened expressivity of ornamental construction in late seventeenth-century Russian applied art - when compared to the former harmonic (so to speak, "renaissance") sense of balance - and in its structural assymetry, "decorative remeniscences" and "stylistic allusions" to Western European Baroque ornamentaion.

In the late seventeenth century, the character of plant ornamentation on gold and silver items from Moscow
changes once again. It loses its abstract quality, and becomes more natural, closer to its prototypes in nature. The complex spiralling stalks are straightened out, whilst not, however, turning back into the easily comprehensible plant forms of the middle of the century. In the late seventeenth century, the ornamental motifs are easily identified: they are plants and leaves which are close to nature, and which seem to grow up from the ground on strong stems, with small, cut-off flowers [20]. This tendency towards naturalness, the approximation of ornamental motifs to prototypes in nature continues on into the end of the seventeenth century. New elements - such as fruit, berries, bunches of fruit - appear in the ornamentation of silver items from Moscow in this period (similar motifs are also found in the decorative wood carvings by Moscow master-craftsmen). Usually these fruits and berries are drawn quite realistically, although sometimes they are transformed into fantastic plants, far removed from the reality of nature.

Often, Moscow silver craftsmen at the end of the seventeenth century use ornamental motifs borrowed from Eastern art. However, individual Eastern motifs, as a rule, are not developed artistically, usually remaining part of a wider Baroque-style decorative composition or decorative scheme. As in the European Baroque, Eastern exotic elements are used in seventeenth century Russia as material for the realistion of stylistically close, new,
Europeanised artistic ideals. The elements of Eastern ornamentation of which the Moscow master-artists were fond - Turkish and Iranian kidney beans, oriental fans (opakhala) and cypress trees - are interwoven with native forms, and inserted, into the decoration of Russian utensils in traditional forms. In ornamentation by Moscow silver craftsmen one often finds so-called "pomegranate apples", and luxuriant grasses, which seems to be growing through refined crowns. These decorative elements were influenced to a significant degree by the ornamentation of precious Italian cloths, which were brought to Moscow by foreign consuls, merchants and travellers.

All these silverwork ornamental forms and decorative schemes were devised in the workshops of the Gold and Silver Chambers. The master gold and silver craftsmen working in this, the main artistic centre of the country, carried out orders not just for the Tsar's court and his entourage - for which they were called upon to "make the beholder marvel" with the splendour and magnificence of the decoration - but also for the Patriarch's Palace, which was also located within the Kremlin. Orders for the Patriarch's Palace - for ceremonial church utensils - had to answer to the same aesthetic and ideological demands as items for secular use. It is possible that these two reasons led to the stylistic proximity of the ornamentation of secular and sacred items in late
seventeenth-century Moscow. It is possible, too, that the same reasons played an important role in the adoption of elements of Western European Baroque at the same time in both secular and sacred gold and silver items. An example of this influence is the Baroque ornamentation of the holy water chalice by M.Ageev from 1695 [21], a gift from Archimandrite Varfolomei to the Church of the Trinity in Moscow, weighing over 11 kilograms {ill.34}. It is decorated in the style of the late seventeenth-century Russian Baroque: with oval, engraved borders (kleima), and inscriptions against a background of magnificent floral ornamentation; the same floral design covers the surface of the high octagonal base of the chalice. The decoration of Ageev's holy water chalice is similar to the ornamental scheme found on items for ecclesiastical use by Moscow silver craftsmen from the 1680's. An example of these is the dish from 1680 [22], with elements of traditional - "spoon-shaped" (lozhchatyi) - ornamentation appearing side by side with areas decorated with the naturalistic plant forms characteristic of the late seventeenth century {ill.35}. Analogous ornamentation is found on the lower part of the stem of the diskos of 1687 [23], {ill.36}. An even greater variety of Baroque decoration types is found on the icon-lamp of 1682, made by S.Medvedev [24]. Here, the ornamentation covers every detail of the lamp - not only the candle-ring and the pedestal, but the whole stem of the lamp. Further examples of this sort of ornamentation
are to be seen on the late seventeenth-century silver plate (tarel') from the Armoury, the potir from 1681 [25], and the skladen' with bone insets from the Museum of the Moscow Kremlin [26].

The technique of chasing used by Moscow master-craftsmen in the majority of these precious items corresponds most closely (as did the technique of painted enamel) to the artistic demands to which the decoration of all applied art was subjected in the late seventeenth century. Chasing (chekanka), in contrast to engraving (gravirovka) (as used in the holy water chalice by Ageev), allowed the craftsmen to convey more clearly the plastic, voluminous form of individual details in the ornamentation. Often, this striving towards plasticity and volume, the attempt to convey three-dimensional space in the decorative details, led not only to the use of very high chasing, but also to the inclusion in the decorative composition of individually sculpted details (such as coats of arms, heads, human figures or torsos, images of fruit or flowers), which varied in their volume from bas-relief to haut-relief, and sculpture in the round. Such devices were widely used in applied art in Western Europe. Examples from here were often brought to Russia as objects of trade, the best of them, from an artistic point of view, being given as valuable presents to the Tsar or his entourage [27]. The influence of Western art in the use of such devices can be seen in the decorative
schemes devised by Moscow silver craftsmen in the late seventeenth century. Examples are found in the silver gift kovshi (GIM and GMMK) [28], the 1656 ripida (GMMK) [29], and the mid-seventeenth-century panagiar (GMMK) [30], {ill.37}. Most often, however, the Moscow master craftsmen used chased ornaments in high relief. In 1688, Larion Semenov used this sort of ornamentation in the decoration of the cover for the Gospels of 1681 [31], and likewise in the decoration of the thurible of 1670 [32], and the bratina of M.A. Cherkasskii [33]. Apart from the Gospel cover of 1688, where the plant ornamentation covers only the free, flat surface of the boards (it is found between the images of the feast days and the evangelists - the traditional subjects for the decoration of Gospel covers), the entire surface of each of these precious objects is covered by chased ornamentation in high relief {ill.38}.

In the second half of seventeenth century, there appear in the decoration of silver items by Moscow master craftsmen, apart from the ornamental compositions themselves, images of people, animals, birds, and Biblical figures. Their appearance was influenced by the fact that Russian artists were becoming familiar with Western European etchings and popular prints - in the form of the pictures contained in the books of Western European, Polish and Ukrainian origin, which gained wide circulation in Russia. The novelty and intriguing nature
of these subjects could not help but attract Russian craftsmen and artists, who were well aware of the changing tastes of the Russian aristocracy and the court of the Tsar, the primary market for their works. The main reason for the stylistic evolution of Russian applied art, however, was in no way a commercial one.

It is indisputable that the attempts at this time to "interbreed" the new decorative aesthetic, which was alien to ancient Russian art, with traditional Russian decoration and the traditional forms and motifs of Russian applied art, were in many ways innovative, even experimental. Of course, not all Russian craftsmen and artists decided to stray from traditions. One could thus almost go as far as saying that the Western Baroque stylistic influence was the major source of inspiration for the artistically most active segment of Russian craftsmen. The late seventeenth century thus saw Russian applied art - in particular Moscow art - "take off", in a way that had not been seen before. Never before had the technique of decoration and the style of ornamentation of objects for domestic use, and gold and silver items, achieved the variety that was now seen.

The combination of Western decorative motifs with the traditional Russian forms often permitted the creation of new objects for everyday use, formerly unknown to Russians. Thus tall stopy appeared, with faceted (or
rounded) edges, as well as small, low charki for fortified wines, and jugs. All these objects, which were new to Russian ceremonial (and non-ceremonial) activities, were most often decorated with niello (chern'). The technique of niello, employed by Russian jewellers over the course of many centuries, from the earliest periods of Russian applied art, was also the most appropriate means of solving the new aesthetic problems which faced Russian applied art of the late seventeenth century. Of great significance for the development of niello in Russia in the seventeenth century was the arrival in Moscow in 1664 of certain Greek jewellers from Constantinople - specialists in black enamel - namely, Ivan Iur'ev and Leontii Konstantinov, with whom the master craftsmen of the Silver Chamber studied during the four years they remained in Moscow. The technique of niello allowed the artists to combine, on the surfaces of an object, both compositions and ornamentation, achieving an effect of colour contrast between engraved gilt ornamentation and the niello background, or niello ornamentation against a smooth gilt background. The Moscow craftsmen used niello in the decoration of church objects and everyday secular items. Amongst the numerous silver objects decorated with niello, one in particular stands out: the large gilt late seventeenth-century plate, bearing an inscription which informs us that the item belonged to Peter I, and decorated with a double-headed eagle (the clear influence
of Western Baroque style).

The most popular subjects in Moscow niello items of this time are as follows: "The Judgement of Solomon", "The Vision of Constantin", "The Whale Swallowing Jonah", and also images of boats (the result of expanding international marine trade), birds of paradise, and various animals (sea and land creatures, both wild and domestic). Images of soothsayers and sybils are also widespread - usually these are female figures in long robes, with wildly flowing hair, usually featured on the sides of tall silver stopy [34].

On silver items decorated with niello by Moscow craftsmen one often finds images of fantastic animals and birds, as, for example, on the glass in the GMMK, where, around the plant motifs in the form of flowers and leaves, there are griffins and unicorns [35]. The same sort of refined niello decoration is used on objects for use in church, made by the masters of the Gold and Silver Chambers in the late seventeenth century. Characteristic of late seventeenth-century Moscow gold and silver art is niello, used in contrast to shining gold (or silver) and a matt black surface; this can be seen on diskosy, zvezditsy, potiry, plates (tareli) and other objects, which filled the interiors of the Kremlin cathedrals, for use during ceremonial religious services [36].
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It should be noted that the technique of niello was in no way new to Russian craftsmen in the late seventeenth century; it was widely used in the ornamentation of applied art in previous centuries also. But in the late seventeenth century - the period which saw the evolution of the Baroque style in the decoration of Russian applied art - niello, like perhaps no other technique, represented the most suitable technique for highlighting what is perhaps the major stylistic element of the Baroque aesthetic: the communication of sharp contrasts - in this case contrasts of black and white, or black and yellow. This sharp change in the "temper" of colour contrasts goes back to the concepts, central to the Baroque world-view, of "making the viewer marvel", "extravagance", "fancifulness", "intricacy".

The Baroque stylistic influence on Russian applied art of the seventeenth century was to a large extent limited to ornamentation and decoration, and scarcely affected the form of the objects themselves. The forms of gold and silver and everyday items remained to a large extent traditional. The inevitable conclusion which must be drawn is that the Baroque artistic philosophy which arose in the artistic conscience of Russian craftsmen was at a superficial, purely external level, that the debt which is owed to the Baroque is a purely formal one, and that there was significant resistance on the part of Russian artistic traditions to Baroque aesthetic principles. The
"pathos of modesty", characteristic of the Russian artistic tradition, clearly exhibited serious resistance to the Baroque ideal of extravagance and aggressive pomposity. An example of the inorganity of the "Baroque idea" for seventeenth century Russia, the purely external character of the assimilation of Baroque aesthetic ideas into Russian everyday culture, can be seen in the peculiar nature of the culture of the Russian court, where Baroque stylistic elements in the ceremonial, theatricalised court "activities" went no further than did the external, purely decorative elements of the external form of everyday behaviour of the Russian tsars and boyars, where it did not change the traditional way of life and order of precedence. A very thin and unstable layer of European education and culture covered the surface of the traditional Russian way of life in the seventeenth century and the still underdeveloped - in comparison to Europe - social and economic conditions of the Russian state. In short, the personal and the individual in the everyday culture of Rus' had still not become emancipated from the pressure of the general, collective consciousness, in the way that the new Baroque world-view called for. And only the further emancipation of the individual in the time of Peter I could create the social preconditions necessary for the organic assimilation of the Baroque artistic ideal.

The fact that the Russian Baroque of the seventeenth
For centuries, Novgorod was one of the great cultural centres of Early Rus'. Works by Novgorod artists and master-craftsmen were distinguished by their high technical and artistic quality, Novgorod art exerting a powerful influence over all of Russian art, right up to the time of the annexation of the city by Moscow in the last quarter of the fifteenth century. If the political incorporation of Novgorod into Moscow was beneficial for Russian art in general, then for Novgorod itself this
loss of independence meant the loss of cultural originality. Cultural and political dependence on Moscow turned Novgorod into a provincial trading town, of merely regional significance. Likewise, Novgorod art, from this period onwards, becomes part of so-called "popular culture" (lubochnaia kul'tura), linked at one and the same time to professional art and to folklore [37]. The condition in which Novgorod art, which until recently had flourished, now found itself, can be judged from the description in the "Tales of Cities, from Great Novograd to Rome", written in the 1560's: "Novgorod stands, it has no walls, for they were of wood but burned down, and the campfires also burned unguarded. And there are no gates to the city, anyone can come and go as he likes, there being no guards...And the people are foul-mouthed, bad, drink much and ill, only their god watching over their dullness" [38]. To underline even more strongly this joyless picture of the allegedly ruined city, the author of the "Tales of Cities" enthusiastically describes Italian cities, in particular Florence, paying particular attention to Florentine crafts. It is obvious, from the style and content of the "Tales of Cities", not only that the author is not a native of Novgorod (most likely, he was a Muscovite), but also that he is an admirer of Western art. And although part of the description corresponds to the reality of the condition of Novgorod after the devastating fires of 1442, the author of the "Tales of Cities" is clearly exaggerating, foretelling,
as it were, the future dereliction of a city that was formerly one of the greatest artistic centres of Rus'.

In the area of artistic achievements, Novgorod in actual fact does lose around this time its significance as a major culture centre of Rus'. Even in the sixteenth century the artistic characteristics of Novgorod art become levelled out, and the devices used in painted images become standardised. These changes appear most significantly in oil-painting, and, to a lesser degree, in applied art. Closer cultural links with Moscow influence the formation of new aesthetic ideals: the noticeable earlier influence of Byzantine art begins to be replaced by the tastes of the capital and the fashions at court. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Novgorod, as previously, trades actively with countries in the East and the West, with artists and craftsmen, fulfilling the demands of the art market, and beginning to draw on new subjects and ornamental motifs borrowed from Western European art, at the same time maintaining the close link with folk art.

Gold and silverwork is particularly widely developed in Novgorod at this time. There were so many masters of silverwork that, as in Moscow, the city's various master artists became more narrowly specialised in different skills within this field of applied art: there were earring-makers, ring-makers, cross-makers, button-makers,
and so on. Moreover, these Novgorod gold and silver craftsmen were quite skilled, drawing on various complex technical devices in the working of the material and in its decoration. On the whole, silver items by Novgorod master-craftsmen do not differ substantially stylistically from works created in other artistic centres of Russia in the seventeenth century. However, the Byzantine artistic tradition, which had been so engrained in old Novgorod art over the course of many centuries, can still be felt in works from the seventeenth century, albeit in a weaker form. Most importantly this can be seen in the traditional ornamental heart-shaped decorative motifs. These heart-shaped motifs, most often used in filigree decoration, appear in Novgorod silver art from as early as the fifteenth century, and are used throughout the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth century [39].

Despite the close ties between Novgorod and Sweden, where filigree occupied an important place in silver work and reached a high artistic level, Swedish art did not exert a noticeable influence over Novgorod art. The chief characteristic of Novgorod gold and silverwork from the seventeenth century is the constant interest of gold and silver artists and others craftsmen in traditional ornamental motifs and elements of folk art.

Having ceased to be an independent centre with its own
"major artistic style", Novgorod nevertheless remained a city where a large number of masters of applied art work, whose professional, craftsman's technique was, as previously, highly developed. Novgorod craftsmen were even often summoned to Moscow to carry out particularly important, or pressing, orders. Thus in 1653, six master silverworkers were summoned from Novgorod to work on the decoration of the icons for the new iconostasis of the Cathedral of the Dormition (Uspenski sobor) in the Moscow Kremlin [40].

The decoration of icons with precious silver covers (or surrounds) had a long tradition in Novgorod art. The tradition of decorating icons with silver covers goes back, it is thought, to antiquity [41]. The painted image of the icon, protected by its cover from the eyes of the viewer, "acquired a symbolic sacrificial significance, becoming a sort of sacred gift, a reliquiary, in which the sacrifice is hidden in its silver shrine (kovcheg) in the same way as the icon in its cover"; the icon image itself "acquired a eucharistic meaning, and the silver cover on it fulfilled not only a decorative role, but also served as a sacred shroud" [42]. However, whereas from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries only the most revered icons were given silver covers - those linked with the names of major church and state figures, or particularly revered family reliquiaries, passed down from generation to generation (of which there were very
few, and even fewer have survived) - by the sixteenth century, the production of covers for icons had become significantly more widespread. It is interesting to note that, at the same time, the relationship to the icon-cover itself changes. Whilst originally it was a symbol of special reverence for the icon for which it was intended - a symbol of its being particularly favoured - gradually the cover becomes a commonplace, purely decorative item; this change brought in its wake the mass production of icon-covers. The mass production of precious silver icon-covers began then in the sixteenth century, and continued through the seventeenth century, when smaller icons as well as grandiose iconostases, in city cathedrals as well as modest country churches, began to be covered with ornamental basma[43] twinkling in the light of candles. These silver basma icon-covers allow one to chart the evolution of ornamental motifs in Novgorod silverwork from the seventeenth century.

In contrast to other forms of decorative art, the ornamental motifs of Novgorod basma icon-covers is characterised by its exclusive traditionalism, and even, in some cases, a certain "artistic anonymity". This standardisation of ornamental motifs in basma covers - analogous motifs are found virtually everywhere in Rus' - is most probably due to the fact that the same moulds for imprinting the design on the icon-covers were used for long periods of time by the craftsmen, who often
travelled from one city to another looking for orders. It is difficult, without information about the origins or authorship of icon-covers, to attribute the basma icon-cover by analysing simply the type of ornamental motifs it contains. It is also difficult to determine on the basis of this alone whether the cover of a particular work is of the Novgorod or the Moscow School of silverwork. It is not so much a question of the conservative artistic thinking and the absence of stylistic individuality, as of the high degree of canonicity, and the normative nature of the decoration of Novgorod icon-covers from the seventeenth century. See, for example, the silver surround of the late seventeenth-century hinged-icon "Saint Evfimii Viazhishchskii with scenes from his life", where ornamental plant motifs in high relief, in the shape of fruits arranged around flowing, intertwined stalks and leaves, are used to decorate the centre-panel [44]. The surrounds of the icons (dating from the end of the seventeenth century) in the Forefathers' Row of the the iconostasis in the Cathedral of the Nativity (Rozhdestvenskii sobor), in Novgorod's St.Anthony's Monastery, are decorated with widely spiralling stems and tendrils, bunches of grapes, and "pineapples", surrounded by leaves, intertwined stems with clover flowers and six-part rosettes, joined together by twisting stems [45]. Plant designs, consisting of stems and tendrils, growing out of elevated vessels, or caught up in so-called kafimskii knots [46],
with fantastic fruits and flowers, cover the surrounds of many icons from the end of the seventeenth century, including the "Blessed Virgin of the Don" icon (Bogomater' Donskaia) from the Local Row of the main iconostasis of the Sofia Cathedral in Novgorod [47], the "Blessed Virgin of the Sign" icon (Bogomater' Znamenie) from the church of Ioann na Opokakh [48], and the "Christ Pantocrator" icon (Spas Vseiderzhitel') [49]. All of these plant motifs in Novgorod silver icon-covers are analogous to ornamentation in Moscow silver works from the second half of the the seventeenth century, and are close in style to the Baroque ornamentation of items of applied art created by the artists of the Gold and Silver Chambers in Moscow.

Outstanding amongst the works of Novgorod craftsmen from the end of the seventeenth century are the works of Grigorii Lopkov, a silver craftsman and trader, who worked in Novgorod between 1673 and 1695 [50]. Archival documents record that, in the last quarter of the seventeenth century, not only was Lopkov working in Novgorod, but also his two sons and a nephew, also silver craftsmen. Inscriptions affixed to works by Lopkov and his family tell us that, more often than not, these were works which had been ordered for the main church in Novgorod, the Sofia Cathedral; they had been commissioned to decorated the ceremonial objects of the ecclesiastical ritual - the cover for the Gospels and the surrounds for...
the main icons, thuribles and crosses. Besides the altar cross, made by Lopkov and his family in 1690 [51], over the course of the last two decades of the seventeenth century he was involved in a number of orders, whose decorative schemes are witness to the mastery and artistic refinement of Novgorod gold and silver craftsmen of this period. Amongst the works which have survived by Lopkov and the master craftsmen of his circle, the following pieces are worthy of particular attention: the engraved thuribles of 1678 and 1695 [52], the silver icon-covers [53], the cover for the large Gospel of 1689 [54], the dishes of the house of St.Sofia in Novgorod [55]. The engraved ornamentation which decorates all of these works consists of a range of plant elements, characteristic of the second half of the seventeenth century, such as suckers, twisted into spirals, large, luxurious flowers, succulent, bent leaves. Often one can find amongst these ornamental plant motifs the heads of birds - usually birds of prey - or of snakes. The effect is achieved by original artistic devices: on the end of flowers or the tips of pointed leaves the artists draws the birds' beaks or eyes, thus bringing the artistic effect of the decoration close to the Baroque principle of cryptograms or enigmatic symbolism. Even the kafimskii knot, its interwoven lines whose beginnings and ends are difficult to find - used in many different forms by Lopkov in the decoration of works in silver, often with lines of text (ie inscriptions) interwoven into the
tangle of lines (see, for example, the cross of 1690) - corresponds to the aesthetic of Russian art of the second half of the seventeenth century, with its desire to surprise and strike the imagination of the viewer.

One of the most important craftsmen in the artistic culture of Novgorod in the second half of the seventeenth century is the silver craftsman Grigorii Ivanov. It is clearly not by chance that his work stands out amongst the works of Novgorod craftsmen of this period. One need only compare the ecclesiastical and secular utensils made by him with those of other Novgorod masters - in particular, with the work of Lopkov - to see not only their exceptional technical mastery, but also their individual artistic style.

Grigorii Ivanov, often called Grigorii Novgorodets in documents of the seventeenth century, was, according to archival sources, a legless cripple [56]. It is possible that this, indeed, was the reason that this master craftsman was not summoned to Moscow, as often happened with the best master craftsmen from provincial artistic centres of Russia in the seventeenth century. Clearly, it was also for this reason that he did not use many of the technical devices for the working of metal which demanded considerable physical strength. It is highly probable that Ivanov made use of less physically demanding technical processes, working on the decoration
of items that had already been prepared, working their surfaces with decorative engravings. Bearing in mind that the forms of Novgorod silver items from the second half of the seventeenth century did not undergo significant changes, the decoration which Ivanov created can be taken as the defining feature of the Russian applied art of the seventeenth century.

The ornamentation which Ivanov uses is marked by a specific pictorial quality, achieved by the use of a particular method of drawing—often the use of shading—which he uses in all the details—the flowers, leaves, ribbons, tendrils, and so on. This type of decoration is found, for example, in the large silver goblets of the Novgorod Metropolitan Pitirim, who later became Patriarch [57], and the bratinas from the Armoury and Historical Museum [58]. Apart from the plant designs, these goblets and bratinas are decorated with animals, birds and subject-based compositions. Ivanov also incorporates cherubim, their wings given an ornamental treatment, into the decoration of these vessels.

Ivanov's style of drawing birds, which he included in almost all his compositions, both ornamental and subject-based, is highly individual. He depicts birds in a great variety of poses: perched on branches, in flight, with folded or outstretched wings, and treated in his characteristic shading style. One often finds, amongst
the subjects featured in the decoration of his goblets and bratiny, scenes on Biblical themes and hunting scenes. Compositions based on four Old Testament subjects in particular ("Samson, breaking open the lion's jaws", "Samson and Delilah", "Susannah and the elders", "Potiphar's wife and Joseph") are amongst the most widespread subjects in Russian applied art of the second half of the seventeenth century. These scenes often form the decoration of works by artists from Moscow, Velikii Ustiug and Sol'vychegodsk from the second half of the seventeenth century [59]. In contrast to the treatment of these scenes in works from Moscow or Velikii Ustiug, however, Ivanov's compositions are often more naive, and, artistically, not as refined (ill.39-40). Ivanov's drawings are characterised by a noticeable flatness in the depiction, a violation of proportion in the treatment of figures and landscape, a static quality, and, in some of the scenes, an immediately striking primitivity in the drawing. These artistic flaws are in particular contrast to their background of refined plant ornamentation, drawn in a free, confident manner. However, these very images, immature from an artistic point of view, allow one to see the artist's desire to communicate the internal condition of the people featured in these scenes, their emotional expressivity. Thus, for example, in the scene depicting the man fighting with the bear, on one of the Pitirim goblets, the artist introduces into the composition spectators - three figures who watch the struggle with
hands thrown up towards heaven in horror.

The use of Old Testament subjects, the depiction of nakedness (in the scenes "Susannah and the elders", "Potiphar's wife and Joseph", "Samson and Delilah"), and the striving to convey emotional tension, demonstrate that Ivanov was not only familiar with Western European art of the seventeenth century, but that he consciously studied and drew on the achievements of this art [60].

The source of Ivanov's subject compositions (and, in some cases, of his images of animals and birds) were the engravings from the Piskator Bible of 1650 [61]. He often selected from the compositionally complex, many-figured graphic original, the two central figures only, leaving out what he considered less important details - secondary figures, sparsely drawn landscapes and complicated architectural backgrounds. At the same time, the artist very often carried over details from everyday life, depicted in the engravings in the Piskator Bible, into his own compositions {ill.41}. Ivanov's subjects, for which the engravings from the pages of the Piscator Bible served as a source, should not be considered copies; they are rather variations or original replicas of the Western European original. The desire is present on the part of the artist not simply to copy, but to rework the picture, to incorporate into his own picture his perception of the original {ill.42}. Much of what was contained in the...
original - both in terms of its physical content and its aesthetic content - must have seemed strange to the Novgorod silver craftsman. As a representative of the provincial - bordering on folkloric - art of the Russian North, still thinking in terms of the artistic categories of Early Russian (ie Byzantine) ideals, he would have found the dynamism and pomposity of Western European engraving quite alien. Still tied to the traditional concepts of ancient Russian painting about the depiction of landscapes and architecture, Ivanov strives towards laconicism and simplification, adopting in his compositions only those artistic elements of the originals which are closest to him. Nevertheless, this very turning to Western European engraving as a source, and, if not directly copying it, then at least studying it and making use of its subjects, demonstrates in itself the penetration of Western European aesthetic ideals into the artistic practice of Novgorod art of the seventeenth century. These new artistic and stylistic tendencies in Russian applied art in the second half of the seventeenth century expressed themselves also in the work of Novgorod silver craftsman Ivanov. And they are seen not only in the choice of subjects; it is possible that the subjects of European engravings and pictures were perceived by Russian master artists as entertaining exotica, quite foreign to the ascetic religious traditions of Early Rus'. Of far greater importance is the fact that Novgorod craftsmen of the 1670's displayed an interest in Old
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Testament subjects not only for their didactic content; to a far greater extent they were interested in their erotic character, and were, significantly, "not troubled by an ascetic attitude of fear towards flesh and sexual motifs, and towards the depiction of the naked female form" [62]. Ivanov includes such subjects not only on secular objects, but also on vessels intended for high-ranking spiritual figures, such as Metropolitan Pitirim. This is surely an example of the incipient "artistic free-thinking", even, as it were, in the provincial craftsmen's workshops, far from Moscow.

Thus, by degrees, not only in Moscow, but also in the extremities of the country, the artistic pre-conditions were being created for the aesthetic transformation of Russian art; a transformation which was completed and formalised - ultimately in full conformity with the aesthetic of the European Baroque - only in the time of Peter I.

(3) "USOL'SKII" PAINTED ENAMELS:

VELIKII USTIUG AND SOL'VYCHEGODSK

The Russian Baroque was a "translation" of Western European aesthetic ideas into the Russian artistic language. The second half of the seventeenth century, however, was a period of early (initial) assimilation of 238
these ideas. For this reason, in contrast to eighteenth century, Baroque elements in provincial Russian applied art in the late seventeenth century for the most part take the form of tendencies in the style of decorative motifs, the way decoration is organised and changes in the pallette of colours used. Thus, whereas the form and technique of production of gold and silver items, crockery and, in particular, religious items remained for the most part unchanged and overridingy canonical in the seventeenth century, their decoration, on the other hand, was subject to significant changes.

The basic decorative technique used in seventeenth-century Russian applied art, and thus the main vehicle of its style, was filigree and painted enamel. Enamel work developed widely as an art form amongst craftsmen in practically all the centres of Russian artistic culture in the seventeenth century - Moscow, Novgorod, and the towns of Northern Russia. Gold and silver items, crockery and other utensils, and items for religious use were all decorated with enamel. However, Velikii Ustiug and Sol'vychegodsk were of course the major centres of enamel art [63].

Located at the crossroads of important trade routes, Velikii Ustiug became the major artistic centre of Northern Russia as early as the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. During the seventeenth century,
industry and the art trade developed in the city at a rapid pace (by the end of the century there were already over 20 factories and textile mills in the city). In the seventeenth century Velikii Ustiug held first place amongst the coastal cities in terms of the size of its merchant population. In the mid-seventeenth century, there were over 500 inhabitants of the city involved in handicraft, specialising in 55 different areas. The number of merchants in the city significantly exceeded the number of members of this section of society in other cities of this region [64]. The extensive trade in works of art, and the development of crafts, attracted a great number of foreign merchants to Velikii Ustiug. These foreign traders, as was usual in Russia, settled in a particular part of town, and thus, as early as the seventeenth century, Velikii Ustiug had its own "Nemetskaia sloboda", or foreign quarter.

At the end of the seventeenth century, Baroque elements appear in the applied art of Velikii Ustiug. This is due, to a large extent, to the great opportunities that the city's merchants had of import from Western Europe items of applied art, cloths, collections of emblems and etchings. In the Velikii Ustiug museum of local lore, history and economy there is an copy of the 1650 edition of the Piskator Bible, the source of wide stylistic and subject borrowing in seventeenth-century Rus'.
Velikii Ustiug and Sol'vychegodsk are connected by one of the most significant phenomena in seventeenth-century Russian art, which most clearly demonstrates the stylistic traits of Western Baroque borrowings - the so-called "usol'skie", or painted, enamels, traditionally considered to be produced in Sol'vychegodsk [65]. The origins of these enamels is one of the least investigated areas in the study of the history of Russian applied art. When looking at the evolution of the style of enamel decoration in seventeenth-century Northern Russian art, one is struck by the appreciable typological similarity of enamels from Velikii Ustiug and usol'skie enamels. At the same time, the question naturally arises not only of their similarity, but also of how well-founded the theory of the separate origins of these two types of enamel decoration is.

Unfortunately, the lack of essential documents prevents one knowing with absolute certainty what the answer to the question of the origins of usol'skie enamels is. Nonetheless, on the basis of a series of indirect historiographic and artistic pieces of evidence, and also through the comparative stylistic analysis of Velikii Ustiug and usol'skie enamels, and an analysis of the socio-economic situation in Northern Russian cities at the end of the seventeenth century, one may question the traditional belief that painted enamels were produced in Sol'vychegodsk, and suggest, as an ad hoc hypothesis,
that they originated in Velikii Ustiug [66].

Filigree enamel dates back to the Byzantine period, and thus chronologically precedes the development of painted enamel as an art form. There is no doubt that both these varieties of enamel decoration should be considered within a framework of the general movement of Russian applied art towards the imitation of European models and an incorporation into the range of themes and subjects of the decoration itself of a greater variety of life's activities. In this light, filigree enamel is more traditional (if not more archaic) than painted enamel, although their mutual stylistic similarity is no less obvious; essentially, the two techniques of enamel decoration can be considered as links in the long chain of evolution of Russian enamel art, from the enamel of the eighteenth century. However, whilst, chronologically, filigree enamel predates painted enamel, in practice both these forms of enamel decoration co-existed for a long period of time, without supplanting each other, and exerting mutual artistic (stylistic) influence on each other in a quite natural way.

Russian applied art, to no less an extent than other forms and genres of Russian seventeenth-century art, was subject to the influence these new cultural and historical trends, based stylistically on the Baroque
aesthetic. Likewise, Russian enamel art also underwent its own aesthetic "schismatisation" (raskol). As a result of the triumph of this new philosophical and artistic thinking the technique of enamel decoration was fundamentally transformed, and a whole series of stylistic and semantic changes, conditioned by the Baroque aesthetic, took place in the decorative style itself. All of this was reflected in the way in which painted enamel was made. European artistic ideas and above all the direct experience and technique of European art (oil-painting, drawing, enamels) played a significant role in the evolution of Russian enamels. It should be stressed, however, that we are talking here not so much about the appearance of a new form of applied art, as the evolution of an old one, for a great deal of the style and form of painted enamels derives from traditional filigree enamels. A very good indication that painted enamel is rooted deeply in traditional filigree enamels is the fact that masters of painted enamel widely use filigree as an added artistic feature in decoration. The filigree serves as a frame for the painted flowers, brands and rosettes, or forms a stem for the flowers. Typical examples of such decoration can be seen in the late seventeenth century silver stakan, larets and chasha [67], {ill.43}.

The main feature of the "semantic shift" which occurred as a result of this Baroque-style "enamel revolution" was
the appreciable secularisation of the decoration: the sacred symbols incorporated "in code" in the ornamentation disappear, and fragments of subjects from everyday life and the countryside appear in the Velikii Ustiug enamels. The primary aesthetic result of this evolution was that the main decorative motifs became less stylised and more realistic, during which process a whole series of motifs disappear completely (krin, petalled rosettes, heart-shaped and geometrical figures). Plant (ie flower and grass) ornamentation (fleron) is replaced by stylised garlands, in which it is not difficult to recognise actual types of flowers (tulips, poppies, cornflowers, etc). At the same time, the stylisation here is so insignificant that only with great difficulty can these painted flowers be called ornamentation. This sort of decoration is found in the late seventeenth century silver korobochka, cover for the Altar Gospel, and larets [68]. As concerns the pictures of animals and birds, and also the human figures and scenes from everyday life with people in them, which are widespread in painted enamels, these new motifs in enamels can be entirely ascribed to secular oil-paintings close to popular prints: see, for example, the images on the four late seventeenth-century silver chashi and the charka [69], {ill.44-45}. A combined plant and animal variety of decoration is used in the decoration of enamel surfaces, as, for example, on the chasha and the inside of the lid of the silver larets [70], {ill.46}. Besides
people and animals, there often appear polymorphic beings, such as sirens, griffins and unicorns: examples of these can be seen, in particular, on the side faces of the late seventeenth-century silver chasha [71]. The influence of Baroque stylisation begins to appear clearly in the principles of ornamentation, albeit softened by the "low" character of its manifestation and by elements of Russian folk art.

Characterising the typology of the motifs and subjects of painted enamel in this way one can see that the invariability on which the decoration of filigree enamels is based has disappeared. This is linked to the divergence of painted enamels from the canonicity of old, "pre-Baroque" enamel decoration and from the orientation towards the symmetrical principle in the creation of ornamentation, thus giving greater freedom to the artist in the devising of decorative subjects.

The introduction into objects featuring painted enamel of scenes similar to those found in oil-painting, as on the inside of the lid of the silver korobocka [72] and of allegorical subjects, as on the two late seventeenth-century chashi [73], allows the decoration to have a new semantic effect, which goes beyond purely decorative semantics and creates a wide field of everyday, and didactic, associations. It is typical that earlier attempts in Velikii Ustiug and Sol'vychegodsk to give the
decoration of enamels this sort of new effect were made not with the help of the plastic language organic to the structure of the decoration, but by means of "literary invasion" ("oliteraturivanie") in the decoration - the introduction into its space of edifying and historical inscription, as, for example, in Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's gold chasha from 1653 [74].

The changes in the traditional style of Velikii Ustiug and Sol'vychegodsk painted enamel decoration which took place under the influence of the European Baroque were closely linked with the evolution of the technique of depicting the decorative subjects. The flatness of the ornamentation is replaced by a three-dimensional representation of the decorative elements. This occurs mainly with the help of the technique of shading borrowed from European art and engraving - the use of dark strokes in drawing to give the picture volume and a feeling of being in relief. Such shading is found in the decoration of many enamel works from the end of the seventeenth century, including the two silver chashi and the charka [75]. In the case of complex compositions with many figures, the artists' understanding of the laws of perspective is clearly felt; as in the hunting scenes inside the cover of the larets, or the landscape on the base of one of the chashi, which are clearly treated differently from analogous subjects in Early Russian painting[76].
The use of a mixed technique in the creation of decorative spaces can also be seen as part of the evolution of the decorative technique used in usol'skie enamels, whereby, besides painting, there are also engraved cast or filigree silver decorative elements fused onto the enamel surface; this decorative device is used, for example, in the late seventeenth-century silver cover for the icon "The Blessed Virgin with Child" and the altar cross [77], {ill.47}. This sort of mixed technique is particularly widespread in enamels from Velikii Ustiug from the turn of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The Baroque influence is also seen in the changes which take place in the colour systems used in the decoration of painted and filigree enamels. Whereas the treatment of colour in the ornamentation of filigree enamels follows the laws of local colours' influence on one another, the line between the colours and their contrast with each other not hidden, but actually intentionally brought to the fore and accentuated - as, for example, in Tsarevich Ivan Alekseevich's silver hand-bowl (rukomoL) from 1676 [78] - in painted enamels the handling of colour is much closer to that found in oil paintings: because of the use of shading, the colouring is here perceived as that of the illuminated object - not local colour, but rather the co-occurrence of a wealth of different shades. For this
reason, colour is noticeably less important in the rhythmic organisation of the decoration of painted enamels, whilst there are much wider possibilities for the organisation of rhythmic movement in the decorative motifs employed in filigree enamels, due to the rhythmic repetition and juxtaposition of geometric figures, constructed according to symmetrical principles and filled with local colouring.

When we consider the rhythmic organisation of the drawing in painted enamels, that is, the principle of the distribution of the decorative elements on the plane, then we find, besides the use of assymetrical (irregular) rhythmic constructions, a circular dynamic in the decoration's movement. This is linked to the fact that the vast majority of items decorated with painted enamel are chashi, stakanv, charki, or korobochki - in other words, objects of a spherical or semi-spherical nature. Hence also the "rotating" treatment of the decoration's movement - the fact that the decorated object has a spherical surface means that the structural dynamic of the decorative elements must be unidirectional (usually anti-clockwise). The variations on flower motifs around the painted base or mishen' (which is also circular) create the illusion of circular movement; an example of this variety of decoration can be seen on one of the late seventeenth-century silver chashi[79]. Typically, centres of rhythmic symmetry can always be identified in the
dynamic of such plant or mixed (plant-animal) ornamentations. Whereas the rhythmic organisation of the ornamentation of filigree enamel is generally constructed according to a two-way (binary) contrast - left to right, high to low, dark to light (hence the symmetry) - four centres of symmetry can usually be found in the decorative rhythm of painted enamels (usually the central figures of the decorative scheme), between which centres there is either further variation on the basic ornamentation, or additional decorative elements taken from other genres - predominantly animal ornamentation (especially birds) - which create an additional, often fundamentally assymetrical, "rhythmic interchange". The transition to the quarternary principle in the construction of symmetry (which is also rather archaic, and no less ancient than the binary principle) allowed a significant enrichment (complication) of the rhythmic structure of the decoration, often making its highly coloured rhythmic sound in fact polyrythmic (most often on the exterior, but not the interior, of the chasha).

An examination of the typology of Russian enamels of the seventeenth century and the evolution of the structure and semantics of their decoration during this century reveals a serious change in the artistic world-view of this period of Russian culture - a period which is transitional between medieval (Early Russian) artistic concepts, closely tied to religious practice, and the new
artistic view of the world, stimulated by the establishment of a personal, individualised consciousness, and the beginning of Russia's inclusion in the general European cultural area. Analysis of the changes which took place in the technique and style of Russian seventeenth-century enamels underlines yet again the close link of artisan production to the philosophical and aesthetic principles of the age.

Seventeenth-century Russian enamels are not only important in that, by studying their typology and technical evolution, they permit one to follow the significant changes going on in Russian culture, everyday life, artistic tastes and the way the nation thought, which began in the seventeenth century; the enamels also played an enormous role in preparing the Russian artistic consciousness, previously formed around icon-painting, for the acceptance and comprehension of principles found in oil painting of the reflection of reality in art.

3. ART EMBROIDERY

Russian seventeenth-century artistic embroidery had a tradition of at least two hundred years behind it. As early as the fifteenth century the art of cloth embroidery was highly developed in Muscovite Rus'; it became one of the most important varieties of Russian
Embroidered items decorated not only the interiors of churches and the mansions belonging to boyars and the Tsar, but also the homes of ordinary people, where patterned tablecloths, towels, and clothing decorated with coloured silk embroidery would be displayed in prominent places. During religious and festive processions in Russian towns, embroidered shrouds of Christ (plashchanitsa) and ecclesiastical banners (khorugvi) would be carried; again, when the army marched, they would be also be accompanied by embroidered flags and icons. I.E.Zabelin, describing the domestic way of life of Russian tsars and tsaritsas, points out that "in seventeenth-century Moscow there was (cloth) wallpaper made from gold cloth, such as that which decorated one of the inner rooms in the Posol'skii dvor (Ambassador's Palace) on Il'in Street in the Kitai-gorod area of the city. The story of Samson was depicted on this wall-paper...Curtains, especially window-curtains, were almost always decorated with silk galloon edging, with gold or silver woven into the fabric, or made from gold woven lace, embroidered in satin or some other silken material...Even the flaps and edgings were sometimes decorated with embroidered grass or other designs, big leaves of various colours, and pictures of animals such as lions or birds"[80].
Unfortunately, secular Early Russian embroideries for everyday use have not in general survived. At the time, they were not considered important pieces of artistic heritage, and consequently they were destroyed as tastes changed. Those pieces which have survived are generally religious items: embroidered icons, funeral shrouds, saints' clothing, shrouds of Christ, altar-cloths, and so on. It is on the basis of these items that the quality of Early Russian embroidery must be judged. N.A. Maiasova points out the important paleographic peculiarity of Russian litsevoi embroidery: "The specific peculiarity of litsevoi embroidery - the affixed inscriptions with dates and names, and the choice of subjects which link the works with the fate of those who produced them, make these works important points in the study of other works of Early Russian art, the majority of which are nameless, and can be dated only by chance indications" [81].

Needle-women enjoyed great social prestige everywhere in Early Rus' - often they were the daughters, wives or other relatives of boyars, or even of the Tsar himself. Many were in charge of entire workshops. As a rule, embroidery was in the hands of women in Early Rus'; women completely monopolized the art-form. Moreover, embroidery was perhaps the only type of art or craft where, by tradition, Russian women could display their artistic skills.

252
There were two major centres of embroidery in Rus' in the second half of the seventeenth century: the Tsaritsyna masterskaia palata (Tsaritsa's workshop chamber) in Moscow, and the Stroganovs' workshop in Sol'vychegodsk. The Tsaritsyna masterskaia was run by the Tsar's clerk (d'iak). To this workshop were called the most talented gold-embroiderers and needle-workers in all of Rus', the creators of virtuosic embroideries with gold, pearls and precious stones, based on designs drawn by the flag-makers of the Gold and Silver Chambers. By the end of the seventeenth century the needle-workers of the Tsaritsyna masterskaia numbered around one hundred [82].

Essentially, the Tsaritsyna masterskaia in Moscow was the chief breeding-ground of Western artistic ideas in Rus', and fashions in embroidery essentially emanated from this workshop. Of course, apart from the Tsaritsyna masterskaia in Moscow, a great many other, lesser workshops existed in the seventeenth century, under the patronage of the boyars' wives - such as the chamber (svetlitsa) of Boyarynia Daria Miloslavskaya; all of these, however, more often than not simply imitated the technical devices and style of the needle-workers in the Tsaritsyna masterskaia. The style of the Moscow school can therefore essentially be taken as the style of works from this workshop. It is clear that the main route of transmission for the Western Baroque influence on the style of embroidery in Moscow was through the Tsar's flag and icon-painters, who had immediate knowledge of
contemporary Western oil-paintings, prints and applied art. Thus perhaps the greatest Russian icon-painter of the second half of the seventeenth century, Simon Ushakov, as a master-artist from the Silver Chamber (he worked in the Armoury from 1664) worked a great deal both on designs for embroidery and on their ornamentation [83]. Ushakov's passion for Western artistic ideas is well-known. It is also clear that works from the Tsaritsyna masterskaia, intended for the most part for the Tsar's palace, were to a great extent the models, if not indeed the canonical prototypes, of works from other Moscow women's chambers and provincial workshops. Thus the Baroque style, serving almost, as it were, as the "Tsar's canonical style", indirectly influenced all Russian embroidery of the second half of the seventeenth century.

Typical of the Moscow School is a highly decorative style, striving towards an extremely sumptuous overall effect. In Moscow, pearl embroidery was prevalent, the embroideries often actually being turned into pieces of gold and silver art, inasmuch as the cloth itself (the base) would be covered with a layer of pearls, slivers of gold, and a great number of precious stones. A wide proliferation of elegant geometrical figures and virtuosic decoration was also characteristic of the Moscow School. Characteristically, the faces of saints and prophets on shrouds, embroidered in silk thread, are
particularly eloquent, and artistically highly expressive (ill.48). The technique by which inscriptions were embroidered on the borders (kaimy) of shrouds (of particular saints or of Christ himself), and likewise the iconographic schemes of pictures from the Moscow School are typically closer to the secular portrait style and the ornamentation found on Western tapestries, than to the icon-painting aesthetic of provincial schools and workshops.

Embroidery from the Stroganov School from the second half of the seventeenth century (like icon-painting in the Stroganov style) is technically and stylistically distinct from Moscow facial (litsevoe) and decorative embroideries. Monumental altar-cloths covered entirely with gold embroidered patterns are typical of the Stroganov School. Apart from this luxurious decorative style, Stroganov embroideries also typically have the faces, bodies and the folds of the clothing surrounded painstakingly with pearls, silver, or red lines, with a contrasting outline for the eyes, the stitches worked intricately in gold. Faces and hands in embroideries from the Stroganov School are usually done in grey silk, the joints picked out with brown circles and semicircles [84]. Amongst other technical features of Stroganov School embroidery, L.D.Likhacheva, who has studied the style closely, notes in particular that "the contours of the figures and the folds of the clothes...are
characteristically picked out by raised silver lines. The backgrounds are embroidered entirely in gold thread, with the background of the edging often remaining unembroidered, particularly in later examples" [85].

The flourishing of the Stroganov workshops at the end of the seventeenth century was linked to the activities of their leader, Anna Ivanovna Stroganova (wife of Dmitrii Stroganov), who was herself an outstanding needle-worker. The latest and most important of the surviving works created under her guidance in the second half of the seventeenth century is the funeral cloth with the image of Sergei Radonezhskii v zhiti, amongst scenes from his life. This cloth was donated by Anna Stroganova to the Troitse-Sergiev Monastery on the death of her husband in 1671. The cloth itself is sewn in gold and silver thread, the outlines of all the figures on the cloth, and the inscriptions, being sewn with pearls. The Sergei Radonezhskii v zhiti, as it is known, is decorated with precious stones and gold; it now forms part of the Zagorsk Museum's collection, housed in the Trinity-St.Sergius Monastery [86].

The quality of embroidery in seventeenth-century Rus' was extremely high from an artistic point of view. There were two basic varieties of embroidery: facial (litsevoe) embroidery, and decorative embroidery. Facial embroidery was closely linked to icon and oil-painting, its style
ranging over the whole variety of portrait painting styles - whence its name: portraiture is the painting of faces, (in Russian litsa), thus litsevoe embroidery. The link between embroidery and icon-painting was not only one of function, but also of technique. Aesthetic sensibility amongst Russians at this time scarcely distinguished between the two genres. Before the cloth was embroidered, a master draughtsman (znamenshchik) would "mark" the cloth, that is, draw a design on it. The technique of marking the design on cloth was essentially no different from the technique used by the icon-painter when beginning work on an icon. The draughtsman would outline the picture (that is, draw it onto the cloth) in great detail, and only after this would the master needle-workers begin embroidering, following the pattern marked on the cloth by him. It seems that facial (litsevoe) embroidery in Rus' derived from the tradition of funeral shrouds - portraits of the deceased done on cloth - which were placed on the grave itself. This tradition is in turn closely linked to the that of putting icons (of the appropriate patron-saint) on the deceased Tsar's grave, or the graves of his relatives. Thus the appearance of parsuna's and portraits in Rus' in the seventeenth century was closely bound up with to the art of facial embroidery, which predated, and anticipated, the oil portrait genre. Like icon and oil-painting, facial embroidery aimed to give a realistic representation of a concrete historical figure. Many
Russian portraits from the second half of the seventeenth century are strikingly similar in their manner of execution and use of colour to the technique of facial embroidery. The portrait of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, painted in the 1670's (GIM), uses a range of colours which is similar to those used traditionally in contemporary funeral shrouds - gold and silver for the Tsar's robes, against a crimson velvet curtain for a backdrop. Again, the portrait of Tsar Fyodor Alekseevich, painted in 1685 (GIM), has a light blue background, with gold-coloured grass designs, reminiscent of gold embroideries with their grass patterns. Applique portraits form a transitional stage between oil-paintings and facial embroidery. The best-known of these is the portrait of Patriarch Nikon, made in the 1680's (GIM). Patriarch Nikon's face and clothes, drawn life-size, are made from silk, gold cloth and velvet, pasted onto board; the face itself is drawn onto the cloth.

The influence that Baroque art exerted over the style of Russian facial (litsevoe) embroidery from the second half of the seventeenth century was similar to its influence on icon-painting, where the silver framework of the icon began to dominate the artistic action, forcing the actual image into the background. To a great extent the typical examples of facial embroidery from the seventeenth century - funeral-cloths embroidered with life-size human figures, with ornamental inscriptions on the edgings -
began themselves to resemble icons with metal frameworks. In these funeral cloths only the face and hands are embroidered in satin-stitched silk, the rest of the picture being embroidered in metal thread (of silver or gold). A typical example of this decorative stylisation of the portrait is the embroidered shroud of Metropolitan Aleksii (GMMK, second half of the seventeenth century). Even more reminiscent of the decorative Baroque stylistic approach (whereby images of animals, or even the person's face, are stylised, fulfilling a purely ornamental function) is the sakkos (clerical vestment) of Patriarch Nikon, made in 1655 (GMMK) [87]. The outside of the sakkos is embroidered with the images of a large number of saints, linked together by ornamental inscriptions. All the figures on the sakkos are outlined in pearls, which are sewn onto the material itself. The geometrical decoration on the gold surface of the cloth, the half-figures of saints, surrounded by a frame (obniz') of pearls, the inscriptions which run into the drawings - all of these are subservient to the unified artistic intent, which gravitates towards the entirely Baroque idea of sumptuous decoration, at the cost of the original religious message of the "text" of the work. The faces of the saints have become simply part of the decorative ornamentation. It is interesting to note that the faces of the saints and prophets depicted on the sakkos, surrounded by a frame of pearls, are reminiscent of icons covered entirely with
metal frames, with narrow slits for the faces and hands of the saints - which proclaim the near total victory of the decorative idea over religious symbolism and the ending of the traditional primacy of the spiritual and religious content of old Russian art (from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries).

Amongst the examples of embroidery from the Stroganov School are five vestment fragments from the second half of the seventeenth century which are close in their realisation to the Baroque style [88]. Three of these are embroideries of single figures, portraying the "Descent into Hell", one fragment shows the Depostion from the Cross"; and one is of the "Laying in the tomb" (GRM). In all five, made predominantly from gold and silver threads, the contours of the lone figures in the compositions, the framing, and the inscriptions are all embroidered in silver thread, so as to create, as it were, a unified decorative, ornamental whole: the figures of Christ and the saints form the elements of a general decorative ornamentation and colour scheme, overshadowing, or perhaps suppressing, the purely spiritual content of the images - a further example of the Baroque influencing the formerly strictly canonical applied art of Early Rus'. All five fragments from the Russian Museum in St.Petersburg are a sort of stylistic hybrid of facial (litsevoe) and decorative embroidery. It was precisely in this way that decorative embroidery,
often amalgamated and combined with *litsevoe* embroidery, became so widespread in Rus' in the seventeenth century.

The evolution of Russian decorative (ornamental) embroidery in the seventeenth century is closely linked with the general aesthetic changes taking place in Russian applied art in this period. "The ornamentation and style of embroidery does not differ from the graphic style of gold and silverware and wood-carving; artistically, it is interrelated with these arts"[89].

As early as the beginning of the seventeenth century, flat, stylised "grass" designs, embroidered on gold and silver backgrounds, began to be woven in amongst the images of mythological beings, such as unicorns, and legendary birds, such as phoenixes, which appeared in Russian decorative embroidery. Nevertheless, in the first half of the seventeenth century, decorative embroidery was still dominated by flat, stylised pattern designs. Towards the middle of the century - as in all Russian applied art of that time - decorative embroidery came under the influence of Western patterned cloths and Eastern brocades, newly appeared on the Russian market, and also the general process of secularisation of aesthetic tastes in Russia. As a result, the traditional flat graphic style was gradually ousted by sumptuous relief ornamentation and plastic constructions of great volume {ill.49}. This process was, at the same time, made
possible by the new fashion for "using at every opportunity, and in great abundance, pearls, gold and silver plates, and relief drawings on cloth, often imitating ornamental engraving and the technique of engraved patterns on metal, against a gold background" [90].

The enormous aesthetic influence of the Tsar's palace on the tastes and fashion of the time should also be noted. The Western, Baroque style often indirectly influenced everyday life during the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich and Tsarevna Sofia Alekseevna, through the wide imitation of furniture and other items from the Tsar's palace and the mansions of the most important men of the time, many of which contained an abundance of cloths and upholstery made in the West. I.E.Zabelin describes the everyday life of the boyars in the second half of the seventeenth century thus: "the boyars' enjoyed an opulent style of life, and some of their houses were decorated with tapestries (shpalery), or foreign upholstery (oboi) made from cloth. Prince V.V.Golitsyn had his son Aleksei's dining chamber decorated with such upholstery in 1688 - not only the walls, but the ceiling as well. In February 1690, the tapestries were taken down, described, valued and taken to the Gostinyi dvor to be sold" [91].

The finest examples of decorative embroidery from the second half of the seventeenth century were made by the
gold-embroiderers of the Moskovskaia Tsaritsynaia masterskaia. Usually, these ornamental embroideries - in contrast to facial (litsevoe) embroideries - are not independent, autonomous works of art, but rather a decorative addition to utilitarian items, such as the saddles, saddle-cloths, sleigh-rugs, table-cloths, towels, and pillows, which on festive occasions replaced the polavochniki otherwise in everyday use (for the covering of wooden benches), and the like. Russian decorative embroidery is affected to differing degrees by the Baroque stylistic influence in different examples; one outstanding example is the towel belonging to Patriarch Adrian, dating from 1696, now in the collection of the GMMK (Gosudarstvennaia Oruzheinaia Palata) (State Armoury). Embroidered with pearls and precious stones, it has clearly lost its functional aspect, and become a symbolic image, of a purely decorative nature - a detail in an extravagant liturgical ceremony, and part of the theatricality much-beloved of the Baroque. It is difficult to imagine that this "metallicised" towel was ever used in its primary function as a towel.

In the second half of the seventeenth century, Russian ornamental embroidery borrows artistic ideas extensively from Western European decorative art. For example, the ornamentation of the collar (oplech'ie) on the crushed velvet smock (stikhar') (GMMK, the end of the seventeenth
encompassing "decorativeness", becoming stylised under the influence of the sumptuous carving of iconostases, the eccentric architectural details and the reliefs of palaces' facades, and using new ranges of colours, which appear under Western influence of secular oil-painting. This ornamented style, appearing in the most important genres of Early Russian art in the seventeenth century - icons, frescoes, embroidery, architecture - is a fundamental sign of the victory of Baroque stylistics in Russian art of this period. Russian master needle-workers create complex multi-figured compositions and scenes on the material of clothing, which itself becomes a sort of ornamentation. The artists transfer this "ornamental clothing" onto icons and mural paintings. Ornamentation predominates in the mural paintings of seventeenth-century Moscow, Rostov and Iaroslavl'. In the carved lace-like interiors of churches, the carved ornamental details of architecture, with their animals and birds in "grass" designs, in the white stone reliefs on the facades of churches and palaces - in all of these, ornamentation is dominant. Even the script of Russian written language of the second half of the seventeenth century comes under the influence of this new ornamentation: the old sedate semi-uncial handwriting of the (chinnyi poluustav) is replaced by the decorated cursive style (skoropis'), a sort of ornamental ligatured script. This "total ornamentation" of Russian artistic thought of the seventeenth century can be explained to a
large degree by the fact that Baroque influences on Russian applied art, because of the enmity of official orthodox church ideology to everything Western - everything foreign or nemetskii - had to be of an abstract, purely decorative character, and thus difficult to interpret as a symbol or view objectively as an image from an alien culture. The Baroque style in Russian embroidery and other varieties of applied art got in not so much by the door, as through the window, by means of the new, not quite fully realised, aesthetic relationship to form and ornamental detail.

Notes


4. Prokof'ev V.N. "O trekh urovniah khudozhestvennoi 266


7. The holy-water chalice is in the State Museum of the Moscow Kremlin, inv. No. MR-8987/1-2.
   The full inscription, located on the bowl of the chalice in four oval kleimas: "in the year 7203 (ie 1695), in the month of March, on the 25th day, this chalice for holy water was given to the house of the most pure Trinity and the most pure Blessed Virgin and the miracle-worker Daniil, by Archimandrite Varfolomei, in eternal remembrance of his soul and of his relatives."
   The inscription with the name of the master-crafstmen is located on the base of the chalice, on the underside.
   See *Russkoe serebro*, ill.31.

8. Efimok - the Russian name for the high quality silver Joachimstaler.

Jacob Reitenfels, Polish national, aristocrat and resident of Courland, met Simeon Poltskii in Moscow - a meeting about which he writes in his memoirs, written for his patron Kozìma III. In these memoirs he writes about Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, the people he met in Russia, and about the events which he witnessed during his journeys through Russia. He writes of Polotskii that he was "a writer and monk of the Basilian order, ...by the name of Simeon, full in the highest degree of Latin learning..." - see Skazanie, p.160. Thanks to Jacob Reitenfels, the first Russian theatre in Russia, established under Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, was known about not only in Florence, where he wrote his book, but also in many other Western European countries. See Robinson A.N. Bor'ba idei v russkoi literature 17 veka, M., 1974, p.113.

10. The icon-lamp is kept in GMMK, inv. No. MR-9985. The inscription on the base reads as follows: "this icon-lamp was fashioned to the glory of God, the Creator of all, and in honour of the Most Holy Virgin Mother of God, Mary, on the orders of the Grand Lord Most Holy Kir Adriian, Archbishop of Moscow and all Russia, and all the northern lands of the Patriarch, for his arch-pastoral sacristy, in the year 7200 since the creation of the universe (1692), 1692 from the birth of Christ, in the month of March, on the 25th day." See Russkoe serebro, 268

12. This is E.Tezauro's definition of the theory of the new poetry of the Baroque, as given in his 1655 treatise: "Podzornaia truba Aristotelia". See: Golenishchev-Kutuzov, I.N. "Barokko i ego teoretiki", 17 vek v mirovom literaturnom razvitii, p.143.


16. Chin - order, regulation, rule, meaning.

17. Sobranie pisem tsaria Alekseia Mikhailovicha..., op.cit., p.23.
18. Thus, in court documents from 1668, the ceremonial decoration of willow-trees as palm fronds on Palm Sunday is described as follows: "...in Holy Week everything was done according to the former pattern (March 15th). But the feast of Palm Sunday this year was celebrated, according to the Sovereign's orders, in a most grandiose fashion, for the first time, and not simply as in previous years..." from: Zabelin, I.E. Domashnii byt russkikh tsarei v 16 i 17 stoletiiakh, izd.3, M.,1895, pp.409-410.

19. Ibid., p.409.

20. Similar cut-off flowers are often found in the ornamentation of items of applied art by seventeenth-century Ukrainian craftsmen. The motif of the cut-off flower is often found in Ukrainian silver items and in embroidery from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

21. See note 7, above.

22. The dish is kept in the GMMK. Inv. no. 3409. See: Postnikova-Loseva, M.M. Zolotoe i serebrianoe delo 15-20 vv., M., 1983, ill. on p.74; the inscription on the side is as follows: "In the year 7188 (1680), on the 25th day of June, this dish was given, made by Kiril Semenov, son of Ushakov, and by Vasil'ev of the Kazantsov family". See also Russkoe serebro, ill.32.
23. The **diskos** is kept in the GMMK, inv.MR-4432.
See *Russkoe serebro*, op. cit., ill.30.


25. The **potir** is kept in the GMMK, inv.No.MR-4428.
The inscription on the base reads as follows: "These church vessels were made in the year 7190 (1681), on the first day of November, on the orders of the Great Sovereign Tsar and Grand Prince Fyodor Alekseevich, ruler of all Greater, Lesser and White Russia, for the Monastery of Reverant Father Nil Stolbenskii". See: *Russkoe serebro*, op. cit., ill.40.

The central panel shows the image of the **Spas Nerukotvornyi**; the leaves either side show Dmitrii Solunskii and Fyodor Stratilat. See: *Russkoe serebro*, op. cit., ill.41.

27. The following German, in particular Nuremberg, silver items from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which appeared in the seventeenth century in Russia, are examples:

(1). Early sixteenth-century silver goblet (**kubok**), purchased from the Englishman Fabian Ul'ianov (the surname has evidently been affected by folk etymology)
for the treasury of Tsar Mikhail Fyodorovich, in 1629 (GMMK, No.MZ-265 (1-2)).

(2). Early sixteenth-century silver goblet (kubok), a gift to the Troitsa-Sergiev monastery from Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich in 1648 (GMMK, No.MZ-266(1-2)).

(3). Late sixteenth-early seventeenth century silver goblet (kubok), given to Aleksei Mikhailovich in 1646 (GMMK, No.MZ-505).

(4). Silver jug for the washing of hands (kuvshin rukomoinyi) by Meister Kristofer Ritter I, late sixteenth century, presented to Aleksei Mikhailovich by representatives of the Iaroslavl' area in 1648 (GMMK, No.MZ-1255(1-2)).

(5). Late sixteenth-century silver goblet (kubok) by Meister Adam Fischer, presented to Aleksei Mikhailovich by the boyar B.M.Lykov in 1646 (GMMK, No.MZ-256(1-2)).

(6). Late sixteenth-early seventeenth-century silver goblet (kubok) by Meister Hans Petzolt, part of the ambassadorial gifts from the Swedish king, Karl XI, in 1684 (GMMK, No.MZ-518 (1-2)).

(7). Silver goblet (kubok) from 1588-1622 by Meister Hans Beutmuller, part of the ambassadorial gifts from the
Swedish Queen Christina in 1647 (GMMK, No.MZ-516 (1-2)).

(8). Early seventeenth-century silver goblet (kubok) by Meister Hans Petzolt. Part of the ambassadorial gifts from the Danish King Christian IV in 1644 (GMMK, No.MZ-227 (1-2)).

(9). Silver goblet (kubok) from 1598-1625 by Meister Jorg Riul, presented to Aleksei Mikhailovich by the boyar Ia.K. Cherkassky in 1648 (GMMK, No.MZ-1220 (1-2)).

28. The dipper (kovsh) is in the GMMK, inv.No.MR-2067. See: Russkoe serebro, ill.58.


31. The gospel cover is in the GMMK, inv. No.KN-10. On the reverse of the centre panel is the inscription: "Zolotar Laryon Semenov". See: 1000-letie russkoi khudozhestvennoi kul'tury, ill.319, p.231.

32. The thurible is in the State Hermitage, inv.No.E/RO-273.
8180. See: Berniakovich, Z.A. *Russkoe khudozhestvennoe serebro 17 – nachala 20 veka vsobranii Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha*, L., 1977, ill.8. Inscription: "In the year 1670, on the 6th day of December, this thurible was given *viazmiu* to the Monastery of John the Baptist, to the House of the Most Pure Virgin Mother Hodygitria, by the visitor Grigor'ev, son of Shorin."

33. The *bratina* by M.A. Cherkasskii is in the State Hermitage, inv.No. E/RO-6919. See: Berniakovich Z.A. *Russkoe khudozhestvennoe serebro*, ill.4. The inscription on the crown of the *bratina* reads as follows: "This *bratina* was given to Prince Mikhail Alegukovich Cherkaskii by the Great Sovereign Tsar and Grand Prince Aleksei Mikhailovich, ruler of all Greater, Lesser and White Russia."

34. The *stopa* with sybils is in the State Hermitage, inv.No. E/RO-6897. The *stopa* belonged to the stolnik E.T. Alymov. See: Berniakovich, ill.II. The silver *stopa* with the image of the sybils is also in the Gos.Istoricheskii Muzei. See: Postnikova-Loseva, M., p.74.


(2) The plate (tarel') is in the GMMK, No. MR-4488. See: 1000-letie russkoi khudozhestvennoi kul'tury, ill.321, p.230.

(3) The plate (tarel') is in the GMMK, No. MR-4485. See: 1000-letie russkoi khudozhestvennoi kul'tury, ill.322, p.230.


37. Primitiv i ego mesto v kul'ture novogo i noveishego vremeni, M., 1983.


39. Filigree - designs traced or soldered onto a metal background in fine gold, silver or copper wire, in straight lines or twisted into the shapes of branches; one of the most widespread techniques in gold and silver work.


43. Basmash - hand printing of images and designs onto fine sheets of gold or silver.

44. From the Viazhishchskii monastery near Novgorod; preserved in the Novgorodskii muzei-zapovednik. Inv. No.1601. The hinged-icon was prepared in 1654, on the orders of Archbishop Lavrenty of Tver and Kashin for the Viazhitskii monastery. The engraved surround of the central-panel of the hinged-icon was made some time around the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries. The combination in the decoration of engraving in high relief, and the alternation of matt and gloss surfaces makes the work stylistically close to the surround of the Gospels from some time in the 1680's (GRM, inv.BK-3075) and from 1693 (GRM, inv. BK-3071).

46. The kafimskii knot motif was used in the decoration of works made of wood, stone, skin, bone, and in ornamentation on cloth and silver. See: Postnikova-Loseva M.M. "Serebriane delo v Novgorode 16-17vv.", Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo. Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura Novgoroda, M., 1968, p.315-316.

47. Novgorod Museum, inv.No.1545.


51. Novgorod Museum, inv.No.1316. Silver altar cross with the inscription "this cross was made by Grigori Nikiforov, son of Lopov, and his children".

52. Novgorod Museum, inv.No.859 - thurible from the
Znamenski Cathedral; inv.No.1129 - thurible from the St. Anthony Monastery.

53. Novgorod Museum, inv.No.1545 - icon of the Blessed Virgin; inv.No.1582 - "Pantocrator" icon (Vsederezhitel').


57. Four goblets of Patriarch Pitirim, by G.Ivanov.

58. GIM, inv.No.26970; Armoury, inv.Nos.12173 and 12261 - bratinas by G.Ivanov.

59. See the silver chashi, korobochki, goblets, etc, with painted enamel - in GE, Armoury, GIM.

60. It is interesting that in the scene "Potiphar's wife with Joseph" in the mural painting of the church of Nikola Mokryj in Iaroslavl (1673), completed around the same time as the drawing of the same subject by Ivanov, the wife of Potiphar is dressed in luxurious clothes - the Iaroslavl artist at the beginning of the 1670's, as
noted by I.Grabar', cannot bring himself to depict her naked. Only 15 years later, however, in the decoration of another Iaroslavl church - the church of Ioanna Predtechi v Tolchkove - Potiphar's wife is portrayed naked, in accordance with the Old Testament story. See: Grabar' I.E. Istoriia russkogo iskusstva, vol. 4, M., 1913, p. 53.


64. Several rich dynasties were found amongst the merchants of Velikii Ustiug in the seventeenth century, such as the Reviakins, Gusel'nikovs, Gruditsyns and other families, whose Sol'vychegodsk town houses were no less
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opulent that those of the Stroganovs. As early as 1618, Velikii Ustiug began trading with England and France; the opening in 1653 of the Northern sea trade route, linking Rus' with the West, which passed through Velikii Ustiug, promoted economic and cultural growth in the city. The presence in the city of important, wealthy social groups could not fail to be a stimulus for the development of arts and crafts, in particular the production of gold and silver items, embroidery, icon-painting, architecture; the city's many churches (at the end of the seventeenth century there were 28) were erected drawing on the financial resources of such people. An idea of the richness and way of life of the merchant class in Velikii Ustiug is gained from the document concerning the fire in N.Reviakin's mansion in the mid-seventeenth century. The many magnificently furnished and decorated rooms of his house contained, in particular, "animal skins, books, clothes, metal objects, items made of gold and of pearls, and silver vessels, and tin and copper kitchen utensils, and caskets, and chests, and boxes, and all sorts of animals and items of clothings, and sorts of objects" — quoted in Bocharov G.N., Vygolov V.P. Sol'vychevodsk, Velikii Ustiug, Tot'ma, M., 1983, p.83.

65. The argument in favour of Sol'vychevodsk as the centre of the production of precious painted enamels with a characteristic white background is based on the analysis by N.Pomerantsev of the sole surviving item
which has an inscription on it, which reads as follows: "This charka was made in 198 (1690) in Solivychegodsk...". See: Pomerantsev N.N. Finift' usol'skogo dela - in the collection Oruzheinaia palata, M., 1925, pp.96-98.

66. The archival research and historical investigation carried out by I.Bobrovnitskaia convincingly demonstrates the unreliability of the theory that the Stroganov family, famous for their embroidery and icon-painting workshops, were involved in the production of usol'skie enamels. Bobrovnitskaia comes to the following conclusion: "The absence today of any direct indication that there were enamel workshops in the Stroganov's Sol'vychedgodsk estates, and, on the other hand, the existence of a series of facts which would lead one to doubt such a supposition, gives us reason to consider the question of the origin of the so-called usol'skie enamels as yet unanswered." See: Bobrovnitskaia I.A. "Ob emaliakh Oruzheinoi palaty", Muzei, No.4, M., 1983, p.63.

67. The silver stakan is in the State Museums of the Moscow Kremlin (GMMK); the larets and chasha in the State Hermitage (GE).

68. The silver korobochka is in the GE, the Altar Gospel and silver larets are in the GMMK.
69. The silver charka is in the GE; the four silver chashi are in the State Museums GMMK.

70. The chasha is in the GE; the larets is in the GMMK.

71. In the GMMK.

72. The korobochka is in the GE; the chashi are in the GMMK.

73. One chasha is in the GMMK, the other is in the GE.

74. In the GMMK.

75. One chasha in the GE, the other is in the GMMK. The charka is in the GMMK.

76. Both items are in the GMMK.

77. The icon-cover is in the GMMK, the cross in the GE.

78. The rukomoi is in the GMMK, the korchik is in the GE.

79. The chasha is in the GE.
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81. Maiasova N.A. *Drevnerusskoe shit'e*, M., 1971, p.34.


88. Published in the catalogue of the *Gosudarstvennyi Russkii muzei's exhibition: see Iskusstvo stroganovskikh masterov*, L., 1987, pp.131-134. Inv. no. DRT - 150, 70, 362, 376, 361.


92. Svirin A.N. *Drevnerusskoe shit'e*, M., 1963, p.120.
IV CONCLUSION
The transitional period from the Middle Ages to the Modern period, which began in Russia in the mid-seventeenth century, is usually considered by writers to be a process of the accumulation of secular elements in Russian culture, and a growing secularisation in art. This process of secularisation is usually thought of as the dominant feature of the development of seventeenth century Russian art. This thesis is indirectly supported by the concept of the Russian Baroque as proposed by Likhachev, who underlines its Renaissance function in Russian art. Of course, in the West, as well, the Renaissance age was marked by a process of secularisation in art - this, in fact, is one of the peculiarities of the Renaissance artistic consciousness. Yet one must not forget that many of those involved in Russian culture in the seventeenth century (in particular, the opponents of the Western European style, or friaz') considered the Baroque artistic influence to be a deviation from the sacred nature of Russian art.

However, the analysis of the Baroque (and, more widely, the European) influence on seventeenth century Russian art which is presented in this work hopes to demonstrate that one must take extreme care when talking about secularisation as the basic, dominant feature of Russian art in the transitional period between the Middle Ages and the Modern period. Despite the incipient tendency to assimilate secular elements from European culture, both
Russian seventeenth-century art and Russian society of this period remained deeply religious at heart. One of the most important conclusions of this work is the suggestion that the Baroque stylistic influence in seventeenth-century Russian art took the form of a "theological dictatorship" on the part of the Church, and a powerful "making sacred" (or "sacralisation") of the artistic consciousness of Russian artists of the time. Thus, the process of secularisation of Russian art of the transitional period was, in reality, rather a weak tendency.

A further conclusion concerns the widely-held belief (even in Russian historiography) that seventeenth-century Russian society was absolutely traditionalistic in character, and that the "window onto Europe" was created solely by Peter I, in the eighteenth century. Research into Russian culture of the late seventeenth century demonstrates incontrovertibly that not only was there a powerful Western artistic expansion into Russia at this time, but there were also attempts to modernise the country artistically, along Western lines, by the country's rulers themselves. Thus, despite what is still widely believed to be the case, it was not Tsar Peter I who began the "Europeanisation" of Russian art at all, but in fact Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich.
work did not suspect that they were "speaking in prose"; for them, there was no Baroque style, only friaz', a synthetic term meaning the Western European style, including its Renaissance, Mannerist and Baroque elements. For this very reason, attempts to find Baroque elements in seventeenth-century Russian art (particularly in applied art) can be compared to panning for gold, in that one has to sift through a ton of non-Baroque 'stylistic silt' in order to find a few 'Baroque golden nuggets'.

Many of the conclusions of this work were unexpected, even for its author. Thus, contrary to expectation, it is clear that many of the largest artistic centres of seventeenth-century Russia (Pskov, Vladimir, Rostov Velikii, Tver, et al.) were practically untouched by Baroque stylistic influences, whilst in other centres the Baroque was an appreciable and integral part of the stylistic form of works of art. Evidently, the traditional Russian autarchy and state isolationism was superimposed, in many regions of the country, on rudimentary manifestations of regionalistic isolationism and traditional xenophobia; it was, after all, less than 200 years since the creation of a centralised state in Russia, and memories of the time when Rus' was a conglomerate of autonomous apanage principalities were still strong in the nation's artistic memory.
One further conclusion comes out of this investigation of Russian seventeenth-century art, affecting the general classification of Russian art of the transitional period from the Middle Ages to the Modern period. One inevitably comes to think of the Russian culture of this period as being cross-cultural in nature (as, indeed, was Byzantine art). Clearly, the fact that, for centuries, Russia was located on a cultural crossroads led to a widespread stylistic eclecticism in its art. Hence, also, the drama which marked the progress of the stylistic Westernisation of seventeenth-century Russian art, whenever Western Baroque elements came into conflict with the still powerful Eastern (ultimately Asiatic) aesthetic ideal.

One must not forget one further important methodological conclusion, which affects the dynamic of the spread of Western Baroque influences and their assimilation by seventeenth-century Russian art. Despite the appreciable, often very deep assimilation of Baroque stylistic elements into certain artistic forms and genres in a series of Russian artistic centres, on the whole (if one thinks in terms of the whole country) the Baroque influence on seventeenth-century Russian art was rather more of an artistic tendency, than a widespread stylistic innovation. It is obviously important to remember, in this context, that Russian seventeenth-century artists only learned about European art at second hand, often having no idea either about the major works of the
European Baroque, or indeed about the high Baroque in general. Yet this lack of artistic information does not, of course, fully explain the superficiality on the whole of the seventeenth-century Russian Baroque. In order to fully assimilate this style, Russian art needed the revolutionary social reforms of Peter I. Nevertheless, late seventeenth-century Russian art in many respects prepared and predetermined the nature of the flourishing of the Russian Baroque in the eighteenth century.
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VI GLOSSARY OF TERMS
**Basma** - technique of working metal. Hand engraving of images and ornamentation on thin sheets of gold or silver. It differs from chasing (chekanka) in that it is in low relief.

**Bratina** (loving cup) - a low-stemmed drinking-vessel, of almost spherical form, sometimes with a lid. Bratiny are first mentioned in written documents from the sixteenth century. They were used for drinking circular "cups of health" (zazdravnye chashi); they were also filled with sytaia voda (water mixed with honey) and placed on graves.

**Charka** (one-handled wine cup) - a small vessel from which spirits are drunk. Particularly common in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

**Chasha vodosviatnaia** (holy water chalice) - a vessel used for the ritual sprinkling of holy water. Usually a large, semi-spherical stemmed cup, with two ring-shaped handles.

**Chekanka** (chasing) - relief engraving - a technique found in gold and silver items. Special instruments (puansony) are used to decorate an object with relief ornamentation.

**Chern'** (niello) - a special alloy of silver sulphide,
made from a mixture of silver, copper (or tin), lead and
sulphur, in powder form. It is placed on the surface of
the object. After heating, the powder melts and forms a
black background.

**Diskos** (diskos) - a circular, occasionally star-shaped,
stemmed dish, onto which pieces of the host are placed.

**Drobnitsa** (plaque) - a small silver or gold plate, with
holes on its edges so it can be sewn or otherwise fixed
to a surface (eg the a gospel cover or mitre).

**Emal** (enamel) - an alloy of glass, decorated with metal
oxides of various colours. After firing, this becomes a
hard, shiny surface.

**Emal' raspisnaia** - painted enamel - a monochrome enamel
background is first created, which is then painted (by
brush) with special enamel paints.

**Emal' po skani** - filigree enamel.

**Felon** (phelonios) - a type of overcoat - the wide,
long, sleeveless outer garment of a priest, with a space
for the head and a slit down the front.

**Fleron** - ornamentation.
Glad' (satin-stitch) - embroidery technique.

Izograf - icon-painter (ikonopisets).

Kadilo (thurible/censer) - a vessel in which incense is burned, made of two cups, with holes so the incense can escape. The upper part of the kadilo is usually shaped like a church roof.

Kovsh (dipper) - a shallow, wide, boat-shaped drinking vessel, in outline rather like a duck. The kovsh is usually oval or circular, with a high, raised handle. A gold kovsh is first mentioned in the fourteenth century. Gold and silver kovshi were common drinking vessels until the end of the seventeenth century.

Korchik - a small kovsh with an oval base, used for wine.

Krest naprestol'nyi (altar cross) - a large, hollow, usually wooden cross, decorated with silver or gold basma, for use in church services.

Krin - ornamentation.

Ktitor - the person who has commissioned the work.

Mishen'- the ornamented inner bottom of a vessel.
Mitra (mitre) - the hat worn by clergymen of the highest rank. Usually made of material, stretched over a frame, with pearls, precious stones, and gold and silver drobnitsy sewn onto it. Patriarchs' and metropolitans' mitres are decorated with a cross on the top.

Oblachenie - ecclesiastical vestments.

Oklad Evangeliiia (gospel cover) - precious decoration of the cover of the book. In the centre there is usually a drobnitsa with a picture of the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Descent into Hell, or The Saviour in His Glory. On the corners are drobnitsy with pictures of the four gospel-writers and their symbols.

Oklad ikony (icon cover/frame) - precious icon decoration, made from gold, silver or copper. Usually consists of several parts: the rama ("frame"), covering the frame of the icon; the fon ("background"), covering the background; the riza ("robe"), covering the clothes of the person depicted; and the venets ("crown"), where the halo would be.

Oplech'e (yoke) - a special wide collar.

Panagiar (panagiar) - in Early Rus' this was the small box in which the Father Superior of the monastery put any left-over host remaining at the end of the liturgy, and
took from the church to the refectory, in honour of the Blessed Virgin. Later, the box was replaced by a circular dish with a lid, raised on a high stem made in the shape of angels.

Panagiia (panagia) - "most holy" (Greek) - a small icon, worn by the highest-ranking clergy on a chain round the neck. From the sixteenth century, the panagiia was decorated with enamel, precious stones and pearls.

Pelena (icon-cloth) - embroidered with the same scene as the icon which stands on it in church.

Plashchanitsa/vozdukh (aer/shroud) - an embroidered depiction of the scene Oplakivanie Khrista or Pogrebenie Khrista.

Pokrov (pall) - an embroidered cloth bearing the image of the saint on whose tomb it is lain.

Potir (chalice) - the eucharistic chalice, almost always decorated with the image of the Deisus.

Proris' ("traced pattern") - a drawing on the icon-board or on cloth, which serves as the basis of the painted or embroidered picture.

Ripida (sacramental fan) - a type of fan in the shape of
a metal circle, decorated with cherubim and seraphim, on a long handle, used for clergymen of the highest rank during the service.

Sakkos (an outer garment) - part of the ecclesiastical vestments of an arkhierei, or member of the higher orders in the Russian Orthodox Church (bishop, archbishop or metropolitan).

Shit'e litsevoe - facial embroidery; the embroidery of faces and uncovered parts of the body.

Skan' (filigree) - designs in fine gold, silver or metal wire, either lain in smooth lines, or twisted into the shape of branches, done as open-work or soldered onto a metal background. One of the most common techniques used in gold and silver items.

Stikhar' (surplice) - part of the vestments of priest - a smock going down to the ankles, with a hole for the neck and wide sleeves.

Stopa (drinking glass) - a stemmed drinking-vessel, in the form of a large glass, sometimes with a lid.

Zvezditsa (asteriskos) - placed over the diskos so that the cloth diskos-cover does not touch the pieces of the host. The zvezditsa consists of two flat arched shafts,
joined in such a way as they can be brought together or pulled apart.
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32. The icon-lamp. Moscow, 1692. Silversmith A. Medvedev. GMMK.

33. Loving cup (bratina). Moscow, 1650's. GMMK.
34. The holy-water chalice (chasha vodosviatnaia). Moscow, 1695. Silversmith M. Ageev. GMMK.
35. Dish (bliudo). 1680. Moscow. GMMK.
36. Diskos and Asteriskos (diskos and zvezditsa). 1697. Moscow. GMMK.
37. Sacramental fan (ripida). 1656. GMMK.
40. Detail of Goblet [#39].
41. "Susannah and the elders" from Piskator Bible of 1650. GIM.
42. "Potiphar's wife and Joseph" from Piskator Bible of 1650. GIM.
43. Goblet (stakan usol'skoi emali). The end of 17th century. GMMK.
44. Cup (chasha usol'skoi emali). The end of 17th-century. GMMK.
45. Cup (chasha usol'skoi emali). The end of 17th-century. GMMK.
46. Coffret (larets usol'skoi emali). Detail. The end of 17th-century. GMMK.
47. Cover for Icon "The Blessed Virgin with Child". Velikii Ustiug, the end of 17th-century. GMMK.
48. Icon-cloth (pelena) "The Dormition of Virgin". Moscow, 1640-1642. GMMK.
49. Phelonion (felon'). 1680. GMMK.
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