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Introduction

James Butterwick

To find a cache of forty seven high quality works on paper by any Soviet avant-garde artist of the 1920s must be considered a stroke of good fortune. However, to find work by an artist with the reputation and international standing of Yakov Chernikhov must be classed as a minor miracle. To give an idea of context, *Yakov Chernikhov 1889-1951: The Soviet Piranesi* is the first personal exhibition by any Russian avant-garde artist in London for well over fifteen years.

Whilst Yakov Chernikhov (1889-1951) is, first and foremost, an architect, he is also a theoretician and the majority of this exhibition, nineteen works, come from the *Aristografiya* series, showing this more theoretical side. Chernikhov had his own system of teaching which he described as *Eksprimatika* (‘the best form of graphic expression’) and consisted of working out the new principles of drawing based on symmetry, the rhythm and relationship between component parts, constructions and colours. These vignettes, icons for their time, highlight a brief period of artistic flowering in Soviet Russia before the onset of repression.

In the 1920s Chernikhov organised his own Research and Experimental Laboratory of Architectural Forms and methods of Graphic Art where he sought to teach a “lighter method of the teaching of drawing and its laws”. The aim of this was not just to teach students the art of drawing but to strengthen their independence of thought, a concept that ran contrary to Soviet discipline and led to problems for the artist.

It is this independence of thought that marked out the Russian avant-garde as a movement unique for its time. Chernikhov, the ‘architect-composer’ believed that art could free the most limited of minds – we hope that this exhibition provides a reminder of the glory of Russian art in the early years of the twentieth century and that visitors appreciate the breadth of talent of Yakov Chernikhov.
Yakov Chernikov at the biological laboratory in the institute of the Red Army, Leningrad, 1924
I immersed myself in the most secret regions of invention and imagination, and discovered unknown treasures of images never seen.\textsuperscript{1}

- Yakov Chernikhov
Yakov Chernikhov (1889-1951), one of the greatest formal innovators of the Russian avant-garde, epitomizes the many different societal roles of an architect with his visionary architectural drawings, prolific writing on architectural design theory and teaching.

In the 1920s and 30s, Chernikhov designed about fifty public and industrial projects across the USSR. A talented graphic artist, who created numerous drawings of utopian architecture, he published six books between 1927 and 1933, which he illustrated himself, systematizing the rules of geometrical drawings and developing his own teaching program.

As Chernikhov stated, he was trying “to establish the clear and precise basis for constructive concepts and principles, and to elucidate their essence, their logic, their rules and their laws.” Visual material published in Chernikhov’s books as well as his architectural drawings are unique in their aesthetic diversity and formal inventiveness. Many decades after his death, Chernikhov is now recognized as one of the major Russian writers of architectural design theory of the period, despite his often being severely criticized in the Soviet Press.

As Andrei Chernikhov, his grandson and himself a noted architect pointed out, on the one hand Yakov Chernikhov’s achievement was a cosmopolitan one but on the other, he was inherently a phenomenon of post-revolutionary Russia. This essay will place the work of Chernikhov within the broader context of the political and cultural conditions of Soviet Russia of the 1920s-30s. It will also situate him within the movement of Constructivism - one of the most influential avant-garde developments in the new Soviet State.

What is remarkable about the creative career of Yakov Chernikhov is that his work maintained the experimental nature of avant-garde art within the context of strictly traditional architecture. Chernikhov was one of the very few professional architects in those years who openly declared that innovation was not a, “bonfire of the old culture.” Chernikhov rejected the Constructivist assertion that, “the artistic heritage of the past is unacceptable.” As the Constructivist architect Aleksei Gan (1893-1942) stated in his 1922 book Constructivism: “Without art, but by means of intellectual-material production, the constructivist joins the proletarian order in the struggle with the past and the conquest of the future.”
Chernikhov had all the benefits of a solid educational background with an artistic development deeply rooted in the Symbolist movement. Chernikhov received his first art lessons from M.I. Sapozhnikov in the school of the city of Pavlograd, Ekaterinoslav Province in Ukraine. Sapozhnikov painted symbolist works and was a devotee of the Swiss Symbolist painter Arnold Böcklin (1827-1901), whose pictures portray mythological, fantastical figures along with classical architecture. Later in his career, in his *Architectural Fantasies* of the 1930s, Chernikhov established himself as an accomplished “artist-architect,” and symbolist motifs can be found in his various graphic series, including his fantasies on historical themes.

In 1907, Chernikhov entered the Odessa School of Art, one of the best in the Russian Empire. Among his teachers were two important, realist artists of the South-Russian School, Kiriak Kostandi (1852-1921) and Gennadii Ladyzhensky (1853-1916). In 1890, both became founding members of the Association of South Russian Artists. Excelling in realist landscapes, portraits, and genre scenes, they taught their students, including Chernikhov, to paint in a representational manner, studying strict directives of composition and experimentation with painting techniques. In 1914, Chernikhov moved to Petrograd and continued his studies at the Painting Department of the Petrograd Academy of Art whilst, at the same time, enrolling in the Pedagogical Institute. In 1916, Chernikhov transferred from the Academy’s Painting to Architecture Department and from 1916 to 1926, he successfully combined military service with teaching calligraphy and technical drawing in various schools in the Petrograd area.

In 1922, Chernikhov resumed his formal art education by entering the Architecture Department at the Petrograd VKhUTEMAS (The Higher State Artistic-Technical Workshops), as the Petrograd Academy of Arts was re-named. While at VKhUTEMAS, Chernikhov studied with Professor Leontii Benua (1856-1928), one of the major architects...
In post-Revolutionary years, many radical ideas on architectural design were related to an already thriving modernist movement in the visual arts. Although in the 1920s Chernikhov declared himself neither a Constructivist nor a Suprematist, it was undoubtedly Kazimir Malevich’s experiments with non-objective forms that provided Chernikhov with a new visual language. Malevich considered aspects of utilitarianism irrelevant to the aims of his non-objective movement of Suprematism. As Gan has pointed out, although Malevich’s works “…do not have that concrete social utility, without which contemporary architecture is not architecture at all - they have very great importance as abstract investigations of new form.” In his architectural drawings Chernikhov shared with Malevich a desire to find a new language of form and took from him a concept of non-objectivity, based on the complete liberation from subject-matter. In 1927, Chernikhov published his first book, *Iskusstvo nachertaniia (The Art of Graphic Representation)*, a revolution in the academic school of architectural drawing in which he stated that the Suprematist approach was essential to his work. By this, the artist noted, he understands that, “the pursuit of equilibrium
between subsections of the representation as a whole, and between interconnecting lines, planes and volumes as abstract elements. Chernikhov wrote: “With the help of so-called non-objective elements we have the possibility to create a series of the most fantastic formal constructions which are not initially constrained by any direct practical application.”

Chernikhov’s gouaches for the two unpublished volumes Eksprimatika and Aristografiya, his drawings for Fundamentals of Modern Architecture, as well as his series of drawings for The Construction of Architectural and Machine Forms - all clearly exemplify the artist’s debt to Suprematism.

In the early years of the twentieth century, experimental Russian artists embraced a spirit of rebellion against old, longstanding values and authorities. Architectural developments in the post-revolutionary era also took place against a background of the general destruction of historical monuments and its traditional environment. According to the Communist, utopian ideal, the environment of everyday life had to be radically changed; a complete break with the past was held to be imperative.

In 1921, the debates between the adherents of “construction” and “composition” were to be a watershed in the development of Russian avant-garde architecture, as the two camps that formed contained the embryos of the Constructivist and Rationalist groups. The major points of debate between the Rationalists, or “formalists,” and the Constructivists, lay in the importance assigned to aesthetic theory as opposed to a functionalism derived from technology and materials. The new notion of “construction” differed as an aesthetic principle from the old-established notion of “composition” that was dominant in classical training. “Construction,” many avant-garde artists and architects believed, critically embodied the spirit and philosophical essence of the age. In March 1921, some artists who were convinced of the special role of the new principle of “construction,” centered around Alexander Rodchenko (1891-1956) and Gan, who formed the First Working Group of Constructivists. These artists declared “Death to Art” which they castigated as “a bourgeois phenomenon.” They were in favor of only that type of art that functioned to advance social objectives, proposing the concept of the “artist-engineer,” a functional approach to design, prefabricated housing, efficient building methods, new materials, and industrial production. Constructivism’s main premise was “scientific communism based on the theory of historical materialism.”

Those architects who still believed in the primacy of the “composition,” and sought to develop the psychological and perceptual direction established by Kandinsky’s initial
works from the series, *Aristografiya* (pp. 82 & 94)

works from the series, *Fundamentals of Modern Architecture* (pp. 40 & 44)
program at INKhUK (The Institute of Artistic Culture)\textsuperscript{22}, were to become the architectural Rationalists, led by Nikolai Ladovsky (1881-1941) and his colleague Vladimir Krinsky (1890-1971). In 1923, they created the Association of New Architects, or ASNOVA, to propagate this Rationalist approach. The work of ASNOVA was based on ideas about the psychology of perception, in particular the impact and reading of form. As Ladovsky wrote in March 1921: “The task of our group is to work in the direction of elucidating the theory of architecture.”\textsuperscript{23} Members of ASNOVA participated actively in architectural competitions and focused largely on aesthetic principles of architectural shapes. In terms of actual construction, the ASNOVA group produced little. Many Constructivist ideologues considered the ASNOVA approach excessively abstract and maintained that the work of the architect must not be separated from the utilitarian demands of technology. Constructivists stated that their work was different from both idealistic symbolism and the abstract formalism of ASNOVA.

Chernikho\v{v}, like the Constructivist artists - members of OSA\textsuperscript{24} (The Union of Contemporary Architects), was convinced that the new architecture “can, and must, take into consideration all the concrete needs of contemporary life and must answer in full the needs of the mass consumer, the collective ‘customer’ - the people.”\textsuperscript{25} Yet, paradoxically, Chernikho\v{v}’s emphasis in his various texts on individuality and self-expression placed him at odds with the Constructivist movement where individualism was rejected and every person had to become a standardized unit within the social structure.

Even though the work of Chernikho\v{v} constitutes an important part of Constructivism, he did not formally belong to any of the Constructivist groups of the period and was not a contributor to the prominent Constructivist journal LEF (Left Front of the Arts; 1923-25). Viewed as a loner, Chernikho\v{v} was not involved with many of the larger concerns of the Constructivists. As Cook pointed out,
Chernikhov’s work complemented that of the Constructivists, “by analyzing with particular rigour the ‘constructive’ formal language which characterizes the machine, and explores its implications for spatial organization in architecture.”

Art critic Erik Gollerbach argued that Chernikhov was, in a certain sense, considered “leftist” in architecture, yet he had mastered those preparatory fundamentals which were lacking amongst the artists of the “left front” who were generally viewed as inferior in their attempts at engineering. Chernikhov’s architectural philosophy can be seen as a synthesis of various influences, including his training, his pedagogical work, and the impact of different architectural movements of the period.

Similar to the Constructivist architects, Chernikhov emphasized the notion of construction, but unlike the Constructivists, he also advocated the notion of “composition.” When Chernikhov speaks of “konstruktsia” (“construction”) and Constructivism, he is considering only a question of formal assembly and transformation. As he noted: “To execute a construction we have at our disposal either very simple objects such as line, plane, surface, volume - or more complex objects that can be utilized for the aims of construction. But in order to reduce the indicated elements to a state of constructive interconnection, certain motives are required.”

Identifying the basic laws of construction, Chernikhov stated: “A construction is a construction only when the unification of its elements can be rationally justified.”

Defining the concept of Constructivism, Chernikhov said that it can be any compact combination and articulation of differing objects that can be united as a whole.

As postulated by Gollerbach, Chernikhov’s *The Construction of Architectural and Machine Forms* was not a “narrowly specialist technical investigation but an investigation of theoretical principles which touch upon certain problems of the philosophy of art.” The critic also pointed out that Chernikhov’s merit lies in the fact that he has brought the “technological” forms of architecture and mechanical engineering into the graphic field. A special place in Chernikhov’s oeuvre belonged to the machine, which he saw as the embodiment of constructive principles in their purest form. Moisei Ginzburg (1892-1946), a co-founder and chief theoretician of OSA, in his 1924 book *Stil’ i epokha (Style*
and Epoch), also saw the machine as a model for generating the spatial organizations of new building types. However, as Gollerbakh has remarked, it was Chernikhov who showed the possibilities of a very special kind of architecture - machine architecture, in all their full potential as art. Chernikhov wrote: “In former times machinery was considered something profoundly inartistic, and mechanical forms were excluded from the province of beauty as such... But now we know and see, thanks to the development of the constructivist world outlook, that machinery not only lies within the confines of artistic conception but also has its own indisputable and convincing aesthetic norms and canons....A new conception of the beautiful, a new beauty, is being born - the aesthetics of industrial constructivism.”

Teaching remained Chernikhov’s main activity throughout his life. He believed that the best way to teach architectural design was through producing a large series of graphic illustrations, developed at the Moscow VKhUTEMAS (Higher Artistic Technical Workshops) in the previous decade. Soviet modernists created this state-sponsored school in 1920 in order to realize their dreams and to train highly qualified master artists for industry. Ladovsky and Krinsky were particularly influential in the Foundation or “Basic” course at VKhUTEMAS, teaching all students the fundamentals of formal composition, rhythm and expressiveness of form. Some of Chernikhov’s contemporary critics compared his method with the “psycho-analytic” method as developed by Ladovsky and his colleagues in the field of architecture at VKhUTEMAS. Ladovsky’s method was focused on two main aspects: the role of architectural volume in space, and the problem of perception of architectural volume by the viewer.

Ladovsky stated that although his method “...cannot create artists... it can give them all a solid starting point, from which they can achieve the aims to which they aspire by the
most scientifically correct means.” Chernikhov categorically asserted that Ladovsky’s theory did not influence him because, as he stated, none of Ladovsky’s investigations were published at that time and remained unknown to him. 

By the early 1930s, the avant-garde artists and architects, who initially supported the Bolsheviks and the Soviet regime en masse, were losing their influence in Soviet society. In 1929, Evgenii Katsman, a founding member and Secretary of AKhRR (Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia), which revitalized Realism, was convinced that the “art of the Revolution is first and foremost an ideological art.” He wrote that “everything coming from VKhUTEIN [Higher Artistic Technical Institute] is ninety percent harmful,” and called its professors “aesthetes and apolitical people in conflict with the Revolution.”

In 1929, Vopra (All Union Association of Proletarian Architects) was founded. It proclaimed the creation of a new “proletarian” architecture based on mechanization and standardization, “class-committed in form and content.” Vopra was used by the Soviet state against all free-minded modernist architects. Its members criticized and rejected Constructivists and their work.

In 1930, the Moscow VKhUTEMAS, by now renamed VKhUTEIN (1927-30), was closed down. This signified the ousting of the innovative experiments of the progressive art school from Soviet pedagogy. By the early 1930s, any artist or architect experimenting with modernist styles was accused of being a “formalist,” which by then became a serious accusation, since “formalism” was now clearly identified with bourgeois ideology and “decadence.” A. Mikhailov, the critic and theorist of emergent Socialist Realism, in his 1932 book Izoiskusstvo rekonstruktivnogo perioda (Visual Arts in the Period of Reconstruction) pointed out that if in 1928 a questionnaire addressed to Soviet artists revealed that most of them did not accept the idea of “proletarian art,” then now (1931) “no one denies its rapid development.” The critic called for “the further development of the struggle against bourgeois ideology.” During the 1930s, Chernikhov was constantly criticized for being a “formalist” and for insufficient attention to the social and ideological role of architecture.

As most of Chernikhov’s biographers have pointed out, he was not interested in politics. Mikhailov wrote in the early 1930s that Chernikhov lacked attention to architecture’s social role and showed no connections between
his teaching and real practice. Beyond some apparent similarities of Chernikhov’s work with that of the Constructivists, there were some significant differences. As Mikhailov noted, to consider Chernikhov as a Constructivist “would be unjust to the Constructivists.” In order to be published and be able to work, however, Chernikhov tried to relate his work to the Soviet ideology and to adopt to the architect’s new role as a supporter of the Communist Party. He started including in some of his drawings such slogans as “Proletarians of the world unite!” or “Down with the petty bourgeoisie.”

Some of Chernikhov’s architectural drawings provided an outlet for his creative ideas during times of extreme economic poverty when high quality materials for construction were hardly available in the new Soviet state. His Architectural Fantasies of the 1930s envisioned the utopia of an industrialized future, and, at the same time, reflected the creative thought process of the architect.

Science fiction, folk tales, and myths always played an important role in the formation of Chernikhov’s creative thinking. He collected known classics of fantastic literature from all over the world, including the myths of ancient Greece, Russian folk tales, and books by Jules Verne. His plea for the retention of inspiration and fantasy manifested itself in his 1933 book Arkhitektur’ye fantazii (Architectural Fantasies), in which the word constructivism was already absent. Presented as the sketchbook of an architect, the book was intended for sale abroad, and was published in three languages - German, French, and English in a large edition of 8,000. This was a continuation of Chernikhov’s ideas that were developed in his earlier treatise Fundamentals of Modern Architecture.

Chernikhov always stressed the importance of fantasy in the work of an architect, pointing out that any architectural work always starts from fantasizing about a particular building type. According to Chernikhov, the lines and planes could present “ideas, dreams, and fantasies”
and could conjure up “that which never before existed and is newly born in the consciousness of the creator.” Chernikhov argued that the capacity to fantasize and to create fictional forms through two-dimensional depictions is the most important basis of the new architecture. He wrote: “The foundation for the creation of my architectural fantasies was a desire to present through various graphic and compositional means all those representations that can arise in the head of the architect.” According to Chernikhov, “Architectural fantasies show new approaches to composition, new methods of portraying, they bring up a sense of form and color, train imagination, stimulate creative impulses, entail new creations and ideas, and help to find a solution to new ideas.”

Chernikhov’s large cycle of drawings of the 1930s comprised numerous unpublished volumes, including *Industrial Tales* and *The Architecture of Industrial Buildings*. Ranging from industrial buildings to entire town-planning structures and architectural compositions of a completely abstract character, Chernikhov’s *Architectural Fantasies* depart from the strictly geometric quality that exemplified his earlier works with links to Suprematism. As is typical of many Chernikhov’s works, the border between the non-objective elements and the depiction of real structures has been blurred. In his *Architectural Fantasies*, Chernikhov appears as a true eclectic, having an impressive capacity to synthesize a disparate array of sources and ideas into a fresh and coherent construct. He created a variety of spatially complex and colorful compositions from a combination of curved structures and rectangular planes, imagining different forms in all their possible inter-relations. Some of his drawings recall the visionary work of Etienne-Louis Boullée (1728-99) and Giovanni Battista Piranesi (1720-78), whilst others are reminiscent of various formal elements of compositions found in the work of the German Expressionist architect Erich Mendelson (1887-1953) and the Italian Futurist architect Antonio Sant’Elia (1888-1916). A group of highly imaginative drawings by Sant’Elia for cities of the future called Città

The Krasny Gvozdilshchik (Red Nailmaker Factory) at 25 Liniya St., St. Petersburg is one of few realised projects by Yakov Chernikhov. Built between 1929-31, this impressive and lasting design (originally for a water tower and rope production facility) was studied in person by Zaha Hadid during her stay in the city.
Nuova ("New City"), made between 1912-14 and Chernikhov’s compositions from Architectural Fantasies, have some similar characteristics, such as emphasis on construction, dynamism, and contrast. In the architectural drawings of both Sant’Elia and Chernikhov, the architectural images are shown without any surrounding context, landscape, or human figures.

In 1936 Chernikhov moved to Moscow, where he was appointed Professor in the Department of Industrial Architecture and headed the Department of Descriptive Geometry and Graphics at the Economics and Engineering Institute. In 1945, he was named Head of the Department of Architecture at the Mossoviet Institute of Construction. At the same time, from 1935 until his death in 1951, Chernikhov continued working on his numerous series of drawings. Two series, which were entitled Palaces of Communism (1934-41) and Pantheons of the Great Patriotic War (1942-45), responded to the doctrine of developing Socialist Realism. However, instead of adhering to Soviet stylistic imagery, these series conveyed the same quality of fantasticality as his earlier series of 101 Architectural Fantasies or Industrial Tales. No wonder that Chernikhov’s work was again denounced in Soviet official press as merely fantastical and “formalistic.”

It is only more than half a century since his death that we can fully appreciate Chernikhov’s uniqueness. Although he neither created his own artistic school nor developed his own architectural style, Chernikhov had a special talent of masterfully combining into one powerful composition many architectural styles and movements including Suprematism, Constructivism, and Symbolic Romanticism. As a basis for his architectural drawings Chernikhov appropriated the entire range of forms and concepts of the architectural avant-garde as it developed in the second part of the 1920s in both Soviet Russia and the West. He did not mind stylistic diversity or innovative architectural trends, taking from each of them its specific concept, its component, and adding to it his own variations of graphic representations.

A man of exceptionally profound and wide-ranging talents, Chernikhov occupies a very important place in the history of both Soviet avant-garde architecture and graphic art.
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40 The primary aim of the members of AKhRR (Association of Artists of Revolutionary Russia) was “to present Revolutionary Russia in a realistic manner by depicting the everyday life of the proletariat, the peasantry, and the Red Army.” See Russian Art of the Avant-Garde: Theory and Criticism, John E. Bowlt, Editor and translator (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1988), 265-272.

41 See Alexei Mikhailov, Groupirovki sovetskoi arkhitektury (Moscow/Leningrad: OGIZ-Izogiz, 1932).

42 Alexei Mikhailov, Iziskusstvo rekonstruktivnogo perioda (Moscow/Leningrad: OGIZ-Izogiz, 1932), 47.

43 Ibid, 4.

44 See, for example, R. Ia. Khiger, “Chernikhov - Osnovy sovremennoi arkhitektury,” in SA, no. 3 (1930).

45 A. Mikhailov, “O khlestakovcchine i burzhuaznom vrediteleste na arkhitekturnom fronte,” in Sovetskiaia Arkhitektura, nos. 5-6, 27, 29 (1930)


47 While Chernikhov’s 1933 book Architectural Fantasies was published in a large edition of 8,000, his earlier book Fundamentals of Modern Architecture, first published in 1929, had an edition of only 1500. But this latter book was soon sold out, and a second edition was published.


49 Yakov Chernikhov, Arkhitekturyne fantazii (Moscow, 1933), 20-21.

50 Ibid.

51 Erich Mendelson became one of the first foreign architects to receive a significant Soviet commission. In connection with his commission to design the building for Red Banner textile factory in Leningrad, Mendelson visited the Soviet Union in the Fall of 1925 and returned twice in 1926. Mendelson’s Red Banner factory was broadly advertised by photo during that period.

Chernikhov’s industrial vignettes are of two types and form a bridge between the main series of large *Architectural Fantasies* and the small *Historical Landscapes*.

Drawn with unerring precision, these tales, literally ‘fairy tales’, were never published in Chernikhov’s lifetime, are frequently small in size and yet resemble vast, futuristic film sets. It is these works that most resemble those of Piranesi.

According to the certificates provided by the artist’s grandson these works were completed in the 1920s, but further evidence suggests a concrete date of 1933. This cycle of work allowed the artist to continue architectural speculation and exploration.

Attracted to the concept of geometrical ornament, these small, fantastic jewels, redolent of Filonov in easel painting and Piranesi in architectural drawing, are among the crowning achievements of Chernikhov’s art.
Industrial Tales

late 1920s

gouache and ink on paper

sheet size 10.5 x 10.5 cm (4⅛ x 4⅛ in.); image size 9.9 x 9.9 cm (3⅞ x 3⅞ in.)

Provenance

Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3594)

Exhibited

Frankfurt, Schaudepot des Deutschen Architekturmuseums, Iakov Chernikhov Architektonische Fantasien, 1989

Literature

Y. Chernikhov, Industrial Tales, 1933, p. 72 (unpublished)

Notes

This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
**Industrial Tales**

late 1920s

gouache and ink on paper

sheet size 10.5 x 10.5 cm (4⅛ x 4⅛ in.); image size 10 x 9.9cm (4 x 3⅞ in.)

**Provenance**

Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4208)

**Notes**

This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Chernikhov’s work on the *Palaces of Communism* (1934-41) and the slightly later *Pantheons to the Great Patriotic War* (1941-45) represent his response to the demands of the new official doctrine of Socialist Realism in architecture.

These were formally expounded at the First Congress of Soviet Architects in 1937 and, to all intents and purposes, saw the end of individualism in this discipline.

In Chernikhov’s unpublished writings of the 1940s, he is still insisting that the ultimate purpose of a piece of architecture must be ‘to express something’; whilst still advocating the case for exploration through fantasies. Now, however, every one of these aesthetic principles is harnessed to mainstream Socialist Realist doctrine. Thus, he insists upon the central importance of the ‘image’ which, in Socialist Realist jargon, signifies the key concept of the ‘form embodying a message’.
1942-44

gouache, crayon and ink on paper

sheet size 13.8 x 13.8 cm (5¾ x 5¾ in.); image size 13.1 x 13.1 cm (5⅛ x 5⅛ in.)

Provenance

Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3592)

Notes

This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Pantheons of the Great Patriotic War 1941-45

1943
gouache, crayon and ink on paper
sheet size 21 x 30.2 cm (8¼ x 11½ in.); image size 14.5 x 20.6 cm (5¾ x 8⅛ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3598)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Pantheons of the Great Patriotic War 1941-45

1943
gouache and ink on paper
sheet size 21 x 30.1 cm (8¼ x 11¾ in.); image size 13.7 x 20.7 cm (5½ x 8½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3599)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990

Quoted as follows, the pamphlet gives a good idea as to the thinking of Chernikhov at the time. “The development of the conception must always be based upon the manifestation of the creative particularities within each individual. It is through the personal inventiveness of the executant that any kind of architectural idea must be given form, not through blind imitation of the classics.

The power of fantasy is best developed through drawing out the creative side of each individual by means of exercises in graphics. The capacity to fantasize and create fictional forms in drawing is the first law of the new architecture.

The aim of any piece of architecture must be an expressive, visible reflection of the internal properties of the actual building involved and the impulses of its age.”
COMPOSITION ON THE THEME OF A SULPHURIC ACID FACTORY

1920s
pencil, pen, ink and watercolour on paper
23.8 x 29.6 cm (9¾ x 11¼ in.)

PROVENANCE
The artist’s grandson, Moscow
Sale: Sotheby’s London, 6 April 1989, lot 621
Private collection, UK
Sale: Christie’s London, 3 November 1999, lot 185
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4524)

EXHIBITED
Rome, Palazzo delle Esposizione, Architettura nel paese dei Soviet 1917-1933, 1982
Paris, Centre Georges Pompidou, Tchernikhov: Fantaisies architecturales, 1985, p. 142, fig. 154 (illustrated)

LITERATURE
Y. Chernikhov, Fundamentals of Modern Architecture, Leningrad, 1930, p. 58
(illustrated)
**Nonconstructive Union of Planes**

late 1920s  
Indian ink on paper  
29.9 x 24 cm (11⅜ x 9⅜ in.)

**Provenance**  
Estate of the Artist  
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4206)

**Exhibited**  

**Notes**  
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Fundamentals of Modern Architecture

mid 1920s
Indian ink on paper
23.5 x 29.6 cm (9¾ x 11¾ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4209)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
**Fundamentals of Modern Architecture**

---

**Constructive Union of Planes**

mid 1920s  
Indian ink on paper  
29.6 x 23.6 cm (11⅝ x 9¼ in.)

**Provenance**  
Estate of the Artist  
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4212)

**Exhibited**  

**Notes**  
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikho, dated 8 April 1990
**Elevators: Sustainable, Conical, Compact Mass**

mid 1920s  
Indian ink on paper  
sheet size 30.7 x 24.7 cm (12⅝ x 9¾ in.); image size 22 x 17.8 cm (8⅝ x 7 in.)

**Provenance**  
Estate of the Artist  
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4216)

**Literature**  

**Notes**  
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Complicated Bending Forms (Strength and Movement)

mid 1920s

gouache and ink on paper

30.3 x 24.1 cm (11⅞ x 9⅜ in.)

Provenance

Estate of the Artist

Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3836)

Literature

Y. Chernikhov, Fundamentals of Modern Architecture, Leningrad, 1930, p. 44, no. 87 (illustrated)

Notes

This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Fundamentals of Modern Architecture

Complicated Figures (no. 35)

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
29.6 x 24 cm (11⅝ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3840)

Literature
Y. Chernikhov, Fundamentals of Modern Architecture, Leningrad, 1930, p. 22, no. 35 (illustrated)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
The theme of the relationship between art and technology ran at the very centre of Soviet Art ideology, but Chernikov’s approach has its own particular focus. Here we find his most explicit statements about the key role of the machine as the basis for contemporary social aspiration.

Obsessed with ‘construction’ and ‘assembly’, Chernikov understands the machine as the supreme exponent and repository of the principles of ‘construction’ and it is the aggregate of these principles that he terms, ‘Constructivism’.

“One fact is established irrefutably when we study the problems of constructive research. This is, that the highest proportion of the most complex constructive principles is found in the machine, which imperiously demands the application of these principles at exceptionally high levels of concentration.”
- Yakov Chernikhov, 1930.
I-JA Synthetic Silk Factory (first variant)

late 1920s
Indian ink, ink and whitener on paper
24.5 x 29.7 cm (9⅝ x 11¾ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3596)

Exhibited

Literature
Y. Chernikhov, The Construction of Architectural and Machine Forms, Leningrad, 1931, pl. 335 (illustrated)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
The Construction of Architectural and Machine Forms

The Constructed Play of Cylindrical, Conical and Spherical Volumes Amongst Themselves that Supports the Through Thrust of Different Angles

late 1920s
Indian ink on paper
30.3 x 24.5 cm (11¾ x 9¾ in.)
numbered and initialled ‘1698 YC’ (lower left)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4219)

Literature

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
The Construction of Architectural and Machine Forms

The Constructed Play of Cylindrical Forms Amongst Themselves

late 1920s
Indian ink on paper
30.1 x 25.5 cm (11¾ x 10 in.)
numbered and initialled ‘1693 YC’ (lower left)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4203)

Literature

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
**The Construction of Architectural and Machine Forms**

---

**The Constructed Play of Cylindrical, Conical and Spherical Volumes Amongst Themselves that Supports the Through Thrust of Different Angles**

late 1920s  
Indian ink on paper  
26.7 x 31.8 cm (10½ x 12½ in.)

**Provenance**  
The artist’s grandson, Moscow  
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7022)

**Literature**  

**Notes**  
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Composition with Dynamic Features and a Complicated Curving Body

late 1920s
Indian ink on paper
29.7 x 24.2 cm (11¾ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7080)

Literature

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
**Demonstration of the Scope of a Cylindrical, Curved Form by Insertion of a Cylindrical Rod**

mid 1920s  
Indian ink on paper  
29.9 x 23.9 cm (11 ¾ x 9 ½ in.)

**Provenance**  
Estate of the Artist  
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7084)

**Literature**  
These extraordinary gouaches are Chernikhov’s answer to Suprematism. The artist knew Malevich personally, but saw non-objectivism only as a possible base for graphic and spatial modelling. Chernikhov uses supematist structures as a means to convey colour.

For Chernikhov, Suprematism was more an intellectual and cerebral art form than an artistic one. ‘However numerous’, he wrote, ‘even infinite may be the possible combinations accessible to Suprematism – the circle, rectangle, square, straight line – in essence, they repeat each other. Suprematism is not capable of producing melody’.

Therefore, the Aristografiya (he devised the term from the Greek root aristo – the very best – to signify ‘the art of creating the beautiful graphic image’) series shows how the artist has absorbed Suprematism, but Chernikhov’s handling of form and colour (he termed this Supematika) is very different. To Chernikhov, the five vital elements are the handling of line, plane, surface, volume and space.
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
28.5 x 23.9 cm (11¼ x 9¾ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3833)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikho, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30 x 24.3 cm (11¾ x 9⅝ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3835)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
29.9 x 23.8 cm (11⅜ x 9⅜ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3837)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
29.9 x 24.1 cm (11¾ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3839)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
28.5 x 24 cm (11¾ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3842)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
28.5 x 24 cm (11¼ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3843)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
sheet size 30 x 24.2 cm (11¾ x 9½ in.); image size 15 x 15 cm (5⅞ x 5⅞ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3849)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.4 x 24.2 cm (12 x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3850)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikho, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

1927
gouache and ink on paper
30.4 x 24.1 cm (12 x 9½ in.)
signed ‘Ya. Chernikhov’ (lower right)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4211)

Exhibited
New York, Ross Architectural Gallery, Iakov Chernikhov: The Logic of Fantasy, 1990-91, p. 10 (illustrated)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.9 x 24.8 cm (12⅞ x 9¾ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4217)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
 gouache and ink on paper
 28.5 x 24 cm (11¼ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4220)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.1 x 23.8 cm (11⅞ x 9⅜ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4499)

Exhibited
Frankfurt, Schaudepot des Deutschen Architekturmuseums, Iakov Chernikhov
Architekttonische Fantasien, 1989

Literature
A. Chernikhov & C. Cooke, “Iakov Chernikhov Architektonische Fantasien”,

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s
grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s

gouache and ink on paper

29.9 x 23.5 cm (11¾ x 9¼ in.)

Provenance

Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4500)

Notes

This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
 gouache and ink on paper
 30 x 23.7 cm (11¾ x 9¾ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4501)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikho, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
28.5 x 24 cm (11¼ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF6001)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30 x 24.2 cm (11¾ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7077)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.3 x 24.2 cm (11⅞ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7078)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
29.8 x 23.5 cm (11¾ x 9¼ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7081)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikho, dated 8 April 1990
Aristografiya

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.3 x 24.3 cm (11⅞ x 9⅝ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7175)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
The Course of Dimensional Art series can be seen as an extension of the planar studies of Aristografiya; it is within this series that Chernikhov expands upon the categories of volume and space.

The addition of these elements to previously flat geometric drawings created a dimensional aspect, which aided Chernikhov in his exploration and progression from Suprematist ideals to more concrete studies in The Construction of Architectural and Machine Forms, published in 1931.

Chernikhov explains, “By construction we understand a combination of surfaces and volumes in which one part of the body or surface is rationally, compactly and coherently fitted to another. First, we set up exercises in the ‘constructive solution of planes on a plane,’ and then in the ‘construction solution of planes in space.’ Having studied the construction of planar solutions, we move on as appropriate to study construction with volume … We study how to think spatially, since volume does not permit absence of space, and the construction in space speaks for itself.”
The Course of Dimensional Art

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
29.9 x 23.9 cm (11¾ x 9¾ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3838)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
c.1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30 x 24.2 cm (11¾ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3841)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
The Course of Dimensional Art

c.1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30 x 24.3 cm (11¾ x 9⅝ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3844)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikov, dated 8 April 1990
The Course of Dimensional Art

mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.1 x 24.2 cm (11⅛ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF3845)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
c.1920s  
gouache and ink on paper  
30.3 x 24.2 cm (11⅞ x 9½ in.)

Provenance  
Estate of the Artist  
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4202)

Notes  
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.4 x 24.2 cm (12 x 9½ in.)

PROVENANCE
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF4204)

NOTES
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.7 x 24.4 cm (12½ x 9⅝ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF6002)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
30.3 x 24.2 cm (11⅞ x 9½ in.)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7079)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
The Course of Dimensional Art

c.1920s

gouache and ink on paper

dimension 24.1 x 30 cm (9½ x 11¾ in.); image size 14.4 x 19.5 cm (5¾ x 7¾ in.)

Provenance

Estate of the Artist

Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7176)

Notes

This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
mid 1920s
gouache and ink on paper
24.3 x 30 cm (9⅝ x 11¾ in.)
signed and inscribed ‘Y. G. Chernikhov. The Course of Dimensional Art.’ (lower right)

Provenance
Estate of the Artist
Barry Friedman Ltd., New York (stock no. BF7735)

Notes
This work is accompanied by a certificate of authenticity issued by the artist’s grandson, Andrei Chernikhov, dated 8 April 1990
Я. Г. ЧЕРНИХОВ. Курс межродающего искусства.
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