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The mission of Master Drawings is to present the best and most important new research and reviews in the field of drawings, from the fourteenth century to our own time in Europe and the Americas. The journal is primarily concerned with the publication of newly discovered material, significant new reattributions, and fresh interpretations.
The British Museum, London, preserves a fine drawing with an interesting topographical subject, the *View of the Palace Embankment, St. Petersburg, from Quarenghi’s Stock Exchange* (Fig. 1). To record the Neva and the Winter Palace on the embankment of the other side of the River Neva, the artist was seated near the unfinished Stock Exchange on Strelka Point, Vasilyevsky Island, which was designed and begun in 1781 by Giacomo Quarenghi (1744–1817), but was left unfinished. The Stock Exchange is depicted in the foreground at an early stage of its construction, before being dismantled a decade later to give way to a replacement designed by Thomas de Thomon (1759/60–1813).

As noted on the museum’s website, the drawing was formerly attributed to John Augustus Atkinson (1774/76[?]–1830), an English artist and engraver who spent almost twenty years in St. Petersburg (1784–1801). The drawing was acquired as a work of that artist when purchased by the museum in 1941 from Francis Harper (dates unknown); its earlier provenance remains obscure. In a paper delivered at an annual meeting of the Study Group on Eighteenth-century Russia, held at Hoddesdon, Hertfordshire (2012), I suggested that the drawing should be reattributed to the talented Russian artist and engraver Gabriel [Gavriil] Skorodumov (1754–1792), a graduate of the Academy of Fine Arts in St. Petersburg, who honed his talent in London (1773–82). Within the context of a much wider topic at the conference (tracing the development of panoramic views in Russia in the early nineteenth century), I was not able to substantiate and develop my proposal. The present study aims to justify my reattribution and to establish the topographical accuracy of the view, which became an important iconographical source for later depictions.

In the foreground of the drawing is a staircase up to the Stock Exchange and a narrow strip of the shore with boats. The middle ground is occupied by the river with sailing ships. In the background is a panoramic view of the Palace Embankment from the Hermitage Theater to the Admiralty Embankment. The artist scrupulously drew the granite revetment of the banks on the opposite side of the river, the rustication of the lower floor of the Hermitage Theater, and the rich sculptural décor of the Winter Palace, ignoring the basic rules of perspective.

The foreground of the British Museum sheet has a fascinating genre scene with engaging details, one that goes beyond the traditional role usually played by staffage in topographical views. The scene is teeming with activity: the construction workers grind, carry, and lay stones, and erect wooden sheds on the boats; supervisors observe their work. At lower center, two workers seated on the base of a column are taking a break and eating. Even on the opposite shore of the river one can discern miniature carriages and a boat with a sailor and a passenger coming from the Winter Canal to the Neva.
Figure 1

Gabriel Skorodumov

View of the Palace Embankment, St. Petersburg, from Quarenghi’s Stock Exchange

London, British Museum
THE REATTRIBUTION TO SKORODUMOV

The British Museum drawing is similar in its details to five fragments of a proof state of a stipple engraving by Skorodumov, the so-called Construction of the Neva Embankment, preserved in the State Russian Museum, St. Petersburg (Figs. 2a–c and 4a–b). The stipple engraving, which was apparently never finished, was intended as part of a grandiose panorama of the Neva Embankment consisting of twelve segments. The project is documented in an account by Comte Alphonse-Toussaint J.M.M. Fortia de Piles (1758–1826):

"Il a commencé un ouvrage qui sera fort intéressant lorsqu’il sera terminé; trois morceaux sont déjà achevés, ils sont fort bien exécutés, et représentent une partie du cours de la Néva: il compte en faire encore neuf pour compléter les différentes vues d’un fleuve qui en offre de très-variées et de magnifiques. Il ne les mettra en vente que toutes ensemble.” (“He began a work that will be very interesting when it is completed; three segments are already finished, they are very well done, and represent a part of the course of the Neva: he is planning to make nine more in order to complete the different aspects of a river that offers very varied and magnificent views. He will put them on sale only as a complete ensemble.”)

Leading Skorodumov expert Dr. Elena Mishina
has postulated that the series was made by the artist of his own volition rather than on commission, though there is no direct evidence of this.\textsuperscript{6} She convincingly argued that three unique impressions of stipple engravings depicting the English Embankment in the collection of the Russian National Library, St. Petersburg (Figs. 6–8),\textsuperscript{7} very likely belonged to the same set.\textsuperscript{8}

The Russian Museum’s proof fragments by Skorodumov closely correspond to passages of the drawing from the British Museum (\textit{cf.} Figs. 2 and 4 with Figs. 3 and 5)—the same barges on the river, stones, column base, and figure groups (two workers, bent and kneeling, who are laying stones, a supervisor, people on the barges). Also similar, but with minor differences, are the conversing figures on the shore. Furthermore, the sizes of the fragments of the proof coincide with the matching details of the drawing. Small differences in the staffage the sort that one would expect—in the stipple engraving, for instance, there is a youth with an umbrella standing behind a worker with a spade, whereas in the drawing the worker is leaning against a column and the boy is absent—suggest that the British Museum work is a preparatory sketch for Skorodumov’s stipple engraving rather than a copy.
Atkinson, by contrast, never made such meticulous renderings of architecture. That his personal style is different can be best illustrated by comparing the British Museum drawing with the first plate of his four-part Panoramic View of St. Petersburg of 1805 (Figs. 9–12). Whereas the author of the drawing from the British Museum painstakingly rendered all the details of the sculptural decoration of the Winter Palace (Fig. 13), Atkinson turned it into a sketchy, stylized pattern (Fig. 14).

So far, only seven other drawings by Skorodumov are known, of which only one other is a topographical view, the Neva Embankment (1791–92), preserved in the State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg (Fig. 15). Despite its different technique and its function as a more finished study, it reveals obvious stylistic similarities in the overall handling of the figures (e.g., the way the hats are drawn). Compare, for instance, the standing figure in profile at the left of the Hermitage drawing with the seated figure eating at lower center of the British Museum sketch.

Further evidence for the reattribution of the British Museum sheet to Skorodumov comes from the repetition of specific motifs from the drawing in related prints from the same series. For instance, two dogs with gracefully curled tails at the lower right of the drawing (Fig. 16) appear at the lower center of the Russian National Library’s Neva Embankment (see Fig. 8), where they are now lying together on the ground in a tight-knit group (Fig. 17).
Figures 9–12 (top to bottom)

JOHN AUGUSTUS ATKINSON

Panoramic View of St. Petersburg
Four hand-colored prints in etching and aquatint
St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum

Figure 13 (top)
GABRIEL SKORODUMOV
Detail of Figure 1

Figure 14 (bottom)
JOHN AUGUSTUS ATKINSON
Detail of Figure 9
Figure 15
GABRIEL SKORODUMOV
View of the Neva Embankment, St. Petersburg
St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum

Figure 16
GABRIEL SKORODUMOV
Detail of Figure 1

Figure 17
GABRIEL SKORODUMOV
Detail of Figure 8
There is one even more revealing detail. Among the figures in the drawing is one who seems to be Skorodumov himself! The person wearing a bicorne, standing to the right of the central column and proudly looking out past the viewer (Fig. 18), strongly resembles Skorodumov’s drawn self-portraits, such as one from 1785 or later in the State Russian Museum (Fig. 19)\(^1\) and one from the late 1780s or ‘90s in the Yaroslavl Art Museum.\(^2\) As Dr. Elena Mishina has observed, even though the detail is quite small, he seems to have the same profile, pursed lips and gaze, and paunchy figure. If her identification is correct, as I believe to be the case, it proves that the drawing must have been executed by none other than Skorodumov himself, for it is unlikely that any other artist would have inserted a portrait of him in such a drawing. (Atkinson’s physical appearance is regrettably not known.) The only other logical candidate who could have been portrayed in this context would be the person connected with this phase of construction of the Stock Exchange—the architect Quarenghi himself. In most portraits, he is seen with a very large, bulbous nose, but the evidence of a less exaggerated drawn portrait by I. Haacke (dates unknown) in the State Hermitage Museum (Fig. 20)\(^3\) enables us to identify him potentially as the man standing at a table to his right, appropriately working with architects’ tools.

On close inspection of the British Museum drawing, one can discern two different styles of draftsmanship. The stylobate (top step or landing), the staircase, and the columns are crisply, even stiffly, drawn. By contrast, the sculpture of a sphinx is confidently rendered, but with a delicacy and spontaneity that are typical of a mature artist. The staffage and the edifices across the river are treated in the same delicate, though detailed manner. A similar combination of styles characterizes Skorodumov’s stipple engravings in the Russian National Library (see Figs. 6–8). Some parts are skillfully done, whereas other passages are treated in a rather routine, monotonous way.

One would describe Skorodumov’s proof print in the Russian Museum, on the other hand, as animated and vigorous throughout. On the basis of this, Mishina concluded that the main portions of the finished stipple engravings in the Russian National Library were carried out by...
Skorodumov personally, but, as was a common workshop practice, the finishing touches were done by his assistants. Such collaboration is far less likely in a drawing. The stiffness in the rendering of architecture in the foreground should probably be viewed as a sort of initial architectural framework drawn mechanically by Skorodumov with rulers or other tools, on top of which he executed the more picturesque staffage freehand with the pen. Tellingly, in the surviving fragments of the proof print, the treatment of the stones is softer and less mechanical.

The iconographic significance of Skorodumov’s topographical view
As a topographical view, Skorodumov’s drawing in the British Museum can be studied within the context of similar subjects, including four works (two drawings, a hand-colored print, and a painting) by Benjamin Patersson (1748/50–1815), a Swedish artist active in St. Petersburg from 1787 to 1815. In various museum catalogues, the images have different titles, but in fact they all replicate, with slight differences, Skorodumov’s British Museum drawing. These are as follows:

---

Figure 21
Benjamin Patersson
View of the Palace Embankment, St. Petersburg, from Quarenghi’s Stock Exchange
Moscow, Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts

Figure 22
Benjamin Patersson
View of the Palace Embankment, St. Petersburg, from Quarenghi’s Stock Exchange
Hand-colored etching
Moscow, Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts
1. A monochrome drawing in the Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow (Fig. 21).\(^16\)

2. A hand-colored etching, an impression of which is in the Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow (Fig. 22);\(^17\) the differences from no. 1 are an arch on the bank of the canal between the Winter Palace and the Admiralty, the balustrade on top of the Stock Exchange, and minor differences such as the form of the flock of birds and the clouds. There is also a hand-colored etching of the subject, dated 1799, an impression of which is preserved in the Hermitage, St. Petersburg (Fig. 23).\(^18\) The minor differences (e.g., cloud forms, birds, and stones in the foreground) are due to the hand coloring in watercolor; this dated version is, in fact, the same basic etching.

3. A drawing formerly in the collection of Pavel Dashkov (1849–1910) and later that of N. Kondoianaki (dates unknown), whose current whereabouts are unknown; its appearance is recorded in the reproduction in Nikolai Vrangel’s article in the journal *Starye Gody* (Fig. 24).\(^19\) This replicates the monochrome drawing in the Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts (see Fig. 21), but the Stock Exchange is shown from a different angle, and there are other differences in details and staffage (e.g., a figure with a portfolio and the dogs in the center foreground, the form of the stones, and, more importantly, the group on the stylobate, which repeats not the details in the above works, but instead the motifs from Skorodumov’s drawing and proof print).

4. A painting, dated 1793, in the Museum Complex of Ivan Slovtsov (Tyumen Museum Educational Association), Tyumen (Fig. 25),\(^20\) based on the above untraced drawing (no. 3; see Fig. 24), but with the Stock Exchange represented from yet another angle.

In an unpublished typescript preserved in the print room of the State Russian Museum, Satynik Velikanova pointed out that one of the fragments of Skorodumov’s proof print can be seen in Patersson’s hand-colored print of 1799 (no. 2 in the above list; see Fig. 23).\(^21\) Later Mishina noted that Patersson used Skorodumov’s engravings of the Neva Embankment (or preparatory drawings for them) in three other views of the city.\(^22\) Her conclusion confirmed Velikanova’s suggestion:
Patersson’s view of the Winter Palace must have been based on a drawing by Skorodumov or his unfinished stipple engraving, now known only from the proof fragments. The discovery of Skorodumov’s drawing in the British Museum settles the question. It or the proof print after it was, in actual fact, at least one of the sources of Patersson’s compositions.

The main difference between Skorodumov’s drawing and Patersson’s compositions lies in the depiction of the Stock Exchange. What is the explanation for these differences? Whose depiction is more accurate? The failure to complete the building of the Stock Exchange is one of the few dramatic episodes in the artistic career of Quarenghi, who had otherwise enjoyed much success in Russia. Owing to financial difficulties caused by the beginning of the Russian–Turkish War, work on the Stock Exchange was halted in 1787, six years after it had started. Some portions of the building on the spit of Vasilyevsky Island, opposite the Winter Palace, remained in place for several years, before eventually being demolished and completely replaced by the ensemble (1805–14) of Thomas de Thomon. The first to assemble archival materials related to the construction of the Stock Exchange were Grigorii Nemirov and Aleksandr Timofeev, but in the early to mid-twentieth century its architecture and location came in for harsh criticism by Soviet scholars. Only Petr Stolpianskii payed tribute to Quarenghi’s concept, saying that the project had produced “a delightful building;” his observations were further developed by Yurii Egorov, German Grimm, and Marina Iogansen, who analyzed the historical conditions and advantages of the design by Quarenghi. Until now, however, scholars have not studied contemporary depictions of the Stock Exchange to determine if they shed light on the project. Nor have such depictions been compared to archival records to establish how faithful they are.

In the British Museum drawing, the columns of the Stock Exchange are shown under construction, with the lowest stone blocks already in place. According to Quarenghi’s own plans, the bases of columns were to stand at the very edge of the stylobate, exactly as they do in Skorodumov’s drawing. These partial columns, however, do not appear in the surviving fragment of the proof print (see Fig. 4b); we can thus conclude that there were neither columns nor their bases in the full proof print. By contrast, the columned portico of the Stock Exchange is completed in the foreground of all five works by Patersson (see Figs. 21–25).

According to archival documents, the portico was never in fact built. In 1801, a building inspection was arranged to decide how to use the existing architectural elements. The resulting report stated: “On the side of both the meadow and the Neva there are porches, stairs are made
from rough stone, on the landing are bases for 12 columns.” Note that the report refers to “bases,” but not the columns themselves. This account coincides with the state of the building shown in the left background of Quarenghi’s drawing Sliding Hills on the Neva, in the Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow (Fig. 26), and in pl. 4 of Atkinson’s Panoramic View of St. Petersburg (Fig. 27), which records the architectural landscape of 1801. The building is not roofed. The semicircular sides are missing their upper stories and semicircular domes; the central block lacks its top story and pyramidal hip roof; and there is no portico or pediment. We know what the finished building and façade should have looked like from Quarenghi’s own watercolor rendering, also preserved in the Hermitage (Fig. 28).

Following the traditions of early eighteenth-century Russian vedute, Patersson obviously opted to represent the existing architectural elements alongside those that were yet to be constructed. He showed the Stock Exchange in all its glory, as if it had just been completed (though this, in fact, never happened), and the workers are clearing the area in front of it. The depiction of the Stock Exchange in his monochrome drawing in the Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts (see Fig. 21) differs from his engravings only in details. In the monochrome drawing, only the base of the balustrade that would be above the cornice is
represented, while in the prints the balustrade is fully shown, but the sculptures above it are half cut by the edge of the composition. In all three cases (monochrome drawing and prints), there is a four-column portico, whereas according to Quarenghi’s project it was meant to consist of six columns. In the ex-Dashkov drawing and the Tyumen painting (see Figs. 24–25), the Stock Exchange is represented from a viewpoint that shows only a few columns (two in the drawing and three in the painting) and part of the portico appears to be concealed. These variations may have occurred because Patersson was searching for the best way to recreate a “finished” Stock Exchange, which, of course, did not exist in reality and was not represented in Skorodumov’s drawing (nor, almost certainly, in his proof print).

Such “reminiscences of the future” appear in works by some of Patersson’s contemporaries. For instance, in a drawing of 1787 in the State A. S. Pushkin Museum, Moscow (Fig. 29), Jean Balthasar de La Traverse (fl. 1778–90) depicted the Stock Exchange as a completed structure, basing his recreation on Quarenghi’s own watercolor (see Fig. 28). As in Patersson’s works, the landscape is an odd mix of imposing buildings and a construction hut, unpaved ground with bushes, and figures engaged in lively everyday activities. But the splendid building of the Stock Exchange itself and the richly decorated ships in the foreground create a festive atmosphere, while the agitated clouds and unfurled sails provide an enchanting accompaniment to the intricate forms of the imaginary Stock Exchange. Skorodumov, by contrast, recorded the routine building process. Yet he did not produce a true-to-life depiction of the Stock Exchange in his drawing either. The erection of the columns was never begun, but he needed them in his drawing as a kind of system of coordinates intended to serve as a setting for the action.

Skorodumov’s drawing offers an opportunity to reconstruct the lost parts of the proof print. The surviving fragments are usually reproduced so that the one in two parts with a depiction of workers and a supervisor on a staircase pylon is seen as a continuation of the three-part fragment with barges. Were they juxtaposed in this way, however, the figures would have been standing on the very edge of the pylon. In Skorodumov’s drawing, on the other hand, between these figures and the edge is a space with a “construction-work still-life” consisting of a square stone base and tools. To the left of this is the beautiful sphinx (Fig. 30), whose arresting image includes a diadem, earrings, a string of beads, an ornate hairstyle, and a veil covering her head, but leaving her breast naked. There must have been another sheet with these motifs between the two fragments of the proof print. Otherwise, the proportions of the edifice would not correspond to Quarenghi’s plan. More importantly, a part of the construction still life is just discernable at the left of one of the fragments (see Fig. 4a). We do not know, however, whether there was a sphinx in the proof print or not. It is absent in all of Patersson’s works, though in his ex-Dashkov drawing and the Tyumen painting, there is a pedestal for a sculpture at the far edge of the nearest staircase pylon, the one on the north side.

Figure 29
JEAN BALTHASAR DE LA TRAVERSE
Capriccio with the Stock Exchange of Giacomo Quarenghi, 1787
Moscow, State A. S. Pushkin Museum

Figure 30
GABRIEL SKORODUMOV
Detail of Figure 1
of the building (not shown in the drawing). In the Pushkin monochrome drawing and the two prints there is a pedestal base on this northern foundation as well, but placed in the middle rather than at the edge of the pylon. Beneath the pedestal bases, however, we see small branches used to roll them to their proper place at the edge of the stylobate.

Neither Quarenghi’s surviving designs nor the archival documents allude to the presence of sphinxes decorating the entrance to the Stock Exchange. Moreover, Quarenghi generally used sculpture only moderately, especially on his exteriors, taking care not to disturb the clarity of the façades of his buildings. The sphinxes in Skorodumov’s drawing could thus be sheer fantasy. However, Quarenghi did allow sculptures in locations when they were justified architectonically, and though they are few, sculptural accents were of great importance to his designs, intensifying the powerful sense of volume.\(^3\) In fact, sphinxes were apparently one of his favorite motifs, used in more than ten designs, although ironically never on an existing edifice. Thus, the British Museum drawing raises the possibility, but leaves the question unanswered.

Skorodumov carefully drew the buildings across the river, and they are accurately replicated in all of Patersson’s works. Apart from the well-known and still-extant Hermitage Theater, Old Hermitage, and Winter Palace, these works of art offer a rare record of the buildings formerly on the southwestern part of Palace Square, which had been constructed by Yury Fel’ten (1730/32–1801), according to the reconstruction plan of the square made by Aleksey Kvasov (1718–1772). Although the buildings were later destroyed, the straight axis of the plan (curved only at the upper part) was preserved in the present majestic ensemble designed in the 1820s by Karl Rossi (1775–1849).\(^3\) To the left, one sees the buildings of the Admiralty constructed in 1732–38 by Ivan Korobov (1700/1701–1747), which would later be replaced by a new one carried out to the designs of Andreyan Zakharov (1761–1811).

Patersson presumably knew not only Skorodumov’s proof print, but also his drawing. The location of the spalls (small chips) of the stones and bases of the columns in the foreground of all of Patersson’s works is exactly the same as in Skorodumov’s drawing, but varies from the corresponding fragment of Skorodumov’s proof print. Furthermore, both the ex-Dashkov drawing by Patersson and his painting in Tyumen feature a fluffy dog with a curled tail in the foreground, which corresponds to the one at the top of the stairs in Skorodumov’s drawing in London (see Fig. 16). The repositioning of this canine motif and of some other figures (such as the workers carrying stones) is explained by the modification of the whole composition. Skorodumov shows the building in such a way that the bottom edge of the sheet cuts across the central staircase and we see only the inner side of the far (i.e., southern) staircase pylon. The same perspective was chosen for Skorodumov’s proof print as we can safely deduce from its fragments. Patersson, on the other hand, depicted the finished building from farther to the north, so that we can see the whole building, not just its cross-section; in the foreground is the northern pylon shown from its outer side. As it happens, in the final version of his set of stipple engravings, Skorodumov seems to have decided to transfer the dog to another plate. Now we see it on pl. 3 depicting the English Embankment (see Fig. 8), and it is highly unlikely that the same dog would have appeared in two plates from the same set. Significantly, since Patersson had already depicted the dog in his view of the Stock Exchange (see Figs. 24–25), he removed it from his copy of Skorodumov’s pl. 3 (Fig. 31).\(^3\)

Noteworthy is the vignette of stonemasonry, depicted both by Skorodumov and Patersson. The only equivalent to such a scene in eighteenth-century Russian art is Giacomo Quarenghi’s drawing of the Monument to Peter 1 in Senate (Petrovskaia) Square, known in three variants.\(^3\) Skorodumov was obviously influenced by an English tradition of cityscape. He had first-hand knowledge of it since he had spent almost ten years in London (1773–82), having been sent there as a student of the Academy of Fine Arts.\(^3\) As Larisa Dukelskaia observed,\(^3\) the mid-eighteenth-
century perception of the British capital as a busy mercantile city resulted in a vedute tradition that often featured structural engineering projects, such as the rebuilding of London Bridge and the construction of such new spans as Westminster Bridge (1739–50) and Blackfriars Bridge (1760–68).

Finally, Skorodumov's drawing in the British Museum proves that Mishina was correct to question the traditional title, the Construction of the Neva Embankment, applied to the composition of the lost proof print in the State Russian Museum preserved only in fragments. A variation of that title, the Arrangement of the Granite Embankment of the River Neva, was coined by Petr Kornilov and adopted by Ekaterina Nekrasova and by German Grimm and Liudmila Kashkarova. Grimm and Kashkarova also added an incorrect location, the embankment by the Senate Square. This was understandable, since the fragments of the proof provide insufficient details for identifying the precise site and the series was known to have been executed in the early 1790s, when such construction works were taking place in Senate Square. That name was later used by Galina Komelova (with an explanation for that identification of the location), and by Maria Alekseeva and Mikhail Flekel. Liudmila Rybakova and Sofia Sherman cautiously used a more generic formulation, the Embankment of the Neva, but likewise described it as a genre scene showing the construction of the embankment. By focusing on Paterson’s engravings, Mishina instead established that the stones at far right of the proof’s fragments were not part of the embankment, but a part of the Stock Exchange—a conclusion now proved by the British Museum drawing. In fact, the stone embankment in front of Quarenghi’s Stock Exchange was never constructed. (Although he represented the Stock Exchange itself as finished, Paterson accurately rendered the ground in front of the Stock Exchange as bare earth.) The granite embankment at the site was built only later, under the supervision of Thomas de Thomon, in front of his new Stock Exchange. The proof prints from the Russian State Museum should thus be entitled Early Stages of Construction of Quarenghi’s Stock Exchange, fragments of the unfinished engraving, View of the Palace Embankment from the Spit of Vasilyevsky Island.

CONCLUSION

Summing up, the drawing from the British Museum increases our knowledge of Skorodumov as a draftsman, previously known from only seven examples. It also expands our understanding of his project for a set of twelve panoramic engravings depicting the River Neva, best known from the written account of Fortia de Piles, as well as fragments of a proof in the State Russian Museum and three extant impressions in the Russian National Library. It further provides evidence of the way images of St. Petersburg were circulated and later reused by other artists, in this case specifically by Benjamin Paterson.

Ekaterina Skvortcova (e.skvortsova@spbu.ru), who received her PhD from St. Petersburg University in 2012, is now a senior lecturer at the university, with research interests in Russian art of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as well as Russian–European artistic links.

NOTES

1. Inv. no. 1941,1011.172. Pen and black ink, with gray wash, over graphite, on two joined pieces of paper; 428 x 929 mm; see www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online. At upper right there is a contour of a female profile, almost erased.

2. On Atkinson and his connections with Russia, see Ekaterina Skvortcova, “Tvorchestvo D. A. Atkinsona i D. Uokera


7. Inv. nos. Sin. 6, p. 21, no. 794 (484 x 697mm), Sin. 6, p. 21, no. 795 (468 x 692 mm), and Sin. 6, p. 21, no. 796 (490 x 682 mm); see Mishina 1999, pp. 331–33, all repr. IMAGES: © Russian National Library.

8. See Mishina 2003, pp. 27–32.

9. St. Petersburg, State Hermitage Museum, inv. nos. ERG-20026, ERG-20027, ERG-20028, and ERG-20029 (all four parts, aquatint and etching, with watercolor; 438 x 805 mm (Pl. 1), 440 x 810 mm (Pl. 2), 445 x 810 (Pl. 3), and 440 x 810 mm (Pl. 4). IMAGES: Svetlana Suetova and Leonard Kheifets / © Hermitage State Museum.

10. Inv. no. ERR no. 6408. Pen and black ink, with gray and brown washes; 207 x 355 mm; see Mishina 2003, no. 79, repr. IMAGE: © Hermitage State Museum. To the six drawings are included in Mishina’s catalogue (2003, nos. 74–79), one more was later attributed to him, Musical Concert, also in the State Hermitage Museum. (inv. no. ERR-4794; pen and black ink, with gray wash, over graphite; 190 x 220 mm); see Aleksei Solov’ev, “O nekotorykh risunkakh iz al‘boma M.B. Rozenberga” [“On some drawings from Morts Rozenberg”], Kul’tura i iskusstva Rossii (Trudy Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha XL), St. Petersburg, 2008, pp. 166–83 (esp. p. 182, repr.).
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