

MIKHAIL VORONTSOV.

A Metaphysical Portrait in the Landscape.

by

M. I. Mikeshin

St. Petersburg
1998

© M.I. Mikeshin, 1998

Translated by Penelope Kemp, B. A. (Edinburgh)*

* The author very much appreciate the translator's work, though it does have some shortcomings. Unfortunately, the author has had no possibility to meet the translator and discuss them.

Translator's Notes

(The notes refer to passages marked with an asterisk in the text).

Methodology

The passages from Eugene Onegin are taken from Charles Johnston's translation, published in 1977.

Paradise

Genesis 3.24 - "He placed on the east side of the Garden of Eden Cherubim and a flaming sword flashing back and forth to guard the way to the tree of life".

The Significance of the Vertical

My Translation.

The Palace

I Corinthians 15, ff54-57, quoted from the Authorised Version of the Bible. My translation.

Conclusion

My Translation.

A FOREWARNING

First of all I should like to warn you, dear reader, that this is to be by no means an history in the usual sense of the word. You will find in these pages no exhaustive accounts of the battles of the Napoleonic and Russo-Turkish Wars in which, as officer and general, the Russian Count Mikhail Semionovich Vorontsov so distinguished himself. I shall not attempt to unravel for you the subtle intrigues and complex diplomatic manoeuvres of this veteran courtier and diplomat. The life of a man who ended his days a great prince and Fieldmarshal-General, who was educated in England and spent eighteen uninterrupted years on the battlefield, and who for over a quarter of a century was sovereign ruler of the Caucasus and of the vast territory of Novorossia, is rich material enough for a great many novels and fascinating historical works. Nor does this book offer a history of ideas, no gripping account of the conflict (generally pure invention on the part of the biographer) between opposing ideological standpoints and emotions.

Instead, I believe I can offer you a no less absorbing occupation. It is one which, of all the historical disciplines, is probably closest to palaeontology; indeed, Gaston Bachelard called it "the palaeontology of the vanished soul." What I shall attempt to do is to reconstruct the way in which Vorontsov thought. To do this fully is, of course, an impossible task, and I shall, therefore, confine myself to the main points of his personal philosophy. This more limited aim is capable of objective attainment, although its veracity can, of course, never be fully established. It is a form of study generally undertaken by the historians of philosophy: a comparison between the philosophical texts of the subject, in the light of the major social events of his day, with the diverse views of philosophers of other epochs. This approach has a number of drawbacks, which I shall not discuss here, but in the present case there is a further complication: Vorontsov wrote almost nothing of his personal philosophy down, save for a few remarks here and there in his extensive correspondence. He "merely" did a great deal -both for his country and for himself. He is remembered for the scale and uncommon wit of his conclusions. Even the tendentious Leo Tolstoy in his work Hadji Murat acknowledged the fineness of the Count's mind and European education. And yet Vorontsov was not a professional thinker, not a philosopher; nor was he an author, artist or writer of memoirs. This greatest of princes was all of these at once. Working, apparently, within the confines of the court "standards" of his day, Mikhail Vorontsov left a legacy which represents the quintessence of his culture. When he built himself a holiday home, he created the Alupka Palace and gardens - a space where the Spirit lives. Perhaps you find my description too effusive? We shall see what you say by the end of the book.

My task, then, is twofold: to reconstruct, in hypothesis, the philosophy of Mikhail Semionovich Vorontsov, and to demonstrate that the structure of Alupka Palace is in fact a reflection, a self-portrait of its owner and architect. And I should like to emphasise that it is the personal philosophy of the man which concerns me here, and I shall barely touch upon his psychology, despite the interest and charm which it holds for me personally. Moreover, it is paramount that the psychological and palaeontological aspects of this study be clearly differentiated.

In addition, I should very much like the reader to have his own picture of Alupka, and to visit it at intervals during his reading of this book: "I am the enemy of all prophets who violate the soul with truths. Our path is the way through substance and its forms. He who calls to the soul is calling us backwards and not forwards... But my aim is neither to move, nor to set ablaze. My appeal is to the understanding, not to the emotions. I deliberately raise a barrier between the reader and myself so that I may leave him his freedom; I do not wish to make him agree with me so that he should not agree with me, but to have something of myself remain and awaken in him his own thoughts." (Voloshin, M. A. The Shores of the Koktebel, Simferopol, 1990, p.122.)

1. METHODOLOGY

*Thought is the form taken by emptiness,
and in no way the content of what fills it:
language, culture, text.*

A. M. Piatigorskii

Having chosen to write an historical portrait, I am faced with the familiar paradox of the genre, namely: the fact that in descriptions of historical events, the actors remain faceless. In the name of scientific objectivity, history often unwittingly takes on the attributes of the natural sciences. Only the facts, stripped of subjective or psychological stereotyping and interpretation, are acknowledged. Ideally, the aim is to reconstruct the sequence of events with one hundred percent accuracy. Historical fact is an event involving personalities, involving names - yet in histories of this kind, there are no personalities; it is as if they have been dismissed beforehand as belonging to the realm of psychology. All that remains of a once fully rounded personality is their profession, or some or other function ("X as diplomat," "Y as an aristocrat," etc.). This approach allows for only two kinds of historical description: one detailing a chain of events in which people act as functions; the other seeing people as functions, playing a role during their lifetimes in a sequence of events. The individual is thus broken down into functions, and history distilled into categories: this was Pushkin's circle, that the politicians' circle, this is what the military did, and so on. The danger here is that such pigeonholing is less consistent with the reality of the subject's life than with implicit premises of the researcher present in his methodology even before the work is begun.

Particular difficulties arise when the personality is regarded as a function of thought. In seeing the thinker (by analogy with the craftsman) as manufacturer of a "product" - thoughts, concepts, systems - we come up against the ancient and thorny problem of creativity. The individuality of the thinker "dies in the product," it is "masked by the apparent momentum of the system which it has created: by its systematic [non-personal] enquiry and logical [non-chronological] consistency." (Soloviev, E.Y., "Biographical analysis as a form of historico-philosophical research" in *Voprosy filosofii*, N0s 7-8, 1981, p.116)

Worst of all for the artisan is when he is studied from an unconventional angle: say, the artist as thinker (Cf. Malinin, V.A., *Pushkin as a Thinker*, Krasnoyarsk, 1990, and many others). Attempts to give a systematic presentation of the philosophical beliefs of a poet, for example, results simply in the forced assimilation of the latter into the philosophical preconceptions of the researcher himself. And indeed, what is the historian to do when the poet has no such philosophical system of his own? It becomes a matter of extracting from his writings clearly stated philosophical judgements and dividing them up into categories. And in this it is clearly of help to study the philosophies of the poet's teachers. The philosophies of the poet and the historian are thus expressed in the same terms - no substantive differentiation is made between them. The result is that the artist is confused with the era in which he lived, interpretations remain unsubstantiated, and the work becomes purely speculative. The value of art, and in particular of poetry and parable, is the wealth of meaning which it brings to those willing and able to discern it within their own arbitrary cultural context. Remove all that lies between the creative text and the philosophy, and the poet often appears as a trite purveyor of platitudes.

The relationship between the individual and society, between life and thought, always presents difficulties which should be dealt with as each case demands. Generalisation and categorisation can create their own problems and offer no real solution. By creating categories, we merely link

potential difficulties, each of which can only be resolved through correlation of the particular facts and conditions of the case in question.

If we are not to fall into the trap of simple game-playing or of fictional biography, then we must identify an appropriate method: one which will enable us to reconstruct the fundamental personality of the subject - or in this case, as I wish to limit the field of study considerably, to attempt reconstruction not of the whole man, but purely of the reflective aspect of his personality. For me - and, I hope, for you - it is a) the reflective, and b) the social side of the personality which is of particular interest. In other words, I hope to reconstruct the key structural points of social significance in the thinking of a particular individual. It is the indications of personal philosophy, supported by cultural signifiers, which will be of relevance in this method. Personality is therefore perceived through second-order elements, ie: through the particular properties of the way in which the philosophical system is interpreted and manifests itself.

A striving for scientific objectivity is by no means synonymous with a search for an unambiguous truth. So unfamiliar are we with life in a complex yet accessible culture, rich with the traditions of a thousand years, that we see cultural creations as strange miracles, and their creators as guardians of some arcane knowledge. For the whole and harmonious culture now lost to us could only exist, renew itself - and, indeed, degenerate! - in an environment in which the cultural heritage was passed uninterrupted from one generation to the next.

If what we perceive to be the cream of a culture is its humanitarian elements - its poets, writers, artists and philosophers - then are we not forgetting that these are merely cultural amplifiers, the loudspeakers or mouthpieces of a culture, as well as, at the same time, they express, tell and distort it. For they talk of the things which they believe need to be discussed, and leave out what they take for granted. Besides, they talk; surely much must go unsaid?

M. Foucault (*Words and Things*, Moscow, 1977) seeks to establish the structure of thought, and observes major changes at its very earliest stages. But that is nothing; that is only half the journey. It is also interesting to trace a path in the other direction: from general structures to reality. And the real, observable manifestations of these structures can only be discerned in the personality; that is the only way in which they are revealed. It is not the psychological aspect which concerns me, but the individual's consciousness of the abstract. A deeper pattern can only be traced (adjusted, founded, determined) by a personal understanding and perception of abstract reality. This pattern, or episteme, has a determining effect on personal perceptions not only through language - that would be too general, too abstract -but by means of a specific, personal-universal language of signs. " The written word does not vanish like the spoken word. It imprints its stamp upon the mind... Yet at the same time, by codifying the spirit, the word robs it of mobility, oppresses it... The word is a verb addressed to the whole of time - it is not one speech of the Lord's, but the whole of His heavenly image..." (Chaadaev, P. Y., *Essays*, Moscow, 1989, pp. 134, 136) Contemporary language - both in philosophical and everyday speech - has become flat, stale, stilted and impoverished. It needs to be enriched again, and that means changing the intention and possibilities of the thought which conveys an image in words: we must go beyond the word to the imagery it conveys. For this it is best to fall back on an old Russian tradition - albeit one we have broken with - a tradition which touches not only upon the word, but, on a broader scale, thought, imagery. So I shall be making use not only of the text as it stands, but of the text of ideas, which is broader and richer than verbal language; it is non-linear, allowing a variety of interpretations, and does not lead into a sub-text of assumed given knowledge. This will give us an opportunity to train ourselves, to study our language and thought.

One such text is architecture (including the landscape architecture of parks and gardens). Many researchers have noted the similarities between the languages of architecture and nature,

and equally the synthesis of architecture and philosophy, a phenomenon resulting from the creative nature of the former. Architecture is a manifestation of the spirit; it reinforces time within a given space, and transforms the transitory into the eternal. In organising space through architecture, Man not only creates a functional living-environment, but also reveals his vision of the world, his perception of beauty and harmony, and his dreams of an ideal life. There is hardly an architectural structure or landscaped park which does not rival in its impact the works of literature - and some, indeed, are even superior. The classical example is that of the temple as a model of the world, of the cosmos, as a link (mesocosm) between Man (the microcosm) and the universe (macrocosm). "Architectural monuments, as valuable documents of an epoch, are perfectly valid subjects of culturological study, and of especial value in reconstructing an integral social consciousness by means of composite source study and source integration." (Gromov, M. N., "The Philosophical Semantics of Architecture," in *Social Thought: Research and Publications*, Second Edition, Moscow, 1990, p.85)

The difficulty lies in tracing the semantics of architecture, parks and gardens, in identifying the content of their imagery. We lack practice in reading images of the world in wood and stone.

D. S. Likhachov (*The Poetry of Gardens*, St.Petersburg, 1991) sees the garden as a text. The message of the garden - full of ambiguity, irresolution and movement - can only be divined. Of all the aspects - semiotic, emotional, architectural - of the garden as an iconological system, it is the semantic which is the most essential. It is this which gives it its link, its organic kinship with the written and oral arts, and poetry in particular. In different epochs the word has received various treatment and reference to it has varied accordingly; hence the diversity of the "appeal" which the garden makes to us, through its dual semantics. It speaks to everyone, both through its style (aesthetic system, appurtenance to a given aesthetic climate) and through the meaning of each of its component parts. A wide variety of devices are employed as signs in the service of landscape architecture: flora, engravings, sculpture, scent and sound. Everything is used to aesthetic effect, and each of the senses is stimulated. Throughout the ages, the central feature of the garden has been variety. Variety is essential because a park or garden always presents a model of the world in microcosm, a transformation of the world into a kind of interior, a picture of the ideal relationship between mankind and nature.

People perceive the garden variously as:

- * a likeness of the universe, a book about the universe;
- * analogous to the Bible, the universe being the Bible made manifest - a text in which we read the will of God;
- * a book reflecting only the good, the ideal features of the world, ie: an Eden, a Paradise;
- * the passing of time;
- * human life with all its history, diversity and memories;
- * a representation of reason (the visualisation of thought);
- * a representation of the soul (the visualisation of emotion);
- * a classroom, a school, a college - a place for reading, studying, for private reflection and conversation;
- * a journey;
- * a social gathering;
- * a cabinet of curiosities;
- * a theatre;
- * a painting;
- * an imitation, a game, etc.

It is therefore clear that the garden has close links with the social construct, with the way of life and everyday existence of its owners. Hence D. S. Likhachov's deliberate introduction of the concept of "the daily life of the garden."

Likhachov has undertaken the study of style in the art of landscape architecture in the context of the great stylistic movements witnessed in the other arts. There are, as he himself notes, difficulties involved in this approach. Firstly, gardens do not lend themselves well to categorisation by style, being living works of art subject to constant change. Secondly, the particular characteristics of the medium mean that the history of landscape architecture has not been marked by radical stylistic changes; moreover, the principle of diversity must include diversity of style. Indeed, the very concept of a relationship between landscape design and philosophy does not stand up to thorough investigation, since on the one hand, "the landscaped gardens of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, although expressive of a certain philosophy, could not be classified as belonging to any particular style," whilst on the other, "classicism and the principles of landscape design both based their philosophy on the cult of nature..." (Likhachev, op. cit., pp. 182, 187) A garden does not lend itself readily to verbal description.

Likhachev's excellent book relieves me of the need to summarise the opinions and literature relevant to the subject, and to evaluate the park's place in European culture. Despite the virtues of the author's idea, however, it also has a certain number of drawbacks. The exercise of forcing existing parks into certain preordained stylistic categories merely leads us to a number of generalised empirical conclusions, for style is more than simply conformity with the aesthetic consciousness of a given era. The only meaningful judgement we can make is that gardens have always been cultural phenomena (which includes aesthetic and ideological forms), which is to say that they have been deliberately included in the cultural sphere. The style of a garden is determined by the essential characteristics of the semantic devices used, ie: of how a certain something is expressed. The observer does not see what distinguishes that something, or its link to the how of its expression; nor do we see its fundamental connection to the individual style and character of the architect of the garden, park or building.

G.K.Wagner, and P.A.Florenskii before him, recommend the use of a functional method to demonstrate the semantics of architecture. "Separate the church from what takes place within it, forget about the images associated with individual parts of it and with its structure, and you get a kind of skeleton, a lifeless, voiceless anatomical mass. In order to understand the purpose and interrelation of its component parts, you must first see the life-function which they perform..." states A.I.Golubtsov (From Readings on Liturgy and the Architecture of Churches, Part II, "The Sergieva Quarter," 1918, p.3). By the functional method Wagner, the foremost proponent of the idea, means an analysis of the object's structure within the environment and circumstances in which it was built and within the context of its activity, its life-function. The functionalisation of the object is taken to mean not only the fulfilment of purpose and requirements, but also the fulfilment of "requirements [or of a purpose] of a much broader, ideological nature - the considerations of personal philosophy (symbolic, cosmological considerations), of politics (considerations of State) and of aesthetics (of art)." (Wagner, G.K., *The Art of Thinking in Stone*, Moscow, 1990; Cf. also I.P.Shmelev's "third system of signals," in *The Golden Section*, Shevelov,I.S., Marutaev,M. A., Shmelev,I.P., Moscow, 1990.) Florenskii sees the need for this approach as a result of Man's spiritual activity: "The higher the nature of human activity, the greater the need for a functional approach to understanding and examining this activity, and the more sterile becomes the work of the crude collector of the curious and the monstrous..." (Florenskii,P.A., "The Troitse-Sergieva Monastery and Russia -The Church as a Synthesis of Art," in *0 Rus, Stern Sorceress*, Novgorod, 1991, p.233)

In his study of the Troitse-Sergieva monastery in the context of the Russian culture, Florenskii gives an excellent example of the functional approach. He sees the monastery as a living entity of microcosm and microhistory, like a synopsis of daily life, a portrait of Russia in her entirety," a manifestation or implementation of the Russian idea - an entelechy," where Russia is perceived as an indivisible whole. This gives the monastery the qualities of a noumenon. The place is imbued with the spiritual energy of its founder, Saint Sergii. Sergii's house is the face of Russia, a portrait conveying, in condensed form, a variety of different impressions. The theoretical possibility of a portrait of this kind is inherent in the very idea of culture: "the very idea of culture implies both the value of outward form and an intrinsic value which flows from the external and yet is unconnected with the material world. Culture also implies this giving of an outer form, which is a sign of what one might call the plasticity of life, since life has value only where there is an expectation of value." (Florenskii, op.cit., p.214) Signs of such manifestations invoke an emotional response in us. The monastery is an image of the face of Mother Russia, and its founder is her first image, her first manifestation - an icon of her face.

If we trace briefly the main points of Florenskii's approach, we see that it forms a chain: cultural community - the face of this community (the entelechy) - the image of its face (the architect). This gives me an opening, in accordance with long-established convention, to return to the subject of the great prince and his palace at Alupka. Here, at Alupka, I found my emotions stirred. The palace and its grounds attract me - just as the monastery attracted Florenskii - not because of its social dimension, but most of all because of its character. The attraction towards the higher manifestations of a personality can nowadays be fully explained. Moving "from the solitary intellect to universal reason," (Florenskii, op.cit., p.230) under our own impulsion, stuck in the mire of the Middle Ages with our modern standards and technology, we have developed an idiosyncrasy, an allergy to society, to community, which causes us to search desperately for the individual in our native traditions.

Most of the existing works on the subject of the Alupka Palace are essentially descriptive in nature. They all affirm the uniqueness and great value of Alupka, yet none of them helps me to understand why I feel more at home there than in my own house. They fail to deal with questions of structure and the underlying principles of its construction - by which I mean not just the aesthetic principles born of long tradition, but the philosophy behind its creation. There is of course the stylistic approach commonly favoured by art historians; I have already stated that this is essentially descriptive, but it none the less serves as a "first step" towards solving my queries. I shall thus attempt, with reference to Vergunov & Gorokhov (Russian Parks and Gardens, Moscow, 1988), and Likhachov (op. cit.), to give a brief account of the stylistic features of Romantic parks, among whose number the grounds of Alupka must be counted.

The early nineteenth century is generally considered as the heyday of landscape architecture, and the romantic park as its crowning glory, embodying as it did the very best in craftsmanship and ideas that landscape design had produced over the preceding two hundred years. The landscape garden has its foundations in two ideological traditions - British liberalism and the philosophy of rationalism - and one literary one - poetry, and the poetry of Milton in particular. Landscaping is the legacy of a philosophy of the natural world, a cult of nature which held the natural world to be inviolable. It means transforming and improving upon nature by bringing out its essential character (and not imposing an extraneous order, nor yet paring nature down to a schematic core), resulting in the aestheticisation of nature, Man's internal perception of it as a landscape reflection of his inner world. The garden became a work of art - a synthesis of all the arts, yet with a strong leaning towards the art of the painter. The overriding feature of the garden was the greatest possible diversity in the smallest possible space; the principles of aesthetics and freedom served to bring about the triumph of the dynamic over the static: the unending process of creation, vitality, the changing nature of the garden itself and the mobility of the observer all

took on the utmost importance. Since visitors to parks and gardens largely go there to take a stroll, the genre of the sentimental journey became popular. The diversity of contrasting styles which developed, and which overlaid the boundaries of cultural epochs, suggest that the statement of a world view made by a garden was a faithful reflection of its creator's own philosophy. With the advent of Romanticism, the traditional emblematic or commemorative function of the garden was replaced by one of remembrance. In accordance with the principle of liberty, all boundary-lines were expunged from the park, so that it blended in with its surroundings. The aim was no longer to create a diversity of objects, but to produce a multitude of impressions, by the use of sudden contrasts of scenery, and associative perceptions were fostered less by the use of emblems and symbols than by the very nature of the garden's composition. Conceptual symbols were replaced by emotional ones, associations of ideas by associations of moods, historical events were reduced to the level of personal biography - in short, every element of the park was made subordinate to the individual's emotional experiences. "Gardens and groves live within us," said Shaftesbury. The Romantic park responds more closely than any other to individual tastes.

Steeped in tradition as it is, the landscaped park represents a considerable increase in the volume and variety of information that the medium can convey. The nature of the message is, however, extremely unspecific, and its decoding depends on the reader's mood and his knowledge of the Romantic lexicon. This means that the Romantic park exists only for the educated visitor, which at the time meant basically the aristocracy, for whom the landscaped garden was one of the greatest cultural attributes, and one closely identified above all with poetry. The elements of the romantic garden were consequently not understood out with the garden life of the well-bred, well-educated, enlightened aristocrat. As a result, the composition and message of the Romantic park, particularly when the movement was at its height, were to a very great degree dependent upon the personality and way of life of the proprietor, who in the majority of cases took a direct part in its design and construction. The implication of this is that without detailed knowledge of the owner, it is impossible to determine the message and meaning of a park. There are, of course, a set of standard elements common to romantic landscaping: gently flowing water, engravings, traces of classical inspiration, old trees standing alone, grass and flowers, a Parnassus, etc. - these are like landmarks in a sea of meaning. Yet even the use of such constants was highly idiosyncratic. Thus Ossianism, a bleak and melancholy atmosphere without a shadow of irony which took as its theme sadness and death, was characteristic of Romantic landscape architecture; however, only an extremely small area of Alupka is in this style - not enough to qualify the park to be described as "showing an Ossianic influence" (Likhachov, *op. cit.*, p.316). (A typical Ossianic landscape is the Highlands of Scotland - a wild, cold, bleak, rocky northern terrain; Alupka, in contrast, is warm and sunny).

For me, the most interesting and penetrating observations about the inner meaning of Alupka are those made by the head of research at the palace museum, Anna Abramovna Galichenko, both in her writings and in public speeches, presentations and discussions. Drawing upon a wealth of observation and documentation, she concludes that Alupka was built on the site of a mediaeval farmstead belonging to the Paleologue family (and of an even older sanctuary), and continues in the same tradition. Alupka lies in a natural hollow in the shape of an amphitheatre on the sea-shore, and represents the union of form and idea. The interior movement is along the vertical plane of the amphitheatre from the sea. The park opens out before the observer the whole history of landscape art, from ancient Greece to the Renaissance and the Orient. The palace is at the centre of the world (the estate); within its walls, Europe unfolds from West to East, and to observe the changing styles of the successive rooms is to take a comfortable and reflective journey through the countries of the world. To the North of the palace lies Chaos, symbol of the unrelenting and elusive passage of time. And above it all sits Ai-Petri, lodestar and heavenly castle, home of the higher Reason. (Cf. Galichenko, A.A., Palchikova, A.P., Alupka Palace

Museum, Simferopol, 1989) According to Galichenko, Alupka represents the dual world of the Russian nobility (social appearances/private intimacy) by its division into two parts: the official and the intimate. The space is ordered in the shape of a giant cross (its axes running from Ai-Petri to the sea, and from the Church of the Archangel Michael to the promontory AiTodor) with the palace at its centre, which with its grounds presents a microcosm, a model of the world, the embodiment of that other world, or perfect bliss, of Plato's Phaedrus which is symbolically represented by a pyramid in the lake in the upper park.

Much of this interpretation is undoubtedly valid; however, on the whole it seems to me to be artificial, an arbitrary and ad hoc collection of ideas, taking as its sole metaphysical basis the concept of the other Earth, which in Plato's description is in no way reminiscent of Alupka. Of course the architect was conversant with classical literature (indeed, he was already translating classical texts from the French when still a boy), but he was too complex and self-willed a character to base his creation on a single abstract idea. Even at first glance one can see the intricate structure of Alupka, which suggests that it is structurally linked to the personal philosophy of Mikhail Semyonovich Vorontsov. An understanding of the structure of Alupka should give us a clear picture of the individual philosophy of a certain social class at the time of its construction. I should like, however, to avoid the conventional aesthetic method of describing the culture of an era by reference to the prevailing styles of the time, which in turn requires an understanding of why one or another -ism was in vogue at a given moment. What we see at Alupka is a model of the world, in which "human culture is represented by palaces, life by trees, and the Earth by a rock" (Florenskii, op.cit.,p.223), a reflection of particular conceptions about the world (a second reflection).

Strictly speaking, then, I must prove a theorem of possibility, ie: prove that the metaphysical structure of Alupka adequately reflects the structure of the personal philosophy of one of the highest-ranking Russian noblemen of the first half of the nineteenth century, who - through the intermediary of a great many craftsmen - designed and built the Alupka estate. Proof of this nature demands the application of a methodology which will permit us to identify and contrast these two structures.

As the subject of our study belonged to a social class and to an era which are both brilliantly portrayed in classical Russian literature, I wondered whether literary works might perhaps give us a few hints. And indeed, the necessary clues come instantly to hand, in Chapter Seven of Pushkin's Eugene onegin. It is the character of Tatyana who solves our problem, when she attempts (and with some success) to comprehend the structure and sense of Onegin's soul by examining the farmstead which he has left. I shall call this the TDL method (for Tatyana Dmitrievna Larina); below is an examination of the method with commentary. (Pushkin, A.S., Complete Works in Ten Volumes, Fourth Edition, Moscow, 1977, vol. V, pp. 126-130)

xv

*... In her dreaming
profoundly sunk, Tatyana stalked for hours alone;*

1. T. thinks about O. for a long time, and is in tune with him. She is well acquainted with his circle of friends, his conversations, his scandals, his picture of the world, and certain important events in his life.

*... she walked and walked...
Suddenly, from a crest, she sighted
a house, a village, and a wood*

*below a hill; a garden stood
above a stream the moon had lighted...*

2. She must look at the place, the homestead, where he lived. First its general aspect and layout.

...he has left, and no one here has met her...

3. 0. is no longer there, there are only traces, leftovers, fragments of his reality ordered by his consciousness.

4. T. is an outside observer, but with a personal interest in what she observes, because she loves 0. and is sensitive to his emotions.

xvi

*"The house, the park.. I'll go and see!"
So down came Tanya, hardly daring
to draw a breath, around her staring
with puzzled and confused regard...
She entered the deserted yard...*

5. T. now looks at the house from close up, and with it -importantly - the courtyard and garden. She looks at it with astonishment, as if uncomprehending.

xvii

*... she went inside the empty shell
in which our hero used to dwell.
She looks: forgotten past all chalking
on billiard-table rests a cue,
and on the crumpled sofa too
a riding whip. Tanya keeps walking...
"And here's the hearth", explains the crone,
"where master used to sit alone.*

xix

*Tatyana in deep emotion
gazes at all the scene around;
she drinks it like a priceless potion;
it stirs her drooping soul to bound
in fashion that's half-glad, half-anguished...*

6. Now T. carefully examines the house from the inside, and observes its particular character and the traces of 0. For her it is the spirit of the place which is important, and not the bare facts of it. All of it is important, every detail: the furniture, the pictures, the statuettes, even the view from the window. But the spirit lies in the totality of the impression created by an accumulation of small details. For it is the soul of 0. as he lived here which is the unifying factor bringing the conventional details together.

Let me now return to part of verse XVIII, which I left out:

*... And just here, in the window-nook,
is where old master took up station,*

*and put his glasses on to see
his Sunday game of cards with me...*

7. It is no bad thing to consider the traditions of the past as well, the ancestral background upon which the traces of O. are overlaid.

xxi

*... The next day
at earliest morning out she started,
to the empty homestead made her way,
then in the study's quiet setting,
at last alone, and quite forgetting
the world and all its works, she wept and sat
there as the minutes crept;
the books then underwent inspection...
at first she had no heart to range;
but then she found their choice was strange.
To reading from this odd collection
Tatyana turned with thirsting soul:
and watched a different world unroll.*

8. Now to what O. used to read; and then, broadening the investigation, to what surprised him, and to the images among which he lived.

xxii

*There many pages keep the impression
where a sharp nail has made a dent.
On these, with something like obsession,
the girl's attentive eyes are bent.
Tatyana sees with trepidation
what kind of thought, what observation
had drawn Eugene's especial heed
and where he'd silently disagreed.
Her eyes along the margin flitting
pursue his pencil. Everywhere
Onegin's soul encountered there
declares itself in ways unwitting -
terse words or crosses in the book,
or else a query's wondering hook.*

9. T. establishes that O.'s soul was loath to express itself in response to the current of culture (my emphasis).

xxiv

*And so, at last, feature by feature,
Tanya begins to understand
more thoroughly, thank God, the creature
for whom her passion has been planned
by fate's decree: this freakish stranger,
who walks with sorrow, and with danger,
whether from heaven or from hell,
this angel, this proud devil, tell,*

*what is he? Just an apparition,
a shadow, null and meaningless,
a Muscovite in Harold's dress,
a modish second-hand edition,
a glossary of smart argot...
a parodistic rare-show?*

xxv

*Can she have found the enigma's setting?
Is this the riddle's missing clue?*

10. O.'s contradictions now become apparent. T. searches for a word to describe the fundamental structural characteristics of his soul.

11. And lastly it should be noted that the clue which T. finds is ironical and incomplete; it can only be formulated as a question, and not as an answer.

And there we have the basic principles of the TDL method (points 1 - 11). However - suitably inspired by Pushkin - we must go on to pursue a more serious line of enquiry. (*)

The human consciousness is closed to the philosopher; it is not an object (Mamardshavili, M.A., "The Philosophical Problem of Consciousness," in *voprosy Filosofii*, NO 10, 1990) and cannot, therefore, be constructed in theory. In order to pin down the non-material, unsubstantive consciousness we must shine it upon something concrete and study its reflection; or to be more accurate, it is the consciousness itself which constantly shows its reflection in something or someone, changing as it does so; the consciousness is the construction and reconstruction of links between elements of the objective world. In my research I shall not seek to reveal the workings of the conscious mind; I shall instead endeavour to judge its preconceptions from their product - from the reflections, the imprints left behind. "No human being can convey to another the ideal as such, as a pure form of activity... The ideal as a form of subjective activity can only be gleaned by actively working with the subject and the product of that activity, ie: through the form of the product, the objective form of things" (Ilyenkov, E.V., "The Ideal" in *Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, vol. 11, Moscow, 1962, p.226). The form in which the ideal is expressed is language: language links the elements of what is conveyed, in the broadest sense of the word, within a coherent system of imprints. It might even be said, with respect to our particular concern in the matter, that the consciousness acts as the imprinter, a mechanism for structuring and restructuring material, creating qualitatively new links between objects. The consciousness can thus be seen as unsubstantial in the sense that its carrier is the whole of mankind.

Different imprints show up - with varying degrees of clarity - different characteristics of the conscious mind. In order to limit the scope of our enquiry, I shall be looking solely at those imprints which indicate philosophical beliefs. The totality of these beliefs shall be termed the philosophical structure. I can therefore state that there is a correlation, implicit in the word imprint, between a person's philosophical structure and the structural connections that person creates as a result of his activities. Study of the subject's philosophical beliefs thus allows us to interpret their imprints, and vice versa.

This approach will permit us to examine the complexity and ambiguity of the relationship between beliefs and imprints, basing our study upon a two axioms:

Firstly, that, out of all the diverse manifestations and characteristics of a society's consciousness, it is possible to establish its philosophical structure.

Secondly, that in a given society at a given stage of its development (ie: at a given point in time), there are always one or more kinds of philosophical structure which are characteristic of the majority of the members of that society and are reflected in their works.

By studying the various material creations of a particular age, we are able to establish which philosophical structures were the most widespread at the time. All imprints can be divided into the linguistic and the non-linguistic (or quasi-linguistic). The latter term denotes the unspoken yet active sense-images which float in the continuum of the conscious mind. The former denotes texts, which give us a system of philosophical categories, and also myths, which are pictures of the world. Texts written with the aim of presenting a system of this kind are termed properly philosophical, or having a philosophical content. The coordinates of the philosophical structure consist of categories which reveal interpretations of the Absolute, the world, the individual, and their interrelations. The essential philosophical structure may be determined from the way in which the Absolute and the individual's relationship to it are perceived; these are the two points at either end of the harp-string whose note is philosophical myth. This is without a doubt the point at which we find ourselves in the realms of religion; only in this case, we are dealing with another, philosophical, quasi-religious Absolute. (Mamardshavili, M.K., op.cit., p.17)

In the European culture, imprints very often reflect the individual personality. "The ideal exists only where there is individual personality," because the ideal is "the form taken by the individual's activity." (Ilyenkov, E.V., op.cit., p.227) The problem is that the relationship between the individual and society, between individual consciousness and what might be termed the social consciousness, and also between real life and the world of ideas, is not known. There are very few general indications, since the coming together of mutually influential personalities as a sociocultural whole is both historically and individually changeable. Each individual case must be examined on its material merits.

The individual consciousness creates a mutable personal myth (Losev, A.F., "The Dialectic of the Myth," in *A Selection of Early Works*, Moscow, 1990), but the basic structures of personal myths in a given society typically change extremely slowly. As has already been stated, there are typologies for such myths. The philosophical structure of a mutable personal myth will leave its imprint on literally everything, as it provides the structure for the entire personality; however, some of these imprints give us a clearer picture than others, namely: those which indicate the relationship between the individual and his personal Absolute. In order to gauge this relationship accurately and to understand the language it employs, one must first gain familiarity with the contemporary context - ie: with the forms of the relationship as it existed at the time - and this can be most easily determined from contemporary philosophical works, since they are specifically concerned with the voicing of mythological structures. One other extremely rich seam of information is furnished by the contemporary arts, and literature in particular, since it is in the arts that the personality is revealed (through the identification of subject and object in the object, according to Losev), and thus becomes more easily subject to analysis.

This approach would appear to enable us to resolve, in each specific case, a problem which concerns a number of disciplines, including hermeneutics (Cf., for example, Gadamer, G.G., *The Actuality of Beauty*, Moscow, 1991), of the plurality and comparison of traditions. In order to understand a thinker of an earlier age (or, indeed, of a different tradition), one must tune in to his tradition, without losing touch with one's own. This means finding a means of comparing traditions, an adequate translation of the language used. A past consciousness can be traced only by the imprints left behind; an alien consciousness is judged by its outward manifestations. Of

course, the very fact that it is possible to decipher these imprints points to a common bond uniting all humanity. However, more specific questions demand a certain objectivity: how did they really think? In other words, a system of categorical philosophical coordinates is required. Talk of really would be possible were there - as in Newton's system - a set of absolute coordinates, a single gnosiological Absolute. In fact no such system exists; there are, however, historically mutable systems of personality, and we are confined to comparing these.

Bachelard (*L'Activite rationaliste de la physique contemporaine*, Paris, 1951, p.25) spoke of two histories: history seen from here and history seen from there. Yet the latter must also to some extent be seen from here, since it is impossible -and, indeed, unnecessary - to view it entirely from the other side. In my terms, the two histories will be distinguished by a yardstick, ie: by measurement against the Absolute. History seen from here is the study of an earlier philosopher (alien to us) by the standards of our own, local Absolute; in this case, the structure, the common bond, is usually lost, and we are reduced to creating categories of the successful and unsuccessful, true and false traces/imprints/ideas (true ideas are generally termed as being before their time.) History seen from there is the study of a philosopher within his own set of coordinates, measured by his own Absolute, and guided only by his own personal philosophy, which determines the meaning of his enquiries. It is in this case that Bachelard talks of the "paleontology of the vanished soul."

The paleontology of the soul allows us to follow two related lines of enquiry: firstly, to reconstruct - with some degree of verisimilitude - the personal philosophy of a particular individual; and secondly, to decipher and understand the meaning of that person's creative works. For the first task, we must examine two sources of information:

1. Texts and other imprints of the subject's personality upon his actions;
2. The sociocultural background against which the personality and its imprints must be seen.

There are certain difficulties which can only be overcome by luck and intuition on the part of the researcher. These concern the proper preparation of the sociocultural background (essentially in respect of the philosophical coordinates) and, in the absence of explicit statements of personal philosophy, the use of the cultural images which were in the air, so to speak, at the time, even where the subject was unaware of using them -since if they were in the air, it was because people used them to try to express their view of the world. The methodology we are developing, then, will enable us to identify the subject's philosophical structure, which forms the basis for the image-language through which he expresses his individual spirituality. In other words, we shall be examining his character and its works, its means of self-expression - against its own yardstick.

Thus the paleontology of the soul combines two elements: on the one hand, the artefact, the cultural phenomenon, the creation, which is read in accordance with its fundamental semantico-structural principles; and on the other, the structured philosophical myth of its creator. This tells us what the myth is dependent on, what the conditions of its formation and existence. The fundamental principle of the myth within a culture is most commonly related to the idea of God: God's omniscience, His relationship with the world and with the individual, form stable points, landmarks, the invariables of the self. Much, however, depends on the degree to which the creation or imprint is charged or loaded with philosophical meaning; texts may therefore be roughly divided into the following:

1. The broadly philosophical text.
2. The artistic/reflective text.
3. The scientific/methodological text.
4. The theoretical, speculative text (within the fields of natural science, theology, astrology, etc.). (In each of these, the personal philosophy of the subject is clearly or fairly clearly discernible.)
5. Cultural constructs created in the same style, by the same author or architect, or at the same

time (ie: with a connection to a given time or place, eg: churches, towns, novels, parks, estates, etc.).

6. Poorer works of art and other works.

7. Auxiliary, separate works containing only an insignificant degree of information about human relations.

(These last three kinds of text require far greater knowledge of the background, the implicit images, the cultural traditions, without which no remotely relevant hypothesis can be made regarding the subject's personal philosophy.)

If the broad outline of the subject's philosophy is known, it may help to decipher the world of his creations, since these are the material and spiritual expression of the whole personality, personal beliefs included. For this a rough set of philosophical parameters must first be established, which will depend largely on the genre of the creative works in question. Emphasis may be placed upon the ontological, gnosiological or other parameters. Thus we can trace both the tradition within which the subject thought, and rival traditions (at which, either openly or implicitly, its polemic was targeted). The anthropogenic structure which is thereby revealed gives us an understanding of cultural creativity as the creation of a unified and harmonious structure, enriched by the modulations introduced by individual contributions. Once we have grasped the individual's own interpretation of the images he uses, we can also decipher what he is trying to say with them, by the way in which he places them in context and in relation to one another. This is the material embodiment of philosophical structures, which aims to discover (or invent) an intermediate structural form for them in accordance with the spiritual culture of the time, the era and the individual characteristics of the case.

2. THE NOBILITY

Il faut que j'arrange ma maison

Pushkin's last words

The main factor determining M.S.Vorontsov's social status was his position in the highest ranks of the Russian nobility. Since there is, of course, a correlation between social status and personal beliefs, I should first, in order to uncover the nature of the latter, give a brief summary of the role of the nobility in the history of eighteenth and early nineteenth century Russian society, and of the corresponding evolution of that class's perceptions of the world. However, since space does not permit this, I must instead refer you to the best that the Russian historical sciences have to offer in this respect, namely V.O.Klyuchevskii's work on the subject, in his *Essays* (Moscow, 1987-1990, vol.V, pp.117-281).

The shape of social tensions in Russia at this time can be described as a triangle formed by the monarchy, the nobility and the people. Tsar Nicholas I set out his policies in the following terms: "I never hinder the natural course of things, and I can indeed say with confidence that we are advancing carefully, avoiding major upheavals and uprisings. Russia may pride herself on this achievement before the other great powers. But I must repeat that change of any kind must not only be gradual, but it must also be based upon one central idea..." "I try to let everything come from here [at this point he gestured to his breast]..." (The Archives of the Vorontsov Princes, ed. P.I.Bartenev, Moscow, 1870-1897, vol.XXXVIII, pp.407,387). The noblemen were meanwhile trying to put pressure on the government and limit its powers by means of creating their own senate and constitution. "The upper classes ... represented numerically only a slight unevenness, like small boils barely noticeable on the body social; and yet they were the only section of society to enjoy full civil rights..." A complex system of government and a set of bureaucratic institutions "were run by a small group of people, perhaps a little over a million in all; the rest of the masses were governed by other authorities" (such as landowners and the Zemstvo police). Serfdom was the norm. The nobility were mostly in favour of abolishing the feudal system, not out of any sympathy for the serfs, but out of anxiety about their land. The original purpose of the system of serfdom had been to bind the aristocracy into the service of the tsar and give them the task of policing the countryside. But there were few committed advocates of the abolition of slavery: "statesmen used to reflection and who had considered the position of the nobility to which they themselves belonged, such as Count Kiselyov and Prince Vorontsov" (Klyuchevskii, *op.cit.*, pp.250,435).

There was at this time a persistent trend in the social elite of emancipation from the political centre. The ideology and psychology of aristocratic autonomy and his Lordship the squire were anathema to the autocrat, who sought to find an antidote in the service class - a group of people bound to the court by their total dependency on imperial appointment and the salary it brought. The powerful landowning gentry were again in the ascendant at the start of Alexander II's reign. "One excellent specimen of the breed was the distinguished Count M.S.Vorontsov.. being in the service and under the control of the tsar did not prevent him from getting what he wanted... His success stemmed from the fact that he recognised the futility of opposing the monarch; Vorontsov preferred to serve him. And yet this did not make him one of the usual parvenu bureaucrats at the imperial court. Vorontsov retained a great and aristocratic style." One could recount a fair number of the great names of the early nineteenth century whose collective style had a long tradition, going back "to one Prince Shcherbatov, an aristocratic dissident at the time of Catherine the Great." (Paramonov,B., "The Griboyedova Canal," in *Znanie - sila*, N0 4, 1991) Here we already address the issue of the characteristics of the nobility and of the aristocratic

character-type(s). For a discussion of the way in which the character of the nobility developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and its influence on social development, we again turn to Klyuchevskii.

According to Klyuchevskii (Cf. also Guber, P. K., *The Romances of Puslikin*, Moscow, 1990), the Russian nobleman since the time of Peter the Great has passed through the following stages in his development:

* soldier and navigator under Peter the Great (with technical and military training);

* petty gentry under Elizabeth (versed in worldly affairs);

(it was during these first two stages that he acquired a taste for study and began to aspire to education)

* *homme de lettres*, freethinker, freemason and Voltairean under Catherine the Great (when a little literary polish became *de rigueur*).

The next generation were to differ from their Voltairean fathers in their propensity for sentiment, which they valued over thought. The young generals of 1812 and the Decembrists of 1825 acted in response to the stimulation of war. This generation were raised by the so-called third wave of French emigres, conservative catholics who brought with them - along with French games and liberal ideas - both genuine and insincere religious belief and a vague feeling that one should live by one's wits. However, this upbringing gave the young noblemen little experience of reality. After their experiences of the privations of war and all that they had seen in Europe, the men of the new generation aspired to be of use in a real world which seemed utterly bleak to them. Whereas their fathers knew nothing of the real world and paid it no attention, they themselves, although equally ignorant of it, began to pay some heed. "The fathers were Russians longing to be French, and the sons were brought up as Frenchmen and longed to be Russians." Thus the December uprising, according to Klyuchevskii, was the unfortunate expression of the young noblemen's "seething emotions." And the whole time, these moral and political ideas were kept apart from their private lives and relationships.

Whilst including the reigns of both Nicholas I and Alexander II in one epoch, Klyuchevskii simply and graphically demonstrates the different moods of the start of Alexander's reign and the period after the war with Napoleon, thereby distinguishing the distinct philosophical structures of the two emperors. The early Alexandrian style is as high as a bird flies and his architectural plan of reality is drawn in outline, the trivial details - the cogs, the oiling of the wheels, the waste - passing unnoticed; conversion of the social machine can therefore be started straight away - all that is needed is to have a prototype of the new mechanism (ie: a new policy) drawn up. (Cp. Tolstoy, L.N., *War and Peace*, in the Complete Works, vol.IV, Moscow, 1951, pp.171-172) Nicholas's style gazes up from below, up from the barrack-room upbringing and across the turning of a thousand bureaucratic wheels in the state machine, up out of the concrete; the marshalling of Russian society into a vast army, with laws, statutes and discipline acting as the bastion of a stable order, and where order is class, is marching to a beat, where the soldier's strength resides in the solidarity of the group, where innovation means handing down traditions, gradually acquiring practice and the force of habit (and where creative inspiration is outlawed). The essential feature of Nicholas's world-view - society as an army - also had an influence upon his personality. Within the family circle he was frank, cheerful and witty, a good master with a highly developed sense of beauty. But in his official capacity his manner was that of a harsh, stern and powerful overlord. And whilst at the beginning this was a studied pose befitting the tasks of government, it soon became his habitual and involuntary manner. He began to speak and give orders with a peremptory bark, and saw any deviation from the norm as a breach of military discipline.

Our discussion of the overall social position of the nobility would be incomplete - in respect of Prince Vorontsov -without specific reference to the army. The army was an institution of crucial importance both to the nobility and to the country as a whole. Its fate clearly highlights one of the most important inconsistencies of the Russian State of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries - and, indeed, in both earlier and later incarnations. Every stable social structure strives to achieve greater independence and autonomy, strives to become, in effect, a social class in its own right. Such was the Russian army at the start of the nineteenth century, as it took on the features of a self-contained corporate structure. The new recruit who passed into the ranks was in fact and in legal terms crossing over into a different class, and the government tried to make military service hereditary. The army also had its own kind of socio-psychological make-up. It was one of the channels of vertical social mobility; people's aspirations to social promotion were often realised here, where, more than anywhere else, elevation on the social scale was the result of merit. The effect of individual and corporate interest was that people traditionally vied with one another in their devotion to the service of crown and country, and to be decorated for one's service counted as the highest social honour. A whole body of special measures, decorations and incentives grew up, and was largely instrumental in the development of an army value-system. And for the aristocracy, military service was like a compulsory stage in a young man's education. It was considered one of the most noble occupations for the upper classes, besides carrying a man up the social ladder up to two times as fast as did civilian service. Moreover, a military man was prized, when he left the army to go into civilian service, for the qualities that made a good bureaucrat - efficiency, decisiveness and the capacity for clear judgement.

The balance of stability and instability at that time was the opposite of what we see in the army today: the rank-and-file soldiers tended to serve almost their entire lives in the same regiment, whereas the officers spent only a few years in the same place. This meant that the figure of the kind commanding officer, who was a father to the soldiers, took on considerable significance. The men tended to place all responsibility for either fortune or disaster squarely upon the person of the commanding officer.

One other detail of some importance in assessing the role played by the army in society is that "The army and navy were the central institutions of the Russian Empire - around half of all state expenditure passed through the Defence Ministries" (Lapin, V.V., *The Semyonovskii Regiment*, 16-19 October 1820, Leningrad, 1991, p.46).

After the 1812-1814 war, the obsession with discipline in the army intensified and the rules of the strictest seniority were enforced, by beatings where necessary. This came firstly as a result of a general strengthening of bureaucratic trends in the running of the country, and secondly because even during Catherine's reign, abuses in the army were on the increase. And thirdly, the powers that be could not fail to see the danger in the emergence within Russia of a military corpus capable, in future years, of acting as counterweight to the centre of power" (Lapin, *op.cit.*, p.57). After the return of the Russian occupying forces from France in 1819 and the disturbances in the Semyonovskii Regiment in 1820, many of the officers and generals who had distinguished themselves during the war by their true and worthy service to their country and had since gone on to occupy important positions, felt that they were no longer needed. This was especially true of those noted for their independence of character. The years 1820-1823 were a turning-point in the lives of many. A.N.Seslavin was dismissed and placed under covert police surveillance, D.V.Davydov retired, Prince Volkonskii was summarily removed from the post of chief of staff, A.A.Zakrevskii was exiled with honour and became governor-general of Finland, P.D.Kiselyov left for a long stay abroad, A. P. Yermolov considered taking his retirement, and P.Y.Chaadaev unexpectedly took his. M.S.Vorontsov was expecting a similar fate. At this time there commenced a gradual erosion of the bonds which had previously united the autocracy and the

enlightened elite (a section of the nobility), and this continued under Nicholas I: "the tsar lost the unconditional support of a number of principled noblemen who wished to serve their country. There were now in the ranks of the Russian nobility men who were no longer needed, men who had served in the army both at the lower and upper levels. Service to the tsar was no longer the same as service to one's country - a fact that caused spiritual crisis for a number of high-ranking generals used to the indivisible unity of the two." (Ekshut, S., "Churban-pasha" in Rodina, No. 5, 1991) And it was here that many people began to go their separate ways.

It is thus clear that by the start of the nineteenth century the Russian nobility had acquired a wealth of social and cultural experience. Throughout the eighteenth century they developed as a ruling and service class, and during the course of this evolution, a certain type - or, rather, types - of aristocratic character were formed. The golden age of aristocratic culture in Russia came in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and brought with it a very great diversity of personalities. At the same time, the move to the individual - the emergence of a culture of revitalised, brilliant and highly individual people - signalled the apogee, the beginning of the end of this particular socio-cultural movement. Of this spectrum of character-types, the one which I am concerned with is that of the active nobleman who has served his country and done his sacred duty; for it was to this type that Prince Vorontsov belonged.

There are a few other important aspects of the aristocratic character which I should like to mention. Firstly, the aristocrat's passionate love of freedom; or, more accurately, aristocratic freedom - the freedom of the aristocratic character: essentially the only form of freedom which was possible for a very long time in old Russia. This is the reason for the great attraction which the aristocracy holds for Russians today, and for the fact that the nobility are often confused with the intelligentsia. Secondly, the guiding principle of aestheticism. Thirdly, a "paternal love for the Fatherland" (P.A. Vyazemskii), which, like a man's love for his sons, was still perceived as a kind of guardianship, a concern for the welfare of one's native country. A corollary to this attitude was the way in which the nobility perceived its relationship with the state, and thus with power, the inherent function of statehood. The aristocracy believed it had been created by God to govern society, to guide it like a father and protect it from its enemies. This paternal love for the Fatherland was not a feeling of dependency, of being owned - of devotion to one's master - but rather the reverse: it was the sense of responsibility which the master himself feels; the stern pater familias who answers for his country and his people only before God, and who, whilst serving his master, is prepared (as happened more than once) to correct the monarch, and even replace him, if he is not performing his duty towards the Fatherland.

The best representatives of the nobility were not only rulers, but also organisers. And they did not only organise the state and its various institutions, but also society and culture. Any form of organisational activity requires a certain degree of understanding, including understanding of matters universal and philosophical. Hence the aristocracy's metaphysical interest in freemasonry and its international cultural symbolism. And the universal forms of expression for their general philosophical sentiments were their lifestyle and their estates.

The estates of the nobility were their inalienable property. "Wherever fate flings the Grinevs, the Lavretskiis, the Nekhlyudovs and the Levins, they will not, they cannot fail to feel that bond. The family estate is the centre around which their lives revolve: here they were born, here is the source of their existence, here is where they come to rest and find peace." (V. Pereverzev, quoted in "Love as a condition of the existence of the Kingdom of God," by O.V. Pol, in Chelovyek, NO 5, 1991) The estate is the focus of the nobleman's freedom and spiritual peace; here is the sovereign master in his State, the centre of his universe. Here is his comfortable house, his park, his river, his sky, his landscape - all there just for him. Through his estate he is rooted in the past and present history of his land and family.

The estate required the master's full input, and he would spend at least half of each year there (from Easter to the Orthodox Feast of the Veil, on October 1st). And each generation would try to construct life there in their own way, try to bring it closer to their own ideal. As a result, the estate was very often an expression of ideas about the way the world and society should be, about heaven on earth. Today, in consequence, these estates are texts from which we may read and reconstruct the philosophical ideas of our forefathers. "Well now, you have a delightful estate: why don't you settle down there until the end of your days? It is a fortunate necessity, and it is up to you to make use of it in a way which will provide you with instructive philosophical insights. Make your retreat as attractive as possible: fill it with beautiful ornament; why not even introduce a little style and refinement? For this is no peculiar hedonism: your concern will not be vulgar pleasures, but the opportunity for full concentration on your inner life. I implore you not to neglect these details of outward show. We live in a country which is so bereft of manifestations of the ideal, that if we do not surround our domestic lives with a little poetry and good taste, then we risk losing all subtlety of feeling, all sense of refinement... One of the most important factors slowing our progress is the lack of artistic expression in domestic life" (Chaadaev, *op.cit.*, pp.35-37).

3. THE VORONTSOV FAMILY

Why is the era of Nicholas I called the century of Pushkin, Lermontov and Gogol, and not the century of Yermolov, Vorontsov and the like? We cannot say. We have been so spoiled with books that we do not even remember our military leaders... surely this is one-sided and untrue. "Great literature" is not necessary; a great, beautiful and useful life is

V. V. Rozanov

The Vorontsovs are one of the oldest families of the Russian aristocracy. The General Heraldry of the Noble Families of the Russian Empire, Section I, No. 28, traces its lineage to one Simon Afrikanovich, a military commander who came from Germany to Kiev in the eleventh century. The Vorontsov boyars played a distinguished part in the life of the court of the Grand Dukes of Moscow. However, the family is known today for its history after 1741, the year in which a very active part in the palace revolution which put the tsarina Elizabeth on the throne was played by one Mikhail Illarionovich Vorontsov, who was later to become chancellor and a most brilliant statesman. His brother Roman also occupied a number of government posts, including that of governor-general of Vladimir, and was famed for his great wealth. Following the ennoblement of his brother, Roman too was given the title of Count.

Of Roman Illarionovich's five legitimate children, nearly all won fame at some point in the history of Russia. His daughter Elizaveta became the favourite mistress of Peter III; Ekaterina, who married to become Princess Dashkova, was one of the most famous personalities of the time of Catherine the Great and head of the Academy of Sciences; Aleksandr was indispensable to both Catherine II and the young Alexander I, who appointed him chancellor at the age of sixty. This last, Aleksandr Romanovich, had no wife or children and did not divide his inheritance with his brother Semyon, but considered the latter's son his own and not only bestowed upon him his love and attention, but also bequeathed him all his wealth. The youngest of Roman's children, Semyon, was for over twenty years (1785-1806) plenipotentiary Russian minister (or ambassador) in London, where he became famed as a highly intelligent, far-sighted and noble diplomat. In 1781, by that time major-general and a hero of the Romanian campaigns, he married Ekaterina Alekseevna, daughter of the great Senyavin family, many members of which brought honour to the Russian fleet. After bearing Semyon Romanovich two children - a son and a daughter - Ekaterina Alekseevna died in Venice in 1784.

The extraordinarily eventful and active life of the son, Mikhail Semyonovich Vorontsov, began in St. Petersburg on 19th May 1782 (Cf. Keppen, P.I., "On the antiquities of the Southern Crimean Coast and the Tavrian Hills," in A Crimean Collection, St. Petersburg, 1834), in the house at Malaya Morskaya Street. Catherine II sent a jewelled snuff-box in honour of his birth. His early childhood was spent in Venice, and then England, which his father had chosen as a suitable place to carry out his diplomatic duties, and also, importantly, so that his children could receive the best education of the day. Semyon Romanovich was extremely exacting in his choice of separate tutors and teachers for each of his children. His son received a very broad education, covering subjects from the humanities, languages, natural science, mathematics and architecture to horse-riding, the use of firearms and visits to English factories, worldly gatherings, parliament and Russian warships. Even as a small child, he displayed a passionate desire to pursue a military career, and he followed the successes of Suvorov's forces with keen attention. His father brought him up to be patriotic. Believing that the revolution which had started in France would soon be replicated in Russia, the Russian ambassador taught his son to be a craftsman, so

that he might occupy a worthy place in his country after the revolution. Naturally enough, the boy also learned the art of diplomacy, acting as secretary to his father.

It should be noted that the ambassador was not particularly wealthy at this time, especially during the months of Paul's reign when he was dismissed and his lands confiscated. At that time the family was forced to live in debt, with the help of friends in English banking circles. On the accession of Alexander I, Semyon Romanovich had his post and properties restored to him, and his son, on attaining his majority in 1801, set off for Russia with a single suitcase and without servants.

Registered at birth as Corporal Bombardier in the Life Guard of the Preobrazhenskii regiment, and court chamberlain at the age of sixteen, Mikhail Semyonovich could, on his arrival in Russia, have taken up the very highest positions at court and in the army. Yet he asked to be merely a lieutenant in the Guards, and after a year's service in the capital he grew bored, and with the help of his uncle, Aleksandr Romanovich, went to serve in the real army, in the Caucasus. From that point on, the young aristocrat was on the battlefield practically without a break for about twenty years. Up until 1805, he was fighting in the Caucasus, where he reached the rank of major and earned three medals, coming close to dying in January 1804. From 1805-1807 he fought in Pomerania and became a colonel. 1809-1812 he fought the Turks under Bagration on the Danube, winning another two medals, a diamond-studded gold sword for his services at Rushchuk, and the rank of major-general (in 1810).

And it was thus, in Bagration's army, that Vorontsov entered the war of 1812. At Borodino, his combined grenadiers defended the famous Shevardinskii redoubt, a fortress near the village of Semyonovskaya. By the end of the day on 26th August, of his division there remained only 300 soldiers and 3 officers. The commanding officer himself was wounded, shot in the leg, and was sent back from the front, to the Moscow house he had inherited from the Princess Dashkova (and which now houses the Moscow Conservatory).

At this time the valuables were being removed from the house for safety and loaded on to boats. The master ordered the loading of his possessions to be stopped, everything to be removed from the boats, and the wounded to be placed on board instead. Around 50 generals and officers were transported in this way to Vorontsov's Andreevskoie estate in Vladimir, where their injuries were treated at their host's expense. The library of several thousand books left behind in Moscow burned to the ground.

In December of that year Count Vorontsov, his wounds healed, returned to the front. He again distinguished himself in the campaign through Europe up to the fall of Paris. In February 1813 he was given the rank of lieutenant-general, a medal for the battle of Leipzig and one for the battle of Craon, where he fought Napoleon himself. In 1815, with some twelve years' experience of active service, Lieutenant-General Count Vorontsov wrote *A Few Rules for Dealings with the Lower Ranks of the Twelfth Infantry Corps*, the basic message of which was that both officers and men should be ruled by honour and ambition. It being humiliating to command the humiliated, punishment should be meted out in strict accordance with the law, and wilfulness should be eliminated. In August of that year, the Count was appointed commander of the Russian forces in Wellington's allied army, stationed in France from the end of the war until 1818.

The comments of the distinguished writer of the day, F.F. Vigel, who served for many years under Vorontsov, in his memoirs, are of particular interest (*The Diary of Filip Filipovich Vigel*, Part 1, p.76, Part 5, pp.138-139). "Most recently the Russian army has had... two favourites: Vorontsov and Yermolov... Brave Vorontsov, who when still young, rich in gold and valour, preferred all the burdens and perils of a soldier's life to the pleasures and splendour of court, was

a tender father to his men, and a comrade, friend and brother to his fellow officers." In 1818, Vigel travelled to the encampment/billets of the Russian forces in France (thirty thousand men), and this picture met his eyes: "I entered Russian territory. Ahead stood a wooden pillar, painted black and white with red stripes... On it was written, in Russian, the distance to each town and village, and, counting the number of versts to go, I travelled as if along the road to Moscow... Such impudence was thanks to Vorontsov... The Russians there were entitled to billets, but they were wealthy and preferred to live in greater style and show off their generosity... Our soldiers here are indeed fortunate: three years spent enjoying the spoils of victory and, following their leader's example, treating the local inhabitants with courtesy and pride and trying to win them round with kindness and money... In the space of a few days I was transported from central France to Russia! It was a home from home: cabbage soup, kasha, kulebyaka pies and blini washed down with a drink of kvass, double glazing, stoves with benches around them, company singing and a Russian sauna. The local populace declared themselves grateful and struck new medals in honour of the occupying army. When the troops left France, Vorontsov paid off his officers' debts - to the tune of one-and-a-half million.

In 1819, the Count married a wealthy relation of the Prince Potemkin, one Elizaveta Ksaverevna Branitskaya, whom he had met in Paris.

From 1820-1823 Vorontsov was home from the wars. But our hero did not remain idle: he travelled extensively throughout Europe, bought lands in the Crimea from Paris, studied works on estates and parks in preparation for his own nest, and chose the site on which it was to be built. He was also involved in what one might term social works: in 1820 M.S.Vorontsov and A.S.Menshikov presented the tsar with a project for a new society which they offered to lead, based on the freeing of the serfs, and each of them offered to give his own serfs their freedom, begging His Majesty to allow them to persuade others to follow their example. They had the support of the Turgenev brothers and a number of other important figures. The tsar, however, did not consent. Vorontsov and Menshikov, together with S.Pototskii and A.A.Lobanov-Rostovskii, then founded the First Russian stagecoach society, which negotiated contracts with the Post Department and acquired rights to the conveyance of passengers between Moscow and St.Petersburg from 1820, and later to Vyborg, Imatra, Kiev, Kovno, etc..

It was Vorontsov's wish to serve in one of the Southern garrisons, and he finally obtained a posting, to the satisfaction of most of his relatives, friends and well-wishers. His appointment was as governor-general of Novorossia and Bessarabia. Novorossia at that time included the Southern Ukraine, the Northern shores of the Black Sea, and the Crimea. These lands did not become part of the Russian Empire until the late eighteenth century, and for the most part they were practically deserted. After some hesitation, Count Vorontsov chose Odessa as the site of his official residence, and for his private residence, the Crimea.

At this point in our story comes the round of the governor-general's daily life, the endless journeys through the province and, once every one or two years, travels right across Europe to England to visit his father and sister. In mid-1823, Vorontsov took the steam-ship he had had built on his estate with a steam engine brought from St.Petersburg out on the Dnieper river, much to the astonishment of passers-by. He then travelled by rowing boat to Ekaterinoslav to take up his post as governor-general. One of the first major problems that awaited him there was a six-year plague of locusts, as we know largely thanks to Soviet historical and literary accounts of the confrontation between Vorontsov and Pushkin. (I shall, however take the liberty of omitting this episode, as Pushkin spent less than a year in Odessa, and since it touches upon his life, special research involving a vast volume of literature would be necessary). In 1824, construction started on the houses in Odessa and Alupka. In 1825 Vorontsov battled with the bubonic plague in Izmail; and it was in the same year that saw the start of the eye disease which

was to afflict him for over twenty years. It was at this time that the governor-general began to enter into direct contact with the Crimean Tartars and their religious leaders. Vorontov's contemporaries note that it was characteristic of him to maintain excellent relations with the local populace, be it in the Crimea, in Bessarabia, or, later on, in Tiflis (now Tbilisi).

In October of that year, Alexander I travelled to the Crimea, where he caught a fever and died. Vorontsov went to Taganrog to pay his respects to the deceased emperor, and it was here that he learned of the December 14th uprising. He wrote proudly in his diary that not a single person in Odessa was arrested for complicity in the affair. In 1826 he was appointed a member of the State Council, and in this new capacity sat at the first sessions of the special tribunal set up to try the Decembrists. He then went to Ackerman, near Odessa, for negotiations with Turkey, which resulted in an accord favouring Russia's interests, whereafter he took the astonished Turks for a ride on his strange and wonderful steam-boat. At the end of the year, Vorontsov was elected honorary member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.

It was during these years that Odessa began to develop as a major port and began to gain a reputation as a home to all of Europe. The town grew and acquired its famous steps, the monument to Richelieu, its palaces, roadways and sea-front. Vorontsov not only took charge of a number of projects and decisions, but pushed them through the local governing bodies, and he also brought over European engineers and doctors and even personally transported a set of surgical instruments from Britain for the town hospital. Odessa became a multinational trading town. At the court of the Vorontsovs in Odessa, a cultured society developed, with a theatre, a lyceum, an institute of oriental languages (founded by the Count himself), scientific societies (of agriculture, history and antiquities) and a public library (built up largely from the Count's private collection). Vorontsov himself kept an extremely rich private library, containing a great number of precious manuscripts and documents. He invited antiquarians to work with him, and, under fire in the Crimean War, he ordered the rescue of the collection before anything else. The public library, together with the merchants and industrialists, served to ensure that French and English culture became widespread across Southern Russia (Cf. Alekseev, M.P., *Essays and Research on English Literature*, Leningrad, 1991, p.308), and two semi-official newspapers came out in Russian and French, as well as a journal, the *Novorossian Calendar*.

Vorontsov found the Crimea, which he chose for himself and "cherished like a plaything, like a favourite child" (Aksakov, I.S., *Letters Home, 1844-49*, Moscow, 1988, p.449), practically deserted, and he had a policy of actively encouraging settlement in the region. He received tsars and their families at Alupka and persuaded them to keep estates of their own there, thus boosting the prestige of the area immensely in the eyes of the upper classes and in the press. He gave lands to his officials on the strict condition that they actively maintain them. It was during Vorontsov's time as governor-general that the Crimea's wine-growing trade developed, and the vineyards on his estates at Ai-Danil, Gurzuf and Massandra became world-class industrial concerns; wine experts and the choicest grape varieties of Europe were sent for, and wine-cellar, distilleries and breweries were built. Exotic plants were also introduced into the Crimea from all over the world. A road was constructed from Simferopol to the sea, linking Vorontsov's properties to the South coast and continuing along the shore to Sebastopol. The Crimea began supplying the whole of Russia with wine and exporting by the shipload to Europe. The enlightened Count was also interested in the history and antiquities of the Crimea and a keen supporter of archaeological research; on his instructions, the plans of the ancient fortifications of the South Coast were reconstructed and the Bakhchisarai palace and the towers of the Alushta (Alushta) fortress restored.

In 1828 a steam-ship company began to operate on the Black Sea, the first vessel being brought over from Britain. In the same year, Nicholas I visited Odessa and appointed Vorontsov

commander of the siege of Varna in place of Menshikov, who had been forced to relinquish his command due to shell shock. Within one-and-a-half months, Varna had surrendered, and the Count was awarded the honour of the diamond rifle. In 1829 he received the highest order of the empire, the order of St. Andrei the First-Called, for his brilliant conduct of the campaign and for the continuous maintenance of supply-lines. Returned to civilian duties, Vorontsov was again faced with epidemics of bubonic plague in Odessa, Bessarabia and the Crimea. Stamping out the plague was especially difficult in Sebastopol, where the sailors mutinied at the measures enforced to halt the spread of the disease. Vorontsov had to go in personally to restore order and conduct an inquiry into the matter (which was regarded, incidentally, as being extremely fair and lenient). During this time, his daughter was dying overseas, in spite of all his attempts to save her. Overall, the three years from 1830-32 were extremely difficult ones for Vorontsov's family life: away in England, first his son Mikhail died, and then his 88-year old father. These events would appear to have strengthened the Count's determination to build up his nest, since during the same period work increased on the construction of the Alupka estate and its design was altered.

In 1833, the Odessa-Constantinople Steam Communication Company was set up, with bases in the port of Yalta and Berdyansk. Yalta was developing rapidly, and in 1837 with the visit of the emperor it became the regional capital. Southern Russia was hit by very poor harvests in 1833, leaving 700,000 people without sustenance, but the governor-general managed to organise the transportation, storage and distribution of grain so effectively that not one person died of hunger. The Count also took an interest in tree plantations, following the experience of the German colonists, and the Mennonites in particular.

The development of Novorossia at this time was not achieved on the traditional basis of slave labour. According to the census of 1857, for example, only 6% of the population of the Crimea were serfs. Many runaway serfs fled to the South where they would not be pursued, and the growing towns, the navy and trade all had need of labour. Vorontsov's own views on the subject of slavery are expressed in his letter to Count P.D. Kiselyov of 17.02.1837 (The Archives of Prince Vorontsov, ed. P.I. Bartenev, Moscow, 1870-97, vol. XXXVIII, pp. 15-17): "You honour me by asking my opinion on the serf question. My principles on the matter have long been known to you, and as regards practice, I am already so far from and so opposed to the methods both of the government and of the country as a whole, since its wealth is based on forced agricultural labour, that my ideas on the initial measures to take, or indeed of the scale of the obstacles to (not to say, the impossibility of) overcoming the prejudices and habits of the peasants and domestic servants are unlikely to meet with general approval. Nonetheless, since you ask my opinion... One safe way to start would be to put into practice, without delay, the proposals put forward and approved by the Emperor seven years ago for domestic serfs and those tied to the land to be made entirely separate... This first step would merely take us to the stage reached in some European countries two or three centuries ago; but it would nonetheless constitute a major advance, and indeed, I believe that such a move would lead to the careful yet rapid and rational emancipation of the serfs. It is truly unfortunate that the proposals were not acted upon when the last census was taken: within a very short space of time our ruler would have seen that he stood only to gain by the changes, and the reduction in the number of servants, which could be further speeded by means of a hefty tax on domestics, would be compensated by the emergence of a way of life which would have a tempering and civilising effect on the morals and customs of our land-owning classes. And in this way, this burden, which is the true shame of nineteenth-century Russia - the slavery of the individual - would be, if not eliminated, then at least speeded on its way... Everyone would be the richer for it, and the country itself would be richer, because a larger labour force would be available for industry and agriculture, and because the working population would be distributed for the common good and according to the quantity and quality of the land, rather than being handed out arbitrarily." Following the decree of 2nd

April 1842 on bound peasants, Vorontsov was the first to express the wish to give the serfs on his estate at Murino outside St.Petersburg the status of bound peasants. "I take very great satisfaction in this matter, and if all goes well at Murino in the coming year and the peasants there begin to appreciate the advantages of their newly acquired social status, then I shall take a few bright peasants from our other estates and show them, and shall have no doubts about the success of the venture. Tell me, please, have perhaps a few landowners followed the example of Murino?" wrote Vorontsov in another letter to Kiselyov (The Archives of Prince Vorontsov, vol.XXXVIII, p.103). But his example was in fact only followed by Wittgenstein and the Pototskiis. A total of only 24,708 male serfs changed status. Vorontsov himself came up against a series of administrative obstacles and delays, so that it was only after repeated petitions that the matter finally went through. (Cf. Brokraus and Efron's Encyclopaedia, St. Petersburg, 1895,1897, vol.XVIa, p.700) The history of the Count's attempts to bring about the abolition of serfdom went back a long way - not just to 1820, but to 1815, when he signed M.F.Orlov's petition to the tsar on the subject.

The demand for labour in Novorossia was indeed very great. The population of Odessa, for example, doubled between 1823 and 1849, to reach a total of 87,000. And this in spite of the war of 1828-29, an outbreak of bubonic plague in 1829, the cholera epidemic of 1830, the failure of the harvests in 1833, the plague again in 1837 and the cholera of 1848-49 (Cf. Brokraus & Efron, vol.XXIa, p.727). (Vorontsov became so skilled at taking harsh organisational measures to halt the spread of contagious diseases which crossed the border from Turkey, that the simple fact of his arrival in an infected town was sufficient to inspire in the townsfolk complete confidence and strict observance of quarantine restrictions). And Odessa astonished and impressed visitors. In addition to the chapter in Pushkin's Eugene onegin devoted to the city, there were other comments: "Odessa in the 1830's combined all that was cultured, rich and refined in Russian society and which for one reason or another did not sit well with life in the capital or abroad. The southern climate, the warmth and sunshine for most of the year, the wonderful, gleaming, rainbow-hued Black Sea... the Italian opera... the resonant Italian voices in the streets, the cheapness of the free port, and generally just the freedom and ease of life in this half-foreign, half-Russian town, together with the enlightened and accessible nature of its governor-general, Mikhail Semyonovich Vorontsov, inspired the warmest feelings for Odessa" (Dabizha,V.D., "Nikolai Nikiforovich Murzakyevich, 1806-1883", in Russkaya Starina, January 1887, vol.LIII, p.5). I.S.Aksakov wrote in November 1848: "I was struck by the trade and the entirely original physiognomy of the town. The sea with its wooden masts, the beautiful streets of flat-roofed, unplastered houses made of natural stone, the tree-lined embankments, the gleam and shine of European trade, the absence of heavy-handed bureaucracy [my italics] - all this gives a pleasant initial impression. Do not judge Odessa as you would judge a Russian town. It is a market place of many races, where people have been brought together from different places by mutual advantage to form a single community. The town is an artificial construct, but not one which has been forcibly imposed, as St.Petersburg was. It is a town entirely constructed of foreign elements, bound together with fairly amicable Russian cement. Cosmopolitans and liberals - Duke Richelieu and Counts Langeron and Vorontsov - have invested it with a cosmopolitan character. Trade flourishes under Russian military protection, and is little concerned with the domestic politics of Russia itself - and Odessa is all trade... Everything is cheap here except for firewood, which, incidentally, is beginning to be replaced by coal from Ekaterinoslav. You will be surprised by the freedom -one might even say the lack of ceremony - which prevails in official circles here... Odessa... has no political importance whatsoever, and the life of the town is so suited to its natural surroundings that it becomes all the more natural for it" (Aksakov,I.S., op.cit., pp.408-9).

The provision of coal from Ekaterinoslav province which Aksakov mentions is also largely to the governor-general's credit. It is even said that he himself conducted successful experiments in

Odessa and later in the Caucasus to convert wood-burning stoves to burn coal, thus solving the problem of the fuel supply. These coal deposits were to be the basis for industrial development in the Donbass region.

In December 1844, the sixty-two-year-old governor-general, by imperial command, became in addition governor-general of the Caucasus and commander-in-chief of the Caucasian forces with unlimited powers. At Tiflis he found "an abyss of confusion" (V.Tolstoy, Prince Mikhail Semyonovich Vorontsov in the Russian Archives for 1877, vol.111, p.295): everywhere the highlanders had the upper hand, and they were reducing to rubble all the previous victories of the Russian troops. The new leader found himself once again in the familiar chaos which he had known since his youth. Before entering into battle, he went to Moscow to meet his friend of many years and senior to him, A.P.Yermolov, and discuss the problems of the Caucasus with him. In St.Petersburg he received the tsar's personal instructions and was directed to take the capital Shamil aul Dargo by storm. The campaign for the capital, which commenced on 6th June 1845, was fraught with dangers, failed to achieve its purpose, and incurred immense losses. The Count himself led the charge, suffering the same privations as his troops and exposing himself to mortal dangers. Accounts of these events differ widely in their assessments, which is hardly surprising, since the imperial commands issued in St.Petersburg, when put into practice in the Caucasus, very nearly resulted in tragedy. I myself am not competent to judge Vorontsov's talents as a military leader, but on the evidence of his and Yermolov's vast wealth of experience of war in the Caucasus, it would seem reasonable to assume that he chose to lead his men into battle precisely because he knew that Nicholas's plan to take Shamil in a single assault was doomed to failure. And when Vorontsov ultimately succeeded in extricating himself from an extremely difficult situation without dishonour either to his superiors or to his calling, the Emperor elevated him to the rank of Prince in recognition of his services during the campaign and of the imperial debt owed him.

The Russian forces later went on to even greater victories, thanks to the greater order which the Prince managed to instil into their organisation and the changes he made to their battle tactics: he judged that rather than making sudden, swift attacks, it would be better to "follow a more offensive pattern, in more gradual but perhaps surer stages" (Letters from M.S.Vorontsov to A.P.Yermolov, in the Russian Archives from 1890, N's 2-4, p.181). Vorontsov adapted the tactic of ecological warfare developed by Yermolov. Along the roadsides, the trees to double firing range would be felled and set fire to, and gradually a long line of fortifications would emerge. This deprived the highlanders of the opportunity to make surprise attacks, and cut off access to the fertile valleys where they found food. As a result, on Vorontsov's arrival on the scene, matters in the Caucasus "changed radically for the better" (Dondukov-Korsakov,A.M., "Prince Mikhail Vorontsov," in *Starina i Novizna*, 1902, Ulyanovsk, p.298).

Vorontsov's non-military achievements in the Caucasus were also extremely considerable. He won over the local aristocracy, made his decisions as public as possible, and in the space of three years created such order that life in the region became relatively calm and safe. As he had done in Novorossia, Vorontsov paid special attention to the development of trade, industry, roads, ports and arable farming in the Caucasus. The impression one gets from his diaries for these years (Vorontsov,M.S., *Extracts from the Diaries of M.S.Vorontsov, 1845-54*, St.Petersburg, 1902) is of a heavy burden of daily administrative work, visits from high-ranking government figures, war, the illness of an already elderly man, and above all, endless journeying through the Caucasus and Novorossia. The Prince was concerned with the education of children of all classes, the preservation of antiquities, the construction of a theatre in Tiflis, and the rebuilding of Sofia Cathedral in Kiev. "His guiding thought was to create private capital in the lands which he governed, and thereby encourage private investment in the exploitation of the local natural resources" (V.Tolstoy, op.cit., p.304). He was also given the title of His Highness.

Finally, in 1853, Vorontsov requested that he be relieved of his duties on health grounds. In the summer of 1856, on the day of Alexander II's coronation, he was made Fieldmarshal-General, and on 6th November, back in Odessa once more, he died.

It is true that Vorontsov spent half his life in colonial wars, that he was a high-ranking official in the service of an autocratic state, trusted by the emperor, and that he was an immensely rich and powerful man. Nonetheless, men such as he are rare in Russian history, men with such a record of service as organisers and creators, and the fruits of whose achievements we can still witness today.

Even a superficial acquaintance with the life and works of Prince Vorontsov shows that his membership of the upper ranks of the aristocracy, military command and government apparatus is not sufficient to explain the whole of his personality. He clearly distinguished himself from the rest of that 1% of the population which made up the Russian nobility of the early nineteenth century. His most fundamental precepts led him to renounce both a career at court and a quiet life on his own estate, although he never broke with either life completely. Although he never wanted for money, thanks to his inheritance, he consciously chose the path of extremely full and responsible lifelong service. It is clear that Pushkin's "Half-milord, half-merchant" was more than simply a spiteful epigram. The poet had hit upon an essential feature of the governor-general's position. It would seem that the Prince had found himself a niche where he could be freer and less vulnerable; he used the advantages of his social position, but he strived, with some success, to avoid its pitfalls. He was an aristocrat, yet he made service to his country his life's work and was never idle. He was a member of the bourgeoisie - but without their mercantile and acquisitive ways. He was a powerful government official - but he took no pleasure in administration or the foolishness of red tape. These were the three sides of his character, but he was not slave to any one of them. Vorontsov was quite out of the ordinary, and his character was formed of three hypostases: he was an individual, an individual combination of Russia and the West, of friendship and command, nobility and privilege, business and luxury, poet and civil servant. Perhaps this is a result of his character and temperament... Clearly an appreciation of the psychological makeup of the Prince is needed to determine why the epigrammist's hope that he would opt for a single one of these facets of his personality was not realised. I shall attempt to give a picture of the man's psychology in as concise a fashion as possible, drawing upon a total of 30 sources.

4. THE NOBLE MAN OF REASON

For my contemplation of youth, I should like to paint the portrait a worthy government servant... one of those open and educated men of action given the honour of sitting with him [the sovereign] in council and put their ideas to him directly, one who is entitled to act in the ruler's name and granted the glorious and dangerous privilege of witnessing, ratifying or countersigning his royal decrees, and answering for their success with his honour and his life. In short, I wish to describe the intermediary between the people and the throne, to show the merits of the government servant, minister or ruler...

G.P.Derzhavin

Prince Mikhail Semyonovich was around 1.75m tall, of slight build and dry good looks, with thin, not entirely regular but handsome and noble features in a masculine cast. His appearance was pleasant throughout his life, with an amiable (or insidious?) smile almost always playing about his thin, finely sculpted lips. His whole life, Vorontsov resembled the most famous portrait of him, by the artist Lawrence. His voice could be both harsh and tender. He dressed simply - his everyday dress was a hunting-coat without epaulettes - and although outwardly easy-going, he was nonetheless essentially reserved. Lev Tolstoy, in his work Hadji Murat, likens him to a fox. He was a true grand seigneur, of genuine lordly refinement. Most people noted the Englishness of his manners, his appealing pride and foppish awkwardness. Those who disliked him thought him an egotistical self-made aristocrat and viceroy, whose bearing was haughty and who made politeness sound like an insult. But his close friends said that in his heart he was Russian through and through. Vorontsov looked fresh and cheerful even at the age of seventy, although he was troubled by an eye disease and suffered from the cold. Observers unanimously record the acute and supple intellect of our hero, his discernment, wisdom and clarity of thought. He was a "noble man of reason" (The Archives of Prince Vorontsov, vol.40, p.525), with a gift for forcing others to recognise his superiority. Cold judgement and unremitting intelligence gave him a facility for understanding people on a fundamental level.

Prince Vorontsov was unusual in having had a European education. From an early age he read a great deal and was versed in several languages and the exact sciences. In view of his enlightened and tolerant views, it is fair to say that he was very highly cultured, and highly sensitive to culture. In his work he distinguished himself by his zeal, tenacity, patience, persistence, selflessness, industry, his methodical approach and his strength of purpose. He was a man of practical action; he lived firmly in the present and, himself a tireless worker, he was exacting and demanded a great deal of others. He liked to act quietly, firmly, quickly, decisively - and as he wished. The viceroy to Southern Russia was one of the few genuine government servants: he ruled conscientiously and with moderation, and took a sober, functional and broad view of things. A liberal administrator, the success with which he governed his territories was due to the fact that he had direct knowledge of their needs. Life under Vorontsov was distinctive and pleasant. He was no formalist, and did not seize upon details, but concerned himself with the essentials. His actions were frequently autocratic, but they were also gradual and prudent; he brought order and met with no resistance. He disliked red tape and paperwork, and did not extend the bureaucracy of government in the provinces. He made his orders as public as possible,

and gave help and patronage to the local population. He dictated all his own correspondence. He sought out and summoned people he could use, and did not spare his opponents. As a result, he gathered about him a body of people who were devoted to him and received his full confidence, and the occasions when one or other of them betrayed his trust were personally painful for him.

With subordinates he was mild-mannered and charming, yet demanding. Even Pushkin admitted that he was a good and affectionate superior to his officials. He was approachable, straightforward, and no pedant. The atmosphere in his headquarters was relaxed. He spared neither his officials nor himself, and his attitude to work was a strict one, but he would not tolerate cruelty to subordinates. He knew how to inspire hope. To his fellow officers he was a friend and brother.

With his superiors, Vorontsov was a shrewd courtier; he made many powerful friends, and would write astute private letters to those above him. He enjoyed the especial favour of tsar Nicholas I, who trusted him implicitly. This fact gave him protection in everything he did, since the emperor's confidant was, in the eyes of his subordinates, practically royalty himself. He did, of course, support the monarchy, and indeed with unswervingly loyalty, despite his extreme liberalism. As P.A. Vyazemskii writes, he did not attempt vain battle, Don Quixote-like, with the windmills of the monarchy. As an autocrat, in effect, in his role of governor-general, Vorontsov was and continues to be condemned by his detractors, and especially by those writers and literary historians who persist in judging him solely on his public role.

Prince Vorontsov was certainly despotic, and particularly so in his later years, as those who worked closely with him testify (Cf. Dondukov-Korsakov, A.M., *op.cit.*). His enemies thought him an ambitious and unprincipled careerist and incurably vain and overweening, although this judgement does not square with his rejection of a life at court, his distaste for St. Petersburg and the fact that he stayed on the same post for thirty years, in the remote and then deserted province of Novorossia and the dangerous and politically complex Caucasus. I believe the explanation is fairly simple: he was a man with a sense of his own worth. What frustrated him was not a matter of delays along his career-path, but undeserved underestimations of himself and his colleagues. This was why he chose military service and provincial government: because they allowed him greater independence, and success depended more upon personal merit, skills and judgements. And this was the reason for his tendency to show off (Cf. Volkonskii, S.G., *The Diaries of Sergei Grigorevich Volkonskii*, St. Petersburg, 1902), his insistence on giving both counsel and complaint a private hearing, and his refusal to share responsibility. It was from his father that he learned self-reliance and self-respect. As a child he had dreamed of going to the army, and on the battlefield he was skilful, courageous, selfless and bold - particularly in moments of danger. He despised ceremony and vainglory. And - to continue the list of virtues - he was self-sufficient, which sometimes cost him dear. Bold on the battlefield and in his work, liberal and hospitable at his leisure, he was the darling of the Russian army.

I discern the same striving for and independent appraisal of his own personal merits in Vorontsov's peace-time activities as well. He was extremely wealthy - or, rather, he became extremely wealthy on receiving an inheritance from his aunt and uncle and on his marriage to Branitskaya, who was heiress to the Potemkin fortune. Yet he liked to think of what he had earned himself rather than his inheritance. His household, although scattered right across the European West of Russia, was always in order, and knew "neither want nor excess" (*The Archives of Prince Vorontsov*, vol. XXIII, p.49). This rejection of excess seems surprising to us today, accustomed as we are to poverty (the Soviet Encyclopaedia, 1929 edition, incidentally, singles out the opulence of Vorontsov's lifestyle for special attention.) None of his contemporaries speaks of extravagance in connection with the Prince; rather they talk of the beauty, careful arrangement, harmony and proportion of his character and lifestyle. His

stewardship was good-natured and economical without being parsimonious; generous, but discerning. At his leisure he was a cordial and hospitable host, and throughout his life, in the accounts of various observers, his dinner guests constantly and astonishingly numbered over a hundred. Yet his own eating habits were extremely simple: at these dinners he would eat in moderation, taking only two courses and showing a preference for cabbage soup and kasha. The desire to please, to win goodwill, attention and affection - one of Vorontsov's most appealing features, along with his easy, approachable and simple manner, and his great charm - won him universal respect. Even open enemies, of which there were few, admitted this. Everyone else loved him, and he himself loved reliable and practical people, and at moments of relaxation he loved good company, horse riding, sailing, travelling, the countryside of the South, books, manuscripts, engravings - and his home at Alupka.

During his long and eventful life, the Prince learned a great deal. The most important lesson he learned was a bitter one: towards the end of his life he had less and less faith and trust in people. He came to this conclusion largely as a result of an essential paradox of his nature.

Mikhail Semyonovich was brought up by loving and attentive people, and educated by a selection of hand-picked tutors. His spirituality, his warm and gentle heart, his innate kindness, easy disposition, sensitivity and integrity were a direct consequence of his upbringing. The attempts, encouraged by his father, to prepare himself for army service with self-taught skills developed in him a certain firmness of spirit, assurance, strength of will, respect for and deep devotion to duty, modesty and tolerance. The fact of having his family behind him - the support and confidence he received from his father and sister for most of his life - helped him to be noble and magnanimous, fair and impartial, and lenient, forgiving weakness and defending others against slander. He was never afraid to show his human fallibility, and did not disdain to blame himself, even in front of his subordinates. He knew measure in everything, and strove to live an ordered, rational and disciplined life; but although he loved order, he never let himself be ruled by it.

Arriving in Russia a courageous, intelligent and charming young man, Vorontsov found himself in a world that was neither kind nor romantic. Collisions along the course of his life would appear gradually to have changed the outward displays of his qualities. He began to be sceptical, even contemptuous, about other people, and became secretive, arrogant, unjust and unbearable. People's inability or unwillingness to judge others on their merits irritated and wounded the Prince's pride. He became harshly critical of others, bore malice, heeded gossip and avenged petty wrongs. His detractors judged him ungrateful, an unscrupulous schemer, and in post-1917 histories he is branded an informer.

Thus Vorontsov, who had a - not unfounded - high opinion of his own worth, was able in real life to be open with an increasingly small group of people. He believed only in himself and his junta, becoming in later years an outright egotist, all the more so because, as an intelligent, talented, brilliantly educated and ordered individual, he was condemned for being different, for anglomania and being un-Russian. (Cf. my primary sources: No.s 3, 4 (vol.XII, p.289; vol.XXIII, p.49; vol.XXXVII, pp.285,323,326; vol.XL, pp.509-528), 6, 10, 11, 21, 22, 27 (pp.74,91), 39, 61 (vol.X, pp.70-72), 81, 86).

And now we come to the subject of the Prince's personal philosophy.

5. VORONTSOV'S PHILOSOPHY

*The most important thing is to control movement,
and not to let it control you; but it is not enough
to state this principle -one must then act upon it,
and where better to act easily, forcefully
and with conviction than here in Russia?*

M. S. Vorontsov

Modern cultural mythology contains a general type of the Russian thinker/writer/philosopher, the typical Russian intellectual. This type philosophises in colours and living forms. For him, Russia is the most important theme of reflection, and one which he treats as a question of duality and the perennial nervous conflict between East and West. His dual world is utopian through and through. The archetypal Russian thinker suffers from a peculiar neurosis and cherishes the idea of a universal organism, of spiritual wholeness and an absolute union which is lost to us today but existed at some time in the past. Yet the gnostic paradigm of the successive domination of Light and Dark answers his need to be part of some ideal whole; he need no longer be an orphan, but can instead become one with the blessed masses of the people. For him, expectations must transform reality. True enlightenment, he believes, is only to be found in the consciousness of the people, and it is essentially the Orthodox religion which gives the Russian people their distinctive character. The effects of this philosophical paradigm on the individual are depressiveness, a distaste for the realities of the present, exaggerated fears about eternity, self-absorption and a refusal of responsibility (Cf. eg. Khoruzhii, S.S, "The Philosophical Process in Russia as the Meeting of Philosophy and Russian Orthodoxy" in *voprosy Filosofii*, N0 5, 1991).

Prince Vorontsov clearly was not of this type, being no intellectual revolutionary, but a member not only of the ruling class, but of its highest echelons. He was not, of course, a professional thinker, but his thinking was founded in reason, he rationalised the correlation between the things in which he believed, and his conclusions were diverse and the result of profound reflection. His command of the figurative demonstrates a great breadth and depth of knowledge of the European culture of his day, a Romantic transformation of the rationalist legacy of the eighteenth century. In my observation, Vorontsov's personal philosophy was close to the thinking of V.F.Odoevskii and P.Y.Chaadaev - and so close to the latter's philosophy, indeed, that pictures of the estate at Alupka could almost be illustrations of one of Chaadaev's texts, and equally, Chaadaev's works could be a commentary on the structure of Alupka.

Philosophical expectations in the early nineteenth century were "not so much of an answer to the theoretical queries of the intellect as of indications of how to solve life's conundrums. This was not to brush aside the theoretical problems, but there was a need for an integral synthesis similar to that offered by religion. Philosophy became the principal field of creative enquiry precisely because it was seen as a secular substitute for the teachings of the Church... The whole of this era was marked by a kind of universal Christianity that went beyond the Church..." (Zenkovskii, V.V., *A History of Russian Philosophy*, Leningrad, 1991, vol.1, Part I, pp.120,126). The new philosophy was founded on the ideal of Man's community with God - hence the great influence of Saint-Martin's ideas, when he returned to the teachings of the Christian Church on the harm caused to Man, and through him to Nature, by the original sin. Through his actions towards God, Man seeks to transform himself and Nature, and thus return to his true state of before the Fall. Aesthetic principals were therefore of great importance at this time, and coloured every philosophical debate.

According to Odoevskii, Man combines three elements: faith, understanding and aesthetic sense. The full union of all three represents the essence of culture, and their development is the unfolding of history. Through his love and understanding, Man gradually frees himself from his state of sin and through his aesthetic development he symbolically and prophetically transforms his future, giving it the wholeness that Adam knew before the Fall (Cf. Odoevskii, V.F., "Testing a Theory of the Fine Arts, with Particular Reference to Music", "Essence or Existence", "Maxims of the Nineteenth Century", "Notes from a Notebook", in *Russian Treatises on Aesthetics from the Early Nineteenth Century*, Moscow, 1974, vol.11). This wholeness is then also restored to the natural world, in which everything is a metaphor for everything else, one reflecting another, as Man is reflected in Nature.

The concept of Nature being restored or healed as a process parallel to the development of Man and human consciousness is one which is well-established in the thinking of the early bourgeois natural philosophers, including that of Sir Francis Bacon, for example. Inherent in this idea is the notion of divinely sanctioned study of nature from its origins, ie: following classical scientific method. The whole world is thus seen as being encompassed by a universal rational force which is in principle within reach of human reason through a global process of revelation, progress and the march of history towards the founding of a Kingdom of Heaven on Earth. The order of thought and the order of life are interwoven within the single field of life and understanding. In classical thinking, to understand was to disappear, to become a piece of the continuum, transparent in its visibility. And to understand and to act was to let go of everything, to have no insoluble, irreducible, dense, impenetrable sediment, or core. The classical concept of history is of "Conscientious observation followed a description of the results of that observation in plain, neutral and reliable words... The documents of this new history are not more words, texts or archives, but limpid spaces where things are combined: the herbarium, the natural history collection, the garden... Between them, the garden and the natural history study... provide classification." According to Foucault, there was no concept of Man in the European culture of the time. "Throughout the eighteenth century, classifications were made by comparison with visible structures"; but at the turn of the nineteenth century a major change took place in Europe. "signs continued to be formed from structures, but no longer from their external appearance; rather according to an inner principle, which was far more than a play on abstractions." It was also at this time that there emerged the first concept of "an empirico-transcendental duality known as Man." And this was not due to the influence of some kind of creeping Romanticism, but to the fact that the connecting principle of the philosophy was beyond conceptualisation. Things and concepts come together because of their relationship to and inclusion in the organising structure of the personality. Thus the principle of the structuring personality developed. "As a combination of the empirical and the transcendental, Man is a point of incomprehension - the same incomprehension that constantly menaces thought with its inexistence, yet at the same time gives thought a wholeness which comes from all that escapes it" (Foucault, M., *Words and Things*, Moscow, 1977, pp.192, 302, 316, 410, 415).

The same changes would appear to have occurred in the thinking of a number of Russian cultural figures. What in Europe developed as a feature of the consciousness of a particular social class, a prevailing condition, or an element in the ideology of various social movements (already implying the existence of a sovereign, bourgeois individual identity), in a cultured Russian milieu became a rare peculiarity, a purely individual characteristic. That, for me, Alupka and its owner from other Russian estates and their owners.

Since Vorontsov left virtually no direct written indication of his philosophical views, we can only hope to reconstruct his principles hypothetically, on the basis of his autobiography, the recollections of his contemporaries and material on his father, who was personally responsible for his upbringing.

Semyon Romanovich Vorontsov was a personal acquaintance and devoted disciple of the then renowned philosopher Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin, who was the archetypal *homme de desir*, in his own words, or man of the future. "It should be noted that at this point Saint-Martin's thinking was undergoing a radical shift: he had renounced freemasonry for the idea of a liberal, humanitarian utopia, free from the constraints of a masonic order... This shift of thought was clearly taken up by both Saint-Martin's circle in Russia and S.R.Voronstov" (Lotman, Y.M., Uspenskii, B.A. "Karamzin's Letters of a Russian Traveller and its Part in the Development of Russian Culture", a commentary to Karamzin, N.M., Letters of a Russian Traveller, Leningrad, 1987, pp. 547-548). The French philosopher named a small number of his friends whom he believed capable of rising to the heights of his noble speculations; among them was Semyon Vorontsov.

Here are what I see as the major points of Saint-Martin's view of mankind and the world:

- * Man and the Universe are given life by virtue of a single principle from which spiritual forces emanate;
- * these forces operate both in Nature and in Man;
- * lower forces govern material nature, and higher ones the intellectual life of Man;
- * Man is higher in the order of things than Nature, and generally closer to these higher forces;
- * the supreme effort of Man's spiritual potential must be a *grande oeuvre*, ie: a striving for direct union with these higher forces, which will bring revelation of the secrets of divinity and creation;
- * the forces governing material nature are not essentially physical laws, but active spiritual energy;
- * these spirits assume an abstract moral significance through their function of giving meaning to material nature;
- * there are subtle gradations of spiritual energy, and different levels of spiritual worth;
- * true enlightenment is a difficult feat for mankind which requires not only an effort of emotion and abstract thought but also certain material means;
- * Man finds the laws of morality within himself, for he is the reflection of the Supreme Being and must be guided by his own inner light;
- * Man should not forget his noble mission, and should try to earn the respect of others; love for one's neighbour preserves the purity of the divine spirit (Cf. Pypin, A.I., Russian Freemasonry in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century, Petrograd, 1916, pp.211-212, 216, 217);
- * some people become slaves, whilst others manage to avoid doing so; he who avoids that pitfall alters and disfigures his divinity less, and remains closer to his original condition; he who does not try hard shall enjoy neither success nor gifts; he who is privileged must rise higher and take on the task of government;
- * he who guards against darkness and depravity should rule not only because that is his calling, or because it must be so, but because that is his duty; he should own slaves, in order to preserve his power and the security of society, and should enjoy sovereign rights, including, where appropriate, religious ones; such is the origin of the temporary dominion held by one man over his own kind;
- * not only is this dominion not an act of oppression, but it is the strongest bastion of a natural society, its best means of fortification against enemies both without and within;
- * he who has dominion over others must himself adhere firmly to the qualities which brought him his power, and should strive, in his own interests, to secure the welfare of his subjects; he is the ruler of the Light, with the help of which he can and should see everything - he must know the basis of laws and justice, the principles of military rule, the people's rights and his own, and the origins of government by the State (Saint-Martin, L-C., On Truth and Misconceptions, Moscow, 1785, pp.268-270, 277-278).

The salient features of this philosophy: 1) their verticality (ie: the hierarchical organisation of people and spiritual forces); 2) the emphasis on individuality, on personality; and 3) the fact that

the difficult task of enlightenment requires material means together with spiritual endeavour, because Man is spiritually at one with Nature. Saint-Martin's path towards a golden age, towards heaven on Earth and the perfection of the human spirit, is far more individual and introspective than in other masonic systems. Moreover, he shifts the accent away from outward ritual and onto ethical and moral laws.

The concept of duty which runs through Saint-Martin's world-view would appear to have been of paramount importance to the Vorontsovs, both father and son. In a parting letter to his eighteen-year-old son on his departure for Russia on 3rd May 1801, Semyon Romanovich urged him to choose a profession of which he could later be proud, and above all, always to carry out his duty to the letter ("faire exactement votre devoir"), this being of particular importance in "a nation oppressed and enslaved, and which has lost its splendour and its sense of duty." "Remember", wrote his father, "that it is better to do good than to be rich and powerful", and that honour and a clear conscience are the best foundations for a happy life. It was pointless, he said, to attempt to change the morals of the country, as they were dependent upon the climate, the form of government and the education of the people. The young man would do best to devote his whole attention to the way in which he thought, acted and behaved with other people, giving respect to those around him, and not missing any opportunity, once he reached Russia, to give assistance to honourable yet unfortunate souls (The Archives of Prince Vorontsov, vol. XVII, pp.5-10). The same concept of duty is apparent in the prince's own memoirs and letters (Cf. *ibid*, vol. XXXVII, pp.82, 89, 94-95; vol. XXVIII, para. 2198, 2200). Close colleagues also testify in their memoirs to his great devotion to duty (*ibid*, vol. XL, p. 516; vol. XX, p 124). Clearly, duty for Mikhail Vorontsov meant the individual's duty of self-realisation, of remaining true to oneself: this meant carrying out the tsar's orders not because duty to one's country and one's sovereign came first, but because one had made the choice to be bound by the ties of duty, and that decision had to be seen through to the end (this is, of course, the notion of honour). And this faithfulness to one's duty, this noble service, may outwardly appear self-serving.

People's attitude to their duty is what breeds morality and makes them bend to the law and respect the truth. And yet the law, surely, is only law because it does not emanate from us, and truth is truth because we did not invent it... At the heart of a moral action, however detached and independent it may seem, there is always, therefore, a sense of duty - and this, according to Chaadaev, is submission; and he goes on to say that this submission to one's duty prevents the individual from becoming isolated from the rest of society and estranged from those around him by his own individuality, giving him "the inner sense, the profound consciousness, of his place as an integral part of the universe." By ridding himself of the pernicious individualistic attitude towards his own ego, Man "as it where rediscovers the idea, the universal nature of the personality, and the great power of pure reason in his primal link with the rest of the world... It is as if he were starting his life over again, the life given to him by the Lord God on the day on which He called him into existence... The perfect life we threw away we can restore again... It depends entirely upon us, and does not require us to leave the world we live in" (Chaadaev, *op.cit.*, pp.54-56).

Remember the main feature of the philosophy to which Vorontsov adhered: the hierarchy of the personality. That philosophy was completely in keeping with his character.

6. PRINCIPLES

*The Apostle did not say:
"I bring you some new and unknown kind of faith,"
but "I reveal to you what was already in your hearts."*

Aleksandr Men

Having determined the philosophical type and background to which our prince belonged, I shall now briefly give the basic methodological principles I shall be using in the analysis of the metaphysics of Alupka.

1. The Principle of Dynamic Design

As a product of a rich and highly developed culture, Alupka Palace does not lend itself to straightforward interpretations. It is a many-layered, polyphonous whole. It is impossible to pinpoint one single reason for its design and construction. Vorontsov was accustomed to seeing and thinking in a very complex, which is to say cultured, way. Everywhere at Alupka we find ambiguity, multifunctionality, polysemanticity. Moreover, the palace is built on the principle of motion. Both the palace itself and the park which surrounds it are landscaped. When one thing is in view another is hidden. The principle of dynamic design implies that there is no legend, and no epistemological absolutes - it is impossible to grasp the entire structure of Alupka at the same time. There is movement from one point to the next, a play and interaction between different meanings and landscapes which at the same time form a semantic whole: "like the single, scattered ray of a rainbow" (Voloshin, MA., *The Shores of the Koktebel*, Simferopol, 1990, p.148).

2. The Unifying Principle of the Personality

I shall be searching, in this study, for the unifying factor of Alupka in none other than the personality of its owner. Neither a single, uniform style nor an abstract metaphysical concept drawn from literature lies at the heart of Alupka - or, rather, neither was clearly illustrated by its owner and creator. As you will see I shall be attempting to define the outlines of such a concept, not for Alupka, but for the prince's philosophical type. For Alupka is an inner self-portrait of M.S.Vorontsov. "This miracle... is rooted in the miracle of his personality, too broad to be compressed into a monologue, too kaleidoscopic to be expressed as a logical system - and yet still forming a whole" (Pomerants, G.S., *Infinite Openness: Talks with Dostoevskii*, Moscow, 1990, p. 379). An estate was, of course, only as artificial as the personality of its aristocratic owner. The palace is a rejection both of the classicist model and of the Alexandrine rows of columns which typify St.Petersburg. Neither does Alupka contain even the symbolism of Ancient Greece or Rome (which generally testified to a democratic or imperial slant of political thought respectively). Nor is the pathos of military victory and heroism clearly in evidence. It is instead the individual personality which is displayed: neither the State nor totalitarianism, but the individual in relation to the world, in the world, doing his duty before God. It is not opulence for the sake of opulence or for displaying personal wealth. It is richness for the sake of the harmony, joy, completeness and diversity of the individual - but it is neither gluttonous, conventional or braggardly. The ideological position of the palace is firm, but with an outwardly pliant self-sufficiency. It is a house in the Kantian sense, but not by the measure of the German burgher, but of an enlightened Russian nobleman of rich and ancient blood.

That the character of Alupka reflects the character of its owner is confirmed by the extremes of reaction it provokes (as did Vorontsov himself), ranging from great delight to surprise at its crude construction and the waste of resources that went into building it.

3. The Principle of Familiar Symbolism

It is possible to find esoteric meaning in the design of Alupka, but this is not a major feature. Vorontsov makes use of forms which are present in, and diffused throughout the general consciousness (ie: the general culture) of the upper echelons of the nobility of his day. His man-made harmony is directly accessible to us, to the unenlightened, as long as we possess some general knowledge of European culture. Much of the general consciousness of the time was defined by intuition or acquired through upbringing and education. Nowadays there is much in it that we must decipher. However, it is essential to bear in mind that, firstly, as in heraldry, the symbol is contained not in an individual detail, but in a collection of elements; secondly, Vorontsov made use of these elements in an idiosyncratic manner, for he wanted to express not abstract ontological concepts of moral qualities, but the properties and predilections of his own nature; and thirdly, each element of Alupka always has a simple, natural, non-symbolic explanation, in that it is logical, for instance, or convenient or attractive, "One might with pure logic pinpoint a given trend, but still not see the whole picture. In order... to see the picture, one needs a powerful imagination... It is the externalisation, in poetic, rhythmic or musical pictures, of what burns in the soul... in this case, in and around a universal Russian soul" (Mamardshavili, M. K., "A Philosopher May Not Be a Prophet..." in *Chelovyek* N 2, 1991).

7. MASONIC SYMBOLISM

*It was a town where scientists, philosophers and students lived,
it was a town filled with statues, sculptures, beautiful temples
to pagan gods, but what was lacking there was charity.*

Aleksandr Men

I have stated that the symbolism of Alupka is non-esoteric; let me now examine one system of philosophical symbolism which was far from esoteric at the time, being in widespread use among the aristocrats of the day. In fact, Vorontsov's father, his uncle and a great many other relatives were freemasons (and indeed, which of the high-ranking noblemen of the day was not?). And although I have not managed to find proof that the Prince himself was a member of a masonic order (I personally believe that it was not by chance that he did not get involved in the movement), nonetheless, in the ranks of the occupying force he commanded at Maubege there was a thriving masonic lodge which included, among others, all of his adjutants.

I shall endeavour, with the aid of the most commonly used masonic symbols (Cf. Moramorko, M., *Freemasonry Past and Present*, Moscow, 1990), to decipher the details of the meaning of Alupka.

Freemasonry is not a religion, but a school of initiation which holds that the mystery of Truth is intimately linked to the inner nature of the individual - that the soul is capable of understanding the truth for the reason that it contains truth within itself. Freemasonry presents itself as a repository of a universal, super-historical religiosity based on a sense of the unity of life, on an inner conviction of the existence of moral law, and on the simultaneous experience of the mystical and the rational, both part of the sacred aspect of life which pervades everyday existence. It is upbringing and education which are of the greatest importance for the masons, and this does not mean the striving to create the new man; conviction, and not constraint; forgiveness, and not vengeance. The leitmotiv of masonic symbolism is universality. Freemasonry can be of help to the individual in his life, but no one is compelled to heed its teachings. For a mason, personal improvement is synonymous with self-creation); he is called to build for all eternity, to advance the cause of growth, development and knowledge: this is his dharma. Once he has accomplished this great task, he must offer it to the world. The temple is not only a reflection of the world, but also a recreation of the transcendental on Earth.

If we take a masonic viewpoint, then, the meaning of Alupka is the mystery of the One Truth. Alupka is a masonic temple given to the world and perennially accessible (the park was always open to visitors, and there was a thoroughfare through the inner courtyard). Let us begin our reading of its meaning, bearing in mind that "the symbolism of the masons is a cryptogram for any other free mason to decipher through creative examination".

The entrance into a masonic temple symbolically faces West, and at the entrance are two pillars: B and J. Pillar B, for Boaz or founded in strength, is lower and to the left; Pillar J, for Joachim, or founded in God, is up to the right. This is also a fairly accurate description of the entrance to the West wing of Alupka.

In the East of the temple is the Master's throne. The East is seen as the source of spiritual light. At Alupka, the Prince's study, his work library and his landscaped park were all on the East of the estate.

To the South and West are the places of the first and second Watchers. It is the facade of the South and West wings of the palace which are accentuated.

In the centre of the temple is the altar, and by the pedestal stand two stones, one carved and one unworked. The palace is at the centre of the grounds, and surrounded by natural rocks (to the South) and worked stone (to the North).

Along the wall of the temple is a cord with seven love-knots. And remember the six inscriptions at Alupka along the wall in the southern recess: "There is no victor save Allah" (why there are six and not seven merits a debate in its own right, and I myself have a few ideas as to the answer).

The whole temple is built like a consecrated cosmos, on a line running from zenith to nadir. At Alupka the vertical is provided by the summit of Ai-Petri, like a temple not made by human hands.

In the temple, the masons are involved in Work, which ceremony is opened by the Watcher in the West; the Watcher in the South announces the end of the Work and calls the masons to rest. The western entrance to Alupka was the back door of the palace, leading to the working rooms; the southern wing is the area for relaxation and luxury.

The temple is supposed to be a place of reason, seriousness, good deeds and good cheer. All of these were, according to contemporaries, to be found in plenty at Alupka.

The masonic master, in English, is called worshipful and worthy. It is amusing to note that the initials of Worshipful Master, Worthy Master and Worontsov Michel, as his name was then written in French, are the same: WM. And M. Worontsov was how the prince signed his name. His monogram, which can be seen all over the palace - over the fireplaces, on furniture, etc. - is very reminiscent of a masonic stamp.

The temple is in the form of a rectangle. So is the main section of the palace.

The black-and-white chequered floor of the temple symbolises cosmic dualism, the Earth, the thorny path across black and white. The floor of the prince's Winter Garden at Alupka is also of black and white chequered tiles.

From the Bible the masons learned that the Tree was the start of the dualistic division of the world; the Tree is also associated with heroic endeavours. The Master, like the guardian angel in the Bible, defends the Tree of Life by the sword. The sword is the symbol of manhood, just as the bowl is the symbol of womanhood. The flaming sword is the symbol of strength, freedom, creativity, of rupture and the purification which precedes new birth. Note that at the centre of the Alupka estate (above the courtyard wall) is a tree, a Japanese pagoda-tree, and the owner is a military hero, with great sword-fighting skills. Moreover, the ground-plan of the palace is very like the shape of a sword (or perhaps a sabre) pointing towards the South and West (the regions where Vorontsov did battle) and protecting the tree and the bowl (the master suite in the palace); and the prince himself is a creator, a destroyer, a purifier. The silhouette of the palace is also open to interpretation. It may be seen as the axe with which Lebanese cedars were cut for the construction of the temple; there are a great many cedars in the park. The symbol of the broken key, and the Master's duty to repair it, to make it whole - in other words, to overcome death by resurrection - is another possible interpretation.

The Arch plays an important part in masonic symbolism. There is a ceremony of the Arch, central to masonic philosophy, which confers the degree of Master. The Arch symbolises closeness to God, spirituality, the entry into eternal life, beauty, strength, a rainbow. Needless to say, unlike the pillars, the theme of the arch is a strong architectural feature of the palace. The most important is, of course, the arched recess in the south-facing facade.

The colours of the purple, blue and dark red curtain which hangs in the temple are similar to the colour-scheme of the palace: the Blue Drawing Room, the Crimson Study (or Chintz Room), and the Chinese Study (or Small Drawing Room) are examples.

In the initiatory order, the masons make use of a vessel of water (symbolising the soul within the body), a libation cup (a chalice filled with the water of memory and the water of oblivion), an image of the river Lethe which in Greek mythology flows into hell, a representation of a cave (the contemplation room, a place for meditation), the inscription VITRIOL - "Visit the belly of the Earth, and, if you straighten your course, you will find the secret stone" (ie: having profoundly understood the darker side of one's being, one's blindness and unenlightened nature). Each of these things has its parallel in the lakes and grottoes of the Chaos at Alupka. Even the alchemical symbols of the Sun and the Moon (gold and silver) find an echo in the names of these lakes.

And on the Vorontsov family tomb, representations of which, in the image of a rose and a lily, are numerous within the palace, there is much natural symbolism of this kind, depicting, for example, the blossoming of the soul and the signification of the holy trinity. At some time there was also, incidentally, a fountain decorated with roses and lilies at the foot of the Lion Steps in the park...

And the symbol of the pyramid, of course, is not only a feature of the lake at Alupka: it is the ultimate masonic symbol.

So there we are. Everything can be so neatly explained, down to the last detail. But in fact these are only explanations in appearance, for the most important element is still missing, the key which is specific to Alupka and its owner. And this key is the character of the prince. Masonic symbolism is universal and impersonal, and everything in it is subordinated to the idea of the order, of being initiated into an esoteric community. My understanding of Vorontsov is of a simpler man: he simply built himself a private residence, and made everything about it as comfortable and convenient as possible. Indeed, comfort and convenience are the most salient features of the palace, a reflection of the prince's personal philosophy and of his common sense. Everything else, including the numerous symbols borrowed from freemasonry, heraldry and other sources, is used only where necessary, as a convenient means of expression and signification, one whose meaning will be clear to cultured people in all its ambiguity and which both provokes thought and creates the desired mood.

8. THE CHOICE OF SITE

*... If one must be born in an empire,
better to live in a far-flung province by the sea.
Far from Caesar, and from storm.
No need to fawn and trot and rush about.
You say that all governors are bandits.
But I'd rather a bandit than a parasite.*

I. Brodskii

How did Vorontsov's beliefs affect his choice of a site for this, his main estate? I shall be dealing with this question, but first I should like to quote from an argumentum ad hominem in the first person - a letter to Count Buturlin during a short break in the hostilities of the Napoleonic Wars, written on 30th March 1815:

"You advise me to do two things: firstly, to leave the army, and secondly, to start a home of my own. As regards the first of these, I must assure you on my honour that you are mistaken if you believe that it is ambition or a thirst for glory which keeps me in this profession. True glory is too rare and too hard to win for me to set my cap at it, and since fame is a fashionable commodity these days, it truly is not worth the trouble. I cannot play the sycophany and accept the applause it brings me, when at the same time the same credit is being given to men such as Chernyshyov and Vintsengerod. And as far as ambition is concerned, I have never thought to seek rank or power; for that I should have to return to the Court, which I have always avoided, and to the courtiers for whom I have no love. So these are not the reasons why I serve in the army: I do so because my tastes, inclinations and habits all tend that way. You remember my passion for this profession when I was younger; nothing has weakened that passion - on the contrary, everything serves to increase and strengthen its hold upon me. It has given me much joy and good fortune, and, most importantly, I have made it a thing of habit. The happiest years of my life have been spent in the army, for (with the exception of 1808, which I spent making mischief in St.Petersburg) I have been in camp with only short breaks since 1803. The army has become my country, if I may put it thus. Of course I grieve to see most of those I have been close to since I joined die around me in the midst of cruel battle; but that is a misfortune which nothing can mend. Yet I still have bonds to the army which I cherish, and there would not now be time to build up others like them elsewhere. The idea of leaving the army for ever seems to me more cruel than that of death, for which everyone, and especially a soldier, must be constantly prepared. So my answer to your first piece of advice is that I cannot follow it, although I should probably think the same way if I were in your position.

"Your second counsel is a very different matter. I share your viewpoint and feel that a well-ordered household and private life would be the best means of securing a happy future. I should be content just to see the satisfaction it would give my father and my relations; but I am thinking neither of a calculated nor an arranged marriage. It is something which must happen by itself; I would have to love and respect the other person, and they would have to care for me. One or two peace-time stays in Russia should be more than sufficient to find what I'm looking for. I am quite unattached, and I only hope that it will work out first time, because I am not getting any younger: although not yet old, I am beginning to get my first grey hairs. That is a consequence of the life I have led, but still, it might not please the ladies, and they may not wish to have anything to do with me.

"But the war resumes, and I must leave all thought of such matters for now; it is annoying, but nothing can be done about it, and as for the army, I shall not be leaving it.

"You know, my dear Count, military service is even good for my health: my predilection for the heat has been strengthened as I have become accustomed to spending my whole time in temperate and hot climates; eight or nine months shut up indoors in the cold of St.Petersburg or Moscow would not suit me at all any more. To be stationed in one of the southernmost provinces of the empire, in Kiev, for example, Volyn or Podolia, with trips to the capital or Moscow for three or four months of the year and visits to England to see my father and sister - that is the existence I would hope for in peace-time.

"And that, my dear Count, is my credo. And I think it is a sensible one, given my inner predispositions and the force of habit which, as you know, is the strongest reflex." (The Archives of Prince Vorontsov, vol.XXXVII, pp.411-413).

I should like to draw particular attention to the sincere tone of the letter, and also to the fact that the plans Vorontsov outlines in it were fulfilled over the next forty years practically down to the last detail. And thus the choice of a southern location for the estate was determined.

In April 1819, Mikhail Vorontsov celebrated his wedding in Paris, and by early November he was at his mother-in-law's estate at Byelaya Tserkov near Kiev. In late November he visited Odessa for the first time. He was not on active service at the time, having requested leave - he had even asked permission to resign, but the tsar would not hear of it. In the February of 1820, Vorontsov at last took command of the third battalion of the First Russian Army at its headquarters in Kremenchug, when the emperor learned of his wish to serve in the south. But his former way of life continued unchanged. In his correspondence with his father, they discussed the commercial, economic and political importance of the south of Russia; Vorontsov senior also urged his son to settle down. In 1820, Mikhail acquired the Moshny estate in Circassia, not far from the Dnieper river. There then followed more journeys around Novorossia. His father wrote from London to enquire how the search for a suitable site for the estate was progressing, and persuaded his son against buying property in Poland (on the grounds that the province should in all justice be allowed its independence), pointing out instead that the Crimea was the southernmost region of the empire (excluding the Caucasus, where there was a war on). During a stay in Paris in September 1820, Mikhail Semyonovich took an unexpected step: although he had never been to the Crimea, he nevertheless, on the recommendation of Count Richelieu, bought from the director of the Nikita botanic gardens lands in Martyan and Ai-Danil, on the southern shores of the Crimea.

The whole of 1821 and early 1822 Vorontsov spent in England and Paris, after which he journeyed to Novorossia. Count F.V. Rostopchin, who saw him there, wrote to Semyon Romanovich that although his son was not on active service, he was not wasting his time, being absorbed in the study of construction and the management of the estate, household and gardens. In August 1822, Mikhail's father advised him to buy the lands which Richelieu was leasing in the Crimea, to economise with the family resources, which at that time were not very extensive, on the cost of setting up an estate, and also because the garden there was better. It was in late 1822 that Vorontsov visited the Crimea for the first time. When he returned, he began praising and describing the region to his friends and acquaintances, whom he urged to buy land there; Semyon Romanovich joined him in his efforts.

Following his appointment to the post of governor-general in 1823, Vorontsov, given a free hand, unwisely chose to make his official residence in the then new, small town of Simferopol. Only his affairs in Bessarabia and the absence of suitable buildings in Simferopol forced the

future viceroy to make his capital in Odessa. As early as the following year, the foundations were laid for the houses at Odessa and Alupka.

And so, as ever with Vorontsov, events have a perfectly rational explanation - or rather, they do not conflict with the natural order of things. And yet the process by which the choice of site was made remains hidden from us, and the documents give only fragmented information. For example, we learn that the Vorontsov clan did in fact have links with the Crimea all along, sometimes weak, but sometimes also at very important moments. In 1517, two commanders, F.Y.Kutuzov and one Mikhail Semyonovich Vorontsov (an interesting coincidence, once every 300 years!) fought in the southern province of Meshyor to defend Muscovy against the raids of the Crimean forces (Cf. Zimin, A. A., *The Development of the Boyar Aristocracy in Russia in the Second Half of the Fifteenth and Beginning of the Sixteenth Century*, Moscow, 1988, p.158). From 1768-1774, Semyon Romanovich Vorontsov fought in Rumyantsev's army at the famous battles of Lagra and Kagul; their victories on the Danube in June 1774 brought an end to Turkish rule in the Crimea. In 1769, Mikhail's uncle, the Admiral A.N.Senyavin, was appointed by Catherine the Great to establish a strong navy in the newly-conquered territory. In 1782, when Count Bezborodko came to give Semyon Romanovich the emperor's present of a snuff-box to commemorate his son's christening, he also brought news of Potemkin's exploits in that region. In July of 1783, Mikhail's cousin, Pavel Mikhailovich Dashkov, brought from the battlefield telegrams from Prince Potemkin to the Empress reporting that the Crimea had finally surrendered to the imperial forces. In 1784, Bezborodko asked Semyon Romanovich to find him an Englishman to manage his estates in the region. And in the following year he sent the ambassador to London Potemkin's idea, which had been given the force of an imperial order, to arrange with the British government for the urgent despatch of a large number of British criminals to settle the Crimea, left deserted by war and political strife. The ambassador voiced strong objections and instead offered his own idea for settling the region: by bringing traders, craftsmen, wine-growers and other experts over from Europe (as his son was later to do). Semyon Romanovich had also written a book about the natural life and history of the Crimea, and often discussed the area's various problems in his letters. And finally, our prince married the daughter of one of Potemkin's kinsmen, heiress to Potemkin's hugely wealthy estate (possibly including his lands in the Crimea).

Despite the secret attraction of the region for the Vorontsov family, however, the choice of site was not, of course, predetermined. "The attraction of the Crimea in the 1820s and 30s was not simply part of the natural process of colonisation in southern Russia, but was also to some extent sparked by romantic, idealistic notions of Russia's eastern provinces, notions which were nurtured by the emotional and cultural life of the Russian nobility at this time." The rise of the bourgeoisie throughout Europe meant that "the feudal aristocracy and its ageing culture, which had had its last heyday in the early nineteenth century, was going through a period of nostalgia." This was expressed through two interests: one in the chivalry of the Middle Ages, the other in the romantic character and natural world of the East. "Economic organisation as an incentive for colonisation became secondary, and the homes of the nobility on the south coast became purely country residences" (Shcherbinin, M.P., *A Biography of Fieldmarshal-General Prince M.S.Vorontsov*, St.Petersburg, 1858, p.18). In fact Pushkin (in 1820) expected to see "the ruins of Mitridatov's coffin" in the Crimea, and the "traces of the [ancient hellenic Black Sea port of] Pantikapaion". "The ship had meanwhile stopped within sight of Yursuf. Upon waking, I saw a captivating scene: the many-coloured hills gleamed; from a distance, the flat roofs of the Tartar huts looked like beehives sticking to the hills; among them, the poplars rose, tall and shapely, like green pillars; to the right was the giant hill Ayu-Dag... and all around, the clear blue sky and the bright sea and the brilliant light and the air of the south... I lived an idle existence on the south coast at Yurzuf, swimming and eating too many grapes; I instantly became accustomed to the nature of the south, and enjoyed it with all the unconcerned indifference of a Neapolitan

lazzarone." The poet was unmoved by the rocks of Kikeneis and the palace at Bakhchisarai, but he was greatly impressed by the Georgiev monastery with its vast staircase down to the sea and the celebrated ruins of a temple to Diana. "Now tell me", he wrote to the poet Delvig, "why the southern coast and Bakhchisarai hold such an unaccountable charm for me. Why do I feel such a strong urge to revisit places which I left without a second thought?" (Cf. also A.S.Pushkin, Complete Works in ten volumes, fourth edition, Moscow, 1977, vol.X, pp.17-18).

Voloshin criticises this attitude in the most severe terms: "The attitude of Russian artists towards the Crimea was that of tourists having a look at famous beauty-spots. The tone was set by Pushkin, and for an entire century thereafter poets and artists saw in the Crimea only "a magical land, a joy to behold" - and nothing more. Such is the mood of Russian poetry and paintings of the nineteenth century. They all praise the beauty of the southern coast, and the poems are as full of exclamation marks as the paintings are of the skinny cypresses of Yalta. There were undoubtedly among these visitors some who were extremely talented, but they had no connection either to the land or to the region's past, and as a result they were blind and deaf to the tragic land on which they trod." "The south coast is a poor, mass-produced imitation of Russia; to look at it is to destroy the overall impression of the region. But for those for whom that is the principal charm of the place, the true Crimea remains a closed book. In all its history, the Crimea has probably never known such desolation as at the time of its conquest by Catherine the Great, and the blame for that lies not only with the Russians and their harsh imperial policies, but with the fact of Crimea's isolation from the open sea routes and life-giving breath of the Mediterranean sea." "The ancient empire of the Goths, from Balaclava to Aluston, was built over with bawdy imperial villas resembling brothels and station buffets and hotels that looked like imperial palaces. The resulting museum of bad taste, which fondly imagined it rivalled the cosmopolitan hang-outs of the Riviera, will doubtless remain in Crimea as a single vast monument to the Russian era." "So what are the monuments of the Crimea? - Ruins and scenery. Every people, every culture, carries its own historical landscape with it... There is no country in Europe with such a vast number of these landscapes, diverse in spirit and in style, or where they are so focussed upon a tiny portion of the Earth's surface as in the Crimea. Not even in Greece are they so focussed. This is a consequence of the great cultural abundance and racial diversity of the Crimea... In the Crimea - the Russian Crimea - of today, there is nothing left but the scenery; yet in it one can read the whole history of the land. It is a glorious book illustrated by a master of genius" (Voloshin,M.A., op.cit., pp.216-219).

I believe that this invective is not entirely fair in the case of Mikhail Semyonovich, although it is true that he began the colonisation of the south coast by the Russian gentry. It was he who began to replace the single system of fortresses and fortifications along the coast which had been in existence since the days of Byzantium and which have reached us almost exclusively in ruins, with a chain of luxury villas. And yet his own palace he built in the ancient style, "skilfully and with an excellent knowledge of the location" (Keppen,P.I., op.cit., p.45), and roughly on the site of what had been one of the largest fortifications in the whole system, Alupka-Isar. In making his personal choice of the location and architectural style of the buildings, the prince created a real synthesis of art and nature, architecture and scenery, sea and hills, wood and stone, nature and civilisation, wildness and refinement, history and modernity, North and South, Europe and Asia. He looked at the great number of springs, the climate and the protection offered by the mountain pastures, the large area covered by south-facing slopes, and the splendour and diversity of the romantic scenery there (Vergunov,A.P., Gorokhov,V. A., Russian Parks and Gardens, Moscow, 1988, p.319; Livanov,F., A Guide to the Crimea with Historical Accounts of the Attractions of the Region, Moscow, 1875, Part 19, pp.2-3; Timofeev,L.N., Tsarin,A.P., The Alupka Palace Museum, Simferopol, 1981, p.4). "The proud and beautiful spire of Ai-Petri dominates the landscape from Ai-Todor to Simeiz... The summit of Ai-Petri is at its most beautiful and

imposing when viewed from Alupka" (Moskvich,G.G., An Illustrated Practical Guide to the Crimea, St.Petersburg, 1912).

Here is the vertical axis, or, to be accurate, its visual representation, provided by the sheer rock of Ai-Petri and the sloping terraces of the coast, which enabled the prince to turn his pyramidal philosophy into graphic reality and create a world part-real, part-ideal, in which the harmony of Man's oneness with the world would be realised. For here he could unite and fuse the vertical line of the spirit and the horizontals of life, by creating something comfortable and convenient - ie: which corresponded in every way to the philosophy of its creator. For me, its uniqueness lies in the scale of the project and of the individual behind it, and at the same time the intimacy of its design. Vorontsov made use of all the cultural and natural potential at his disposal, from top to bottom, and yet managed to retain comfort and, I believe, a particular sense of discreetness. This last is also apparent in the way in which he made sensitive use of the natural surroundings without spoiling them; in the mosaic of the architecture, each major element of which relates to the rich history of the Crimea (the Grecian pavilion, the Genoese towers, the follies and moorish arches); and in the choice of building materials - Grunstein, the diabase of which the surrounding rocks are made - and in the silhouette of the palace itself, which roughly follows the contour of the hills. Seen from a distance, the natural surroundings triumph over the artificial, absorbing it rather than being scarred by it, as is the case nowadays when modern holiday homes are built. The intimate globality of Alupka is due to the universality of one individual, and bears no relation to the gigantism of our modern, depersonalised social structures.

9. THE VERTICAL

... There exists a noble courage: the courage to invent, to create, to flesh out an idea with creative thought - and that is the courage of Shakespeare, Dante and Milton...

A. S. Pushkin

A.A.Galichenko is absolutely right to see Alupka Palace as the centre of a model universe. The palace forms a middle point on a vertical line between the hills and the sea. Its situation gives a second view of the estate - the first being God's viewpoint, encompassing the whole from above - that of the owner, from the centre, Man's viewpoint. However, not all the lines radiating out from this centre to the different compass points are of equal importance. Ai-Petri is indisputably "the true pole-star of the park" and indeed of the whole of Alupka; "movement is along the vertical axis of the amphitheatre, starting from the sea shore" (Galichenko,A.A., Palchikova,A.P., op.cit., pp.13, 53, 63), and it is the Ai-Petri meridian which forms the main axis of Alupka (north-south). One's strongest impression at Alupka is of openness, of turning outwards (or upwards). The area around the palace and the walks through the park have a sense of intimacy, yet without giving a feeling of being isolated or cut off from the world. The sea and the hills give a constant impression of openness all around. The view of the sea gives one the joy of height and space, of soaring above the waves. The view of the hills gives joy in the presence of great height, which is the straining upwards of the soul. The peak of Ai-Petri can be seen as a heavenly castle or magnificent temple only when viewed from Alupka; many works and tourist guides on the area note the ancient tradition of veneration of the Sacred Stone as a sanctuary or house of the soul. As a military man, the prince may have been reminded, when he looked at the three-toothed peak, of looking through gun-sights, whilst as a romantic, he may have seen it as a many-turreted mediaeval castle, or even as a pair of half-open palms, cupped around the sacred stone.

The prince would have had an especially good aim out of the north-facing windows, from which one's field of vision is so restricted as to point the gaze in one direction: past the rocks to the right and through the branches of the pagoda-tree (the tree of wisdom) to the mountain peak. The desk in the master's study, for instance, is placed to the left of the window, so as to command a view of Ai-Petri. The outline of Izyum-Tash Rock (called Grape Rock, Moon Rock or Potemkin Hill) echoes the line of the precipitous peaks, cutting across the whole lower portion of the picture and leaving only the distant hills open to view.

In short, everything within the observer's field of vision from the north-facing windows of the palace are a reminder, a cry, a pointer, a drawing towards Ai-Petri.

The axis hidden by the rock is not lost - it is marked in the upper park by the brush of the area named Chaos and the pine-trees which grow there (and which, incidentally, were planted specially in that spot). And further on and higher up, the imaginary meridian intersects the terrace which was formerly the site of the ancient Alupka-Isar fortress (the ground-plan of which the prince had drawn up). In 1820, a large white wooden cross was erected in the ruins above Alupka on an isolated rock (Keppen,P.I., op.cit., p.197).

And lastly, to the south of the palace, a meridian runs past the Grecian summer-house and out to sea to a point near Aivazov Rock.

Thus Vorontsov used the stony scrubland, the rocky outcrop of Ai-Petri (which, it has been suggested, formed in the fourteenth century as a result of an earthquake) to impose the vertical principle on the locality in its visual signifier. It becomes apparent that Alupka is an estate with a concealed axis, marked only by a few natural and artificial features. It was not the prince's invention, since the hidden axis, visible only from a distance, was used by N.A. Lvov in the design of his own estate at Nikolskoe. Lvov (1751-1803), a famous architect, artist, composer, diplomat, scientist, social activist, expert on symbols and allegories and trend-setter, was for many years a friend of Mikhail's father and uncle, and did a lot of work on buildings for the Vorontsov estates. Somehow, the ground-plan of Nikolskoe has been preserved in Alupka library since Vorontsov's time. The traces of Lvov's influence on the spiritual lives of the three Vorontsovs are also apparent in other ways (in symbolism, in the plan to mine the local coal resources, etc.). Lvov made use of the hidden axis in his design for Nikolskoe, which he saw as "a model of the natural man's world" (Vergunov, A.P., et al, op.cit., p.352). For Vorontsov, this axis at Alupka represented the keystone of his character.

Clearly the time has come to give a shape, an image to this vertical axis, one which will reflect the unity of the vertical and horizontal in the structure of Alupka. There is no need for invention here, since for thousands of years the indo-european culture has contained an image of the vertical as a symbol of the interdependence of the different levels of hierarchy, of static movement, of the interaction of opposing forces. Nikolai Kuzanskii, writing in the fifteenth century, called it the figure P, or the paradigm - in geometric terms it is the perpendicular intersection. This symbol has been widely used since ancient times, and in a variety of ways: it is represented as interlinked pyramids (or cones, or triangles), the shield of David, the cross of St. Andrei, the symbol for an amalgam in alchemy, the sign of the golden cut, and very much more. The well-known symbol for Jesus Christ fits here too - the crossed P with alpha and omega on either side - both in its vertical line and in the strong horizontal line formed by the alpha, signifying the beginning, and the omega, the end. The linguistic term paradigm belongs to the legendary alchemist Hermes Trismegistus: "What is below resembles what is above, and what is above resembles what is below. And this all goes to complete the miracle of oneness" (quoted in Rabinovich, V.L., *Alchemy as a Phenomenon of Mediaeval Culture*, Moscow, 1979, p.369). The paradigm exists and may be deciphered in masonic texts and pictures, but I find it better to follow the detailed advice and explanations of Nikolai of Kuza.

"Imagine a pyramid of light suffused with darkness, a pyramid of the dark moving into the light, and then put all you may into that figure, so that with guidance you may turn your speculations upon the unknown... God, being indivisible, is, as it were, the base of the [pyramid of] light; the base of the [pyramid of the] dark is nothingness. All creation... lies between God and nothingness. Therefore, as you can clearly see, the higher world has an abundance of light, but also some shadow, although darkness seems to disappear before the clarity of light. The lower world, on the other hand, is the realm of darkness, but it too is not entirely without light; yet the figure reveals that light in darkness is more often obscured than displayed. The middle world has correspondingly median characteristics, so that if the subject of your enquiry concerns time and space, then you should divide it into smaller sections to obtain your result... When enquiring about a subject which is part of a larger whole, you should use the figure to represent it in its totality, and imagine different levels of intensity of the light and density of the darkness accordingly, to gain a more substantive knowledge of any object and its place in the Universe... The figure TL will serve for every purpose: for sensual enquiry, when you should take unity to be sensual light and otherness sensual darkness; for rational enquiry, when you should name the discourse of reason unity; and it will also serve for intellectual enquiry, when unity should be taken as the light of the intellect... You will see sublime life, where the clarity of unity swallows up all trace of otherness; and you will see that other life, whose unity is shrouded in the otherness of ever-changing, unstable darkness" (Nikolai Kuzanskii, *Essays*, in two volumes, Moscow,

1979, vol.1, pp.206, 207, 209, 222, 251-2). The paradigm's principle of universal likeness makes it possible to combine in one multicoloured creation a multitude - in fact, an infinite number of meanings, each giving a different interpretation of the static interaction of opposites. This gives us at the same time a picture of the world and of the individual, the history of the individual, social structures, and an historical picture of knowledge.

Applying the figure P to the non-Euclidean, signifying visual surface of the Alupka estate, I take one of its bases (the light) to be the summit of Ai-Petri, and the other the point of the promontory which juts into the sea with the fishermen's wharf at its seaward end. The palace then falls on the central line of the figure, and within the space it defines lie special areas of the park - the upper and lower parks, so saturated with meaning as to stand out starkly from the rest of the grounds. The limits of the paradigm to east and west are marked by streams flowing from the same ancient spring, with paths and steps running alongside. All this might appear to be stretching the point, were it not for the designer's clear indication of his ideal structure: in the upper park by Great Chaos is a lake, and at the centre of the lake is another classic representation of the paradigm: two three-sided pyramids joined at the base, or rather, the top of a pyramid with its reflection in the water. Seen from the point where the meridian meets the lake-shore, the pyramid is a compass-needle pointing at the peaks of Ai-Petri and their reflection in the lake. I shall endeavour to use this key to unlock the secret of Alupka's structure. I am also prompted in this by the prince's monogram, which itself forms a perpendicular intersection, or figure it.

There was at least one day when the master of Alupka showed the configuration of his estate to everyone. This was during the celebrations for the arrival of Nicholas I and his family in Alupka, in 1837. "The whole of Alupka, from the magnificent gardens to the rocks of chaos, was splendidly illuminated, and fires of various colours burned brightly. The inaccessible heights of Ai-Petri Mountain, covered with barrels of blazing tar, made a wonderful sight. The whole mass of flames threw brilliant reflections over the waves in the bay" (Livanov,F., op.cit., p.5).

I shall come back to the subject of symbolism and the intricate vertical structure of Alupka, but first we must explore the broader abstract composition of the estate.

10. PARADISE

*How many times did I dream on my school bench:
"What hills are these? What rivers these?
Is a landscape better without tourists?
No mistaking, it's Rainer; is paradise mountainous and stormy?
With no widows' claims. For is there not one paradise,
but another paradise above that?
Stacked one on another like terraces?
To judge by the Tatrian mountains - paradise must surely be
in the form of an amphitheatre.
(And the curtain falls on someone...)
No mistaking, it was Rainer; and God - is he a baobab tree?"...*

Marina Tsvetaeva

The conventional method is to divide the park into zones which are differentiated by particular topographical features or the predominance of a particular kind of flora. Thus: the upper zone at the foot of the hills, to the north of the palace; the zone near the palace to the south (both of which were developed from late 1820, while the palace itself was under construction); and two zones to the east, on the paths to the north and south of the park, which share much the same landscape (Vergunov, A.P., et al, op.cit., p.320). The differences between these zones are so stark that "the principle of contrast here is not in the composition merely of individual groupings, but of entire areas" (Voloshin, M.P., Kosarevskii, I.A., Rubtsov, I.A., Alupka Park in the Crimea, Kiev, 1961, p.33). I shall mark out five clearly distinct areas: the palace, and the front, north, south and east of the park. These zones are of differing sizes, proportionate to their metaphysical significance. The front section forms the main entrance to the estate, and is of little interest to us. The drama is all enacted in the space between the vertical axis in the west (running north-south through the palace) and the freedom of the east. In the east lies the Garden of Eden (Cf. Genesis 3.24). It was quite typical of the estates of the aristocracy to have an Eden of this kind, but here at Alupka the impression it makes is many times stronger. Leaving the main courtyard through the eastern gates, one sees how the castle seems to vanish underground, to disappear and dissolve into the landscape. The rocks become progressively smaller until they are only a scattering of stones, and the streams are tamed, disappearing into the vegetation and deep-gouged channels in the soil; bridges cross over them as they fade from view, and the noise of the water grows muffled. The composition is drawn together by glades of picturesque trees, which were carefully selected and brought here from countries all over the world. It is important to note that the natural habitat of the trees around the eastern exit are the lands of the biblical Eden: Asia Minor, Syria, Lebanon, Transcaucasia. Here the vertical becomes sub-text: Ai-Petri in the background, with the long fingers of the cypresses pointing towards it. Peaceful, pleasant terraced avenues run alongside, and higher up are narrower stone steps. The higher one goes, the more chaotic and impassable it becomes - according to the Romantic principle of attributing a soul to nature, the wildness does not signify hell, but the free and spontaneous life of the spirit (remember that Adam and Eve's task in the Garden of Eden was to quiet the unruly excesses of the vegetation). In the landscaped part of the park, the concept in motion is based on the idea of familiar unexpectedness: at each step one sees familiar sights, and yet it is very difficult to return to them, and as the paths wind and fork, it becomes virtually impossible to retrace one's steps.

The old trees standing wide apart, their branches luxuriantly outspread, on the soft, smooth emerald green of the well-tended lawns give an impression of freedom, light and tranquility. The great number of varieties of trees is impressive but not excessive, kept within reason by the

absence of wild undergrowth among them. This Eden is thus reasonable freedom. One might even say that it is not Eden at all, but the essential attribute of Eden: the concept of freedom. As in the palace, there is nothing to excess; it is in perfect concord with the prince's tastes: reasonable sufficiency in thought and feeling. And there is, of course, none of the sad idea of the beggar that Paradise means having everything one could wish for in abundance. On the contrary, excessive opulence would be one of the greatest dangers, one of the worst distortions of Vorontsov's design.

Since English landscape architecture owes much to literature, and in particular to Milton's *Paradise Lost*, you may wish to compare his description of Paradise with the layout and landscape of the eastern part of the Alupka park (or, indeed, with other descriptions from literature; you will find that they sometimes fit Alupka almost to the letter). Comparison gives us the following interpretation of Alupka: the Ai-Petri range is a symbol of Paradise - the precipitous, inaccessible Gates of Heaven. On the slopes below, Man, cast out of the eastern Gates of Heaven, travels along the whole cycle of human life and his own existence, and approaches Paradise once more from the west. But the way to perfect union can only be upwards, in the soul's striving for the heights of the spirit. Incidentally, before Adam was cast out of Eden, he had been to the supreme summits of Paradise, where the archangel Michael (in Russian, Mikhail) showed him the whole of his future on earth, and told him the tasks he must fulfil, before casting the couple out of the Garden.

A poetic Eden has its own particular characteristics, because "a poet is more generous than an apostle. The poetic paradise is not limited to eternal bliss, and there is no danger of its being becoming dogmatic. Unlike the Christian convention of paradise as some kind of last stop on the journey, the dead-end of the soul, the poetic vision of Eden is of a country where the singing soul does not so much attain perfection as perpetual motion. The poetic notion of eternal life tends more towards cosmology than theology, and a soul is often judged less in terms of the degree of perfection required to come closer to and become one with the Creator, than of the physical (or metaphysical) distance it has travelled through Time" (Brodskiĭ, I., "Marina Tsvetaeva," in *Novy mir*, N02, 1991, pp.159-160).

Vorontsov's static vertical motion leads Man towards Paradise, but it does not let him into Paradise, even in allegory, for this would contradict the truth and the principle of Duty, which is the guided movement through life towards God.

The entrance from the west and Eden in the east, and also the sacred peaks above - all this forms a single Temple, which Man has already entered, standing, still and yet in motion, on the path.

If the western paradigm (the West, in the Russian tradition, being the domain of the Devil) is centred on Man, then Paradise is the place where everything is at the centre, in every clearing. It does not lack a centre; rather, there is the feeling that the centre is omnipresent, for the human and divine are all around, in every clearing. The Sacred Stone here is not an object to which one strives, but a symbol hanging, not up ahead, but up above, ever-present.

Thus the metaphysical plan of Alupka is not one-, but three-dimensional: paradise made flesh. The figure P is a microcosm: Man cast out of Paradise and standing at the gateway, cast into a sea of sin, a mundane and laborious existence from which he has re-emerged - for the static paradigm depicts the progress of the human soul to the point at which, at the peak of its development it becomes one with Paradise. The pyramid would appear to be the Tree of Understanding (the pagoda-tree), historically and spiritually now a part of the past, redeemed.

The Tree of Knowledge, which became part of Man in his sin, is now returned by him to Paradise, purged of sin.

I shall now return to the subject of the vertical and its meanings.

11. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VERTICAL

*We can Only create that which is implied within us.
This then becomes reality...*

M. Voloshin

As I have already stated, the pyramid in the lake is the key to the vertical axis. It is situated quite high up, close to the spirit region, because the pyramid is an extremely abstract concept, forming the basis of the entire structure of Alupka. I should like to note that here too there is a latent static dynamic: on the route from the palace to the lake, one sees several pyramids - first on dry land, so to speak, and then in the small pond below the waterfall. In this way, we receive intimations, presentiments of the symbol as it develops. To dry theory come the living streams of water, time and life. They mingle and crystallise to form the paradigm, reflected in the clear surface of the lake.

At one point a fountain sprang from the apex of the pyramid to a height of 20 metres; then it lessened, and today it is clogged up for good...

*"...O fount of mortal thought,
O inexhaustible fountain!
Which inscrutable law
Works you and shapes you?
How greedily you burst to the sky!
Yet some unseen, fateful hand
Breaks your stubborn beam
And you come glittering down from above."*

(Fyodor Tyutchev, The Fountain, 1836).

The ancient symbol of the pyramid is naturally open to a great number of interpretations. Thus the theme of the solid prismatic pyramid in landscape design was developed by N.A.Lvov, with the idea of the triangular pyramid as "the indivisible union of three virtues: Truth, Conscience and Love for Mankind;" (Nikulina,N.I., Nikolai Lvov, Leningrad, 1971, p.77). This concept has much in common with the lily on the Vorontsov tomb, since the lily is one of the symbols of the Holy Trinity.

And there is yet another ancient unity here. Four elements, four beginnings, four dynamic forces, are united here: water, earth, fire and air. The tetrahedron - the symbol for fire - made of stone, in the air and reflected in the water. It is a mystical union of opposites: the fire-stone in the water... And the (four-sided) pyramid, with its serpentine beauty line, was the symbol of diversity in English aesthetic thought at the time (Cf.eg. Savarenskaya,T.F., The Town-Planning of Western Europe from the Seventeenth to the Nineteenth Century, Moscow, 1987, p.30).

However, let us return to the subject of the paradigm; its meanings are innumerable, but each case highlights just a few. And at Alupka there are a fair number of meanings which may be attributed both to the local conditions and, of course, to Vorontsov. Since the figure Tt may be applied to any inherently contradictory phenomenon, it serves to describe the opposition of the material and the spiritual, here as elsewhere. At Alupka, the lower (southern) boundary - or

rather, infinity (the horizontal tangent of its visual signifier) - is of an endlessly changing, unformed material: the sea. The upper (northern) boundary signifies permanence, the spirit, God. The southern area of Alupka represents stages in the growth of civilisation at which the spirit begins to shine from within the base material. The palace area represents the middle line - Mankind. The feminine half is the south facade (luxury, comfort, wealth); the masculine half the north facade (asceticism, reason, order). The northern area shows stages in the development of spirituality and thought, and the gradual loosening of the ties of the material world (and spirituality becomes a monolith, alienated from the material world, an unwieldy mass of abstractions).

On the ground, these features may be divided for our purposes into seven zones:

1. the sea;
2. the landscaped terraced park;
3. the terraced stalls;
4. the palace and the zone immediately around it;
5. Lesser Chaos;
6. Great Chaos;
7. Ai-Petri.

Alternatively, they can be divided into seven kinds of landscape:

1. the sea;
2. rocks, cypresses and poplars;
3. shrubbery;
4. the italian terrace, the palace and the main courtyard;
5. the ruins, caves, local vegetation and the lakes;
6. poplars and piles of boulders;
7. a sheer wall of rock.

In the southern area of the park, stone fountains dominate, whereas in the northern zones they are replaced by natural springs. The space between the palace and the southern limits of the estate is an artificial, hand-crafted, civilised, humanised place. Behind the palace to the north, all outward signs of humanity quickly disappear, and we are suddenly in another, less visual, world.

The terraces of the southern slopes present us with both the geographical bands of Europe and the stages in that continent's history: the Mediterranean Sea with its echoes of antiquity, half-wild thicket and high walls of the Middle Ages, the Italian Renaissance and the moorish Alhambra, and, at the northernmost point of it all, Britain. Similar strips depict the geography and history of Russia in parallel, only travelling in the opposite direction.

The cliffs rise out of the sea to meet the ennobling space of the Grecian-style hollow, set like a stage before the amphitheatre of the terraces with their appropriately selected covering of trees - plane-trees, laurels and oaks. "By Jove, it really is a wonderful little place! That tall, spreading plane-tree, and the big, shady pussy-willow is magnificent: in full flower, making the air around it fragrant and sweet. And what a wonderful spring bubbles up under the plane-tree: its water is quite, quite cold, if you test it with your foot. This must be a sanctuary for Achelous and his nymphs, or such like, to judge by the statues of maidens here, and the sacrificial offerings. I must say, it is quite cool here, which is extraordinarily pleasant, and the summery chorus of the cicadas rings out above. And what is most fortunate is that here on the gentle slopes there is so much grass that one may lie down and feel it soft under one's head" (Plato, Phaedrus, f.230). And indeed, here would be a very comfortable spot for Socrates's contemplations, with the summer-house as sanctuary and the spring a triple-jetted fountain in a Grecian basin, right along the axis from the summer-house. From the small peristyle formed by twelve pillars, one may contemplate

not just the sea and the rocks, but the trinity of passing time depicted by the three jets of water springing from the fountain. Plato's reflections clearly held an important position in Vorontsov's philosophy, for the Grecian stone summer-house is the only building in the park apart from the palace, and is, moreover asymmetrical with the lake which contains the symbol of the pyramid (the lines meet -approximately, of course! - at the crook around the main palace building, lying on a straight line but on opposite sides of it). "...In our younger days we loved to read Plato. Do you remember how sollicitously that loftiest and most idealistic of the ancient sages surrounded the dramatis personae of his philosophical dramas with all the creature comforts? They were always either strolling along the beautiful coast of Illis, sheltering in the cool shade of an old plane-tree or tasting the delights of relaxing on flowering lawns, or else, once the heat of the day is past, enjoying the aromatic air and the cool and tranquil evenings of Attica, or yet reclining in comfort with goblets in their hands, around a table laden with viands, and then no sooner had the author arranged them on the ground than he would whisk them off to the moonlit expanses where he loved to wander" (Chaadaev,P.Y., op.cit., p.36). The aristocrat Vorontsov had found himself a twin soul among the ancients.

The topic of the connections with antiquity is not yet exhausted, but I shall return to it a little later for an examination of the palace itself.

Higher up on the terraces, the sea, which dominates the Grecian scenery below, is obscured by trees, and the sound of the waves is replaced by the gurgling of the waterfall. From here only the tops of the palace turrets are visible against the backdrop of Ai-Petri. Great boulders are scattered across the ground. Nothing but pine trees and the wildness of nature. This is mediaeval spirituality: a distant goal lies ahead, but the direct path to it is blocked.

The terraces closest to the palace depict the phases of the Renaissance in Europe. The Lion Steps are the dominant feature here, ornamented with great carved marble lions imported from Carrara in Italy. The slopes at this level are covered with all the caprices of an Italian garden and resemble the gardens of Tivoli and Frascati (and I do not think that this is merely the mark of romantic fashion; the prince's travels in Italy were not without purpose, and indeed, one of his visits caused him to make a fundamental alteration to his plans for the palace). It is onto this that the library opens.

The upper terrace is in the style of the so-called Italian gardens of Britain.

On these terraces, as in the cultural reality of the Mediterranean, the Orient and the Renaissance meet - the Alhambra and Pliny's villa. The feeling which predominates here is one of the fullness and richness of life, a refined humanistic luxury. But the forms of landscape and architecture cut across the line leading to the pole-star, the mountain peaks. Thus when it leads eastwards, the little path onto which the majestic Lion Steps open suddenly and unexpectedly comes up against a wall of rock. At this point, Ai-Petri suddenly comes into view, and the only movement possible is the sweep of one's gaze across the turret of the library and its weather-vane pointing towards the light (which is the direction of the latent main axis). Another such dead-end view can be seen from the eastern corner of the very highest terrace; here it is not possible to move upwards, but only down, to the Fountain of Tears and the first floor of the library, over the (once) mature, dusky vineyards. "You shall live in a garden, and every morning when you go out onto the terrace, you will see how the thick, wild vines envelope your house" (Mikhail Bulgakov, quoted in Shevelev,I.S., et al, op.cit., p.153). From here, both inside the library and without, one can see that the periods of human history depicted around are also the stages of one individual's education and enlightenment -Vorontsov's.

Closer to the goal of Ai-Petri, the way lies through spiritual searching. This is represented by the rocks, paths and water-channels of Chaos. There are no buildings here; it gives the appearance of a harsh natural landscape, and the murmur of cascading water was designed to create an atmosphere suited to reflection and deep contemplation. The murmuring streams of the park are symbolic of time, thought, spirit; a life-giving current, symbol of life. But here, where Lesser and Great Chaos meet, alongside the wild waterfalls, are tranquil lakes, all silent, from the top lake - secret and still and covered with fallen leaves - to the large, open, almost round bottom lake. The trinity of lakes invites thoughts of spiritual enlightenment (as do their names: Moon Lake, Sun Lake...). The big lake becomes the culmination of spiritual searching: the broad stream of clear water from above washes and reflects the earthly design of the stone pyramid. It is here at these spiritual heights that the symbol of Alupka, the symbol of Mankind, has its place. Thought becomes clearer and somehow takes root in the Light.

The springs and streams of water which feed the park are also of metaphysical importance. They all start from more or less the same source at the summit of Great Chaos and pervade the whole estate, sometimes returning underground, sometimes gushing to the surface in the form of fountains and waterfalls. In the landscaped park they are scarcely to be heard or seen, but are concealed in dells and hollows. On the inner terraces, the sound of the sea on the shore gives way to the noise of the waterfalls. Along the vertical axis, the streams and the paths and steps alongside them mark the conventional limits of the paradigm. The fountains mark the most important points and dates around the palace. And this upward movement along the water-channels always leads to the goal, to the primary source, to the summits of the spirit.

Here in Great Chaos, the summit and the abyss are very close; the peaks and chasms of the spirit, radical extremes and opposites are brought together here: the horror of the abyss of chaos, the silence which absorbs and engulfs - and the wind, the danger of the peaks and the bare wasteland. When the soul is released from the constraints of matter, it returns to Chaos, which in Greek mythology is father of all. The traveller reaches this wasteland, where the tops of the pine trees describe the line of the vertical axis, after a perilous journey through life and spiritual searching. And what does he find there? That nothing has been achieved; it all lies ahead of him still. And the summit of Ai-Petri is as inaccessible as ever.

Thus ends the image in stone and earth, the three-dimensional allegory of the interweaving and interaction of two forces: the spiritual momentum from above, from the north, from Ai-Petri (which came down from chaos and broke up to form the palace; harmony focuses, takes shape, and begins to hold sway over the material, and the soul emerges into the light); and the material, natural, lower force. Here is the drama and mystery of Truth, History, Man and the Universe.

Be wanderers, like our prince: stroll through and reach harmony with the world.

The main axis of the vertical gives direction to the whole structure. Locally, it is faint and indistinct. A way is cleared along its length, but forming only a rough and natural line. Certain landmarks plot the course of the axis: the point of the promontory, the centre of the main body of the palace, the pagoda-tree, the pines in the scrub of Chaos, and the summit of Ai-Petri. The lower section of the paradigm is parkland, and the path of the axis is therefore almost impossible to chart; one can only wander through. The only spot, as I have already mentioned, from which a clear direction and certain points along the axis can be seen is from the windows of the northern facade.

Along the whole length of the vertical, the difficult path of spiritual searching and development is shown in allegory by the use of hills: the goal looks close at hand, yet there is no direct way of reaching it. However, a direct path does exist, running almost exactly along the line of the vertical. It is a secret path, and twists and turns like the curves of the beauty line. In the southern part of the estate, this path runs straight from the Grecian park to the palace by way of secret steps set into the terrace walls, each with a small stone fountain. In the north, the way lies along a roughly-paved path. It weaves its way around rocks and boulders, yet it is the quickest route from the palace to the summit of Chaos, starting from under the pagoda-tree. And it is along this path that the main events in the mystery of Alupka lie: the Grecian glade, the Lion Steps, the palace, the pagoda-tree, the perennially cool gorge (where a favourite hound was buried), the dry pyramid, the pyramid in the lake, the chasm of Chaos, and, finally, the patch of scrubland. This is by no means a gentle, undemanding walk, and it gives the walker a graphic idea of the eyes and legs philosophy of the master of Alupka. The climber's heavy breathing as he reaches the top tells of the difficult path along which the soul has come.

Divine Providence is not revealed in sharp focus at Alupka, but hidden, as it is hidden in real life. Not only are there no avenues or paths running straight along the axis, but its relation to features of the park is also obscured - as is its sociocultural meaning. Thus the Grecian direction which lies along the line of symmetry between summer-house, fountain and the hollow runs parallel to the main axis, but slightly to the west. The axis is consequently also delineated in the Grecian area of the park, by the line running through the stone summer-house to the point of the promontory and the foot of the great steps. In other words, it is possible to distinguish the axis by reading the local signs, with, it is true, some knowledge of the direction in which history is moving. This was a generally-held belief at the time of the Enlightenment, when the ancient - and, among them, the Platonic - antecedents of Christian thought came once again to the fore. From the hollow, the summit of Ai-Petri is invisible behind the left-hand turret of the palace.

But the most important factor obscuring the true axis is the fact that the main section of the palace, the arched recess and staircase of the south facade, and the Lion Steps, leading nowhere, are all at an angle of 30° to it... And so we turn to the palace itself.

12 THE PALACE

*... Even in the raptures of Eastern pleasures,
a European should remain European in his tastes and opinions*

A. S. Pushkin

"Scott's estates grew, and with them grew his house... A house which was already starting to turn in to what Scott called the enchanted castle. The architects, Edward Blore and William Atkinson, were forced to alter their designs to meet their employer's ever-changing demands. The construction of the house took several years, what with one thing and another, and Scott became as absorbed in the process as he had in the cultivation of trees. In 1822 he wrote: "I spent this whole summer working to finish my dream-home, modelled on the country houses of Scotland's past..." He spoke of the house as the Tower of Babel he was erecting, and of the architectural ornament as this foolery... The great Abbotsford estate was a statement in stone and earth of the writer's love of the romantic... He did not try to amass money - instead he liked to spend it on making his dreams reality or others' lives easier. Perhaps the most attractive form of vanity is the purchase of an estate; it allows one to form bonds to Mother Earth and make her more fertile, and also gives an opportunity to help one's fellows, to those that way inclined. Scott was an exemplary laird. He lived on the estate... and took a thorough-going interest in all its affairs, knew all his hired labourers personally and was concerned for their welfare - a hospitable, generous and patriarchal master" (Pearson, H., *Sir Walter Scott*, Russian edition, Moscow, 1983, p.114 - my translation, P.K.).

Substitute Vorontsov's name for Scott's, alter the geography slightly, and here you have a description of the prince's feelings towards his estate. In Sir Walter Scott's words: "My heart lies in the estate which I built with my own hands" (ibid, p.173). Clearly the architect Blore took his commissions from a certain kind of client - one whose estate became his self-portrait. At Alupka, the palace itself is a personality (or the image of a personality) which goes on living after its master is gone. The building looks imposing yet open from the main drive. At one time, the harsh, bare stone walls were largely covered by a thick covering of climbing flowers and ivy (Shiryayev, S.D., *Alupka: the Park and the Palace*, Simferopol, 1927). Thus was the character of Mikhail Semyonovich: his gentle, welcoming exterior hid a man of hard principle.

The intention of Vorontsov and his architect was to give the palace the appearance of an "organic and integral part of the surrounding landscape" (Voloshin, M. P., et al, op.cit., p.6). One way in which they achieved this was by building it from the same stone as the rocks around it. Diabase overlays lead, reinforced with copper pins to give a stable structure built to last and sturdy enough to withstand earthquakes. The palace was planted high up in the scrub. Seen from the shore, the estate is set against the background of the rocky precipice which falls from the mountain pastures, and its shape roughly follows the line of the hills, the two-storeyed main building echoing the contours of the peak - the castle in the sky - and the line of terraces which follows the edge of the pasture.

Examination of the general architectural layout of Alupka leads us to another interesting analogy which, although some may dismiss it, nonetheless serves to some extent to broaden the subtext to the prince's philosophical position. Within the palace itself there would appear to be no references to antiquity; this is not, however, the case. The very layout of the estate has its analogy in antiquity. For it resembles that of... the Acropolis of Athens. The angle at which the Pantheon in the Acropolis is turned towards the light is the same as that of the main palace buildings at Alupka (which is one possible reason for their location at an angle to the meridian).

Both Alupka and the Acropolis have the main entrance in the west, protected by its own fortifications. Where the Clepsydra fountain used to stand in the Acropolis, the Trilby fountain stands at Alupka. The site of the Greek Bacchus theatre is occupied here by the Lion Steps and the amphitheatre formed by the curve of the bay where the sea is closest to the palace. One other important point to note is the church in Alupka village. This lies to the west of the palace and about three times its length away, and was completed in 1838 in the Doric style after the temple to Theseus in Athens (Shiryaev, S.D., op.cit., p.27), according to descriptions in old guidebooks of the area. Such works also note the resemblance between the Church of the Archangel Michael, whose design had to be approved by Vorontsov even down to the iconostasis, and others of his antiquities - the house in Simferopol and the summer-house (although Orthodox churches in the form of a peripter were not scarce in those days, for example, the Peter and Paul Fortress at Sebastopol, built in 1844, which still stands to this day, and which is similarly compared with the Parthenon and the Theseon). In Athens, to the north-west of the Acropolis stood the temple of Hephaestus, patron saint of craftsmen, who was - and still is given the misnomer Theseus. The temple was a Doric peripter, built in the fifth century A.D., and "was better preserved than other similar structures, having been turned into a church in the sixth century" (A Dictionary of Antiquity, Moscow, 1989, p.573). By analogy, the palace at Alupka becomes a replica of the Acropolis, the village of Alupka the craftsmen's quarter of Athens, and the church the temple to Theseus. And the prince himself resembles - no, not Pericles, but the hero of ancient Greece himself: Theseus - which is only logical, given that "the transformations with which the ancients credited him set an example to all Greece and laid the foundations... of the Athenian spirit of democracy and supremacy over the rest of the country... Ancient Greek tradition credits Theseus with uniting the residents of Attica into one people... and one state (or polis): Athenai... Theseus introduced these reforms in the prime of life. He earned the Greeks a reputation as incorruptible and just mediators in difficult conflicts." In 1838, Vorontsov turned 56, and the church reminded him that "in his fifties, Theseus became attracted to the illicit acts which were to be his downfall" (Myths of the Peoples of the World, Moscow, 1988, vol.11, p.504). Similarly, at Alupka one senses the influence of a free citizen who has laboured long to serve his country, a just and democratic master.

The palace takes on and extends all the natural features of Alupka, and all the former styles and periods of the Crimea. Vorontsov used, combined and united all of the elements to create a new and unified whole - a setting, a home which lived out the history of his personality. It was not for nothing that Blore's first careful design was rejected, later to be executed by Hunt. The solitary, fortified and turreted castle by the sea is very characteristic of the architecture of the south coast. All along the shore-line, the Byzantines, the Theodorites and the Genoese had built their fortresses; Vorontsov's castle was another such.

Because the Crimea has always been a crossroads and its population diverse, its culture has tended towards syncretisation, its peoples are of "every origin and faith," and its art is a combination of diverse elements, giving "the elusive flavour of a fusion of eastern and western cultural influences" (Fadeeva, T.M., *Among the Crimean Hills*, Moscow, 1987, p.93). As a result, the Alupka estate does not so much stand out from, as blend in with its natural and cultural setting; so the prince's wish was not to accentuate the differences between Man and Nature, but their unity, their observance of the same laws.

The construction of Alupka took place at a time of a radical shift of style in Russian and European architecture. St.Petersburg - the ideal of architectural perfection in a predominantly classical style - was seen as the slow coming to fruition of the ideas of the Enlightenment and its ideological concern for social welfare. The rousing civic spirit of the capital's architecture was an expression of the upsurge of patriotism which attended the beginning of the nineteenth century and the growing power of the Russian state. The cult of reason which characterised the

Enlightenment called for the wisdom of simplicity and naturalness, which was interpreted as the predominance of a single principle in architectural design - symmetry: neat, regular columns, harmonious, unobtrusive proportions, a dominant classical structure, ceremony and circumstance. All of this is in stark opposition to the spirit of Alupka. There is not a single pillar in the palace, and nor are there direct correlations with the democratic symbolism of ancient Greece or the autocracy of imperial Rome. There is no vertical axis here - not even an obelisk - apart from the line towards Ai-Petri, and that is the private, implicit, spiritual vertical of a sovereign character.

"Classicism brought us the expressions eternal truth and eternal beauty; it strove for harmony and equilibrium. In contrast, the art of the Romantic period strove for an understanding of Man and his world in all their diversity, and endeavoured to capture and convey the changing nature of the world, the fluctuating seasons and the subtle modulations of the soul... The freedom of the human spirit - and at the same time the urge to sink into the secrets of the soul - a heightened sensitivity to personality, to what is unique and individual both in the human character and in the events of our lives: these were the principle features of Romantic aesthetics" (Punin, A.L., *The Architecture of St. Petersburg in the Mid-Nineteenth Century*, Leningrad, 1990, p.27). This fascination with uniqueness goes hand in hand with an interest in history and antiquity, but it is more human; "archaeological data began to be used to establish a more accurate, flesh-and-blood picture of the past... For the first time, the distant past came to be perceived as something real and tangible. Antiquity came to be seen in a new light, and Greece was given preference over Rome. Accounts of ancient architecture, costume and tools strove for archaeological accuracy, but above all they sought, in their character-portraits, to move their audiences with the heroes' greatness of spirit and noble deeds." In Britain, a country with which the prince had strong connections, contemplations of national history followed, "and it was also characteristic of the English Romantics that they stressed the importance of the spiritual element... and worshipped all that was beautiful and which ennobled the human soul - and nature above all else... It was this fusion of ethical and aesthetic principles which distinguished the British art of both the Romantic school and the school of Realism" (Nekrasova, E.A., *Romanticism in British Art*, Moscow, 1975, pp.8,12).

The Romantic movement in Russia, of course, had its own particular characteristics. A vast wealth of literature has been written on its influence on Russian art. Vorontsov was very familiar with artistic circles, and indeed played an active part in that culture. However, the Romantic movement seemed to define the aristocratic spirit of the age, and pervaded the social sphere; so that, although the prince did much to attract Russian landowners to the south, his task was to some extent simplified by the Romantic preoccupations of the nobility at the time.

This new emphasis on the inner life of the individual could not fail to influence the development of the situation and surroundings in which that individual lived. The first indication of this was in the design of estates and the architecture of private residences, palaces and country houses. "It was in this field of construction that a fairly consistent approach to the functional aspects of design began to be put into practice, together with newly-developed ideas regarding ease and comfort.

Purely aesthetic concerns were also important: wealthy and well-educated aristocrats, no less than the architects they employed, had caught wind of the latest artistic trends and delighted in making use of them to fit out their houses. The comfort of the interior design and the diversity of detail were considered the essential criteria on which a house was judged" (Punin, A.L., *op.cit.*, p.69). The idea of personal choice was a fundamental concept, and with it eclecticism, the main principles of which were: 1. Man in the world, the uniqueness of the individual; 2. the correlation between the practical function and style of a building; 3. the concept of rational choice - not an

arbitrary decision, but one which determined the style of the building on the basis of the functional and creative needs and personality of the client. Whereas, in the classical model, a rationale was provided by the prevailing artistic and ideological style of the time, in Romantic eclecticism, this rationale, the life-style, is determined by choice, in rational accordance with the individual's style of thought and feeling and the functional requirements of the design. This is the unifying principle of the personality.

In his design for Alupka, Edward Blore showed himself to be one of the purest examples of the Romantic eclectic. A renowned court architect in Britain, he did not simply copy from the past, but strove to achieve an effect which would be in harmony with the thoughts and ideas of his own time. To this end, he used the strangest combinations of elements, yet without losing his fine sense of style. Not only did he study his sources with great care, but he penetrated and reinterpreted their very nature, linking different elements of a deeper pattern. As a result, "the eclecticism of Blore's architecture, whatever our reactions to it, is somehow the secret of the particular charm of Alupka, what gives the place its uniqueness" (Shiryayev, S.D., op.cit., p.35).

It was not by chance that Vorontsov decided to commission Blore's work. The reasons, besides their mutual acquaintances in England, lie in the European fashion for Gothic architecture - "practically the only consistent application of Romantic ideals in the architectural field at that time." The works of Scott and Byron further increased the attraction of the Gothic style, and it also appealed to Nicholas I, whose estate at Peterhof is considered to show Gothic influence, and the country houses and estates of the aristocracy throughout the European west of Russia began to show the strong influence of Gothic taste. "There is a certain ideological subtext discernible in this phenomenon - the desire to emphasise the privileged status of the aristocracy, and to set the ancient lineage and exalted station (whether genuine or imaginary) of that class in juxtaposition to the social forces born at the start of the nineteenth century" (Punin, A.L., op.cit., pp.30,37). The main feature of Romantic architecture in the Russia of the 1820s and 30s was its predominantly British influence. Neo-English Gothic started out as an imitation of the late-Gothic perpendicular style, then went back to earlier examples of Gothic style, and then to the hybrid style of the English Renaissance, which was itself influenced by the Germano-Flemish and late Italian Renaissance. Blore's use of "the forms of the early English Renaissance was entirely logical and justified by the nature of the project. For it was in sixteenth century England that the style of rural castle to which Alupka belongs first developed. The reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I saw the birth and the golden age of humanism, at a time of unusually strong economic activity and international trading for the country" (Shiryayev, S.D., op.cit., pp.33,41-42). (It should, incidentally, be noted that the very choice of the age of culture you will remember Vorontsov's mention of "two or three centuries ago" in his letter to Kiselyov - indicates the prince's ideas concerning the future of southern Russia and his role in that future as a local landowner). It is of importance that in "the Tudor style, one of the principal aims was to create a refined and comfortable living-space" (Punin, op.cit., p.71), with the result that the military function of castles began to shrink in importance and they became instead the country houses of the nobility.

Vorontsov grafted the concept of the English country castle onto a Russian context, and despite its apparent westernness, it seemed somehow in its rightful place there, graphically demonstrating the Russian capacity for borrowing from the West.

Lastly, the use of the Gothic style at Alupka was imperative from a metaphysical standpoint - ie: as regards the vertical - as Chaadaev ably explained in 1832 (op.cit., pp.217-220). The triangle is the Gothic figure. The verticality of Gothic structures is the antithesis of Hellenic architecture's emphasis on the horizontal - indeed, the antithesis between horizontal and vertical is the foundation of every architectural style in every age. "The Greek style... is settled, domestic,

bound to the earth and the comforts it brings; ... Gothic architecture is a monument, a representation of thought, a spurt towards the heavens and heavenly bliss; the Greek style, and all its manifestations, are an expression of Man's material needs," whereas the Gothic is "an expression of moral needs; in other words, the triangular form of architecture has something sacred and heavenly about it, whilst the horizontal is human and earthly." At first sight, the Gothic seems overstated, purely impressive. "But if you look more closely, you will notice that the beauties of nature are much the same... When you see the most wonderful works of nature, your first reaction is not to question whether they serve a purpose, but a purely unselfish response; and in this, incidentally, they indeed serve a purpose, although it is not a self-evident one, but a function which reveals itself only to the contemplative." Gothic creations lead heavenwards, and "show how human creation was elevated to the greatness of nature for the greater glory of God."

Thus, according to Chaadaev, the Gothic style - which is essentially triangular, pyramidal, vertical, overstated, purely impressive, a rush of thought towards heavenly bliss - is an expression not of the material, but of the moral needs of mankind, demonstrating that "beauty and goodness are drawn from the same source and subject to the same law." The same first images of architectural beauty which form the metaphysical structure of Alupka are contained in the Gothic repertoire -which gives an indication of the inner unity of the whole estate, and an explanation of why the palace could not be other than it is - in the Grecian style, for instance. It is at the point where Grecian and Tudor, matter and spirit, meet, that the lower park at Alupka is built.

I should, however, note that the southern facade of the palace is not at all Gothic. There is a powerful Eastern (Arab) influence here too. The terrace and balcony on the south side create the impression of the pavilioned architecture characteristic of Moorish palaces (such as at Bakhchisarai), which appears to merge into the greenery of its natural surroundings. Moreover, the outline of the palace in silhouette, seen from the south, follows the historico-geographical shape of the south coast: fortresses to the extremes of west and east, the extravagance of the climate, the architecture and the mountains -and with the highest point in the centre. The lavish style of Moorish architecture is unlike any other: the palace is seen as the realisation of the dream of the Garden of Eden, where the line between magical fantasy and reality becomes itself mere reverie. "This notion of a garden-palace is a feature - albeit in a variety of different forms - of Moorish architecture from every corner of the Muslim world: from Topkapi Palace in Istanbul to the famous Alhambra in Granada, with its delicate openwork pavilions ringing the inner courtyards centred - both physically and semantically - on fountains or mirror-like ornamental ponds" (Fadeeva, T.M., op.cit., p.64). All these elements are present at Alupka, even to the replica of the Bakhchisarai fountain which stands in the shaded inner courtyard. In Moorish architecture, however, the pavilions are essentially just extensions of the world-model which the mosque represents for the fundamentalist, whereas Vorontsov's personality, far from being simply an accessory to the design of his estate, was of paramount importance - although, to make the illusion complete, there is, in fact (or rather, there was) a mosque at Alupka. It stood to the north-west of the palace; indeed, the main buildings were so placed as to have the magnificent arch on the south facade facing it - facing a mosque! The juxtaposition is clear when viewed from the sea up the Lion Steps. There is, of course, an innocent explanation of why the main buildings are so placed: they are turned to face the path to the sea, which naturally passes down the great staircase. From the archway, only the sea is visible, the terraces of the park being entirely hidden from view. This is the shortest path to the cliffs. If we take the rule of antisymmetry mentioned earlier, we see that the (spiritual) impact of the mosque counter-balances the (material) impact of the cliffs. This short line may therefore be considered a false axis; the great staircase leads down to nowhere and up to the resounding chord of the arched portal.

The origins of this archway are a mystery. On the one hand, it was conceived by Blore as a semi-open interior, which in his draughts for the building is labelled salon, or drawing-room. It was also used as a hall for recitals, and Shalyapin and Rachmaninov, among others, both performed there. On the other hand, however, the foundations of the archway were laid as part of the first design for the palace, before Blore was commissioned. Surely the vast archway, set against the backdrop of the dome of a mosque and a minaret, was intended as an entrance, probably a gateway to the Paradise of the Mohammedans? Yet on entering, we see - not paradise, but... a typical English hallway in the Tudor style. This would appear to be another instance of Vorontsov's fondness for metaphysical irony.

In 1844 (before the prince's appointment to the Caucasus, the war on Shamil and the siege of Dargo), six inscriptions in Arabic were carved into the wall of the recess, bearing the legend: "there is no victor save Allah" ("va la halib illyallah"). The legend was probably taken from the Alhambra palace, famous throughout Europe, where it is repeated in every room in the form of a pattern, thousands of times over. Tradition has it that the builder of the Alhambra, Sultan Mohammed Ibn Ah Akhbar, was forced, in 1248, to fight alongside Christian armies against Muslims; when, on his triumphant return, the crowds which greeted him cheered for his victory, he is said to have shaken his head sorrowfully and repeated: "there is no victor save Allah" (Landa, P., "The Alhambra and Heneralife," in *Africa and Asia Today*, N05, 1991). Here the outward resemblance between Alupka and the Alhambra ends, but the following points are of interest: the palace at Granada enjoyed a wide reputation as the finest example of Moorish culture and splendour of its time; during the reign of Catherine the Great, the palace at Bakhcharai had already earned the sobriquet of the Russian Alhambra. The Spanish castle gained the attention of the cultured classes in the late 1820s for the added reason that from 1828-30 it was undergoing restoration following the earthquake of 1822. Like the Alupka complex, the Alhambra performed three functions: it was both a castle and a palace, and also contained the servants' quarters. There, too, the citadel lay to the west, and the layout and the shape and position of the hill are reminiscent of the upper terraces of the Alupka estate. The parkland around the palace, as at Alupka, was filled with roses. But the main feature of the park in Granada was a dense grove of English elms, brought over in 1812, during the Napoleonic Wars, by the Duke of Wellington, who later became a close acquaintance of Vorontsov... (Cf. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Chicago-London-Toronto, 1959, vol.1, p.622)

Besides the indications provided by the prince's aesthetic tastes, I have a delightful, if not very watertight, hypothesis regarding the Eastern influence on the design of Alupka. Remember that during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Arab world was famed, on the one hand, for its strict monotheism, and on the other, for its excessive love of luxury and sensual pleasures, and its fanaticism. The false axis is the cherished Mohammedan idea of monotheism. Born in the wilderness of the Middle Ages [at the foot of the staircase], this idea blossoms, meanders along its way [as the lions coil along the stone staircase] and rises as the great arch. But this arch is not the gateway to heaven, but a recess bearing an affirmation of monotheism. And not only that, but an affirmation that the Islamic culture, made strong by its deep convictions, is not victorious, that it has not followed the true way, but only an adjoining path. To the six engraved legends (in two rows of three - three being a sacred number) there belongs a seventh: the whole of Alupka, whose message is: "There is no victor save God"; no truth save God's truth; no law save God's law; no beauty save the beauty of God; no wholeness save the wholeness of God. Yet Vorontsov would not have been Vorontsov if he had not regarded the metaphysical aspect egoistically, with reference to his own character. His greatest weakness was probably for luxury, emotion and sensual pleasures. The symbolic references to these are concentrated here, in the feminine, more luxurious south wing.

This hypothesis receives the support of Chaadaev. He credits Islam with helping to destroy polytheism and spread the concept of one God. "In the great historical development of revelatory religion, the Mohammedan faith must be seen as a branching out" (in the present case, at an angle of 30°). In the Arab world, poetry, philosophy and art are all seen as "serving, both now and in the past, one single purpose: the satisfaction of the physical being... The exaggeration of the importance of thought is simply a foolish fancy prompted by material man's desire for self-aggrandisement." "Like all human instincts, the instinctive idea of immortality was originally simple and rational; but in the fertile soil of the East it grew out of all proportion and was ultimately expressed as profane dogma" (Chaadaev, *op.cit.*, pp.127, 106, 74). The epigrammatic inscriptions in the archway bear a certain resemblance to the epigram chosen by Chaadaev for his Third Philosophical Letter: "Absorpta est mors ad victoriam" ("Death is swallowed up by victory" - I Corinthians 15.54). The similarity becomes more apparent if we read the whole of verses 54-57 of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians:

"54. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up by victory.

55. O death, where is thy sting? grave, where is thy victory?"

56. The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law.

57. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

I shall now endeavour to develop the theme of Alupka's previously-mentioned principle of antisymmetry (in approximate terms, of course, to allow for natural discrepancies). On a line running through the centre of the main palace building - so that each blocks the view of the other, if one describes an imaginary 1800 turn around the palace - lie the summer-house and the lake with the pyramid at its centre; on another line lie the cliffs, the Lion Steps, Potemkin Rock and the mosque; on a third - the meridian - are the summit of Chaos and the tip of the promontory. The courtyard, on a fourth line, matches up with the upper terraces, and Vorontsov's study with the Blue Drawing-Room. The antisymmetrical principle is also in evidence, incidentally, on the Vorontsov family tomb: at the centre is a lily, symbol of the trinity, and roses, which are ranged antisymmetrically along the diagonal. And there is an even more subtle pattern to be observed in this asymmetry: "It consists of two lines - the line of affirmation and the line of denial. The first is the line of love, the second the line of jealousy. Or, to be more precise, the former expresses a moment of worship, the latter a moment of envy, for these are the two essential forms which love takes. To the first power, love is worship of an individual (although this does imply an element of universality)... To the third power it embraces the entire universe... In the first power, envy is directed against an individual rival; in the third power it becomes envy of Satan and the outer darkness" (Pol,O.V., *op.cit.*, p.118). In this case the paradigm may be expressed as a diagonal: the East as envy, Antiquity as adoration, running from south (specificity) to north (universality).

Evidently, this hypothesis should also be treated with a degree of scepticism, as there is a danger of too much being read into each individual, specific detail - that is its charm. Take the illustrious lions, for example: some see them as an allegory for the south coast as a far-flung bastion of empire (the lion being the symbol of strength - cf. Wagner,G.K., *op.cit.*, p.320), whilst others regard them purely ornamental (cf. Voloshin,M. P., et al, p.23). One might note that the entrances to Eastern palaces and temples are characteristically guarded by figures of wild beasts or fantastical creatures. This interpretation emphasises the importance, the sacredness, of Alupka Palace. Other interpretations are possible, one of them being that "the word lion is of Indo-European origin, and designates an animal which is at the same time a symbol of the sun and moon: the sleeping (couchant) lion is the moon, the waking lion the sun" (Levin,E., "The Fabulous Mirror of Crimean Toponymy," in *Crimea '90: an Almanach, Simferopol, 1990, p.89*).

This instantly calls to mind the names of the Alupka lakes and Islamic symbolism. In short, then, each aspect or substrate of Alupka acts as a semantic fountain, showering a broad spectrum of meaning before us in droplets of association; and the rainbow can only be seen from one angle...

Now let us enter the palace. Maybe it was indeed designed "in the form of a journey," as Ms. Galichenko maintains; at any rate, it gives the unmistakable impression of the passage of history, particularly in the main passageway of the palace. "The further one proceeds from the western archway, the more the marks of the architecture of earlier eras accumulates" (Galichenko & Palchikova, *op.cit.*, p.9). As you move east through the palace, the walls change: the rough-hewn stone becomes progressively smoother and more regular; the buttresses are replaced by pilasters and projecting chimney-breasts; up above, the rough crenellations, square chimneys and towers give way to more delicate crenellations and fountains in the shape of goblets. Then comes the unexpected sight of a delicate, open-work bridge, and the whole perspective shatters - the corridor turns a corner, and the courtyard opens up before you. Along the length of the corridor, the ground-level and surrounding walls rise steadily. From out of the early Middle Ages we find ourselves suddenly dropped into the English Renaissance. By the time one reaches the eastern gate of the courtyard, the architecture is the exact opposite of the style of the western entrance.

The ground-plan of the main building and reception rooms is fairly unelaborate. Here one sees the Biedermeierzeit principle of comfort in operation - a stark contrast to the previous succession of opulent yet often cold and impersonal rooms. Here in the main building, the central principle of Alupka is again at work. The study faces the drawing-room, north-east (the east being the domain of work and reflection) to south-west (the south being the domain of rest and relaxation). Each room was conceived in a different style. If one passes through each in succession, the impression may be described as a journey through different countries (cf. Galichenko & Palchikova, p.20), although here there are in fact only three: the Turkish (or Circassian, or Blue) Drawing-Room, the Chinese Study (or Small Drawing-Room) and the English Hall - chinoiserie at the time being taken to mean all things eastern, including the Arabic inscriptions (Cf. E. Levin, *op.cit.*, p.3). Perhaps the layout of the rooms was more philosophically motivated (in masonic fashion). "The procession from the Blue Drawing-Room to the billiard room would appear, given the generally linear structure of this section of the palace, to have been designed with very Odessan ideas of comfort and domestic custom in mind: The great hall, which was almost always empty, separated two large rooms and two discrete societies. One - almost plebeian, although the count himself was rarely absent - was permanently in the billiard room. The other - a select group - remained in the drawing-room with the countess... The two groups would meet in the dining-room for dinner..." (Vigel, F.F., *op.cit.*, p.124). The master and mistress would come from the main palace building, the numerous guests from the Shuvalov reception wing, otherwise known as the Asiatic pavilion.

CONCLUSION

*They say the park expresses a whole philosophy,
but the secret has been lost and it's all overgrown...*

Tourists overheard at Alupka

In one of the finest books written on the subject of Alupka (Shiryaev, S.D., op.cit.), I found a different translation of the Arabic inscriptions in the archway: "There is no happiness save that sent from God." This may not be an accurate version, but it conveys the idea, the slogan, the motto, if you like, of the whole estate. The message of Alupka is the joyful and optimistic mystery of Truth and of the Individual within it. Its uniqueness lies in the scale of its creation, its considered design and the qualities of its creator. The prince made use of everything, of every layer of meaning and every sense available, from top to bottom. There are many beautiful places and pieces of scenery in the Crimea, but Vorontsov used the entirety of the region for his palace - and yet managed to retain a sense of cosy intimacy, for his was not an uncompromising, totalitarian adherence to a single idea. Let me give a practical example of this: in the 1930s, a development project for the Yalta-Miskhor-Alupka area was drafted. The proposals included plans to build an electric railway, with two escalators from the station, one to the centre of Alupka, the other to a point nearer the shore, a total of 600 metres in length and 140 metres in depth. A cable railway was to carry passengers from the station to the park, at a depth of 101 metres. Plans were unveiled for a 5,000-6,000-seater stadium and an open-air theatre seating 3,000 next to the park. A platform 60m by 12m was to be built for passengers. Levels of passenger-traffic were estimated (in thousands), and the path of a chair-lift to Ai-Petri calculated (in metres), etc.. To be brief, a hundred years after Vorontsov, the total ran into the thousands. The viceroy's private residence was to be turned, like the rest of the Black Sea coast, into a health resort. Only it was never specified whether, this time round, the convicts were to be local residents or imported from abroad...

Both overall and in individual cases, "the metaphysical is conveyed in physical terms, so philosophy, as it were, is made visible... (and it may well be that for the time being there is no other way of teaching philosophy in this culture than by simple demonstration)" (Ryklin, M.K., "The Metaphysics of Speech," in *Voprosy Filosofii*, N0 5, 1991, pp.20-21). Vorontsov gave an egotistical, egocentric emphasis to his creation (for a start, the text takes the form of his own estate), avoiding specific socio-cultural references. He created beauty for himself - ie: an eternal beauty - and for others; for the aesthetic implications are far broader than those of the verbal or, in particular, the traditional philosophical text, "because what the text treats are cultural objectivisations, chance crystallisations of consciousness into language, such as can never give a true understanding of philosophy" (ibid, pl.20). Here at Alupka, one can see traces of metaphysical preoccupations which were to become so important later in Russia. Here is the essentially religious desire for wholeness, "the proper and rightful condition of Man and the Universe" (Khoruzhii, S.S., op.cit., p.34); the concept of a perfect existence, which has its roots in the mythology of Eden; the idea that restoring this way of life is "the fundamental object of Man's historical existence, its purpose and its meaning, the harmonious combination of diverse yet interrelated elements (the total union of the future), which is a legacy of neo-Platonic Christian thought; the deeper connection between empire and Absolute; the interconnection between ontology and gnoseology (which sees cognition as an act of reintegration), and finally, the perception of the Trinity as a universal ontological paradigm - a dynamic structure, a principle describing the drama of existence. "And do you know what kind of life this is? It is Heaven, and there is no other heaven than this... It is nothing less than the complete renewal of our nature in its present condition, the furthest limit of rational human endeavour, the ultimate

destiny of the spirit. I do not know whether each of us will follow this great path, or whether we shall all reach the glorious goal which lies at the end of it, but that the limit of our achievements can be nothing less than the total fusion of our nature with that of our world - of that I am sure. For only in this way can our spirits rise to the summit of perfection, which is the one true expression of Higher Reason. There are two points to note here: firstly, that we do not mean to suggest that life contains heaven in its entirety - heaven merely begins in life [in the figure P], as death is no more since the Saviour overcame it [there is no victor save God]; and, secondly, that this does not imply the fusion of matter with time and space, but only with idea and principle" (Chaadaev, op.cit., p.57).

The traditional Russian love of the Christian figure of the vertical is so strong and goes back so far that it is still apparent even today. "The essential point is that there should be heaven on earth, and vice versa. Mandelshtam once said - and here he shared the Christian viewpoint - that this is not the eternity of time, but eternity as a vertical cross-section of life.

"I believe that there is, in this world of ours, another world, another heaven, another world. The oldest surviving piece of philosophical wisdom, inscribed on Egyptian parchment, says: on earth as it is in heaven. In other words, if you have a link, a connection, with heaven - and such is the nature of human history, which is the history of Man's elevation beyond himself, beyond the limits of his mortal nature, his duality - then you must order the earthly in heaven's image... do on earth as it is in heaven.

"This is at the heart of every religious and philosophical truth.

"This is indeed something unearthly, and it is happening on earth. It is the vertical cross-section of the earthly - it is, so to speak, eternity. It is not the eternity of time of some ageless, unchanging object of greater perfection than our own imperfect objects - not at all. This cross-section is the art of the true spiritual, religious, exotic and moral nature of mankind; it is heaven brought to earth... This other life exists in this life, only not as an object, but as a shifting point on the vertical cross-section of this life" (Mamardshavili, M. K., op.cit., p.136).

Our prince was able to take the apotheosis of time and mutability - the Romantic park - and turn it into an image of eternity.

In order to understand the theory of how this was possible, we must consider once more the analogy between the park and poetry, since "landscaped parks in particular were primarily the work of poets" (Likhachev, D.S., op.cit., p.24), and verse is frequently compared to a garden in flower. The basic characteristics of the metaphysics of poetry are can be found in I. Brodskii (op.cit.) and A. Kushner (*Apollo in the Snow: Notes on Fields*, Leningrad, 1991). Poetry is focussed thought, a distillation, it omits the obvious. It holds back time by presenting us with a vast wealth of symbols whose meaning we must seek repeatedly. And verse is vertical: it is an idea, a description of that other light; it is the source of all our conceptions of that light. Poetry and landscaped parks are similar in that both are distinguished by a complete absence of didactic a priori positivism; both are unpredictable, and, therefore, illogical. An idea does not exist in a vacuum either in poetry or in landscape design; it is indivisible from its signifier, detailed and specific, and may not be made into an absolute or its meaning stretched, by logical inference and generalisation, to cover every imaginable case. Nor is it monilinear, but moves in all directions at once, as life does, growing like a crystal or, if you like, a tree; stylistic contrasts are fully permitted, even implied, and stem from the moral centre - the conscience - as branches grow from a tree-trunk. And an idea can never be retold, or it will become banal or absurd; it may only be demonstrated. This is what I have endeavoured to achieve with this book: retracing our footsteps along the ray of light.

At Alupka, as in true poetry, there is a sense that success (ie: novelty) has its foundations in a tradition centuries old. It is a monument to happiness.

But we should bear in mind what lies at the heart of these games with words, with landscape and style. The man who created the park as it were left everything as it was. The crystalline quality of the park, its ambiguity and its multifarious styles could not exist without a certain inner game, an ageless irony. And not only, incidentally, was creative thought in Vorontsov's day entirely aesthetic, but also equally ironic - think of Pushkin, for example.

Once a number of different interpretations are allowed, what I would call the irony of multilevel sufficiency immediately arises: that of any interpretation goes. The delicate fountain which flows from the apex of the pyramid also works as a parody. And then there is the fountain entitled Trilby - hats at the time were seen as a symbol of freedom of thought; depicted on the fountain is a scene of a dog catching a cat... And then in the dining-room there are two large Hubert Robert canvasses. One of these depicts Jean-Jacques Rousseau's grave in the famous Hermonville park - merely a symbol of the Romantic park and of melancholy. But does it reflect the mood of Alupka? Not in the least! It simply offers a contrast. Delicate Moorish pavilions containing inscriptions were common in landscaped parks at the time, but at Alupka the pavilion bearing a motto in Arabic is the palace itself. These examples, together with contemporaries' comments on the prince's fine mind, suggest that Vorontsov's creation is in fact a huge hoax in a Romantic style very fashionable at the time, whose message lies not so much in the style - although there too, of course - as in a carefully considered personal/metaphysical concept. The irony lies in the presentation of meanings. The fashionable nature and style of the park do not, as it happens, undo the careful consideration, but in fact combine to ironic effect. Indeed, true, unspiteful irony can only exist, and only shows itself, where the play is on earthly meanings, but the subtext touches upon heaven.

I am convinced that at Alupka, Vorontsov fulfilled the fundamental task of any philosopher, thinker or creative spirit: to leave a legacy of the paths to truth, by attempting, "by means of his own development and enlightenment, to develop and structure the social fabric around him, to differentiate and diversify it. For only complex organisms are capable of life" (Mamardshavili, M.K., "On Philosophy," p.10).

And I can see now the comparison which the "half-ignoramus" Count Vorontsov made in 1824, when he said that the young, talented but dissolute Pushkin was uneducated. He was comparing the poet with himself, and the latter's work with his own embryo creation, the poem of Alupka.

But let us not forget the irony I mentioned earlier: it is quite possible that all that I have written here is but a dream, a glass-bead game... "Opening his eyes slightly, he found he was sitting on some stone object. There was noise all around him. When he opened them fully, he saw that the noise came from the sea... and that, in short, he was sitting on the very end of the pier, and that below him was the sparkling sea, and behind him a beautiful city in the hills". Nowadays, the best interpretation of Alupka one can expect is that it is the flowering island from the novel about Melmot the wanderer which the prince loved. Today people see merely the vestiges of a former glory robbed of its metaphysical base, which has somehow become almost completely overgrown - what one might call the most philosophical areas are deserted (the terrace by the library, the secret path, Chaos, etc.), and "the park, for most of its visitors, is simply a pretty landscape. Our forefathers' mystical, contemplative attitude to nature has been overtaken by a pragmatic utilitarianism... We must make it a priority to restore not only the architecture, but also the human consciousness of the past" (Pimonova, V., "In Search of a Lost Age", in *Iskusstvo Leningrada*, N0 3, 1991, p.31).

Yet Prince Vorontsov could hardly take offence at the way time has treated his creations. Much of what he did still lives and is of help to people today. And the spirit of that bright soul lives on in his works, hidden, at their very core, like the house on Malaya Morskaya Street in St.Petersburg where he was born, which has not disappeared completely, but instead, at the beginning of the 1900s, became the lower storeys of the immense Shtal Brothers building.

*... The green of the laurel tree, shivering gently
The casement all dusty, the door latch undone
The abandoned stool and the easy-chair empty
The stuff of it drenched in the warm midday sun*

*The noise of the bridge past the fence of black pines
A struggling boat off the point in the wind
The Elder Pliny on a blistered bench lies
In the satin-manned cypress, a noisy thrush sings*