

HISTORY AND THEORY OF CULTURE



UDC 7.036.1

<https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-9-4-57-62>

Diverse Retrospectivism. Style Features of Rostov-on-Don Architecture of the Pre-revolutionary Period

Evgenia M Kishkinova

Don State Technical University, 1, Gagarin Sq., Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation

✉ KEM0022@yandex.ru

Original article



Abstract

Introduction. The purpose of this paper is to determine the main stylistic trends of the Rostov architecture of the retrospective period, to identify prototypes, methods of heritage transformation, regional features of monuments.

Materials and methods. The bibliographic method, stylistic and comparative analysis based on a synchronous and diachronic approach are used.

Results. The leading stylistic direction within the framework of Retrospectivism in the architecture of Rostov-on-Don is Neoclassicism which is characterized by a significant influence of St. Petersburg architecture. Organic inclusion of Neoclassicism in the architectural fabric of Rostov-on-Don was facilitated by the presence of buildings in the style of Classicism, classicizing Eclecticism and Art Nouveau.

Discussion and conclusion. The prototypes in the creation of architectural and artistic solutions of the facades were monuments of antiquity, Late Renaissance, Early and especially Late Classicism. While transforming the heritage, two methods were used: contextual, referring to a certain circle of monuments or period, and conceptual, referring to the historical era as a whole. Regional features of Rostov Retrospectivism include the active use of the Greek Revival motifs and balconies-terraces on Doric columns characteristic of the southern region.

Keywords: Architecture of Rostov-on-Don at the beginning of the 20th century, Retrospectivism, Neoclassicism, Neo-Renaissance

For citation. Kishkinova EM. Diverse Retrospectivism. Style Features of Rostov-on-Don Architecture of the Pre-revolutionary Period. *Science Almanac of Black Sea Region Countries*. 2023;9(4):57–62. <https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-9-4-57-62>

Научная статья

Многоликий ретроспективизм. Стилиевые особенности архитектуры Ростова-на-Дону предреволюционного периода

Е.М. Кишкинова

Донской государственный технический университет, Российская Федерация, г. Ростов-на-Дону, пл. Гагарина, 1

✉ KEM0022@yandex.ru

Аннотация

Введение. Цель статьи – определение основных стилистических направлений ростовской архитектуры периода ретроспективизма, выявление прототипов, методов трансформации наследия, региональных особенностей памятников.

Материалы и методы. Использованы библиографический метод, стилистический и сравнительный анализ на основе синхронического и диахронического подхода.

Результаты исследования. Ведущим стилевым направлением в рамках ретроспективизма в архитектуре Ростова-на-Дону является неоклассицизм, характерно значительное влияние петербургской архитектуры. Органичному включению неоклассицизма в архитектурную ткань Ростова-на-Дону способствовало наличие здесь построек в стилистике классицизма, классицизирующих эклектики и модерна.

Обсуждение и заключение. Прототипами при создании архитектурно-художественных решений фасадов служили памятники Античности, позднего Возрождения, раннего и особенно высокого классицизма. При трансформации наследия использовались два метода: контекстуальный, отсылающий к определенному кругу памятников или периоду, и концептуальный, отсылающий к исторической эпохе в целом. К региональным особенностям ростовского ретроспективизма относится активное использование мотивов неогрека и характерных для южного региона балконов-террас на дорических колоннах.

Ключевые слова. Архитектура Ростова-на-Дону начала XX в., ретроспективизм, неоклассицизм, неоренессанс

Для цитирования. Кишкинова Е.М. Многоликий ретроспективизм. Стилиевые особенности архитектуры Ростова-на-Дону предреволюционного периода. *Научный альманах стран Причерноморья*. 2023;9(4):57–62. <https://doi.org/10.23947/2414-1143-2023-9-4-57-62>

Introduction. The pre-revolutionary decade left a great number of monuments in the architectural heritage of Rostov-on-Don, which are very significant in terms of artistic level. They repeatedly attracted attention of researchers and were mentioned both in general monographs [1] and in articles on the work of individual architects [2]. However, the question is still open. The purpose of this paper is to determine the main stylistic trends of the Rostov architecture of the retrospective period, to identify prototypes, methods of heritage transformation, regional features of monuments.

Materials and methods. The bibliographic method, stylistic and comparative analysis based on a synchronous and diachronic approach are used.

Results. Retrospectivism and its main direction Neoclassicism are the most studied in the architecture of St. Petersburg [3, 4, 5, 6]. For St. Petersburg, Neoclassicism became truly significant, for the first time having materialized the idea of historical and artistic value of a wide layer of domestic culture from Petrovsky time to the middle of the 19th century. In search of national identity, architects used to turn only to the Middle Ages, but now there is an awareness of Russian Classicism and Russian Baroque importance. Accordingly, in parallel with Neoclassicism, within the framework of Retrospectivism, there were Neo-Baroque, referring to the era of the emergence of St. Petersburg, and Neo-Renaissance, as a reminder of the monuments that inspired the masters of Classicism. E.A. Borisova proposed the following periodization of Neoclassicism: since the mid-1900^s, when it interacted with Art Nouveau, and since the 1910^s, when it took more traditional forms [7, p. 169]. The question of Neoclassicism and Art Nouveau interaction remains debatable. According to the studies of B.M. Kirikov, the first examples of Neoclassicism appeared in St. Petersburg in the 1890^s. At the same time, Neoclassicism does not oppose Art Nouveau, but “closely comes into contact with the neo-romantic movement of the beginning of the 20th century” [8, p. 373].

Rostov-on-Don at the beginning of the 20th century experienced a building boom associated with the rapid industrial development of the city, in particular, due to the fact that the city was one of the largest railway junctions in the country. Many architects (L.F. Eberg, G.N. Vasiliev, E.M. Gulin, A.H. Zakiev, V.V. Popov, P.Ya. Lyubimov and others) who got a professional education mainly in St. Petersburg, at the Academy of Arts or the Institute of Civil Engineers, less often in Moscow, worked simultaneously in the city. Metropolitan architects such as M.M. Peretyatkovich, V.A. Pokrovsky, G.Ya. Gelat, A.F. Niedermeyer engineered for Rostov.

Neoclassicism in Rostov had been established with a slight delay by the beginning of the 1910^s. It organically entered the architectural and urban planning fabric of the city, which received regular urban planning fabric and initial development during the period of Classicism, and later many buildings in the spirit of classicizing Eclecticism. Interest in Classicism associated with the past of a relatively young city and therefore conscious as a response to its own history manifested itself during the modernity period. The most significant monuments of classicizing Art Nouveau are the buildings of the Volga-Kama Bank (1906–1909, architect A.N. Beketov) and the Summer Commercial Club (1912–1913, architect G.Ya. Gelat). However, in both cases, the features of Art Nouveau, close to the Vienna school, play a leading role, so they remain outside the scope of this paper.

The largest among the public buildings of the neoclassical period are the buildings of the Rostov office of the State Bank (1910–1915, architect M.M. Peretyatkovich; Sokolova, 22), District Commercial Court (1914, architect P.Ya. Lyubimov; Socialist, 164/35), and the winter commercial club (1912–1915, architect A.Kh. Zakiev; Budennovsky, 34).

The U-shaped building of the State Bank forms a block, overlooking the red lines of B. Sadovaya, Socialist streets and Sokolov Avenue. The central pilaster side of the main facade includes a ten-column loggia of a giant Tuscan order. Two

quadrangles rise above the pilaster side. The lower one is completed with a similarity of a pediment and is cut through by a semicircular window, against the background of which a sculptural group is placed. There is a double-headed eagle in its center. There are sitting Ceres and Mars (sculptor L.A. Dietrich) on the right and left from it. The upper quadrangle carries a low angle dome crowned with a spire (engineer P.I. Dmitriev). The prototype of the architectural and artistic solution is the building of Moscow University, created within the framework of strict Classicism by M.F. Kazakov and rebuilt by D. Zhilyardi. However, the abundance of sculpture allows us to talk about the influence of Late Classicism. In a single ensemble with the building M.M. Peretyatkovich created a fountain, decorated in the corners with pedestals with sculptures of lying lions by Ya.Z. Weide. This fountain also gives a reference to the monumental and decorative sculpture of St. Petersburg Late Classicism.

The two-story courthouse was erected with a setback at the corner of the block. It has an F-shaped plan. The main, northern facade is especially expressive: it seems that the strict order cover deforms here under the pressure of the live body of the building, giving it complicated plasticity. The central risalit is supplemented with a usable roof floor and highlighted by the multiple pilaster side, and the main role in the three-dimensional solution is played by a balcony on pillars connected by arches, forming a portico, and a stained-glass mullioned window, which includes a door to the balcony decorated with dripstone. The powerful archivolt of the window, emphasized by a cornice, is decorated with a relief “wave”. Stairs and ramps lead to the portico. On the architrave of the side facades there are two lions. Unfortunately, the rest of the sculptures that enriched the appearance of the building were lost. If the general composition and interpretation of the side facades is akin to Late Classicism and resembles the works of C.I. Rossi, then the main risalit with its plastic evokes associations with the ancient architecture of the Roman provinces, for example, Palmyra, of course, rethought under the influence of Art Nouveau.

The commercial club building construction was preceded by two competitions announced by the St. Petersburg Society of Architects in 1906 and 1912. The results were published in the journal “Architect” [9]. There were 35 projects. According to the results of the first competition projects by A.V. Samoilov, M.M. Peretyatkovich, M.S. Lyalevich, A.B. Minkus were awarded. Two projects were recommended for implementation, among them there was a work of A.F. Niedermeyer. Only 10 projects were submitted to the second competition, the jury decided not to award the first and second prizes. As a result, none of the plans were implemented, and the four-story club building was erected in 1912–1915 according to the project of A.Kh. Zakiev, possibly with the participation of A.V. Poznyakov. Three minor pilaster sides with thermal windows at the level of the upper floor divide the main facade, overlooking the red line of Budennovsky Avenue, into two unequal parts. The asymmetric composition vaguely resembles the facade of the Azov-Don Bank in St. Petersburg in its final version (1907–1909, 1912–1913, architect F. I. Lidval).

Another competition was announced by the St. Petersburg Society of Architects in 1913 at the request of the board of the People’s House. The building was supposed to become very significant in scale and include many rooms of various purposes. There were 13 projects and only three received the prize: N.V. Vasilyeva, A.Z. Grinberg, P.P. Svetlitsky [10]. The projects of Greenberg and Svetlitsky were designed in the spirit of Neoclassicism and Neo-Russian style, respectively, while N.V. Vasiliev turned to Neo-Renaissance. The symmetrical composition includes several volumes, the silhouette is determined by low towers with a domed top. Deep, two floors high, with a wide range of arcade of the main facade’s loggia is complemented by small often located arched windows of the third floor, evoking generalized images of Renaissance architecture. Having made changes to the project, the building was constructed in 1914–1915 (Semashko, 89).

The regional features of Rostov Neoclassicism include the presence of a noticeable “Greek Revival’s” component. Examples are the buildings of the electrobiograph “Miniatures” (architect V.V. Popov; significantly rebuilt; B. Sadovaya, 51) and the city school named after E.T. Paramonov (architect G.N. Vasiliev; Pushkinskaya, 140), both built in 1913. The main facade of the first of them is asymmetric testifying to the influence of Art Nouveau. The smaller risalit is accented by the caryatid portico. The rhythm of the extended right wing with a clearly identified frame structure is determined by arched stained-glass windows for the entire height of the facade and pillars with ionic pilasters. Under the architrave there were fielded panels filled with multi-figure narrative reliefs (now lost). The main facade of the second building is more traditionally solved, it is symmetrical, the center is emphasized by a gable and a wide frieze with a multi-figure composition resembling, as in the previous case, the Parthenon frieze. Doric half-columns are placed in the level of the second floor between the windows. The Greek Revival, along with classicizing Art Nouveau, can be considered the immediate predecessor of Neoclassicism in the context of Rostov. It should be noted that the Greek Revival is “rooted” in the historical past of the region, near Rostov there is ancient Tanais, the northernmost of the Greek Black Sea colonies, and in the city itself in the 19th century there was an influential Greek diaspora.

The mansion of N.E. Paramonov (1914, architect L.F. Eberg; Pushkinskaya, 148) belongs to the monuments of Neoclassicism, solved in a more traditional way with the Greek Revival motifs. This is a building indented from the red

line, the compositional center of which is the atrium hall. The main northern facade is symmetrical and resembles the Petit Trianon. In the center there is a six-column ionic loggia, a two-sided staircase leads to the front entrance. The southern garden facade is enriched by an open terrace with two rows of colonnades and bas-reliefs: mascarons of the Gorgon Medusa and heraldic compositions with griffins on the sides of the vase.

The earlier mansion of R. Sarmakesheva (1910s, Murlychev, 33/25), still carries the “echo” of Art Nouveau. Its composition includes two rectangular volumes located in parallel, one of which is angular, and the second is indented from the red line, and a deepened “lintel” perpendicular to them. The deepened part is especially rich in reliefs: the attic here is decorated with laurel wreaths and a garland, a vase with falling branches is placed in the lunette, and there is an image of a dancing girl in ancient clothes below in a rectangular niche. Made in low relief, gracefully drawn decorative motifs seem to have gained volume with vignettes from the pages of the “World of Art”.

By 1914, the influence of Art Nouveau had weakened, and Neoclassicism was increasingly gravitating towards symmetrical facade compositions and acquiring independent style features that had already been formulated by that time in metropolitan architecture. At the same time, it begins to interact with the Neo-Renaissance, which, like the Greek Revival, was actively used in the Rostov architecture of the eclectic period, and now it is in demand mainly in forms of Palladianism.

Most of the buildings of the retrospective period in Rostov are revenue houses. They are divided into occupying an angular or horizontal position. At the end of the 19th century streets are actively built up which were considered outlying. When designing, the land area is used as much as possible, the number of storeys increases and ranges from four to seven floors, facades are usually symmetrical. The urban planning role of these buildings is manifested in the peculiar expansion of height and scale from the urban center to the periphery. In artistic solutions, the influence of St. Petersburg architecture is noticeable.

Frequently, this influence affects the use of compositions developed in St. Petersburg, techniques for organizing facade plastic art and details, with a free author's interpretation of them. So, for example, the facade of the Russian-Asian Bank building (1910^s, architect A. Kh. Zakiev, B. Sadovaya, 88) reveals a certain similarity with the already mentioned building of the Azov-Don Bank in St. Petersburg, built by F.I. Lidval. Sometimes the impact of St. Petersburg architecture takes the form of almost direct copying. The Sariev's four-story revenue house (1915, architect A.F. Niedermeyer, B. Sadovaya, 94) has a facade with a clearly defined framework structure reminiscent of rational Art Nouveau. The facade stands out as uncharacteristic for Rostov cladding with natural chocolate-hued granite and is generally perceived as a smaller copy of the facade of the St. Petersburg bank building “I.V. Juncker and K” (1910–1911, architect A.E. Erichson and Wilhelm Van der Gucht).

The five-story revenue house of the Dutikov brothers (1913, architect L.F. Eberg, Budennovsky 3/3) is reminiscent of two prototypes at once: the St. Petersburg trading house of F.L. Mertens on Nevsky Avenue, erected by M.S. Lyalevich (1911), where huge stained-glass arched windows and narrow partition walls between them clearly reveal the reinforced concrete frame of the building, and the Palazzo del Capitano in Vicenza A. Palladio, which served as an inspiration for him. The latter does not allow to doubt the Palladian style of the Dutikov house. The main difference from the St. Petersburg prototype is the lack of cladding with natural stone. The number of sculptures is also somewhat reduced.

This does not mean the absence of regional originality in the architecture of Rostov during the period of Retrospectivism. In addition to the already noted appeal to the Greek Revival, one should point out such sadly lost details as balconies-terraces on Doric columns, complementing the main facades. These were possessed, in particular, by the buildings of the “Soleil” electrobiograph (radically rebuilt) and the City Revenue House (1914, architect I.E. Cherkessian) located in B. Sadovaya, 70 and 33, respectively.

The motif of the rounded corner, emphasized in semi-columns, is also present in the revenue house building of the mayor's office in B. Sadovaya, 105 (1914, architect G.N. Vasiliev). The building is five-story with a smoothly rounded corner part. The second and fourth floors are united by giant half-columns of the Ionic order. The vertical rhythm is supported by semicircular bay-windows and pilaster sides completed with attics and gables, the central ones with thermal windows. The sculptural decoration includes lion mascarons vases, laurel garlands, a female mascaron surrounded by torches.

In the building of the “Palace Hotel” (1914–1915, architect A.Kh. Zakiev, A.V. Poznyakov, significantly rebuilt; Budennovsky, 43) the corner tower, supplemented by sculptures, received a faceted shape, but it is crowned by its rotunda with a gently sloping dome. Another building of Zakiev also has a faceted corner part, this is a five-story revenue house of M.V. Shirman (1911; Voroshilovsky, 20). The corner was fixed by a sculptural group (now lost) that enriched the silhouette of the building.

A significant contribution to the Rostov historical center's appearance of the pre-revolutionary period was made by the already mentioned architect L.F. Eberg. Revenue houses built according to his designs are distinguished by a large

number of storeys, the allocation of a powerful basement and sometimes attic, the use of bay-windows and a giant order. The largest remaining building of Eberg's work is the five-story revenue house of V.K. and S.K. Chirikovs (Budennovsky, 44–46/55), solved in the spirit of Neo-Renaissance. The plastic art of the main facade is determined by bay-windows, the central of them are united by a massive arch, above which there is an arcade mezzanine, which originally included a conservatory. The west between the bay-windows is decorated with two giant columns of a composite order, reminiscent of the Palladio buildings. The side bay-windows in the same level are cut through by triple arched windows, and the central ones by Florentine double windows characteristic of Early Renaissance, united by an archivolt. The seven-story, tallest of that time house in Rostov, the house of B.E. Khudodovsky and E.L. Retsker (1916), has not been preserved. Its facades were diversified by half-rotunds, rectangular bay-windows and giant Corinthian half-columns, which also had Palladian prototypes: the loggia del Capitano and the palazzo Valmarana in Vicenza. Another work of Eberg is the five-story revenue house of T.K. Gershkovich (1913, B. Sadovaya, 160/67). The originality of its figurative solution is reported by the pillars of rustications at the corners of bay-windows and facades, together with the contrast of red and white bricks reminiscent of the techniques of Early French Baroque of Louis XIII.

B.M. Kirikov revealed among the monuments of St. Petersburg examples of three modifications of Neoclassicism. "The retrospective version tended to recreate the integral system of the traditional style, to historical authority and even the illusion of antiquity... The modernized version was distinguished by free pointed stylization, which sometimes bordered on grotesque deformation... The eclectic version allowed for discretionary disjuncture of an integral system of relationships and cohesion of elements in any compositional-style context" [p. 375]. Based on this classification, within the framework of the Rostov Retrospectivism it is possible to distinguish buildings created on the basis of two different methods of heritage development, which we conventionally designate as contextual and conceptual. Contextual (on the basis of which buildings of the "retrospective" version are created) refers to a specific historical and architectural context, whether it is a certain recognizable monument, a circle of monuments or a period (Late Classicism, Early Renaissance, etc., as in the building of the State Bank or Paramonov mansion). At the same time, compositions, characteristic of prototypes, are often used, the interpretation of order forms and sculpture is close to traditional. The conceptual (underlying buildings of the "modernized" version) operates with motifs freed from historical context, referring to the eras of Antiquity, Classicism or Renaissance as a whole, to their generalized idea, a holistic concept, as in the buildings of the Commercial Club or the City School. The motifs drawn from the heritage are organized into compositions that have no analogues in the past that reveal the modern purpose of buildings, the order is hyperbolized, the sculpture acquires a connotation of Art Nouveau style. Among the considered monuments, representatives of the application of the second method dominate.

Discussion and conclusion. Retrospectivism in the architecture of Rostov-on-Don was formed with a slight delay compared to St. Petersburg, but the heyday of the direction chronologically almost coincides with a similar process in the capital. The leading style direction within Retrospectivism is Neoclassicism, Neo-Renaissance is inferior to it in the number of monuments. Organic inclusion of Neoclassicism in the architectural fabric of Rostov-on-Don was facilitated by the presence of buildings in the style of Classicism, classicizing Eclecticism and Art Nouveau. The significant influence of the St. Petersburg school, firstly, is due to the fact that most Rostov architects received professional education in the capital; secondly, the fact that St. Petersburg architects designed a number of objects for Rostov; thirdly, the participation of St. Petersburg architects in project competitions for Rostov buildings. The prototypes for the creation of architectural and artistic solutions to the facades were monuments of antiquity (Parthenon, Erechtheum, the ensemble of the center of Palmyra), Late Renaissance (the work of Palladio), Early and especially Late Classicism (works by M.F. Kazakov, K.I. Rossi). In the transformation of heritage, two methods were used: contextual, referring to a certain circle of monuments or period, using compositions characteristic of prototypes, and conceptual, referring to the era as a whole, using compositions that have no analogues in the past; the second dominates in the number of monuments. Regional features of the Rostov Retrospectivism include the active use of the Greek Revival motifs and balconies-terraces on Doric columns characteristic of the southern region.

References

1. Esaulov G.V. *Arkhitektura Yuga Rossii: ot istorii k sovremennosti* = *Architecture of the South of Russia: from history to the present*. Moscow: ArkhitekturaS; 2016. 568 p. (In Russ.).
2. Voloshinova L.F., Tokarev A.G. L.F. Eberg – vedushchiy arkhitekt Rostova pervoy poloviny KHKH veka = L.F. Eberg is the leading architect of Rostov in the first half of the 20th century. *Donskoy chronicle*. 2001;10:77–80. Available from: http://donvrem.dspl.ru/Files/article/m19/2/art.aspx?art_id=375 (Accessed 8 October 2023) (In Russ.).
3. Kirichenko E.I. *Russkaya arkhitektura 1830–1910-kh gg* = *Russian architecture of the 1830–1910th*. Moscow: Iskusstvo; 1978. 399 p. (In Russ.).

4. Punin AL. *Neoklassicheskoye napravleniye v arkhitekture Peterburga nachala XX veka = Neoclassical trend in the architecture of St. Petersburg at the beginning of the 20th century*. In: Architecture. Reports of XXI scientific conference. Leningrad: LISI Publishing House; 1963. p. 22–26 (In Russ.).
5. Volkov VI, Goryunov VS, Zavarikhin SP, Kondratieva LN. Neoklassitsizm i neoromantizm: yedinstvo protivopozhnostey v arkhitekture epokhi moderna = Neoclassicism and Neo-Romanticism: the unity of opposites in architecture of Art Nouveau. *Bulletin of civil engineers*. 2016;6(59):19–23 (In Russ.).
6. Borisova EA, Kazhdan TP. *Russkaya arkhitektura kontsa XIX – nachala XX veka = Russian architecture of the late 19th – early 20th centuries*. Moscow: Nauka; 1971. 237 p. (In Russ.).
7. Borisova EA, Sternin GYu. *Russkiy neoklassitsizm = Russian neoclassicism*. Moscow: Galart; 1998. 80 p. (In Russ.).
8. Kirikov BM. *Arkitektura Peterburga kontsa XIX – nachala XX veka Eklektika. Modern. Neoklassitsizm = Architecture of St. Petersburg in the late 19th – early 20th century. Eclecticism. Art Nouveau. Neoclassicism*. St. Petersburg: Kolo; 2006. 447 p. (In Russ.).
9. Konkursnyye proyekty zdaniya kommercheskogo kluba v g. Rostove-na-Donu = Competitive projects of the Commercial Club building in Rostov-on-Don. *Zodchiy*. 1907; Tables: 14–18 (In Russ.).
10. Konkursnyye proyekty Narodnogo doma v Rostove na Donu v pamyat 50-letiya osvobozhdeniya krestyan = Competitive projects of the People's House in Rostov-on-Don in memory of the 50th anniversary of the liberation of peasants. *Zodchiy*. 1914; Tables: 14–15 (In Russ.).

About the Author:

Kishkinova Evgenia Mikhailovna, Cand. Sci. (Art History), Professor, Don State Technical University (1, Gagarin Sq., Rostov-on-Don, 344000, RF), KEM0022@yandex.ru

Received 16.08.2023

Revised 15.09.2023

Accepted 20.09.2023

Conflict of interest statement

The author does not have any conflict of interest.

The author has read and approved the final manuscript.

Об авторе:

Кишкинова Евгения Михайловна, кандидат искусствоведения, профессор, Донской государственный технический университет (344003, РФ, г. Ростов-на-Дону, пл. Гагарина, 1), KEM0022@yandex.ru

Поступила в редакцию 16.08.2023

Поступила после рецензирования 15.09.2023

Принята к публикации 20.09.2023

Конфликт интересов

Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов

Автор прочитал и одобрил окончательный вариант рукописи.