

RU

Современная российская эмаль как феномен станково-декоративных искусств

Стеклова И. А., Полякова Т. А.

Аннотация. Цель настоящего исследования - установить подходы к идентификации российской эмали, выделить тенденции развития, которые обеспечили ей международный успех. Есть основания утверждать, что достижение цели будет содействовать как детализации, так и обобщению картины современного искусства, переживающего стресс глобального реформатирования. Научную новизну статьи представляет, во-первых, легитимация станково-декоративных искусств как автономного вида; во-вторых, раскрытие декоративной сущности эмали в амбивалентном стремлении к сохранению древнего языка и к стилистическому новаторству. В результате предпринятого исследования понимание этого феномена возводится к характерным качествам станково-декоративных искусств, которые объективно зависят от эстетики материалов и технологий изготовления и исторически нагружены стилеобразующими и смыслообразующими функциями.

EN

Modern Russian Enamel as a Phenomenon of Easel-Decorative Arts

Steklova I. A., Polyakova T. A.

Abstract. The research aims to determine approaches to the identification of Russian enamel, to highlight the development trends that have ensured its international success. It can be argued that achieving the aim will contribute to both specification and generalisation of the picture of modern art, which is under the stress of global reformatting. The scientific novelty of the article is represented, firstly, by legitimising easel-decorative arts as an autonomous type; secondly, by providing insight into the decorative essence of enamel in an ambivalent strive to preserve the ancient language and to foster stylistic innovation. As a result of the research, the understanding of this phenomenon is traced to the characteristic features of easel-decorative arts, which objectively depend on the aesthetics of materials and manufacturing technologies and are historically loaded with style-forming and meaning-making functions.

Введение

The relevance of the research topic is due to the high status of domestic enamel in the rankings of world art, as well as the intensity of the creative search for masters who maintain this status (Гилодо, Шклярчук, Карпун, 1989). Personal and collective exhibitions of their works are gaining more and more popularity in the vastness of Russia. Perhaps it occurs due to the attractive atmosphere of “irony, citation, contextuality, symbolism, eclecticism” (Черняева, 2020, с. 187), and perhaps due to the richness of visual contrasts between works for every taste in ancient and innovative enamelling techniques – between mysterious enamel miniatures, monumental polyptychs, kinetic sculptures, brutal assemblages, etc. (Габриэль, 1988). According to the perceptive conclusion of observers A. N. Ogar'kov and O. S. Subbotina, “neither the type nor the genre of these works can be identified, one thing can be said with certainty: the decorative function of enamel... has been converted into an infinite integral equation of contemporary art” (Огарков, Субботина, 2018, с. 273). Inquisitive competent criticism problematizes the development of Russian enamel approximately in such metaphors, convincing that: firstly, attempts to identify it are natural and inevitable; secondly, decorativeness serves as the only reliable navigator of identification; thirdly, the accumulation of many evidences of “revived Byzantine craftsmanship” (с. 274) presents modernity – a panorama of artistic images that resonate with the innumerable problems of the present day.

To identify the works of the latest enamel art means to rationalize their sensual perception in a different way, guided by the most striking goals, choosing the most economical ways and the least unsteady conceptual references, translating the spontaneous impression of artistic originality into the disciplined understanding of specific features. For example, for the purposes of art criticism, which is concerned with correlating formal-compositional, stylistic,

figurative-semantic, and other features, it is required to orient perception in the space of the dominant cognitive tradition, to find a compromise between different views on the causes and consequences of new forms emergence, to generate a minimalistic title and optimally expanded definition.

The stated aim involves the solution of the following tasks:

1) to correct the scheme of types subordination in the classical hierarchy of arts and to fix the point of correlation of the enamel works artistic originality;

2) to comprehend the essence of decorativeness and the fundamental parameters of enamel decorativeness;

3) to explain the paradox of the modernity of the ancient art of enamelling.

To solve these problems, it is advisable to resort to the proven experience of a number of methods: on the one hand, formal compositional, artistic and stylistic ones, on the other, semantic and philosophical-cultural ones.

The theoretical background of the article consists of three research groups. Firstly, these are studies of spatial arts as an evolving system by V. R. Aronov, G. Wölfflin, V. G. Vlasov, N. V. Voronov, V. F. Eroshkin, M. S. Kagan, G. S. Knabe etc. Secondly, these are studies of decorative and applied arts, a segment of this system by K. M. Kantor, V. B. Koshaev, A. de Moran, A. B. Saltykov, A. A. Fedorov-Davydov, A. K. Chekalova, etc. Thirdly, these are studies of the artistic specifics of enamel, balancing on the “edge of fine, decorative and applied arts” (Александрова, 2019, с. 20), by Ya. A. Aleksandrova, G. N. Gabriel, T. V. Gorbunova, G. N. Komelova, and I. Yu. Perfil’eva. The articles by A. A. Gilodo, A. Shklyaruk, A. Karpun, A. A. Konchenkov, L. G. Kramarenko, M. L. Terehovich, E. N. Chernyaeva and others, devoted to the transition of enamel into a sphere independent easel arts with a powerful conceptual potential are of particular interest.

The practical significance of the article is due to the widespread interest in enamel. Understanding the artistic specifics of the present and predicting the future of enamel is needed not only by theoreticians, but also by practitioners, especially those who have found themselves in the shadow of the metropolitan processes. To clarify the priorities in the development of national culture, the efforts of author’s workshops as well as art and educational clusters have an increased representativeness. This is especially true for small mobile structures created in the 1990s on the pure enthusiasm of individualists and the semi-legendary memory of flourishing crafts. Among them are the hospitable workshop of N. M. Vdovkin in the Stavropol village of Pobegailovka, the centres of A. A. Karikh in Yaroslavl and M. A. Selishchev in Rostov the Great. This article seems to be a humanitarian support for their selfless devotion, a feasible contribution to the improvement of their activity.

Results and Discussion

If in the classical cognitive tradition the motley flow of fine art fits down to the ground into three types, being distributed between easel, monumental and decorative-applied sets, and then by genres, themes, materials, etc., then such a correlation is not enough to identify current-day works. Understanding their formal and compositional, artistic and stylistic, figurative and semantic features is hampered by the fact that the very configurations of types, the boundaries between them, the peripeteia of mutation from one type to another are changing, requiring periodic ascertaining and rethinking. It is logical if the rethinking in the format of this article will be based on an array of collected definitions.

It should be noted that thanks to the successful choice of titular definitions, the situation with understanding the essence of easel and monumental arts, marked by primary generic features, is quite stable. The specificity of these arts is determined, as a rule, in pairs, in the system of oppositions, verified at one or another level of subject analysis (Ермолаева, 2003). So, A. A. Melik-Pashaev considers the formal and compositional freedom of the former and the dependence on the dictates of the environment of the latter (Мелик-Пашаев, 1999, с. 630), and E. Powell considers the difference in ideological and content load, insisting on the conceptual advantages of easel images over images that are irreversibly “fixed in the system of architectural space” (Powell, 2010, p. 154). Ideas about the evolution of easel and monumental works are associated mainly with the trend of decorativization as a “secondary abstract symbolic” transformation of nature (Федоров-Давыдов).

According to the reflections of V. G. Vlasov, M. S. Kagan, A. A. Fedorov-Davydov and others, various decorative moments highlight everything created in the spatial arts. They become the subject of discussions both when discussing classical paintings and statues focused on nature, and on their own, without correlation with nature, as indicators of the individual mastery of artists, “a self-sufficient combination of visual experience categories” (Федоров-Давыдов). It can be said that the number of decorative moments increases when the indicated categories sort out their relationship with each other, and not with reality.

Understanding other arts, autonomous from easel and monumental types, is much more mobile. It is symptomatic that, starting with the names, it needs two definitions at once – to consolidate the parity of artistic and utilitarian functions. We are talking about the arts, which are most often called decorative and applied arts. The corresponding works, according to authoritative dictionaries, serve the daily life of people and respond to their aesthetic needs (Власов, 2005). Satisfaction of seemingly elementary needs turns into an active decoration of life and acquires the meanings of artistic cognition of the world (Чекалов, 1962). Meanings are assigned to things and make them signs, symbols, and allegories (Каран, 1961). And since the focus of things on the same way of life presupposes their participation in a stylistic synthesis, then there occurs imposition, mixing, multiplication of meanings. The object-spatial environment becomes not only more comfortable and harmonious, but also encyclopaedically wise, like a “magnifying glass through which the displayed fragments begin to appear as power clots” of the universal whole (Аронов, 2012, с. 53).

Separate non-artistic things are replaced by interacting artistic things with eloquent messages, enriching the “spiritual image of a person” (Салтыков, 1959, с. 28) and society. V. R. Aronov, N. V. Voronov, M. S. Kagan, A. B. Saltykov, A. K. Chekalov and others give examples of the beneficialness of convenient, aesthetic and meaningful environment as a second nature, “created according to the laws of harmony and beauty, according to the laws of artistic tastes prevailing in society” (Воронов, 1977, с. 57).

However, one cannot but take into account that the idea of decorative and applied arts, developed by the classics of the Russian humanities, has not covered the realities for a long time. Actually, even K. M. Kantor wrote about things that “exclude consumer attitude towards themselves and appeal to the viewer’s ability to see their poetic imagery, aesthetic, cultural significance” (Кантор, 1981, с. 4). Observation of the steady growth of easel tendencies, national-folklore and individually mannered stylization allowed him to rename the aforementioned arts into easel-applied arts half a century ago (Кантор, 1970).

At the same time, the word “applied” is also consistently omitted. Its literal meaning is emasculated by the fact that fine crafts are transformed into full-fledged, non-utilitarian arts. We can say that only the phrase “decorative arts” remains for their designation in the asset of discourses of the XXI century. Now a heterogeneous class of types and subtypes of creativity in the formation, design, decoration of the subject-spatial environment is more often called in such a way.

It should be recognized that the result of the decorativization of easel and monumental arts and the easelization of some useful arts was the mutation of specific forms and subordinations between them, between them and sacramental forms, and finally, the restructuring of the entire hierarchy of arts. The studies of restructuring have not yet formed a coherent theory. The predictable problem for this discussion is the conceptual amorphousness of the decorative arts and one of the types of this class, which can be called easel-decorative, by analogy with the monumental-decorative type that is privileged in architecture and urban planning. Despite the fuzzy semantic scope, this term is used periodically. For example, L. G. Kramarenko states that the stylogenic “relationships between the master and the material, form and emptiness, plane and volume, visible and illusory space” are manifested namely in the practice of easel and decorative arts (Крамаренко, 2005, с. 51). And it is precisely this set that makes I. Yu. Perfilyeva consider it expedient to position the “multidimensionality of individual searches and experiments” of modern Russian enamel (Перфильева, 2020, с. 586).

Thus, the direction of enamel art development suggests to considering its products in the easel segment of a vast decorative class – among the easel and decorative arts, which pushed off from decorative and applied arts, but did not stick to the “noble” ones (Конченков, 2015, с. 119). They are placed much lower in the academic hierarchy, partly because of prejudice against the value of the decorative. Recognition of their viability in the matter of life-building is intoned not without condescension: instead of shocking and re-educating the humanity, they serve the half-forgotten cult of beauty, interpreting plots “about the personality’s inner world and his emotional and mental patterns, about the entire area where history becomes an experience, and where the early impulses of social behaviour are formed” (Кнабе, 1985, с. 39).

The meanings of “decorativeness”, “decorative”, “decoratively” are known to all, despite the fact that the specific content of the derivatives of the root “decor” remains in the background. It is implied rather than rationalized, based on completed perception, in most independent discourses. The fact that the listed categories are used without proper theoretical background and visual texture has become a sensitive problem for Russian art criticism. For example, V. G. Vlasov insists that it is necessary to separate at least three meanings of decorativeness – derivatives of “decorative function, the qualities of decorativeness that appear as a result of this function, and a separate type of art in which the decorative function is dominant” (Власов, 2012, с. 8). In particular, colour is the main conductor of decorativeness for V. G. Vlasov (с. 45). For V. F. Eroshkin, it is rhythmic relations of “parts and the whole” (Ерошкин, 2015, с. 97). For V. B. Koshaev, it is a complex of “conventionality of colour and form, the nature of a linear contour, the expressiveness of a spot, stylization effects”, etc. (Кошаев, 2006, с. 7).

Probably, the quantity of decorativeness in the reproduction of nature, in the playing of objective and non-objective plots is proportional to the degree of distance, removal, distraction from direct vision and the radical restructuring of this vision according to author’s self-selected rules – into simplified or hypertrophied formal-compositional, linear-rhythmic, light-tonal, coloristic and etc. relationship. Actually, in this way, the quantity of decorativeness turns into quality, which is enhanced by everything that speeds up perception, connects, thickens, and localizes the artistic image. That is, a striking quantity of non-canonical decorative qualities is an increment not only of authors’ talent, but also of their abstract thinking, the mediation of presumptuous intellects between reality and the viewer.

So, if the language of any art is conventionality, then the languages of the arts marked with the word “decorative” are a multitude of conventionalities of a decorative quality. On the one hand, they are due to materials that have a primary aesthetic and sometimes sacred value; on the other hand, to the techniques and technologies of material processing, taught to increase this value in the course of empirical testing. In particular, A. de Moran presented the history of these languages in essays on the processing of stone, wood, metal, glass, ceramics, and textiles (Моран, 2011). If at the level of materials the languages diverge, then at the level of attitudes towards reality they converge. Here their conventionality increases and passes into the phase of super-conventionality as liberation from nature and subordination to the means of representation.

Compared with the types devoted to the construction of optical illusions, the decorative arts are much more dependent on these means, on the parameters of materials and technologies. For example, the responsibility of a single colourful stroke on a painting canvas is incomparable with the responsibility of an iridescent vitreous element on an ornamented

metal surface. In turn, this element would not have appeared there without careful observance of high-temperature technology: transparent, translucent, opaque masses of molten glass acquire solid outlines on surfaces and in the gaps of patterns, because they have the same thermal expansion coefficient as metal. In Byzantium, the technology of developing images by repeatedly applying liquid glass, heated together with a gold support or frame, was called "fire writing". The relentless historical background is another parameter of the decorative essence of enamel.

The ancient techniques of champleve enamel, cloisonne enamel, relief enamel, stained glass enamel, cast enamel, painted enamel practically do not change, just as the physical and chemical laws expressing their essence do not change. They are preserved because they are technologically modernized. The use of "industrial high-burning enamels (loofs, femeshes, matte and titanium-containing enamels)... an electric muffle with program control and temperature automatics in the traditional chain of operations" (Петренко, Штайн https://www.rah.ru/the_academy_today/the_members_of_the_academie/member.php?ID=51464), etc. allowed enamellers to break far ahead, express themselves in large spatial objects, move on to working with stainless steel, cast iron, titanium, aluminium and even plastic.

It turns out that a slow archaic skill continues to evolve, keeping up with other easel and decorative arts. Moreover, it proves the potential of its dependent and free historical language in new formats: miniature, easel, interior, exterior, landscape, etc.

The millennial interaction with precious stones and metals in the decoration of church and worldly life advanced enamel, freed it from routine usefulness and endowed it with the will to express the meanings of the time. The mystical justifications for this were invented by the Byzantines, who reasoned that "smalt and metal had to undergo the cleansing action of fire before becoming an image" (Тяжелов, Сопоцинский, 1975, с. 102). Starting with such treatises as "Imagines" by Philostratos, "The List of Various Arts" by the Benedictine Theophilus, "Legend from the Byzantine Chronograph" by Dorotheus of Monemvasia (Александрова, 2019, с. 143), the attraction of enamel towards the actual religious-symbolic, elite-symbolic, corporate-symbolic, etc. rhetoric, the style of which has become more and more capacious over the past decades, is revealed (Терехович, 1983). As Honoured Artist of Russia N. M. Vdovkin writes, "the laconic expression of meaning, its symbolism and figurative content sometimes significantly exceeds its descriptive particularity. Excessive enthusiasm for illustrative, narrative, literary characters harms art in general, and this is especially inappropriate in enamel" (Вдовкин <http://design-review.net/index.php?show=article&id=212&year=2008&number=1>).

The fact that the development of enamel, easel and decorative arts as a whole can be traced in the dynamics of style does not raise any questions. Questions arise about the very properties of style against the background of general artistic, and general cultural processes. G. Wölfflin has answered them most convincingly. According to him, the aforementioned arts have an increased stylistic sensitivity and are the first to respond to the requests of the audience, in whose knowledge "decorative schemes" are built in (Вельфлин, 2018, с. 279). That is, in these arts precisely the excess of style-forming energy accumulates, "the sense of form finds a free and direct resolution for itself, and from here renewal begins" (Вельфлин, 2004, с. 143). If we agree with it, then the function of designing styles, stylistic experimentation, a testing ground for style formation should be considered as a side acquisition of decorative arts, directed to the emotions and thoughts of the audience along truncated authorial trajectories. Otherwise, the origins of great styles should be found in works that offer an individual experience of abstraction from reality, ready-made conceptual schemes.

Style is an on-duty, temporarily mobilized communication between a work of art and a viewer, rearranging the actual accents of the world outlook. On the part of the works, this is an expression of the general structural principles of different artistic languages. On the part of the audience, it is a recognizable, often shocking irritant of perception, which must be reborn again and again in order to be effective, that is, to contribute to the breakthrough of works through the thickness of prejudices into the sovereign world of the individual.

The evolution of easel enamel proves that devotion to banal beauty does not interfere with the search for the next breakthrough style, adequate to the acute experience of the present and the inescapable past. We can say that the style of enamel shifts history into modernity, and vice versa. At the same time, the requirements for materials as well as technical and technological regulations work both as deterrents and as motivating factors. On the one hand, the testing ground for style formation is limited and blocked off. On the other hand, it is such difficulties that increase the degree of creativity: the more obstacles it comes across, the more inventive it becomes to, bypass, overcome and eliminate them.

Conclusion

The tactics of the Russian artists shows that easel enamel does not imitate either natural gems or realistic painting. It is enough for easel enamel to remain itself, a phenomenon of easel and decorative arts, and follow the trends that have made it a global phenomenon. This means that we should continue to develop the decorative expressiveness of the language, which super-conventionality does not prevent, but helps to increase the content capacity of the style; continue experiments with a style that links history and modernity.

In the course of this study, the following conclusions have been drawn.

1. If the identification of works of art implies their correlation in the system of superior, then the various works of Russian enamel of the last quarter of the 20th – early 21st century are the result of the general easelization of decorative and applied arts. There are reasons to classify them as a type of easel and decorative arts, which, in turn, belongs to the class of decorative arts, where decorative moments are not a bonus, but an essential quality.

2. The principal parameter of the decorative essence of easel enamel, as well as the whole type of easel and decorative arts, is the increased conventionality – super-conventionality – of the artistic language, once set by the objective properties of materials, techniques and materials processing technologies. The possibilities of representing certain objects in the super-conventional language of enamel are predetermined by maximum creative freedom and are limited by the physical properties of glass and its fixations.

3. The fact that the ancient enamel art once again has become fashionable testifies to its natural inclination towards experimental style formation as an expression of the main trends of the era. Experimentation with a historically rooted style, capturing the aesthetic, philosophical, ideological trends of our time, allowed Russian enamel to approach the self-awareness of the world of the 21st century with its tossing between the past and the future.

Источники | References

1. Александрова Я. А. Станковая эмаль Ленинграда - Санкт-Петербурга второй половины XX - начала XXI в.: истоки и эволюция: дисс. ... к. иск. СПб., 2019. (Aleksandrova Ya. A. Easel enamel of Leningrad - St. Petersburg in the second half of the 20th - early 21st century: origins and evolution: PhD diss... St. Petersburg, 2019.)
2. Аронов В. Р. Карл Кантор - художественный критик. От материальной культуры к произведениям искусства // Вопросы философии. 2012. № 12. (Aronov V. R. Karl Kantor is an art critic. From material culture to works of art // Questions of Philosophy. 2012. No. 12.)
3. Вдовкин Н. М. Горячая эмаль и ее применение в творчестве художников. URL: <http://design-review.net/index.php?show=article&id=212&year=2008&number=1> (Vdovkin N. M. Hot enamel and its use in the creative work of artists. URL: <http://design-review.net/index.php?show=article&id=212&year=2008&number=1>)
4. Вёльфлин Г. Основные понятия истории искусств. Проблема эволюции стиля в новом искусстве. М., 2018. (Wölfflin G. Basic notions of art history. The problem of the style evolution in the new art. M., 2018.)
5. Вёльфлин Г. Ренессанс и барокко. СПб., 2004. (Wölfflin G. Renaissance and Baroque. St. Petersburg, 2004.)
6. Власов В. Г. Новый энциклопедический словарь изобразительного искусства: в 10-ти т. СПб., 2005. Т. 3. (Vlasov V. G. New encyclopedic dictionary of fine arts: in 10 volumes. St. Petersburg, 2005. Vol. 3.)
7. Власов В. Г. Основы теории и истории декоративно-прикладного искусства. СПб., 2012. (Vlasov V. G. Fundamentals of the theory and history of decorative and applied arts. St. Petersburg, 2012.)
8. Воронов Н. В. Искусство предметного мира. М., 1977. (Voronov N. V. Art of the objective world. M., 1977.)
9. Габриэль Г. Н. Старый материал - новые формы // Декоративное искусство СССР. 1988. № 4 (365). (Gabriel G. N. Old material - new forms // Decorative art of the USSR. 1988. No. 4 (365).)
10. Гилодо А., Шклярук А., Карпун А. Факультет ненужных вещей. Орден Эмальеров // Декоративное искусство СССР. 1989. № 11 (384). (Gilodo A., Shklyaruk A., Karpun A. Faculty of unnecessary things. Order of Enamelers // Decorative Art of the USSR. 1989. No. 11 (384).)
11. Ермолаева Л. П. Декоративная живопись. М., 2003. (Ermolaeva L. P. Decorative painting. M., 2003.)
12. Ерошкин В. Ф. К вопросу о декоративности в произведениях изобразительного искусства // Международный научно-исследовательский журнал. 2015. № 3 (34): в 2-х ч. Ч. 2. (Eroshkin V. F. On the decorativeness in works of fine arts // International Scientific Research Journal. 2015. No. 3 (34): in 2 parts. Part 2.)
13. Каган М. С. О прикладном искусстве: некоторые вопросы теории. Л., 1961. (Kagan M. S. About applied art: some questions of theory. L., 1961.)
14. Кантор К. М. Людмила и Дмитрий Шушкановы. М., 1981. (Kantor K. M. Ludmila and Dmitry Shushkanovs. M., 1981.)
15. Кантор К. М. Споры и художественная практика // Декоративное искусство СССР. 1970. № 10. (Kantor K. M. Disputes and artistic practice // Decorative art of the USSR. 1970. No. 10.)
16. Кнабе Г. С. Язык бытовых вещей // Декоративное искусство СССР. 1985. № 1. (Knabe G. S. The language of everyday things // Decorative art of the USSR. 1985. No. 1.)
17. Конченков А. А. Место художественной эмали в морфологии искусств // Инновации в социокультурном пространстве: материалы VIII международной научно-практической конференции (г. Благовещенск, 19 февраля 2015 года). Благовещенск: Амурский государственный университет, 2015. (Konchenkov A. A. The place of artistic enamel in the morphology of arts // Innovations in the socio-cultural space: Materials of the VIII International Scientific and Practical Conference (Blagoveshchensk, February 19, 2015). Blagoveshchensk: Amur State University, 2015.)
18. Кошаев В. Б. Декоративно-прикладное искусство: Понятия. Этапы развития. М., 2006. (Koshaev V. B. Decorative and applied arts: Notions. Stages of development. M., 2006.)
19. Крамаренко Л. Г. Декоративное искусство России XX века. К проблеме формообразования и сложения стиля предметно-пространственной среды: автореф. дисс. ... д. иск. М., 2005. (Kramarenko L. G. Decorative art of Russia of the XX century. To the problem of forming and adding the style of the subject-spatial environment: author. diss... M., 2005.)
20. Мелик-Пашаев А. А. Современный словарь - справочник по искусству. М., 1999. (Melik-Pashaev A. A. Modern dictionary - a reference book on art. M., 1999.)
21. Моран А. де. История декоративно-прикладного искусства: от древнейших времен до наших дней. М., 2011. (Moran A. de. History of decorative and applied arts: from ancient times to the present day. M., 2011.)

22. Огарков А. Н., Субботина О. С. Что отражается в зеркале мира? Обзор выставки горячей эмали // Месмахеровские чтения - 2018: материалы Международной научно-практической конференции (г. Санкт-Петербург, 21-22 марта 2018 г.) / науч. ред. А. О. Котломанов. СПб., 2018. (Ogarkov A. N., Subbotina O. S. What is reflected in the mirror of the world? Overview of the exhibition of hot enamel // Mesmacher Readings - 2018: Materials of the International Scientific and Practical Conference (St. Petersburg, March 21-22, 2018) / scientific ed. A. O. Kotlomanov. St. Petersburg, 2018.)
23. Перфильева И. Ю. Современная художественная эмаль: стилистические и инновационные тенденции развития // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета. Искусствоведение. 2020. № 10 (4). (Perfilyeva I. Yu. Modern artistic enamel: stylistic and innovative development trends // Bulletin of the St. Petersburg State University. Art history. 2020. No. 10 (4).)
24. Петренко Д. И., Штайн К. Э. Николай Михайлович Вдовкин / Российская академия художеств. URL: https://www.rah.ru/the_academy_today/the_members_of_the_academie/member.php?ID=51464 (Petrenko D. I., Stein K. E. Nikolai Mikhailovich Vdovkin / Russian Academy of Arts. URL: https://www.rah.ru/the_academy_today/the_members_of_the_academie/member.php?ID=51464)
25. Салтыков А. Б. О художественном вкусе в быту. М., 1959. (Saltykov A. B. About artistic taste in everyday life. M., 1959.)
26. Терехович М. Л. Советско-венгерский семинар // Декоративное искусство СССР. 1983. № 9 (310). (Terekhovich M. L. Soviet-Hungarian seminar // Decorative art of the USSR. 1983. No. 9 (310).)
27. Тяжелов В. Н., Сопотинский О. И. Искусство средних веков. М., 1975. (Tyazhelov V. N., Sopotsinsky O. I. Art of the Middle Ages. M., 1975.)
28. Федоров-Давыдов А. А. Русское искусство промышленного капитализма. URL: <https://biblioclub.ru/index.php?page=book&id=570657> (Fedorov-Davydov A. A. Russian art of industrial capitalism. URL: <https://biblioclub.ru/index.php?page=book&id=570657>)
29. Чекалов А. К. Основы понимания декоративно-прикладного искусства. М., 1962. (Chekalov A. K. Fundamentals of understanding decorative and applied arts. M., 1962.)
30. Черняева Е. Н. Всероссийская художественная выставка «Эмаль России» в контексте основных направлений развития станковой эмали // Изобразительное искусство Урала, Сибири и Дальнего Востока. 2020. № 1. (Chernyaeva E. N. All-Russian art exhibition "Enamel of Russia" in the context of the main directions of easel enamel development // Fine Arts of the Urals, Siberia and the Far East. 2020. No. 1.)
31. Powell A. Painting as Blur: Landscapes in Paintings of the Dutch Interior // Oxford Art Journal. 2010. Vol. 33. Issue 2. P. 143-166.

Информация об авторах | Author information

RU

Стеклова Ирина Алексеевна¹, д. иск., доц.
Полякова Тамара Александровна²

^{1,2} Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова

EN

Steklova Irina Alekseevna¹, Dr
Polyakova Tamara Alexandrovna²

^{1,2} Lomonosov Moscow State University

¹ i_steklo60@mail.ru, ² polyart7@mail.ru

Информация о статье | About this article

RU

Перевод статьи опубликован по просьбе автора. Первоисточник: Стеклова И. А., Полякова Т. А. Современная российская эмаль как феномен станково-декоративных искусств // Манускрипт. 2021. Том 14. Вып. 19. С. 1997-2002.

EN

The article is translated and published by the authors' request. The original source: Стеклова И. А., Полякова Т. А. Современная российская эмаль как феномен станково-декоративных искусств // Манускрипт. 2021. Том 14. Вып. 19. С. 1997-2002. (Steklova I. A., Polyakova T. A. Modern Russian Enamel as a Phenomenon of Easel-Decorative Arts. In: Manuscript. V. 14. Iss. 19 P. 1997-2002.)

Дата поступления рукописи (received): 14.10.2022; опубликовано (published): 30.11.2022.

Ключевые слова (keywords): станковая эмаль; станково-декоративные искусства; декоративность; стилеобразование; easel enamel; easel-decorative arts; decorativeness; style formation.