

SAINT PETERSBURG AND THE ART OF SURVIVAL

WILLIAM CRAFT BRUMFIELD

Dostoevskii's *Underground Man* called it "the most abstract and intentional city in the world." The Comte de Segur spoke of it as a "monument to the victory of genius over Nature." For Alexander Blok, in his great novel *Petersburg*, it was the point where Russia "almost dissolves into a nothingness, a point of departure into infinity." Even during the Soviet period, as the City of Peter became the City of Lenin, its perverse climate and monumental architecture served to remind of an almost mythic imperial past--and of a capacity for survival against unthinkable odds.

For two centuries Saint Petersburg was the capital of a vast and complex empire, a symbol of the implacable will that forged Russian into a modern European state. The city rose from a collision of two cultures, Muscovite and European, and the ensuing tensions formed one of the most persistent themes of a remarkable succession of writers, enthralled not only by the spirit of the city but by its very appearance. And with reason, for the architecture of Saint Petersburg--grandiose, overpowering at times, obsessed with a rational design--remains the clearest statement of purpose that Imperial Russia ever made: to measure, to build, to impose order at whatever cost.(1)

The city was built at the estuary of the River Neva (Finnish for "swamp"), and the flat terrain, marked with a network of canals and inlets, provided an effective setting for the visions of Petersburg's imperial architects. In both Baroque and neoclassical styles, the monumentality of Petersburg architecture has a slightly stagy quality, and not all critics have been favorably impressed. As an ensemble, however, the city is one of the most imposing and best preserved in Europe. The regulated height, the dramatic use of columns and arches, the vivid palette of colors for the stuccoed walls create an aura of fantasy, in an environment that seems to be floating.

Peter the Great established the city in May 1703. Sankt Piterburkh was to be his “window on the West,” as well as tangible evidence of this determination to transform Russia into a modern state.(2) But its immediate purpose was more limited: to serve as a strategic fortification at the point where the Neva River flows into the Gulf of Finland. Peter was then engaged in the Northern War, a protracted struggle with Sweden for control of northeastern Europe. Although the Swedish army, under Charles XII, was effectively destroyed at the battle of Poltava in 1709, the Baltic provinces--specifically the area around Saint Petersburg--would not formally be considered Russian territory until the Treaty of Nystad in 1721.

The 20,000 conscripted serfs and prisoners of war who labored to complete Peter’s fortress in the fall of 1703 were soon followed by tens of thousands more. Many died from exposure and disease, but concern for such costs has been notably absent in Russian history, and the city began to take shape. Piles were driven, canals dug, marshes drained, streets paved, and craftsmen resettled by the thousands.(3) By 1712, after the victory at Poltava, the imperial court and much of its bureaucracy had been transferred from Moscow. Peter had become the first Russian emperor, and Petersburg was to be the seat of his empire. Noblemen were required to building houses in the city, foreign trading concerns were expected to do business through its port, and everyone entering Petersburg was required to bring a certain number of stones, since there were no quarries near the city. In 1714 masonry construction was prohibited for a time throughout the rest of the empire, so that all available resources could be applied to the new capital.

Like the real-estate developer he was, Peter laid a grid of canals and streets on Vasilevskii Island, the largest of the estuary islands, but the canals soon silted and building shifted south to the mainland, to the left bank of the Neva. The frequent use of the French word “marais” on early maps of the city reveals that Petersburg, like its contemporary New Orleans (founded in 1718), was designed according to a rigidly

geometric French plan arbitrarily laid over a flood-prone swamp.(4)

One of Peter's major goals--it might be called an obsession--was the creation of a Russian fleet, which, with a reorganized army, would serve as an instrument of Russia's rapidly expanding role in European politics. Petersburg, with its admiralty and its shipbuilding enterprises, was originally conceived to resemble the unpretentious Dutch seaports Peter had seen (and worked in) during an extended trip to western Europe at the end of the seventeenth century.(5) His relatively modest, practical taste in architecture was soon superseded by a desire to build in a manner befitting the capital of a great power. Thus the architects entrusted with the design of the city's palaces, parks, and state buildings during the next century were to work on a monumental scale congenial to the tastes of their imperial patrons and patronesses.

Whatever their style--from the Baroque of the empresses Anna and Elizabeth to the neoclassical of Catherine the Great and Alexander I--the idiom was emphatically Western in origin, as were most of the architects: French, German, Scottish, and above all, Italian. Of this group, the most imaginative and perhaps the most gifted was Bartolomeo Francesco Rastrelli (1700-1771), son of Count Carlo Bartolomeo Rastrelli, an architect and sculptor who entered Peter the Great's service in 1715. Little is known of the younger Rastrelli's education and travel in Europe, but it is obvious that he was familiar with the varieties of European Baroque architecture, for in his palaces, pavilions, and churches he was to define the late Baroque in Russia.(6)

Rastrelli's early work was commissioned by the empress Anna Ioannovna and her Baltic German courtiers in the 1730s. Little has survived from that period, since much of the building was done in wood, a material readily available in Russia and often used in the construction of "summer palaces." The greatest of Rastrelli's projects were realized during the reign of Peter the Great's daughter by his second marriage, Elizabeth (reg. 1741-1761), whose generous purse and extravagant tastes gave free rein to the architect's imagination. His magnificent wooden Summer Palace--built in

1741 and demolished to construct a new palace for the emperor Paul at the end of the eighteenth century--established a pattern that would be carried forward in his more solid masonry structures: grand proportions combined with a dramatic use of decorative detail. the theatrical effect was perfectly suited to Elizabeth's love of court spectacles and lavish masquerades.(7)

During the two decades following the construction of the Summer Palace, Rastrelli was occupied almost exclusively with the design of imperial residences: Peterhof and the Catherine Palace at Tsarskoe Selo, both gutted during World War II. (Russian restorers subsequently devoted great effort to room-by room restorations of both.) Rastrelli's final imperial project was yet another version--by some counts the fourth--of the Winter Palace. In each of these palaces the architect was ordered to carry out a massive expansion and reconstruction of a pre-existing building, a task that imposed considerable limitations on his own concept of structural unity. The enormous facades (almost 1,000 feet at the Catherine Palace) could not escape a certain monotony, despite Rastrelli's valiant effort to break the horizontal with the use of columns, pilasters, caryatids, and the ingenious application of window detail.

The new Winter Palace, commissioned by Empress Elizabeth, was Rastrelli's grandest project. He had built an earlier version for Empress Anna, but Elizabeth wished a larger, more symmetrical design in which the palace would convey the image of a great European power. Discussion of the project began in the early 1750s, and by 1753 Rastrelli had submitted the final variant of his plan. He operated under constraints similar to those imposed at Peterhof and Tsarskoe Selo: to incorporate a large existing structure (in this case Rastrelli's own Third Winter Palace) into the design of a still larger work, staggering in both size and cost. As construction proceeded during 1754, Rastrelli concluded that the new palace would involve not simply an expansion of the old, but would have to be built over its foundations, thus necessitating the razing of the previous structure.(8)

Rastrelli had no hope of meeting Elizabeth's expectations for constructing the Winter Palace within two years, yet he exerted his considerable experience in directing the vast project, organized to a degree unprecedented in Petersburg. Construction continued year round, despite the severe winters, and the empress--who viewed the palace as a matter of state prestige during the Seven Years War--continued to issue orders for its completion and requests for supplemental appropriations. Indeed, it is a telling comment on the state of Elizabeth's finances that the 859,555 rubles originally allotted for construction of the Winter Palace were to be drawn, in a scheme devised by her courtier Petr Shuvalov, from the revenues of state-licensed pothouses--frequented, no doubt, by Rastrelli's army of laborers, most of whom earned a monthly wage of one ruble.

Despite the huge sums designated for the Winter Palace, cost overruns were chronic, and work was occasionally halted for lack of materials and money at a time when Russia's resources were strained to the limit by involvement in the Seven Years' War (1756-1763). Ultimately the project cost some 2,500,000 rubles, drawn from the alcohol and salt taxes placed on an already burdened population. Elizabeth did not live to see the completion of her greatest commission. She on December 25, 1761. The main state rooms and imperial apartments were ready soon the following year for Tsar Peter III and his wife Catherine.

The plan of the Winter Palace resembles, albeit on a far greater scale, the perimeter concept of the Stroganov Palace, with a quadrilateral interior courtyard decorated in a manner similar to the outer walls. The exterior facades of the new imperial palace--three of which are turned toward great public spaces--can only be compared to those of the Catherine Palace at Tsarskoe Selo. On the river facade the palace presents from a distance an uninterrupted horizontal sweep of over 200 meters, while the Palace Square facade is marked in the center by the three arches of the main courtyard entrance, immortalized by Sergei Eisenstein, who used the entrance to

portray the "storming of the Winter Palace." The west facade, overlooking the Admiralty, is the one area of the structure that contains substantial elements of the previous palace walls; and the decorative detailing of its central part of the facade, flanked by two wings, reflects the earlier mannerisms of Rastrelli's style.

Although a strict symmetry reigns in the articulation of the facades, each has its own formulation in the design of pediments and the spacing of attached columns, whose distribution provides an insistent rhythm to the horizontal expanse. The 250 columns segment some 700 windows (not including those of the interior court), whose surrounds are decorated in 20 different patterns reflecting the array of ornamental motifs—including lion masks and other grotesque figures—accumulated by Rastrelli over a period of three decades.⁽⁹⁾ The three main floors of the Winter Palace are situated over a basement level, whose semicircular window surrounds establish an arcade effect that is followed in the tiers of windows above. The horizontal dimensions of the palace are emphasized by a string course separating the two upper floors from the first, and by the complex profile of the cornice, above which is a balustrade supporting 176 large ornamental vases and allegorical statues.

Changes have inevitably occurred in the structure and decoration of the Winter Palace. Above the balustrade the stone statuary, corroded by Petersburg's harsh weather, was replaced in the 1890s by copper figures; and the sandy color originally intended for the stucco facade has vanished over the years under a series of paints ranging from dull red (applied in the late nineteenth century) to the present green.

The interior of the Winter Palace, with its more than seven hundred rooms, has undergone far greater modifications. Rastrelli's original designs used decorative devices similar to those of his earlier palaces: gilded plaster and wooden ornamentation, elaborate pilasters to segment the walls of large spaces such as the Throne Room, and intricate parquetry for the floors. Yet little of Rastrelli's rococo interior decoration has survived. Work on so elaborate a space was to continue for several decades, as rooms

were changed and refitted to suit the tastes of Catherine the Great and her successors.

Far more damaging was the 1837 palace fire that raged unchecked for over two days and destroyed the interior of the palace itself, although prompt and vigorous action prevented the fire from spreading to the adjoining Hermitage buildings with their priceless collections of art.(10) During the reconstruction of the Winter Palace, most of the rooms were decorated in eclectic styles of the mid-nineteenth century or restored to the neoclassical style used by Rastrelli's successors in decorating the Winter Palace, such as Giacomo Quarenghi. Only the main, or Jordan, staircase and the corridor leading to it (the Rastrelli Gallery) were restored by Vasilii Stasov in a manner close to Rastrelli's original design. Yet the Winter Palace remains, rightly, associated with the name of Rastrelli. For all of Elizabeth's apparent caprices and the problems inherent in a project of such scale, Rastrelli's genius succeeded in creating not only one of the last major Baroque buildings in Europe, but also--in light of subsequent events--one of the central monuments in the history of the modern world.

Rastrelli's rococo genius is better revealed in his partially realized plan for the cathedral at the Smolny Convent of the Resurrection (1748-64), a work whose sculpted, compact design provided a focus lacking in his larger palace structures. Intended for Elizabeth, who combined pleasure with piety and wished to retire to a convent that provided both, the ensemble represents an ingenious fusion of Russian Orthodox and Baroque elements.(11) But it is the palaces, above all the Winter Palace, that define the spirit of Petersburg's Imperial Design. The height of the Winter Palace served as the city's standard, broken only by domes and spires, and when viewed across the Neva River, the horizontal mass of the palace dominates the sweep of the city's left bank. On closer inspection, the painted stucco facade with white columns and trim--repeated in many of Petersburg's imperial monuments--assumes a magnitude oddly at variance with the brilliant, almost frivolous, color scheme.(12)

Not every visitor has approved of this mixture of Russian and Baroque

exuberance. The Marquis de Custine, in La Russie en 1839 described Saint Petersburg as “without character, more pompous than imposing, more vast than beautiful, filled with edifices without style, without taste, without historical significance.”(13) Another nineteenth-century traveler compared the palaces to the chicken he had eaten at a Russian border station--all skin and no substance. Yet even the Marquis de Custine occasionally lapsed from his severe opinion and effusively praised the city and its setting.

Indeed, in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, Petersburg--not the medieval city of Moscow--served to validate Russia's position as a nation with a significant history. This paradox is illuminated in Fedor Dostoevskii's "Petersburg Chronicle" for June 1, 1847. In commenting on the advent of spring to the northern capital, the flaneur (the roving observer that is Dostoevskii's narrative persona) describes a city in the throes of growth: "Crowds of workers with plaster, with shovels, with hammers, axes, and other instruments dispose themselves along Nevskii Prospekt as though at home, as though they had bought it; and woe to the pedestrian, flaneur, or observer who lacks a serious desire to resemble Pierrot spattered with flour in a Roman carnival."(14)

Similar motifs of urban expansion and change reappear in the novelist's post-exile work, most notably Crime and Punishment, where they form an integral part of the psychological environment. The preceding passage, however, veers into a discursus on the built environment as history, a text whose decoding leads to the past as an expression of native identity. With summer approaching and cultured society leaving the town:

What remains for those citizens whose captivity forces them to pass their summer in the capital? To study the architecture of buildings, to how the city is being renewed and built? Of course this is an important occupation and indeed even edifying. Your Petersburger is so distracted in the winter,

and has so many pleasures, business, work, card-playing, gossip and various other amusements--besides which there is so much dirt--that he would hardly have the time to look around, to peer into Petersburg more attentively, to study its physiognomy and read the history of the city and all our epoch in this mass of stones, in these magnificent edifices, palaces, monuments [emphasis added--W.B.]. After all, it would hardly come into anyone's head to kill valuable time with such an absolutely innocent and unprofitable exercise.(15)

The irony here is doubly ambiguous, since Dostoevskii's subsequent work uses architecture as an extension and reflection of the contemporary mental state of individual characters as well as entire collectives--hence the "Petersburg theme." Furthermore, by the time of Dostoevskii's early work, the city's architecture reflected only slightly more than a century of history, and that often in deliberate contrast to the cultural traditions of the pre-Petrine period. Although sensitive to the psychological impact of urban architecture, Dostoevskii showed little interest in architectural historicism as a means of reclaiming a sense of Russianness that presumably resided in pre-modern (i.e., pre-Petrine) history.

Dostoevskii's ambivalent--or highly selective-- attitude toward history is developed in the subsequent passage of his June 1 entry in the Petersburg Chronicle. At this point Dostoevskii presents the historical approach to architecture through the comments on Russian monuments contained in La Russie en 1839, by the Marquis de Custine. Although banned in Russia, the book was nonetheless widely known in intellectual circles and is the unmistakable source of Dostoevskii's references:

Incidentally, a study of the city is really not a useless thing. We don't exactly remember, but sometime ago we happened to read a certain French book, which consisted entirely of views on the contemporary condition of Russia. Of course it is already known just what foreigners'

views on the contemporary condition of Russia are; somehow up to now we stubbornly do not submit to being measured by a foreign yardstick. But despite that, the renowned tourist's book was eagerly read by all Europe. Among other things, it stated that there is nothing more lacking in character than Petersburg architecture; that there is nothing especially striking about it, nothing national [Dostoevskii's emphasis], and that the entire city is a hybrid caricature of several European capitals. And finally, that Petersburg, if only in an architectural sense, represents such a strange mixture, that one cannot cease to exclaim with amazement at every step.(16)

In Dostoevskii's paraphrase, Custine portrays Petersburg as an architectural hybridization: "Greek architecture, Roman architecture, Byzantine architecture, Dutch architecture, Gothic architecture, architecture of the rococo, the latest Italian architecture, our Orthodox architecture--all this, according to the traveler, whipped up and shaped into a most entertaining form, and in conclusion not one genuinely beautiful building!"(17)

In his Diary of a Writer during the 1870s Dostoevskii would publish similar views on the hybrid nature of Petersburg architecture as a barometer of social confusion. Of more immediate interest, however, is his reaction to Custine's claim that the architecture of Petersburg lacks an authentic, appropriate style. Despite his defensive manoeuvre ("we know what foreigners' views of Russia are worth"), Dostoevskii seems to revel in Custine's description of the city's architectural palette. Although Custine criticized the aesthetics of Petersburg, he was also amazed at the city's appearance, which combined stylistic variety with the monumental uniformity of an imperial capital.(18)

Furthermore, Custine saw the building of Petersburg as both validated by history and anticipating it:

Elsewhere great cities are made in memory of great deeds of the past. Or, while cities make themselves with the help of circumstances and history, without the least apparent cooperation of human calculation, Saint Petersburg with its magnificence and immensity is a trophy elevated by the Russians to their power yet to come; the hope that produces such efforts seems to me sublime! Not since the Temple of the Jews has the faith of a people in their destiny wrested from the earth something more marvelous than Saint Petersburg. And what renders this legacy made by a man to his ambitious country truly admirable is that it has been accepted by history.(19)

The reference to the Temple in Jerusalem is particularly apt in view of the Zion motif as a symbol of endurance and survival, of faith in the destiny of a people. Yet the more peculiar aspect of the preceding passage is its comment on Petersburg as a city both preparing for history and having been accepted by it. In the scheme presented by Custine, there are two levels of history: a universal history of established civilization and culture, and the history of Russia, existing in tenuous relation to the former.

Custine, like Dostoevskii, sees historical meaning in the stones of Petersburg. In commenting on the forbidding form of the Mikhailovskii Castle, in which the Emperor Paul was assassinated in 1801, Custine notes in his ninth letter: "If men are silent in Russia, the stones speak and speak in a lamentable voice. I am not surprised that the Russians fear and neglect their old monuments: these are witnesses of their history, which more often than not they would wish to forget."(20) Yet there were, in fact, no "vieux monuments" in Petersburg: the Mikhailovskii Castle, for example, was completed less than four decades before Custine's journey.(21) Furthermore, it is clear from subsequent parts of Custine's narrative--particularly in Moscow--that much had indeed survived from Russia's distant, turbulent architectural past.

Throughout Custine's account the specific meaning of "histoire" can only be

determined by context--in the preceding case, the recent political history of the imperial regime. In the same sense, no doubt, Dostoevskii advised his readers in 1847 to ponder the history of their city, whose imperial architecture--despite its recent provenance--can be defined as a historical text begun by Peter and decipherable by the contemporary resident or visitor. Yet Custine also describes Peter's great vision, whose tangible form derived from so many foreign sources, as an aggression directed toward the West ("contre l'Europe une ville ... pour dominer le monde"). Even in its approach toward integration with Europe, even in its new western-style capital, Russia is potentially hostile, alien, and separate.

As to the historical significance of Saint Petersburg and its architecture, one can hardly blame the Marquis for lacking the gift of prophecy--only for his impatience. Few cities have witnessed more momentous historical events, and certainly none in the twentieth century. Although the storming of the Winter Palace as recreated in Eisenstein's Ten Days that Shook the World is myth, pure and simple, it is entirely appropriate--in a dramatic as well as a historical sense--that the palace which served as a symbol of the Imperial order should also serve as the backdrop for two revolutions: one in 1917 and the other in 1991. Anyone who saw the crowds gathered on Palace Square in August 1991 would understand that great architecture has a way of creating its own destiny.

NOTES

1. For a detailed survey in English of the architecture of Saint Petersburg, see William Craft Brumfield, A History of Russian Architecture (Cambridge, 1993).

2. A recent authoritative Russian interpretation of the changes instituted by Peter the Great is Evgenii Anisimov, Vremia petrovskikh reform (Leningrad, 1989).

3. The standard account of the planning and construction of Saint Petersburg in its first decades is contained in S. P. Luppov, Istoriia stroitel'stvo Peterburga v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka (Moscow, 1957). On the process of amelioration, see pp. 78-81.

4. See Samuel Wilson Jr., Bienville's New Orleans. A French Colonial Capital (New Orleans, 1968).

5. For an analysis of Peter's voyage to Europe as it affected his artistic tastes, see V. F. Levinson-Lessing, "Pervoe puteshestvie Petra I za granitsu," in G. N. Komelova, ed., Kul'tura i iskusstvo petrovskogo vremeni (Leningrad, 1977), pp. 5-36. The considerable evidence of Peter's direct involvement in the design of Petersburg is presented in M. V. Iogansen, "Ob avtore general'nogo plana Peterburga petrovskogo vremeni," in T. V. Alekseeva, ed., Ot Srednevekov'ia k Novomu vremeni (Moscow, 1984), pp. 50-72, and particularly pp. 66-67.

6. There have been numerous surveys of Rastrelli's work, among which one of the most perceptive is B. R. Vipper, Arkhitektura russkogo barokko (Moscow, 1978), pp. 65-94. Other studies include D. Arkin, Rastrelli (Moscow, 1954); and Iu. M. Denisov and A. N. Petrov, Zodchii Rastrelli: Materialy k izucheniiu tvorchestva, (Leningrad, 1963), which includes a comprehensive listing of known Rastrelli graphic material in Russian, Polish, Swedish, and Austrian collections. A recent monograph is Iu. Ovsianikov, Franchesko Bartolomeo Rastrelli (Leningrad, 1982).

7. On the construction of the Third Summer Palace, see Denisov and Petrov, Zodchii Rastrelli, p. 9 and figures 75-127.

8. The most authoritative recent history of the design and construction of the Winter Palace is Iu. M. Denisov, "Zimnii dvorets Rastrelli," in Piliavskii and Levinson-Lessing, eds., Ermitazh: Istoriia i arkhitektura zdaniia, (Leningrad, 1974), pp. 39-64.

9. S. B. Alekseeva provides a thorough analysis of the various sculptural

elements of the Winter Palace, in terms not only of the plasticity of the facade, but also of their domination of the extensive space around the palace. See her "Arkhitektura i dekorativnaia plastika Zimnego dvortsa," in T. V. Alekseeva, ed., Russkoe iskusstvo barokko (Moscow, 1977), pp. 128-58. Earlier variants of the plan had a weaker segmentation of an even greater number of windows on the facades. See Denisov, "Zimnii dvorets Rastrelli," pp. 42-43.

10. The circumstances surrounding the Winter Palace fire are described in V. M. Glinka, "Pozhar 1837 goda," Piliavskii and Levinson-Lessing, eds., Ermitazh: Istoriiia i arkhitektura zdaniia (Leningrad, 1974), pp. 107-18. On the rebuilding of the palace, V. I. Piliavskii, "Vosstanovlenie Zimnego dvortsa posle pozhara 1837 goda," *ibid.*, 119-72. See also Richard M. Haywood, "The Winter Palace in St. Petersburg: Destruction by Fire and Reconstruction, December 1837-March 1839," in Jarbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas, 27 (1979): 161-80.

11. For an analysis of the adaptation of the traditional pentacupolar design in Russian baroque church architecture, see T. P. Fedotova, "K probleme piatiglaviia v arkhitekture barokko pervoi poloviny XVIII v.," in Alekseeva, ed. Russkoe iskusstvo barokko: Materialy i issledovaniia, pp. 70-87. In view of the Italian origins of so many of Russia's architects, it is logical to assume, as Fedotova does, that seventeenth-century Italian churches (especially the work of Borromini) were influential in the Russian integration of baroque decoration with the concept of the central dome and surrounding towers. It must also be remembered that centralized church designs were very much a part of the Roman baroque, as is demonstrated in Rudolf Wittkower, Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism (New York, 1971).

12. Boris Vipper noted that for all of the power and the variety of the Winter Palace, there is a certain "ambiguity" in Rastrelli's design that derives from the contradictions between the waning Baroque style and the rise of a neoclassical architectural aesthetic. Vipper, Arkhitektura russkogo barokko, p. 83.

13. See Le Marquis de Custine, *La Russie en 1839*, second edition (Paris, 1843), 1: 225-28.

14. "Peterburgskaia letopis'," in F. M. Dostoevskii, *Polnoe Sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh*, vol. 18 (Leningrad, 1978), p. 23

15. *Ibid.*, 24.

16. *Ibid.*

17. Dostoevskii probably refers to the opening passage of Custine's eighth letter, in which he presents his initial impressions of Petersburg. Similar views are presented in a description of the palaces and buildings of the central squares in the eleventh letter. Dostoevskii would likely have known the second, "corrected and expanded" edition of Custine's work, which appeared in 1843 and was rapidly smuggled into Russia. See Dostoevskii, *Polnoe Sobranie*, 18:226n24; also P. V. Annenkov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia* (Moscow, 1960), pp. 256-57. The reaction of Vissarion Belinskii, Alexander Herzen, and Dostoevskii to Custine's work is analyzed in E. I. Kiiko, "Belinskii i Dostoevskii o knige Kiustina 'Rossia v 1839'," G. M. Fridlender, ed., *Dostoevskii. Materialy i issledovaniia*, vol. 1 (Leningrad, 1974), pp. 189-99.

18. Custine, 1: 225-28; 344-49.

19. *Ibid.*, 267-68.

20. *Ibid.*, 259.

21. On the design and construction of the Mikhailovskii Castle, see V. K. Shuiskii, *Vinchentso Brenna* (Leningrad, 1986), pp. 120-64.

William Craft Brumfield is Professor of Slavic Studies at Tulane University, where he also lectures for the School of Architecture. A member of the Russian Academy of Architecture, he is the author and photographer of a number of books on Russian architecture, including: [Gold in Azure: One Thousand Years of Russian Architecture](#)

(Boston: David Godine, Publisher, 1983); The Origins of Modernism in Russian Architecture (Univ. of California Press, 1991); A History of Russian Architecture (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993), which The New York Times Book Review included in its "Notable Books of the Year 1993"; Lost Russia: Photographing the Ruins of Russian Architecture (Duke Univ. Press, 1995); and Landmarks of Russian Architecture: A Photographic Survey (Gordon and Breach Publishers, 1997). His photographs of Russian architecture, which have been exhibited in galleries and museums, are part of the collection of the Photographic Archives at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.