

NATIONALMUSEI SKRIFTSERIE NR 9

Russian architectural drawings in the Nationalmuseum

BY

BJÖRN H. HALLSTRÖM

Stockholm 1963

INTRODUCTION

THE FRIEDRICH WILHELM VON BERGHOLTZ COLLECTION

In June 1721, Friedrich Wilhelm von Bergholtz, Gentleman Usher to the Duke of Holstein, returned to St. Petersburg after an absence of four years. As his carriage drove in the late afternoon into the Nevskij Prospect he saw the gilded spire of the Admiralty rising up at the far end. The closer he came the less he recognised his surroundings. In the four years he had been away the city had been radically changed.¹ Peter the Great had been doing everything in his power to turn the fortress which he had founded in the Neva delta in 1703 into a great metropolis. Artisans and workmen from the whole of Russia, and native and foreign architects and master builders had been called in to create a new Russian capital. Early St. Petersburg had been very much of a garrison town, but the situation had become quieter after Peter's victory at Poltava in 1709, and its buildings gradually assumed a more civilian appearance. By 1721, when Bergholtz revisited the city, the Nevskij Prospect had been transformed from a highly practical connection between the centre of the city and its surroundings beyond the marshes into a magnificent monumental street, with an imposing perspective view.

Bergholtz has described his return in a diary from the years 1721—25, "Friedrich Wilhelm von Bergholtz, grossfürstlichen Oberkammerherrn, Tagebuch, welches er in Russland von 1721 bis 1725 als holsteinischer Kammerjunker geführt hat";² a detailed account of the city that has won him a lasting place in Russian history. His firsthand reports from the Imperial Court, and his description of the architecture of early St. Petersburg are often quoted in historical works. The rapid development of architecture at this time and the comparative scarcity of documentation make Bergholtz's detailed and objective reports of particular value.

Bergholtz stayed in Russia on this occasion for six years, leaving the country in 1727. In the following year there was born, in the marriage between Karl Fredrik and Anna Petrovna, a son, Karl Peter Ulrik, and it was as his tutor and Lord Steward that Bergholtz next visited Russia, in 1742, when it was known that Karl Peter was to be appointed heir to the Imperial Russian throne. St. Petersburg had now undergone a further change, and was on its way to becoming a world capital. No diary has been preserved from this visit, but it

was in all probability then that Bergholtz acquired his collection of drawings, many of which are now in the possession of the Swedish National Museum in Stockholm. The detailed inscription on the drawings give us some information on what happened during these years, and a further source is provided by the memoirs of Catherina II, in which Bergholtz is mentioned on several occasions.

In 1746, Bergholtz was dismissed, together with Count Brümmer. The two are described by Catherina as "pedagogues", and unsuited as tutors to her future husband, the Grand Duke. Catherina mentions that Brümmer in particular had proved difficult, owing to his love of political intrigue. Bergholtz and Brümmer proceeded to Wismar, which was at that time Swedish. To begin with the two exiles enjoyed a pension from the Russian court, but this was withdrawn in 1748.

In November 1749 there was held in Stockholm a meeting of the Secret Council, the minutes of which mention two letters, from Brümmer and Bergholtz:

"Hans Excellens Herr R.R.Gr. Tessin uppläste bilagda bref till Sig det war ifrån Holsteinske Öfwermarskalken Graf Brümmer och det andra ifrån Öfwerkammerherren Bergholtz, dat^e Wismar d $\frac{30.\text{o.kt.}}{10.\text{nov.}}$: innhållande föreställningar om deras nuvarande medellösa och nästan aldeles utblottade tilstånd, sedan de dem af Ryska Kejsarinnan anslagne pensioner, numera ej blifwa betalta, utan lämnades utan alt understöd: hwarföre de nödgas taga sin enda tilflykt til Hans Kungl. Höghet af Sweriges Crona i hopp att af dem ej blifwa aldeles öfwergifna, som de förr så troget sökt tienat med mera."³

"His Excellency Herr R. R. Gr. Tessin read out the enclosed letters from Count Brümmer, Lord Marshal of the Court of Holstein, and from Lord Steward Bergholtz, dated Wismar 30th October (10th November): with representations of their present state, without means and almost paupers, since their pensions granted by the Russian Empress are now not paid out, but they are left without all support: wherefore they in need must take their only refuge with His Royal Majesty of Sweden's Crown in the hope that they will not be altogether abandoned of them whom they have previously endeavoured faithfully to serve: etcetera."

It appears from the same minutes that Brümmer had in 1743, when peace was concluded between Russia and Sweden persuaded the Empress Elisabeth not to take the whole of the part of Finland conquered by the Russians.

Bergholtz's letter is along much the same lines, and the results of their appeal was the granting of a Swedish pension for a period of two years.

In 1752 Bergholtz turned to the Empress Elisabeth with an appeal that the pension that had been stopped for the past four years should be paid out. The Empress in time allowed herself to be persuaded and in 1754 Bergholtz and the heirs of the now deceased Brümmer received between them a sum of 27,549 roubles.¹

Brümmer and Bergholtz lived in the main square of Wismar, in a house that is still preserved. There Bergholtz remained until his death in 1771. He was buried in St. Nicolai in Wismar, where his portrait still hangs. In his will he left 3,000 Thalers for an altar in the church.⁴ (Fig. 1.)

There is reason to suppose that when Bergholtz left Russia in 1746 he took with him a large collection of engravings and architectural drawings. From a large number of letters from Bergholtz to J. J. Stählin, the Secretary of the Academy of Arts and Sciences in St. Petersburg, we know that Bergholtz sent Stählin fruit and young trees from Wismar via Lübeck, and that he received engravings in return.⁵ Most of his architectural drawings, however, must have been collected before 1746, as it is clear from the inscriptions, and from other evidence, that the buildings portrayed are from that time. After Bergholtz's death his collection of engraved portraits went to Russia. On his last letter to Stählin, dated 29 th August 1770, we find a commentary by Stählin: "NB / Die Collection bestand nach dem im 1771 Jahr erfolgten Ableben des Hr. Oberkammerh. v. Bergholtz in etwa 30,000 Kupferstichen, péle méle, am meissten Portraits, kam nach Mecklenbg an den Hofmarschall Gr. Bassewitz, u. wurde an Ihro Kaysl Maj:t nach Russland für 5000.— verkaufft. Die Kayserin fand sich aber damit sehr betrogen."⁵

Already at Bergholtz's death this material was of no more than historical interest.

What happened to the architectural documents is not known. The first traces of Bergholtz's collection are to be found in an inventory made in 1790 by Assistant Secretary of State Wilde for the Royal Museum in Stockholm.⁶ The collection as a whole is first mentioned at the end of the 19th century in Gustaf Upmark's catalogue.⁷ It has not yet been possible to determine exactly how and when the collection came to Sweden, but it is very possible that Bergholtz left it to the Swedish Royal House, which had helped him during the difficult years at the end of the 1740s, and with which he had close connections.

The Bergholtz collection gives us a cross section of architecture

in St. Petersburg and Moscow in the 1740s. Most of the drawings seem to have been acquired between 1741 and 1746. The inscriptions most often refer to current events in these years, but references are also made on occasion to events during the time of Peter the Great, which Bergholtz remembered from his earlier visits.⁸ The collection of architectural drawings covers all together some 400 numbers, many of which include several drawings.

The drawings can be divided in three groups:

1. Measurement drawings from St. Petersburg in the 1740s.
2. Architectural drawings: working drawings or projects, originals and copies.
3. Amateur drawings in pencil.

1. MEASUREMENT DRAWINGS FROM ST. PETERSBURG IN THE 1740S

A large proportion of these drawings have been collected into four volumes, with gummed strips of facades along the main streets of the city.⁹ (Figs. 2, 3, 5, 9, 13.) The longest is over 5 metres long. The scale is not always the same, but is around 1:120 or 1:130.¹⁰

The drawings in these volumes show the buildings in the Admiralty Quarter from the Summer Garden along the Neva towards the Admiralty and out on towards the Gulf of Finland, along Millionnaya Street with its side streets, by the Admiralty Meadows, by the Mojka and along the Nevskij prospect. Most of the houses along the quays on Vasilij Island are given, and the palaces in the City Quarter along the Neva up to Little Nevka. (Fig. 2.)

As an experiment, these drawings have been used in the making of a model of a block delimited by the present Saporozjnyj *pereulok*, the Dvortsovaja quay, the Mramornyj *pereulok* and both sides of the *ulitsa* Hlaturina. (Fig. 6, 7, 11.) Photographs of the drawings have been joined together and gummed onto a skeleton of balsa-wood. The sizes of the actual bodies of the houses, and other details that it is impossible to interpret directly from the drawings, have been re-constructed with the use of contemporary maps. The drawings have proved to be relatively reliable, particularly in the case of the horizontal measurements, which it has been possible to check against the remains of 18th century buildings in modern Leningrad.

Kantemir Palace

Translated, as it were, into a model the drawings have given information for instance about the roofs, that it was difficult to interpret directly from the individual projection. The Kantemir Palace

at the corner of the Dvortsovaja quay and the Mramornyj *pereulok* is shown in three different drawings, two of which make possible a reconstruction of what is probably the original roof of the main building.¹¹ (Fig. 5, 6, 7.)

Kantemir's house was built in 1721, and is said to be Bartolomeo Rastrelli's first work as an independent architect.¹² So far as can be judged, the main building was in the material usual at that time, brick and plaster. The rustic-work in the lowest storey, however, was done with in-laid sheets of limestone.¹³ The plan of the house is typical, with projecting corner pavilions on the main facade against the Neva, and slightly recessed pavilions towards the courtyard. This sort of plan began to appear in St. Petersburg from around 1713–14, examples being the Grand Palace in Peterhof and the Kikin Palace. Kantemir's house shows perhaps Rastrelli's roots in the architectural traditions formed in St. Petersburg in the second decade of the 18th century.¹⁴

One of the drawings shows the main facade towards the Neva, of which no other record has apparently been preserved.¹⁵ (Fig. 7.) The outer staircase is distinguished by a certain liveliness. Right up until the 1740s, as we can see e.g. from the many facade drawings in Bergholtz's collection, most outer staircases in St. Petersburg were straight and ran parallel with the wall. The outer staircase to Kantemir's house does seem to have been relatively steep, but it runs straight out from the body of the house, and is curved in a way that reminds us of this architect's later monumental staircases.

Kantemir's house is an outstandingly valuable building from the point of view of cultural history, and it can be studied fairly exhaustively with the measurement drawings in the Bergholtz collection.

The majority of palaces are given only in one, sometimes two projections, but the relative accuracy of the measurements, and their inscriptions, which in all cases makes it possible to identify them, make this material invaluable in the study of local history.

This part of the collection is probably comprised of copies from an official measurement of St. Petersburg undertaken at the end of the 1730s or in the early 1740s, and of which these copies are now the only record. These measurement drawings can be compared both with Sieghelm's map from 1737 and with the category of sites made by the Russian historian P. N. Petrov in 1885.¹⁶ They are equally interesting as a complement to the fragment of St. Hilaire's perspective map från 1764–73.

Similar measurement drawings are to be found in the collection as loose leaves. These include a group of churches in St. Petersburg. The drawings are schematic, and no scale of measurement is given.

2. ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS

working drawings or projects, originals and copies.

These drawings are more accurately executed, and in most of them the scale of measurement is given (M). Some of the drawings are signed. They include, for instance, a series of drawings of the Anitshkov Palace at the corner of the Nevskij Prospect and the Fontanka, signed by Grigorej Dmitriev.¹⁷ Many projects remain anonymous, but on most of them there is a commentary by Bergholtz, even if he rarely mentions the artist's name. In one case, however, the name of the artist was recorded due to his connection with a political event that attracted Bergholtz's attention.

Tsherkaskij Palace

On two small facade drawings showing the Tsherkaskij Palace on the Neva by the present Saporozhnyj *pereulok* Bergholtz mentions first that the palace was built in 1746 by Tsherkaskij's widow, from a project he had left.¹⁸ That was the year in which Bergholtz left Russia. At the bottom of the drawing we find a supplementary note in the margin:

"Dieses Gebäude sowohl, als das hinter haus, nach der Millions Strasse, ist von dem geschickten, unglückl gewordenen, Girapkin, projectieret." (Fig. 10.)

"Unglückl gewordenen" in Bergholtz's language means executed, and Girapkin is an alternative spelling for Eropkin, who was mixed up in the "*Volynskoe delo*" and was executed in 1740. This Russian architect had been sent to study abroad by Peter the Great, and had lived in Rome. On his return to Russia he devoted himself largely to city planning in connection with the replanning of St. Petersburg at the end of the 1730s. No important palaces by Eropkin are otherwise known, so that the two drawings in the National Museum round out our picture of this architect's work in a very satisfactory way. The courtyard building mentioned in Bergholtz's comment is preserved, although it has been partly rebuilt. The measurement drawings (group 1) include drawings of this building's facade facing the street.¹⁹ (Fig. 11.)

The Tsherkaskij Palace provides an interesting illustration of the general shift in taste that occurred between Peter the Great's time and the 1740s. Facades have become richer, and the outer staircases begin to curve. Even so, there is a marked difference between Eropkin and Rastrelli. Eropkin is stricter, and avoids the "plaited" rhythms that by that time were fully developed in the facade motifs of Rastrelli.

This same palace also shows how the proportions of buildings in the city grew during the 18th century. It is much larger than the palaces around it. Kantemir's house, which was drawn 20 years previously and once dominated the block, can now no longer hold its own. Nor was it long before the Tsherkaskij Palace was dwarfed by the new buildings that went up along the Dvortsovaja quay, as we can see from engravings from the end of the century.²⁰

Münnich Palace

The Bergholtz collection includes also a series of drawings of Count Münnich's Palace on Vasilij Island, where the Frunse Academy now stands.²¹ (Fig. 12, 13, 14, 15.) These drawings are signed with a Russian name that is difficult to interpret, but which is possibly Mazovskoj. This palace was one of the most important in St. Petersburg, and is pictured e.g. in a Machaev engraving from 1753. The building was erected in the 1730s. The style is strict, without actually reverting to Peter the Great's Baroque. It may conceivably be modelled on French architecture, or on peripheral examples of the French style in Germany. Its closest counterparts in St. Petersburg are *Lityeiny dvor* (1735) by Schumacher and the work of an unknown artist, the Cadet Corps' manege (1757–59) on Strelka (Vasilij Island).²²

Osterman-Bestouzhev Palace

In the Admiralty Quarter, by the old St. Isaac's Church (where the Falconet Monument now stands) there stood in the time of Peter the Great a great palace, which is said originally to have belonged to Prince Meshikov, but where Count Osterman later lived. The Osterman House was typical of Peter the Great's time, with a block-like bode, a strict facade and a high, broken roof. (Fig. 16.) As in Prince Menshikov's palace on Vasilij Island, the facades had separate courses and the bottom storey had, lowest down, an entresol, which was marked by smaller windows.

A series in the Bergholtz collection shows the reconstruction of this house around 1745, with copies of the new project and measurement drawings of the original palace.²³ (Fig. 16, 17, 18.) The reconstruction was commissioned by Count Bestouzhev and the finished palace can be seen in Machaev's engravings from 1753.

A plan, with the walls of the old palace marked in, shows that the central axis of the original building's facade towards the Neva was retained. (Fig. 17.) The building was broadened, however, towards the courtyard, so that the axis was displaced inside the palace. The architect solved this problem by shifting the double *enfilades*, just

as Jean Courtonne had done for the Palais Matignon in Paris in 1737. The link with Paris is no more coincidence. French motifs are to be found in the facades, and these too appear in the art of Courtonne.

The architect was extremely ambitious, and the different facades have individual systems. We unfortunately have no drawing of the courtyard facade, but this section is schematically suggested on one of Machaev's drawings. This engraving also shows that the gate tower over the entrance to the courtyard has been built from other drawings than those copied for Bergholtz.

The stylistic trend suggested by the drawings that have been preserved, and by Machaev's engravings, is very different from that we meet in Rastrelli. The rhythm that distinguishes Rastrelli's facades during this period and which highly developed in the great wooden palace in the Summer Garden (early 40s) is in strong contrast to the calm facades with collected groups of windows and rustic chains in the Bestouzhev Palace.²⁴

We have no information on the designer of the project, but it is a reasonable guess that the plans for this reconstruction were the work of Andrej Kvasov. Kvasov, like Eropkin, was highly esteemed by his age, but little is known of his work. At the end of the 1740s he moved to the Ukraine, and all that is preserved of his work in and around St Petersburg is a wooden model of a palace project for the Tsarskoye Selo. This model, however, closely resembles the reconstruction project for the Osterman House. (Fig. 18, 19.) The individual motifs in the details are identical, and in view of the way that the Bestouzhev Palace differs from Rastrelli's style, and from the sort of thing then being built in St. Petersburg, we can reasonably take this similarity as some evidence that Kvasov was responsible also for the Bestouzhev Palace.

Kvasov had been trained in the Chancery of Works, and worked for a long time under and together with Michail Semtsov. In 1743 he was appointed Apprentice Architect, and could start carrying out independent commissions. In December 1743 he was sent to the Ukraine to build a wooden palace for Count Rasumovskij, favourite of the Empress Elisabeth. The palace lay at Koselets, some 80 km north-east of Kiev, and was famous for having been built and furnished in the short time of four months.²⁵ (Fig. 20, 21.) In May 1744 Kvasov was back in St. Petersburg, and was soon brought in on the erection of the new palace in Tsarskoye Selo. Kvasov was later relieved from this commission, but seems even so to have gone on working on his wooden model, which suggests that he had become deeply engaged in the project.²⁶ What Kvasov did between the time

when he was relieved from this commission and June 1747, when he moved to the Ukraine for good we do not know. It is reasonable to assume that he was engaged in commissions of a private nature.

Bestouzhev was granted the Osterman House in December 1744.²⁷ The reconstruction was probably carried out during 1745 and 1746. Bergholtz mentions in an inscription (1746) that the courtyard wing was in process of construction.²⁸ In February 1747 Bestouzhev celebrated his son's marriage in the house.²⁹ The palace was thus erected in the time when Andrej Kvasov was in St. Petersburg, and not long after the architect's failure in Tsarskoye Selo, which could explain the marked similarity between the two projects.

B. Rastrelli

Among the other leaves in this part of the Bergholtz collection are numerous drawings of the works of Bartolomeo Rastrelli.³⁰ Unlike e.g. the great Rastrelli collection in the National Library in Warsaw, which contains several masterly drawings from his greatest period, the drawings in the National Museum show no great artistic finesse. They are mainly copies, but as historical documents some of the drawings are unique. Some of them are also valuable in that they illustrate the earliest, least known, production of this architect.

One of the drawings shows the wooden palace Annenhof in Lefortovo, outside Moscow, built in 1730. This is a copy of the main facade towards the Jausa. There is also a plan, probably an original, of the same place. (Fig. 26.) This shows another, probably earlier variation of the project.³¹

Rastrelli was also active in St Petersburg, for the Empress Anna, and he was responsible for the reconstruction of Apraksin's and Kikin's palaces in the Admiralty Quarter, to form the Third Winter Palace. Copies of this project are to be found in the Bergholtz collection, as are copies of different projects for Rastrelli's great palaces in Courland: Mitau and Ruhental.

A copy (probably on a reduced scale) of a drawing showing Schapellov's house on Millionnaya Street has been placed among the long strips of measurement drawings along the streets of St. Petersburg. (Fig. 22.) This house is included in Rastrelli's catalogue of his own works, but has not otherwise been preserved.³² From the great wooden palace in the Summer Garden, the Third Summer Palace, the appearance of which is well known from Machaev's engravings from 1753, there is a facade drawing, possibly an original, and a plan drawing of the entire building. (Fig. 23.)

Other works by Rastrelli are shown in drawings in categories 1. and 3.³⁰

3. AMATEUR DRAWINGS IN PENCIL

These drawings are primitively and as a rule somewhat pedantically executed with the help of a ruler. Practically all have inscriptions by Bergholtz and show buildings that Bergholtz knew well and had lived in, during the 1740s. A large proportion of these amateur drawings are collected in a volume together with drawings from other Russian towns and places than St. Petersburg.³³

These pencil drawings are particularly interesting because of their similarity to a series of drawings discovered in the Hermitage in Leningrad in 1950, and published by I. E. Grabar in 1954. Grabar mentioned as a possibility that these drawings could have been made by J. J. Stählin, the Secretary of the Academy of Arts and Sciences in St. Petersburg.³⁴ The inscriptions, however, are in Bergholtz's hand, so that I earlier ascribed these drawings to him.³⁵ A very similar series of pencil drawings from the Hermitage has been published by I. N. Archipov and A. G. Raskin, in 1961, in a work on Peterhof. These show different buildings in Peterhof, and all bear inscriptions by Bergholtz. Archipov—Raskin, however, gives the artist as a certain Pieter Frählik, a Swedish prisoner-of-war.³⁶

The quality of the drawings in the National Museum is uneven. Some of them consist only of a few lines, and have practically no artistic or documentary value. Others, in their way, attain a sort of monumental effect. Some of the best drawings are from Moscow, and these include the famous Gagarin Palace on Tverskaya Street³⁷ and the Dolgorukij Palace opposite the Kremlin.³⁸ (Fig. 24.) Both of this buildings are of North Italian style and seem to be the sort of thing Stählin was referring to when he spoke of "bessere u. modernere Baukunst" from the time of Peter the Great in his "Anmerkung über die Architectur zu Moscau".³⁹ These drawings have a high documentary value. In some cases it has been possible to check their accuracy, as in the case of a drawing of the Imperial Mint, which still stands on the Red Square in Moscow. (Fig. 25.)

A journey from Moscow to Kiev has left us with a series of drawings, including some from Koselets, some 80 km north-east of Kiev, the last main halt on the way. It was here that Andrej Kvasov built a wooden palace for Count Rasumovskij in 1744. This can be studied in some details of the drawings, and provides us with valuable information on this architect.²⁵ (Fig. 20, 21.)

Bergholtz was a very methodical collector. In the large volume that covers mainly the drawings from Moscow and the journey to Kiev it is the pencil drawings that dominate. Some of these have been made from architectural drawings or engravings. Here and there we

find original architectural drawings or professionally made copies enclosed. A plan of the Annenhof in Lefortovo, for instance, probably made by Rastrelli himself (Fig. 26), has been enclosed with a series of awkward pencil drawings from the same palace. Bergholtz's system is topographical rather than artistic. He has tried to the best of his ability to find pictures of everything he saw, from the whole of European Russia at that time. Apart from architectural drawings, his collections included a wealth of material on types of Russian character, and pictures of Russian vehicles.⁴⁰ Even so, according to Stählin, his collection of portraits was the main thing. Possibly Bergholtz was planning to publish a tome of engravings on Russia. Some of what he got together has found its way to the Tessin collection, where his motley sheets from Russia and the numerous amateur drawings stand out in bare contrast to the rest of the collection. Bergholtz was a collector of vastly different temper to Tessin. His keenness stemmed not so much from a love of beauty as from the passionate curiosity that marked the age of Peter the Great. His greatness lies not in any subtlety of taste but in a sober objectivity that meets the Empress Catherina's description of him. He remained, above all, a pedagogue.

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. For the life of Friedrich Wilhelm von Bergholtz, see *Russkij Biografitsjeskij Slovar*, St. Petersburg, 1900 Part II, pp. 755–57 (N. Pavlov–Silvanskij). Bergholtz, the son of a Holstein noblemen serving as a Colonel in the Russian Army, was born in 1699. He grew up in Russia, but returned to Germany on the death of his father in 1717. He spent some time in Mecklenburg, but shortly became Gentleman Usher to Karl Fredrik of Holstein. In this capacity he travelled among other places to Paris and Stockholm, and returned in 1721 to St. Petersburg, to stay in Russia until 1727. 1742–46 B. visited Russia once more, after which he returned to Germany and settled in Wismar, where he lived until his death, the year of which is erroneously given in *R.B.Sl.* as 1765. This date has probably been based on vague information given in the foreword to Bergholtz's diary for the years 1721–25. The true date 1771 is clear both from a note on one of the letters to Stählin and from the church records (St. Marien Kirchenbuch 1744–91, p. 138, No. 53, Wismar City Archives). See also KHT 1960 I–II (Björn Henrik Hallström, *Ryska byggnadsritningar i Nationalmuseum. Några tidiga verk av Bartolomeo Rastrelli.*)
2. *Büschings Magazin für die neue Historie und Geographie*. Halle 1785–87.
3. Riksarkivet, Stockholm. Hemliga beredningens protokoll 1739, 1743–45, 1748–50, 1753 (med bilagda handlingar).
4. Information obtained by correspondence with the Wismar City Archives, Wismar, East Germany.
5. KHT 1960 I–II (Hallström).
This is clear from Bergholtz's letters to Jacob Stählin, as preserved in *Publitsjnaya Biblioteka imena Saltykova-Shchedrina*. Leningrad (*Archiv Shchelina*).
6. "Catalogue Des Dessins Originaux Des plus fameux Maitres De toutes les Ecoles Qui se conservent a la Bibliotheque Royale De Stockholm", compiled in 1790 by "Kgl. Bibliothecarien och Canzlirådet Wilde". NM – A 92.
This includes mention of three drawings that are possibly in Bergholtz's own hand (p. 191). These portray a desk, a cabinet in which to keep drawings, and a barrel-organ: "*Abzeichnung des grossen positives, so da, in anno 1745, aus London, nach St. Petersburg, gebracht worden, welches, nicht allein, nach dessen aufrichtung, gantze Concerten, ohne Menschen Hand, gespiehlet, sondern anbey (?) auch, zu gleicher zeit, alles darauf gespiehlet werden...(?)*" The drawings are preserved in the National Museum (Tessinkapsel Vol. No. XVII). In the 1863 inventory (NM – A 106) the drawings are listed as "Diverse, utan egentligt värde" (Miscellaneous, without real value).
7. NM – B 236.
8. E.g. THC 9044, on which is written: "*das hinter hauss des vormahligen Ragusinkyschen hauses in welchem Hause der Gottseel Bischoff von Lübeck, gestorben ist.*"
The Bishop of Lübeck was in this case Prince Bishop Christian August,

father of the their to the Swedish throne, Adolf Fredrick, and cousin to Karl Peter Ulrik's father Karl Fredrick, to whom Bergholtz was at this time Gentleman Usher. The Bishop died in St. Petersburg in 1726.

9. NM, THC 8961-9075.
10. The reliability of the measurements can best be checked in modern Lenin-grad in the region of *ulitsa Halturina (Millionnaya)* and by *Naberesz-naya Krasnovo flota*, where the 18th century architecture is relatively well preserved, in spite of later additions and reconstructions. The latter of these areas coincides with THC 9038, and the two can be compared as in the following table. Certain buildings have been completely de-molished, and have given place to large buildings covering 2-3 of the old sites. The measurements are approximative, as accurate measurement has in certain cases been impossible. (Measurements in cm. and m.)

THC 9038	THC (cm.)	Actual buildings (m.)
Demidoff (41)	25	29.75
Hendrikof (40)	18	23.5
Gallitzen (39)	16	18.5
Nimzof (38)	41	c. 47 (paced)
Serdukof (37)		
Gallitzin (36)		
Mattuskin (35)		
Beetlin (34)	16.5	21.5
Dolgorukoff (33)	13.5	17.4
Lapuchin (Lobrin) (32)	13.5	18
Müller (31)	15.5	18
Scheremetof (30)	56.5	21.5
Mattuskin (29)		
Mattuskin (28)		
Scheremettof (27)	21.5	58
Iwanof (26)	28	24
Gollowin (27)		
etc.		30

11. See KHT 1960 I-II (Hallström).
In St. Hilaire's perspective map of St. Petersburg (1764-73) the palace is shown with a roof that differs from THC 9028, 9040 and 9041. In an engraving by M. G. Eichler from a painting by de Mayr (from c. 1800) the palace seems to have been further reconstructed (see Note 20). Later on in the 19th century the building was radically changed when it was furnished for the Turkish legation. It is in this form that the building still stands.
12. See Grabar 1954, pp. 280-81 (B. R. Vinner) and Grabar 1960, pp. 176 1-7 (B. R. Vinner).
13. So far as can be judged certain parts of the original palace have been preserved inside the later additions. On the west side of the building there are traces of the original rustic-work under the plaster. In the main courtyard, which is now practically built over, some of the palace's original contours can be traced in the masonry. Some of the window openings are also probably the original ones (December 1961).
14. KHT 1960 I-II and KHT 1961 III-IV (Hallström).
15. A glimpse of the palace is given in an engraving by Elliger (c. 1730), but no details can be distinguished. See KHT 1960 I-II (Hallström).
16. This hypothesis has been put forward by the Russian expert on Rastrelli J. M. Denisov, who has been of great assistance in the compilation of

material, and has made out a table comparing the drawings in Stockholm, Siegheim's map with the catalogue of sites from 1737 and P.N. Petrov's topographical register from 1885. This table was to have been included in the catalogue, but technical considerations have unfortunately made this impossible.

17. THC 116, 117, 120, 121, 437.
18. THC 9026, 9027. See catalogue.
19. THC 9041.
20. "*Vue du Palais de Marbre*", engraving by M. G. Eichler (1748–after 1818), after a painting by de Mayr.
21. THC 195, 196 and 197 are also to be found on THC 9054, which makes it possible to check the reliability of the measurements.
A similar, but unsigned, drawing of the facade towards the Neva is to be found in the great Rastrelli collection in the *Biblioteka Narodowa* in the Krasinski Palace, Warsaw, with the inscription:
"*Copie de facade du palais de le feldmarechal comte de Munnich du coté de la grande riviere. N. 11*"
When the Frunse Academy was restored recently traces were found of the original palace, including the characteristic rustic-work. Photographs are to be found in the archives of the Inspectorate of Monuments, Leningrad.
22. *Pamjatniki architektury Leningrada*, edited by N. N. Belehov, Leningrad 1958, p. 184. The building was constructed by I. Burghardt, contractor to the Cadet Corps. It is unknown whether he was responsible for the actual drawings, or was merely in charge of construction.
Particularly marked is the resemblance between Münnich's palace and Schumacher's *Lityeyny dvor*, in which the elements of the facades are extremely close to each other: the surrounds of the windows, the special use of rustic work, and the semi-circular frontons. Schumacher was born in 1701, and was active in St. Petersburg until his death in 1767. Those of his works that are known are all from the 1730s. See I. E. Grabar's *Istoriya Arhitektury*, Moscow 1909–14, part III, pp. 88, 89.
Schumacher was Münnich's special protégé and it is perfectly conceivable that he was the man behind the building of Münnich's palace on Vasilij Island.
Schumacher was the brother of the librarian of the same name at the Academy of Science. *Lityeyny dvor* has been described by Grabar as a superb piece of architecture. See also Grabar 1954, pp. 165, 166 (V. F. Schilkov).
23. THC 204–209, 9037.
24. The rhythmic treatment of his facade motifs seems to be a highly individual characteristic of Rastrelli's. The window surrounds are shaped in different ways, and varied horizontally so that the different storeys form interwoven series.
In native architects, like M. Semtsov and his pupils, we find a tendency to the classical that contrasts strongly with the mannered style of Rastrelli. In the Bestouzhnev Palace, the windows are collected in groups, without individual variations in each group. These groups cover three or five axes and are separated by chains of rustic-work.
This same principle, with a clear and simple division of the facades, is to be found in A. Kvasov's wooden model for the Grand Palace in Tsarskoye Selo and in Rasumovskij's country house of Koselets near Kiev, which was built by the same architect.

- It is this clear contrast between e.g. Rastrelli and Kvasov that makes us doubt I. E. Grabar's attribution of the Bestouzhev pleasure palace at *Kamenny ostrov*, which on vague grounds is ascribed to Rastrelli (although it is not included in Rastrelli's list of his own works). The facade ornamentation and the harmonic grouping are quite alien to Rastrelli, but are close to Kvasov. See I. E. Grabar, *Istorija Arhitektury* III, pp. 190 ff.
25. THC 9076/91:I. See catalogue.
See also Grabar 1954, p. 335 (A. N. Petrov) and Grabar 1960 p. 225 (A. N. Petrov).
 26. Information obtained orally from personnel of the restoration workshop in Tsarskoye Selo (Pushkin).
 27. P. N. Petrov, *Istorija Sankt Peterburga*, St. Petersburg, 1885, p. 509.
 28. THC 209, see catalogue.
 29. P. N. Petrov, op. cit.
Bogdanov-Ruban's description of St. Petersburg gives 1747 as the year it was built, but this can best be interpreted as the year in which it was completed.
 30. See KHT 1960 I-II (Hallström).
The works of B. Rastrelli that have in some form or other been reproduced in the THC drawings are:
 1. The Kantemir Palace, 1721-, THC 9028, 9040, 9041.
 2. The reconstruction (with his father) of the Schafirov Palace, on the Petersburg side, THC 9024 (exterior).
 3. Annenhof, Lefortovo (Moscow), 1730-, THC 170, 430, 9076/27:I, 29:I-II, 30:I-II, 31:I-III, 32:I-II, 33:I-II.
See also THC 9076/27:II-I, 28:I-II, 10:I-II, 38:II.
 4. Empress Anne's wooden palace in the Summer Garden, 1732, THC 149, 171.
 5. The Third Winter Palace (reconstruction of the Kikin and Apraxin palaces in the Admiralty Quarter) 1732-, THC 113, 114, 115, 1286, 9029, 9030, 9032, 9043, 9044.
 6. Ruhental, c. 1735-40, 1524, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1528, 1529, 1530.
 7. Mitau, 1738-, THC 1520, 1521, 1522, 1523.
 8. Third Summer Palace, 1740 s, THC 125, 126, 127, 128, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182.
 9. Gallery in the Summer Garden, 1740 s, THC 447, 448, 466.
 10. Worontsov Palace, 1744-, THC 198, 199.
 - Undated works:*
 11. Shapellov Palace in Millionnaya st., THC 9042.
 12. Sholyakov Palace on the Fontanka, THC 210, 211, 214, 215.
 13. Lewolde (Löwenwolde) Palace on the Moika, THC 980, 983.
 31. The origins of the different buildings in Lefotovo, Moscow (Annenhof) are extremely complicated, and cannot be understood directly from the drawings in THC or the information given in the available literature. I have received exhaustive information in this respect from the Russian Rastrelli expert J. M. Denisov, who has collected the material available in Russian archives and in the Warsaw National Library. The drawing of the main facade of Annenhof is published in KHT 1960, I-II (Hallström).
 32. THC 9042. A summary of Rastrelli's "Relations" is published in Thieme-Becker's *Lexikon der bildenden Künstler*.
 33. THC 9076. See catalogue.
 34. Grabar 1954, p. 102 (I. E. Grabar).

35. KHT 1960 I-II (Hallström).
36. N. I. Archipov, A. G. Raskin, *Petrodvoryets*, Leningrad-Moscow, 1961 p. 171, Note 30.

Archipov's attribution is based on a comparison of the drawings in the Hermitage with a signed water colour in the Public Library, Leningrad, showing a mill in Peterhof. The Frölich mentioned by Bergholtz in his diary (6.2. 1722) had been captured by the Russians at Ivangorod in 1704, and returned to Sweden in 1722. His Christian name, however, was not Pieter but Bengt, so that the connection suggested by Archipov between him and Bergholtz need not be taken as established.

The Hermitage drawings are in pencil, and all have inscriptions by Bergholtz. Archipov has dated certain of them to the 1720s. Probably, however, they were made later, possibly during the 1740s, from which the drawings in the National Museum seem to stem.

A comparison between the pencil drawings in the Hermitage and the Bergholtz collection in the National Museum shows that several of the Leningrad drawings have direct counterparts in Stockholm, drawn clean in ink and painted in with water colour (e.g. THC 128-Herm. 10 938, THC 146-Herm. 10 924, THC 149-Herm. 10 925, THC 152-Herm. 10 927, THC 201-Herm. 10 928, THC 202-Herm. 10 932, etc.).

It is not inconceivable that the amateur drawings collected by Bergholtz – both those in the Hermitage and those in the National Museum – are the work of different artists, on different occasions. The inability of amateurs to give a true picture cannot always be taken as showing personal style, and interpreted as evidence of identical origin.

There are, however, strong indications that they are the work of Bergholtz himself. The drawings in the large volume THC 9076 follow the doings of the Court. It includes, for instance, a number of drawings from the route from Moscow to Kiev described by Catherina II in her diary in the latter summer of 1744 (with several references to Bergholtz). These drawings must have been made by someone at the Court. Bergholtz enjoyed great freedom of movement, and as tutor to the young Karl Peter Ulrik it is not inconceivable that he gave instruction in drawing.

There are no drawings from places where Bergholtz had not been. The drawings of other categories (the folk costumes, for instance) often have *motifs* from places that Bergholtz had demonstrably never visited. They also frequently have inscriptions by other than Bergholtz himself, while the amateur drawings both in the Hermitage and the Nationalmuseum have only inscriptions in Bergholtz's hand. It is worth mentioning that the inscriptions on the amateur pencil drawings are always in the same material as the drawings themselves (although in certain cases the text is touched up with ink, in the same hand).

The question of the artist is not, on the other hand, absolutely vital. What is important is that it was Bergholtz who collected the drawings and wrote the inscriptions during the 1740s.
37. THC 9076/73. See also KHT 1962, III-IV. Björn Henrik Hallström, *Eine neue russische Kunstgeschichte*.
38. THC 9076/59. The palace seems, however, to have been reconstructed or added to by Russian builders.
39. Public Library, Leningrad (Shtelina Archives). See also KHT 1962 (Hallström).
40. THC 987-1001 (sleds and carriages).

CATALOGUE

Both the catalogue and the index have been arranged in two sections:

1. Loose pages to be found in the Tessin-Hårleman Collection (THC) as well as four volumes containing measurement drawings from St. Petersburg (THC 8961–9075).
2. A volume of diverse drawings, chiefly from Moscow and a journey from there to Kiev (THC 9076, 102 pages).

The original German descriptions have been retained as far as possible. A name with or without a title indicates that the person owned, lived in or had to do with the building in question; such details will be clear from the inscriptions. Unless it is stated to the contrary, the buildings are in St. Petersburg.

Dimensions are given in centimetres with the height first, and refer to the drawing itself even when this has been mounted.

A (*B*) in connection with the inscription indicates that this is in Bergholtz's handwriting. A (*B*) in connection with the pencil drawings indicates that these are the work of an amateur, either Bergholtz himself or someone working for him. An *M* in connection with the drawings indicates that these are accompanied by some form of scale.

Parts of the collection of drawings have been published or referred to in papers by the author published in *Konsthistorisk tidskrift* (KHT), Stockholm: 1960, 1–2; 1961, 3–4; 1962, 3–4.

"Grabar 1954" refers to *Istoriija russkoj architektury pervoj poloviny XVIII veka*, Moscow 1954, edited by I. E. Grabar.

The appendix comprises a list of the folk costumes and types to be found in Bergholtz's collection. It has been drawn up by fil. lic. Peter Pfab. Some of these drawings have been published by Gustaf Ränk in *SVIO-ESTONICA, VOLYM XVI*, ny följd 7. Lund 1962. "Estniska folkdräkter från 1700-talets första hälft."