

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers

***In Russian, East European,
and Central Asian Studies***

Iconography, Power, and Expertise in Imperial Russia

Andrew Jenks

No. 42

June 2004

*The Henry M. Jackson
School of International Studies
The University of Washington*

**Iconography, Power,
and Expertise
in Imperial Russia**

Andrew Jenks

The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies
University of Washington
2004

ISSN 1078-5639

© Jackson School of International Studies
University of Washington, 2004.

Editor:	Glennys Young
Managing Editor:	Douglas Dyer
Editorial Council:	Herbert J. Ellison
	James R. Felak
	Judith A. Thornton
	Daniel C. Waugh

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers in Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies provide a forum for the rapid dissemination of current scholarly research on the regions indicated by the title. Publications include papers from symposia and monographs that may be too long for most journals but too short to appear in book form. Subscriptions and special orders are available. The Editorial Board of *The Donald W. Treadgold Papers* does not endorse the views, or assume any responsibility for the factual accuracy, of any publication in the series. The respective authors are solely responsible for the views expressed and the factual accuracy of their contributions.

Submissions in the field of Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies are considered for publication. Articles should be of substantial length — approximately 40–100 pages, including endnotes. All transliteration should conform to Library of Congress rules. Submission on disk is requested upon acceptance. Submissions should be sent in triplicate to the address below, with attention to Glennys Young, editor. Scholars interested in submitting works for consideration are asked to obtain a copy of the style guide before submitting their work.

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers
Jackson School of International Studies
Box 353650
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3650
(206) 221-6348
treadgld@u.washington.edu

About this series

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers publication series was created to honor a great teacher and great scholar. Donald W. Treadgold was professor of history and international studies at the University of Washington from 1949 to 1993. During that time, he wrote seven books, one of which — *Twentieth Century Russia* — went into eight editions. He was twice editor of *Slavic Review*, the organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, and received the AAASS Award for Distinguished Contributions to Slavic Studies, as well as the AAASS Award for Distinguished Service. Professor Treadgold molded several generations of Russian historians and contributed enormously to the field of Russian history. He was, in other ways as well, an inspiration to all who knew him.

The *Treadgold Papers* series was created in 1993 on the occasion of Professor Treadgold's retirement, on the initiative of Professor Daniel Waugh. Professor Treadgold passed away in December 1994. The series is dedicated to the memory of a great man, publishing papers in those areas which were close to his heart.

Glennys Young, Editor

Sabrina P. Ramet, Editor (1994-2001)

About the author of this issue

Andrew Jenks is an assistant professor of Russian History at Niagara University. His articles on the history of the Russian culture and politics have appeared in the journals *Technology and Culture*, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, and *Cahiers du monde Russe* (forthcoming). He currently has a book under contract with Northern Illinois University Press: *Russia in a Box: the Invention of Russian and Socialist Identity, 1814-2001*.

Acknowledgments

Many of the themes of this paper were presented on multiple occasions to the Stanford University “kruzhok” devoted to Russian and Soviet history, as well as to a gathering of Stanford and Berkeley graduate students and professors of history. Many thanks to the organizers of these gatherings, especially Amir Weiner and the late Reggie Zelnik. I also presented many of the ideas regarding Old Believers to a conference on Old Belief held at Stanford University in January 2002, which was organized by Nancy Kollmann. I also want to thank the editors and anonymous readers of the *Treadgold Papers* for their incisive critiques. Finally, I want to thank colleagues who took away from their precious time to read and comment on my work on the icon experts, including Richard Wortman, Alexander Martin, Nicholas Riasanovsky, and Wendy Salmond.

[Alexander III] called forth [the icon painters of Palekh] from the humble provinces for the glory of his holy coronation. [Such] loving devotion of the Sovereign Emperor toward Russian peasant icon painters inevitably brings to mind an old Russian saying: 'A prayer for God and service for the Tsar are not made in vain'.¹

On 1814, Maria Fedorovna, the empress mother, received an inquiry from the German writer Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Goethe had been admiring Russian icons in Weimar, where he learned that peasant craftsmen near the ancient city of Suzdal painted holy images. How were the icons made, he wondered? Furthermore, did ancient Christian and Greek images serve as models? Did they paint images in a more contemporary style? "It would be especially nice," wrote Goethe, "to receive some typical examples of every type of icon...and if possible, from the best contemporary artists." He thought it "very instructive...that right up to our day an entire branch of art is preserved unchanged from the most ancient of times, thanks to an uninterrupted tradition passed down from Byzantium." Elsewhere, he lamented, "art...has strayed from its original, religious, and severe forms."²

The empress mother passed the request to the Minister of Internal Affairs O. P. Kozodavlev, who conveyed it to the Vladimir Governor Avdei Suponov. Suponov answered on 17 May 1814, after gathering material from local informants. While he had little information on the history of icon painting in the region, he said the icon painting traditions continued in the three villages of Palekh, Mstera, and Kholui. The masters of Palekh painted the highest quality icons. In the hamlet, approximately 600 males (estate serfs who mostly belonged to the Buturlin family) worked full-time as icon painters. A strict division of labor governed icon production, as some artists painted only the face and arms, others the clothing, and others the inscription and background. Greek originals served as models, "and although they are old, they are nonetheless preserved in churches and even in private houses." Suponov passed on two icons from Palekh's best artists to Goethe in Weimar.³

Eager not to disappoint the great German writer, the minister of interior Kozodavlev asked the official court historian, Nikolai Karamzin, to research the history of Russian icon painting in the "Vladimir-Suzdal" region. Karamzin's terse and perfunctory response provided few new details – and suggested something less

than keen interest in the subject. Suzdal icons (i.e., those made in Palekh, Mstera and Kholui) “imitate the Byzantine style which entered Russia along with the Christian faith in the reign of Vladimir.” The Greek icon painters “were our teachers,” wrote Karamzin, who believed the manner and content of the icons had not changed for centuries “since the clergy demanded from painters an exact copy of Byzantine models and innovation was considered a heresy.” As proof, Karamzin cited a sixteenth-century church council (the 1551 “Stoglav”), which dictated the painting of icons, “according to the models of Andrei Rublëv and no other way.” Karamzin was unsure how long the Suzdal icon painters had been working, but he guessed that it was since the time of Andrei Bogoliubskii, who in the twelfth-century supposedly “called to Vladimir the Byzantine artists.” Karamzin could find “no further data on this topic.” He suggested Goethe might turn to the Academy of Arts, since he did “not interfere in matters relating to the study of art.”⁴

While Karamzin seemed perplexed by Goethe’s interest, by the 1860s an influential group of Russian academics, collectors, and aristocratic enthusiasts (referred to hereafter as the “icon experts”) made the icon a thriving intellectual and political enterprise. The enterprise generated articles and books, a vigorous and lucrative trade in old icons among educated elites, and high-level patronage for the peasant icon painters of Palekh, Mstera and Kholui. This essay explores the rise of the icon expert in late-imperial Russia. Its broader aim is to examine the relationship of academic expertise to the politics and ideology of the late-imperial regime. Building upon the recent work on agrarian experts in late-imperial Russia, I seek to demonstrate how the Russian state used academic expertise to thwart a political nation of free and equal citizens in order to maintain the imperial system of separate estates and monarchical rule.⁵ Allied with Tsarist bureaucracy, the experts used political power to influence the people and to shape their lives according to a utopian image of pre-modern Russian history and art. That image emerged from a broader pan-European critique of bureaucratization, mechanization, and consumer culture, which the experts eagerly put in the service of reactionary Tsarist politics.

The analysis follows three interrelated themes: the ongoing definition of Russia in comparison and contrast with the West; the paradoxical relationship of elites to “the people,” including the Old Believers whose interests the experts claimed to represent; and the exploitation of academic authority as an instrument of political and social control. The craft of icon painting, according to the experts,

would help to reinforce the official version of Russian society as divided into a hierarchy of separate estates. By reinforcing the estate-based system of Russia, the regime believed that it would also reinforce its ability to control Russian political life – and forestall the creation of a political nation of free and equal citizens. Tracing the simultaneous emergence and politicization of icon expertise in the 1840s, the discussion culminates in Alexander III's coronation in 1883 and in the formation of Nicholas II's 1901 Committee for the Tutelage of Russian National Icon Painting. In both instances, the icon experts played a pivotal role in reviving Muscovite conceptions of an estate-based "Holy Russia."

The first experts

Despite their anti-Western rhetoric, icon experts were the children of German Romanticism. They agreed with Herder, "that since individuals were products of a particular time, place, and culture, all their acts, especially artistic endeavors, constituted an expression of the personality of the whole nation."⁶ Inspired by many of the same romantic notions that had sparked Goethe's interest in Russian peasant icon painters, conservative elites during the reign of Nicholas I began looking toward the pre-Petrine past. Peasant folk traditions and Russian Orthodox worship were seen as the foundation of this new view of old Russia.⁷ These elites consciously opposed the universal, rationalizing spirit of the Enlightenment, which they identified with the vandalism and destructiveness of the French Revolution. Constructing their own identity in opposition to the more developed West, they exercised the "privilege of backwardness," taking traditions defined by others as "backward" and using them to create a conservative utopia more authentic and "ancient" than its supposedly soulless, modern counterpart in the West.⁸

The experts took their cue from the autocracy. In 1833, the Minister of Education, Count S. S. Uvarov, proclaimed "Official Nationality" and its banner of "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality" the overarching ideology of the realm.⁹ The policy introduced the idea of Russia as a "nation" into official discourse. It also linked official Russian identity to Orthodox culture and the authority of the imperial family. Reflecting these new priorities, in 1842, Nicholas I introduced legislation that attempted to establish state control over the preservation and restoration of Russian Orthodox churches and cathedrals. "As a general rule," noted the law, "the ancient ap-

pearance of churches, both internally and externally, must be assiduously preserved..." The protection of Russian Orthodox culture thus became an explicit component of Imperial politics. To fulfill the mandate of preservation, the state now hired experts in Church art and archaeology. New opportunities emerged for individuals such as the architect K. A. Ton (1794-1881), creator of the mammoth Christ the Savior Cathedral in Moscow (built to honor the defeat of Napoleon), and the artist F. G. Solntsev (1801-1892). Solntsev, the son of a serf from Yaroslavl', had been enrolled by Count A. I. Musin-Pushkin in the Academy of Arts. After finishing his program of study, Solntsev worked in the Academy's division of archaeology and ethnography. During the 1830s, he traveled throughout European Russia, copying and studying icons and frescoes. In the 1840s, he became a favorite artist of Nicholas I and a leading figure in the state-sponsored restorations of church art, as well as participating in the more general official revival of Russian and Byzantine art. Solntsev also worked closely in this period with the largest icon studio in Palekh, the studio of M. L. Safonov, restoring numerous ancient Russian cathedrals, including the Dmitrii Cathedral in Vladimir.¹⁰

The new emphasis on state-funded preservation dovetailed with growing elite interest in Russian history and culture. Debates between Slavophiles and Westernizers highlighted the problem of Russia's distinctiveness. Historians, philologists, and archivists began gathering and publishing documents about Russia's folk customs, habits, language, art, and history – efforts that were funded by the state and by contributions from wealthy aristocrats.¹¹ Moscow was a locus for much of this activity. Separated from the daily business of empire management since the time of Peter the Great, Moscow furnished an ideal breeding ground for retrospective visions of the Russian people – and for future icon experts. The city contrasted with the bureaucratic, planned capital of St. Petersburg and its neo-classical architecture and imposing state structures. Moscow's churches and monasteries provided professors and students with living monuments to pre-Petrine Russia. Thriving communities of sectarians, who worked in industry and trade in Moscow, preserved forms of worship that pre-dated the latter part of the seventeenth-century.

The most visible manifestation of the new interest in Russian traditions was a lively antiquarian trade, which spilled onto Moscow's winding alleys and streets by the reign of Nicholas I.¹² Old Believer collectors, and the demand of prominent individuals such

as Count S. G. Stroganov (1794-1882), supported this lucrative antiquarian business.¹³ Even the persecution of Old Believers produced a rich harvest of antiquities. When authorities swept through Old Believer communities in the 1830s and confiscated un-canonical icons, many of the seized icons, rather than being destroyed, made their way into Moscow's antiquarian markets and from there, into the hands of aristocratic private collectors.¹⁴

Reflecting the new interest in Russian culture and history, in 1835, Moscow University began teaching Russia's first university courses in Russian history and literature. Mikhail Petrovich Pogodin (1800-1875), the son of a serf, occupied the university's first chair of Russian history. A tireless promoter of patriotic ideals, he believed the historian's job was to bring a people "to an understanding of itself," an understanding that linked popular life, Orthodox worship, and the ruling dynasty. In the words of the icon expert Fyodor Ivanovich Buslaev (1818-1897), whom Pogodin patronized, Pogodin railed against, "cosmopolitans who preached...universal human interests, the striving for which...should eliminate...any distinctions between nations." Like the many icon experts he inspired and encouraged, Pogodin also combined the profession of history professor with antiquarian, amassing a huge collection of ancient manuscripts, books, and Russian icons (which he eventually sold back to the state for a huge profit).¹⁵

In addition to Pogodin, a visitor to Moscow's bazaars in the 1830s might have encountered Ivan Mikhailovich Snegirev (1793-1868), a pioneer in Imperial icon studies. While working as Moscow's top censor and giving occasional lectures at Moscow University, Snegirev wrote numerous articles on icons in the 1830s and 1840s. These articles were based on observations from countless walking tours of Moscow's cathedrals and monasteries. In 1848, he published the first secular monograph on holy images: On the Significance of the Fatherland's Icon Painting.¹⁶ The book was the first to examine icons as artistic monuments rather than objects of religious worship. The "mysterious symbolism" of ancient Russian icons, wrote Snegirev, "gives food for thought and imagination, it leads us into the sphere of the soul, it familiarizes us with the views and conceptions of our ancestors."¹⁷

Following Snegirev, I. P. Sakharov (1807-1863) attempted to place the nascent study of the Russian icon on a more solid scientific foundation. In the 1830s and 1840s, Sakharov published numerous works on Russian folk language, fairytales, and his travels among the Russian people. He concluded his romantic musings about

the Russian people with his most famous work: Investigations into Russian Icon Painting, published in two volumes in 1849. He said he took up the theme because of a growing aversion to “the emptiness of the West.” The first volume was republished in 1850 and the 1,400 copies were almost immediately sold out.¹⁸

While Sakharov outlined the various schools of icon painting, culminating in the present icon painters of the Suzdal region, the most critical legacy of his work was a call for a new field of icon studies. As envisioned by Sakharov, the new field should author biographies of the greatest icon painters, analyze Russian and Byzantine icons, investigate archival sources, and explain the proper techniques of icon painting. Most importantly, he urged the creation of a new “*podlinnik*,” literally “an authentic,” as a compilation of the correct images and styles of icon painting to guide modern icon painters and restorers. According to Sakharov, the *podlinnik* would become the “Holy Grail” of icon expertise, a mechanism for defining and controlling the ancient traditions, as well as their modern practitioners.

The term “*podlinnik*” in Russian means an original copy or something “authentic.” In the case of icon painting, it refers to style manuals with an illustrated part (*litsevoi*), showing the saints and festivals of the church according to the church calendar, and an explanatory (*tolkovyi*) section, which describes the technique and significance of the icons. The Suzdal icon producers had used these style manuals for centuries, though just what they contained was not clear to many icon experts. More than just a style manual, however, the *podlinnik* was thought to provide supposedly genuine insight into the holy image of early Christianity and its preservation by Russian masters. Combined with the more general romantic quest for cultural “authenticity” (as opposed to the “falseness” of modern culture), the perception that icon painters must follow a genuine Christian style gave the *podlinnik* special significance for conservative Russians. In subsequent decades, icon experts would attempt to realize each aspect of Snegirev’s agenda, culminating in the production of the first state-sponsored *podlinnik* in 1905.¹⁹

Paralleling Sakharov’s and Snegirev’s work, Ivan Egorovich Zabelin (1820-1908) began developing a vision of icon veneration as a common link between Russia’s rulers and subjects. Raised in a state orphanage, Zabelin owed his education and livelihood to the patronage of Count Stroganov and the historian Pogodin. Beginning in 1837, he worked as a clerk in the Kremlin Armory archive. There he sifted through ancient documents about Muscovite Russia, orga-

nized and summarized them, and then formulated ideas about their meaning and importance.²⁰ He believed the physical objects of everyday life in Muscovite Russia reflected a unified style and a common spirit that linked ruler and subject. Along with other aspects of everyday life, Zabelin surmised that the worship of icons provided “the foundation of the entire social structure of the land.” Zabelin made retrieval of such objects that invoked a golden age of past unity a life-long endeavor. Eventually, as chief curator of the State Historical Museum (opened in 1881 on Red Square), he became the nation’s chief antiquarian.²¹

In addition to his theoretical contributions and collecting talents, Zabelin stimulated the budding field of icon studies with new revelations from the archives. With Count Stroganov’s help from 1847-1850, Zabelin published 14 groups of documents from the Armory Archive, most concerning the life and times of the pre-Petrine Tsars.²² The most important appeared in 1850 under the title “Materials on the History of Russian Icon Painting, 1551-1623.”²³

Using Zabelin’s 128 pages of documents, D. A. Rovinskii (1824-1895) attempted to reconstruct the official system of icon production in Muscovy. Rovinskii’s intellectual interests, like those of his good friend Zabelin, linked Russian folk art, Orthodox worship, and state power. On long walks with Zabelin, he gathered materials and observations from Moscow’s cathedrals, monasteries, and chapels. His work on religious icons posited an extensive system of control and censorship over holy images in late Muscovy. With Rovinskii’s work, the idea of an ancient system of icon patronage became a *leitmotif* of Imperial icon expertise. In making this point, Rovinskii’s 1856 study, A Review of Icon Painting in Russia up to the End of the Seventeenth Century, highlighted the Stoglav Council of 1551, a key source of authority in icon expertise. The Stoglav was one of several councils held in Muscovy to set standards among the clergy and laity. It laid down one hundred chapters of reformation (including the 43rd on icon painting) with the provision that disobedience would result in transgressors being forever accursed. The Stoglav, wrote Rovinskii, condemned the artless painting of holy images and lambasted any departure from sacred models. He believed the Stoglav laid the foundation for state icon supervision (Rovinskii used the Russian verb *nabliudat’*) in the seventeenth-century, which was centered in the Kremlin Armory. According to Rovinskii, the Armory’s patronage forged a single Russian style for the realm. In Rovinskii’s analysis the Tsar, rather than church offi-

cials, was the central patron of Holy Images, a supreme arbiter in all matters concerning the production and worship of icons.²⁴

By way of contrast, Rovinskii implied the Russian state had orphaned peasant icon painting—and like many orphans, the Russian people had strayed. For instance, Rovinskii called Palekh's icons "cheap" and "artless." He saw the Palekhians as direct descendents of the icon painters condemned in the 1551 Stoglav council for painting icons "without any learning, in a facile and self-satisfied way, and not according to a model, and these icons are sold cheaply among simple and ignorant people." He cited a complaint to Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich in the seventeenth-century that reprimanded the icon painters of Palekh and Kholui for "painting icons without method and without fear." Subsequently, Rovinskii noted that "untrained icon painters continue to paint 'improper icons' and sell them cheaply to the impoverished people." Though Rovinskii admitted that a few modern Suzdal icon painters possessed great skill, he complained that some masters used their talents to produce fakes of old icons.²⁵ Interestingly, Rovinskii had a more positive attitude toward the icons in the collections of Old Believers, whose images he discussed in his original manuscript. The references were excised by censors amidst Nicholas I's crackdown on Old Believers (the 1903 reprint cited here included the icons and positive references to Old Belief).²⁶ Nevertheless, Rovinskii's positive treatment of Old Believer forms of worship betrayed new elite attitudes toward Old Belief as the embodiment, rather than antithesis, of Russian Orthodoxy.²⁷

Rovinskii's contrast of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century state patronage with the absence of state support in the present became a central theme in Russian icon studies, as did his positive representation of Old Belief. Like Snegirev, Rovinskii placed high hopes for the future of icon painting and the purity and holiness of Russian culture on the *podlinnik*, a seemingly reliable instrument for regulating the production of holy images. Academics would take the lead in compiling these icon primers.

With Rovinskii's work, which seamlessly integrated historical analysis, aesthetic critique, and a search for the historical roots of a distinctive Russian style, the Imperial icon expert was in full blossom. After the emancipation of the serfs on 19 February 1861 (Old Style), investigations into the past and present of Russian icon painting intensified. There were also new calls to cleanse the icon painting traditions of harmful influences. This paralleled a more general concern to maintain control over peasants, who were now liberated from the private control of their aristocratic owners.

The second generation of icon experts

Icon experts such as Rovinskii had ample opportunity to compare the icons of the past with those of the present. Russia had a thriving market for new and old icons. A special class of icon-traders known as the *ofeni* (many of them Old Believers) specialized in pre-Petrine icons and other holy relics, but they also traded icons produced by Suzdal peasant icon painters.²⁸ A Minister of Interior report from 1858 noted that the icon painters of Palekh, Mstera and Kholui painted more than two million images annually, providing a rare example of mass culture in a largely illiterate society. These icon painters served a diverse and differentiated market – from peasant consumers and Old Believers to aristocratic and ecclesiastical patrons.²⁹ The icon painters of Mstera catered to Old Believers, producing icons with representations of saints making the sign of the cross with two, rather than three, fingers. Nearly two thousand peasant masters in Mstera produced icons in a style known as “*podstarinnye*,” or in a supposedly canonical Byzantine manner, which was also imitated by masters elsewhere. Masters deliberately painted icons in dark tones and colors to give their holy images an ancient appearance – and in many instances they produced fake old icons. They catered to Old Believers, as well as elites who had been inspired by the official Orthodox style of the reign of Nicholas I – ironic, given the simultaneous persecution of Old Believers in his reign. Thus, the same peasant icon painters who produced holy imagery for official Orthodoxy also supplied Old Believer communities.³⁰

Meanwhile, many Palekh and Kholui peasant icon studios maintained a mixed Western and Byzantine style known as “*friaz*,” which was also popular among many merchants and nobility. This mixed style used brighter colors and integrated elements of naturalism, such as rounder faces, *chiaro-scuro*, and true perspective, which had been taught in some Palekh icon studios since the 1850s. These icons applied generous amounts of gold paint to fill in the background and highlight features. Those who specialized in this style were known as “*friazisti*.” They often painted the background using oil paints and a more realistic style. Masters then switched to tempera to paint the face, hair, eyes, and certain other parts of the icon in a more traditional manner.³¹ The *friazhskii* manner integrated Orthodox aesthetic traditions with post-Renaissance influences from the West. Rounder faces, bright colors, and a more realistic tech-

nique (including the use of oil paints) highlighted the possibilities of life in this world and suggested a culture close to that of Catholic Europe. The *friazhskii* style of icons also matched the growing spirit of conspicuous consumption in some quarters: richly decorated as they were with gold ornament and enamel, bright colors, and saints with colorfully round and full faces.³²

Other Palekh studios, such as the Karovaikov and Korin studios (the famous Soviet-era People's Artist Pavel Korin came from this family) specialized in miniature painting (*melochnoe pis'mo*), cramming dozens of saints into incredibly minute spaces. These painters continued a trend toward miniaturization and the use of bright colors that were initiated in the so-called Stroganov school of icon painting in the seventeenth-century. They were known as "*melochniki*." On an icon scarcely larger than the size of this page, miniaturists could cram thirty figures into each of twelve frames representing the months of the year and accompanying church festivals – with a face of Jesus in the center surrounded by 360 Mothers of God!³³

The lively market for icons provided experts with a good-news, bad-news scenario. On the one hand, it suggested a profound religiosity among the Russian people. On the other hand, many experts believed market forces threatened the purity of Russian icon painting – and the Orthodox nature of Russia itself. None was more troubled than Fyodor Ivanovich Buslaev. The most influential of the icon experts in the era of the Great Reforms, Buslaev's ideas reached into the highest echelons of state power. A professor of philology and history at Moscow University, Buslaev's path to academic prominence in post-emancipation Russia began in the provincial backwater of Penza, where his father had worked as a low-level bureaucrat. After finishing the gymnasium in Penza, Buslaev passed Moscow University's entrance exams and entered its historical/philological faculty in 1834, just as the university prepared to teach its first courses in Russian history and literature. With Pogodin's help, Buslaev won a state stipend to finance his education. He made frequent use of Pogodin's vast collection of manuscripts and icons, which he said "defined all the rest of [his] scholarly activity."³⁴

Buslaev also received the patronage of Count Sergei Grigorievich Stroganov, who oversaw educational institutions in Moscow in the 1830s and 1840s. In 1839, one year after Buslaev finished his studies at Moscow University, Stroganov invited the young Buslaev to be a tutor for his children on a two-year trip to

Germany, Austria, and Italy.³⁵ Following Goethe, the twenty-one year old Buslaev imagined this period as his "*Wanderjahre*," or his transformation from apprentice-scholar into a seasoned master. The works of Johann Winckelmann, the eighteenth-century German archaeologist and pioneering art historian, introduced Buslaev to Italy's monuments of art and antiquity. Buslaev now imagined the classical and medieval ethos as an essential antidote to the alienating forces of modern society and culture. In contrast to the pre-Petrine era, modern culture, he once wrote, "lacks unifying ideals."³⁶

On the strength of Count Stroganov's recommendation, Buslaev became tutor to the Tsarevich, Nikolai Aleksandrovich, in 1859. His lectures to the Tsarevich (and the lecture notes he left behind) also influenced Nikolai's younger brother, the future Tsar Alexander III.³⁷ Buslaev combined the preparation of lectures for the Tsarevich with the writing of a book on ancient Russian literature and art, published in early 1861, as Buslaev was completing the Tsarevich's tutoring sessions.³⁸ The two-volume collection of essays (*Historical Essays on Russian National Literature and Art*) provoked a lively debate in educated circles, drawing the ire of some critics and the praise of others. As Buslaev boasted in his memoirs, his detractors "looked at Russian antiquity and nationality (*narodnost*), at the eternal customs and habits, which constituted the subject matter of my monographs, as worthless, useless junk to be tossed out the window." His supporters, who included the Empress, applauded his examination of "nationality, with its ancient principles as one of the most important and critical issues of the day, in light of the emancipation taking place before our eyes."³⁹

The first volume of Buslaev's work covered ancient Russian life, sayings, epic tales, and the relationship between Ukrainian and other Slavic literatures to ancient Russian literature. The second volume dealt primarily with pre-Petrine developments in literature and art – and with the problem of "nationality" in these spheres. He lamented the rift between *belles-lettres* and ancient Russian literature, which he hoped would be healed by a new appreciation of Russian antiquity. One essay linked Byzantine and ancient Russian symbolism in the surviving manuscripts of Muscovy from the fifteenth- and sixteenth-centuries. Another essay examined the beard in ancient Russian icons, a manner of representation that supposedly distinguished Russia from the West (where Jesus, he noted, was shown as clean-shaven rather than bearded in the Russian style). Finally, following the lead of Zabelin and Rovinskii, essays on Russian icons explored the Kremlin Armory's system of control and

ensorship in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-centuries.⁴⁰

While Buslaev shared many of the same idealized conceptions of the pre-Petrine era as the famous Slavophiles, he was careful to distinguish himself from them. He loved Rome, which he called "the motherland of my moral constitution," and marveled at the artistry of early Renaissance masters. Though he saw Russian icons and Orthodox culture as distinguishing marks of the Russian people, he also insisted that Russian icons continued Byzantine traditions firmly grounded in Greco-Roman civilization. He lashed out at those who suggested that Russian medieval art reflected Russia's "oriental" origins. Byzantium tied Russia to ancient Greece and Rome, thus making Russia an occidental rather than oriental society, he noted further.⁴¹ Most importantly, Buslaev was a committed servant of the state and its Petrine mission of modernizing and enlightening the empire.

These complex attitudes toward the West and Russia's own pre-Petrine heritage produced a unique synthesis. While he pursued a romantic vision of Russia that was firmly grounded in ancient Russian traditions, he also connected these traditions to an aesthetic and religious culture which Russia shared with the West. It was a delicate balancing act. Invoking the privilege of backwardness, Buslaev admitted that Russian icons were aesthetically inferior to Western art, since they lacked proper perspective and realism. Yet those icons, rough and primitive, reflected the authentic belief of their creators. "The lack of development of our iconography, in an artistic sense, constitutes not only its distinguishing characteristic, but also its superiority before Western art," wrote Buslaev.⁴²

By remaining faithful to ancient models, Russian icon painters exhibited the proper spirit of Christian discipline, unlike religious painters in the West. Individual creativity, as emphasized by the 43rd chapter of the 1551 Stoglav, was a product of pride and willfulness, "which violates the cleanliness of the holy enterprise of icon painting," wrote Buslaev.⁴³ Traditions of rote copying in icon painting preserved "the primitive purity of iconographic principles" against "the erosion of morals, the naked materialism and senseless idealism which reigned in Western art from the middle of the sixteenth century."⁴⁴

While the Russian icon was a truly Christian artifact, and hence reflected a universal Christian community, it was also uniquely Russian. The icon reflected "the determined independence and uniqueness of the Russian nation, in all its indestructible might, raised for centuries in backwardness and stagnation, in its unwavering faith

in the long-ago accepted principles, in its primitive simplicity and strictness of moral habits.”⁴⁵ The icon was a banner of Russian asceticism and self-denial, of the Orthodox spirit of kenosis and martyrdom.

The ascetic personalities of icon painting, courageous hermits and self-denying elder-ascetics, the lack of any softness or the seductions of feminine beauty, the relentless uniformity of icon painting subjects, the corresponding uniformity of worship – all this encouraged an ascetic, rural people, slowly formed into a great political whole, a people who love to work, prosaic and direct in the inventiveness of mind and imagination.⁴⁶

Yet despite his praise of Russia’s primitive simplicity, Buslaev continued to demand a more sophisticated technique from Russian icon painters. Like many contemporaries he looked to seventeenth-century Russia for guidance, a time when the Romanovs forged a new unity built upon the fusion of Orthodoxy theology and Western learning and technique.⁴⁷ For Buslaev, the greatest seventeenth-century icon painter, Simon Ushakov, embodied this correct synthesis of Western and Byzantine traditions.⁴⁸ Following Ushakov, Buslaev believed that contemporary Russian icon painters should paint in a more realistic style, though somehow avoiding the “naturalism” that had corrupted most Western religious art since the late Renaissance.⁴⁹ “History indisputably proves that the excessive development of Western art damaged its religious orientation,” wrote Buslaev. The trend inevitably led down the slippery slope to crude materialism and “paganism.” “Obsessed with anatomy, Michelangelo distorted the figure of Jesus Christ in his representation of the final judgment,” he wrote. It was improper, as Catholics did, to show holy figures clean-shaven, in modern clothing “dressed like Catholic priests” or to show Christ, “as betrothed to marry or be engaged with some maiden,” continued Buslaev. Rembrandt reduced holiness to “cynical triviality” when he dressed holy figures “as Dutchmen in the clothing of the time.” Moreover, the resurrection of Christ should remain a mystery, Buslaev would insist. His actual representation in an icon (the figure of Jesus arising from the sarcophagus had become increasingly popular in Russian icons since the seventeenth-century) should not be allowed and was un-Orthodox (and hence un-Russian). Meanwhile, Buslaev quipped that Prot-

estant religious art, "makes no sense," and he told his students that Protestants were "iconoclastic." The Reformation had replaced "the depth of religious inspiration with vulgar sentimentality...how pathetic and senseless are the caricatures of holiness, which even great masters such as Rembrandt and Rubens pass off as icons to be worshipped in church altars." To the extent that Protestants produced religious art, it had no foundation in "the dogmas of the church or faith" and had "turned into a playful game of fantasy."⁵⁰

Steeped in Hegelian dialectics, Buslaev thus offered his formula for adapting Western artistic technique to sacred icon painting traditions.⁵¹ The vagueness of the formula reflected the infant state of Russian icon studies, nonexistent a few decades previously. It also embodied the challenge of defining Russian icons as distinct from, and yet part of, Western aesthetic traditions:

The concept of nature in art is assumed to be a faithfulness to reality in the drawing of figures, in their position and movement, and especially in the expression of spiritual movements, and finally in coloration. This demand should be acknowledged as lawful and reasonable on the basis that only through the naturalness of all external forms of representation, only through a faithfulness of spiritual expression, both in the entire figure and particularly in the face, can the artist instill the ideas that inspired him to the viewer. A faithfulness to nature and naturalness have to be strictly distinguished from so-called naturalism, which has acquired predominance among the most recent artists, especially in our fatherland. Raphael was always true to nature, but none would accuse him of naturalism.⁵²

Determined to preserve the distinctiveness of Russian icon painting, and yet update it in a way that would not corrupt those traditions, Buslaev gathered together the nascent community of experts in the first years of the Great Reforms.

From scholarship to control

In 1863, while speaking at the newly opened Rumiantsev Museum in Moscow (the oldest building in the Lenin Library com-

plex)⁵³, Buslaev proposed an “icon-painting brotherhood” to translate his vague notions into a program for icon painting. The proposal contained all the essential elements for making expertise an instrument of social, aesthetic, and cultural control. The brotherhood, said Buslaev, would be unlike any organization devoted to antiquities in the West, “because icon painting for the Russian people constitutes an essential, and to this day surviving, modern element of life, just like other moral interests that define the national physiognomy.” While the ancient schools of painting had “temporarily stagnated in the hackneyed production of the Suzdal icon painters” (he did not specify what made this production hackneyed), they still exerted a broad influence among the masses, spreading religious ideas and conceptions “just like the Tsarist school of icon painting in the reign of Alexei Mikhailovich.” The Old Believers, “who are not deprived of a certain aesthetic taste,” had also helped develop icon painting within the framework of the old style, “and they did so without the aid of science and educated artists.” Russian icon painting was therefore a living part of culture that struggled with the “new secular art” and the doctrine of crude, godless materialism it propagated.⁵⁴

The reference to Old Belief was particularly significant. It marked the ongoing, and remarkable, transformation of Old Believers from pariahs into caretakers of the sacred traditions.⁵⁵ Buslaev said that academician artists had lost an appreciation of “the root traditions of Russian life,” which were to be found, among other places, within the communities of Old Believers. To heal Russian culture, the proposed brotherhood would give “the icon painter the means for an aesthetic education” and the secular artist a thorough grounding in “the national traditions of Russian icon painting.” This fusion of the academically trained artist, who had turned away from national traditions, and the Old Believer peasant icon painter, who had stagnated in them, symbolized a broader reunification of Russian culture.⁵⁶ This idea was seconded in another publication of one of the attendees of the Rumiantsev conference, G. D. Filimonov. He said scholars should not fear the accusation of being “Old Believers” in explaining the roots of icon painting. Since the time of Peter, he noted, Russia’s elites had lost contact “with the firm ground of the people’s spirit.” They not only stopped patronizing icon painting, but also looked upon it as “some kind of Old Believer craft.” On the contrary, he added, Old Believers should be thanked for their services in preserving the old Russian traditions.⁵⁷

Buslaev, meanwhile, invoked romantic notions regarding the

integrity and nobility of craft labor. He envisioned the new icon painters as a defense against the modern trend of specialization. They embodied the unified worldview and culture of bygone times that he so desperately sought as an antidote to modern life. "Specialized fields," said Buslaev, "develop more and more at the expense of universal knowledge and practical abilities, which at one time were concentrated in one person." By contrast, icon painters, like the first Renaissance artists, should be full-fledged scholars, "who study the rules of geometry, perspective, anatomy, and other sciences." Like medieval masters, they were to combine theory and practice, mental and manual labor and their devotion to Orthodox Christian principles was to guarantee the unity and harmony of their aesthetic labors.⁵⁸

Buslaev considered a new "*podlinnik*" critical for educating icon painters about the proper technique, history, and meaning of the icon. However, it was unclear which icon-painting traditions would comprise the style manual; the icon experts were keenly aware that much work remained to be done in the science of icon studies, hence the vagueness of many of their proposals. Thus, Buslaev considered the art of the catacombs as a safe starting point. Drinking deeply from the well of ancient Christian art, Russia's "national" traditions would absorb the uncorrupted spirit of early Christianity, along with the aesthetic principles of Greco-Roman civilization.⁵⁹

Meanwhile, the brotherhood would help icon consumers distinguish authenticity from its cheap imitation. By confusing the cheap production of peasant icon painters with "ancient-Russian icon painting, and the latter with Byzantine icon production," unqualified experts "bring more harm in spreading their false ideas than those who openly revile the art."⁶⁰ Critical reviews from the brotherhood's publications, including advice on how to identify a counterfeit icon, would help "purge and direct artistic taste." To avoid becoming an "oppressive censor," the brotherhood vowed to rely on the "precise data of science" as a guide for establishing canonically correct models. With the authority derived from its selfless and scientific labors, the brotherhood would enjoy broad rights of control in the icon producing community, thus obviating the need for compulsion and fiat.⁶¹

Curiously, Buslaev's proposal excluded the one institution already formally endowed with oversight in the spiritual sphere, the Russian Orthodox Church.⁶² Buslaev and the many icon experts whom he inspired believed the church had been deeply compromised by the supposed ignorance of its own priests. Exclusion of the

priestly hierarchy, which was already likely to reject lay expertise, guaranteed the religious bureaucracy's hostility to the proposals of icon experts. Indeed, church officials in 1857 had already voiced concerns about academics and secular artists controlling icon production and the formation of a new *podlinnik*.⁶³ In early 1863, the Holy Synod flatly rejected a proposal from the Academy of Arts to establish a special committee overseeing all holy image production, which had the Ministry of Interior's approval and was likely inspired by Buslaev. The committee, which made no provisions for the participation of church officials or icon painters, envisioned a system of inspectors to survey and approve production in icon painting villages. In addition to requesting start-up capital of some one hundred thousand rubles, the committee's backers proposed a ten percent surcharge on all holy images to support its activities. The proposal was rejected, among other things, for usurping the prerogatives of the church censors.⁶⁴

Meanwhile, other key players were also absent during Buslaev's 1863 presentation: the actual peasant producers and distributors of icons from Palekh, Mstera, and Kholui. Although icon experts frequently condemned the icon painter's ignorance, few had ever actually talked to one. Like their radical counterparts, conservatives often preferred to view "the people" through the lens of their own stereotypes and political agendas.⁶⁵ A handful of articles, to which the discussion now turns, displayed the aesthetic and political preferences of icon expertise. They were penned by the economist and state servant V. P. Bezobrazov (1828-1889), a widely read author who developed an interest in the culture and life of peasant Russia in the wake of the Emancipation; and by the art historian G. D. Filimonov (1828-1898), one of Buslaev's students and a close associate of Zabelin, with whom he continued to develop the nascent field of icon studies. The authority of both authors was bolstered by their direct contact with the icon painting villages, which they presented in published articles as an objective representation of the current state of icon painting. While solidifying romantic images of peasant icon painters, these authors sounded increasingly shrill alarms about the dangerous influence of market forces and mechanization – two ideas central to the political mobilization of icon expertise in later years.

The land of the *ofeni*

Bezobrazov journeyed to the center of peasant icon painting in the summer of 1861. He traveled by horse to Viazniki from the provincial center of Vladimir before visiting Mstera, Kholui, and finally Palekh, producing a detailed account of his trip in the journal Russkii vestnik. Bezobrazov's account became a standard point of reference for all subsequent experts on the contemporary state of peasant icon painting.⁶⁶ The three villages ran south to north, separated from each other by approximately thirty kilometers. Mstera, a center of Old Belief, occupied the southernmost part of the Suzdal icon painting industry and was closest to Vladimir. As Bezobrazov traveled north past Kholui to Palekh, he noticed the thinning of the population, which he believed marked the transition from a primarily craft-based economy (including the production of icons, but also other industries) to one with a mix of crafts (almost exclusively icons) and agriculture. The Kliazma and Teza rivers drained at the southern end of Mstera and Kholui, which were "sandy and infertile," wrote Bezobrazov, with many "swampy areas." By contrast, as he approached Palekh, soils became more fertile and agriculture more common.

The town in the middle, Kholui, hosted a bustling peasant market, which in the summer served as a gathering point for a class of peddlers known as the *ofeni*, many of whom were Old Believers. The *ofeni* specialized in the region's icons, purchasing them from local producers in the summer and reselling them the remainder of the year throughout Russia and even into the Balkans.⁶⁷ As Bezobrazov noted with great curiosity, they were unlike any other people he had encountered in Russia, and he wondered, with some trepidation, if the *ofeni* might harbor the future spirit of the Russian nation.⁶⁸ He contrasted Russia's "broad, massive features, its spaciousness and lack of discipline, the broad sweep of its movements and idleness of life," with the "miniatureness" of the icon peddler's physique. The *ofeni* built their houses "in the rural gentry style with various pretensions and decorations," including calico curtains and potted geraniums in windows. At home, the typical peddler wore an oriental robe with a tie underneath, a vest, black pants, a pocket watch, waistcoat, and bronze pin.⁶⁹ The wives of the peddlers also had "delicate manners," he wrote, and were of small stature. While the peddler husband and wife presented an image of domestic bliss, the portrait was nonetheless an illusion, wrote Bezobrazov. The little

house and ideal wife were diversions from the all-consuming demands of business, a brief opportunity for the icon peddler to be “the boss of the home...have someone to order about.” In these peddlers, Bezobrazov encountered a kind of Russian he did not believe could exist: “You don’t know how to place [this type], ahead or behind the pure Great Russian peasant, and similarly you are puzzled: who will advance further in success in national life: the peddler or his neighbor peasant farmer?”⁷⁰

Even as Bezobrazov was unsure if the icon peddler “was ahead or behind the pure Great Russian peasant,” his comments nonetheless suggested something unseemly and unstable in their lifestyle, something delicate, not quite manly, and distinctly un-Russian. For Bezobrazov, as for later investigators and state officials, the icon peddler stood in for the petty peasant trader, famously disparaged by Marx as part of the “petty-bourgeoisie.” Hostility to the *ofeni* also was fueled by a pervasive Old Regime discourse about people whose way of life did not fit the standard role assigned to their estate; it was widely assumed that physical and spiritual corruption would follow from their behavior.⁷¹ The *ofeni* were stingy and lacked the hospitality supposedly so common to Russians. They had their own dialect, which they used to deceive clients. Bezobrazov wrote that the peddler was happy, “not that he has a wife, but that he can show her off.” A peddler, according to Bezobrazov, bragged about his money once he came home, even though he might travel thousands of miles on foot, hiring horses for the last leg of the trip to impress his neighbors. Unlike the Great Russian peasant, the peddler had “awkward features, dark hair, and an inaudible voice.” When approached by an outsider, the icon peddler often “carefully retreats into his house, locking the door behind him.” The suspiciousness of the icon peddlers, or the perception that they held back the secrets of their trade and gave false information, represented a major theme of this and subsequent descriptions. For instance, one 1866 article represented the *ofeni* as sly, pushy, and devious. They operated according to the saying, “If you don’t lie, you won’t sell.” Due to the extended travel of the *ofeni* away from home, they had troubled families. Their wives and daughters had loose morals, leading to high rates of birth out of wedlock. They operated on the boundaries of legitimate society, registered as peasants, yet worked as merchants and used a language similar to the specialized language of criminals “to hide the essence of their conversation from the uninitiated.”⁷² Through the end of the century, published reports increasingly presented the *ofeni* as the exploiters and “kulaks” of the icon

painters, an emblem of everything that was polluting, tawdry, and corrupting in the rule of money.⁷³

Bezobrazov's first glimpse of peasant icon painters in 1861 came in the town of Mstera, which was primarily populated by Old Believers and catered to the demands of sectarian communities. He then traveled to Kholui, which was rightly noted for its production of cheap, poor quality icons. Of the three towns, Palekh, he believed, was indisputably the premiere center of icon painting (reflecting the same view presented to Goethe in 1814). Icon painters worked both in their own homes and in studios, the largest of which (with fifty icon painters) was owned by the former icon master Safonov. Safonov, he noted, had an immense collection of icons, as well as copies of ancient icons by his best masters who had restored and painted holy images throughout Russia. For specialists such as Buslaev, these collections represented a potential treasure trove of ancient Russianness. Any effort to create a new *podlinnik* would now require their examination and analysis.⁷⁴

For all his suspicions of the icon peddlers, and his outrage at the drunkenness and poor quality of production among some painters (especially in Kholui), Bezobrazov nonetheless felt he had encountered a world where religiosity, trade, and work were intimately bound together. He had experienced a way of life that was "real, genuine, and national," where heavy-handed state intervention was not required. Even the poorest peasants, he imagined, would "sooner go around without a piece of bread, even vodka, than live without [worshipping icons]."⁷⁵ Impressed by the seeming spontaneity of icon production and worship, and yet appalled by the lack of artistry and the dominance of commercial interests, he was unsure whether it was a good idea for outsiders, even with the best of intentions, to interfere.⁷⁶

Bezobrazov's indecisiveness echoed a broader dilemma for many educated Russians in the 1860s. On the one hand, many believed the "people" and their customs should be respected. State interference in peasant economic and cultural matters was preferably to be kept to a minimum, a point reflected in the emancipation itself, which preserved supposedly "traditional" institutions for the peasantry, such as the peasant commune and the cantonal administration. On the other hand, conservative Russians wanted the masses to conform to elite conceptions of an "ideal" Russian citizen (humble, pious, and loyal to Tsar and country), which was often contradicted by reality. The appointment of the conservative Dmitrii Aleksandrovich Tolstoi (1823-1889) to head the Holy Synod in 1865

and then his appointment to head the Ministry of Enlightenment in 1866 would mark a new conservative willingness to intervene in peasant society.⁷⁷ Haunted by the specter of revolutionary terrorism, conservative activism would gain momentum with the assassination of Alexander II on 1 March 1881 – and dovetail, as we shall see, with the demands of icon experts.

Meanwhile, Bezobrazov's portrait of the icon painting vilages was soon followed in 1863 by another travelogue from the scholar and icon collector Filimonov. A close associate of Buslaev and Zabelin, Filimonov came from a gentry family in Poltava. He studied history and philology at Moscow University, specializing in Russian church art. Beginning in 1858, Filimonov worked as chief archivist at the Kremlin Armory, continuing and expanding Zabelin's explorations into the pre-Petrine history of icon painting. Like Buslaev and others of his time, he saw the seventeenth-century as a golden age – and the artist Simon Ushakov (about whom he would write a biography) as its model icon painter.⁷⁸ The seventeenth-century represented a seemingly ideal synthesis of Western, post-Renaissance technique and pre-Nikonian Russian Orthodox tradition, which the experts believed had been so assiduously preserved by Old Believers. Ushakov had helped bring about this supposedly balanced synthesis of old and new and Russian and Western tradition, which was supposedly abandoned by many Russians after Peter the Great. If the Old Believers were too rigid in their defense of tradition, noted Filimonov, then at least they had the traditional foundation necessary for moving into the future – unlike their Westernizing counterparts.

In 1862, a visit to the Moscow Sukharev bazaar stimulated Filimonov's interest in the Suzdal icon painters, especially those of Palekh, who seemed to embody the fusion style (*friaz'*) of old and new that the Great Reform-era experts idealized.⁷⁹ Like other aficionados, Filimonov frequently visited the book markets and bazaars of Moscow, in which the tracings used by icon painters as style manuals often appeared. In 1861, his colleague Zabelin stumbled upon two thousand tracings from a brigade of early nineteenth-century Moscow artists led by the Sapozhnikov brothers. Inspired by the find, Filimonov discovered yet another cache of Sapozhnikov tracings in the fall of 1862. The tracings, including those of many Ushakov icons, had guided the Sapozhnikov brigade, whom Filimonov further learned had close connections with Palekh masters. Intrigued by the connection, and by persistent rumors that the Palekh icon studios kept vast collections of the style manuals,

Filimonov decided to travel to Palekh himself in the winter of 1863.⁸⁰

As he inquired about the hamlet before his departure, he was surprised to find that “almost all the icon painters [in Moscow were] from Palekh.” The best painters of Palekh had gained broad knowledge, both in icon painting traditions and in modern life, in their far-flung assignments to restore and paint icons across Russia. Self-taught, with only a year or two of schooling, “many are at a higher level of education than our merchants,” said Filimonov. Some masters even read newspapers and journals and cultivated reasoned views on a variety of topics. For Filimonov, the painters were not merely passive and largely unconscious continuers of an ancient tradition, desperately in need of drawing lessons and general enlightenment, but respectable craftsmen, and at times, even artists. They seemed to be the living embodiment of the seventeenth-century ideal.⁸¹

Filimonov’s article revealed new details about the more recent development of Palekh’s style. The Sapozhnikov brigade had fled Moscow during the Napoleonic invasion, spending two years in Palekh and painting the frescoes of the town’s central Cathedral. Filimonov theorized that the Sapozhnikov sojourn in Palekh and the contact between its artists and the other local masters, imparted to Palekh’s art a more realistic style of painting, including the use of proper perspective and a mix of oil and tempera paints. Filimonov applauded the development as paralleling Ushakov’s infusion of fresh technique and Western learning into Russian icon painting in the seventeenth-century, creating the so-called “*friazhskii*” style.⁸² This was precisely the kind of natural style (though not “naturalism”) that Buslaev had been advocating, a measured and organic combination of native Russian traditions and modern Western learning. In addition, Filimonov believed a more realistic style, which could convey distinctly Russian landscapes, architecture, and figures, could also communicate “the signs of a purely national character in all the minutest details.” Russian icon painting could thus “awaken national forces” and use the messages of Christianity as a “civilizing force” within the Empire.

The mural painting skills learned in Palekh from the Sapozhnikov brigade also prompted other Palekhians to branch out into the church-mural business, a lucrative endeavor, given the empire’s tens of thousands of Orthodox churches. Subsequently, according to Filimonov, the best Palekh masters began working as mural painters and restorers throughout Russia, thereby acquainting themselves with all the major styles of Russian icon painting.

More than simply mastering these styles, however, the Palekhians made tracings of the best works they encountered, which they then added to the hamlet's growing collection of style manuals. For instance, when the masters visited an icon on-site, they traced the contours of the image on paper and memorized its colors and other details. Upon return to Palekh, the masters laid out prepared wooden boards on the studio floor, on which they copied the contours from their drawings, using coal to mark central features, shadows, and other details. An apprentice then traced these contours with a knife and placed the larger boards against the wall and the smaller ones on an easel. Mixing tempera paints in eggshells, the masters then applied colors memorized from the original.⁸³

In short, Filimonov in Palekh "had encountered the people, who justifiably can be called the leading force of Russian nationality (*narodnost*)." He regained "faith in the possibility of progress in icon painting in the future." The budding field of icon studies, he was sure, would be forever indebted to Palekh for the massive quantities of icon tracings and icon copies stored in its studios and homes. He called Palekh "a kind of academy," using a term ("academy") that subsequently became a standard conception of Palekh in Russian culture. The idea of Palekh as a village academy had been born (an idea that survived into the Soviet era, when Palekh switched to the new medium of lacquer miniatures and folk motifs). According to this notion, Russia would be one part "academy" and one part "village," thus representing the fusion of intelligentsia and peasant culture that many elites now envisioned.⁸⁴

Filimonov's discovery of the village academy, however, was tempered by sobering developments. Instead of Christian virtue, many masters now worshipped the almighty ruble. "Unfortunately, in Palekh I often hear the expression, 'I paint for the money,' an expression, of course, which is impossible to justify in church art." Many younger artists, in their travels "far away from their homeland" had removed themselves "from the soil of old traditions and native customs." They had become "indifferent to the old ways" and clearly reflected a secular, rather than religious, approach to art, Filimonov complained.⁸⁵

Filimonov also linked the division of labor in icon painting to contemporary capitalism and its relentless quest for efficiency and profit – although such divisions had existed for centuries. Icon painters, as Goethe had discovered, were divided into those who painted just the exposed parts of the body and especially the face (*lichniki*) and those who painted the clothing and less holy parts

(*dolichniki*).⁸⁶ Filimonov intimated that these divisions were the product of a more recent capitalist development. He said that cheap production from Kholui, which was famous among the experts for producing shoddy icons, forced owners in Palekh to introduce an ever increasing division of labor among their own masters. In doing so, the owners reduced resources and time for training future artists and prevented masters from having the skills to paint icons outside the context of the peasant icon studio (referred to derisively by later experts such as Nikodim Kondakov as a factory, or *zavod*.) All of this was done “for the selfish goal of making profit,” wrote Filimonov, binding the master to the owner, destroying the integrity of the artistic process, and profaning sacred medieval traditions.⁸⁷ “In the studio,” commented one observer nearly two decades after Filimonov’s trip, “all the production is based on strict routine, on the mechanical memorization, learned by rote, of every brush stroke, shadow, and feature. Even the inscriptions of the icons are produced by illiterate painters, who learn them by heart.” It seemed the master was “printing the icon, and not painting it,” as if the painter was “a machine.”⁸⁸

Admittedly, there was some truth to the idea that profit motives in the post-Emancipation era had cheapened the quality of production and the integrity of the icon painter’s labor, especially in Kholui; but many studios in Palekh and Mstera, while retaining the long-standing division of labor between *lichniki* and *dolichniki*, had a reputation for high quality production. According to statistics compiled by the Vladimir guberniia in 1899, a Palekh master spent five workdays to produce ten icons, compared to one hundred icons in the same amount of time by a master from nearby Kholui (thirty kilometers to the south). While Palekh icons sold on average for more than a ruble per image (and the best for one hundred rubles or more), icons from Kholui were sold in bulk – one hundred for eight rubles. Keeping in mind the notorious underreporting of income, the icon painters of Palekh officially earned an average of two hundred rubles a year in the studios (compared to 153 in Kholui), and often much more than that for contract work performed outside the studio system. Many Palekhians worked both in the studios, where they received a salary, and at home filling orders directly for personal patrons. Others worked only at home, producing cheaper icons on contract for a studio or for middlemen at the local fairs, especially the 14 September fair on the Festival of the Assumption.⁸⁹ Moreover, through the last half of the nineteenth century, contrary to the experts’ stories of capitalist exploitation and degradation,

talented masters in Palekh frequently broke away from the supposedly iron-fisted control of their bosses to start up their own studios (many with branches in Moscow and St. Petersburg). Many owned homes, taverns, and other enterprises outside of their native village. Most of their icon studios survived and thrived to the end of the tsarist period, supplying icons and painting religious murals for high-level patrons in Moscow, Nizhnii Novgorod, Vladimir, Kiev, St. Petersburg, and elsewhere.⁹⁰ Though no expert dared to admit it, perhaps a division of labor in icon production was compatible with traditional practices, or at least those which had been in use since before the nineteenth-century in the icon painting villages; it was the fantasy of the integrated medieval master, under the tutelage of academic expertise, which was thoroughly modern.

An ivory tower utopia

After returning from Palekh in January 1863, Filimonov became the first head of the Rumiantsev Museum's Division of Christian and Russian Antiquities. Under his direction, the museum began collecting icons, not merely as objects of religious devotion, but also as national artistic symbols and archaeological artifacts. By taking the icon out of the iconostasis and into the museum hall, Filimonov unwittingly challenged a core aim of icon expertise: the recreation of a unified medieval worldview, in which religious worship and aesthetics were tightly integrated. Seen in what Braudel called "medium time," Filimonov's collecting activities were the first step in the gradual secularization of icon painting traditions (which would be carried to its logical conclusion in the Soviet period, when authorities made ancient icons a central feature of the Soviet art museum exhibit).⁹¹

Meanwhile, just as Goethe had earlier drawn the attention of Russian bureaucrats and elites to the uniqueness of the Russian tradition of icon worship, Westerners continued to help the icon experts define the Orthodox, and hence Russian, image.⁹² Viktor Butovskii, Director of the Stroganov School, enlisted the help of a French scholar to write the first comprehensive history of medieval Russian church art in the 1860s.⁹³ Filimonov later praised foreigners for first distinguishing the originality of Russian medieval art. "It was precisely from these same foreign scholars," he remarked, "that we finally began to discover that our art should be national in character."⁹⁴

In the 1870s, in addition to collecting icons, the Rumiantsev museum also hosted the next iteration of Buslaev's 1863 icon-painting brotherhood, which appears to not have survived beyond the original organizational meeting. The new organization was known as the Society of Ancient Russian Art.⁹⁵ As with the earlier brotherhood, Buslaev, and now Filimonov, imagined the icon as a unifying force in Russian society. Properly purged of all vulgarities and Western influences, the icon, like a great suture, would heal the rift between elite and mass culture that Peter the Great's reforms had first opened and place Russia's national development on a unified and indisputably "Orthodox" Christian path. In 1874, the journal of the Society of Ancient Russian Art reprinted an 1865 article by Buslaev, which argued that the national traditions of church architecture, music, and icon painting, "confirmed by historical criticism and explained by means of comparison with similar phenomena in the West," should provide "the foundation of the artistic development of the Russian people." Scholars from society would evaluate "worthy national traditions and facilitate their further development" in order to integrate "Russian nationality and Orthodox antiquity." Buslaev also saw the icon as a powerful instrument of empire-building, spreading Russia's unifying spirit into the western borderlands and southward into the Caucasus.⁹⁶

By the mid-1870s, the society's more than two hundred members represented a broad cross-section of patriotic forces leading to the highest echelons of power. At the pinnacle stood Grand Prince Mikhail Nikolaevich and Grand Princess Maria Nikolaevna, who occupied the positions of central patrons. Count S. G. Stroganov, Count A. S. Uvarov (son of the creator of "official nationalism"), and Prince V. F. Odoevskii provided critical material and moral support. Filimonov edited the society's publications, which he used to showcase his own research as well as Buslaev's.⁹⁷

Other society members included Zabelin, Rovinskii, Snegirev, the art critic V. V. Stasov, the icon restorer F. G. Solntsev, Academy of Arts professor V. A. Prokhorov (the first to teach icon painting at the academy), and dozens of other academics and icon experts. The society also included prominent Moscow merchants and art collectors, such as I. V. Strelkov, who specialized in Old Believer icons, and S. T. Bolshakov. N. V. Isakov, the head of educational institutions for the military, joined the society with plans to use a newly compiled style manual to guide the painting of murals in churches and other constructions in the military's possession. On 30 January 1866, Buslaev's student Nikodim Pavlovich Kondakov

attended his first meeting and became a member. Though Kondakov's contributions to the study of icon painting were still meager, some thirty years later in 1901, after two personal meetings with Tsar Nicholas II, he became Secretary of the inter-ministerial "Committee for the Tutelage of Russian Icon Painting," the direct descendant of Buslaev's 1863 proposal for an "icon-painting brotherhood."⁹⁸

While the society consolidated the world of icon expertise, its membership in the 1860s and 1870s also reflected a curious kind of utopia. For those whose authority rested on the dictates of science (*nauka*), a secular university degree trumped seminary training and practical experience. In the icon expert's microcosm, secular experts operated the ideological levers of power.⁹⁹ The experts received patronage from the upper nobility and ultimately from the royal family itself. Icon collectors and merchants (with connections to wealthy Old Believers) supplied the society with access to their growing collections and to the "pre-Petrine" expertise of the sectarian communities. While a smattering of high-level church officials joined the society, they remained on the margins of icon expertise, relegated to a largely honorary role, part of the "symphony" of state and secular power envisioned by the Slavophiles. Finally, the actual icon-studio owners and painters occupied the bottom of the envisioned hierarchy, possessors of the nation's sacred traditions, yet excluded, as we shall see, from a say in their further development.¹⁰⁰

The spirit of the Ivory Tower utopia was reproduced in the writings of Nikolai Leskov, who in the 1870s became one of the primary popularizers of icon expertise in educated circles. Leskov had become fascinated with Russian icons after meeting many Palekh masters in St. Petersburg. Like the experts, he combined an almost populist reverence for the people and their customs and a paternalistic disdain for what "the people," and in particular the peasant icon painters, actually practiced.¹⁰¹ In his 1873 short story "The Sealed Angel," published in Mikhail Katkov's conservative journal *Russkii vestnik*, Leskov paid homage to the ancient craft and belief-system associated with icons and to the living masters of Mstera and Palekh who continued those traditions. In great detail, he described the work of the peasant icon master and his intimate knowledge of ancient craft traditions and practices unknown to the contemporary world. The story, which impressed Alexander II, linked the survival of the ancient craft of icon painting to the patronage of Old Believers, whom he presented as authentic connoisseurs of Russian iconography, the keepers of the pre-Petrine traditions.¹⁰²

An article the same year nonetheless tempered Leskov's ro-

mantic portrait. According to Leskov, mechanization, profit-motives, and ignorance had seriously degraded the icon painting traditions. He repeated the now familiar call to resurrect Muscovite systems of control. The St. Petersburg Academy of Arts should operate this system of censorship and an icon school to train and certify future masters. "Icons must be painted by the hands of icon painters, and not lithographically reproduced, but they must be painted better than they are presently painted, and strictly according to the Russian icon-painting *podlinnik*." The style manual, in addition, would "reveal the secrets" of icon painting, which he said were jealously guarded by the surviving masters and studio owners to the detriment of icon renovation. As an act of patriotic duty, the owners must be forced to divulge the sources of their expertise, which belonged to the entire nation and could never be considered a trade secret.¹⁰³

Leskov's aggressively anti-capitalist rhetoric was typical of icon expertise in the last part of Alexander II's reign. An 1881 report from the Aleksander Nevsky brotherhood, formed in the Vladimir province to promote Russian Orthodox values, referred to icon peddlers as "kulaks" who, along with the icon-studio owners, had driven the masters "to the brink of starvation." Both were "dangerous enemies." Marketers of icons "outrageously exploited" the ignorance of the masses, selling un-canonical (i.e. Catholic) images, particularly in Ukraine and the western borderlands "far away from the center."¹⁰⁴ A special publication that was launched in 1882 in St. Petersburg and devoted to icons, referred to icon traders as "sharks." "The easy money and the loose life of the sharks, with which the interests of icon painters are so tightly connected, has instilled in [icon painters] the striving for a quick ruble." They had exchanged "the holy art [for] the far from holy business of buying and selling Christian antiquities." Traders of icons "are blocking the road to the formation of a Russian school of iconography and the purging of our native iconography from the influence of Western painting, which has unceremoniously penetrated Orthodox cathedrals and the extended family of the Russian people."¹⁰⁵

The Safonov empire and the 1883 coronation

In the meantime, the peasant icon business thrived, fueled by elite demand. The Safonov studio in Palekh was the most prominent and successful of the "Suzdal" peasant icon centers. For the

experts, the Safonovs were both a link to authentic Orthodox traditions, but also a potential source of contamination by market forces and Catholic imagery. Deftly exploiting the growing demand for authentic, ancient Russianness, the Safonov studio thrived at the high end of the icon market in late-imperial Russia. This section thus ends with a brief portrait of the Safonov business and its greatest triumph: the 1883 coronation of Alexander III, after which Safonov's authority became increasingly under expert attack.

According to local lore, a certain Nikita Safonov, a *lichnik*, or painter of the faces on icons, started the Safonov icon business in Palekh at the end of the eighteenth-century. His son began hiring masters from outside the family and initiated a system of apprenticeship (*uchenichestvo*), through which apprentices were divided into those who painted only the face (*lichniki*) and those who painted other portions of the icon.¹⁰⁶ Meanwhile, Nikita's nephew, Lev Mikhailovich, departed Palekh sometime before the war of 1812 and settled in St. Petersburg, where he opened an icon studio. The Buturlins, who owned most of the serfs in Palekh, were apparently impressed by Lev's managerial abilities and sent him back to Palekh in 1830 as their *burgomeister*, or the serf attendant of their affairs; meanwhile, Lev maintained the icon shop in St. Petersburg.

Lev's two sons helped expand the icon business in the 1840s, receiving a number of prominent restoration and icon painting jobs. When on orders from Nicholas I, F. G. Solntsev directed the first state-sponsored restorations of religious frescoes in the 1840s, he hired the Safonovs to restore and paint icons in Vladimir's twelfth-century Dmitrii cathedral.¹⁰⁷ In addition to the job in Vladimir, the Safonov studio restored church murals in Iaroslavl' and Pskov. The Safonovs also exploited close ties with the Vladimir diocesan administration, which recommended the Safonov studio for all the major restorations, mural painting jobs, and icon orders placed in its jurisdiction. The masters and studio owners of Palekh thus secured state and church patronage at the very dawn of "Official Nationality" and its linkage of "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, and Nationality."¹⁰⁸

Lev's son Nikolai managed the business throughout the 1860s, absorbing a number of smaller icon studios in Palekh. At the beginning of the 1870s, Nikolai's nephew, Nikolai Mikhailovich, took over the family's growing icon empire, which included a lucrative operation in Kiev, fueled by close contacts with the Kiev Metropolitanate. He shrewdly cultivated contacts with both church officials and academic societies, including the Moscow Archaeo-

logical Society and the Society of Ancient Russian Art, which oversaw many of the most important restorations of the time.

By all accounts, Nikolai Mikhailovich Safonov was a talented artist and businessman. His ability to paint an entire icon, combined with his self-cultivated literacy, impressed educated elites and attracted high-level patronage. According to one journalist, Safonov was an exceptional figure, “an educated and enlightened man” in an oasis of poverty, ignorance, and hack craftsmanship: “Familiarity with Moscow and St. Petersburg church art gave him a refined taste and an understanding of antiquity.” He possessed a large collection of originals, the “*podlinniki*.” Despite lacking a formal degree, he was attempting to return icon painting to its roots – thanks to the demands of sophisticated buyers, noted one journalist.¹⁰⁹ “The name of Safonov,” remarked an 1881 Aleksandr Nevskii Brotherhood report, “is famous in all Russia. One can encounter the iconostases of Safonov in Simbirsk, Samara, Saratov, Siberia, in the south of Russia, and even in Bulgaria.”¹¹⁰

The Safonov studio’s greatest triumph came in 1881, when its best masters were selected by the Tsar himself to paint the murals of the Kremlin’s Palace of Facets. The restored murals were to serve as a backdrop for the Tsar’s elaborate 1883 coronation, which articulated a new relationship of Tsarist power to the Russian people – without, of course, reducing the power of autocracy. Like his predecessors, Alexander III expressed the ruling ideology through a series of rituals. The coronation established a Tsar’s “scenario of power,” which symbolically unified the Tsar and his ruling elite. Alexander III’s scenario, among other things, attempted to subvert the populist vision of the revolutionary Russian rebel with a vision of the humble, icon-worshipping Russian Orthodox people. It was the first coronation scenario to reserve an honored place for “the people,” as symbolized by the selection of the Safonov studio for the Palace of Facets job.¹¹¹

Selection of the Palekhians for the prestigious job immediately followed the March 1881 assassination of Tsar Alexander II. Instead of sparking a great uprising of the Russian masses, as the assassins had hoped, regicide encouraged greater state control and police surveillance. The “Temporary Regulations” of August 1881 gave the authorities expanded power to shut down newspapers and commercial ventures, remove local officials, and jail individuals and remained in force to the end of the empire.¹¹² Simultaneously, the assassination lent a greater sense of urgency to the search for unifying symbols and myths, ideas that would link the Tsar to the people

and make autocracy a popular, as well as divinely-sanctioned, institution.

Art historians, including icon experts, helped lead the search for new instruments of social integration that could help to both stabilize Russian society and protect the Tsarist hierarchy of privileges associated with the official estate system. Alexander III, who considered himself a connoisseur of art, followed and appreciated Buslaev's work and apparently recounted Buslaev's lessons in art history to his older brother Nikolai in 1860. In turn, Buslaev "was well aware of the Sovereign's warm relationship to questions of art," remembered Count Sergei Dmitrievich Sheremetev (soon to be a critical patron of peasant icon painting). "[Buslaev] welcomed and celebrated [this interest], which promised the flowering and rebirth of native art," he remarked further.¹¹³

While Buslaev had cultivated the sovereign's appreciation of icon painting, it was Filimonov who first suggested that the icon painters of Palekh be hired for the Palace of Facets job. According to Sheremetev, Filimonov had a "premonition, that [the reign of Alexander III] was fated to direct us onto the correct path of national development in all aspects of the life of state and society, and that the sphere of our native art would occupy an important place in the constant concerns of the Sovereign." Following the assassination of Alexander II, Filimonov delivered a "passionate speech" to the St. Petersburg "Society of Lovers of Ancient Literature" urging that the Palekh masters be given the contract to restore the Palace of Facets. The proposal was passed on to Alexander III, who approved the idea and subsequently met with Filimonov to discuss the details, including hiring the best Safonov masters, V. E. and I. V. Belousov, whom Filimonov had met during his 1863 trip to Palekh.¹¹⁴

Costing nearly half a million rubles, the renovation of the Palace of Facets was designed to transport viewers "far back into the historical past, to the very beginnings of Moscow."¹¹⁵ Built in the reign of Ivan III by Italian architects (1487-1491), the Palace of Facets in the pre-Petrine period served as a major venue for receptions of visiting dignitaries, merchants, and gatherings of the Tsar and his *boyars*. During the reign of Ivan IV's son Fyodor, there came the first mention of frescoes in the spacious main hall. After numerous fires and neglect and the ravages of the Time of Troubles, the frescoes and the hall itself deteriorated, prompting a major renovation and repainting in 1667-1668 during the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich. Tsar Aleksei chose the chief artist of the Kremlin armory, Simon Ushakov, to lead a team of artists in repainting the

murals as they appeared in the late sixteenth-century. Under instructions from the Tsar in 1677, Ushakov also provided precise descriptions of all the frescoes and their locations – fortuitously, as it turned out, since the restored murals were whitewashed in the reign of Peter the Great and covered with tapestries.¹¹⁶

The 1870's discovery of Ushakov's descriptions in the public library archive (which Filimonov then published in the Society of Ancient Russian Art's proceedings) created something of a sensation in the icon expert community. While these descriptions furnished the Palekhians with a precise guide for their restoration, they also allowed the great seventeenth-century icon painter to participate directly in Alexander III's retrospective utopia. The use of Ushakov's descriptions as a "*podlinnik*" thus connected the Muscovy of Ivan III (when the palace was built), Ivan IV's son Fyodor (when the murals were painted), the much beloved seventeenth-century (when the murals were restored), and modern Tsarist autocracy.

Tellingly, though Filimonov instructed the Belousovs to paint the murals strictly in the style of the sixteenth-century, or the style of the era of Ivan IV, he did allow the artists "some alterations in favor of a more realistic style and correctness of drawing, which accords with the current state of development of modern church and folk art." As earlier, the demands of modernity for "a more realistic style and correctness of drawing" tempered Filimonov's (and now Alexander III's) idealization of Muscovy. The fusion style (*friaz'*) was now the official style of the regime.¹¹⁷

As for the murals themselves, the images represented biblical stories of creation, original sin, and Christ. Shifting from the ceiling to the walls, one traveled from the heavenly to the earthly kingdom, with the Tsar as intermediary. The frescoes illustrated medieval legends about the derivation of the Romanov dynasty from Muscovy, Vladimir, and the Rurikid princes, who in turn supposedly traced their roots to the Roman Emperor Augustus.¹¹⁸ Murals drew connections between the modern Russian state with the Tsar at its head and its pre-Petrine predecessors, the Roman Emperors, and Christ himself. In this elaborate staging of modern Tsarist power, the autocracy's handlers made Christian icon painting traditions a lynchpin of Official Nationality and tied both exclusively to the authority of the Romanov dynasty. Alexander III expressed his gratitude to Filimonov and the Palekh masters (who were awarded medals for their efforts), and believed theirs to be a "useful and desirable" precedent. By reaching into the plebian ranks for aesthetic

guidance, and verifying it with the labors of highly trained scholars, Tsarist autocracy had illustrated its ability to rise above estate and class divisions.¹¹⁹ Not coincidentally, the historian Zabelin secured support in 1882 for a series of icon restoration works in the Kremlin, for which he also hired the Safonov studio. Zabelin drew inspiration from the seventeenth-century legacy, so that the Kremlin would have “the same look that it had under the rule of Aleksei Mikhailovich,” remarked one commentator.¹²⁰

The ceremonial display of social and political harmony nonetheless masked fundamental tensions and conflicts in Russian society. Many artists trained in the Academy of Arts resented the award of the Palace of Facets job to untrained “icon daubers (*bogomazy*),” as the peasant icon painters were frequently called. The protest of professional academic painters was all the louder because they were accustomed to receiving the big commissions – for instance, St. Isaac’s and the Cathedral of Christ the Savior. Criticism of the allegedly inferior work of the Palekh masters continued during and after completion of the murals, “primarily,” recalled Sheremetev, “from those who mostly speak foreign languages.” Meanwhile, a number of Safonov masters had a keen sense of their distinct social and professional status. They cultivated a growing resentment of academic overseers. In the words of one journalist in 1879, they harbored “the typical disdain of the practical worker for the theoretician.” One icon painter, in discussing the fine, squirrel-hair brushes used to paint intricate details, said, “not one academically trained artist could paint with such brushes.” According to another master, when Palekhians worked on a job under the direction of an icon specialist, “the latter could only yell and scream, but would never take the brush in his own hands for fear of embarrassing himself.”¹²¹

While the intelligentsia challenged the competency of the people it paradoxically privileged, it also made increasingly shrill demands for greater state control over icon production. Inspired by the Emperor’s patronage of icon painting traditions, a new journal called *Izograf* emerged in St. Petersburg in 1882 to promote the cause of icon painting, autocracy, and national unification. The editors borrowed the title of the journal from the Greek word for icon painters, rather than from the Russian “*ikonopisets*.” The choice of name reflected a view of Russia as heir to Byzantine and Greek traditions, thus subsuming “Russianness” under the broader imperial rubric of Byzantium, Eastern Orthodoxy and the later Roman Empire. While embracing all “true” Christians, the journal nonetheless privileged the Russian people as the most Orthodox and faithful of

them all. "We hope," said the journal, "that the Russian people [will join] in fervent prayer the beloved crowned monarch's decision to reject foreign influences." The praise of all things pre-Petrine as a model for Russia's future also carried an increasingly open plea to bring Old Believers back into the fold of the Russian nation. Izograf prematurely expressed the hope that Alexander III's appreciation would lead, "in addition to a return to our national distinctiveness, to a coming together of Orthodox and Old Believers."¹²²

In the aggressive jingoistic spirit of the period, the journal applauded the coronation of Alexander III in Moscow, "the heart of Russia," and anticipated that it would initiate the re-establishment of "our national distinctiveness." At the same time, the selection of the Palekhians had not merely reflected the Tsar's will according to Izograf, but also the will of the people, who had expressed "a desire for the restoration in our cathedrals of the ancient Russian art and the rejection of harmful Western influences." Alexander III was advised to respond with "the establishment in Rus' of special schools for the study of this classical art...There is no doubt that in the near future there will be born icon schools, in which Russian icons will be separated from the mixture of Catholic and secular art."¹²³ Accordingly, in 1883, Izograf published another proposal for icon "surveillance" (*nadzor*), yet another iteration of Buslaev's 1863 proposal for an icon-painting brotherhood. As dictated by the 1551 Stoglav, which helped to define the spiritual ideals of many elites, the icon painters were to lead a virtuous life and avoid the temptations of secular artistic pursuits. Authorities were advised to end the division of labor in the painting of icons with the aid of a new *podlinnik* and the training of artists in post-Renaissance techniques of drawing and proper perspective. Icon producers must share the secrets of their trade as a national resource and market influences and profit-motives should be curtailed, Izograf further insisted. The representation of religious images should be banned on items such as "tobacco cases, dinner plates, tea cups and similar such things." Only a comprehensive system of licensing, state distribution, and censorship (which would link every produced icon to its producer) could realize these goals. The back of every approved icon should therefore carry a state seal and the name of the author, not as proof of authorship and individual creativity, but as a means of controlling production.¹²⁴

The expert in power

Inspired by Alexander III's coronation, icon experts in the 1890s aggressively promoted the icon as an instrument for forging a new Russian nation, modernized, yet firmly grounded in ancient traditions, social structures and sincerely held Orthodox religious beliefs. They finessed their contacts in the imperial bureaucracy, including the powerful Minister of Finance Sergei Witte and the Minister of Interior Dmitrii Sipiagin. Through a series of backdoor meetings and behind-the-scenes lobbying, they finally gained official approval for their plans in 1901, convincing Nicholas II to establish a special committee to censor and control icon production in Palekh, Mstera, and Kholui.¹²⁵ It was led by the aristocrat, Count Sergei Sheremetev, and the Byzantinist, Nikodim Pavlovich Kondakov, also the star student of Buslaev. Having secured the Tsar's support, the new committee, staffed almost exclusively by academics thus set out to implement a far-ranging program of icon surveillance and national unity. According to the committee's program, all mechanical and foreign production of icons should be outlawed. Graduates of the Imperial Academy of Arts should teach the proper techniques of painting in new icon schools in each of the villages. The state should set up icon stores with a broad variety of icons done honestly, in good taste, "and not of an industrial character." Permanent exhibits of icons should educate the public about the proper kinds of icons to worship and spread an appreciation of authentic iconography in urban centers. The Tsar should extend his direct patronage to the icon painters in order to restore "the glorious period" of iconography of the pre-Petrine period. Finally, the state should issue a definitive "*podlinnik*" as a guide for a new breed of educated icon painters. With its help, icon painters would devote their life and soul to holy imagery, avoiding excessive realism, but also shunning the "whimsical eclecticism" of some supposedly "Byzantine" originals.¹²⁶ Kondakov summed up the committee's goal: "For so many decades we have affirmed the harmful break of Russian educated society with the people. Here is a chance to unite the two diverging sides in a common endeavor, and having begun to take care of the people's needs, to set on its feet a general national mission."¹²⁷

That national mission, it should be noted, did not offer equal rights and powers. In its nearly two decades of operation, the committee refused to allow the peasant icon painters to participate in the committee's operations. The peasant traditions of icon painting

had become a source of political legitimacy for the autocracy, yet the peasants who followed these traditions did not receive a voice in their own affairs. The committee's attitude reflected the contradictory and elitist character of Tsarist ideology, which Alexander III had earlier dubbed a "people's autocracy." It privileged traditions preserved by the "people." Yet it remained deeply anti-democratic, rejecting the idea of a political nation of free and equal citizens to replace the Tsarist hierarchy of privileged estates and monarchical power. In the conservative utopia constructed by the Tsar's new icon committee, the privileged estates, especially the Tsar's servants and advisors, thus retained the reins of power and dictated the authentic forms that national aesthetic traditions should follow.

The icon experts justified their elitist agenda by charging that pecuniary interests, combined with the lack of education in the countryside, had disqualified the peasant icon painters from active management in their own affairs. As mentioned above, when Kondakov visited Palekh, Kholui, and Mstera in 1900, he insisted on tarnishing the Safonov studio with the label of "factory" (*zavod*), endorsing the fashionable spirit of romantic anti-capitalism that influenced all ends of the Russian political spectrum.¹²⁸ "We were extremely embittered," he wrote, "by the tactics of the local icon factory, that of the famous Safonov," which blocked their attempts to gather information. Palekh's studio owners "lied" to tax inspectors and presented themselves as "master craftsmen icon painters" rather than "industrialist-traders in icons."¹²⁹ Kondakov lumped Safonov into "the camp of the kulak" (*kulachestvo*), which opposed the interests of the nation. The Safonov studio, in Kondakov's view, was a predatory monopolist, forcing smaller studios to assimilate and eliminating diversity in production (although, in fact, just the opposite was true: many of Safonov's former masters had actually become Safonov's competitors). Safonov's restorations, wrote Kondakov in his memoirs, were a "pogrom of ancient monuments" and an "imitation of ancientness." Safonov, he noted further, "is a kind of archaeological monster," who nonetheless "to this day enjoys authority in the Holy Synod." Others referred to Safonov's restorations as "vandalism," using a term that had originated with the French Revolution and its violent rejection of all things traditional.¹³⁰ The charges prompted an angry letter from Safonov to Sheremetev – charges which the committee ignored.¹³¹

The attitude of experts to local producers by the end of the old regime was summed up by the icon expert V. T. Georgievskii in 1894, who would later play a key managing role in the icon

committee's affairs: "All provincials," he proclaimed, "generally consider it necessary to hide the truth as much as possible [from] archaeologists, scholars, and writers." The Palekh masters, he noted in a letter to his patron Kondakov in 1899, "by nature are extremely suspicious and secretive. Not for any kind of money would they reveal that which provides their daily bread, which they received as an inheritance from their ancestors."¹³² He continued:

In addition to the mistrust which one encounters here,...one runs into the purely ignorant fear of the average craftsman who believes he will lose something by giving away 'the secrets' of his craft...And perhaps they have a point. Try to put yourself in the place of an icon painter and imagine that some interviewer has fallen from the sky into your office – perhaps even a famous person. Then he begins to interrogate you about your current work, what kind of sources you use and could he just take some of these sources for some goal that is entirely abstract and confused for you. It is understandable that you would try in a delicate way, not having given him what he wants, to get him to go back from whence he came. Almost everywhere such a fate threatened me and my helpers from among the aborigines, even in circumstances where the owner was not infected by such prejudices. In the latter case, the owner had fears of a mercantile nature: perhaps he would sell things for less money than his neighbor and thus appear in his neighbor's eye as a simpleton and a fool.¹³³

Georgievskii expressed his disdain for Palekh's cultural achievement during a conversation with his guide from among "the aborigines" of Palekh, the local Palekh priest Nikolai Chikhachev. As reported by Georgievskii in 1894, the two had the following chat:

—"Well, father Nikolai, show me your much-praised masters."

—"With pleasure, with pleasure. I've long ago wanted you to visit our Palekhians. As you know, Palekh is a people's academy."

—"And you think such a nickname suggests some-

thing honorable for Palekh?”

—“Of course. Iurii Dmitrievich Filimonov himself, having come here more than once, called Palekh an academy. How could you not call it such a thing, since our Palekhians had the honor of painting even the famous Palace of Facets before the coronation [of Alexander III]? They didn’t invite your academically trained painters for this job, but our *muzhiks*. And what happened? Our guys certainly didn’t fall on their face.”

Challenging the worthiness of the Palace of Facets job, Georgievskii said that things had changed in the last decade. Academically trained artists were reacquainting themselves with ancient techniques and “Russian antiquity,” so the Palekhians had no exclusive claim over icon painting. The expert had successfully assimilated the traditions. “Let’s not waste time,” said Georgievskii, cutting off the debate. “Let’s look at your ‘academic studios’ and see for ourselves.”¹³⁴

Predictably, Georgievskii was unimpressed. With regard to the Belousov studio of Palekh, which worked in the “*friazhskii*” style, he insisted that his previous negative comments on the *friazhskii* style applied completely: one is struck by the “excess of gold ornament” and the almost total ineffectiveness of the depicted image. After seeing dozens of icons, he could not remember a single face and was struck by “the clichéd monotony” of the images. He felt the effects, albeit incompetently absorbed, of “academic influences” in the representation of Christ, a style that ineptly copied the murals of the Christ the Savior cathedral in Moscow. “It is obvious that they have stopped using the *podlinnik*,” he remarked. Testifying to the Palekhians’ ignorance of the traditions they claimed to represent, the studio allowed tracings of ancient icons to gather in a heap, tattered and torn. Only a lack of culture, noted Georgievskii, could prevent the studio owner from compiling these tracings of ancient icons into an album, thus making them available for archaeological investigation.¹³⁵

The Safonov studio was no better, said Georgievskii. He condemned the studio owner’s neglect of the masters’ working conditions and health. Everywhere he encountered supposedly “gaunt and pale faces, which testify to the fact that [the master’s] fate is not an easy one.” Tuberculosis was rampant, a disease from which his patron Kondakov also suffered. The long hours ruined the masters’ eyesight. His guide at the Safonov studio, the son of the owner N. M.

Safonov, was “a young man, dressed foppishly, who, it seems, no longer paints icons and at the very least, in our view, knows little about them,” complained Georgievskii. “None of the works in the Safonov studio stood out,” he complained further, then dismissing all the works he saw as “painted in the stylized Palekh manner.” When he inquired about the “style manuals” used by the Safonov studio, the owner’s son said they had no such things, “which can hardly be the case,” wrote Georgievskii. Instead, Safonov showed Georgievskii photos of religious paintings by academic painters, seemingly reflecting Georgievskii’s own previous endorsement of recent academic religious art (especially the work of Viktor Vasnetsov) as a model for the painters. Georgievskii was unimpressed. It was one thing for icon experts to suggest models of academic painters to follow, but quite another for peasant icon painters to make these choices on their own.¹³⁶ The icon expert’s ethos of tutelage, which soon became the regime’s, could not tolerate such freedom.

Meanwhile, the new generation of experts was far more explicit in their praise of Old Believer icons, by which they meant icons from Mstera rather than Palekh. This change in attitude represented an important shift away from the earlier praise of the fusion style that the Palekh masters had enshrined in the Palace of Facets and it signaled the ongoing transformation of Old Believers from pariahs into model Russian citizens. The committee’s state-funded *podlinnik*, compiled by Kondakov and published in 1905 as a guide for peasant icon painters, contained numerous Old Believer icons, despite the protests of church censors. Furthermore, the committee had increasingly hostile relations with Palekh. Unlike Old Believers in nearby Mstera, the hamlet was deemed to be too tainted by modern trends. The committee’s new icon school in Palekh, created in 1902, was directed to end teaching in the local Palekh style – and to hire Old Believer icon painters from nearby Mstera to teach the Palekh masters how to paint in the now “authentic” Russian style. When Palekhians complained and requested a meeting to discuss the issue, Kondakov rejected the proposal, saying to Georgievskii: “From [the locals] we won’t hear anything but the typical Russian complaints about everything under the sun. There is nothing we could learn from them.” Shortly afterward, in another letter to Georgievskii, Kondakov said that the committee’s biggest challenge was to get the icon painting villages, and especially the Palekh masters, “to fight with their own inertia.”¹³⁷

By way of contrast, as head of the Tsar’s icon committee,

Kondakov favored the Old Believer icon painters of Mstera. Kondakov's 1905 *podlinnik* did not contain a single image of a Palekh icon, yet it commissioned numerous models of Old Believer icons from the Old Believer community of Mstera and elsewhere.¹³⁸ At the turn of the century, the experts thus endorsed the increasingly popular view of Old Belief as the purest form of Russian culture. Emboldened by this conviction, they attempted to use state power to make Old Believer practices the foundation of a restructured icon painting industry and to eliminate those trends in Palekh, which they now excluded from their definition of authentic Russian culture.

Power, expertise, and Old Belief

Beginning with the early experts in the reign of Nicholas I, the study of the icon was tightly linked to the policy of Official Nationality. That policy identified Russian identity with Orthodox Christianity and the Romanov dynasty. Following the lead of the state, experts attempted to define the nature of this Orthodoxy, an effort that included a positive re-appraisal of a group formerly banished from the confines of the Russian nation: the persecuted Old Believers. The more positive assessment of Old Belief marked a key shift in official and elite conceptions of Russian identity in the mid nineteenth-century. This change in attitude resulted from a growing critique of modern life, which the experts shared in common with similar critics in the West, such as John Ruskin and William Morris.¹³⁹ Since Old Believers seemed to reject the forces of modernization that many experts now condemned, the sectarians were no longer considered pariahs and dissidents, but potentially sources of authentic Russian national culture. This turn to Old Belief was at first tempered by continuing recognition of the need for a Russian style that was nonetheless more modern, an ideal mix of Western and Russian traditions embodied by the *friaz'* style of the official court icon painter of the seventeenth-century, Simon Ushakov. Equally important, the linkage between expertise and political power eroded the boundary separating the study of icons from tsarist politics. As a result, the study of icons became a political, as well as academic, profession.

Along with the development of expertise came demands to establish a new state-run system of icon painting. This academically-managed system of censorship was based on the idealized es-

tate-based society of Muscovy. It was inspired by a reaction against the supposedly corrupting influences of the modern world, especially market forces and consumer culture. The experts' reading of pre-Petrine Russian history, along with their critique of modern civilization, thus helped the regime craft an ideology for integrating and thus controlling Russian society in an age of rapid economic and social change.

Buslaev's proposal for an icon painting brotherhood provided the first blueprint for stemming the tide of modernity and preventing the loss of Russia's national distinctiveness. Buslaev's plans were finally realized in the Tsar's new Committee for the Protection of Russian Icons (1901-1918). Subsequently, the committee embarked on a far-reaching and an ultimately failed attempt to restructure the icon painting industry in accordance with the icon experts' notions. As the conservative critique of modernity gained more popularity, the Old Believers, who seemed to be the antithesis of modernity, acquired new authority in official circles. Among the experts on the Tsar's icon committee, there was a decisive turn away from the fusion (*friaz'*) style that was endorsed by the first generation of experts and toward an explicit embrace of Old Belief as the most authentic expression of the Russian nation.

The search for native roots in the mid nineteenth-century thus ended in Nicholas II's attempt to use religious art to shore up the authority of the old regime and create a distinctively Russian national culture. Old Belief played a surprisingly central role in this political project. Tapping into fashionable anti-capitalist sentiments, this effort sought to suppress homogenizing market forces, and by implication, the power of consumers to determine their own national identity and culture of religious worship. It also reflected the patronizing attitudes of some educated elites and tsarist bureaucrats toward many of the peasant masters over whom the Tsar's icon committee exercised tutelage – especially those considered tainted by profit motives and non-Orthodox values.

Ultimately, the lines between icon scholarship and political power were blurred completely in the reign of Nicholas II. This was true among the icon experts of this study, but also among other experts, as Yanni Kotsonis argues in his research into agrarian experts.¹⁴⁰ Far from resisting an erosion of their autonomy by the state, the icon scholars tore down the boundaries between politics and academic expertise. Experts such as Kondakov eagerly invited the state into their field of study, consciously developing the ideas and agendas of earlier generations of experts. In exchange, they

hoped to receive the kind of power necessary to graft their own vision of Russian culture onto Russian society. Viewed in a longer chronological perspective, it was a precedent that anticipated a more complete fusion of academic expertise and politics in the revolutionary state to follow.

End Notes

¹ Izograf, tom 1, vypusk II (1882): 4.

² S. Durylin, “Rannie russkie znakomstva Gete,” Literaturnoe nasledstvo, no. 4-6 (1932): 117.

³ The images were an icon of the Virgin Mary and one showing the central calendar feasts. Whether Goethe received the icons and his reactions are not recorded. D. F. Kobeko, O Suzdal'skom ikonopisanii (St. Petersburg, 1896), 2-3, 5.

⁴ Kobeko, O Suzdal'skom ikonopisanii, 6.

⁵ See Yanni Kotsonis, Making Peasants Backward: Managing Populations in Russian Agricultural Cooperatives, 1861-1914 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999).

⁶ Wayne Dowler, Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev, and Native Soil Conservatism (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982), 20.

⁷ As Richard Wortman has remarked: “We witness the paradox of conservative nationalism, that in order to appropriate the dominant Western doctrine of nationalism, Russian monarchy had to be shown to be non-Western and to derive from beliefs and traditions rooted in the people.” Richard S. Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy: Volume Two: From Alexander II to the Abdication of Nicholas II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 161.

⁸ One scholar has remarked that Russians in the nineteenth-century “participated in debates on enlightenment, universalism, and integration through a discourse on the West – much as Western Europeans could address the same issues through an ongoing discourse on Russia.” David Hoffmann, Yanni Kotsonis, eds., Russian Modernity: Politics, Knowledge, Practices (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 3.

⁹ Edward Thaden, Conservative Nationalism in Nineteenth-Century Russia (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), 19.

¹⁰ Cited from G. Vzdornov, Istoriia otkrytiia i izucheniia russkoi srednevekovoi zhivopisi. XIX vek (Moscow: "Iskusstvo," 1986), 35, 29-31. On Solntsev and the emergence of the first professional restorer of icons in the 1840s (N. I. Podkliuchnikov, also the son of a serf), see Vzdornov, 28-46.

¹¹ For the development of the historical profession and its centrality in official efforts to define Russian identity, see: N. Rubinshtein, Russkaia istoriografiia (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1941), 217-220; M. V. Nechkina, ed., Ocherki istorii istoricheskoi nauki v SSSR, vol. II (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1960), 596.

¹² Vzdornov, Istoriia otkrytiia, 59-70, on the role of Old Believers in collecting icons and in their connections with icon experts in the 1840s-1860s.

¹³ Heir to the famous Stroganov family that conquered Siberia, Stroganov was an avid collector of icons. In addition to overseeing educational institutions in Moscow in the 1830s and 1840s, Stroganov financed various publishing enterprises, including the journal for the Society of History and Russian Antiquities attached to Moscow University. He also supported those who studied and published on icons.

¹⁴ During campaigns to seize Old Believer icons in the 1840s, Count Stroganov successfully convinced Metropolitan Filaret to let him review a warehouse full of seized icons (which were to be burnt) and take those he deemed worthy for his personal collection. F. I. Buslaev, Moi vospominaniia (Moscow: Tipografiia G. Lissnera i A. Geshel'ia, 1897), 170.

¹⁵ Buslaev, M. P. Pogodin kak professor (Moscow: Tipografiia A. Gattsuka, 1876), 7, 13; Nicholas Riasanovsky, Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), 52-53, 56-57, 102.

¹⁶ G. Vzdornov, Istoriia otkrytiia, 47.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 51-52, 54-55.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 55, 56-57.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 57-58.

²⁰ In the early 1840s, Zabelin and Pogodin took frequent trips to study the icons and other religious artifacts of the Novodevichii monastery in Moscow. A. Kizevetter', "Zabelin, Ivan Egorovich," Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Granat, 378-379; A. A. Formozov, Istorik Moskvy I. E. Zabelin (Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1984), 52.

²¹ I. E. Zabelin, Domashnii byt russkikh tsarei v XVI i XVII st. Chast' 1 (Moscow: Tipografiia V. Gracheva, 1862), v-viii.

²² Formozov, Istorik Moskvy, 38-40.

²³ The documents are contained in: I. E. Zabelin, "Materialy dlia istorii russkoi ikonopisi," Vremennik Imperatorskago Moskovskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh, Kn. 7, (1850), 1-128.

²⁴ D. A. Rovinskii, Obozrenie ikonopisi v Rossii do kontsa XVII veka (St. Petersburg: A. S. Suvorin, 1903), 5, 8, 43-50. This is a reprint of the work originally published in 1856.

²⁵ Rovinskii, Obozrenie ikonopisi, 19, 50, 55-56.

²⁶ A. Novitskii, "Pamiati D. A. Rovinskogo," Russkoe obozrenie (October 1895), 808.

²⁷ G. Vzdornov, Istoriia otkrytiia, 74-75.

²⁸ O. Iu. Tarasov, Ikona i blagochestie: Ocherki ikonnogo dela v imperatorskoi Rossii (Moscow: "Progress-Kul'tura"), 209.

²⁹ "Ikonopistsy," Zhurnal Ministerstva vnutrennikh del, ch. 32, ot. III (1858), 26-35.

³⁰ E. K. Bratchikova, Palekh: Izbrannye stat'i (Moscow: Parad, 1999), 26; Tarasov, Ikona i blagochestie, 168-169, 176. By the beginning of the twentieth-century, icon experts began to realize that ancient icons were actually done in bright colors, but only appeared dark due to the effects of aging.

- ³¹ V. Illarionov, "Ikonopistsy-Suzdal'tsy. (Poezdka v ss. Msteru, Kholui, i Palekh)," Russkoe obozrenie (April 1895), 735.
- ³² Arkhiv gosudartsvennogo muzeia Palekhskogo iskusstva (AGMPI), f. Salapin, d. 1, l. 37.
- ³³ The Palekh masters would exploit their skills in miniature painting after 1917 to transform themselves into Soviet lacquer-box specialists.
- ³⁴ F. I. Buslaev, Moi vospominaniia, 128-129; Buslaev, M. P. Pogodin kak professor, 13.
- ³⁵ Stroganov also showed Buslaev his growing collection of icons and "*podlinniki*." Stroganov published one of these style manuals in 1869: "I was so fascinated by these documents of the Count, that I wrote a monograph about the Russian *podlinnik*," remembered Buslaev. Pamiati Fedora Ivanovicha Buslaeva (Moscow:Tipografiiia Sytina, 1898), 18.
- ³⁶ Buslaev, M. P. Pogodin kak professor, 12; Pamiati Fedora Ivanovicha Buslaeva, 125-126; G. Vzdornov, Istoriia otkrytiia 90; F. I. Buslaev, Moi vospominaniia, 324.
- ³⁷ Count Stroganov, who arranged the tutoring assignment, instructed Buslaev to teach the Tsarevich everything "that will serve as an expression of the spiritual interests of the people." For his description of tutoring the Tsarevich, see Buslaev, Moi vospominaniia, 330; 331-348; Pamiati Fedora Ivanovicha Buslaeva, 25; S. D. Sheremetev, "Pamiati F. I. Buslaeva i G. D. Filimonova," Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva, no. 132 (1899), 53.
- ³⁸ He "taught Nicholas Aleksandrovich to seek Russia's national character in the creative forces of all groups of Russian people rather than only in Monarchy." Inspired by Buslaev's tutoring, Nicholas Aleksandrovich "was the first heir to the Russian throne to interest himself in the pre-Petrine literary tradition and Russian folk poetry." Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Vol II, 97-98.
- ³⁹ F. I. Buslaev, Moi vospominaniia, 356, 348.

⁴⁰ F. I. Buslaev, Istoricheskie ocherki russkoi narodnoi slovesnosti i iskusstva. Sochinenie F. Buslaeva, tom II (St. Petersburg: V Tipografii Tovarishchestva "Obshchestvennaia pol'za," 1861), 1-2.

⁴¹ For Buslaev's attack on those who considered Russian medieval art a product of oriental rather than occidental origins, see Butovskii, Russkoe iskusstvo, 14-16.

⁴² F. I. Buslaev, Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, tom I: Sochineniia po arkheologii i istorii iskusstva (St. Petersburg: Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1908), 32; Pamiati Fedora Ivanovicha Buslaeva, 120, 122.

⁴³ Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, 31, 8-9, 10,

⁴⁴ Pamiati Fedora Ivanovicha Buslaeva, 121.

⁴⁵ Interestingly, Buslaev never addressed a tension between his notion of the icon as a visual representation of the holy word and the prominence in the Russian iconographic repertoire of specifically Russian figures such as Aleksandr Nevskii, St. Sergius of Radonezh, Boris and Gleb, and Prince Vladimir, to name a few. Should these figures be banished from the Russian icon painter's repertoire, even though they were absent from the old or new testaments? And what was "Russian" about a religious tradition that originated in antiquity? While the problem eventually divided icon experts in the reign of Nicholas II, it also spoke to a broader challenge in identifying Orthodox Christianity exclusively with the Russian nation. As Nicholas Riasanovsky has argued: "The Orthodox ideal was universal, and as such could not be bound to any nation." Nicholas Riasanovsky, Russia and the West in the Teaching of the Slavophiles: A Study of Romantic Ideology (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1952), 173.

⁴⁶ Buslaev, Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, 41, 257.

⁴⁷ As Richard Wortman has noted, "the seventeenth-century myth...became a metaphor for the long-sought merger of educated Russians, eager to find a stable, conservative state, resting on foundations of law with monarchy. The Muscovite state provided a template for the emergence of a unified 'nation-state,' recovered after the divisive effects of Westernization..." Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Vol II, 440-441.

⁴⁸ Buslaev, Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, 165. The adjective “*friazhskii*” referred to a style that had incorporated elements of post-Renaissance art from the West. It was an ambiguous term, sometimes used as a pejorative, sometimes as a compliment, depending on the user. It also implied a style that nonetheless retained elements of Russian and Byzantine icon painting traditions. Palekh was believed to embody the “*friazhskii*” style in the 1860s.

⁴⁹ A particularly extreme form of naturalism, continued Buslaev, involved “a deliberate representation of only the material side of life, in accordance with those teachings that attack religion and reduce man to base instincts.” As a hypothetical example, Buslaev suggested an image of blood flowing from the corpse of Robespierre. Such an image attempted “to get the public used to the terrors of blood and butchery.” Or one might depict a beautiful woman experiencing intense despondency. She awaits death as floodwaters pour through the window of her room. Such a painting preaches “the uselessness of religion during fateful moments.” See *ibid.*, 49-150.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 31-32, 171-172, 183, 185, 192; Pamiati Fedora Ivanovicha Buslaeva, 123.

⁵¹ Buslaev saw Raphael as the dividing line between authentic Catholic religious art and its “profanation,” which was decisively initiated in the sixteenth-century. *Ibid.*, 122-123. For Buslaev’s often tortured attempts to distinguish between “naturalism,” “realism,” “materialism,” and “idealism” in art, see *ibid.*, 123-124.

⁵² Buslaev, Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, 149.

⁵³ Since 1843, Snegirev and others had argued for a museum of Russian antiquities in Moscow. Pogodin, in the 1850s, had unsuccessfully floated various proposals to create the museum by having the government buy his immense collection – and put him in charge of the institution. Vzdornov, Istoriia otkrytiia, 81-82.

⁵⁴ Buslaev, Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, 406; G. D. Filimonov, “Palekh,” Den’, no. 35 (1863): 9-10.

⁵⁵ Iconoclasm and “religious persecution,” Buslaev noted in his Rumiantsev speech, were now unthinkable, a thinly veiled reference to the previous persecution of Old Believers under Nicholas I and the destruction of many of their icons. Buslaev, Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, 407.

⁵⁶ See *ibid.*, 408. With the unveiling of the monument to the 1000-year anniversary of Russia in Novgorod on 8 September 1862, Buslaev regretted that the monument lacked sufficient representation of the people and focused almost exclusively on state leaders and representatives of high culture: “This is a monument to the millennium not of Russia in general, but of Russian state life, Russian politics.” Quoted in Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Vol II, 84.

⁵⁷ G. D. Filimonov, “Palekh,” Den', no. 35 (1863), 9-10.

⁵⁸ Buslaev, Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, 408.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 407-408.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 148.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 408-410.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 410.

⁶³ “Pis'mo ob ikonopisanii,” Khristianskoe chtenie, (March 1857), 204, 207-208.

⁶⁴ RGIA, f. 797, op. 33, otd. 1, d. 92, ll. 1-4.

⁶⁵ For an analysis of the Russian intelligentsia's projection of its own stereotypes and ideals onto the peasantry, see: Cathy Frierson, Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in Late Nineteenth-Century Russia (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

⁶⁶ Later experts would retrace Bezobrazov's journey to generate their own accounts on the state of Russian icons. By 1879, Bezobrazov's account had inspired a number of notable individuals to visit the three villages, including Prince V. P. Meshcherskii, the poet N. A. Nekrasov, G. D. Filimonov, L. N. Maikov, D. M. Strukov,

V. P. Rybinskii, and A. N. Molchanov. Vladimirskie gubernskie vedomosti (21 December 1879), 2. See also the later accounts of V. Illarionov, "Ikonopistsy-Suzdal'tsy. (Poezdka v ss. Msteru, Kholui, i Palekh)," Russkoe obozrenie (March and April 1895); and N. P. Kondakov, Sovremennoe polozhenie russkoi narodnoi ikonopisi (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia I. N. Skorokhodova, 1901). Illarionov was the pseudonym for Vasilii Timofeevich Georgievskii (1861-1923).

⁶⁷ V. P. Bezobrazov, "Iz putevykh zapisok," Russkii vestnik (July 1861), 266, 281-283.

⁶⁸ Bezobrazov's focus on the *ofeni* may have been linked to the popular poem published by the populist writer Nikolai Nekrasov in early 1861 called "The Colporteurs" (*korobeiniki*). The poem, based on folk motifs, provided a romantic portrait of peddlers traveling throughout Russia and their encounters with the noble but impoverished people. The peddlers meet a tragic fate, murdered for their money while on the road. The poem, incidentally, became a favorite motif of the Palekh lacquer-box miniaturists in the 1920s and 1930s.

⁶⁹ On the role of peddlers as distributors of literature as well as icons after 1861, see Jeffrey Brooks, When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861-1917 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 101-108.

⁷⁰ Bezobrazov, 283-284, 286-287.

⁷¹ I am indebted to Alexander Martin for this point.

⁷² N. A. Trokhimovskii, "Ofeni," Russkii vestnik (June 1866), 565-67, 569, 585, 587, 590.

⁷³ Bezobrazov, 286-288.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 294, 307-308.

⁷⁵ His portrait of Kholui, however, suggested otherwise. In Kholui, he said there was a bottle of vodka in every room, studio, and house he visited, and the offer of vodka before every conversation was made with such graciousness and insistence that he could not refuse.

In all of Russia, he added, only Ivanovo could approach that of Kholui in its level of drunkenness, but “the prize for first place goes to Kholui.”

⁷⁶ Bezobrazov, 294, 298-299, 301.

⁷⁷ This transformation is traced in Francis William Weislo, Reforming Rural Russia: State, Local Society, and National Politics, 1855-1914 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990). The Ministry of Interior's institution in 1889 of the Land Captain, with broad power over peasant administration, was also emblematic of this new conservative activism, as was the emergence of Konstantin Pobedonostsev, appointed Ober-Prokuror of the Holy Synod in 1880, and his ambitious program of patriotic and religious education for the peasantry. Thaden aptly termed Pobedonostsev a “revolutionary conservative.” Thaden, Conservative Nationalism, 203. For Pobedonostsev's attempt to fashion a humble, pious Russian people see A. Iu. Polunov, Pod vlast'iu ober-prokurora: gosudarstvo i tserkov' v epokhu Aleksandra III (Moscow: AIRO-XX, 1996).

⁷⁸ A. Kirpichnikov, “Filimonov (Georgii Dmitrievich),” Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' (St. Petersburg: Brokgauz-Efron, 1902), 747.

⁷⁹ In the course of his adult life, Filimonov, in the words of Count Sergei Dmitrievich Sheremetev, “provided help to the icon painters of Palekh...and constantly attended to their well being, as continuers of the ancient spirit of Russian icon painting.” S. D. Sheremetev, “Pamiati F. I. Buslaeva i G. D. Filimonova,” Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva, no. 132 (1899) ,56.

⁸⁰ Count Stroganov's “*Podlinnik*” represented a first private attempt to establish a definitive guide for icon painters: Stroganovskii ikonopisnyi podlinnik (kontsa XVI i nachala XVII stoletii) (Moscow, 1869). Vzdornov, Istoriia otkrytiia, 105. 114-115; Z. P. Morozova, “Obzor kollektsii prorisei I. E. Zabelina,” in A. D. Ianovskii, ed., I. E. Zabelin: 170 let so dnia rozhdeniia. Materialy nauchnykh chtenii GIM 29-31 oktiabria 1990 goda. Chast' 1. (Moscow: Gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii muzei, 1992), 63-64.

⁸¹ G. Filimonov, "Palekh," Den', no. 34 (1863), 4. Filimonov's article came in two parts: Den', no. 34 (1863), 4-8; Den', no. 35 (1863), 9-11.

⁸² *Ibid.*, part two, "Palekh," 9.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, part two, "Palekh," 11.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, part one, "Palekh," 5.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, part one, "Palekh," 6.

⁸⁶ The Russian scholar Tarasov believes this division of labor first emerged in the seventeenth-century. Along with the use of fixed models (the "*podlinniki*") for icon reproduction, Tarasov believes the separation of tasks in a factory-like environment marked the emergence of distinctly modern cultural and economic practices in the Russian icon industry from at least the seventeenth-century. Tarasov, Ikona i blagochestie, 179.

⁸⁷ Filimonov, part two, "Palekh," 10-11. To use the famous phrase of the labor historian Henry Braverman, capitalist owners appeared to be "deskilling" the master icon painters, using a division of labor among workers to appropriate their expertise and profit from it. Harry Braverman, Labor and Monopoly Capital: the Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974).

⁸⁸ A. Molchanov, "Po Vladimirskoi gubernii," Novoe vremia (14 June 1879), 2-3.

⁸⁹ Kondakov, Sovremennoe polozhenie, 26-29.

⁹⁰ On the vibrant system of capitalist icon production in Palekh circa 1900, and the opportunities that were open to talented masters to start their own studios, see Arkhiv Gosudarstvennogo Muzeia Palekhskogo iskusstva, f. Salapin.

⁹¹ Following Filimonov's lead, the icon expert Zabelin in 1881 became the chief developer of collections at the newly opened State Historical Museum on Red Square, which amassed a huge collection of icons – and employed the Palekh artists to paint many of the museum's murals. The purpose of the museum, which mirrored the main thesis of Zabelin's work, was to link popular practices, customs, and habits to the everyday life of the ruling family. Icons, of course, represented one of these most crucial links. See, for example, the 1874 charter of the museum, reprinted in V. L. Egorov, ed., Izdaniia Gosudarstvennogo Istoricheskogo muzeia, 1873-1998: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel' (Moscow: Gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii muzei, 1999), 17.

⁹² Though many Europeans considered Russia a backward and reactionary society, others increasingly viewed Russia as a land of tradition and authenticity, a patriarchal order regulated by native peasant communalism and aristocratic values. August Freiherr von Haxthausen (1792-1866), for instance, came to Russia in the 1840s to study the peasant land commune, which he envisioned as an ancient Slavic institution, embodying patriarchal and conservative values – as well as an alternative to modern methods of social and economic organization. His studies of the Russian land commune spurred Russian investigations into the institution by conservatives and radicals alike.

⁹³ The scholar was E. Viollet-le-Duc. The medievalist V. I. Butovskii, commenting on Viollet-le-Duc's work in 1879, regretted the slow development of native studies of Russian Medieval art and welcomed his French colleague's work as decisively proving "the originality of our art." In 1875, Viollet-le-Duc informed his Russian colleagues of his plans for writing a study of Russian medieval art, in which he noted the ability of Russians to fuse numerous foreign influences into a uniquely Russian style. V. I. Butovskii, Russkoe iskusstvo i mneniia o nem E. Violle-le-diuka, frantsuzskogo uchenogo arkhitekтора i F. I. Buslaeva II (Moscow, 1879), 10.

⁹⁴ G. D. Filimonov, Samostoiatel'nost' russkogo stilia s tochki zreniia sovremennoi kritiki iskusstva na Zapade (Moscow: Katkov, 1879), 9, 6-7.

⁹⁵ Vestnik Obshchestva drevne-russkogo iskusstva pri Moskovskom publichnom muzee, no. 4-5 (1874), 35.

⁹⁶ See *ibid.*, 37-40. The article is a reprint of Buslaev's 1865 article in the first number of Sovremennaia letopis' for 1865.

⁹⁷ On behalf of the society, he presented Buslaev's 1866 work on icon painting to Tsar Alexander II, the Tsarevich Nikolai (Buslaev's pupil), the gubernator of Moscow, Metropolitan Filaret in Moscow, and numerous prominent members of the nobility. See Vestnik Obshchestva, no. 1-3 (1874), 16.

⁹⁸ Vestnik Obshchestva, no. 11-12 (1876), 83-85; Vestnik Obshchestva, no. 1-3 (1874), 7-8, 10, 14.

⁹⁹ F. I. Buslaev, Sochineniia F. I. Buslaeva, 193.

¹⁰⁰ Vestnik Obshchestva, no. 1-3 (1874), 12, 15. Though the Palekh icon studio owner Nikolai L'vovich Safonov became a corresponding member in 1865, his primary role was to provide information about the "podlinniki" in his possession. Tellingly, when Tsar Nicholas II finally formed his committee on icon painting in 1901, it excluded church officials, icon painters, and icon-studio owners.

¹⁰¹ Leskov viciously satirized "nihilists" in his 1864 story "No Way Out" and wrote frequently on church life and affairs. In the 1870s, he associated with conservative thinkers such as Nikolai Danilevskii, Konstantin Pobedonostsev, and Dmitrii Tolstoi. See A. A. Gorelov, "Patrioticheskaiia legenda N. S. Leskova (poetika 'preobrazovaniia' i stilizatsii v povesti 'Zapechatlennyi angel')," Russkaia literatura, 4 (1986), 159, fn. 22; K. A. Lantz, Nikolay Leskov (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1979), 22; Valentina Gebel', N. S. Leskov, v tvorcheskoi laboratorii (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1945), 25, 27.

¹⁰² Hugh Mclean, "Russia, the Love-Hate Pendulum, and *The Sealed Angel*," in To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, 11 October 1966, vol. II (Paris: Mouton, 1967), 1332.

¹⁰³ “O russkoi ikonopisi,” Russkii mir (26 September 1873), reprinted in N. S. Leskov, Sobranie sochinenii, tom desiatyi (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958), 180-187.

¹⁰⁴ RGIA, f. 1331, o. 1, d. 10, ll. 9, 11. The ecclesiastical press also expressed outrage at the profanation of icon painting by traders and profit motives. See, for example, Ioann Iakovskii, “O prodazhe ikon pri tserkvakh,” Vladimirskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti (1 February 1876), unofficial section, 135-136; “Neskol’ko slov ob ikonopisi,” Vladimirskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti (1 December 1875), unofficial section, 1153-1156; I. Galabutskii, “Koshchunstvenno-naglye prodelki prodavtsov ikon,” Poltavskie eparkhial’nye vedomosti (15 October 1871), unofficial part, 731-739.

¹⁰⁵ Izograf: Zhurnal ikonografii i drevnikh khudozhestv, tom 1, vypusk 1, no. 1 (1882), 3.

¹⁰⁶ N. Kolygina, “Prikasaias’ k istokam promysla,” Prizyv (21 October 1998), 3.

¹⁰⁷ Vzdornov, Istoriia otkrytiia, 30.

¹⁰⁸ N. Kolygina, “Prikasaias’ k istokam promysla,” 3; V. Ilarionov, “Ikonopistsy-Suzdal’tsy. (Poezdka v ss. Msteru, Kholui, i Palekh),” Russkoe obozrenie (April 1895), 743.

¹⁰⁹ A. Molchanov, “Po Vladimirskoi gubernii,” Novoe vremia (14 June 1879), 2-3. Though Safonov could paint an entire icon, he maintained a division of labor in his studio.

¹¹⁰ The report continued: “It is impossible to say that [Palekh’s] art has not developed. In it one notices a process of perfection and a striving toward beauty, which, however, also provides grounds for criticism. Contemporary Palekh painting already has lost the grandeur of Byzantine art, having succumbed to sentimentality and prettiness. Since this [development] reflects the unavoidable influence of the time, a stern condemnation of the masters would be unfair. Thanks to the favorable conditions of demand for their work, the Palekhians are not separating into small enterprises, but are grouped around their authoritative masters and studio owners.” RGIA, f. 1331, op. 1, d. 10, ll. 29-30.

¹¹¹ Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Vol. II, 192, 224. On the accession and coronation more generally, see 196-235.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 263. On the role of terrorists in strengthening police surveillance, see Richard Pipes, Russia Under the Old Regime, 2nd ed. (New York: Collier Books, 1992), 297-312.

¹¹³ S. D. Sheremetev, "Pamiati F. I. Buslaeva i G. D. Filimonova," Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva, no. 132 (1899), 54. Alexander III was a lover and patron of art and he encouraged native Russian art, including the Russian realist school of painters. Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Vol II, 177.

¹¹⁴ S. D. Sheremetev, "Pamiati F. I. Buslaeva i G. D. Filimonova," 56.

¹¹⁵ Cited in Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Vol II, 224. "Fortunately," said Filimonov in a March 1882 report on the restoration's progress, "national Russian church art lives on and has excellent representatives in the person of the Orthodox icon painters of Palekh." "Otchety o zasedaniakh Obshchestva liubitelei drevnei pis'mennosti 1881-1882," Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva, no. 80: 82.

¹¹⁶ A. Nasibova, Granovitaia palata moskovskogo kremlia (Leningrad: Avtora, 1978), 5, 7, 10, 13.

¹¹⁷ "Otchety o zasedaniakh Obshchestva liubitelei drevnei pis'mennosti," 82-83.

¹¹⁸ Nasibova, 16.

¹¹⁹ S. D. Sheremetev, "Pamiati F. I. Buslaeva i G. D. Filimonova," Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva, no. 132 (1899), 57.

¹²⁰ Izograf, tom 1, vypusk II (1882), 4.

¹²¹ A. Molchanov, "Po Vladimirskoi gubernii," Novoe vremia (14 June 1879), 2-3.

¹²² Izograf, tom 1, vypusk I (1882), 3; Izograf, tom 1, vypusk II (1882), 4-5.

¹²³ Izograf, tom 1, vypusk II (1882), 4-5; Izograf, tom 1, vypusk VII (1884), 32, 38.

¹²⁴ "Mnenie Arkhimandrita Iur'evskogo monastyria Fotiia o ikonakh i nadzore za ikonopistsami," Izograf, tom 1, vypusk V-VI (1883), 15-25.

¹²⁵ On the committee, see Robert Nichols, "The Icon and the Machine in Russia's Religious Renaissance, 1900-1909," in William C. Brumfield and Milos M. Velimirovic, eds., Christianity and the Arts in Russia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 131-144. See also chapter three, "Palekhians into Russians, 1901-1918," of Andrew Jenks, "The Nation in a Box: The Production of Russian and Socialist Identity, 1814-2001" (Ph. D. diss., Stanford University, 2002).

¹²⁶ Kondakov, Sovremennoe polozhenie, 50-56, 62.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹²⁸ On the conception of romantic anti-capitalism in late Imperial Russia, see Katerina Clark, Petersburg: Crucible of Revolution (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995); Steve Smith and Catriona Kelly, "Commercial Culture and Consumerism," in Catriona Kelly and David Shepherd, eds., Constructing Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 106-156.

¹²⁹ Peterburgskoe otdelenie Akademii nauk Rossisskoi Federatsii (POANRF), f. 115, op. 4, d. 98, l. 19; N. P. Kondakov, Vospominaniia i dumy (Prague: Seminarium Kondakovianum, 1927), 77; Kondakov, Sovremennoe polozhenie, 4-5, 33.

¹³⁰ M. E. Kuz'min, "Neskol'ko soobrazhenii po povodu unichtozhennykh i utselevshikh pamiatnikov stariny v Kievopecherskoi Lavre," Iskusstvo i khudozhestvennaia promyshlennost', no. 17 (February 1900): 223; Kondakov, Vospominaniia i dumy, 77; Kondakov, Sovremennoe polozhenie, 20, 26-27.

¹³¹ Otdel rukopisei Russkogo Muzeia (ORRM), f. 122, letter of Nikolai Mikhailovich Sofonov to S. D. Sheremetev, ll. 1-3. There was no file number for the file containing the letter.

¹³² Illarionov, "Ikonopistsy-Suzdal'tsy," (March 1895), 192, 194; POANRF, f. 115, op. 4, d. 98, ll. 3, 5.

¹³³ POANRF, f. 115, op. 4, d. 98, l. 7.

¹³⁴ V. Illarionov, "Ikonopistsy-Suzdal'tsy. (Poezdka v ss. Msteru, Kholui, i Palekh)," Russkoe obozrenie, (April 1895), 738.

¹³⁵ Illarionov, "Ikonopistsy-Suzdal'tsy," (April 1895), 738-40.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 743-45. One study of cultural history in late imperial Russia aptly noted that intellectuals "both attempted to provide workers and peasants with the means of thinking independently, and resented it when they did." See also L. McReynolds and C. Popkin, "The Objective Eye and the Common Good," in Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution, 1881-1940, 70.

¹³⁷ ORRM, f. 122, d. 73, ll. 11, 14.

¹³⁸ ORRM, f. KPRI, d. 35, l. 20; ORRM, f. KPRI, d. 73, l. 99.

¹³⁹ See, for example, T. J. Jackson Lears, No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Peter Stansky, Redesigning the World: William Morris, the 1880s, and the Arts and Crafts (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); Eileen Boris, Art and Labor: Ruskin, Morris, and the Craftsman Ideal in America (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986).

¹⁴⁰ Kotsonis, Making Peasants Backward.

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers

In Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies

Available Publications:

No. 1: Law In Russia (1994) *Theodore Taranovski, Peter B. Maggs, Kathryn Hendley, Steven L. Crown* (\$5.25)

No. 2: Religion in Imperial Russia (1995) *Robert L. Nichols and Henry R. Huttenbach* (\$5.25)

No. 3: The Fate of Russian Orthodox Monasteries and Convents Since 1917 (1995) *Charles Timberlake* (\$6.50) SOLD OUT

No. 4: The Mennonites and the Russian State Duma, 1905-1914 (1996) *Terry Martin* (\$5.25)

No. 5: Corporate Russia: Privatization and Prospects in the Oil and Gas Sector (1996) *Leslie Dienes* (\$5.25)

No. 6: Post-Communist Transitions: The Rise of the Multi-Party Systems in Poland and Ukraine (1996) *Andrii Deshchytsia* (\$5.25)

No. 7: Russian Banking: An Overview and Assessment (1996) *Kent F. Moors* (\$5.25)

No. 8: Nationalism and Religion in the Balkans since the 19th Century (1996) *Peter F. Sugar* (\$6.50)

No. 9: Modes of Communist Rule, Democratic Transition, and Party System Formation in Four

East European Countries (1996) *Grigorii Golosov*
(\$7.50)

No. 10: The Politics of the Domestic Sphere: The *Zhenotdely*, Women's Liberation and the Search for a *Novy Byt* in Early Soviet Russia (1996) *Michelle V. Fuqua* (\$6.50)

No. 11: Ethnic Bipolarism in Slovakia, 1989-1995
(1996) *David Lucas* (\$6.50)

No. 12: Literacy and Reading in 19th Century Bulgaria (1997) *Krassimira Daskalova* (\$5.25)

No. 13: Critical Theory and the War in Croatia and Bosnia (1997) *Thomas Cushman* (\$6.50)

No. 14: Nation, State, and Economy in Central Asia: Does Ataturk Provide a Model? (1997) *Paul Kubicek* (\$6.50)

No. 15: The Labor Market, Wages, Income, and Expenditures of the Population of the Republic of Uzbekistan (1997) *Alexander Agafonoff, Dilnara Ismiddinova, and Galina Saidova, editors* (\$6.50)

No. 16: German-Bashing and the Breakup of Yugoslavia (1998) *Daniele Conversi* (\$6.50)

No. 17: Romanian-Hungarian Economic Cooperation and Joint Ventures in Post Ceausescu Romania (1998) *Erica Agiewich* (\$6.50)

No. 18: Energy and mineral Exports from the Former USSR: Philosophers's Stone or Fool's Gold?
(1998) *Leslie Dienes* (\$6.50)

No. 19: Ethnic Cleansing in Twentieth Century Europe (1998) *Norman Naimark* (\$7.50)

No. 20: Nationalism, Populism and Other Threats to Liberal Democracy in Post-Communist Europe (1999) *Vladimir Tismaneanu* (\$6.50)

No. 21: The Formation of the Post-Soviet International Politics of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan (1999) *Rafis Abazov* (\$6.50)

No. 22: The Serb Lobby in the United Kingdom (2003-Reprint) *Carole Hodge* (\$7.50)

No. 23: The Security Services and the Decline of Democracy in Russia: 1996-1999 (1999) *Amy Knight* (\$6.50)

No. 24: The Repluralization of Slovenia in the 1980s: New Revelations from Archival Material (2000) *Leopoldina Plut-Pregelj, et al.* (\$7.50)

No. 25: Ethnic Conflict and European Affairs Revisited: The Serb-Croat Quarrel and French Diplomacy, 1929-1935 (2000) *Brigit Farley* (\$7.50)

No. 26: Poland and Germany, 1989-1991: The Role of Economic Factors in Foreign Policy (2000) *Randall E. Newnham* (\$7.50)

No. 27: Eastern Europe and the Natural Law Tradition (2000) *Sabrina P. Ramet* (\$7.50)

No. 28: Local Self-Government and the State in Modern Russia (2001) *Thomas E. Porter and John F. Young* (\$7.50)

No. 29: Catholic Power and Catholicism as a Component of Modern Polish National Identity, 1863-1918 (2001) *Konrad Sadkowski* (\$7.50)

No. 30: Structure and Exposure: The Dilemmas of Democracy in Russia's Television Market (2001) *Ellen Mickiewicz* (\$7.50)

No. 31: Military Threats and Threat Assessment in Russia's New Defense Doctrine and Security Concept (2001) *Stephen Blank* (\$7.50)

No. 32: Nationalism, Culture, and Religion in Croatia since 1990 (2001) *Vjieran Pavlakovic, editor* (\$7.50)

No. 33: Russian Policy Toward the Middle East Since the Collapse of the Soviet Union: The Yeltsin Legacy and the Challenge for Putin (2001) *Robert O. Freedman* (\$7.50)

No. 34: Statistical Falsification in the Soviet Union: A Comparative Study of Projections, Biases, and Trust (2001) *Mark Tauger* (\$7.50)

No. 35: The Land Question in Ukraine and Russia (2002) *Stephen K. Wegren* (\$7.50)

No. 36: Russian Regionalism: The Economic Dimension (2003) *Steven Rosefielde, et al.* (\$7.50)

No. 37: Regionalism in Russia's Foreign Policy in the 1990's: A Case of "Reversed Anarchy" (2003) *Mikhail Alexseev* (\$7.50)

No. 38: Macedonia's Child-Grandfathers: the Transnational Politics of Memory, Exile, and Return, 1948-1998 (2003) *Keith S. Brown* (\$7.50)

No. 39: 'Great Russians' and 'Little Russians': Russian-Ukrainian Relations and Perceptions in Historical Perspective (2003) *Andreas Kappeler* (\$7.50)

No. 40: Modernization through Resistance: War, Mir, Tsar, and Law in the World of the Pre-Reform Russian Peasantry (2004) *Hugh D. Hudson, Jr.* (\$7.50)

No. 41: Back to the Front: Russian Interests in the New Eastern Europe (2004) *Janusz Bugajski* (\$7.50)

No. 42: The Birth of Modern Russian National Identity and the Icon Painters of Palekh (2004) *Andrew Jenks* (\$7.50)

Prices are as marked. Please add \$1.00 for international orders, 8.8% sales tax for WA state residents. Orders and subscriptions should be directed to: **Managing Editor, The Donald W. Treadgold Papers in Russian, East European and Central Asian Studies, Jackson School of International Studies, University of Washington, Box 353650, Seattle, WA 98195-3650.** Tel: 206-221-6348; Fax: 206-685-0668; E-mail: treadgld@u.washington.edu. Submissions are welcomed. For submission information, contact Glennys Young, Editor, at the above address. Excerpts of the Treadgold Papers are available at our website: <http://depts.washington.edu/reecas/dwt/dwt.htm>

ISSN 1078-5639

The Donald W. Treadgold Papers
in Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies

Jackson School of International Studies
Box 353650
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3650
