NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

As a manuscript

Nikiforova Veronika Ilinichna

Creative Strategies and Kustar Practices in the Initiatives of the Abramtsevo Circle

Summary of the PhD thesis
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Art and Design

Academic supervisor:
Candidate of Art History,
Alla Yuryevna Vershinina

Moscow – 2025

I. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

The relevance of the study

Questions surrounding the formation of Russian cultural identity remain consistently relevant to contemporary scholarship, particularly in relation to the enduring global issue of the dialogue between tradition and modernization. The initiatives of the Abramtsevo Circle, aimed at integrating the creativity of professional artists with the skills of vernacular artisans, are directly implicated in this discourse. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the search for a national style in Russian art entailed a range of strategies, the most prominent of which included the use of archaic models of folk creativity and a re-evaluation of the pre-Petrine cultural legacy as a counterpoint to Europeanized academic canons. At the same time, this process was complicated by the crisis of folk culture itself: the traditional craft industries, which had historically sustained urban settlements and rural communities, faced significant decline in response to accelerated industrial growth and the commercialization of production and distribution. Urbanization, mechanization, and standardization gave rise to an aesthetic and philosophical dilemma: manual labor, associated with the uniqueness of the artifact, was increasingly positioned in opposition to impersonal factory production.

As a result, the very survival of handicraft traditions was threatened by competition from industrial goods, the loss of local markets, and the absence of systematic training for artisans. This crisis prompted responses from both the state and civil society. On the governmental level, responsibility was delegated to the Committee for Handicrafts (Kustarnyi Komitet), established in 1885 under the Ministry of Agriculture. Civil society, in turn, responded through a surge in philanthropic activity by patrons of the crafts. The efforts undertaken at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to address these urgent issues remain relevant in the early twenty-first century. Of particular significance is the role of private initiatives, which were largely excluded from the sociocultural framework during the Soviet period. The introduction of previously unexplored archival materials into

scholarly circulation enables a deeper understanding of the economic and cultural strategies underlying such initiatives.

Private craft workshops, often attached to estate-based schools, functioned not only as instruments for preserving indigenous traditions but also as mechanisms of socioeconomic support for local populations. The Abramtsevo and Talashkino workshops, founded by S.I. Mamontov and M.K. Tenisheva, were among the first to implement a model that synthesized folkloric motifs with the aesthetics of Art Nouveau. Their approach was subsequently adopted by other members of the Abramtsevo Circle, such as the embroidery workshop of M.F. Yakunchikova in Tambov province and the multidisciplinary workshop of E.N. Chokolova in Voronezh province. These later projects, though less radical in their experimentation, sought to adapt the principles of the new artistic style to local conditions. In the context of increasing industrialization and urbanization, artistic handicrafts became not only a means of preserving local identity, but also a site for experimenting with the synthesis of artistic strategies and vernacular craft practices.

The relevance of this research lies in the need for a comprehensive reassessment of the role of private artistic and craft workshops within the broader framework of sociocultural transformations at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Furthermore, an in-depth examination of Abramtsevo's initiatives reveals their methodological significance for analyzing the mechanisms of collective creativity, the transformation of values associated with manual labor, and the strategies of adapting local artistic heritage to new conditions. Processes such as the commodification of handicrafts, the negotiation between serial production and uniqueness, and the integration of craft practices into market relations acquire renewed relevance in the context of digitalization. The contemporary shift toward immaterial cultural consumption is accompanied by a growing interest in materiality, tactility, and authenticity, making the historical experience of Abramtsevo a representative model for interpreting the tensions between virtual forms of cultural existence and the persistence of material art objects in contemporary creative practices.

This research is of particular importance within the global discourse on the preservation of cultural heritage and national identity, both of which are increasingly exposed to various risks in the age of globalization. The organizational and creative principles of nineteenth-century workshops prove applicable to current challenges of adapting local heritage to new sociotechnical environments. In particular, the experience of negotiating the relationship between individual authorship and collective production, as well as balancing handmade uniqueness with reproducibility, offers a methodological model for the contemporary creative industries—one that enables a rethinking of the value of traditional practices under the conditions of dominant digital technologies and standardized production, and reinforces the relevance of the craft-based approach in sustaining cultural authenticity. The conclusions presented here contribute not only to the historical reconstruction of artistic processes, but also to interdisciplinary research at the intersection of cultural studies, the creative economy, and heritage studies, establishing a sense of continuity between historical strategies of identity preservation and the contemporary cultural agenda.

The current state of research on the scientific problem

The phenomenon of the Abramtsevo estate – which synthesized artistic, craft-based, and socio-economic practices and had a profound influence on the shaping of Russia's cultural landscape in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries – has inspired such an extensive body of scholarship that a dedicated chapter of the present study is devoted to its historiographical analysis.

In brief, the historiography of Abramtsevo has developed along several thematic vectors. The foundations for studying the estate through the lens of Russian Art Nouveau and the national-romantic movement were laid by contemporaries of

the process itself, such as Alexandre Benois[1], Vladimir Stasov[2], and Igor Grabar[3]. During the Soviet period, the context was significantly broadened by scholars such as A.A. Fyodorov-Davydov[4], N.I. Sokolova[5], G.Yu. Sternin[6], E.A. Borisova[7], M.M. Allenov[8], M.G. Neklyudova[9], and D.V. Sarabyanov[10], among others. In more recent decades, the factual base has been considerably enriched and new research dimensions have emerged (notably in the work of M.V. Nashchokina[11] and E.I. Kirichenko [12]), including the sociocultural functions of the estate (e.g., T.P. Kazhdan[13]). International scholarship has emphasized Abramtsevo's transnational connections, from Charlotte Gere[14] to Rosalind P. Blakesley[15]. The most substantial contribution to the study of Abramtsevo from historical-cultural and art historical

---

[1] Benois A. N. The History of Russian Painting in the 19th Century. St. Petersburg: E. Evdokimov Typography, 1902 (in Russian); My Memoirs, Books 4-5. Moscow: Nauka, 1980 (in Russian); and others.
[2] Stasov V. V. Art in the 19th Century // *Niva*, Year XXXII, No. 1-26 (1901). P. 212-328 (in Russian); and others.
[3] Grabar I. E. The History of Russian Art, with contributions by A. N. Benois, I. Ya. Bilibin, Ap. M. Vasnetsov, N. N. Vrangel, et al. Moscow: I. Knebel, 1910–1913 (in Russian); and others.
[4] Fedorov-Davydov A. A. Russian Art of Industrial Capitalism. Moscow: GAKhN, 1929 (in Russian); and others.
[5] Sokolova N. I. Development Paths of Russian Art at the Turn of the 20th Century. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1972 (in Russian); and others.
[6] Sternin G. Yu. Artistic Life in Russia at the Turn of the 20th Century. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1970; Artistic Life in Early 20th-Century Russia. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1976 (in Russian); and others.
[7] Borisova E. A. Russian Architecture in the Second Half of the 19th Century]. Moscow: Nauka, 1979; and others.
[8] Allenov M. M. Russian Art of the 19th – Early 20th Century. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1989 (in Russian); and others.
[9] Nekliudova M. G. Tradition and Innovation in Russian Art at the Turn of the Century. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1991 (in Russian).
[10] Sarab'ianov D. V. Art Nouveau Style: Origins, History, Issues. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1989 (in Russian); and others.
[11] Nashchokina M. V. Moscow Art Nouveau. Moscow: Zhiraf, 2003; The Spirit of Symbolism. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiia, 2012; Architectural Ceramics in Moscow. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiia, 2014 (in Russian); and others.
[12] Kirichenko E. I. The Russian Style. Moscow: Galart, 1997 (in Russian); and others.
[13] Kazhdan T. P. The Artistic World of the Russian Estate. Moscow: Traditsiia, 1997 (in Russian); and others.
[14] Gray C. The Russian Experiment in Art, 1863–1922. New York: H. N. Abrams, 1970; and others.
[15] Blakesley R. P. The Russian Canvas: Painting in Imperial Russia, 1757–1881. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016; The Arts and Crafts Movement. London: Phaidon, 2005; and others.

perspectives has been made by Eleonora Paston[16], whose comprehensive research has examined the artistic legacy of the Abramtsevo Circle and its significance within late imperial Russian culture.

Nonetheless, a clear imbalance persists between the prevailing biographical approach – dominant in studies of key artistic figures such as Vasily and Elena Polenov, Viktor Vasnetsov, Mikhail Vrubel, Valentin Serov, and Konstantin Korovin – and the relative neglect of collaborative creativity and the educational and economic principles underpinning the operation of the Abramtsevo workshops. Although technical aspects of workshop activity have been explored (e.g., by A.B. Saltykov[17], B.A. Rybakov[18], M.V. Andreeva[19], and K.N. Pruslina[20]), these studies require supplementation through socio-economic analysis, for which initial frameworks have been outlined in the works of M.V. Kartashova[21], B.N. Mironov[22], V.G. Yegorov, O.A. Zozulya, and M.V. Paleolog[23], as well as in studies of the

[16] Paston E. V. Abramtsevo: Art and Life. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 2003; and numerous studies including doctoral research and articles in *Iskusstvoznanie*, *Akademiia*, *Tretiakovskie chteniia*, *Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura; and others.* (all in Russian).
[17] Saltykov A. B. Russian Ceramics of the 18th–19th Centuries. Moscow: Goskultprosveshchizdat, 1952; and others. (in Russian).
[18] Rybakov B. A. Crafts in Ancient Rus'. Moscow: Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1948; and others. (in Russian).
[19] Andreeva M. V. Wondrous Transformations: Clay, Stone, Sand. Leningrad: Aurora, 1973; and others. (in Russian).
[20] Pruslina K. N. Russian Ceramics (Late 19th – Early 20th Century). Moscow: Nauka, 1974; and others. (in Russian).
[21] Kartashova M. V. Handicrafts of the Russian Empire in the Last Third of the 19th – Early 20th Century (1872–1917). Nizhny Novgorod: Kvarts, 2018; and others. (in Russian).
[22] Mironov B. N. The Social History of Imperial Russia (18th – Early 20th Century): The Genesis of the Individual, the Democratic Family, Civil Society, and the Rule of Law, 2 vols. St. Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2000 (in Russian).
[23] Egorov V. G., Zozulia O. A., Paleolog M. V. Handicrafts of the Non-Chernozem Village in the Second Half of the 19th – Early 20th Century (Based on Materials from the Moscow Province). Moscow: Institute of Diaspora and Integration (CIS Countries Institute), 2011; and others (in Russian).

workshops' interactions with state institutions (e.g., E.M. Dorina [24], N.A. Koveshnikova[25], V.V. Perkhun and D.G. Chernykh[26]).

A significant body of research has also addressed the institutional dimension of Abramtsevo, including the Mamontov family's patronage (E.R. Arenzon[27], A.I. Bokhanova[28], L. Garafola[29], E.A. Anisina[30], and others) and educational programs (S.V. Gorozhanina[31], N.V. Malashina[32], E.N. Mitrofanova[33], M.N. Seregina and M.R. Tavasieva[34]). At the same time, the methodological gap between the study of "high" art and applied practices persists to this day. A similar situation characterizes the analysis of the regional impact of the workshops: for instance, research on the Abramtsevo-Kudrino woodcarving tradition established by V.P. Vornoskov, as well as on the Sergiev Posad craft heritage (e.g., E.N. Shulgina[35], E.V. Davydova[36], O.N.

[24] Dorina E. M. The Cottage Industry of the Moscow Province in the Late 19th – Early 20th Century: The Problem of Capitalization and Modernization. Candidate of Historical Sciences dissertation, Tambov, 2010; and others (in Russian).
[25] Koveshnikova N. A. Industrial Development and Art-Industrial Education in Russia in the 19th – Early 20th Century // *Sibirskii pedagogicheskii zhurnal* 10 (2009). P. 285-292; and others (in Russian).
[26] Perkhun V. V., and Chernykh, D. G. The Struggle for Cultural Sovereignty in Art and the Art Industry in Russia in the 19th – Early 20th Century // *Arkhitekton: Izvestiia vuzov* 1 (61) (2018). P. 157-174 (in Russian).
[27] Arenzon E. R. Savva Mamontov: Art and Railways. Moscow: Bizneskom, 2011; and others (in Russian).
[28] Bokhanov A. I. Collectors and Patrons in Russia. Moscow: Nauka, 1989 (in Russian).
[29] Garafola L. The Russian Ballet of Diaghilev. Moscow: KoLibri, Azbuka-Attikus, 2021 (in Russian).
[30] Anisina E. A. The Formation of Patronage Models in Russia. Candidate of Cultural Studies dissertation, Saransk, 2009 (in Russian).
[31] Gorozhanina S. V. The Vasnetsov Abramtsevo School of Art and Industry: Origins, Development, and the Continuity of Folk Art Traditions. Candidate of Art History dissertation, Moscow, 2013; and others. (in Russian).
[32] Malashina N. V. On the Contribution of the Mamontov Family to the Development of Education and Enlightenment in Russia in the Late 19th – Early 20th Century // *Abramtsevo. Materialy i issledovaniia* 14 (2019). P. 74-86 (in Russian).
[33] Mitrofanova E. N. The Mamontov Spiritual Initiative at Abramtsevo as an Integral Model of Artistic Process. Candidate of Art History dissertation, Moscow, 2005 (in Russian).
[34] Seregina M. N. and Tavasieva M. R. Traditions of Children's Artistic Education at Abramtsevo // *Abramtsevo. Materialy i issledovaniia* 11 (2013). P. 105-109 (in Russian).
[35] Shulgina E.N. The Abramtsevo-Kudrino Folk Craft of Decorative Wood Carving. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1946 (in Russian).
[36] Davydova E. V. Miniature Wood Carving in Sergiev Posad in the 19th – Early 20th Century: Origins, Development, Masters. Candidate of Historical Sciences dissertation, Moscow, 2007 (in Russian).

Andreeva[37], and I.V. Plotnikova[38]), remains largely isolated from the broader discourse on the legacy of Abramtsevo.

The aim of this study is to examine the processes by which professional artistic practices were integrated into traditional handicrafts within the Abramtsevo art workshops, and to assess their influence on the formation and development of related initiatives.

Research objectives:

1. To investigate the reception of the "craft question" (*kustarnyi vopros*) in pre-revolutionary publications, including an analysis of articles in the periodical press as well as in specialized works on handicraft production;
2. To analyze the specific features of the revival of artistic craft in Russia and Europe, and to identify possible forms of mutual influence between these traditions;
3. To examine the Abramtsevo Circle's engagement in ethnographic expeditions and the collecting of folk art, and to assess the influence of these practices on the creative strategies of artists associated with Mamontov;
4. To identify the methods and dimensions of integrating artistic craft practices into the professional art milieu, using the example of the Abramtsevo workshops;
5. To analyze the mechanisms of commodification and musealization of decorative and applied art objects produced by the Abramtsevo workshops and related initiatives;
6. To assess the demand for, and possible distribution channels of, the products of artistic workshops;

[37] Andreeva O. N.The Workshops of the Abramtsevo Estate and the Artistic Crafts of Sergiev Posad in the Late 19th – Early 20th Century // *Russkaia usad'ba v istorii Otechestva. Iasnaia Poliana*. Moscow: Iasnaia Poliana, 1999. P. 80-88 (in Russian).

[38] Plotnikova, I.V. A Century-Long Experiment: On the Experience of Integrating Folk Art in the Formation of the Artistic Style of the Abramtsevo Joinery Workshop. In: *Proceedings of the All-Russian Conference "Educational Art Museum and the Contemporary Artistic Process",* St. Petersburg, 1997, P. 183-192 (in Russian).

7. To outline the modifications of the classical concept of authorship in craft practices in light of collective creative models and the reproducibility of forms;
8. To define the specific modes of continuity and legacy in initiatives related to Abramtsevo – such as M.K. Tenisheva's Talashkino workshops, M.F. Yakunchikova's Solomenka workshop, and E.N. Chokolova's workshop-school in the village of Gorozhanka.

Research Hypothesis: The integration of professional artistic practices into traditional handicrafts within the framework of the Abramtsevo workshops resulted in the formation of a new model of interaction between art and craft. This model combined the aesthetic strategies of the emerging modern style with the preservation of folk traditions and the provision of socio-economic support for artisans. It laid the groundwork for the emergence and development of related initiatives—such as those at Talashkino, Solomenka, and Gorozhanka—where artistic direction was coupled with the institutionalization of handicraft production and its incorporation into museum, exhibition, and market circuits.

Methodology

With regard to the subject of the study, the most effective strategy is a comprehensive methodological approach that integrates general scholarly and discipline-specific methods.

Source analysis plays a critical role in data verification and is applied to archival documents, epistolary materials, statistical reports, periodicals, and exhibition catalogues. These sources are interpreted through the lens of historical reliability and representativeness.

The historical-cultural analysis allows for the examination of artworks and artistic processes within a specific temporal framework, taking into account their genesis and contextual conditions. The art historical approach, including formal-stylistic analysis and iconographic method, is employed to study the output of the workshops, tracing in both artisanal works and artists' sketches the evolution from folkloric traditionalism to modernist stylization.

The comparative method enables a juxtaposition of the Abramtsevo model with both its European counterparts and similar domestic initiatives, with particular attention to the transfer of artistic ideas. The socio-anthropological approach focuses on analyzing the impact of private initiatives on the structure and dynamics of rural communities.

An interdisciplinary synthesis of methodologies from art history, cultural studies, social history, and economic anthropology ensures a multidimensional interpretation of the phenomenon of private school-workshops as instruments of cultural policy.

Limitations of the study

This study is aimed at analyzing the role of private initiatives associated with the Abramtsevo Art Circle in the revitalization of artistic handicrafts. It does not seek to contribute to the discourse of gender studies in post-reform Russia, acknowledging the extensive body of specialized scholarship already devoted to this subject, as well as the relative indifference of participants in these artistic-craft projects to the "woman question[39]." The primary focus of this research is the examination of the organizational and creative mechanisms underlying the operation of artisanal workshops at the turn of the 20th century, including the structure of internal communications (among artists, artisans, and patrons) and their role in shaping the socio-cultural and economic landscape of the era.

The chosen approach does not entail an in-depth art historical analysis of individual works produced within the Abramtsevo workshops or related centers such as Talashkino, Gorozhanka, or Solomenka. Such an analysis is further complicated

[39] For further reading, see: Pushkareva N. Russian Women: History and the Present. Two Centuries of the “Woman Question” in Russian and Foreign Scholarship, 1800–2000. Moscow: Ladomir, 2002 (In Russian); The Woman of the Modern Era: Gender in Russian Culture, 1890–1930. A Collective Monograph. A.S. Akimova, A.S. Andreeva, S. Ashone et al.; editorial board: V.B. Zuseva-Ozkan (chair) et al. Moscow: New Literary Observer, 2022 (In Russian); Yukina I.I. Russian Feminism as a Challenge to Modernity. St. Petersburg: Aletheia, 2007 (In Russian); Yukina I.I. From Lady Patrons to Zhenotdel Activists: A History of the Women's Movement in Russia. Moscow: New Literary Observer, 2024 (In Russian); Ulyanova G.N. Merchants' Wives, Noblewomen, Magnates: Women Entrepreneurs in 19th-Century Russia. Moscow: New Literary Observer, 2024 (In Russian); and others.

by the poor state of preservation and difficulties in attributing many of the surviving objects. The limited number of extant artifacts, and the reliance on reproductions published at the turn of the century, do not allow for reliable comparative analysis.

Despite their cultural significance, handicrafts and folk art remain underrepresented in art-historical discourse, typically confined to the domain of historical and ethnographic studies. Addressing this methodological gap requires a clear demarcation between two categories of phenomena: works created within the context of professional artistic communities (as exemplified by the Abramtsevo Circle), and folk art that emerged independently of institutional influence. The key criterion for this differentiation is the participation of recognized professional artists in the activities of school-workshops organized with philanthropic support, as well as the status of their founders.

Unlike spontaneous and vernacular craft practices, the Abramtsevo Circle's projects were directed by individuals whose impact on the development of Russian art is well documented. Among them were Elena Polenova, Ivan Bilibin, Viktor Vasnetsov, Mikhail Vrubel, and other distinguished artists whose creative strategies transformed local crafts into a phenomenon that synthesized authentic traditions with professional aesthetics.

Thus, the institutionalization of handicraft through the lens of the Abramtsevo Art Circle allows for its identification as a distinct category, separate from other private initiatives primarily oriented toward propaedeutic or socio-economic goals. This distinction not only refines the terminological framework of art history but also highlights the role of professional communities in preserving and renewing cultural heritage.

The object of this study is the artistic practices of the Abramtsevo Circle and related private initiatives involving school-workshops in the field of decorative and applied arts and handicrafts from the 1880s to the 1910s.

The subject of this study encompasses the organizational, socio-economic, and artistic dimensions of private initiatives aimed at supporting handicraft production, as well as the mechanisms of interaction between professional artists of

the Abramtsevo Circle and vernacular craft traditions within the framework of workshop-schools.

Scientific novelty

This study offers the first reconstruction of the mechanisms by which cultural heritage was practically engaged through collaboration between professional artists and artisan craftworkers in the 1870s–1910s, with a focus on the Abramtsevo Circle as a key phenomenon and the most prominent artistic and protectionist initiative of the period under examination. Drawing on archival materials—including correspondence, financial records, and design sketches—as well as contemporary printed sources, the research elucidates the following aspects: the genesis of interest in supporting handicrafts within artistic circles; the reinterpretation of elements of vernacular craft in the work of artists associated with Art Nouveau; and the continuity of Abramtsevo's organizational models in later initiatives such as Talashkino, Solomenka, and Gorozhanka.

The scholarly novelty of this research lies in its application of an interdisciplinary methodology that combines art-historical and cultural-historical analysis with tools drawn from socio-economic approaches. This framework enables, for the first time, a reconstruction of the evolution of the Abramtsevo workshops as a multilayered system. Previously unpublished archival materials—including correspondence and financial documents related to the workshops—have been introduced into scholarly circulation, revealing new aspects of the patrons' efforts to legitimize handicraft labor, as well as little-known data on the systems of product distribution. The study also develops a methodology for analyzing collective creative practices, illuminating the interactions among artists, technologists, and artisans within the workshop setting. These findings offer a revised understanding of the role of handicraft workshops in the context of cultural transfer and propose a new interpretation of creative processes in which private initiatives served as a mechanism for integrating traditional crafts into the art market.

The study proposes an original periodization of the activities of the Abramtsevo carpentry and ceramics workshops, reflecting the influence of broader

socio-economic changes of the time. It also develops a methodological framework for analyzing collective creative practices, highlighting the interactions among artists, technologists, and artisans within the workshop environment. These findings prompt a re-evaluation of the role of handicraft workshops in the context of cultural transfer and offer a new interpretation of creative processes, in which private initiatives functioned as instruments for integrating traditional crafts into the art market.

The research holds methodological relevance for the analysis of contemporary creative industries. The commodification of handicraft, the balance between serial production and uniqueness, and the incorporation of craft into market relations – all processes observed in the Abramtsevo case – resonate today in the context of digitalization, where virtual consumption is accompanied by a renewed demand for tactility and authenticity. The historical example of Abramtsevo serves as a model for understanding the tension between intangible formats and the enduring value of material practices, offering criteria for assessing the sustainability of creative industries in an era of technological transformation.

Scientific Novelty of the Dissertation Research:

1) The receptions of the *kustarnyi vopros* (the "craft question") in pre-revolutionary publications have been identified, including articles in the periodical press and specialized works on handicraft production;

2) The specific features of the adaptation and potential transfer routes of European artistic and craft-related ideas into the Russian cultural context of the late nineteenth century have been determined, along with the commonalities and fundamental differences in the developmental trajectories of artistic craft in Russia and Europe;

3) The Abramtsevo Circle’s experience in ethnographic expeditions and the collecting of folk art has been examined, as well as its influence on the individual creative strategies of artists associated with Mamontov;

4) Methods of integrating artistic handicraft practices into the professional art milieu have been identified, using the Abramtsevo workshops as a case study;

5) The mechanisms of commodification and musealization of decorative and applied art objects produced by artisans in workshop-schools have been analyzed;

6) The economic dimensions of the artistic craft workshops' operations—particularly in terms of product distribution, investment, expenditures, and income – have been investigated;

7) The transformation of the concept of authorship in handicraft production has been outlined, including aspects of collective creativity and the reproducibility of forms;

8) The specific nature of the continuity between Abramtsevo and its "successors" – namely, M.F. Yakunchikova's Solomenka workshop, E.N. Chokolova's workshop-school in the village of Gorozhanka, and, to some extent, M.K. Tenisheva's Talashkino workshops – has been established.

Main findings and results

1) The artistic handicrafts of the Russian Empire in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries constituted a complex sociocultural phenomenon that encompassed various forms of organization, including artels, workshops, and cooperatives. Many of these entities were in decline due to market oversaturation, inefficient distribution systems, exploitation by middlemen, and the lack of a stable financial model. In response to this crisis, the state undertook regulatory and economic measures to support the sector. Simultaneously, a broad public debate emerged—commonly referred to as the "kustarnyi vopros" (the craft question)—and private initiatives became a practical attempt to address the systemic challenges facing the industry;

2) The arts and crafts movement that emerged in Western Europe in the mid-nineteenth century as a response to industrialization sought to revive manual labor and establish a national visual language through the synthesis of art and craft. In Russia, despite the active appropriation of European experiences, the distinct trajectory of industrial development in the 1880s foregrounded a different agenda. Alongside modernization, increased attention

was paid to the craft question as both a socio-economic and cultural issue. Within the broader ideological interest in folk art and the spiritual foundations of national identity, a unique model was formed—one that combined the search for artistic identity with institutional support for handicrafts as an autonomous phenomenon of culture and economy. In this context of systemic engagement with vernacular traditions and heritage as foundational constructs, an original framework emerged that linked the formation of national artistic identity with the practical task of supporting traditional craft production;

3) As part of their ethnographic activities, members of the Abramtsevo Circle conducted fieldwork on pre-Petrine monuments and folk art in the central provinces of Russia (Moscow, Vladimir, Kostroma). Their efforts encompassed not only the collection of artifacts for the Abramtsevo art collection, but also the direct study of vernacular and religious art within its original social and ritual contexts. This form of fieldwork, combining a documentary approach to cultural heritage with the creative reinterpretation of its aesthetic and symbolic structures, laid the foundation for a revision of prevailing stereotypes about the "Russian style" and contributed to the development of a new visual language within the Art Nouveau movement;

4) The Abramtsevo artistic circle redefined the status of the handicraft object by integrating it into the realm of high art through the participation of professional artists in the design process. This collaboration enhanced both the aesthetic and market value of the products but simultaneously provoked debates regarding their authenticity. Critics pointed to the ambiguous, "synthetic" nature of such objects, which were perceived as losing their spontaneity and local traditional character. This introduced a fundamental dilemma into the cultural discourse: how to reconcile the modernization of craft production with the preservation of its cultural identity;

5) One of the key strategies for promoting Abramtsevo handicrafts – while simultaneously supporting artisanal labor – was the integration of these objects into cultural and institutional frameworks of commodification and

musealization. The products were exhibited at art shows, including exhibitions organized by the Mir Iskusstva (World of Art) movement, featured in specialized publications, and successfully presented at national and international industrial and handicraft exhibitions. These efforts contributed to their recognition as an integral part of the artistic world. Additional symbolic legitimacy was conferred through acquisition by members of the upper classes, transforming these objects into markers of both social and aesthetic prestige;

6) In their formative stages, the artistic craft workshops were heavily dependent on private patrons for both funding and access to distribution channels. However, analysis of financial records and correspondence indicates that the initiators of these projects aimed to create autonomous creative units capable of operating independently of private support and qualifying for state subsidies. In their mature phase, certain workshops demonstrated economic resilience and self-sufficiency, as evidenced by artisans' incomes, which in some cases exceeded regional averages. The economic attractiveness of participating in such workshops contributed to the popularization of the model and to the elevation of handicraft production as a vital component of cultural and socio-economic modernization;

7) The Abramtsevo Circle adapted a model of artistic production that separated the roles of the artist (concept, design) and the artisan (material adaptation, execution) to the context of the kustarnyi vopros. This collaborative framework contributed to the "alienation" of the final product, diminishing the emphasis on individual authorship. Nevertheless, the production of small series with unique features transformed craft into a form of "minor" art. The artist's involvement as co-author elevated the aesthetic status of the objects. At the same time, artisans—such as V.P. Vornoskov, a student of E.D. Polenova at the Abramtsevo woodworking workshop—and technologists like P.K. Vaulin at the Abramtsevo ceramic workshop, who had received aesthetic training, were later capable of independently creating applied art objects from conception to realization;

8) The principles established by the Abramtsevo Circle were developed and adapted by its successors in various forms. In the embroidery workshops of Solomenka, founded by M.F. Yakunchikova, female craft traditions were reinterpreted in the spirit of Art Nouveau and adapted to the aesthetic demands of the time and the needs of the urban market. The workshop-school in Gorozhanka, organized by E.N. Chokolova, combined educational, artistic, and socio-economic functions, with a strong focus on providing employment for local women and enhancing their economic autonomy. The art workshops at Talashkino, led by M.K. Tenisheva, were characterized by centralized organizational structures and a high degree of institutionalization: the objects created by local artisans were widely exhibited at both Russian and international exhibitions, sold through specialized folk and art craft stores, and ultimately formed the core of a dedicated museum in Flyonovo.

Approbation of the research results. Preliminary findings of the dissertation were discussed in the framework of seminars held by the Doctoral School of Arts and Design at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE).

The main arguments and conclusions of the dissertation were presented at international and national academic conferences, including:

1. XI International Conference "Student Smolny Readings: [ESC]" (May 20–23, 2023, St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State University). Paper presented: "The Field of Artistic Production in Russia in the Last Third of the 19th Century: On the Context of the Emergence and Development of the Abramtsevo Circle."

2. International Conference "Theories and Practices of Art and Design" (April 5–7, 2023, Moscow, HSE University). Paper presented: "The Proto-Art Market: The 'Artist – Patron – Viewer – Client' Relationship within the Abramtsevo Circle."

3. International Conference "Theories and Practices of Art and Design" (April 10–12, 2024, Moscow, HSE University).

Paper presented: “The Influence of the Arts and Crafts Movement on the Activities of the Abramtsevo Circle and Its Artisan Workshops.”

4. International Conference “Theories and Practices of Art and Design” (April 9–11, 2025, Moscow, HSE University). Paper presented: “Women’s Initiatives in the Support of Folk Crafts in Russia at the Turn of the 20th Century.”

Key findings of the dissertation have been published in leading peer-reviewed academic journals indexed in Russian Science Citation Index, Scopus, as well as in journals recommended by HSE University.

The findings of the dissertation were also incorporated into several related academic and curatorial initiatives, including the book project “Russian Style” (November 2022 – September 2024, HSE University)[40], the curatorial project “The Abramtsevo Workshops: Approaches to Russian Antiquity” (November 2023 – October 2024, HSE University)[41], and the research project of the HSE Crafts & Design Research Lab, titled “From Tradition to Experiment: Methodologies for Working with Folk Decorative Art” (November 2022 – October 2024)[42].

In addition, the research results were disseminated through popular science publications[43], a lecture series within the “Moscow Longevity” program (August – December 2024), and a public talk and family workshop “Paint Like Vrubel” held at the National Center “Russia” in March 2025[44].

Theoretical and practical significance of the results

This study is the first to present professional art and vernacular craft within the Abramtsevo Circle as a unified artistic system, conceptualizing their relationship

[40] Nikiforova, V.I. Book Project “The Iconography of the Russian Style.” Available at: https://hsedesign.ru/project/a4c4aa0d676241bb8ee9894406fcb439 (accessed May 25, 2025).
[41] Nikiforova, V.I. Exhibition Project “The Abramtsevo Workshops: Approaches to Russian Antiquity.” Available at: https://hsedesign.ru/project/ab3e96a26caf4adabfe822c2f652822e (accessed May 25, 2025).
[42] Course “From Tradition to Experiment: Methodology for Working with Folk Decorative Art.” Available at: https://hsedesign.ru/teams/hsecourses-archcr?tab=66c486e96723240e5dd1c0c8 (accessed May 25, 2025).
[43] Nikiforova, V.I. “The Abramtsevo Circle as a Prototype of an Artist Residency?” Available at: https://design.hse.ru/news/3674 (accessed May 25, 2025).
[44] Educational Family Workshop “Paint Like Vrubel.” Available at: https://russia.ru/broadcasts/obrazovatelnyi-semeinyi-master-klass-risui-kak-vrubel (accessed May 25, 2025).

not as a binary opposition but as a dynamic process of cultural transfer. The theoretical significance of the research also lies in its reassessment of patronage as a tool of modernization that facilitated the connection between traditional crafts and the evolving art market. The introduction of archival materials—such as correspondence, workshop accounting records, and design sketches—into scholarly circulation reveals the structure of collective creativity and deepens our understanding of production and distribution processes, authorship, reproducibility, and artist–artisan collaboration. The systematization of a methodology for studying artistic associations through the lens of the social history of art offers new approaches to the analysis of transitional periods in cultural history.

The practical significance of this study lies in the potential for integrating its findings into educational programs in art history and cultural studies, where dedicated modules may be developed on the economics of artistic practices, the role of private patronage in shaping new cultural models, and the organization of art production and product distribution. The research materials are of particular value for museum practice, including the attribution of artifacts, the reconstruction of production techniques, and the design of thematic exhibitions—thus contributing to a deeper understanding and broader dissemination of handicraft art.

The study's conclusions may also be adapted for contemporary programs supporting folk crafts, where historical models of artist–artisan collaboration can serve as a foundation for strategies aimed at preserving and developing cultural heritage. In addition, the research results may be applied in the fields of art management and cultural policy—for example, in the creation of cultural heritage brands or the development of initiatives aimed at integrating traditional crafts into the contemporary art market. The collected materials, including archival documents, photographs of objects, and exhibition catalogues, may serve as a basis for further research on related or more specialized topics, opening new avenues for inquiry in art history, historical studies, and sociocultural research.

Dissertation structure

The structure of the dissertation is organized in accordance with the logic of the analysis of the research object and subject, as well as the stated aims and objectives. The work comprises an introduction, four chapters, a conclusion, a bibliography, and appendices. The total length of the dissertation is 339 pages. The appendices include illustrative materials and statistical data that support the verification of the study's conclusions.

II. THE MAIN CONTENT OF THE RESEARCH

The study of the Abramtsevo Art Circle reveals its methodological significance for analyzing mechanisms of collective creativity, the transformation of the values associated with manual labor, and strategies for adapting local artistic heritage within the broader context of socio-cultural changes occurring at the turn of the 20th century.

Chapter One presents a systematization of existing scholarship, which allows for the identification of key gaps that remain to be addressed. Chief among these is the imbalance between a predominantly personalist approach and the study of collective practices: the biographies of craftspersons and the mechanisms of their interaction with the artistic elite continue to be treated as peripheral topics. A promising avenue of inquiry lies in examining the cultural-economic mechanisms of the Abramtsevo workshops, as well as drawing comparisons with other artistic centers that followed in their wake (Talashkino, Solomenka, Gorozhanka). Another important direction involves the study of the continuity of traditions in the context of Soviet decorative and applied arts.

Chapter Two offers an interdisciplinary analysis of traditional handicrafts and the reception of the "handicraft question" in the Russian Empire during the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries. This is approached through the lenses of historiography, economic anthropology, and sociology, with particular emphasis on the transformation of traditional artistic craftsmanship into an institutionalized form of cultural heritage. The semantic ambiguity of key terminology – kustarnichestvo (petty handicrafts), kustarnye promysly (artistic handicrafts), and remeslo (craftsmanship) – is attributed to the interdisciplinary nature of the phenomenon, situated at the intersection of economics, ethnography, kustar art, and cottage industry. A core methodological issue remains the problem of typology: conflicting classification criteria – ranging from labor organization and artistic quality to traditional continuity – continue to hinder the development of a universal framework.

The evolution of exhibition practices – from large-scale manufacturing exhibitions (All-Russian Exhibition, 1870) to specialized handicraft exhibitions (St. Petersburg, 1902) – illustrates a shift from utilitarian perception to symbolic valuation. The processes of musealization and commercialization of handicrafts created a dual status: these objects became both subjects of ethnographic inquiry and commodities for consumption. The success of crafts at international exhibitions (e.g., Paris, 1900) helped construct an image of handicraft as a "guardian of tradition," establishing a semiotic code of the "Russian style" as a marker of cultural identity.

The revival of handicrafts at the turn of the 20th century emerged as a significant socio-cultural phenomenon, representing a response to industrialization and urbanization. The Arts and Crafts Movement, initiated by William Morris, served as a catalyst for the development of national revivalist artistic centers across Europe. Its foundational principles – valorization of manual labor, the aestheticization of everyday life, critique of mass production, and the pursuit of a synthesis between art and utility – formed the ideological basis of various artistic associations across countries.

National interpretations of the movement varied: in France (École de Nancy), emphasis was placed on the integration of art and technology; in Germany (Worpswede, Darmstadt), on the idealization of traditional life and social utopia; in Finland and Poland, craft became a tool for cultural self-identification. The movement promoted cultural exchange and contributed to the development of a new model of human interaction with labor, technology, and nature. Unlike in Western Europe, the Russian Empire witnessed the emergence of a model of collective artistic handicraft, which was embedded in a broader project of national identity construction and the search for a distinctly "Russian style".

Chapter Three of the dissertation examines how the Abramtsevo artisan workshops became a pivotal stage in the evolution of Russian artistic handicrafts, reflecting the socio-cultural contradictions inherent in the modernization processes of the late Imperial period. Their activity is interpreted as an artistic experiment

synthesizing three vectors: the aesthetic explorations of professional artists through the study of kustar traditions; an ideological framework advocating a return to pre-Petrine art as the foundation of national identity; and the development of collaborative creative processes.

The workshops' principal achievement lay in the creation of a new artistic language that overcame the established hierarchy between academic and craft art. This was evident in the adaptation of archaic ornamentation – such as low-relief wood carving in the carpentry workshop – through the lens of modernist stylization, as well as in the practice of collective authorship, where the creativity of the professional artist entered into a dialogue with the technical skills of artisans. The methodological foundation of this process consisted of field expeditions, during which artifacts were collected from the central provinces of Russia, documented, and subsequently transformed into visual motifs within the workshop production. Creative approaches ranged from reproductive copying of folk prototypes in the early stages to more experimental practices, where craft was reinterpreted as the foundation for a new style: Neo-Russian Modernism.

The economic model of the Abramtsevo workshops relied on the institution of patronage, which facilitated a symbiosis between commercial activity and an educational mission. Distribution of products through stores, warehouses, and exhibitions not only promoted the "Russian style," but also integrated craftspersons into the commodity-money relations of the urban market, mediated by patrons. While the role of the patron remained essential to the operation of estate-based private workshops, their organizational structure aimed strategically at achieving economic self-sufficiency. This goal was reflected in the gradual reduction of dependence on financial support from patrons – the workshops' evolution revealed a trend toward autonomy and integration into the market economy under increasingly independent conditions.

This chapter demonstrates the systemic character of the Abramtsevo experiment, in which artistic, conceptual, and economic dimensions were mutually reinforcing. The key mechanism of transformation was not the direct replication of

folkloric models, but rather their dialogical engagement with professional artistic culture, generating a new aesthetic code. The workshops functioned as platforms for the synthesis of kustar tradition and professional art. The activity of the creative intelligentsia extended beyond the aestheticization of craft to include the adaptation of archaic artisanal techniques to market demands, thereby provoking debates about the "authenticity" of the art produced within these settings.

Chapter Four provides a comprehensive study of private initiatives closely linked to the Abramtsevo model in the preservation and transformation of artisanal workshops. Focusing on three key successor centers – Talashkino (founded by Princess Maria Tenisheva), Solomenka (Maria Yakunchikova), and Gorozhanka (Ekaterina Chokolova) – the chapter reconstructs the mechanisms through which alternative forms of female professional self-realization were established. It also analyzes their contributions to cultural modernization and the socio-economic support of rural communities.

The philanthropic activities of these women patrons facilitated both the preservation and modernization of traditional crafts, adapting them to the aesthetic demands of the Art Nouveau era and to market requirements. Despite the apparent progressiveness of these initiatives – which aimed to involve women in professional activity through artistic production – their role in overcoming patriarchal constraints remains ambivalent. An analysis of the support mechanisms organized by the patrons reveals the compromise-driven nature of these practices: although they offered women opportunities for income generation, the structure of such initiatives largely reproduced the traditional gendered division of labor.

The principle of home-based work, central to these projects, institutionally reinforced the connection between women’s employment and their responsibilities in domestic care, child-rearing, and agricultural labor. This aligned with the strategic objective of the patrons: to prevent the mass migration of women to urban centers and to preserve the patriarchal order in the face of growing urbanization. Thus, professional self-realization through handicrafts did not so much expand women’s

opportunities as adapt their labor to prevailing social norms, minimizing the threat of transforming traditional familial roles.

CONCLUSION

The reconfiguration of craft production as an artistic phenomenon emerged as a significant feature of modern culture, and the Abramtsevo Circle played a pivotal role in this process. The central hypothesis of the present study—that the integration of professional artistic practices into traditional handicrafts within the framework of the Abramtsevo workshops led to the development of a new model of interaction between art and craft, which, in turn, influenced the emergence and evolution of subsequent private initiatives – has been confirmed. Through the consolidation of artists and artisans, a model of collective creativity was established, in which artistic workshops contributed both to the transformation of utilitarian objects into works of art and to the institutionalization of vernacular craft practices.

Artistic and craft workshops played a crucial role in shifting handicraft production from the utilitarian sphere to the artistic one. This transition was accompanied by institutionalization: objects were acquired by museums, exhibited at major shows, and received recognition both in Russia and abroad. At Abramtsevo, a model of collaborative creativity emerged, in which artists and artisans functioned as interchangeable participants in the creative process. Although the loss of a key figure could affect the quality of production, the model itself remained viable. This system blurred the boundaries of individual authorship and contributed to the aestheticization of craft objects, transforming them into "minor art" and enhancing their cultural value.

The members of the Abramtsevo Circle and associated initiatives were acutely aware not only of the artistic but also the social potential of crafts. They aimed to improve both distribution channels and working conditions. The European craft revival at the end of the nineteenth century also reflected a search for new forms of harmony amid industrialization – particularly through the idealization of manual labor and attempts to overcome alienation. In contrast to European movements, the

Abramtsevo project was less concerned with industrialization per se, focusing instead on the dissemination of ideas central to the "craft question," a discourse on the fate of traditional handicrafts under conditions of modernization. The perception of craft as cultural heritage lent special importance to the workshop-schools.

Artistic and educational initiatives of the late nineteenth century, especially private workshop-schools, became important experimental platforms for synthesizing traditional forms with contemporary aesthetic practices. The participation of artists in design, the establishment of artisan collectives, and the development of craft education contributed to the institutionalization of handicraft labor as a form of national art and laid the groundwork for the Soviet model of artistic craft production.

The Abramtsevo Circle conducted field studies of folk and pre-Petrine art in the central provinces of Russia, relying on direct observation and contextual analysis. This approach diverged from the conventional practice of cabinet collecting and provided a methodological foundation for the shift from formal stylization to nuanced stylistic reinterpretation, thus fostering the development of a new artistic language of modernism.

Artistic co-authorship made it possible to integrate handicraft production into the domain of authorial art, increasing both its aesthetic and market value. However, this also provoked methodological debates about the permissible limits of intervention into tradition. Products that lost their local specificity were often criticized as synthetic hybrids of craft and fine art.

Commodification and museification played a key role in legitimizing the output of the Abramtsevo workshops: items were exhibited, reproduced in the press, received awards, and gained elite recognition, becoming symbols of refined taste and national artistic heritage.

The Abramtsevo workshops were part of a broader cultural initiative that included other figures – such as Princess Tenisheva, Maria Yakunchikova, and Nadezhda Chokolova – who launched their own craft projects. These practitioners adapted Abramtsevo's methods to local conditions and personal visions. While

Abramtsevo promoted creative freedom, Tenisheva's Talashkino estate introduced centralized management, standardizing the artistic process. This dichotomy of “freedom and system” was later reflected in twentieth-century methodological approaches to art education, which centered on charismatic leadership and systematic documentation of collective labor.

The projects of Chokolova and Yakunchikova, though praised by contemporaries, remain underexplored. Yakunchikova’s Solomenka workshop reinterpreted traditional techniques in the spirit of Art Nouveau, balancing aesthetic goals with market adaptability. Chokolova’s workshop-school in Gorozhanka combined artistic and social functions, creating employment opportunities for women and establishing a sustainable model of local craft production. The connections among these workshops suggest a continuity and shared cultural context underlying these initiatives.

As part of this dissertation, a consolidated table of sales from the Abramtsevo, Solomenka, and Gorozhanka workshops (Appendix 2) has been compiled based on reports from the Moscow Handicraft Warehouse. New archival and periodical sources have been introduced into scholarly circulation, including materials from the 1913 All-Russian Handicraft and Industrial Exhibition and articles from journals such as Mir iskusstva, Zolotoe runo, and others.

A comparative analysis of the Abramtsevo, Talashkino, Gorozhanka, and Solomenka workshops reveals a transformation in the nature of private support for craft production – from male-dominated trades to forms oriented toward women’s labor. The promotion of female employment was closely linked to market integration, challenging the persistent stereotype of such initiatives as aristocratic pastimes. Women-led projects encompassed exhibition, commercial, and publishing activities. However, gender representation remained ambivalent: male involvement in patronage (e.g., V. Tenishev, S. Chokolov) was often marginalized, whereas at Abramtsevo a functional division of labor between spouses was observed. The legal attribution of property to women frequently served as reputational cover, a

phenomenon that merits further inquiry into the gender dynamics of artistic and artisanal initiatives.

Despite the structural changes following 1917, the model of Abramtsevo and related workshops became a foundation for the Soviet system of support for kustar crafts. The functions of private patronage were assumed by institutions such as the Research Institute of Art Industry (NIIKhP), which delineated three stages in the adaptation of crafts: “quotation,” “stylization,” and “transposition.” Although official historiography acknowledged only the first two stages in relation to Abramtsevo, its activities in fact corresponded to the third – transposing traditional forms into the language of modernity.

The sustainability criteria of the Abramtsevo Circle’s initiatives – co-authorship, institutional recognition, symbolic capital, marketing autonomy, and adaptability to external conditions – represent valuable methodological parameters for analyzing contemporary creative industries. Today’s creative clusters and cultural initiatives, operating within the framework of platform economies and digital transformation, still depend on horizontal network structures, collective forms of authorship, and engagement with local contexts. The principles of the nineteenth-century workshop-schools are finding renewed relevance in the formats of creative residencies, artist studios, art clusters, and design workshops. Institutional sustainability is now supported through participation in cultural policy, inclusion in grant programs, and involvement in educational and research activities. The aestheticization of the utilitarian, representation of regional heritage, and engagement with the craft code serve as tools for branding and identity-building in a globalized world.

The technological and cultural transformations of the twenty-first century – digital revolution, media hybridization, artificial intelligence – necessitate a rethinking of the role of manual labor, co-authorship, and issues of local specificity. Nonetheless, the methodological logic of the late nineteenth-century Abramtsevo school-workshop model, grounded in a dialogue between tradition and innovation, craft and concept, creativity and technology, author and executor, the unique and the

reproducible, remains highly relevant. It offers a lens through which creative industries can be understood not only as economic drivers but also as systems of enduring values that ensure cultural continuity and resilience amid constant renewal.

The study of the Abramtsevo initiatives provides insight into the early stage of theorizing institutional recognition and the replicability of manual labor within the creative economy – a subject of growing importance in the cultural landscape of the digital age. The identified patterns of the Abramtsevo artistic environment can inform the development of strategies for supporting traditional craft practices in the face of standardization and digital production. Thus, this research contributes both to the historiography of Russian art and to contemporary interdisciplinary scholarship in the fields of cultural policy, heritage studies, and the creative industries.

III. VALIDATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The key points of the dissertation have been published in journals indexed in international citation and abstracting databases, as well as in periodicals included in the list of high-ranking journals of the National Research University Higher School of Economics:

1. Nikiforova, V.I. Sculptural suites The Snow Maiden and Sadko: The influence of the Abramtsevo circle on the art of Mikhail Vrubel. Bulletin of the Vaganova Ballet Academy, 2024, no. 1, pp. 110-122. [In Russian]. Available at: https://vaganov.elpub.ru/jour/article/view/2366

2. Nikiforova, V.I. The Solomenska Workshops: An Unknown Initiative by M.F. Yakunchikova to Support Kustar Crafts. Art Studies, 2024, no. 4, pp. 244-265. [In Russian]. Available at: https://artstudies.sias.ru/upload/isk/isk_2024_4_244.pdf

3. Salnikova, S.O., Nikiforova, V.I., Turman, R.L., Veresova, N.M. Methods of the Scientific Research Institute of the Art Industry on the Adaptation of Folk Crafts: theory and practice on the example of Upper Vychegda painting and Komi patterned knitting. Bulletin of Ugric Studies, 2024, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 774-786. [In Russian]. Available at: https://publications.hse.ru/articles/960907064

4. Veresova N., Nikiforova V., Salnikova S. and Turman R. Methods of Research Institute of Art Industry of adaptation of Folk Artistic Crafts: on the Example of Bone-carving Crafts // Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts 15, no. 3 (2025). [In Russian] (*forthcoming*)