

это было у представителей западного бидермайера), которого художник трактует как часть прекрасной, разумной вселенной. Особая «телесность» венециановской живописи удивительным образом смыкается с «божественной телесностью» ренессансных картин. Об этих и многих других ренессансных особенностях творчества Венецианова пойдет речь в докладе. Отдельные произведения русского мастера будут сопоставлены с картинами мастеров эпохи Возрождения.

**Tatyana Sidorova-Slusarenko**

*State TV and Radio Company “Kultura”, Russia*

#### **RENAISSANCE ASPECTS IN THE WORKS OF ALEXEY VENETSIA NOV IN THE CONTEXT OF “RUSSIAN BIEDERMEIER”.**

The subject discussed in the report could provide a new look at the works of Alexey Venetsianov, as well as at certain aspects of Biedermeier style.

It was long ago pointed out that the Enlightenment, despite its didactic character, was a sort of a continuation of the ideas of the Renaissance at a new level. The ideal was considered as a synthesis of the natural elements of the world around, the triumph of scientific and technical knowledge was proclaimed, a new type of an artist-the-scientist emerged, etc. Such a “Renaissance” aspect of the Enlightenment was reflected in a special human-oriented, non-official form of classicism, to which the Biedermeier style — namely its early, “high” period (from the 1810s to the early 1830s) is closely linked.

The Renaissance ideals were manifested in Biedermeier artists’ interest to a concrete, diverse reality, which they treated as a reasonably arranged system which could be perceived by both direct observations and theoretical knowledge. This explains a special, truly represented spatial-light environment of the early Biedermeier paintings where people, being self-absorbed, listen to “something more important” rather than talk to each other.

Notwithstanding the fact that Renaissance features were typical for the whole “high Biedermeier”, in Venetsianov’s works — due to national and individual characteristics of the artist — they are especially obvious. Although he was the father of “Russian Biedermeier”, Venetsianov however surpassed it: his works are at the intersection of Biedermeier and human-oriented classicism. The artist took interest in individuals rather than in environment or in interiors, as the representatives of the Western Biedermeier did. He treated his models as a part of the beautiful, reasonable universe. The specific “corporality” of Venetsianov’s paintings, which is related to the features of national mentality, is, however, merged with the “divine corporeality” of the Renaissance paintings. In the current report these and many other features of Renaissance art in the works of Venetsianov will be discussed in detail. Certain aspects of the work of the Russian artist will be compared with the works of some Renaissance masters.

**Евсевьев Михаил Юрьевич**

*Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Россия*

#### **Ошибка Виппера?**

В 1946 г. Б. Р. Виппер написал статью «Сильвестр Щедрин в Италии»; опубликована она была много позже (Советское искусствознание. 74. М., 1975. С. 312–328). В статье Виппер называет «учителем и вдохновителем» Щедрина неаполитанского живописца Раффаэле Карелли (Raffaele Carelli, 1795–1864). Виппер почему-то был уверен, что Раффаэле Карелли умер молодым, в 1815 г. Такая неверная подробность биографии художника имела серьезные последствия для выводов Виппера. Р. Карелли получился «одаренным предшественником С. Щедрина и предвестником пленэра в европейской живописи XIX века»; неаполитанские

пейзажи Карелли, похожие на пейзажи Щедрина, неизбежно оказывались написанными прежде щедринских (ведь Сильвестр впервые оказался в Неаполе в 1819 г.). И Виппер был принужден своей ошибкой считать, что Рафаэле Карелли наиболее значительно повлиял на развитие живописного стиля русского художника. Несмотря на такое заключение, историк отметил серьезное живописное превосходство пейзажей Щедрина над пейзажами Карелли; а поскольку сегодня известно, что достоверных работ Р. Карелли, написанных раньше 1833 г., нет и нет сомнений в том, что творчество Карелли относится скорее к середине XIX в., то значит, что Р. Карелли либо мог видеть что-то из работ Сильвестра Щедрина, либо просто в какой-то мере усвоить манеру неаполитанских пейзажистов 30-х гг. XIX в.

Биографические подробности жизни Р. Карелли как раз потому и забылись, что художник он весьма средний, даже в пределах школы неаполитанской пейзажной живописи XIX в. — и, похоже, он это понимал. Последний раз Карелли выставлялся как живописец в 1835 г., после чего оставил живопись, занимаясь преподаванием и антиквариатом.

**Mikhail Evseyev**

*Saint Petersburg State University, Russia*

#### **WAS BORIS VIPPER MISTAKEN?**

Boris Vipper wrote an article “Silvester Schedrin in Italy” in 1946 which was published in the “Soviet Art History” only in 1975. In this paper he defined Neapolitan artist Raffaele Carelli (1795–1864) as “teacher and inspirator” of Schedrin. We do not know why but Vipper thought that Carelli died young in 1815. This wrong fact in the artist’s biography had strong impact on Vipper’s implications. In the art historian’s opinion Carelli seems to be “a talented predecessor of Schedrin and forerunner of plein air in the European painting of the 19th century”. In this case Neapolitan landscapes by Carelli must have been created earlier than similar works of Schedrin, because Russian artist appeared in Naples only in 1819. This fact forced Vipper to decide that Carelli had great influence on a painting style of Schedrin. Nevertheless, the art historian noted artistic superiority of Schedrin’s landscapes in comparison with Carelli’s works. There are no authentic pieces of art by Carelli dated earlier than 1833. That is why it is clear that Carelli worked as an artist in the middle of the 19th century. Therefore Carelli either could have seen some works of Schedrin or was a skilful follower of the manner of Neapolitan landscapists of the 1830s.

It is not surprising that details of Carelli’s biography were forgotten, because he was a second-rate artist even in comparison with other artists of Neapolitan landscape school of the 19th century. Probably he realized that fact himself. Carelli was exhibited for the last time in 1835, after that he gave up art and got into teaching and antique-trade.

**Tijana Boric, Igor Borozan**

*University of Belgrade, Serbia*

#### **IN PURSUIT OF THE SUBLIME: IVAN AIVAZOVSKY’S “WALKING UPON THE SEA” (1849) FROM THE STATE ART COLLECTION OF THE ROYAL COMPOUND IN SERBIA**

The indescribable idea of the sublime fascinated and challenged a famous 19th century artist Ivan Konstantinovich Aivazovsky whose dwelling upon this concept gave rise to countless visual responses. The paper examines the earliest known version of his piece known as “Walking upon the Sea” from 1849 that has been recently rediscovered and displayed after restoration and conservation within the State Art Collection of the Royal Compound in Serbia. The report offers the analysis of this particular image, a peculiar combination of the stormy sea at night and religious theme that embodies artist’s inner self observations, his thoughts, worldview and perceptive power of the years to come. Aivazovsky