

Danuta Ulicka

Institute of the History of the Arts

1 The site of memory

Among the numerous institutions, official, semi-official and utterly unofficial, in which modern Russian literary studies emerged, one should pay special attention to the Institute of the History of Arts (Institut istorii iskusstv, III). Its originator, founder, patron, and first director was Count Valentin Platonovich Zubov, whose family owned the neo-Renaissance palace in St Petersburg at Isaakievskaja ploshchad' (St Isaac's Square) 5, vis-a-vis the monumental St Isaac's Cathedral. This is where the III has been located since 1912.

However, it is only the seat that has remained unchanged. For instance, between 1912 and 1992, the institute had changed its very name ten times – hardly a wonder in the three-name city. Of course, the Institute was also subject to the pressure of Great History and great politics. This is evidenced not only by its new and official names but also the common names both its opponents and collaborators coined. Some, for instance, said the acronym III stood for “Instiut Ispugannykh Inteligentov” (“Institute of Scared Intellectuals”) (Druskin 1977, 176). Another, no less venomous name, used by Marxists in the mid-1920s – also at the State Institute of Artistic Culture (Gosudarstvennyi institut khudozhestvennoi kul'tury, GINKHUK), located right next to the III, in Myatleva's Palace at Isaakievskaja ploshchad' 9, and incorporated to the institute in 1926 – was: “a monastery on the state's dime” (Seryi 2003 [1926], 242; Bowlt 2013). The supporters and collaborators of “Tonych,” as Count Zubov was called, used to say with self-irony that from the authorities' point of view the III was a “den of formalism” (Ginzburg 1990, 280).

To be sure, it is impossible to identify the Institute with the institution of Russian formalism, even if we focus on the area of St Petersburg exclusively, setting aside the Moscow Linguistic Circle (Moskovskii lingvisticheskii kruzhok, MLK) (Shapovalova 1972). However, given similar sources of inspiration and a similar (unforced) evolution from aestheticism to sociologism, similar dates of birth and the converging period of their “golden years”, and finally the equally unfavorable attitude toward the official policy for science from 1923 onwards, culminating in attacks on and persecution of researchers associated with both the institute and Formalism, this identification is not utterly unfounded. To some extent, it is justified by the very term “formalism”, rarely used in a neutral manner and gradually extended to embrace all artistic currents and scientific orientations (Bagrii 1924; Beskin 1933).

Nevertheless, regardless of these affinities, the equation is merely partial. The III was an institution with a much greater scientific and didactic momentum than formalism; it also had an incomparably wider social impact. In his institute, Count Zubov employed literary, art, architecture, and music scholars from different generations and with different methodological orientations. He created an unofficial, informal milieu centered around the modernist ideals and scientific values. And only opponents of these intellectual trends lumped them together under the label of ‘formalism’, which was considered reprehensible until the mid-1920s. In fact, “Zubov’s House”, as it was commonly called – not without allusions to the close relations between its employees and the researchers associated with it – played a pioneering role in the modernization of the Russian humanities as a whole and a historically invaluable part in its preservation during the difficult years of the authoritarian rule.

2 1912

In his characteristically brief speech at the ceremony inaugurating the III on 2 March 1912, Zubov declared:

In Russia, art history has not been an independent discipline to date: it has been practised within the framework of political history, social history and the history of ideas. Apart from only few exceptions, it has not been taught as a history of forms, i. e. the evolution of man’s formal consciousness. Only the closest context of the creation of the work have been considered interesting, while the genesis of its formal content [...] has hardly attracted attention. (Zubov 2003 [1912], 9)

In other words, the archaeological method of registration, at the service of other sciences, obscured the laws of aesthetic genesis. The expressions used in Zubov’s speech (‘evolution of consciousness’, ‘laws of aesthetic genesis’, ‘formal memory of humankind’, ‘consciousness of form’, cf. Zubov 2003 [1912]) bring to mind the key formulas of German philosophical aesthetics and German art history of the late nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. Certainly, they resemble the formalists’ early declarations and manifestos, but we would hardly find anything similar to Zubov’s comparative project in these texts, let alone his emphasis on social and cultural functions, which the III aimed to perform.

Zubov’s idea is well-illustrated by a photograph from the opening ceremony (Sépman 2003, 11). In a blurry newspaper photograph, we may identify the then St. Petersburg artistic and academic elite: professors of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Archaeological Commission, humanistic departments of St Petersburg University, directors of imperial theatres, the Russian Museum and the Her-

mitage Museum, collaborators of the periodicals *Starye gody* (*Old Times*) and *Apollon*, professors from the French Institute – historians, historians and theoreticians of literature, language, painting and music, philologists, and philosophers. Anna Akhmatova, the “Assyrian goddess” – as she was called due to the fact that her second husband was the Assyriologist, Vladimir Shileiko – stands right next to the count. In the last row, we recognize Lev Gumilev, a future collaborator of the III.

Regretfully, the professors who later taught at the III do not appear in the photograph. This would give a tangible idea of the institute’s research practice. The list of people employed in “Zubov’s House” between 1912 and 1931 reveals that it integrated research on different kinds of arts and that it never separated “aesthetic genesis” from historical and sociological genesis or avant-garde “innovators” from “archaists”, as Tynianov titled his book (Tynianov 1929). Tadeusz Zieliński and his favourite disciple, Mikhail Rostovtsev, worked for Zubov and later for his successor, Fedor Shmidt. Among the Institute’s lecturers, there were: Zieliński’s son, Adrian Piotrowskii, an innovator not only in translation from classical languages but also theatre and film, a playwright who headed the sociology of art section (Gurevich 2007), and Nikolai Radlov, an eminent scholar of both antiquity and modernity. Music was taught by Alexander Glazunov, a traditionalist, Ivan Sollertinskii (who, in turn, was an expert on Gustav Mahler and Arnold Schönberg, a friend of Dmitrii Shostakovich and Mikhail Bakhtin, as well as the founder of ethnomusicology), and Boris Asaf’ev. Boris Kruzhevskii taught courses about old folk and Renaissance theatre – accompanied by Aleksei Gvozdev, the founder of modern theatre studies (Pesochinskii 2007), and Vsevolod Meierhol’d, who directed rehearsals at the institute. Baron Vrangeli lectured on eighteenth-century painting, Vasilii T. Georgievskii on the art of Novgorod, but they never interfered with Malevich, who propagated Suprematism. Ignatii Krachkovskii and Nikolai Konrad taught old Arabic poetry and the poetics of the Quran, while Gumilev interpreted Aleksandr Blok.

There were more such combinations of archaists and innovators. Perhaps, only the cinema section of the Theatre History Department, from which the world’s first institute of film studies emerged, did not follow this pattern, but film experts like Sergei Eisenstein, Vsevolod Pudovkin, Leonid Trauberg, and Grigorii Kozintsev collaborated closely with theatre historians (Likhachev 1927). The Muses – as the institute’s first four departments, founded in 1920–1921, were commonly called (Muse LITO or SLOVO: Literary History Department, IZO: Art History Department, TEO: Theatre History Department, and MUZO: Music History Department) – did not get into conflicts over remits. There was also a photo lab: FOTO, which operated until 1923, attracting the innovators of Russian photomontage, and the Office of Research on Artistic Speech (Kabinet po Izucheniiu

Khudozhestvennoi Rechi, KIRKH), which operated until 1924. Artists employed at the Institute, who also represented extremely different orientations, did not get into conflicts with academics. In Zubov's house, Gumilev was a professor, while Osip Mandel'shtam, Nikolai A. Tikhonov, Evgenii Zamiatin, the poets from the Serapionovy brat'ia (Serapion Brothers) group, Mikhail Zoshchenko and Vladimir Maiakovskii frequented the meetings of LITO. This was also where poetic meetings of the OBERIU group were held.

Against this backdrop, the copy laboratory (*kopiroval'naia masterskaia*) seems to be the most 'archaic', while LITO appears as the most 'innovative' unit. However, the aim of the former was much more challenging: it was to prepare reproductions of the frescos from the Orthodox churches in Novgorod and Pskov – natural copies, as faithful as possible in colour and form, which could not be rendered by photography at that time. In fact, Zubov founded the laboratory in anticipation of the frescos' mournful fate. The copyists were later joined by architects, who carried out detailed measurements of the churches (it is thanks to their documentation that both of them could be reconstructed after World War II). In principle, the III treated all Old Russian artefacts (language, painting, theatre, music) with special care. For according to Zubov, it was these artefacts that granted Russian art a unique place in Europe (Tolmachevskaia 2003).

LITO was officially opened on 28 November 1920. The novelty of its work is already evidenced by the list of its lecturers: the dean was Viktor Zhirmunskii, grammar, semantics and stylistics was taught by Viktor Vinogradov, metrics and textology by Boris Tomashevskii, history of literature by Tynianov and Viktor Shklovskii, poetics by Sergei Baluchatyi, and methodology by Boris Èikhenbaum. However, LITO was not a simple continuation of Society for the Study of Poetic Language (*Obshchestvo izucheniia poëticheskogo iazyka*, OPOIaZ), as it combined theory with historical and sociological research based on empirical foundations. In the Office of Research on Artistic Speech, a unit operating near LITO from 1921 onwards, the "fanatical phonetician", as Sergei I. Bernshtein was affectionately known, recorded the voices of poets (he prepared more than 800 records) and conducted a seminar in which he developed a phonetic method for poetry research (Bernshtein 1972 [1921]). Pioneering studies in sociology of literature were also created in LITO. Boris Bukhshtab addressed the problem of multilingualism in the historical novel (Bukhshtab 2007 [1926]), while Boris Larin devoted his seminar to an analysis of urban languages. On 2 November 1926, Larin delivered a lecture titled "The Problems of Linguistic Research on the City", in which he discussed methodological issues related to the analysis of urban 'dialects', i. e. languages of various social groups inhabiting city spaces. Two years later, Lev Uspenskii analyzed the language of the revolution (Uspenskii 1928). During their numerous ethnographic research expeditions to unexplored areas of the

empire, the III's associates collected records of traditional 'bylina' poems, fairy tales, and rituals, which provided a basis for the development of ethnolinguistics, ethnomusicology, and theory of folk spectacles. As a result of these expeditions, particularly intensive in the years 1926–1930 (Zelenin 1926), the country's first phonographic archive was created. Earlier, the Institute tried to launch a project of Central Folklore Sound Library, which was supposed to collect records of oral and musical stories. However, it has never come into being (Paskhalov 1926). The so-called Young Formalists, the disciples of the founders of OPOIaZ (Lidiia Ginzburg, Boris Bukshtab, Grigorii Gukovskii, Nikolai Kovarskii, Veniamin Kaverin), were much closer to literary history, psychology, and sociology of art than pure poetics. But they were equally fascinated with the approach to the thought-language problem in terms of phenomenological aesthetics, which Boris Engelgardt taught at the III, and for which they "betrayed" Ėikhenbaum's seminar on literary life (Ginzburg 1989, 24).

In short, Zubov's project has often exceeded the boundaries between disciplines, methods, and worldviews. For it was not struggles for the only correct method of research on art that gave rise to the Institute's establishment. From the very onset, the idea was connected to the Russian modernization movements of the nineteenth century. Zubov, born in 1884, grew up in an atmosphere of political change, as multiple questions about Russia and Europe dominated Russian philosophical, social, legal, artistic, and scientific thought of the turn of the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. As a descendant of Decembrists, the great-grandson of the assassin of Tsar Paul (Zubov 2007 [1963], 82) and great nephew of the last Catherine's favourite, related to Aleksandr Gertsen [Alexander Herzen] and Nikolai Ogarev through his wife, and acquainted with Mikhail Bakunin, Zubov inherited these questions from his family tradition (Ismagulova 2004). However, contrary to the programs of the Vekhi ('Landmarks') group and thinkers associated with the periodical *Logos*, Count Zubov placed Russia neither outside Europe nor in a superior position among European nations: he was far from both nationalists and Slavophiles as well as from the proponents of the Third Renaissance, who envisaged Russia as the Third Rome. Distancing himself from these disputes, and later also from the Tsar, Aleksandr Kerenskii, and the Bolsheviks, the descendant of two powerful families (the Zubovs and the Shcherbatovs) and the only heir to their fortune placed Russia into Europe and Europe into Russia with a single move, namely – by establishing the III. And if he ascribed any mission to his work, it was precisely the idea which the aristocratic intelligentsia had regarded as part of its vocation since the beginning of the nineteenth century: the emancipation of the 'people-nation'. Zubov – the future Freemason – combined this mission with the modernist idea of enlightenment and the commitment to unquestionable values deposited in art and science.

By a twist of Great History, these new ideas coincided with the emergence of the Bolshevik ideology, which, in the area of culture, was propagated by Lunacharskii in People's Education Commission (*Narodnyi komissariat prosvetsheniia*). Lunacharskii supported Zubov and his institute. It is probable that he pursued his own project of a new Soviet Academy of Arts on two different scales: on a large scale in Moscow, where he created State Academy of Arts (*Gosudarstvennaia Akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk, GAKhN*), and on a small scale in Petrograd-Leningrad, where he helped transform Zubov's Institute into a GAKhN miniature (both institutions were almost identical in terms of organizational structure). No matter the actual facts, the point is that, thanks to this coincidence, and Zubov's cleverness, the Institute operated officially until 1931, when it was transformed into the Leningrad Division of the State Academy of Art Studies (*Leningradskoe otdelenie Gosudarstvennoi akademii iskusstvovedeniia*). In the years 1933–1937, it officially functioned as State Academy of Art Studies (*Gosudarstvennaia Akademiia iskusstvovedeniia*), then it was reduced to State Research Institute of Musicology (*Gosudarstvennyi muzykal'nyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut*; 1937–1939), to the State Research Institute of Theatre and Music (*Gosudarstvennyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut teatra i muzyki*; 1939–1958), the State Research Institute of Theatre, Music and Cinematography (*Gosudarstvennyi nauchno-issledovatel'skii institut teatra, muzyki i kinematografii*; 1958–1962), and to the State Research Division of the Leningrad Institute of Theatre, Music and Cinematography (*Nauchno-issledovatel'skii otdel Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo instituta teatra, muzyki i kinematografii*; 1963–1992). It was only in 1992 when the Institute returned to the name it received in 1920: Russian Institute of the History of the Arts (*Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv*). However, this was not the original name. The first one, from 1912, was free from the national determination. Indeed, this was yet another feature that the III shared with European modernism.

3 The Institute and the Institution

The golden era of the III is 1912–1924, when it conducted the most intensive and bold scientific work in teaching and publishing. Although, Zubov's initial intent was for the III to also have a socio-cultural function.

The plan to create the Institute first emerged in 1905–1906, in Leipzig. Having abandoned philological studies, which he started in 1904 at St Petersburg University, Zubov went to Germany. Before going to Leipzig, he completed several semesters of art history at Heidelberg University. There, he learned from Heinrich Thode; later, in Berlin, from Heinrich Wölfflin; in Leipzig from Frank Studnick;

and in Halle from Adolf Goldschmidt. “It all began with a drinking spree, which I obviously avoided,” Count Zubov remarks in the first sentence of his memoirs, modestly ascribing the idea to his two friends, Mikhail N. Semenov and Trifon G. Trapeznikov, while he was only to pay for the Institute: “I only assigned a little sum” (Zubov 2004, 93–94). All three departed from Leipzig to Florence. They studied there at the German Institute of the History of Art, directed by Heinrich Brockhaus, amazed at its grand library, free access to the books, and public lectures. It was then that they thought of establishing a similar institute in Russia. About 1910 they began gathering the book collection – which initially numbered three thousand volumes and more than fifty thousand in 1925 – and subscribed all the most important European journals in the field of art history. From Strasbourg, they imported library furniture of the newest design.

The most difficult part was to receive the consent of the Petersburg administration – not for the Institute itself but for its localization. Zubov humorously recalled the difficulty with the phrase, “in the end, I was thinking about presenting the issue even to the State Stud Farms” (Zubov 2004, 95). After prolonged pleas with three ministries, Zubov’s mother suggested that the Institute could occupy their representative family palace at St. Isaac’s Square 5. As it developed, the Institute took over rooms in the house of Prince Paskevich on Galernaia Street 7; from 1920 onwards, this was the place of the literature and music divisions.

Throughout its first year of operation, in 1912, the III functioned only as an open access library. In January 1913, Zubov received the right to offer public lectures, which he gave in four languages to such great popularity among the public that the organizers had to enforce – free – ticketing. Zubov inaugurated the meetings himself on 24 January (6 February N.S.), 1913, with a lecture entitled “On the Methods in Art History”. Other talks were offered by, among others, the Prince Sergei M. Volkonskii, the director of imperial theatres, with a 1913 cycle about “Human as the Material of Fine Arts”, Baron Nikolai N. Vrangeli, a specialist in Russian and French eighteenth- and nineteenth-century painting, and lawyer and collector Pavel Delarov, who lectured in the spring of 1913 on “The History of Painting in the Netherlands”. Interested scholars could have freely used the library and even the private collection of the Zubov family. The Institute established cooperation with similar institutions abroad and, in 1915, added music to the lecture series.

Until 1916, the Institute was mostly a meeting place for the Petersburg elite. Zubov owned it and paid for it. Although on 28 August 1916, the Institute received a charter that deemed it “a special private higher education school for men and women who finished secondary education [...] which offers tri-annual courses” (Zubov 2004, 21), the new organizational form and public mission still failed to serve Count Zubov’s main idea: to intellectually enlighten and emancipate the

“nation”. This idea unexpectedly accelerated with the February Revolution – and ended with the October Revolution.

In February 1917, Zubov asked for and received state subsidies for the Institute. However, as he humorously added, since the Provisional Government did not manage to transfer the subsidies, the Institute nevertheless recognized the October Revolution as a legal state institution that served the common good. And this is what saved it. What allowed the Institute to survive was the rights of an academic institution with the ability to nominate professors and offer special summer courses for secondary education teachers.

However, the Institute owed its salvation not only to the administration-legal actions of its founder but also to Zubov’s understanding of history. Aware of the historical events, the chaos and ineptitude of their main actors, Zubov began a game with the Bolsheviks to preserve his work. This made him unpopular among Russian enemies of the revolution and the émigré community. But as a true modernist, Zubov appreciated cultural values more than political loyalty and his own good name. Due to these values, was Zubov ready to relinquish the Gatchina Palace into German hands in 1916 so that the collections would not suffer during a disorderly evacuation (from the summer of 1917 on, he was a member of a committee appointed by the Provisional Government, which oversaw the takeover and registration of palaces around Petersburg, looted and devastated in the turmoil of World War I and the February Revolution). It was also due to these values that Zubov recognized in 1917 that he could possibly cooperate with Lunacharskii as he had with Kerenskii.

After the October Revolution, Zubov first confiscated his own Palace himself. He merely handed Lunacharskii a piece of paper – with a stamp made with a rubber – on which he himself wrote: “Count Zubov is appointed director of the Institute and both the Institute and Palace become state property along with all the assets accumulated inside and, thus, become subject to the Provisional Workers’ and Peasants’ Government” (Zubov 2004, 42).

Just in case, Zubov occupied for the Institute not only the ground floor but the whole palace, by placing appropriate plaques on all doors. The magnificent Green Room thus became the Grand Council Hall, while the ballroom the Small Council Hall. It was not easy to find such use for all eighty chambers, reminisces Zubov. Then, he made a fictitious inventory by placing numbers by the most important works collected by the Zubov and Shcherbatov families. As it turned out – it was enough, at least until 1924.

Further funding for the Institute’s activities stemmed from covert and overt sales of property. As the director of the nationalized library, Zubov could buy entire collections that the aristocracy had to sell. He always offered the owners the highest price while silently guaranteeing them the preservation of the collection.

As a director of a scientific state institution, he was also able to save people. Zubov hired his previous servants at the Institute as janitors, watchmen, and cleaners. Homeless students found accommodation in the Palace while the audience could always expect a samovar ready with sandwiches.

In the years 1917–1925, “Zubov’s House” was more than just a research institute in which scholars freely developed the history and methodology of the humanities, conducted bibliographic and documentary works, published dissertations – mainly in a publishing house of the III ‘Academia’ operation from April 1923 on, and not integrated into the State Literary Publishing House (Goslitizdat) until 1937 – and organized courses and seminars that prepared specialist-practitioners and public lectures for broader circles of the society. The contemporaries thought of the III as an oasis, one of several such places in Petersburg at the time, along with the House of the Miatlevs, home to Matiushin and Elena Guro, and the House of Arts (Dom iskusstv). However, the III was the most important such oasis because it was egalitarian, open to all. Listeners were deprived of public transport in Petersburg/Leningrad but still travelled on foot even for three hours to attend classes to escape the nightmare of the real life; one only imagine such difficult travels in winter time. The Institute was remembered by Nina Berberova, Lidiia Ginzburg, Ida Napelbaum, and Veniamin Kaverin as a place that helped to survive the cultural values shared by both archaists and innovators. It acted against reality, as Ėikhenbaum writes in the nursery rhyme arranged for the celebrations marking the Institute’s second birthday:

When struck by hunger, cold, despair,
Shootings, policing, and hurt,
We – created out of thin air,
A faculty in the Art of the Word. (Ėikhenbaum 2003 [1922], 110)

A clear sign of such a preserving function was the ball organized at the Institute in 1920 – with all the guests in sweaters and shawls due to cold weather – during which the poet Nikolai Gumilev ostentatiously appeared clothed in a tailcoat with a lady in a black dress, both shaking from the cold (Khodasevich 1996 [1939], 85; Struve 1981, 73). An even more vivid sign is a memory of everyday life by Nina Berberova, who reminisces on the lectures on Flaubert and Stendhal conducted by “Tomashevskii, with clothes all in patches, with puffy eyes, and Ėikhenbaum with shoe soles fastened with a string” (Berberova 1996, 168).

In these two functions – simultaneously scientific and social – the III survived until 1925, when Zubov decided to emigrate as soon as he noticed that he could do no more. Zubov did not leave Russia after the first repressions against the intellectual elite in 1918, nor did he after the second repressions in 1922 – when many deported people fled on the famous ‘philosophers’ ship’, some of

them professors that Zubov previously employed – nor after his arrest and four months in prison (2 August – 2 December 1922). After many years, Zubov recalled his imprisonment with humour, intentionally stylizing his memoirs as an anti-necrography. He thus created a polemical genre against necrography – an invention which became popular in Russian memoir literature (Zarankina 2007): “If I ignore several unpleasant minutes, I must admit that I have enjoyed myself greatly” (Zubov 2004, 151).

4 1925–1931: Years of Struggle for the III

Zubov managed to stop the first attempts to close the Institute in late 1923, under the guise of ‘reorganization’, when the Institute was under the control of a special commission of the Petersburg board of science led by Nikolai Marr. He did not believe that the next attempts (in September 1924) would be successful, though he decided then (or in January 1925) to resign from the director’s function and save his ‘home’. His place was taken by Fyodor I. Shmidt – an art historian like Zubov – who strived to preserve the original methodological orientation, integrating formal-aesthetic, socio-historical, and empirical research, and reconciling them with the requirements of the imposed “sociological method” already officially called “Marxist” or “Marxist-Leninist” (Shmidt 2003, 190–220).

Shmidt was supported by the old employees who defended the ‘formal method’ by proving its agreement with the sociological one. On 25 April 1925, the lecture “The Formal Method in Literary Studies” was delivered by Èikhenbaum; on 13 February Tynianov gave one similar in tone, about the method of studying cinema. From 1924 to 1927, both held a joint seminar dedicated to Russian prose, during which they discussed the issues of literary life and the historical process in literature and art disguised by Tynianov as ‘literary evolution’. The meetings were organized not in the III, but in Èikhenbaum’s apartment (Ginzburg 1989, 356). Despite these efforts, after Zubov’s departure, the III gradually lost its scientific position and original function. The count’s legacy fell on the shoulders of successors incapable of such games with the authorities and the official scientific policy, which was much more restrictive in the second half of the 1920s and in the 1930s than in the first, golden decade of the Institute’s activities. At the time, there were no longer any professors of the pre-revolutionary formation in the state bodies, who previously supported Zubov’s plans. What especially burdened the perspectives of the III was the dismissal of Lunacharskii from the position of the Soviet People’s Commissioner, in whose works some unmasked ‘bourgeois anachronisms’. His place was then seized by the toady party activist, Andrei S.

Bubnov. Lunacharskii's dismissal coincided with the formal dismissal of the 'New Economic Policy' (NEP) that was decisive for the radicalization of policy toward scientific institutions and scientists.

Testimonies and memoirs describing the time that remain public and private archives are not only rare but also biased. We must read them mindful of the circumstances in which they were written, carefully deciphering their camouflage formulas – those purely rhetorical concessions to the enforced phraseology – and separating them from the real content. Received literally, they can lead to misinterpretation. Certainly, these testimonies testify to the situation and fate of the entire Russian humanities in the late 1920s and 1930s, rather than the III exclusively.

Iakov A. Nazarenko competed with Shmidt in the Institute, and the former began to gradually play an increasingly important role: from 1926 as chairman of the Sociological Committee and the director's representative for administrative affairs; from 1928 as a board member of the Institute's publishing house Academia; and from 1929 as official deputy director of the Institute – its only member of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Nazarenko had neither the respect of scholars nor scientific authority, but he did have official entitlement, for example, to ban open admission students from the lectures of Viktor Vinogradov and Èikhenbaum. With the support of worker-communists invited to join the 1928 presiding committee of the III, Nazarenko closed the General Aesthetics and Philosophy Section headed by Èngelgardt and Radlov. There began to emerge "an institute within the institute", as Gvozdev called it, that is, the Sociological Committee (Kumpan 2011, 554).

Both of the last administrators of the Institute, Shmidt and Nazarenko, were arrested in 1932. Zubov's house slowly moved to the centre of the game between the officially propagated sociologism and politically interpreted formalism that previously mostly occupied the press. In the face of increasingly ruthless discussion, disputes about the strategy even set the Institute's employees against themselves, often lost in chaotically unfolding events. For example, the activity of the Section of Research on Artistic Culture of the Soviet Union – approved on 28 May 1928, and led by Zhirmunskii – caused a conflict between him and former members of the OPOIaZ, who suspected he compromised on this matter for the sake of own career; they could not appreciate his scientific interest in similar research conducted in Europe. Similarly, they treated Èikhenbaum's seminar on the literary life as a betrayal of Formalism.

Regardless of political pressures and official decisions by science management institutions, in 1927–1929 Zubov's co-workers strove to continue research in an interdisciplinary, methodologically non-dogmatic, and multifaceted manner. The Kino Committee was reborn, and the experimental work on synaesthetic per-

ception continued in the Kinolaboratorium. Such writers as Konstatin Vaginov, Boris Pil'niak, and Evgenii Zamiatin lectured at the Committee for Contemporary Literature. At the beginning of 1928, the Institute held a discussion on the poetry of the Union of Real Art (Ob'edinenie real'nogo iskusstva, OBÉRIu) and, at the end of that year, a poetry meeting with Zabolotskii, Kharms, and Vaginov. The manuscripts of Kliuev, Kuzmin, and Elena Guro entered the archives of the III (Kopytova 2003; 2008). On October 19, 1928, Oskar Walzel gave a guest lecture. On 9 November of the same year, Bernstein initiated an exchange of recordings of poets with the archives of the Sorbonne and the Berlin Institute of Psychology. A group of Tynianov's students continued work on the book *Istoriia russkoi literatury v parodiakh* ('The History of Russian Literature in Parodies'). The Zhirmunskii-led Folkloric Office collected materials for the study of urban folklore.

The end of the Institute began with drastic personnel decisions: the dismissal of Punin, who managed the Contemporary Art Committee from the beginning of the III; the dismissal of Tynianov, who always led the Committee for Contemporary Literature, along with its secretary, Boris Kazanskii; the dismissal of Zhirmunskii from the presiding committee of the III. The most painful for the further functioning of the Institute was the retraction of the right to teach students and doctoral candidates in November 1929. A year earlier, the Institute lost its publishing house Academia. These provisions practically closed the Institute, something officially attempted four times previously in the summer and autumn of 1930. In the place of the Institute, the authorities established the Leningrad Branch of the State Academy on Study of Art (Leningradskoe otdelenie gosudarstvennoi akademii iskusstvovznaniia) in 1931.

In the historical and popular memory of the III, there mostly remains the name "Zubov's House", used more often than all the subsequent official names from the very outset, which testifies to the success of this missionary enterprise (Kliavina 2008, 3). Only Count Zubov remained homeless in the Institute's history until the 1990s. Zubov's archives went to Columbia University (Bakhmeteff Archive), his scientific work received false attributions, and his memoirs were ruthlessly altered by the émigré publishers. The "golden books" of Russian emigration remained silent on him (Struve 1984 [1956]). His 1917 theoretical article about the "Will of form and consciousness of form in the study of art" (sources give different titles) is probably lost to us. Zubov's forty-sheet monograph about the monuments of the Gatchin Palace was never published, although he strived to do just that at the Institute's publishing house, Academia (Krolenko 2003, 167–191). Research on the history of the institution created by Zubov did not include his own scientific work, which he wrote in the conviction that the goal of the art historian is "to consolidate the facts that refer to the 'small history'" (Zubov 2004, 141; Zubov 1968) and keep every detail in its rightful place – an approach that remains in agreement

with our contemporary outlook. Zubov implemented such an approach when he bought a wax relief after the war in a Paris antiquarian shop and had it returned to its original place – in Gatchina (Becker 1990, 122–124).

However, in the consciousness of not only Russian humanists, “Zubov’s House” has had a mythical character. Indeed, it functions as a collective *lieux de mémoire* (Nora 1974, 401) – a “place of memory” related to a pioneering project of interdisciplinary and even intersemiotic research developed by scholars from different generations, methodological orientations, and disciplinary backgrounds who shared common scientific and ethical values suppressed at their very inception by Great History, which was well-aware of the dangers posed by Little History. This place continues to be surrounded by a legendary aura whose role is primarily to remind the humanistic intelligentsia of its duties and exemplary attitudes under the threat of authoritarianism. That is why, in recent decades, the III has continued to provoke resistance from various proponents of authoritarian tendencies, expressed in successive attempts to liquidate the “House”. Happily, they have so far proved unsuccessful: the informal, trans-generational intellectual community is still working, also on its own history.

Translated by Jan Burzyński

References

- Bagrii, Aleksandr. *Formalniy metod v literature*. Vladikavkaz: Tip. 1 Vladikavkazskoi arteli invalidov-pechatnikov, 1924.
- Becker, Anastasia. “Exiles in Finland.” *The Other Russia: The Experience of Exile*. Eds. Norman Stone and Michael Glenny. London and Boston, MA: faber and faber, 1990. 122–124.
- Berberova, Nina. *Kursiv moi*. Moscow: Soglasie, 1996.
- Bernshtein, Sergei. “Golos Bloka.” *Blokovskii sbornik*. Vol. 2: *Trudy Vtoroi nauchnoi konferentsii, posviashchennoi izucheniiu zhizni i tvorchestva A. A. Bloka*. Ed. Iurii Lotman. Tartu: Tartuskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1972. 454–525.
- Beskin, Osip. *Formalizm v zhivopisi*. Moscow: Vsekhudozhnik, 1933.
- Bowl, John. “Prekrasnyi i stradal’cheskii Pavel Filonov.” *Tret’iakovskaia Galereia* 40.3 (2013). <https://www.tg-m.ru/articles/3-2013-40/prekrasnyi-i-stradalcheskii-pavel-filonov> (11 February 2022).
- Bukhshtab, Boris. “Pervye romany Weltmana.” *‘Mladoformalisty’: Russkaia proza*. Ed. Ian Levchenko. St. Petersburg: Petropolis, 2007. 73–103.
- Druskin, Mikhail. *Issledovaniia. Vospominaniia*. Moscow and Leningrad: Sovetskii kompozitor, 1977.
- Ėikhenbaum, Boris. “Fakslis.” *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*, Ed. I. V. Sèpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul’tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 110–111.

- Ginzburg, Lidia. *Chelovek za pis'mennym stolom*. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1989.
- Ginzburg, Lidia. "Vspominaia Institut istorii iskusstv." *Tynianovskii sbornik*. Vol. 5: *Chetvertye Tynianovskie chteniia*. Eds. V. A. Markov, E. A. Toddes, Iu. G. Tsiv'ian, and M. O. Chudakova. Riga: Zinatne, 1990. 278–289.
- Gurevich, Semen. "Adrian Piotrovskii, leningradskii entsiklopedist." *Stranitsy khudozhestvennoi zhizni 1920-kh godov*. Ed. Anna Nekrylova. St. Petersburg: Federal'noe Agentstvo po Kul'ture i Kinematografii, 2007. 35–51.
- Ismagulova, Tamara. "'Stradnye gody' grafa V. P. Zubova na fone 'serebriannogo veka'." Valentin P. Zubov. *Stradnye gody Rossii: Vospominaniia o revoliutsii (1917–1925)*. Ed. T. D. Ismagulova. Moscow: Indrik, 2004. 6–38.
- Khodasevich, Vladislav. *Nekropol': Vospominaniia*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1996.
- Kliavina, Tat'iana. [untitled]. *Zelenyi zal*. Ed. Iurii Smirnov-Nesvitskii. St. Petersburg: Federal'noe Agentstvo po Kul'ture i Kinematografii, 2008. 3.
- Kopytova, Galina (ed.). *Iz fondov kabineta rukopisei Rossiiskogo instituta istorii iskusstv*. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 2003.
- Kopytova, Galina (ed.). *Putevoditel' po kabinetu rukopisei Rossiiskogo Instituta Istorii Iskusstv*. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, 2008.
- Krolenko, Aleksandr. "Institut i 'Academia': Iz zapisnykh knizhek 1923–1924 goda." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*, Ed. I.V. Sëpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 167–191.
- Kumpan, Kseniia. "Institut Istorii Iskusstv na rubezhe 1920-kh–1930-kh gg." *Institut kul'tury Leningrada na perelome ot 1920-kh k 1930-m godom*. St. Petersburg: Pushkinskii dom, 2011. <http://www.pushkinskijdom.ru/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=ISfRoURS2-k%3D&tabid=10460> (11 February 2022).
- Likhachev, Boris. *Istoriia kino v Rossii (1896–1926): Materialy k istorii russkogo kino*. Vol. 1: *1896–1913*. Leningrad: Academia, 1927.
- Nora, Pierre. "Mémoire collective." *Faire de l'histoire*. Eds. Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora. Paris: Gallimard, 1974. 395–410.
- Paskhalov, Viacheslav. "K voprosu o fonograficheskoi zapisi pesen' i tsentral'noi pesennoi fonoteki." *Trudy gosudarstvennogo instituta muzykal'noi nauki: Sbornik rabot Ètnograficheskoi sekti 1 (1926)*: 83 – 90.
- Pesochinskii, Nikolai. "Nachalo teatrovedeniia: Gvozdevskaia shkola." *Stranitsy khudozhestvennoi zhizni 1920-kh godov*. Ed. Anna Nekrylova. St. Petersburg: Federal'noe Agentstvo po Kul'ture i Kinematografii, 2007. 71–107.
- Sëpman, I. V. (ed.). *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003.
- Seryi, Grigorii [Ginger, Grigorii]. "Monasty' na gossnabzhenii." [1926] *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. Ed. I.V. Sëpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 242.
- Shapovalova, Liubov' [Lubov]. "The Russian state institute of art history: Its contributions to literary scholarship and its liquidation: A Study on Russian Formalism." *Zapiski Russkoi akademicheskoi gruppy v SSHA – Transactions of the Association of Russian-American Scholars in the USA*. Vol. 6. California: Association of Russian-American Scholars in U.S.A., 1972. 115–159.

- Shmit, P. F. "Vospomonaniia ob ottse." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. Ed. I. V. Sëpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 190–220.
- Struve, Gleb. *O chetyrekh poëtakh*. London: Overseas Publications Interchange, 1981.
- Struve, Gleb. *Russkaia literatura v izgnanii*. Paris: Ymca Press, 1984.
- Tolmachevskaia, Natalia. "Moi put' v iskusstve." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. Ed. I. V. Sëpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 40–47.
- Tynianov, Iurii. *Arkhaisty i novatory*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.
- Uspenskii, Lev. "Iazyk revoliutsii." *Piat' iskusstv: Vremennik*. Leningrad: Academia, 1928.
- Zarankina, Iulia. "Literaturnaia nekrografia," *Novyi zhurnal/The New Review* 247 (2007): 247.
- Zelenin, Dmitrii. *Krest'ianskoe iskusstvo Severa: Ob iskusstvovedcheskoi èkspeditsii na Russkii Sever*. Leningrad: Academia, 1926. 105–106.
- Zubov, Valentin. *Karlik favorita: Istoriiia zhizni Ivana Andreevicha Iakubskogo, karlika Svetleishego kniazia Platona Aleksandrovicha Zubova, napisana im samim*. Eds. Dmitrii Tshižewskij, Dietrich Gerhardt, Ludolf Müller, Alfred Rammelmeyer, and Linda Sadnik-Aitzetmüller. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1968.
- Zubov, Valentin. "Otkrytie Instituta istorii iskusstv." *Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv v memuarakh*. Ed. I. V. Sëpman. St. Petersburg: Ministerstvo Kul'tury Rossiiskoi Federatsii, Rossiiskaia Akademiia Nauk, Rossiiskii Institut Istorii Iskusstv, 2003. 9–10.
- Zubov, Valentin. *Stradnye gody Rossii: Vospominaniia o revoliutsii (1917–1925)*. Ed. T. D. Ismagulova. Moscow: Indrik, 2004.
- Zubov, Valentin. *Pavel I* [1963]. Trans. by V. A. Semenova. St. Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2007.