Anna Korndorf

Mnemonic Programmes of Eighteenth-century Russian Imperial Residences. Memory Metamorphoses

Architecture of the past is always a symbol of memory or oblivion. No other image of disrupted memory is as expressive as ruins reduced to dust: after all, the very definition of architecture as "monumental art" encapsulates the idea of effective, awakening memory (the Latin word "monumentum" is derived from the verb "monere" meaning "remember", 'know" and the ending "mentum" meaning "effective means". The monument is thus an "effective means of remembering")[1]. Many landmark phenomena in the history of European architecture and culture originated at the meeting point of memory and oblivion: the Tuscan Order came out of a basket left on a grave and overgrown with acanthus; the origin of Freemasonry and modern construction technologies is traced to the confrontation of memory and oblivion; and the same designs to revive the memory of earlier grandeur move a pair of compasses in the hand of an architect and the emperor's hand on the battlefield.

Structures and projects originally brought to life by the idea of memory occupy a special place in this continuous row of architectural and memorial associations. The history of art traditionally considers the link between architecture and memory on two planes: within the framework of studying memorial structures per se, the main function of which is to perpetuate

[1] The word "monument" meaning "tomb", "grave" was used in Romanic languages already in the late Middle Ages, but in a broader sense, as "a structure or building raised in memory of a notable person, act or event", first appeared in European usage at the turn of the 17th century. (Online Etymological Dictionary: http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=monumentum&searchmode=none)

the memory of the dead or events, and as part of the rhetorical tradition, which assigns the role of the image of loci to architectural forms serving to stimulate memory and embodying spiritual and gnoseological intentions[1].

Both traditions have a long history and each represents a range of architectural monuments of its own such as tombs, mausoleums and temples, on the one side, and hermetic theatres of memory, on the other. Even though *ars memoriae* that have continued to thrive in the modern age significantly extended possibilities for architectural reflection by bringing it into the orbit of rhetoric and turning it into a receptacle of philosophical and even magical knowledge of the universe, structures outside the aforementioned range rarely succeed in presenting a "mnemonic programme" as a semantic factor of their existence. This may partly be explained by the fact that the purely iconographical and nominal succession of some structures with respect to others that offers inexhaustible food for study addresses not so much the social as the "inner" memory of architecture and implies some living continuity of forms and images within the framework of the selected type, continuity that has not been reflected upon. Another point is no less important here, namely, addressing an already existing structure as a model presupposes not only its perception, but also interpretation by the architect and client as a sort of receptacle of meaning that the building erected "in the image and likeness" has to translate.

That is why I would like to share some thoughts arising from the rare meeting of these two methodological approaches. Formerly architecture historians focussed on the memorial and iconographical traditions proper, which provided formal material for the study of authorship and the paths of influence and borrowings, as well as the exploration of general historical and biographical themes. What is studied today is not merely the memorial programme of the structure or its iconographical continuity – the "genetic" memory of its architectural prototype – but the very phenomenon of *memoria* in the architectural programme, its nature and means of expression. In this sense, it may be fascinating to compare different "cultures of remembering" with their specific kinds of mnemotechnique that fix the cultural memory traditions characteristic of these cultures.

The concept of a "mnemonic programme" to be discussed on the basis of three major Russian countryside imperial residences of the 18th century does not presuppose any definite type of architectural structures and is rather an instrument of historical research. Speaking of individual

[1] The idea of using architectural structures as a mnemotechnical instrument goes back to Quintilian's Institutio oratoria. Classical *ars memoriae* presupposes choosing some spacious building having diverse premises and richly decorated with statues, niches, etc. A certain visual image of the forthcoming speech is associated with every one of them, and in order to refresh the memory of it and recite it precisely, it will be enough for the orator to mentally go step-by-step through the building chosen for memorisation, extracting from the engraved places images placed in them in strict order.

buildings or entire architectural complexes as receptacles of "mnemonic programmes", we chart a certain way of studying them. It is believed that the discovery of an idea of memory in the architectural programme, an idea recognised by contemporaries (client, designer, visitors) but at times vague and hidden from descendants, makes it possible to tap into any new semantic level of the structure, one directly connected with the personal "story" of its creator and, more broadly, reflecting the "historical experience" and way of thinking of the period in general, together with relevant social actions. Of special heuristic value are not only the formal and iconographical analyses of architecture, but also the detection of the social context and relations in which those structures appear and function.

Therefore, the mnemonic component of 18th-century Russian imperial residences can be viewed as a mode of thinking and acting characteristic of the period and institutionalising an approach to memorial projects, and for this reason should be discussed comprehensively: from the memorial point of view as remembrance of something, from the iconographical point of view as addressing the architectural prototypes which can serve as a visual "recollection" of an object of memory or an "approach" to it, and from the historico-philosophical point of view as a means of translating and visualising cultural meanings and views of the period.

Strictly speaking, sacred architecture could be the only kind of commemorative architecture in pre-Petrine Russia. From the outset, the idea of building a dedicatory or votive church was to commemorate one event or saint or another. The tradition persisted under Peter the Great, but, like many other spheres, was complemented with certain novelties. The first to appear were occasional monuments such as triumphal arches, columns and tombs that mostly celebrated military victories in the Azov and Northern campaigns[1]. However, overall Peter was content with the old tradition of "cult" memorials and tried to enrich it not by building monuments and obelisks (regarded as "pagan monsters" and therefore tabooed by the Orthodox Church), but by transferring their memorial function to other secular structures that were legitimate from the Christian point of view.

One of these was the Lower Garden ensemble at Peterhof, which was built at Peter's will and under his untiring supervision between 1714 and 1725 and included three pavilions: the Monplaisir Palace, the Hermitage and Marly.

Their construction was long thought to be linked inseparably with the tsar's artistic impressions from visiting the country palaces of French royalty, Versailles and the Chateau de Marly. However, in the past few years scholars have succeeded in identifying the iconographical prototype for

[1] There is a hypothesis that the first triumphal gate in Russian history was built in honour of Peter the Great's father, Tsar Alexis, in Vilno.

every one of these pavilions. The Monplaisir Palace, founded in 1714, was modelled after a small palace of the same name in Schwedt on the River Oder that Peter had the pleasure of seeing in July 1712[1].

The Hermitage Pavilion intended for secluded banquets and equipped with a mechanically hoisted table turned out to have been inspired by Peter's visit to the Eremitagen hunting lodge of King Frederik IV of Denmark in Dyrehaven, Jægersborg, North Copenhagen[2].And finally, Marly, the last pavilion built in parallel with the Hermitage, was conceived as an allusion to the Schloss Monbijou of King Frederick William I of Prussia and his consort Sophia Dorothea on the north bank of the River Spree outside Berlin, where Peter accompanied by Catherine and his retinue spent several days in September 1717. Small wonder that under Peter the new pavilion was called the Monbijou House, or Lusthaus[3]; after the emperor's death the ensemble was called Marly, after the neighbouring Marly Cascade, which was indeed modelled after the grand central cascade at the Marly-le-Roi Park of the French king.[7]

Moreover it has become clear that there was something additional to every pavilion concept, namely, a general memorial architectural programme, perhaps spontaneous yet clearly reflecting the military-political history of Russia through the prism of personal impressions of her monarch. After all, no matter who was commissioned to build "Lusthäuser" and fountains for Peter – A. Schluter, J. Braunstein or A. Leblond – Peter always remained the chief architect and author of the overall garden concept.

In that programme every pavilion of the Lower Garden, which in the eyes of the emperor and his retinue was linked directly with its European prototype, was assigned the role of a commemorative sign, a sort of "memorial landmark" in the grandiose foreign policy project to expand Russian territory on the Baltic Sea, which became the cause of Peter's life.

I will risk suggesting that one of the decisive factors in Peter's choice of the Brandenburg Monplaisir as the model for his favourite country residence was not so much the impression produced by the palace architecture as an event that happened there. It was in Schwedt on the Oder that Prussia signed the Treaty of Schwedt and thus joined the anti-Swedish coalition, and the personal sympathy between Peter and Frederick William I, who had

[1] S.B. Gorbatenko was the first scholar to draw attention to the similarities between the layouts of the ensembles of the Brandenburg Monplaisir and the initial sketch of the Peterhof Monplaisir drawn personally by Peter in 1713 or early 1714. Gorbatenko, S.B., Petergofskii Monplaisir – plod nemetskikh assotsiatsii Petra I (The Peterhof Monplaisir – the Result of Peter the Great's German Associations) / *Russia – Germany. Communication Space*. Papers of the 10th Tsarskoye Selo Conference, St Petersburg, 2004, p. 133.

[2] The pavilion was built in 1694 by Hans van Steenwinckel the Younger, court architect of King Christian V of Denmark.

[3] Dubiago, T.B. *Russkiye reguliarnye sady i parki* (Regular Russian Gardens and Parks), Leningrad, 1963, p. 141.

just gained the royal title, promised to grow not only into a strong military alliance, but also into friendship between two heads of state[1].

Rapprochement with Prussia was a matter of special importance to Peter, who had nurtured plans to influence "German affairs" from the early 1710s and sought to establish close contacts with the duchies along the Baltic coast. His plans were dictated by the political and commercial interests of Russia, which wanted to consolidate its position on the Baltic coast. There was another reason: through political and matrimonial arrangements Peter sought if not to gain the status of member of the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation, then at least to have an opportunity to bring pressure to bear on the other electors. The tsar thought that would add stability to Russian international standing and guarantee continuous support from Austria and other German states in the event of a Swedish revanche or Turkish attack. One of the means of attaining those goals was to be dynastic marriages[2] and another – a stronger alliance with Prussia and Saxony.

The Monplaisir construction project was launched when Peter, pinning great hopes on the Northern Union, expected a tipping point in the Northern War any moment and thought his victory was near at hand. Although his hopes failed to materialise, Monplaisir became for the tsar a memory of his first milestone success in the Northern campaign[3]. Contemporaries[4] were aware of the Prussian connotations of the Peterhof Monplaisir for quite a while, yet nevertheless the Monplaisir construction project was unlikely to have consciously aimed to perpetuate Russian diplomatic success in the memorial programme of the Lower Garden pavilions. One can think that Peter conceived such a plan only in 1721, when peaceful talks

[1] The Baths of Agrippina cascade, the second largest at Marly-le-Roi, served as the prototype for the Ruin Cascade in the Peterhof Lower Garden.

[2] Under the Treaty of Schwedt concluded on 6 October 1713, Prussian troops were to be deployed immediately in Stettin and on lands between the Oder and the Peene, "sequestrating" the area as a neutral force until the two warring parties withdrew their armed forces. The Prussian contingent occupied Stettin the following day, 7 October. The war came close to the borders of Brandenburg and East Pomerania, giving the Russian tsar reasons to hope for a speedy and victorious end to the operation. As it is the case with any international treaty, secret articles were the main points of the Treaty of Schwedt. These stipulated that in exchange for shouldering the Russian and Saxony military expenses in Pomerania Prussia was to get full power over the "sequestrated" Pomeranian lands at the forthcoming peace talks.

[3] In 1710 Peter married his niece Anna Ioannovna to the Duke of Courland, in 1711 his son Alexis to the Princess of Brunswick-Wolfenbuttel, sister-in-law of the German emperor, and in 1716 another niece Catherine to the Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin. One more matrimonial union on which Peter pinned great hopes was in the making – the marriage of Charles Frederick of Holstein-Gottorp (nephew of King Charles XII of Sweden thought most likely to succeed to the Swedish throne) and tsesarevna Anna Petrovna formalised in 1725, already after Peter's death.

[4] During his second tour abroad Peter even commissioned a Schwedt Palace complex plan for his own library. This plan dated December 1717 now forms part of Peter's drawing collection at the library of the Russian Academy of Sciences (NIOR, F° 266, t.5, l.7.).

with Sweden were drawing to a close and after a seven-year break the tsar decided to go on with the Peterhof construction project.

Thus, the Hermitage was a tribute to the memory of the most glorious episode of the Northern War, when on board the *Ingermanlandia* the Russian tsar left Denmark, spearheading 70 ships of the united Russian-Danish-English-Dutch fleet. On 5 August 1715, the largest European squadron set out under the imperial standard towards Bornholm to deal a decisive blow on the Swedish troops and move the theatre of operations from the Baltic Sea to the territory of Sweden itself. The operation, which had taken several months to prepare, was fruitless, yet Peter could not forget that moment of European recognition of his talent as a military leader and Russian glory, even despite the overall fiasco of the landing operation in Scania, which was meant to force Charles XII to speedily seek peace and thus become a turning point in the Northern War.

In a bid to stress the link between his pavilion and the historic event, Peter not only used as an iconographical model the Danish king's Hermitage, in the environs of which, tired of waiting for the operation to begin and of his three-month-long stay in Copenhagen, he repeatedly went hunting, but also issued a special order "in Peterhof... at the Hermitage to make two oak balconies, like those on the *Ingermanlandia* ship, with iron railings of pure work on the windows" of exactly the same design as on the ship. To this end, the master Michel was to make a sketch of the railing on the Baltic fleet flagship. This seemingly insignificant episode bespeaks the importance Peter attached to the sole moment of his triumph in that rather inglorious operation due to the allies' indecision. The Hermitage on the Baltic Sea coast was meant to provide a memory of the tsar's visit to Denmark and simultaneously act as a symbol of Russian naval might.

Finally, Marly-Monbijou[1], the last pavilion of the Lower Garden, again actualized the Prussian connotations of Peter's foreign policy and was to serve as a reminder of Peter's stay at the Monbijou in Berlin in the autumn of 1717 as a guest of the Prussian Crown that was exceptionally promising

[1] For example, the French envoy Jacques de Campredon wrote in a report to his king on 8 September 1723: "The tsar and the prince settled in the small house built in the garden on the sea coast and called Monplaisir in imitation of a similar house near Berlin..." Cit. Arkhipov, N.I., Raskin, A.G., *Petrodvorets*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1961, p. 170. For the sake of justice, it is worth noting that in this often quoted account the French diplomat who was in Prussia only in transit either made a topographical mistake (because Schwedt is not near Berlin but 85 kilometres away, which by Germany's standards is a big distance and, what is more, it is in Brandenburg), or he meant a different castle. Gorbatenko believes that Campredon meant the Monbijou Palace outside Berlin. However, in my opinion, for a person of the early 18th century the "nominalist" aspect was more important than a purely iconographical one and mentioning a similar "monplaisir" meant more than giving its exact location. It is precisely the same name that is a guarantee of the correctly understood continuity.

from the political point of view[1]. What was more, Peter planned to play another card in the tricky North European political game while the pavilion was under construction. He placed his stake on the young Duke Charles-Frederick Holstein-Gottorp (nephew of King Charles XII of Sweden, considered the most likely successor to the Swedish throne) who owing to an alliance with Prussia managed to regain Holstein, which been occupied by Denmark. In June 1721 on Peter's invitation the Duke came to Petersburg as a bridegroom of one of the tsar's daughters (Peter had yet to decide which one) and was used as a trump of Russian diplomacy in discussing the terms of the Russo-Swedish treaty concluded on 22 February 1724. In November the same year Charles-Frederick was finally betrothed to Tsesarevna Anna Petrovna and married her in 1725 after Peter's death. Other structures of the Lower Garden were also assigned their role in that "memory theatre"[2].

Thus, the last of the Peterhof pavilions built by Peter – the secluded Hermitage banquet pavilion equipped with the latest technology and the Marly guest house – were not only prompted by reminiscences of the nearly two-year-long journey of the "tsar's delegation" across Northern and Central Europe, but were conceived as mnemonic images of sorts, of the places

[1] It was Geyrot who first suggested in his *Opisaniye Peterhofa* (Description of Peterhof, 1868) the idea that the images of the country estate of King Frederick William of Prussia had been the source of inspiration for the Peterhof Marly ensemble, the suggestion Gorbatenko echoed later on. At first glance, the small one-storeyed Monbijou Palace, built by Eosander von Göthe the way it was known from the copy of the castle master plan and façade specially commissioned by Peter in 1717, has little in common with the pavilion built in the western part of the Peterhof Lower Garden. Meanwhile, it is important to consider two circumstances. First, Monbijou was rebuilt in 1717, and second, the original Marly plan underwent a number of radical changes in the course of construction. For instance, on Peter's orders a second floor initially not planned was added. Moreover, Peter interpreted rather freely most of the prototypes of his construction projects and reworked them to suit his taste. To follow the spirit rather than the letter, that is, the formal features of the model, was in general a tendency characteristic of the baroque. Therefore, speaking of the Marly construction project primarily in the context of its commemorative function, its link with the Prussian source, will be just as obvious as with the French namesake. All the more so since the same Marly-le-Roi Palace, Louis XIV's favourite residence, served as the prototype for the Prussian Monbijou Palace and the Copenhagen Hermitage.
Despite the later displeasure of the Prussian royal family with the behaviour of the Russian tsar and his retinue, as attested by the well-known eloquent memoirs of Wilhelmina, Peter himself was more than satisfied with the visit and the "grand assemblies" held in his honour at the castle. Furthermore, a mere month earlier an agreement had been

[2] Despite the later displeasure of the Prussian royal family with the behaviour of the Russian tsar and his retinue, as attested by the well-known eloquent memoirs of Wilhelmina, Peter himself was more than satisfied with the visit and the "grand assemblies" held in his honour at the castle. Furthermore, a mere month earlier an agreement had been reached with France and Prussia in Amsterdam providing for the propitious mediation of the two powers in the conclusion of a peace treaty between Russia and Sweden and obliging France to stop giving financial support to Charles XII.

associated with events of paramount importance to Russian prestige, and of the allied states that had largely ensured the Russian tsar's victory. In all likelihood Peter had been nurturing his construction plans ever since his return, but could get down to implementing them only when the outcome of the Northern War had been determined. The Russian tsar, who had just gained the title of emperor, could now devote time and effort to transforming his official residence to match his new status while his memories of meeting the monarchs of European power were touched by tones of his retrospective amicable alliance with them.

The idea to link the new structures with Russian foreign policy events in the wake of the Swedish treaty post factum included the Monplaisir in the common semantic field of the mnemonic programme. This additive principle of creating a whole ensemble by gradually building one independent structure and adding it to another was not new for either European or traditional Russian architecture. What was new was rather the ability of baroque mentality to form a special configuration out of the incipient mutual ties and mutual reflection of the connected projects.

This ability of parts to mutually reflect one another and produce a holistic semantic response, which was later on matched by Leibniz's monadology, proved a remarkable way of organising architecture that was discovered and put to use in the baroque period. The seeming lack of inner unity and integrity of the concept always presupposes a certain elusive layer in such architecture capable of setting a programme for the entire whole, be it the numerical ratios of the structure or a rhetorical paradigm. In our case, the unity of the whole is established by the integrated space of the tsar's personal memory, which incorporates everything there is in it, no matter how multifarious it could be. After all, according to Leibniz, it is memory that develops a quality of the power enabling the universe to hold the singular. However, baroque memory is not yet subjective, and the world cannot be experienced or reproduced within "I". As before, memory retains its ontological status and comes from being itself, as it were, overlaying man from without. It is before him and near at hand, like everything that comes his way, but not inside the interiorised historical process. That is why the emblem becomes the chief memory operation tool for the baroque, ensuring the mystery of communication and the perceptive equilibrium of "individual experience" and the objectivised world of the universals. The very possibility of such emblematic memory is ensured by the continuous allegorical interpretation of all things and phenomena, the tradition of "significative speech", which goes back to the historical sources of rhetoric and overlapping the baroque period.

The internal organisation of the architectural memorial programme fully stems from this type of memory. All the immediate impressions of life, including architecture, are invariably mediated semantically; any remembrance acquires representative symptoms and includes a historico-philosophical plane. Any situation jells up, transforming into a visual scheme that is there and then and becoming interpreted rhetorically and

moralistically, turning into an emblem that expresses a general allegorical meaning. Therefore real events so easily transform into emblematic pictures of fireworks, multipart allegories of school plays or decorative gates celebrating Peter's victories and the other way round. Especially characteristic in this respect are commemorative emblems of the names of Peter's ships[1].

The architectural programme of Peterhof manifests this memory principle just as clearly. The tsar's memories of visiting residences of European monarchs and the events there refracted through the structure of mediatory functions come across as a set of architectural images requiring an additional verbal explanation. Just as an emblem does not appear arbitrarily at its "inventor's" whim, but draws on the rhetorical lexicon of ready-made image words known from a multitude of relevant collections, so the already existing architectural prototype adapts itself to its objectives and is filled with its "own" memorial meaning. Even if the tsar just liked a certain building or its function, he could not mechanically transfer and reproduce it on his soil, but was bound to attach some meaning to it. That is why the building would necessarily get a meaningful name, or rather it is perceived already together with its name, inseparable from it and its function, just as word and motto are inseparable from the pictorial image of the emblem.

The transformation of an architectural project into an emblem presupposes not merely the contiguity of image and word, that is, a telltale name that is simultaneously a motto revealing the function ("my pleasure", "hermit's hut", etc.), but above all an image with a meaning to be sought, an image to be unravelled and that inevitably has an exegetical aura to it, if indistinct. The architectural prototype with its iconographical details turns out to be secondary in such a programme; it comes to mind not as a self-sufficient artefact, but as a function of the whole and exists not within itself, but within the framework of the semantic relationship with the situation in which Peter saw and received it.

The way today's historian sees the events of the Northern War most likely differs from the way its participants saw it, and it is therefore noteworthy that looking for iconographical images for his new garden ideas Peter turned to architectural impressions outside the mainstream of Russian foreign policy. It does not matter whether the historical events that impressed the tsar were significant or insignificant in historical perspective: they reveal wholly subjectively the hidden growth of memory in the tsar as a political figure and man, and in his attitude to the world that man is to master. The memory of them perpetuated in the architectural programme

[1] There is, among other things, Peter's exact instruction about the cascades: "The Grand Cascade is to be made in every way the same as the Marly cascade which is across from the royal chambers. Its proportions can be found in the manuscript rather than printed book, of which there are two in my summer house". To carry through this project, Braunstein did not confine himself to the manuscript presented to Peter during his tour, but ordered requisite blueprints through the chief commissar Ulian Sinavin in France.

of Peterhof is not washed away by the flow of time and does not die away, yet it remains a hermetically closed balanced system.

The situation when a person has to maintain a balance between his personal actions and collective memory ends in Russia in the mid-18th century. In the reign of Catherine the Great the idea of memory representation breaks through the boundaries of emblematic thinking, which finds expression in the Empress's famous declarative rejection of the old memorialisation schemes. Preparing festivities to perpetuate the signing of the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca for contemporaries and descendants, Catherine angrily lashes out in a letter to Grimm at the traditional repertory of architectural mnemonics: "A festival agenda has been drafted, and it is the same as ever: a temple of Janus and a temple of Bacchus, and a temple of a small-time devil and his grandma, …outdated obnoxious allegories…" she wrote.

The Empress was right: now that the *Encyclopédie* had established memory's role as "mother" historia "which connects us with the past centuries, showing a picture of evils and virtues, knowledge and errors, and passes information about us on to the future centuries" (D'Alembert), while the relations of the temporary and eternity had changed radically in the bosom of memory, new effective means of memory representation were needed. From that moment onwards memory captured spontaneously not what there was but what was destined to be as "something significant" and worthy of "being perpetuated"; embodying not an event that happened (as one of the moments added up in time into a sum of such individual moments) or an impression, but the fate of the epoch and the fate of time. Erasing borders between themselves, time and history transform into the continuous infinity of historical memory. The objectification of memory for eternity goes beyond the boundaries of current time and even epoch itself and for this reason needs its meaning to be visually clarified in detail. Architecture ceases to be emblematic and starts "talking", while memory itself is transformed from emblematic to creative.

This simple yet decisive characteristic sets monuments of Catherine's epoch apart from all those types of commemoration that the preceding generations had been used to. All the earlier architectural programmes dealt with memory looking back or upwards to the universe, memory, as it were, recollecting the past or a new embodiment of the eternal, a continuation and interpretation of what had happened or was preset in the present. Instead they were the final point of memory coming from an old myth or tradition to the succeeding present; memoria, the continuing existence of which they sought to fix. In Catherine's architectural programmes memory does not stop at legitimising the present, but looks forward into the future. The projects undertaken by Catherine aimed not so much to build a bridge of tradition from the past to contemporaneity, or to support the myth of "*translatio imperia*" that was relevant to Catherine as addressed to the future from the present. That vector was also characteristic of Catherine's political projects. Now if the traditional political postulate "Moscow is the Third Rome and a fourth there will not be" is a metaphor oriented to

the past, the new "Greek Project" is a call made to the future to liberate Constantinople from the barbarians, to overthrow the Ottoman Porte and revive the Orthodox Greek Kingdom under the aegis of the Russian monarch.

That is why the main goal of Catherine's monuments is to create an image of the present that would address future descendants, project a memory of today in advance to influence the shaping of that future and stake out a place there beforehand. An idea quite worthy of the Enlightenment Age. The Empress not only creates the first "real" monument in Russian history – the Bronze Horseman, columns and obelisks – but it is in her reign that the very word "pamyatnik" (monument) comes into general use in today's commonly recognised sense. It is noteworthy that in the 1750s dictionaries still "do not know" such a notion, and when Mikhail Lomonosov publishes his rendering of Horace's famous 3.30 ode, he gives his poem the title "Monumentum"[1] and starts with a paraphrase defining the expression "sign of immortality", which is absent from the Russian language. In the 1780s, when Falconet was working on the statue of Peter the Great, the words "monument" and "pamyatnik" were used almost interchangeably, and when Garviil Derzhavin translated the same ode of Horace at the end of the century, he conclusively chose the word "Pamyatnik" for the title.

Such vigorous interest in the problem of memory and the possible ways of immortalising it, from historical writings and collecting folklore to a rage for erecting monuments on the graves of favourite horses and dogs, of course, was not inspired "from above". The opposite is more likely:

[1] The symbolic/allegorical naming of ships of the Russian navy and elucidating the symbol were common practice borrowed from Western Europe. It became especially popular after Peter had returned from his first journey abroad, where he had developed a passion for emblems, symbols and allegories. Here are but a few names and mottos of Russian ships: the *Bomb* with the motto "Woe to whoever gets me"; the *Tortoise*, "Patience will let you see the job done"; the *Sleeping Lion*, "Her heart is on guard"; the *Sword*, "Show me the essence of the laurel wreath"; and *Three Cups*, "Stick to measure in all things". The mottos and names were frequently written together on the stern and for this reason ships were often referred to by their mottos on a par with their names: for instance, the order to the Azov Fleet of 26 July 1700 reads, "…Captain Ivan Beckman to be given half a sagene of firewood to boil tar for each of the three convoy ships named *"By his death will ye be healed"*, the *Fortress* and *Door Open*. [3]. That is, the first of the ships mentioned in the order, the *Scorpion*, was referred to by its motto rather than by name. According to documental evidence, Peter and his lieutenants borrowed many names and mottos from popular West European books of heraldry and emblem collections. Beyond doubt, the book *Symbols and Emblemata* printed in Amsterdam (1705) on Peter's special commission played the role of the main reference book. As most of the shipbuilders and naval officers invited from abroad did not know Russian, for better mutual understanding many ships had two or more names, most frequently a Russian name and its translation into Dutch, English, German or French, e.g. *Baran* (Ram) – *Trommel*, *Yozh* (Hedgehog) – *Egel*, and *Kamen* (Stone) – *Stein*. There were ships with three to four names: *Soedinenie – Unia* – Einigkeit, *Bezboiazn – Sonderban – Sonderfrest – Onderfrest*, or even six names: *Blagoe nachalo – Blagoslovennoe nachalo – Blagoe nachinanie* (Good/Auspicious Beginning/Start) – *Gut anfagen – Gut begin – De segel begin* (http://sailhistory.ru/petrships.html)

Catherine's attention to perpetuating memory was a tribute to the pan-European fad.

Man's sudden awareness of the continuous and unidirectional historical process and the plenitude of masonic and mystic doctrines gave an extraordinary boost to the ideas of memory-related architectural structures in Europe. Tombs and cemeteries became practically the most popular theme of architectural fantasies and then real architecture. The widespread megalomania that captured the minds of architects led to the appearance of two new types of memorial structures: cenotaphs and memorial temples. The first cenotaph[1], designed by Étienne-Louis Boullée in the form of a giant sphere, was dedicated to Sir Isaac Newton, a great mystic and "mechanic of the Universe", whereas all the subsequent cenotaphs lacked any particular dedication and conveyed an abstract idea of memory stripped of anything transitory.

No less notable was Claude-Nicolas Ledoux's Temple of Memory in the Ideal City of Chaux, just as utopian in its grandiosity. Its centrally planned cruciform structure rising in ledges like a ziggurat with obelisks at the sides is reminiscent of the numerous reconstructions of Solomon's Temple. Representations of mythological scenes with heroic deeds by women covered the columns, and the temple as a whole was dedicated to motherhood and women regenerating a world ruined by warriors. For Ledoux his Ideal City of Chaux was a symbol of the shaping of a new man and a new world that he conceived as the alchemist's crystal of knowledge. In that way, under the impact of masonic ideas, the memorial temple transformed from a means of presenting all human knowledge and a method of memorising speeches into an education tool. At that time the masonic lodge itself – both as a spiritual structure and the ideal architectural project – was frequently conceived in the categories of the memorial temple[2].

It was within the framework of the above and similar ideas that Catherine conceived her own mnemonic architectural programme embodied in the complex of structures dedicated to the Russo-Turkish war and erected in the 1770s at the Empress' favourite summer residence of Tsarskoye Selo. Just as the Peterhof Lower Garden programme, that programme drew inspiration from Russian successes in the theatre of military operations. However, this fact makes the difference between them all the more obvious.

[1] The first Russian translation of Horace's Ode 3.30 *To Melpomene* (Exegi monumentum aere perennius…) written in 23 B.C. The best known of all odes by Horace, it serves as an epilogue to the three books of odes that formed a separate collection. Horace wrote and published the fourth book of odes much later. The ode was also translated and emulated by Gavriil Derzhavin (*Pamyatnik*), Konstantin Batyushkov (*In Imitation of Horace*), Alexander Pushkin (*Ya pamyatnik sebe vozdvig nerukotvornyi…*), Valery Bryusov (*Pamyatnik "Moi pamyatnik stoit, iz strof sozvuchnykh slozhen…"*), Afanasy Fet (*"Vozdvig ya pamyatnik vechnee medi prochnoi…"*), A.P. Semenov-Tian-Shansky, etc.

[2] Legend has it that the earliest cenotaphs (the Greek for "empty tombs") were built by Oriental rulers next to the only real one in order to confuse the robbers who would thus take too long to look for the right mound where the king with sundry material valuables had been buried.

The idea of commemorating the triumph of Russian arms with relevant monuments occurred to the Empress almost simultaneously with the outbreak of the war. Moreover, the first of these monuments – the Ruin Tower at Tsarskoye Selo (Yuri Felten, 1771) – was to outline her aims and become a graphic symbol of the entire "Greek Project". The Ruin Tower "formed, as it were, a part of antique ruins buried underground with a small Turkish superstructure as an allegory of great Greece half asleep under Ottoman rule"[1]. It consists of a cyclopean-size Tuscan column sunk in the ground with a Gothic pavilion on top. A massive wall cut with a similarly huge arch abuts the column. The entire structure is made of red brick with cracks and dents on its surface to create the impression of age. The structure would hardly be associated with the Turkish theme were it not for the inscription on the arch keystone: "This stone was erected in 1768 in memory of the war declared on Russia by the Turks".

Every victory added something new to the Empress' triumphal memorial programme. The Orlov Gate, the Chesme Column, the Crimean Column and the Kagul Obelisk built in the 1770s to the design of Antonio Rinaldi consistently embodied the theme of antiquity as a "talking" memory accumulated in the space of the Tsarskoye Selo park to tell descendants about the victories scored by the enlightened Empress over the "barbarians". Raised in the middle of the Great Pond, the Chesme Column[2] made the pond a symbol of the battle scene, transforming it into the water space that now played the role of the Mediterranean, now the Black Sea in different spatial allegories, depending on interaction with different monuments dedicated to one victory or another. Catherine the Great wrote: "When this war is continued, my Tsarskoye Selo garden will look like a toy, with a decent monument erected in it after every glorious military deed. The Battle of Kagul … gave birth to an obelisk with an inscription … the naval battle of Chesma produced the Rostral Column in the Great Pond, the conquest of the Crimea and troop

[1] Compared with the memory systems of Giordano Bruno or Guilio Camillo, the masonic lodge is a very simple memory temple. In fact, it is intended to obtain the initiation effect by memorising the images and symbols perceived in the course of physical movement "through" the temple-lodge. Every degree corresponds to one of the aspects of this temple. For instance, Apprenticeship is connected with the "remembrance" of the place of man in the cosmic scheme of things, in the macrocosm. The degree of Fellow-craft takes the initiated down from heaven to earth and corresponds to movement in the material word. The degree of Master makes it possible to descend even deeper into oneself, into the microcosm of the human psyche. Therefore the art of memory has remained an inalienable part of masonic initiation. The initiation method itself is called upon, on the one hand, to interiorize the memory temple in one's soul, and on the other, to create a corresponding atmosphere in the Lodge so that the spiritual road in this temple replete with symbols serves as a memory of the mystical edifice promised in the eternal "home" not of human making in heaven. In this way the Lodge managed to combine the virtual Memory Temple, the imaginary Temple of Solomon and concrete fixed memorial places full of symbolical images referencing these two loci.

[2] Shvidkovskii, D.O. *Yekaterina II: Arkhitekturnaya biografiya* (Catherine II: An Architectural Biography), Proyekt-Klassika, I–$5MI, Inorodnoye telo, Moscow, 2001, p. 136.

landing at Morea have been equally commemorated in other places … I have also ordered construction of the Memory Temple in the woods, where all the events of that war are represented on medallions".

The line from the Ode *To the Seizure of Ochakov*, "In plashes will you enter Hagia Sophia", was the key to the allegory encapsulated in the triumphal part of the ensemble. The phrase meant that the Russian troops would cross the Black Sea and occupy Constantinople, and was matched by the created architectural picture. Charles Cameron built the St Sophia Cathedral beyond the lake with the Rostral Column, the naval victory symbol. In the 18th century, it was thought to be a replica of the Hagia Sophia of Constantinople. Thus, the meaning of the park included the political future, the downfall of Turkey and the formation of the Greek Empire in lieu of the former Byzantium. Catherine's second grandson Constantine was expected to ascend the new throne: he had been named after Constantine the Great, the founder of Byzantium.

Representing the future in a park ensemble was a rarity in the 18th century, but even more noteworthy was the fact that at its heart was the perverted idea of future-oriented memory. Any Russian Enlightenment monument, therefore, had "the overarching objective" to engrave in the public mind a certain concept of history that would legitimise the political goals and moral principles of the time. It was that "content" that remained pivotal to the architectural programmes throughout Catherine's epoch, which had as a distinguishing feature not the emblematic allegorical, but the "talking" component of architecture, to quote Ledoux. The Tsarskoye Selo programme culminated in the official celebration of the Kucuk-Kainarca peace treaty[1], which took place on Khodynskoye Pole in Moscow in 1775 but condensed in an instantaneous impression the memorial idea of the Tsarskoye Selo ensemble, which had taken years to jell, with all the visual didactics of occasional properties architecture.

The discussion of different ways in which monuments and buildings were used in the memorial practice of 18th-century Russian imperial residences and memory metamorphoses can be concluded with another characteristic example. I mean the way the Pavlovsk Park ensemble formed in the 1880s, after the heir to the Russian throne, Grand Duke Paul, and his wife Maria Feodorovna had returned from their two-year-long incognito journey across Europe under the pseudonyms of "the Count and Countess Severny".

On Catherine's request N.B. Yusupov drafted the itinerary, which played a significant role in the creation of the Pavlovsk ensemble and those of other residences of the heir. It was not only because Grand Duke Paul and

[1] Although the column erected by Antonio Rinaldi in honour of the victory of the Russian navy over the Turks in the Battle of Chesma looked like the monument commemorating Lord Grenville's naval victories in the English Stowe Park, which may have been given by the Empress to the architect as a prototype to follow, the Tsarskoye Selo monument was made more formidable and had the pictorial aspect of its allegorical content emphasized. Rinaldi put the rostral column on a powerful stone basement in the form of a separate manmade island.

Maria Feodorovna returned from the Grand Tour with plentiful artistic impressions and trunks full of books, furniture, porcelain, bronzes, tapestries, paintings, clothes and jewellery. Rather what mattered was that ever since that time Pavlovsk and Gatchina developed actively to suit their owners' tastes and could be considered a special space formed in parallel with Catherine's epoch, but according to its own laws of a different incoming era. In this respect another memory metamorphosis that found expression in the architectural programme of the park pavilions built by Charles Cameron in Pavlovsk is quite noteworthy.

Now if Gatchina is more associated with the heir, Pavlovsk was the pet project of the would-be empress, who devoted forty years of her life to turning its alleys into her "memory routes", according to a figural expression of a contemporary. Even though he said this in the 19th century, already in the 1780s the architectural programme of the Pavlovsk Park prioritised sentimental commemorative tokens meant to touch the heart and awaken memory that had already recognised itself as such and in this sense become a key concept of sentimentalism. Embodied in architectural form, memorial signs can gather reflections, serve the rational purposes of re-creating antique specimens or, on the contrary, encourage a Rousseauist flight back to nature, but in any case, they become meaningful only when one reaches out to the very heart in the world of psychologically experienced memory. The focus of attention is steadily shifting from being and recognition of the value of the current historical situation to the inner state of man, his affects and emotions, because now a person is increasingly turning from "man" in general into a psychologically dissected soul. In his book on Rousseau Jean Starobinski introduces the notion "memory herbarism", meaning a special mechanism of memory operation in preserving its signs.

During his walks, Rousseau gathers flowers and plants and then arranges them in his herbarium. When he leafs through his herbarium after some time, recollections crowd in on him. Looking at a concrete plant, Rousseau mentally revisits the place he took it from. The flower becomes a "recollecting sign" [signe mémoratif]. Examining his herbarium, Rousseau awakens memories of his walks and the dreams that accompanied them, and relives the same feelings with the same intensity. Thus a commemorative token exists to commit impressions to memory and at the same time give access to memory. Now if Rousseau has dried plants picked at a certain place and preserved between book pages for such commemorative tokens, taking Pavlovsk as an example, we can see that an architectural form is as good a memory souvenir as can be. A plant from his herbarium revives in Jean-Jacques an image of a sunlit landscape and a wonderful journey and causes him in his current state of mind to recreate the former state of his soul, thus "…la plante aura *servi*, mais à une fin purement intérieure: elle aura rendu Jean-Jacques à Jean-Jacques. Le *signe mémoratif* est donc une médiation, mais qui intervient pour établir la présence immédiate du souvenir. On peut parler ici de médiation régressive, puisque loin de provoquer un dépassement de l'expérience sensible, elle consiste à la réveiller dans

son intégralité; il ne s'agit que de revivre un moment antérieur, tel qu'il fut vécu, sans y surajouter en effort de connaissance qui chercherait à saisir l'essence du tempes. La fleur sèche, plus efficace que toute réflexion, provoque le surgissement spontané d'une image du passé dans une conscience qui se veut passive. Retrouvée dans l'herbier, elle renvoie Jean-Jacques à lui-même et à son bonheur lointaine, à la belle journée où il s'est mis en route pour découvrir le spécimen rare qui lui manquait"[1] [...serves exclu-

[1] The peace treaty of Kucuk-Kainarca between Russia and the Ottoman Empire brought to an end the first Russo-Turkish war and reasserted Russia's territorial gains within the framework of the earlier Belgrade peace treaty of 1739. In peaceful conditions, Russian merchant ships enjoyed the same privileges as the French and English vessels in Turkish waters; Russia received the right to have its fleet on the Black Sea and was allowed passage through the Bosporus and the Dardanelles. Celebrations were to be held in Moscow. The Empress personally drafted the scenario. Here is what she wrote in this connection in a letter to Grimm: "One beautiful morning I summoned my architect Bazhenov and told him: 'My dear Bazhenov, three versts away from town there is a meadow, imagine, this meadow is the Black Sea ...two roads lead there from the town – one of these roads will be Tanais (the ancient name of the Don. – D. Sh.) and the other Borisphen (the Dniepre. – D. Sh.); in the estuary of the former you will build a dining-room and call it Azov; and in the estuary of the other you will organize a theatre and call it Kinburn. You will outline the Crimean Peninsula with sand and put up there Kerch and Enikale, the two ballrooms; to the left of the Don you will place a refreshment-bar with wine and meat for the people, and opposite the Crimea you will switch on fireworks to represent the joy of the two empires at the conclusion of peace. Beyond the Danube you will make fireworks and on the land that is to stand for the Black Sea your will put up illuminated boats and ships; you will decorate the shores of the rivers to be represented by roads with landscapes, mills, trees, illumined houses, and there you will have a festival without any contrivance, but beautiful and especially natural...

"...I have forgotten to tell you that to the right of the Don there will be a fair named Taganrog. True, that the sea on solid ground does not quite make sense, but excuse me this shortcoming" (Shvidkovskii, D.O. *Charlz Kameron i arkhitektura imperatorskikh rezidentsii* (Charles Cameron and the Architecture of Imperial Residences). Moscow, Ulei, 2008, p. 304). Apparently, the Empress and the architect discussed the specifics of all structures expected to be built for the triumphant festivities. It was thanks to that discussion that the new artistic language of the Russian Enlightenment started to develop. Bazhenov was in charge of the Khodynskoye Pole festivities design, enlisting the services of his disciple M.F. Kazakov to make drawings and build pavilions. The festivities lasted several days and were said "to have been engraved in public memory for long". Furthermore, the "talking" architectural language evolved in the course of the 1775 festivities on Khodynskoye meadow formed the groundwork of a number of construction projects, including the imperial Petrovsky Palace (M. Kazakov, 1775–82) and Tsaritsyno Palace (V. Bazhenov, M. Kazakov, 1775–90s, unfinished). Similar structures started to be built on the estates of participants in battles with the same commemorative aim of perpetrating the memory of military victories over the Ottoman Empire. The Mikhalkovo Estate (now within the Moscow boundaries) belonged in the second half of the 18th century to P.I. Panin, hero of the Russo-Turkish war who seized the Bendery fortress in 1770. A mansion was built there, apparently, in the Gothic style reproducing "one of the fortresses seized by Panin" (has not survived). Only the redbrick "fortress" towers of several entrances have survived to this day. In Yaropolets, which belonged to Field Marshal General

sively an internal end: it gives Jean-Jacques to Jean-Jacques. A recollecting sign is thus a mediation, but one that is introduced to establish the immediate presence of a memory. One can say that it is a regressive mediation as, far from provoking something beyond the sensual experience, it has to manifest it in all its entirety; it has to do only with the revival of a preceding moment the way it was experienced, without subjecting it to an effort of cognition that tries to grasp the essence of time. A dried flower is more effective than any reflection; it causes an image of the past to appear spontaneously in the mind that remains passive. The flower that has taken its place in the herbarium returns Jean-Jacques to himself and his distant happiness, to the wonderful journey he undertook to discover those rare subspecies of plants he lacked].

When Starobinski describes this model of memory as a trip through recollecting and recollections through travelling, he practically described the architectural programme of Pavlovsk. Contemporaries already saw that its images were souvenirs of the Count and Countess Severny's journey across Europe. For instance, one of them wrote: "the rose pavilion is reminiscent of that of Trianon; the chalet is similar to those Maria Feodorovna saw in Switzerland; the mills and several farms are built like those of Tyrol; ... the gardens bring to mind the gardens and terraces of Italy"[1], just as the theatre and the long alleys were borrowed from Fontainebleau.

When today we retrace the royal couple's itinerary and architectural impressions, we can identify with greater precision the originals that inspired one structure or another: for the Hermitage it is the monk's hut in the Etupes park of Maria Feodorovna's parents and for the Dairy Farm Pavilion it is the layout of the Dairy Farm of the Duke of Württemberg,

Count Z.G. Chernyshev (18 km away from Volokolamsk), the Mechet (Mosque) pavilion was built on the main alley of the park in 1774 to commemorate the victory over Turkey, with an obelisk erected nearby in honour of the victories achieved by Count Rumiantsev-Zadunaisky. On his other estate, Chereshenki, Chernyshev ordered construction of several structures in the Oriental style, including a Moldavian house and a Turkish house with a theatre. They were made of wood and likewise have not survived. Yet another estate, Troitskoye-Kainarji (21 km from Moscow) belonged to Field Marshal Count P.A. Rumiantsev-Zadunaisky, hero of the war. After the Khodynskoye Pole festivities were over, celebrations at conclusion of the Kucuk-Kainarca peace treaty continued there in August 1775, as a result of which the name of the memorable Turkish locality Kainarji was added to the old name of the village Troitskoye. A wooden pavilion reminiscent of one of the fortresses captured by the count was built in the park (has not survived), where squares at the alley crossings were called Rymnik, Kagul, etc. after the fortresses captured by Russian troops.
(For more detail, see: Shvidkovskii, D.O. *Rabota Kamerona v Tsarskom Sele i "antichnaya tema" v arkhitekture imperatorskikh zagorodnikh rezidentsii 1780-kh godov* (Cameron's Work at Tsarskoye Selo and the 'Ancient Theme' in Architecture of the Imperial Country Residences of the 1780s) // Shvidkovskii, D.O. *Charlz Kameron i arkhitektura imperatorskikh rezidentsii* (Charles Cameron and the Architecture of Imperial Residences).

[1] Starobinski J. *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: La transparence et l'obstacle, suivi de Sept essais sur Rousseau*. Paris: Gallimard, 1971. P. 292–293.

which Maria Feodorovna had personally sent from Switzerland. The Volliere (Aviary) Pavilion decorated with antiques brought from Italy was Cameron's free fantasy on the theme of the Baths of Diocletian. The oval Island of Love was reminiscent of the island with the Temple of Venus in Chantilly, of which Paul had brought a book of sights to Russia, using it repeatedly as a reference for his commissions, and he borrowed the general name of the park – Le Sylvia – from the selfsame Chantilly.

Several prototypes can be found for the Apollo Colonnade, although the project was on the whole approved even before their departure. These include above all the famous colonnade of Versailles and several other similar garden temples that awaited the travellers in the luxurious residence in Schwetzingen of Charles Theodore, the Prince Elector of Pfalz, and also the Temple of Apollo that Maria Feodorovna's uncle, Duke Carl Eugen of Württemberg, demonstrated to his niece as evidence of his former prodigality and addiction to luxury at his Schloss Hohenheim outside Stuttgart, where he held a ball in honour of his dear guests in September 1772. It was under the impression of those visits that Maria Feodorovna decided to move the already erected colonnade to a more picturesque spot.

I will not dwell on other examples because the essence is clear. Walking through Pavlovsk alleys, Maria Feodorovna could reminisce about her dear Württemberg home and her journey. Personal family memories formed another theme that was launched with the building of the obelisk on the foundation of Pavlovsk and then found expression in the added Family Grove of trees planted by members of the family, the Temple of Friendship with the statue of Catherine in the centre and 16 columns around her (for every relation and child of Maria Feodorovna living at that moment), a monument to her sister Friederike that after the death of her parents was transformed into the Mausoleum of her beloved parents and, finally, the Mausoleum "To my Spouse-Benefactor", which appeared after the death of Emperor Paul.

The three important imperial residences have enabled us to trace the metamorphoses that memory itself underwent during that century, and the way architectural programmes reflected them.