

Methodological Traditions of Art Criticism in the Development of Pedagogy of Art

L Nekhvyadovich^{1,a*}, K Melekhova^{1,b}, A Ibragimov^{2,c}, and G Fradkina^{3,d}

¹ Altai State University, 61 Lenina Ave., Barnaul 656049 Russia

² Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after, 13 Dostyk Ave, Almaty 050010 Kazakhstan

³ Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, 60 Mira str., Pavlodar 140000 Kazakhstan

^a*lar.nex@yandex.ru, ^bkschut@mail.ru, ^caman.07@inbox.ru,

^dgella_pavlodar@mail.ru

*Corresponding author

Keywords: methodology, scientific tradition, art history, pedagogy of art, methodology for the description and analysis of monuments

Abstract: The purpose of our analysis is to methodologically substantiate the role of art history traditions in the development of art pedagogy. The basic approach is determined by the method of A. A. Davydov, a prominent Russian art critic. The work is based on the principles of objective analysis, historicism, interconnectedness, and continuity of development. The theoretical background and the development of the scientific method of art critic are considered. The authors review a special attitude of the scientist to the problem of the scientific nature of art history disciplines, a demanding attitude to art history categories, and an appeal to interdisciplinarity. The authors argue that the normative and recommendatory nature of the scientist's research method played a decisive role in the formation of modern ideas in the methodology of stylistic analysis of art monuments. Since the article presents a methodological interpretation of the art history method, the novelty of the study is primarily associated with the identification of new perspectives of analysis and possible methodological approaches in the pedagogy of art.

1. Introduction

The problem of the development of pedagogy of art is one of the urgent in art education and goes to the interdisciplinary level of theoretical understanding. In the interpretation of the national originality of art, modern scholars are increasingly turning to the archetypal features of the ethnos, to genetic memory, mentality [1]. Moreover, a number of areas of art criticism are being squeezed out of the arsenal of the methodology of science by such trends as, for example, the geography of art, archetypal and semitic schools. However, it would be wrong to believe that the ideas of the 20th-century art historians today remain outside the world's theoretical process. The research methodology that was formed in Russian art history at this time is multifaceted and includes procedures aimed at a comprehensive study of the problems of art history. Here, apparently, the authoritative remark of V. P. Shestakova, who believes that the Russian history of art developed in close contact with Western tradition, sometimes following it, and sometimes ahead of it [2].

2. Materials and Methods

The undoubted contribution is made by the Russian historians to the study of the ethnic identity of art. This paper focuses on the scientific heritage of A. A. Fedorov-Davydov, Doctor of Art History, a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Arts, a professor of higher education. In his works "Russian Art of Industrial Capitalism" (1929), "Russian Landscape of the 18th – early 19th Centuries" (1953), "Soviet Landscape" (1958), "Russian Landscape of the End of 19th – Beginning of XX" (1974), "Russian and Soviet art. Articles and essays" (1975), A. A. Fedorov-Davydov developed and tested a methodology for describing and analyzing monuments. When studying the essence of the scientist's research method, many interesting aspects and properties of the latter are revealed. Among such aspects are the connection of the method with

the methodology of the sociology of art and the ratio of absolute and relative moments in its use, including its relation to the concepts of "direction," "creative method," "style."

For the subsequent disclosure of the issue, the correct interpretation of the method is of paramount importance. Analysis of the definitions in the encyclopedic and reference literature led us to the conclusion that in most cases, the method is defined as a research path as a way to achieve certain results in scientific knowledge and practical activity. It should also be said that each method is structured logically in a specific way, which is organized as a system of requirements that are recommended to be fulfilled to achieve results [3].

3. Results

The theoretical premise of the research method developed by A. A. Fedorov-Davydov is, first of all, the tradition of "real" aesthetics, which manifests itself in a special relation to the problem of the scientific discipline "History of Art" and in close attention to art history categories. So, A. A. Fedorov-Davydov poses the problem of style and national identity of Russian art to the center of theoretical searches. Style, according to the definition of an art critic, is not a historical concept, but a typological one – as the sum of certain artificially distinguished and theoretically abstracted tendencies – and only in this abstract understanding does it have scientific meaning and value. "I consider 'style' as the sum of the attributes obtained as a result of a materialistic-production analysis of a given art, an analysis of its social mechanism, a system of artistic techniques in the social functionality of their transformation and deformation of the material of non-artistic reality," wrote A. A. Fedorov-Davydov [4]. To the above should be added the conclusions of the scientist on the correlation of the categories "form" and "content" in the formation of the artistic style. The art historian draws attention to the fact that the style of the era experiences, as a rule, has three main stages. First, it is the era when the content dominates the form. Second, the content and form are most consistent with each other. Finally, when the form dominates the content [4].

A. A. Fedorov-Davydov associated the whole theoretical technique for studying the problems of Russian art with the methodology of the sociology of art. According to this concept, a work of art exists only in a certain social field and depends on many factors. In this regard, art critic G. Yu. Sternin is deeply right. He believed that for A. A. Fedorov-Davydov, the methodological principles of the sociology of art are of broader importance than the instrument of scientific knowledge of the history of art culture itself. According to G. Yu. Sternin, "He sometimes even preferred to speak not about new art criticism, but of a new art understanding" [4]. A. A. Fedorov-Davydov pointed out that Russian art is an integral part of the spiritual culture of Russia, and only with this broad ideological and cultural context in mind can one correctly understand the artist's creative method and determine the place of Russian art among national art schools. A comparative analysis of the entire structure of the artistic process, according to the scientist, can give the correct answer to the question about the national characteristics of art at different stages of its socio-historical development, can contribute to the development of objective criteria for its evaluation. Assessing the heuristic value of the research method A. A. Fedorov-Davydov, should, first of all, take into account the standard of the chosen method. Correctness, as a regulatory and compliance with the rules for the "leadership of the mind" in the words of R. Descartes, is of paramount importance.

An example is his work entitled "Russian Art of Industrial Capitalism" (1929) [5]. Following the concept of V. M. Frice, the scientist focuses on the social interaction of the artist and the state, the artist and society, the artist, and the viewer. The scientific authority of Marxism forces the theorist to use the method of historical materialism more and more actively. Considering the development of landscape painting in the book "Russian landscape of the XVIII – early XIX century" (1953), A. A. Fedorov-Davydov begins the presentation with a clear, reliable establishment of the real reality of historical events. Then, the causes and sources of the emergence and formation of the landscape genre, the conditions for its development, the identification of what contributed to its continued existence, and what role it played in the artistic life of the period under study, are determined. The indicated inclusion in the historical and cultural context makes clear the mobile nature of the creative method of artists, helps to explain the internal dynamics of the development of the landscape genre in Russian art [6].

4. Discussion

To understand what are the specifics of the art criticism approach A. A. Fedorov-Davydov, of paramount importance is the characteristic of his stylistic method. This statement is supported by his work "Russian and Soviet Art: Articles and Essays" (1975) [6]. The views of A. A. Fedorov-Davydov's stylistic analysis is close to the theories of K. Fiedler (opening the formal structure of the work), A. Riegl, and G. Wölfflin. They considered art as a set of formal compositional structures. In modern language, the researcher thought contextually and perceived the specifics of the artistic style depending on the type of culture.

The plan of the stylistic analysis of paintings is reduced to the following stages:

- 1) consideration of the original versions of the picture, previous studies, sketches;
- 2) the establishment of factors that influenced the writing of a work;
- 3) comparison with previously existing works preparing the appearance of an innovative move, but also with the works of other artists;
- 4) identification of the storyline of the work, idea;
- 5) highlighting the main topics;
- 6) a description and analysis of the means of artistic expression (compositional development of the found plastic motive).

An example of such a description is the articles by A. A. Fedorov-Davydov about I. E. Repin, I. I. Levitan, M. A. Vrubel, F. A. Vasiliev, V. A. Serov, and others.

A. A. Fedorov-Davydov, as a result of a stylistic analysis of paintings of Russian and Soviet art, argued that the style of the image of a particular artist, the compositional connection of all elements of the picture, the lines used by him, paints, lighting, etc., are historically determined. He insists on a strictly scientific approach to the definition of the style of "realism" in relation to Russian art. The national originality of realism in Russia is determined by a complex of social, philosophical, moral, and plastic ideas.

5. Conclusion

A. A. Fedorov-Davydov developed a colossal research program on the national identity of Russian art. The normative and recommendatory nature of the research method of the Russian art critic played a decisive role in the formation of modern ideas in the pedagogy of art.

References

- [1] Nekhvyadovich, L. I., & Chernyaeva, I. V. (2016). Experience and perspectives of art history development in educational space of Siberia at the turn of XX-XXI centuries. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, 11(7).
- [2] Shestakov, V. P. (2008). *History of art history: From Pliny to the present day*. Moscow, Russia: LKI Publishing house.
- [3] Yelchaninov, V. I., & Nekhvyadovich, L. I. (2006). *Methodological problems of art*. Barnaul, Russia: Publishing house of Altai State University.
- [4] Fedorov-Davydov, A. A. (1925). *The problem of form and content and its significance for Marxist art studies. Print and revolution*. Moscow, Russia: State Academy the art of science.
- [5] Fedorov-Davydov, A. A. (1929). *Russian art of industrial capitalism*. Moscow, Russia: State Academy the art of science.
- [6] Fedorov-Davydov, A. A. (1953). *Russian landscape of the XVIII-early XIX century*. Moscow, Russia: Iskusstvo.