

## HOW TO BUILD A RUSSIAN IMPERIAL ICONOSTASIS: IVAN ZARUDNY AND THE NAVIGATION OF GUIDELINES AND POLITICS

JELENA POGOSJAN

The reign of Peter I was a period of pervasive westernization, secularization, and regulation of the arts in Russia. Religious art has often been pushed by art historians to the periphery of this emerging cultural space, because it is perceived as being traditional and conservative by nature and, therefore, not consistent with the new trends of the period — not belonging to the “revolutionary” paradigm. It has also been repeatedly noted that while the Armoury Chamber, Moscow’s main state-supported icon painting “factory,” employed hundreds of highly skilled icon painters in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, it had just a few salaried artists by 1701. This observation was originally made by A. I. Uspensky, who stated:

As if a mockery, only two icon painters — Tikhon Ivanov Filiatiev and Kirill Ivanov Ulanov — were still listed with the Armoury Chamber in 1701 and 1702. Apparently, this was still too many as no one took an interest in the icon painters and nothing about their activities was reported [Успенский: 268].

The decline of the Armoury Chamber, however, in no way demonstrates a decrease in the volume of icon painting. During the reign of Peter I there existed a high demand for new iconostases by both the state and private clients. In Moscow and the Moscow region alone, 153 new iconostases were commissioned between 1700 and 1725 [Николаева: 127–278]. During the reign of Peter I, the largest known iconostases were crafted in major centers throughout Russia: in Ryazan, the residence of the Head of the Russian Church; in Pskov, the headquarters of the Russian army at the beginning of the Northern War; in Archangelsk, the so-called “sea gate” of Russia before Saint-Petersburg was established; in Tobolsk, the largest city in Siberia and the base for missionary work aimed at baptizing the “wild peoples” of the empire; and, finally, in the

Sts. Peter and Paul Cathedral in Saint-Petersburg. Icon painting and iconostasis building were not obscure or perishing forms of art. Indeed, they were booming artistic fields, to which artists were enticed by a surplus of influential and wealthy customers. Additionally, more and more iconostases were required for churches in the newly conquered cities of the Baltic, not to mention Saint-Petersburg, Russia's new capital.

Religious art of this period is widely represented by art historians as a product of strict state control. James Cracraft writes:

[T]he overall purpose of this drastic reorganization of ecclesiastical administration, which entailed abolishing the centuries-old headship of the Russian church (the metropolitanate, then patriarchate of Moscow), was to reform the church as well as to run its affairs more efficiently. And high on Peter's list of "irregularities" to be thus eliminated by his Synod were supposedly improper painting and venerating of icons [Cracraft: 295].

Even more strongly, this approach to art is criticized by Leonid Ouspensky:

The state was not concerned with tendencies in art: the one important thing was that art be under its control. It was understood that the essential task of this art was to be useful to the state; it had to contribute to the religious and moral education of the citizens. This is how Peter I viewed art in the general framework of his reforms [Ouspensky: 416].

Ivan Petrovich Zarudny was a key figure in the artistic scene during the reign of Peter I. During his work in Moscow (1701–1727), Zarudny built or decorated numerous churches, palaces, and public buildings, constructed triumphal gates and iconostases, and designed military banners, reliquaries and catafalques for official ceremonies [Мозговая]. Ivan Zarudny was an artist in the early modern sense. As Zarudny himself claimed, he was "an architect, a painter, a carpenter, a carver, a turner, a gilder, and everything that is instrumental for the craft" [Протоколы: II, 479]. He was a trusted artistic advisor to the tsar and his deputies, and the director of Peter I's major artistic projects, which were usually quite ambitious and involved large teams of craftsmen and artists. In some cases, Zarudny used his own designs approved by the tsar or a particular client; in other cases, he followed drawings or verbal instructions supplied by the tsar's deputies [Элькин: 149–150].

For his largest project, the iconostasis of the Sts. Peter and Paul Cathedral, Zarudny worked closely with Italian architect Domenico Trezini, a Roman Catholic whose previous experience was largely with Lutheran churches. Zarudny based the iconostasis on a drawing by Trezini in order to match the overall design of the new church. In this project (and some others) Zarudny's

role was not only to craft the iconostasis according to a proposed design, but, more importantly, to adapt the alien, unfamiliar “western” approach to Russian liturgical practices and thereby create a meaningful biblical narrative within the framework of Russian Orthodox dogmata. He was also expected to skillfully include in this narrative allusions to the tsar’s military victories and dynastic circumstances, turning the iconostasis into a visual panegyric to the monarch.

From 1707 onwards, Zarudny also served as the head of the *Chamber for the Supervision of the Painting of Icons* (“Палата изугравств исправления”). He carried the official title of superintendent, and was obliged to conduct a census of all icons and to certify both Russian and foreign painters. It was a position of power, but also one of great responsibility. It was often up to him to decide which icon was “correct” and which was “corrupted”. Moreover, Zarudny’s own work received the greatest scrutiny, meaning that it could not be anything less than exemplary.

Zarudny’s iconostases were strikingly different from anything that had been produced in Russia before [Gerasimova; Грабарь; Погосян; Постернак], which begs the following questions: why did the creator of this new form of iconostasis decide to depart so drastically from tradition; did any of the church hierarchs stand behind him and his new approach; and what did he rely on when he put together the programs for this untraditional form? All of these questions cannot, of course, be considered in just one article. The main objective of this article is to examine the rules that Ivan Zarudny received as superintendent and which he was supposed to enforce. It is reasonable to assume that Zarudny attempted to follow these rules when creating his own iconostases, and that Zarudny’s extremely unconventional projects were simply a reflection of how he uniquely interpreted those rules.

By the tsar’s order, which appointed Zarudny as superintendent, the Most Reverend Stefan (Yavorsky), Metropolitan of Ryazan and Murom, the head of Russian Church (the locum tenens of the patriarchal see since 1700), was ordered to protect “the greater beauty and honour of the holy icons, [and] to have over them artistic management and spiritual command in accordance with the rules of the apostles and of the holy fathers”. Zarudny, on the other hand, was ordered to certify the artistic abilities of the “iconographers and painters from Moscow, as well as foreigners, working on holy icons anywhere within the Russian state”, by issuing “an official seal for all icons” [Пекарский: I, 2–3]<sup>1</sup>.

Zarudny, with the approval of Stefan Yavorsky, was responsible for judging which icons and iconostases were correct (or proper) and which were not. To

---

<sup>1</sup> James Cracraft gives a concise but full description of this system of certification [Cracraft: 297].

better facilitate this process, the tsar issued Zarudny a set of rules, which included two edicts: the first was issued in 1668 by three patriarchs, Paisius of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch, and Ioasaph of Moscow; the second was an edict given by Tsar Aleksey Mikhailovich in 1669. The rules given by Peter I to Zarudny further stated that “Everything said in the Tsar’s [Aleksey Mikhailovich’s edict] and the longer one of the three holy patriarchs are now inviolate and will be preserved and followed” [Пекарский: I, 2]<sup>2</sup>. As Zarudny was required to enforce the edicts, it is reasonable to assume that Zarudny attempted to follow these edicts in creating his own iconostases — that his unprecedented work was, therefore, a reflection of how he interpreted those edicts. We need then to examine in more detail the content of the edicts, their origins and context in which they existed.

The edicts given to Zarudny were both composed soon after the Great Church Council of Moscow (1666–1667)<sup>3</sup>. By 1667, the Council, among other important theological issues, turned their mind to the matter of iconography, and composed a separate chapter on icon painting.

The rules of the Council are preserved. Some of them are written on behalf of the whole Council and others on behalf of just the two Patriarchs Paisius and Macarius. Some were outlined in the form of rules, some in the form of answers to questions, and some in the form of explanations; but all of them were afterwards accepted by the whole Council. All of the rulings were first written separately from each other on different scrolls and were signed by the fathers of the Council. Later they were copied together into one book under the title of *Acts of the Council* [Макарий: 404]<sup>4</sup>.

The decision on icon painting was only signed by the patriarchs Paisius and Macarius. In this decision, the two patriarchs pointed out a number of errors in existing Russian icons and, in order to prevent such errors in the future, they demanded supervision over all icon painters: “We decree that a skilled painter, who is also a good man (from the ranks of the clergy), be named monitor of the iconographers, their leader and overseer” [Деяния: 22<sup>5</sup>]. Initially, as Peter I

---

<sup>2</sup> A copy of this order survived in Ivan Zarudny’s correspondence together with a later clarification given by the tsar in 1710, and was published later by P. P. Pekarsky [Пекарский: I, 1–30].

<sup>3</sup> The circumstances behind Aleksey Mikhailovich’s decision to call this council, how it worked, and the major decisions it made are discussed in detail in the works of Metropolitan Makarii and A. V. Kartashev [Карташев].

<sup>4</sup> The Book of Acts was not published until 1881. We use the second edition, which was confirmed against the original manuscript and published in 1893 [Деяния].

<sup>5</sup> The part of the *Acts* of the Great Council of Moscow of 1666–1667 that was devoted to icon painting with only few small omissions is included in Leonid Ouspensky’s book *Theology of the Icon* (translated by Anthony Gythiel) [Ouspensky: 371–372]. Here and below all excerpts from the *Acts* are given in this translation.

indicated in his order, “the chief icon painter of the Tsar’s [Armoury] Chamber, Simon Ushakov” was appointed as the overseer. Simon Ushakov received the same rules as later provided to Zarudny [Пекарский: I, 23].

The major decisions of the Council were published in Moscow as a part of the *Sluzhebnik* [Служебник: 2<sup>nd</sup> pagination, 1–17 rev.] immediately following the Council’s conclusion. However, the chapter on icon painting was not included in this book. Since the Council’s decision on icon painting had not been published and was therefore not known by icon painters or the general public, one would expect that the edicts given to the newly established overseer of icon painters, appointed pursuant to said decision, would convey the major recommendations made by the Council in respect of icon painting. In reality, the Council’s major recommendations on icon painting were deliberately excluded from the edicts.

One of the Council’s major recommendations was that the Crucifixion be placed prominently on the top of the iconostasis:

It is good and proper to place a cross, that is, the Crucifixion of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, above the Deesis in the holy churches in place of Lord Sabaoth, according to the norm preserved since ancient times in all the holy churches of the eastern countries, in Kiev, and everywhere else except in the Muscovite State. This is a great mystery kept by the holy Church.

Лепо бо и прилично есть во святых церквах *надейсусе вместо Саваофа, поставити крест, сиречь Распятие* Господа и Спаса нашего Иисуса Христа. Якоже чин держится издревле во всех святых Церквах в восточных странах, и в Киеве и повсюду, опречь московскаго Государства, и то велие таинство содержится во святей Церкви [Деяния: 23–23 rev.].

The Council refers here to the common 17<sup>th</sup> century Russian practice of placing an icon of the Lord Sabaoth in the center of the upper, or “Forefathers,” tier of the iconostasis<sup>6</sup>. In Greek alters of this period (“the holy churches of the eastern countries”), as well as in Ukrainian iconostases (“in Kiev”), the Crucifixion is always placed on the top of the iconostasis and the Lord Sabaoth is never included with the Forefathers. This demand by the patriarchs was meant to better align the Russian tradition with the “ancient” practice of the rest of “the holy Church,” including the Greek and Ukrainian<sup>7</sup> churches.

<sup>6</sup> The first iconostases with a Forefathers tier appeared in Russia at the very end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century (in 1598 in the Smolenskii Cathedral of the Virgin Monastery, and in 1599–1600 in the Trinity Cathedral for the Sergius Monastery) [Мельник: 435].

<sup>7</sup> The patriarchs traveled to Russia through Ukraine. We know that patriarch Macarius, in 1664 visited on his journey a number of Ukrainian monasteries and churches. Detailed descriptions of them (composed by Deacon Pavel Aleppsky, who accompanied the patriarch) specifically men-

The Council, however, not only demanded that the Lord Sabaoth be replaced by the Crucifixion; it prohibited the depiction of the Lord Sabaoth in general:

Let all vanity of pretended wisdom cease, which has allowed everyone habitually to paint the Lord Sabaoth in various representations according to his own fantasy, without an authentic reference <...> We decree that from now on the image of the Lord Sabaoth will no longer be painted according to senseless and unsuitable imaginings, for no one has ever seen the Lord Sabaoth (that is, God the Father) in the flesh. Only Christ was seen in the flesh, and in this way He is portrayed, that is, in the flesh, and not according to His divinity.

И да престанет всякое сиемудрие неправедное, иже обыкоша всяк собою писати безсвидетельства: сиречь, Господа Саваофа образ в различных видех <...> Повелеваем убо от ныне Господа Саваофа образ в предь не писати: в нелепых и не приличны видениях зане Саваофа, (сиречь Отца) никтоже виде когда воплоти. Токмо якоже Христос виден бысть в плоти, тако и живописуется, сиречь воображается по плоти: а не по божеству [Деяния: 23 rev.].

In an attempt to explain its prohibition, the Council references the well-known arguments of John of Damascus (“Only Christ was seen in the flesh, and in this way He is portrayed”).

The Council was similarly troubled by the depiction of the Holy Spirit as a dove:

<...> the Holy Spirit is not, in His nature, a dove: He is by nature God. And no one has ever seen God, as the holy evangelist points out. Nonetheless, the Holy Spirit appeared in the form of a dove at the holy baptism of Christ in the Jordan; and this is why it is proper to represent the Holy Spirit in this form of a dove, in this context only. Anywhere else, those who have good sense do not represent the Holy Spirit in the form of dove, for on Mount Tabor He appeared in the form of cloud, and in another way elsewhere.

<...> святыи дух не есть существом голубь, но существом Бог есть, а Бога никтоже виде, якоже Иоанн Богослов и Евангелист свидетельствует, обаче аще во Иордане при святем крещении Христове явися святыи Дух в виде голубине. И того ради на том месте точию подобает и писати святого Духа в виде голубином. А на ином месте имущи разум, не изображают святого Духа в голубином виде. Зане на Фаворстей горе яко облаком явися и иногда инако [Ibid.: 23].

Let us now turn to how the edicts given to Simon Ushakov and later to Zarudny addressed (or rather, failed to address) these changes to Russian icon pain-

---

tion the Crucifixions over the iconostases and compare them to Greek examples [Павел Алеппский: 38–39, 52, 71–72].

ting. The edict of Tsar Aleksey Mikhailovich likewise avoids practically all of the Council's decisions — the only trace of the Acts of the Council appear in the following segment:

<...> image creation was performed by God himself when he created man in his own image and likeness. [Image creation] became honored also in the New Testament [coming] from Christ the Lord himself when He twice deigned to leave a likeness of His face on a shroud, firstly, for Tsar Agvar, and secondly, for the pious women Veronica. In the same manner, the Holy Spirit created an image [of Itself] when [It] appeared on the [River] Jordan and was praised by the holy apostles.

<...> образотворения дело от самого Бога, егда сотвори по своему образу и по подобию человека. Прият честь и в новой благодати от самого Христа Господа, егда дваши изволил лице Свое на убрусе единою Агварю царю, второе благочестивой жене Веронице богоначертанно устроить; егда и Дух Святой образ сотвори, егда во образе голубя явися на Иордане почтесе от святых апостол [Пекарский: I, 19].

Tsar Aleksey Mikhailovich, following the Council's example, addressed in his edict the possibility of depicting Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, sidestepping entirely, however, the supposed impossibility of depicting the Father. In this commentary, the tsar argued that in all *three* hypostases, God himself created images and gave those images to man in a visible form. It is impossible to imagine that Aleksey Mikhailovich did not perceive the contradiction here to the Council's (the patriarchs') position, and it is clear that he ignored the decision of the Council on purpose. It is likely that he wanted to keep from the public those decisions of the Council which directly opposed Russian traditional practice in order to avoid further Church unrest. It is also probable that he genuinely disagreed with the Council's view on icon painting.

The edict of the patriarchs also fails to mention anything discussed by the Council, however, we do not know, why this is the case. It is quite possible that the patriarchs expected a full publication of the *Acts*, as it was promised in the *Sluzhebnik* in 1667, and viewed the edict itself not as a publication of the Acts, but simply as a complimentary explanation, mostly dedicated to the important role of the icon painter. What is obvious, however, is that the recommendations of the Council on icon painting were not widely known in the time of Aleksey Mikhailovich. This situation was not changed by the reign of Peter I. The events occurring in the Holy Synod immediately after its formation, for instance, demonstrate how little the Council's recommendations were known.

The Holy Synod was formed in 1721 to replace the patriarch in the hierarchy of the Russian Church. One of the first things it sought to establish was

a set of rules and instructions — the reign of Peter I was an era of rules and instructions — to guide the Church. Naturally, in this context, the Synod looked back to the Council of 1667. The Acts of the Council were first mentioned in a meeting of the Synod on June 21, 1721. The Synod requested that the Acts be brought to Saint-Petersburg from the patriarch's treasury in Moscow, and that they be kept as a book of reference available to the Synod at any time. However, the Synod was informed that the treasury was sealed by a secret councilor to the tsar — Count I. A. Musin-Pushkin. According to Musin-Pushkin, he could only unseal it by an order from the Senate.

The situation was not resolved until March 6, 1722, when both the Senate and the Synod travelled to Moscow for the celebration of the Nishtadt peace treaty with Sweden. There, in Moscow, the Tsar, or, to be precise, the Emperor (Peter I accepted this new title in 1721) ordered that the Acts be given to the Synod together with any other books and treasures [Протоколы: I, 181–182, 253–254; II, 114]. On first inspection, this conflict, resolved only by the personal intervention of the emperor, seems like the usual bureaucratic delay. In light of the subsequent events, described below, however, we can assume that the senators had viewed the Acts, and particularly the chapter on icon painting, with extreme suspicion.

The Synod began to combat the improper depiction of God, the Mother of God, and the Saints the moment it received the Acts. It issued its first order on April 6, 1722, when it prohibited the depiction of God the Father as an elderly man on the antimensia. The Synod ordered that “incorrect” antimensia be destroyed and that new antimensia be printed according to the recommendations of the Council, stressing, in particular, that they should not depict the Lord Sabaoth “as prohibited by the Council on pages 42 to 46”. The Synod further ordered that “where God as Sabaoth was depicted from now on depict a radiance and draw the Jewish letters of the name of God.” The Synod explained: “[treat errors in icon painting] not as sinful acts, but as improper ones, which give the ignorant an excuse to forsake [the truth]” (“не аки некое греховное дело, но яко не пристойное, и вину к поползновению невежда подающее”) [Ibid.: II, 163–164]. It is clear that the members of the Synod understood how serious and potentially explosive the new rules were: the order was sent to the printing house, but it was never published.

The question of icon painting rose again after just one week. On April 12, 1722, there was a deliberation “on the correction of icon painting and supervision of painters and icon painters by architect Ivan Zarudny”. This time a joint meeting of Senate and Synod was held, with Peter I also present. In preparation for the meeting, a summary of the Acts was prepared, which included all the

recommendations made by the Council in 1667 regarding icon painting. As a result of the meeting the emperor ordered:

Icon depictions are to be corrected according to the dictates of Church custom and according to [the rules of] the holy patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch and Moscow <...> which were made in 7175 (1667); and supervision over painters and iconographers is assigned to architect Zarudny who has been previously appointed superintendent in 1707; and he is to be placed under the supervision of the Synod.

Иконное изображение исправить по содержанию церковного обычая и по соборному святейших Александрийскаго, Антиохийскаго и Московскаго патриархов [правилу] <...> каково в прошлом 7175 (1667) году учинено, а надзирательство над живописцами и иконописцами иметь архитектору Зарудневу, который и наперед сего, в прошлом 1707 году <...> к такому надзирательству определен и супер-интендантом учинен, и бысть ему под синодальным ведением [Протоколы: II, 177–178].

On May 21, the members of the Synod discussed the subject yet again, composing a more detailed explanation of the emperor's order. It stated that the Synod had found many incorrect holy depictions, including: carved icons, the image of Saint Christopher with a dog's head, the image of Mother of God with three hands, the image of Saints Florus and Laurus with horses, etc. This list also included the image of the Lord Sabaoth, which the Synod again recommended be replaced with the name of God in Hebrew letters in a radiance.

Meanwhile, Peter I was set to leave the capital for the Persian campaign. As soon as the emperor departed, yet another meeting of the Synod on icon painting took place. On June 20, the Synod received visitors from the Senate: chancellor Count G. I. Golovkin, vice chancellor Baron P. P. Shafirov, and prosecutor general P. I. Yaguzhinsky. The visitors delivered the following "discourse":

His Majesty's order concerning how to paint images such as the Lord Sabaoth and others *is to be kept publically silent*. The public is to be informed that there was an order about the rules of painting images, including excerpts from the order such as those concerning Saints Florus and Laurus with horses, but *omitting the rest of the order from the public*. Also, in orders to the archbishops in the dioceses direct that they should attentively oversee the correct painting of the abovementioned icons; that the [prohibited] icons must henceforth not to be painted, and mention that they should make changes gradually, rather than immediately halting [the prohibited icons].

Имянной Его Императорскаго Величества указ о оном писании означение имянно образов яко Госюда Саваофа и протчих, в публице народно умолчать; а в народной публице изьяснить то, что объявлено о писании образов в правилех, выписав их них, а особливо порознь, яко Флора и Лавра с конюхами,

и о прочих в публице умолчать. Также в епархии к архиереом в указах означить, дабы во оном иконном справедливом писании имели усмотрительное попечение и об иконах, о которых объявлено выше, что их впред не писать, упомянуть чтоб со временем исправлять велели б, не вскоре оное прекратили [Протоколы: II, 466–468].

The Synod provided Zarudny, who certified the icons, with the same information about the Peter I’s order as was provided to the public, rather than that which was provided to the archbishops.

As discussed above, Peter I specified in his order of 1707 to Zarudny that the “artistic management and spiritual command” over icon painters was to be left to Metropolitan Stefan Yavorsky. In 1710, Zarudny received some guidelines (“память”) from the Metropolitan [Пекарский: I, 21], but, unfortunately, this particular document has not survived. Stefan, however, explained his views on icon painting in detail in his book *The Rock of Faith*. Although this book was published only after Zarudny’s death, it was written between 1713 and 1718, and we can, therefore, extrapolate from it a general understanding of what the instructions to Zarudny had looked like.

*The Rock of Faith* was written as a polemical treatise against the Lutherans and the Calvinists. The genre — polemical treatise — shapes, to some extent, the structure and nature of the arguments included in the chapter on icon painting (part 1 of the book). Despite the concessions to the genre, Stefan’s positions on icon painting, in general, and the recommendations of the Council of 1667, in particular, are clear.

Stefan begins his defense of icon veneration with a long list of holy images. The first “natural” image of God the Father, he insists, is His Son, as well as any human made in His image. He also qualifies the Holy Scriptures, which render “invisible things visible”, giving God eyes, and ears, and hands, and feet [Срефан Яворский: 4]. From that introduction, depictions of God the Father logically follow. In a chapter entitled *The Stumbling Blocks of Likeness in Holy Scripture as Described by the Prophet Isiah and the Deeds of the Apostles*, Stefan provides a list of potential “stumbling blocks”:

To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him? The workman melteth a graven image, and the goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, and casteth silver chains (Isaiah 40:18–19).

< ... > we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device (Acts of Apostles 17: 29).

These two particular citations were also used in the Acts of the Council of 1666–1667 where they were supplemented with an additional passage from

John of Damascus: “Who can make an imitation of God, the invisible, the incorporeal, the indescribable, and unimaginable? To make an image of the Divinity is the height of folly and impiety” [Деяния: 22 rev.–23]. Stefan attempts to clarify the citations in what he calls, “corrections”. In the first, he states:

When God said: let us create man in image and likeness of Us <...> man thereby became the image and likeness of God; the visible of the invisible, the decipherable of the indecipherable, the imaginable of the unimaginable, the corporeal of the incorporeal.

Егда рече Господь Бог: Сотворим человека по образу нашему и подобию <...> како человек может быть подобием и образом Бога; Како видимое невидимаго, описанное неописаннаго, постижимое непостижимаго, тленное нетленнаго, может быти образом и подобием [Стефан Яворский: 118].

The last lines of this argument are an unreferenced citation from John of Damascus, the same employed in the Acts, to which Stefan certainly had access — the manuscript was kept in his treasury. The use of this type of bundling of thematically-linked biblical quotations was an established practice during this period and these bundles travelled from one work to another. However, it is still likely that Stefan specifically chose this combination of citations as an allusion to the Council and its Acts.

Stefan then turns to the issue of depicting of God the Father and the Holy Spirit:

Icon painters (for whom no written law exists) depict God the Father as an old man beautified by his grey hair, not because this is His image in His incomprehensible divinity, but because this is the image in which He was seen by the prophet Daniel and also Isaiah. In the same way they depict the Holy Spirit in the image of a dove, not [because they are] describing Its indescribable divinity, but because It appeared in the image of a dove above the [River] Jordan”.

Бога Отца иконописцы (имже закон неписан) образуют в виде старца сединами преукрашенного не яко таков есть в своем непостижимстем Божестве: но яко в сицевом образе *виден бысть* от Даниила пророка, и от Исаяи. Тако и Духа святаго образуют в виде голубя, не божество его неописанное описующе, но яко в сицевом *зраце Голубя явися* на Иордане [Ibid.: 119].

He insists that depictions of God the Father are possible because He was seen by the prophets and, therefore, was depicted “by visions”. The Holy Spirit in the image of a dove again is depicted “by appearance”. Stefan’s arguments are very close to the arguments in Tsar Aleksey Mikhailovich’s edict and contradict the rules of the Council.

The first edition of *The Rock of Faith* did not appear in Moscow until 1728. The engravings for this book were specifically chosen to illustrate the author's views on icon painting. The first page includes a depiction of the Trinity of the New Testament: the Son appears on the left, the Father on the right (with the inscription "God Sabaoth"), and a dove between them. Atop the next page is a panoramic of Moscow. Above that, however, are the apostles with the Holy Spirit descending upon them. The Holy Spirit is represented as a dove with a caption reading "the Holy Spirit". The third page includes a portrait of Stefan himself, his coat of arms, and another dove, emitting a ray of light upon the head of the author, again with the caption "the Holy Spirit".

The iconostasis in Dormition Cathedral in Ryazan is another illustration of Stefan's views. Work on this seven-tier iconostasis had already been started by the time Stefan was appointed archbishop of Ryazan and Murom: "in 1700–1702 on the orders of Archbishop Stefan and from his wealth, a large sum of money, 12,500 rubles, the iconostasis was gilded and the icons were painted for the cathedral. On the August 15<sup>th</sup>, 1702, the beautiful cathedral was consecrated" [Дмитрий Градусов: 51]. According to tradition and, pointedly, against the recommendation of the Council of 1667, the Lord Sabaoth again appeared prominently in the upper tier of the iconostasis, and directly beneath him — the Holy Spirit was depicted as a dove.

Let us return to *The Rock of Faith*. Although the image of God the Father and the Holy Spirit are acceptable to the author, he adds the caveat that: "for whom [the icon painters] no written law exists" ("имже закон неписан"). In a general sense, he may mean that icon painters follow unwritten custom, rather than written rules. The written rules in this case likely refer, first and foremost, to the widely known works of John of Damascus on icon painting. Those works were included, for instance, in Petr Mogila's *The Orthodox Confession of Faith*, translated from Greek, and published in 1696, later in 1709, and again in 1717 [Пекарский: II, № 138, 330]. At the same time, Stefan is almost certainly referencing a well-known proverb "There is no law written for fools". By employing this proverb, Stefan distances himself from the icon painters and the polemics surrounding their craft.

The duality of his position is comparable to the views of Dimitry Metropolitan of Rostov, who Stefan unquestionably considered an authority on everything concerning Orthodox dogma. Pavel Hondzinsky writes: "Already in St. Demetrius' "Inquiry into the Schismatic Faith in Brynsk" there is considerable space devoted to the analysis of the historical variability of the rite,

proving that it does not affect the dogmatic foundations of the faith” [Павел Хондзинский: 61].

In “Inquiry into the schismatic faith in Brynsk”, Dimitry repeatedly turns to the question of icon veneration. He insists:

We venerate the holy icons of saints but do not idolize them, nor do we claim that the icon is God; rather [the icon is] a depiction of the likeness of Christ <...> I do not venerate a board, a wall, or paint, but a representation of the image of Christ and the divine Providence <...> When we bow before a holy icon, we bow not to a board, or paints, or patterns, or ancestry, or novelty, because we do not seek substance in an icon <...> instead we behold divinity.

Почитаем мы иконы святых, но не боготворим, не скажем, яко икона есть Бог, но изображение подобия Христова <...> не доску почитаю, ниже стену, ниже мшель (вещество) шаровный, но воображение тела (Христово) и смотрение Господне <...> Егда убо кланяемся иконе святых, кланяемся не дске, ни вапам, ни переводам, ни ветхости, ни новости, понеже не вещества в иконе ищем <...> но на святыню взираем [Димитрий: 13–16].

Therefore, according to Dimitry, the schismatics (or old believers) betray their inability to venerate holiness; instead, perceiving only the corporeal aspect, they damn the new icons. In the same fashion, he argues that the cross too should be an object of veneration, whether it have four points, eight points, or more — every cross is an image of the Crucifix and, therefore, it should be treated as a holy object [Ibid.: 20–21].

Dimitry attempts to explain the striking variability of historical images throughout history with an example from the Old Testament:

[I]n the Old Testament, when Solomon built the Temple of God, he made new cherubs using a new design; and set them over the Ark of the Covenant with the ancient ones, made by Moses. The people of Israel, living in those times, did not reject Solomon’s new cherubs, did not plead saying: we don’t want to venerate the new cherubs, and only keep Moses’ old ones <...> and so we do not pick out the old or the new icons, but equally venerate them all.

[B] Ветхом завете, егда Соломон создав церковь Богу, содела новыя и новым переводом херувимы, и постави я над кивотом завета купно с древними, от Моисея сделанными херувимами, людие Израильстии, в то время бывшии, не отметаху новых Соломоновых херувимов, ни моляху глаголюще не хоцем почитати новыя херувимы, но старых Моисеевых держимся <...> Сице и мы не разбираем между старыми и новыми иконами, но равно почитаем [Ibid.: 18–19].

Of course, Dimitry agrees that there are some errors, for example, in the inscriptions on icons, and that they require correction. For him, though, “depra-

vity” exists not in the errors in iconography or in inscriptions on icons, but in the refusal to honour icons because of those errors. Again, he argues that this refusal indicates that the schismatics only worship the corporeal aspect of icons. In fact, although he leaned towards the need for supervision of icon painting and the correction of errors (“due to our Russian ignoramuses” [Димитрий: 48]), he did not find these sorts of errors particularly troublesome or think them at all dangerous.

When Dimitry writes about objects of veneration, he compares the Old and New Testament:

When, in the Old Testament, God’s people venerated the Ark of the Covenant, and the object it contained <...> and the cherubs of Glory adorning the alter, they worshiped, not the corporeal [objects], but God Himself, in visible objects they worshiped the invisible. Similarly, we, in the time of the New Testament, venerate holy icons.

Якоже в Ветхом завете людие Божии, почитающе кивот завета, и лежащая в нем вещи <...> и херувимы славы осеняющия олтарь, и покланяющиеся тем, не веществу покланяюся, но самому Богу, в видимых святых вещах почитающе невидимаго. Еще мы в новой благодати иконам святым покланяемся [Ibid.: 18].

Stefan bases his understanding of Orthodox image creation on the same principles of the unavoidability and the necessity of historical change in the forms of Church tradition, including in iconography as set forth by Dimitry. There are objects in Church customs and practices for which there is “no law”: ignorance is not a sin; and imperfections are rectifiable. This approach also likely explains the various amendments issued by the Synod to Peter I’s orders concerning icon painting, (e. g.: “[treat errors in icon painting] not as sinful acts, but as improper ones, which give the ignorant an excuse to forsake [the truth]”). The goal of the Synod in issuing the amendments was to enlighten the ignorant, not to fight the enemies of the Church.

The documents provided to superintendent Zarudny as guidelines for supervising icon painting, and therefore also for his own works, did not contain the same prohibitions, as had been imposed by the Acts of the Moscow Council of 1667. On the contrary Stefan Yavorsky, who directly supervised Zarudny, was inclined to avoid imposing restrictions on icon painting. As such, Zarudny was given a broad scope within which to create his iconostasis and he did not hesitate to make full use of this opportunity.

## Works Cited

- Грабарь: *Грабарь И. Э. И. П. Зарудный и московская архитектура 1-й четв. XVIII в. // Русская архитектура 1-й пол. XVIII в.: Исслед. и мат. М., 1954. С. 39–92.*
- Деяния: Деяния московских соборов 1666 и 1667 годов. Издание [второе] Братства Св. Петра митрополита, вновь проверенное по подлинной рукописи / Под ред. Н. Субботина. М., 1893.
- Димитрий: *Димитрий Ростовский. Розыск о раскольничьей Брынской вере. М., 1855.*
- Дмитрий Градусов: *Дмитрий Градусов, архиеп. Гордость Рязани — митрополит Стефан Яворский // Журнал Московской Патриархии. 1946. № 6. С. 51.*
- Карташев: *Карташев А. В. Очерки по истории Русской Церкви. Париж, 1958. Т. 2.*
- Макарий: *Макарий (Булгаков), Митрополит Московский и Коломенский. История Русской Церкви. М., 1996. Кн. 7. Т. 12.*
- Мельник: *Мельник А. Г. Основные типы русских высоких иконостасов XV – середины XVII века // Иконостас: Происхождение — Развитие — Символика / Ред.-сост. А. М. Лидов. М., 2000. С. 431–441.*
- Мозговая: *Мозговая Е. Б. Зарудный // Словарь архитекторов и мастеров строительного дела Москвы XV – середины XVIII века / Ред. И. А. Бондаренко. М., 2008. С. 250–252.*
- Николаева: *Николаева М. В. Иконостас петровского времени: “Столярство и резьба”, золочение, иконописные работы. Москва и Подмосковье. Подрядные записи. М., 2008.*
- Павел Алеппский: *Павел Алеппский, архидиакон. Путешествие антиохийского патриарха Макария в Россию в половине XVII века. Описанное его сыном архидиаконом Павлом Алеппским. От Днестра до Москвы. М., 1897. Вып. 2.*
- Павел Хондзинский: *Павел Хондзинский, прот. Митрополит Стефан Яворский и архиепископ Феофан Прокопович. (По следам диссертации Ю. Ф. Самарина) [Эл. издание. СПб., 2011].*
- Пекарский: *Пекарский П. Наука и литература в России при Петре Великом. СПб., 1862. Т. I–II.*
- Погосян: *Погосян Е. А. Иван Зарудный и программа иконостаса Преображенского собора в Ревеле // Труды Государственного музея истории Санкт-Петербурга. Выпуск 22. Храмы Петровской эпохи. Материалы международной научной конференции. Санкт-Петербург, Петропавловская крепость 7–8 июня 2012 года: Государственный музей истории Санкт-Петербурга. СПб., 2012. С. 115–128.*
- Постернак: *Постернак К. В. Русские барочные иконостасы 1-й трети XVIII века // Труды государственного музея истории Санкт-Петербурга. Вып. 22. Храмы Петровской эпохи: Материалы международной научной конференции. СПб., 2012. С. 83–98.*
- Протоколы: Полное собрание постановлений и распоряжений по ведомству православного исповедания Российской империи. СПб., 1872. Т. I–II.
- Служебник: Служебник. М., 1667.

Стефан Яворский: *Стефан Яворский*. Камень веры. М., 1728.

Успенский: *Успенский А. И.* Царские иконописцы и живописцы XVII века. М., 1913. Т. I.

Элькин: *Элькин Е. Н.* Иконостас Петропавловского собора // Краеведческие записки: Исследования и материалы. Вып. 2: Петропавловский собор и Великокняжеская усыпальница. СПб., 1994. С. 149–159.

Cracraft: *Cracraft, J.* The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery. Chicago&London: The University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Gerasimova: *Gerasimova, Julia.* The Iconostasis of Peter the Great in the Peter and Paul Cathedral in St Petersburg (1722–1729). Leiden: Alexandros Press, 2004.

Ouspensky: *Ouspensky, Leonid.* Theology of the Icon / Translated by Anthony Gythiel. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1992. V. II.