

**St. Petersburg State University
Lomonosov Moscow State University**

Actual Problems of Theory and History of Art

III

Collection of articles

**St. Petersburg
2013**

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет
Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова

Актуальные проблемы теории и истории искусства

III

Сборник научных статей

Санкт-Петербург
2013

Редакционная коллегия:

А.Х. Даудов (председатель редколлегии), З.А. Акопян, Н.К. Жижикина, А.В. Захарова, А.А. Карев, С.В. Мальцева (отв. ред. выпуска), С. Педоне, О.С. Попова, А.С. Преображенский, А.П. Салиенко, Е.Ю. Станюкович-Денисова (отв. ред. выпуска), И. Стевович, И.И. Тучков

Editorial board:

Abdulla H. Daudov (chief of the editorial board), Zaruhi Hakobian, Nadia C. Jijina, Andrey A. Karev, Svetlana V. Maltseva (editor in charge of the present volume), Silvia Pedone, Olga S. Popova, Alexandr S. Preobrazhensky, Alexandra P. Salienko, Ekaterina Yu. Stanyukovich-Denisova (editor in charge of the present volume), Ivan Stevović, Ivan I. Tuckov, Anna V. Zakharova

Рецензенты:

акад. Российской Академии художеств проф. С.В. Голынец (Уральский федеральный университет имени Первого Президента России Б.Н. Ельцина)
канд. иск. проф. И.А. Доронченков (Европейский университет в Санкт-Петербурге)
д. иск. проф. Е. Ердельян (Белградский университет, Сербия)
д. иск. проф. Т.В. Ильина (СПбГУ)
д. иск. проф. В.С. Турчин (МГУ имени М.В. Ломоносова)

Reviewers:

Ilya A. Doronchenkov (European University in St. Petersburg)
Elena Erdeljan (Belgrade University, Serbia)
Sergey V. Golynets (Eltsin Ural Federal University)
Tatyana V. Ilyina (St. Petersburg State University)
Valery S. Turchin (Lomonosov Moscow State University)

Печатается по постановлению Ученого совета исторического факультета Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета и Ученого совета исторического факультета Московского государственного университета имени М.В. Ломоносова

A43 Актуальные проблемы теории и истории искусства: сб. науч. статей. – СПб.: НП-Принт, 2013. – Вып. 3. / под ред. С.В. Мальцевой, Е.Ю. Станюкович-Денисовой. 615 с.

Actual Problems of Theory and History of Art: Collection of articles. – St. Petersburg: NP-Print, 2013. – Vol. 3. / eds. S.V. Maltseva, E.Yu. Stanyukovich-Denisova. 615 p.

ISBN 978-5-91542-230-7

Сборник научных статей содержит материалы Международной конференции молодых специалистов, проходившей на историческом факультете СПбГУ 31 октября – 4 ноября 2012 г. и посвященной актуальным вопросам истории искусства и культуры. В статьях отечественных и иностранных авторов (на русском и английском языках) представлены результаты исследований в области изучения искусства Древнего мира, Византии, Древней Руси, Западной Европы от Средневековья до Новейшего времени, России XVIII–XXI вв., а также теории искусства.

Издание предназначено в первую очередь для специалистов. Может быть использовано в учебной, научно-практической деятельности, а также интересно широкому кругу любителей искусства.

The collection of articles presents the materials of the International Conference of Young Specialists held at the Faculty of History of St. Petersburg State University on October, 31 – November, 4, 2012. It deals with the actual problems of art history and theory from Antiquity to the present day. The articles by Russian and foreign authors (in Russian and in English) present the results of research in the art of the Ancient World, Byzantium, Medieval Russia, Western Europe from the Middle Ages to the 21 st c., Russian art from the 18th to the 21st cc., theory of art.

The edition is addressed to art historians, historians, art students and art lovers.

© Авторы статей, 2013

© Исторический факультет Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета

© Исторический факультет Московского государственного университета имени М.В. Ломоносова

На обложке использована картина Вика «Бегство в Петербург», 2003. Частное собрание, Санкт-Петербург
On the cover: Vik, "Escape to St.Petersburg", 2003. Private collection, St.Petersburg

Содержание Contents

С.В. МАЛЫЦЕВА, Е.Ю. СТАНЮКОВИЧ-ДЕНИСОВА. Предисловие SVETLANA V. MALTSEVA, EKATERINA YU. STANYUKOVICH-DENISOVA. Foreword.....	12
--	----

ВИК. Берство в Петербург VIK. Flight to Petersburg	18
---	----

ИСКУССТВО ДРЕВНЕГО МИРА ART OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

Н.К. ЖИЖИНА. На перекрёстке проблем, или Возраст актуальности: история античного искусства как составляющая общих вопросов антиковедения DR. NADIA C. JIJINA. On the Crossroads of Knowledge or the Age of Topicality: Problems of Greek and Roman Art as Part of General Classical Studies.....	20
---	----

Н.А. НАЛИМОВА. Слепки из Байи: между оригиналом и копией (к проблеме исследования греческой бронзовой скульптуры классического периода). NADEZHDA A. NALIMOVA. Casts from Baia: between the Original and Copy (Researching Greek Bronze Sculpture of the Classical Period)	24
---	----

Е.М. МАЛКОВА. Украшение или символ: диадема в произведениях древнегреческого искусства EUGENIA M. MALKOVA. A Decoration or a Symbol: Diadem in Ancient Greek Art.....	30
--	----

Е.В. МОГИЛЕВСКАЯ. Акварельная пелика из раскопок А.Е. Люценко в некрополе Пантикапея. Вопросы датировки, атрибуции и семантики изображения. EKATERINA V. MOGILEVSKAYA. An "Aquarelle" Pelike from A.E. Liutsenko's Excavations of the Pantikapaion Necropolis: the Problems of Date, Attributing and Semantic	43
--	----

Е.С. ИЗМАИЛКИНА. Проблема отражения греческой, римской и восточной архитектурной традиции в малоазийских ордерных сооружениях эллинистического и римского времени EKATERINA S. IZMAILKINA. The Problem of Greek, Roman and Oriental Architectural Tradition Penetration into Classical Order Constructions in Asia Minor of Hellenistic and Roman Times	49
--	----

КИШБАЛИ ТАМАШ ПЕТЕР. Программа скульптурного убранства Галикарнасского Мавзолея TAMAS KISBALI. Sculptural Program of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus.....	60
---	----

А.С. КОСТРОВА. К вопросу о строительстве римских городов в Нарбоннской Галлии в I веке до н. э. – II веке н. э. ANNA S. KOSTROVA. To the Problem of Specific Features of Roman Architecture in the Cities of Gallia Narbonensis in the 1st Century BC – 2nd Century AD	65
---	----

К.Б. КОСЕНКОВА. Сиракузские метаморфозы: к проблеме преемственности архитектурных решений от античности к христианству (на примере храмов Великой Греции) CATHERINE B. KOSENKOVA. The Syracuse Metamorphoses: to the Problem of Successive Architectural Transformations from Antiquity to Christianity (as Exemplified by the Temples of Graecia Magna).....	74
--	----

Е.Н. ДМИТРИЕВА. Феномен классицизма и античная дактилиотека графа Л.А. Перовского ELENA N. DMITRIEVA. The Phenomenon of Neoclassicism and Count Lev A. Perovsky's Dactylitheca of Antique Engraved Gems	86
Е.Ю. ТРИФОНОВА. Ещё раз о статуе философа из собрания Государственного Эрмитажа EKATERINA YU. TRIFONOVA. Once Again about the Statue of Philosopher from the Collection of The State Hermitage Museum	92
Д.С. ВАСЬКО. Одесский коллекционер Е.А. Шуманский. История одной продажи DMITRY S. VASKO. An Odessa Collector Eugene A. Shumansky: a Story of One Sale.....	99

ВОСТОЧНОХРИСТИАНСКОЕ ИСКУССТВО EASTERN CHRISTIAN ART

А. АВАЛЬЯНО. Поэт и архитектор: размышление о византийских эпиграммах ALESSANDRA AVAGLIANO. The Poet and the Architect: a Consideration on Byzantine Epigrams.....	106
Л.Ш. МИКАЕЛЯН. Некоторые композиционные схемы и иконографические мотивы в раннехристианской скульптуре Армении в свете сасанидских влияний LILIT SH. MIQAELIAN. Some Compositional Schemes and Iconographic Motives in Early Christian Sculpture of Armenia in the Light of Sassanian Influence	112
З.А. АКОПЯН. Раннесредневековая скульптура Гугарка и Картли. Вопросы художественного стиля и мастерских DR. ZARUNY HAKOBIAN. Early Mediaeval Sculpture of Gugark and Kartli. The Problems of the Artistic Style and Workshops	123
С.В. МАЛЬЦЕВА. Проблема прототипов и хронологии построек последнего периода сербского средневекового зодчества (к историографии вопроса) SVETLANA V. MALTSEVA. On the Prototypes and Chronology of Buildings of the Last Period of Mediaeval Serbian Architecture (Some Remarks on the Historiography).....	134
А.В. ЩЕРБАКОВА. Мраморная декорация интерьера кафоликона Осиос Лукас в Фокиде ALEXANDRA V. SHCHERBAKOVA. Marble Decoration of the Interior of the Catholicon of Hosios Loukas in Phocis	141
Л. БЕВИЛАКВА. Представление прошлого в Византии. Споллии с фигуративными изображениями на городских воротах Никеи (XIII век) DR. LIVIA BEVILACQUA. Displaying the Past in Byzantium. Figural "Spolia" on the City Gates of Nicaea (13 th Century).....	145
С.Н. ТАТАРЧЕНКО. К вопросу об интерпретации центрального сюжета росписи в апсиде церкви Богоматери в Кинцвиси (Грузия): историографический аспект SVETLANA N. TATARCHENKO. On the Interpretation of the Image in the Central Part of the Apse Decoration of the Church of the Mother of God of Kintsvisi Monastery (Georgia): Historiographical Aspect...	151
Е. ГЕДЕВАНИШВИЛИ. Изображение Страшного Суда в росписях храма в Икви. DR. EKATERINE GEDEVANISHVILI. The Representation of the Last Judgment in the Ikvi Murals	157
Л. РИККАРДИ. Польза по необходимости: проект каталога «житийных икон» в византийской и средневековой монументальной живописи Южной Италии LORENZO RICCARDI. Out of Necessity Comes Virtue: A Preliminary Index of "Hagiographical Icons" in the Byzantine and Medieval Wall-Painting in Southern Italy.....	163

Ф. ЛОВИНО. Миниатюры Хроники Михаила Глики в рукописи Marcianus gr. 402 FRANCESCO LOVINO. The Illustrations of Michael Glycas' Βίβλος χρονική in the Marcianus gr. 402	175
М.И. ЯКОВЛЕВА. Икона «Спас Эммануил» из собрания ГИМ — микромозаика раннепалеологовской эпохи MARIA I. YAKOVLEVA. The Icon of Christ Emmanuel from the State Historical Museum — a Micromosaic of Early Palaiologan Period.	180
Е.А. НЕМЫКИНА. Композиция «Предста Царица одесную Тебе» и проблема новгородско-балканских связей в живописи XIV столетия ELENA A. NEMYKINA. The Composition "Upon the Right Hand Did Stand the Queen" and the Hypothesis of the Novgorodian and Balkan Relations in the Mural Painting of the 14th Century	186
И. ЙЕВТИЧ. Повествование в поздневизантийской живописи: вопросы о священных образах, возникающие в этой связи DR. IVANA JEVTIC. Narrative Mode in Late Byzantine Painting: Questions it Raises about Sacred Images	195

ДРЕВНЕРУССКОЕ ИСКУССТВО OLD RUSSIAN ART

М.В. СТЕПАНОВ. Рабочие методы древнерусских зодчих MIKHAIL V. STEPANOV. Working Methods of Old-Russian Architects	201
Д.Д. ЁЛШИН. «Двустолпные» храмы древнерусского Переяславля: византийский контекст DENIS D. YOLSHIN. The Two-Pillar Churches of Pereyaslavl-of-Russia: Byzantine Context.....	209
А.А. ФРЕЗЕ. Церковь св. Михаила в Переяславле и византийская архитектура IX – начала XIII века ANNA A. FREZE. The Church of St. Michael in Pereyaslavl-of-Russia and Byzantine Architecture of the 9 th – Early 13 th Centuries	216
Д.А. СКОБЦОВА. Фрагменты фресок храма-усыпальницы Евфросиниева монастыря в Полоцке из фондов Новгородского музея-заповедника DARYA A. SKOBTSOVA. The Fragments of the Frescoes from the Burial Church in St. Euphrosyne's Convent in Polotsk (from the Funds of the Novgorod State Museum)	222
С.А. КИРЬЯНОВА. Об иконе «Богоматерь Упование всех концов земли» SVETLANA A. KIRYANOVA. On the Icon "Mother of God Hope of all Ends of the Earth"	228
П.Г. ЕРШОВ. Успенский собор Старицкого монастыря и «архаизирующие» памятники первой половины XVI века PETR G. ERSHOV. The Dormition Cathedral of Staritski Monastery and "Archaizing" Monuments of the First Half of the 16th Century	231
Н.М. АБРАМЕНКО. Святые князья Борис и Глеб как заступники русского войска в произведениях XVI-XVII веков ABRAMENKO, NATALIA M. Saint Princes Boris and Gleb as Patrons of the Russian Army in the Russian Art of the 16 th – 17 th Centuries.....	241
Н.Г. ТИТОРЕНКО. Церковь Знамения на Тверской улице и особенности истолкования древнерусских форм в архитектуре Санкт-Петербурга начала XX века NATALIA G. TITORENKO. Znamenskaya Church in Tverskaya Street and Some Peculiar Features of Interpretation of Medieval Russian Forms in Petersburg Architecture of the Beginning of the 20 th Century..	248

РУССКОЕ ИСКУССТВО XVIII–XX ВВ.

RUSSIAN ART OF THE 18th – 20th CC.

М.И. МИЛЬЧИК. Разгадка загадки портретов Архиепископа Афанасия или еще раз об их атрибуции DR. MIKHAIL I. MILCHIK. The Solution to the Puzzle of Archbishop Athanasius' Portraits or on their Attribution Once Again.....	254
Е.Ю. СТАНИУКОВИЧ-ДЕНИСОВА. Церковь Симеона Богоприимца и Анны Пророчицы в Петербурге: к истории строительства и реконструкции первоначального облика EKATERINA YU. STANYUKOVICH-DENISOVA. The Church of Sts. Simeon the God-Receiver and Anna the Prophetess in St. Petersburg: on the History of Building and the Reconstruction of Original State.....	258
В.С. НАУМОВА. Усадебное строительство К.Г. Разумовского в Малороссии. Особенности архитектурного заказа VERA S. NAUMOVA. Estate Buildings of K.G. Razumovsky in Malorossija. Specific Features of Architectural Commission	263
М.И. СТИХИНА. Николай Врангель — исследователь творчества Ф.С. Рокотова MARIA I. STIKHINA. Nicolay Wrangel — a Researcher of F.S. Rokotov' Art	269
ТЕТЕРМАЗОВА З.В. Живописный и гравированный портрет в России второй половины XVIII века. Проблема соотношения изображения и слова ZALINA V. TETERMAZOVA . Painted and Engraved Portrait in Russia in the Second Half of the 18 th Century. The Problem of Correlation between an Image and a Word	274
Е.А. КУЛИНИЧЕВА. Деятельность художественных кружков Абрамцева и Талашкина глазами американской художественной критики (на примере журнала «Ремесленник» Г. Стикли) EKATERINA A. KULINICHEVA. G. Stickley's magazine "Craftsman": American Art Criticism on the Abramtsevo and Talashkino Art Groups	280
Ю.И. ЧЕЖИНА. Забытый портрет кисти Г.Г. Мясоедова YULIYA I. CHEZHINA. A Forgotten Portrait by G.G. Myasoyedov.....	287
Т.Л. МАЛЫШЕВА. Шаг к модернизму: В.А. Серов и постимпрессионистические течения в европейской живописи в 1880-х годах TANJA MALYSHEVA. A Step Towards Modernism: Serov and the Post Impressionist Movements in European Art	292
А.И. ДОЛГОВА. Национальные мотивы в интерьере петербургского модерна (дома страхового общества «Россия» и Торгово-промышленного товарищества Бажанова и Чуваддиной) ANASTASIYA I. DOLGOVA. National Motives in the Art Nouveau Interior of St. Petersburg. Houses of the Insurance Society "Russia" and the Trade-Industrial Society of Bazhanov and Chuvaldina	298
К. КУЛДНА, Е.С. ХМЕЛЬНИЦКАЯ. Большая тихая дорога — забытое творчество эстонского скульптора Августа Тимуса KERSTI KULDNA; EKATERINA S. KHMELNITSKAYA. Large Quiet Road — the Forgotten Art of the Estonian Sculptor August Timus.....	303
Е.И. ШАБУНИНА. Творчество архитектора Я.Г. Гевирца после 1917 года EKATERINA I. SHABUNINA. The Works of the Architect Yakov Gevirtz after 1917	308
М.А. БУЛАТОВА. Театральное пространство города в живописи художников группы ОСТ. MARIA A. BULATOVA. City as a Theater Space in the Paintings of OST Artists	314
О.В. ФУРМАН. Портрет в творчестве Павла Филонова. От реализма к натурализму OLGA V. FURMAN. Portrait in the Art of Pavel Filonov. From Realism to Naturalism.....	320

К.В. СМЕРНОВА. Нереализованные конкурсные проекты мемориалов героям и жертвам Великой Отечественной войны XENIYA V. SMIRNOVA. Unrealized Projects of the Contests for Memorials to Heroes and Victims of the World War II	326
У.П. ДОБРОВА. Оп-арт в творчестве А. Андреевой (1917–2008): истоки стиля ULYANA P. DOBROVA. Op Art in the Works of A. Andreeva (1917–2008): Sources of the Style	332
Т.В. ШЛЫКОВА. Традиции русского авангарда в педагогической практике рубежа XX–XXI веков (на примере педагогической деятельности А.В. Кондратьева) TATIANA V. SHLYKOVA. Traditions of Russian Avant-garde in Teaching Practice at the Turn of the 20 th – 21 st Centuries (as Exemplified in Pedagogical Work of A.V. Kondratyev)	339
А.С. ЛООГА. Вик. Творческий метод и символика в живописной серии «Бегство в Петербург» ANASTASIYA S. LOOGA. Vik. Creative Method and Symbolism in a Pictorial Series «Flight to Petersburg»	343
А.С. ГОРЛЕНКО. Образ исторической личности в городском скульптурном памятнике рубежа XX–XXI веков в Санкт-Петербурге: опыт текстуального анализа ALINA S. GORLENKO. The Image of a Historical Personality in the Urban Sculptural Monument in St. Petersburg at the Turn of the 20 th – 21 st Centuries: Applying Textual Analysis	347
Е.Н. ТИМОФЕЕВА. Изучение, сохранение и развитие кружевоплетения русского населения Татарстана в конце XX – начале XXI века EKATERINA N. TIMOFEEVA. Lace-Making by Russian Population in Tatarstan in the End of the 20 th – Beginning of the 21 st Century: Study, Preservation and Development	353
Е.В. ШЕВЕЛЕВА. Частные музеи г. Каргополя Архангельской области и его окрестностей: феномен в контексте развития этнотуризма в регионе ELIZAVETA V. SHEVELYOVA. Kargopol's Private Museums of the Arkhangelsk Region and the Surrounding Area: the Phenomenon in the Context of the Development of Ethnic Tourism in the Region»	359
А.В. АЛЕКСЕЕВА. Синестезия в искусствоведении. Специфика интерпретации термина ANNA V. ALEKSEEVA. Synesthesia in Study of Art. Specificity of the Term	363

ЗАПАДНОЕ ИСКУССТВО XV–XX ВВ.

WESTERN ART OF THE 15th – 20th CC.

М.А. ЛОПУХОВА. Реконструкция древности и воображаемая античность в живописи Андреа Мантеньи и Филиппино Липпи MARINA A. LOPUKHOVA. Imaginary and Reconstructed Antiquity by Andrea Mantegna and Filippino Lippi	369
П.А. АЛЁШИН. Бенедетто Варки и теория искусства эпохи Чинквеченто PAVEL A. ALYOSHIN. Benedetto Varchi and the Cinquecento Art Theory	375
В.Н. ЗАХАРОВА. Современное искусствоведение о портрете итальянского Возрождения: актуальные методы и проблемы исследования VERA N. ZAKHAROVA. Modern Art History on Italian Renaissance Portraiture: Topical Methodologies and Issues of Research	381
Л.А. ЧЕЧИК. Древнееврейские надписи в Венецианской религиозной живописи эпохи Возрождения LIYA A. CHECHIK. Ancient Jewish Inscriptions in Venetian Religious Painting of Renaissance	388

Л.В. МИХАЙЛОВА. Пейзажные мотивы в печатной графике Ганса Бургкмайра Старшего (1473–1531) LYUDMILA V. MIKHAILOVA. Landscape Motives in the Print Graphic of Hans Burgkmair the Elder (1473–1531)	394
Е.А. ЕФИМОВА. Альбомы из коллекции И. Детайера в Государственном Эрмитаже: исторический контекст некоторые проблемы интерпретации DR. ELENA A. EFIMOVA. Albums from the Former H. Destailleur's Collection in the State Hermitage: A Historical Context and Some Problems of Interpretation	401
С.А. КОВБАСЮК. «Злые женщины» в картинах «De Zotte Schilders»: иконографический и социальный аспекты STEFANIYA A. KOVBASIUK. "Evil Women" in the Paintings by "De Zotte schilders": Iconographic and Social Aspects.....	412
Л.Д. ЧИСТОВА. Голландская изобразительная каллиграфия начала XVII века в контексте визуальной и письменной культуры LYUBAVA D. CHISTOVA. Dutch Pictorial Calligraphy of the Beginning of 17 th century in the Context of Visual and Written Culture.....	418
И.М. СОНИНА. Специфика и эволюция бытового жанра в испанской живописи XVII века IRINA M. SONINA. Specific Features and Stages of Evolution of the Spanish Genre Painting in the 17 th Century.....	426
М.А. ПРИКЛАДОВА. Эволюция образа святого Михаила в творчестве сеvilльских мастеров середины – второй половины XVII века MARIA A. PRIKLADOVA. Evolution of the Image of St. Michael in the Art of Sevillian Masters of the Middle and the Second Half of the 17 th Century	432
А. КАЛАДЖИНСКАЙТЕ. Деятельность архитектора Иосифа Фонтана в Витебском воеводстве Великого княжества Литовского AUKSĖ KALADŽINSKAITĖ. The Activity of Giuseppe Fontana within Grand Duchy of Lithuania	437
Е.А. СКВОРЦОВА. Батальная тема в творчестве Дж.А. Аткинсона EKATERINA A. SKVORTSOVA. Military Topic in the Art of J.A. Atkinson	444
Е.Г. ГОЙХМАН. Творчество Эжена Делакруа и образ Средневековья в искусстве романтизма рубежа 1820–1830-х годов ELENA G. GOIKHMAN. Eugène Delacroix and the Image of the Middle Ages in the Romanticism Art at the Turn of the 1820's–1830's.	450
М.А. ИВАСЮТИНА. Истоки импрессионистической концепции пейзажных серий в живописи середины XIX века MARINA A. IVASYUTINA. The Origins of the Impressionist Concept of the Landscape Series in the Painting of the Middle of the 19 th Century	458
А.С. ЯРМОШ. Интерпретация сюжетов и образов древнескандинавской мифологии в шведском фарфоре последней трети XIX века ANASTASIYA S. YARMOSH. The Interpretation of Scenes and Images of Scandinavian Mythology in Swedish Porcelain of the Last Third of the 19 th Century	464
Е.А. ПЕТУХОВА. Плакат в США в 1890-е гг. Истоки и общая характеристика особенностей журнального плаката ELENA A. PETUKHOVA. The USA Poster in the 1890's. The Issues of the Origins and the General Peculiarities of the Journal Poster	470

О.Н. ЗИНЕВИЧ. Проблема традиции и неомифологизма в современном искусстве на примере античных мотивов в «художественной книге» (livre d'art) первой половины XX века OLGA N. ZINEVICH. The Antique Motifs in the "Livre d'Art" of the First Half of the 20 th Century as the Example of the Problem of Tradition and Neomythologism in the Modern Art.....	475
М.А. КРАСНОКУТСКАЯ. Ювелирное искусство ар деко во Франции: взаимовлияние культуры и украшений 1920-х - 1930-х годов MARIA A. KRASNOKUTSKAYA. Art Deco Jewelry in France: Interaction between Culture and the Accessories in the 1920's - 1930's	480
Д.Н. АЛЕШИНА. Бен Николсон и Патрик Хэрон: британская абстрактная живопись до и после Второй мировой войны DINA N. ALESHINA. Ben Nicholson and Patrick Heron: British Abstract Painting Before and After the World War II.....	486
Л. МИТИЧ. Выставки американского искусства в Белграде в период холодной войны: проблема взаимоотношений искусства и политики LORA MITIĆ. The Exhibitions of American Art in Belgrade during the Cold War: Problem of the Relationship between Art and Politics.....	492
Д.А. БУЛАТОВ. Первая <i>документа</i> 1955 года в Касселе и проблема концептированной истории искусства DANILA A. BULATOV. The First <i>Documenta</i> in Kassel (1955) and the Problem of a Conceptualized Art History	499
А.О. КОТЛОМАНОВ. Скульптура Генри Мура в контексте проблематики современного монумента ALEXANDER O. KOTLOMANOV. Sculptures by Henry Moore in the Context of Modern Monument Problems.....	505
Е. МАТИЧ. Фотография модернизма и постмодернизма: теория и способы представления JELENA MATIĆ. Modernism and Postmodernism Photography: Theory and the Ways of Representation	510
К.А. ЧУНИХИН. «Модерн и постмодерн» Клемент Гринберга, или апология модернизма в эпоху постмодернизма KIRILL A. CHUNIKHIN. Clement Greenberg's "Modern and Postmodern": the Apology of Modernism in the Postmodern Era	515
Аннотации	521
Abstracts	545
Сведения об авторах	566
About the authors	571
Иллюстрации	
Plates	575

Lora Mitić
(University of Belgrade)

The Exhibitions of American Art in Belgrade during the Cold War: Problem of the Relationship between Art and Politics

The end of the 5th decade and the beginning of the 6th brought the breakdown with Stalin's dictatorship which resulted in US financial and military help to Yugoslavia and softening of ideological core of communist party regarding culture and art, among the other things. Maybe, the last exhibition of 4 soviet painters (Aleksandar and Sergej Gerasimov, Aleksandar Dejneka, Arkadij Plastov) held in Belgrade in 1947 can be perceived as the metaphor of disappearing influence from USSR. Here, we can state that changing of the political turn toward the west logically was followed by changing of the visual sphere. As in other Eastern-European countries, in Yugoslavia, social realism became official art after the war. How negative attitude communists had about modernism as the sort of decadent bourgeois art alienated from the real world is the common place, and in Yugoslavia there were many examples of it. The fact that many Yugoslav modern artist were expelled from Belgrade academies and the other of them voluntarily chose exile (the case of Zadar school) unwilling to act according to dogma, illustrates how much culture, art, science were under strong control of Agitprop, official committees created in 1945 for that purpose by Communist party.

However, 50s brought the liberalization of culture and art in the country, especially in Belgrade as its capital and main artistic scene. The first symptoms of the liberalization appeared at the end of 1949 with speech of Edvard Kardelj at Slovenian Academy of Science and Art, continuing with the ideas elaborated in The Second Congress of Writer's Union and concluded in that year with report of Milovan Djilas at the Third Plenum of Central Committee of Yugoslav Communist Party [9, p. 305]. This process was continued during the whole 6th decade, with the strong ascent during first 3 years, when Yugoslavia opened its doors to the West, and with short break until 1955, when some attempts to bring back situation to the previous phase of 1945/1950, occurred. They were the consequence of the stabilization of relationship with USSR after Stalin's death in 1953 — and can be traced through the negative attitude towards western influences elaborated during the Second Plenum of Central Committee of League of communists of Yugoslavia (LCY), 1953. In the same year Commission for cultural relations with foreign countries was established which proves that Yugoslav political apparatus was aware of the importance of cultural exchange. Due to the activities of this very commission, Belgrade and other bigger Yugoslav cities hosted many foreign exhibitions. The staggering of ideological core of the League of communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) at the road of liberalization points out that liberalization was difficult process which in Yugoslav society had two faces.

During the first years of the 6th decade, LCY started with decentralization of culture by reducing the activities of Agitprop apparatus to its repeal, social realism was not eligible art anymore, and idea of free artistic expression was put to the air in 1952 by Miroslav Krleža's report at the Third Congress of Yugoslav Writers in which he attacked the soc-realism. But, the fact that LCY saw the freedom of artistic expression only within the idea of social democracy is elaborated at the Sixth Congress of LCY only one month after Krleža's report. Therefore, the freedom given to cultural workers, artists, writers etc, was essentially determined by the interests of LCY and state apparatus.

Nevertheless, the products of corroding of dogma in the 5th decade, among the other things, were the artistic exhibitions. Their number increased from only 12 in period of 1945–1950 to 100 exhibitions per year in the second half of the 6th decade [14, p. 422]. In that sense, we can agree with the statement of Serbian historian Predrag Markovic that course of Yugoslav politics can be traced by the rhythm and sort of artistic exhibitions [14, p. 422]. At the beginning of the 50s, Modernism was brought back to Belgrade art scene: for many art historians the breaking point was the exhibition of Mica Popovic — member of Zadar group in 1950. But historian Predrag Markovic sees in another event — the *Exhibition of French modern art* from the collections of the prince Paul and Eric Shlomovic held in the spring of 1950, half year before Popovic's exhibition, indication of new wave of restoration of the modernism in Yugoslav culture [14, p. 425]. In the year of 1951, which was the year of exhibitions, considering both, the number and deliberating content, another important event happened — *Exhibition of 70 paintings and sculptures from the period of 1920–1940* in 1951 with which the modernism between the two world wars was brought from the dark in which was put by communists. The other important event in 1951 was an *Exhibition of Petar Lubarda*, modern painter, which was recognized in literature as one of the elements that marked the end of socialist realism.

The political apparatus in Yugoslavia started with restoring its own Modernism and continued with the hosting of very interesting exhibitions of western modernist art. Concerning European exhibitions we should mention *Contemporary French painting* (1952), *Le Corbusier, Painting from Holland* (1953), *Henry Moore* (1955), *Contemporary Italian art* (1957), etc. Among these exhibitions of European art, Yugoslav public could see for the first time American art in the two important exhibitions held in 1956 and 1961 that are topic of this work. Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia, became a sort of international artistic scene with the public eager to experience different worlds of art coming from abroad. Behind this almost idealistic situation was the attempt of Yugoslav political apparatus to present its socialism to the world as more humanistic and more democratic. Two American exhibitions can be perceived also from this aspect.

The first exhibition — *Modern Art in USA* was held in Belgrade in 1956 from July 6th to August 6th. It was organized thanks to the collaboration between Informational service in American Embassy and Commission for cultural relations with foreign countries with Marko Ristic, famous Serbian surrealist artist, as its president. It presented art works from the collections of Museum of Modern Art in New York organized in five parts: painting, sculpture, graphics, photography, architecture. The exhibition was the important part of very ambitious Program for international exhibitions organized by Museum of MoMA, with Porter McCray as the director of the program. Belgrade was the last spot on exhibition's tour, during which it visited many European cities, such as Paris, Zurich, Barcelona, Frankfurt, London, Hague and Vienne.

It's not hard to notice that Belgrade was the only communist city on the map of this MoMA's program. And if we add to this, the fact that Vienna was the last stop of this exhibition according to original plan, we must pose a question what kind of occasions caused that changing of the plan. The reason for including one communist city as the last hosting point for this exhibition must be searched for in the political context of its appearance in Yugoslavia. Especially, when we know that the suggestion is made while the exhibition was in Vienna. As we stressed earlier, liberalization in culture during the 50s was the consequence of opening of Yugoslav society to western influences after the political break with USSR. But during this very decade relationships between Yugoslavia and two superpowers was passing different phases with occasional warming and cooling periods. The time of ending the tour of exhibition of American art which was planned to go back to New York after Vienna is the time of the improvement of relationship

with USSR, after the abolition of Cominform (April 1956) and decision of new soviet political structure to begin with the process of liquidation of Stalinist politics. New phase of better Yugoslav-Soviet relationship is begun with the signing of Moscow declaration in June 1956, with which soviet authority blessed equality of communist parties and the particular sort of Yugoslav socialism. Having in mind the ideas of Dwight Eisenhower about the psychological tools for gaining the humans minds as an important element of American cold war strategies, maybe, we can suppose that this turn in Yugoslav politics, made the organizers of the exhibition to decide to bring it to Belgrade, communist city interested in Western art and not so far away from Vienna.

According to an art historian Branko Dimitrijevic, the first invitation was made by American Embassy in Belgrade on May 4th and in less than two weeks, president of Commission for cultural relations with foreign countries, Marko Ristic agreed with the idea, on May 17th [7, p. 241]. At the first place, the suggestions to bring exhibition to Belgrade which were made during the May 1956 caused some negative opinions in Ministry for culture regarding the fact that there was not enough time for organization. Regardless, Marko Ristic recognized the importance of that very exhibition. He knew that this kind of opportunity couldn't be missed despite the lack of time and appropriate space. That was the first appearance of American art in Yugoslavia and according to the statement of MoMA, the biggest exhibition of American art that was sent abroad [7, p. 228].

The extensive content of the exhibitions was put in three separated exhibition spaces: Art Pavillion in Kalemegdan, Gallery of frescos and Gallery of ULUS. During the exhibition, there were some disagreements between Commission for cultural relations and American informational service about tickets, catalogue, recording of the visitors etc. Namely, Informational service of American Embassy wanted catalogues and tickets to be free of charge and planned to record the number of the visitors, and Commission refused that suggestion because it represented the violating of established practice [9, p. 228].

The structure of catalogue follows structure of the exhibition, it was divided into the sections: painting and plastic art — selection of museum curator, Dorothy Miler and text by Holger Cahill; graphic art — selection of the curator of Graphic department — William S. Lieberman who also wrote the text for catalogue; architecture — selection of the curator of the Architectural department, Arthur Dexler, who wrote the text with Henry Russell Hitchcock and photography — selection and text by Edward Steichen, director of Photography department. The preface is interesting because it contains some important spots that reflect very well how both sides — Yugoslav and American, saw the cultural politics. The writer of the preface Rene d' Harnoncourt, director of MoMA, praises the Yugoslav awareness of importance of artistic exchange as the powerful tools for creating the understanding between different nations [18, p. 3]. The confirmation of this awareness, he finds in the activities of Yugoslav Commission for cultural relations with foreign countries concerning hosting all foreign exhibitions in Belgrade, and also in the presence of Yugoslav artistic contents abroad. He underlined that the same idea was the reason for creating the international program by Museum of Modern Art, during which exhibition of American art were presented in many European cities, including Belgrade.

The concept of exhibition confirms its educative aim and its representational character, it offered history of American art production and the review of its phases. Different forms of American painting were presented from the *first generation of modern painters* as Arthur Carles, Arthur Dove, Stuart Davis, Charles Demuth, Max Weber, Arnold Friedman, Layonel Feininger, Niles Spencer, Joseph Stella, Florine Stettheimer; *modern primitivists* such as John Kane, Patrocino Barela, Michel Louis Eilshemius, Joseph Pickett, Morris Hirshfield to *the abstract painting* in the works of William Baziotes, William De Kooning, Fritz Glarner, Robert Motherwell, Arshile Gorky, Franz Kline, R.I.

Pereira, Jackson Pollock, Clifford Still, Mark Tobey, Mark Rothko, Attilio Salemm, W.B. Tomlin. Also, visitors could see *realistic tradition* in the works of Peter Blume, Charles Burchfield, Charles Sheeler, Andrew Wyeth and *romantics* as Hyman Bloom, Loren Iver Mac, Morris Graves, Medda Sterne. American plastic art was represented by the works of Alexander Calder, David Hare, Gaston Lachaise, Elie Nadelman, Seymar Liptom, Theodore J. Rogzak, etc. From the graphic art visitors could see Edward Hopper, Maurice Prendergast, Ben Shahn, etc. The interesting thing is the part dedicated to the architecture which was made according to the exhibition held in America in 1953, *Built in US: Postwar architecture*. Among many other architects, this exhibition included the works of Mis Van Der Rohe and Frank Lloyd Wright. In the preface Rene D' Harnoncourt mentioned that Museum of Modern Art and Informational service of American Embassy had the plan to organize this exhibition in Yugoslavia the following year. But, it didn't happen.

Now, we can conclude that this exhibition can be viewed as the sudden starting point of promotion of American art in Yugoslavia, organized as the part of wider cultural propaganda. The purpose of this propaganda was to show to the world not only military, economical and political force America had, but also cultural and artistic. Belgrade, at that time unexpectedly added as the last stop for this exhibition, just in few years became the regular spot on the tour map of actual American exhibitions that were sent abroad.

It is symptomatic that this first exhibition of American art was held in 1956. That was the year of very fast changing in relations between Yugoslavia and USSR, which ended with escalation of negative feelings regarding the situation in Hungary. Tito's variable attitude towards Hungarian rebels caused the anger of Moscow and cessation of help from USSR. On the other hand, US were not satisfied with improvements of Soviet-Yugoslav relations after abolition of Cominform, in the first half of the year. But we must bear in our mind the fact that this was also the period of American attempts to spread its influence in the Europe using the culture, especially art. These activities were directly supported by American state apparatus, informational services and private founds. Museum of Modern art in New York, established in 1929 as the private organizations during the Cold War, became one of the leading institutions recognized by the American administrative apparatus as the promoter of American Modernism, very important tool in cultural imperialism during the cold war. In the preface of catalogue of this exhibition, author explains that International programme of MoMA is financially supported by Rockefellers brothers.

What was the echo of this first appearance of American art in Yugoslavia is very hard to describe, because we are faced with the lack of the sources. Contemporaries didn't leave many written traces about this exhibition, only two short news articles, one by Miodrag B. Protic wrote for Belgrade magazine *NIN* and the other by R. Putar for *Nacionalni list* from Zagreb. Despite great importance of this first exhibition of American art in Yugoslavia and the ascertainment of Commission for cultural relations that it was the most successful exhibition held during that year, serious analysis didn't come to the light of the day, neither in that time, nor later. What was the real reason for that, we can only speculate.

But, the other exhibition of American art, held five years later, in 1961 had a little bit better reception. Different in structure and in its aim, the exhibition *Modern American Art* brought the abstract expressionism in its elaborated form to Yugoslav public. As former exhibition, this also was organized thanks to the cooperation of American Embassy and the Commission for cultural relations with foreign countries. The exhibition was prepared by the board of professionals from different museums and institutions (Whitney Museum of American art, Baltimore art museum and Indiana University) with the Harvard Arnason, the vice-president of Section of art from the Guggenheim Museum in New York as board's president.

In the catalogue text H. Arnason clearly pointed out that the purpose of this exhibition was to present the most important experimental movement in American art — abstract expressionism whose history he shortly explained there [2, p. 4]. Among works of famous abstract expressionist artists as William de Kooning, Jackson Pollock, Arshile Gorky, Robert Motherwell, William Bazotes, Adolph Gottlieb, Barnett Newman, Ad Reinhardt etc., the concept makers put the works of predecessors of modern experiment — Milton Avery, Stuart Davis, Mark Tobey.

Also, they logically joined this group — works of rather new American artists, whose work don't belong to abstract expressionism epitome, but is product of further artistic experiment — Jasper Johns and Robert Rauschenberg. In the short introductory text, Arnason stresses that it is very problematic to put all artists under one umbrella term such as abstract expressionism or action painting because there are many differences among them. Also, he states, that there is no reason to call abstract expressionism the American avant-garde art because in the moment of its presentation in this exhibition it was very well known and recognized. Doing this he draws some important problematic lines concerning the abstract expressionism.

Thinking about the importance of this exhibition for Yugoslav cultural scene, we can surely say that it was very interesting, because it brought the “weapon of cultural Cold war” as abstract expressionism is explained by many writers to socialist Yugoslav country in the specific period [3, 10, 12, 19]. That was the time of the deterioration of relations between Yugoslavia and the USA, caused among other things by the First conference of non-aligned movement held in Belgrade that year. If we know that this exhibition was sent to its European tour and came to Belgrade on the request of Yugoslav authorities, we may conclude that art and politics were once again in very close relation [22, p. 242]. Same as the American administration, Yugoslav also knew how to manipulate with the cultural influences. But only one question would have right significance — did the appearance of American modern experiment, brought to Yugoslav cities with this exhibition, had any consequences in Yugoslav culture? Unlike first American exhibition held in 1956, this visited not only Belgrade, but also Zagreb, Ljubljana, Skopje, Maribor, Rijeka. That fact speaks about better visibility of presented works and supposes more potential impacts. Despite all this, its reception was modest, but a little bit better than the reception of the exhibition from 1956.

Beside few articles written by Lazar Trifunovic, Zoran Pavlovic, Katarina Ambrozic and Dragoslav Djordjevic, one film was made about it for magazine *Filmske novosti*, but didn't offer many information [7, p. 253]. It is interesting because it reflects the innovative way, for that time, to document some important events from the culture. How Yugoslav public accepted the “modern American experiment” we don't know for sure. The lack of the information and absence of visible elements in the works of artists who worked then, only can lead us to the conclusion that it didn't leave any serious influence to Yugoslav artistic scene. We suppose that the reason for that can be found in the very nature of Yugoslav artistic scene which bears in itself the essence of European modernist epitome. This essence can be easily noticed in the reserved attitude of one of the best Serbian historians of modern art, Lazar Trifunovic, about this exhibition in his short review wrote for magazine *NIN*. He had some objections concerning the conception of the exhibition and the “wrong classification” of art phenomenon. In the text he offers his systematization of presented art works according to the methods of their creation: in the works of Kelly, Reinhardt, Albers, Newman he sees *rational method* mirrored in reflective and rational organization of painting. On the other hand, in the works of Jackson Pollock, Sam Francis, Robert Rauschenberg — he recognizes *automatic method* beside which is unconstrained sensibility and feeling for irrational structure. Trifunovic sees American art as the specific unity in the modern artistic world, but also he underlines that its uniqueness is the product of “the assimilation of the most

positive and the most progressive European artistic trends” [21, p. 102]. This is a good illustration of Trifunovic’s attitude about American art.

The other interesting text about this exhibition was written by Zoran Pavlovic, an artist who was also dealing with art theory and critics. In his text he analyzes the content of the exhibition within the history of abstract painting as the art phenomenon. So, he sees the similarities between American and European phenomenon, especially regarding the American abstract expressionism and European Art Informel — “liberation of all bonds...; unrestricted cession to the very act of painting, which is released of the obligation to take any representations and raised to the level of the real cult” [16, p. 19]. Except the same characteristic between these artistic trends, Pavlovic also notices differences. In that sense he praises the American artists because they enriched abstract painting with some “new substance” that was the result of their interest for Eastern culture in the crucial moment of the “break to a new” [16, p. 19]. That “break to a new” was achieved especially through work of J. Pollock, who brought entirely new approach to the painting as the continuing space, space that merges with the real space of artist action. Same as L. Trifunovic, in his presentation of this exhibition, Z. Pavlovic sorts American artists in some groups, without hesitation to place J. Pollock, William de Kooning, Sam Francis at the first three places as the genial artist of the American postwar movement. At the opposite side of the abstract expressionism, Pavlovic sees the works of other artist such as Newman, Rothko, Vicente, Albers, Reinhardt and Kelly, making the differences among them also, but only at the level of various implementations of “neoplastic” elements. The artist such as Brooks, Gottlieb, Motherwell, Stamos and Still, in Pavlovic’s systematization function as a separate group with some “limited freedom of their forms”. Finally, in the works of J. Jhons and R. Rauschenberg, Pavlovic finds the extension of some experiments started in the activities of dada movement, and gives them special positive marks. Z. Pavlovic finishes his review, aware of all the problems and dilemmas concerning the finding the proper way of understanding and sorting all trends in American abstract painting shown at this exhibition.

For us, those two texts are very important, because they illustrate how actual writers of the art critics and theory deal with the problems of interpretation of American modernism. It will be very helpful to mention that both of the writers were supporters of the Art Informel, L. Trifunovic as the theoretician and Z. Pavlovic as the artist. So, the poetics of abstract expressionism — American “cousin” of European Art Informel could have been very interesting for them. Despite many difficulties on the way of proper interpretation of not only abstract expressionism, but also the other trends in American modernism and abstract painting, both writers agreed that American art can be perceived as specific entity in the history of Modern painting. Another art historian from that time, Katarina Ambrozić, also emphasized significant contribution of American art to contemporary abstract painting in her text about exhibition wrote for *Knjizevne novine*.

Despite the lack of more information from that time about the reception of this exhibition in artistic public, among professionals and ordinary people who had the opportunity to see it, those three texts offer important insight of the attempts of recent art critics to understand and valorize the art that came from totally different cultural context. On the opposite side we can put the other text wrote by Dragoslav Đorđević, official art critic of *Borba*, well known as a political paper, because it bares traces of the revolt caused by abstract painting which will hit the ceiling with Tito’s speech against that kind of art in 1962 [8, p. 8]. Negative attitude toward modern art was indispensable feature of many communist writers of that time. The battle between modernistic trends and realistic tradition marked this period and can be easily observed through the activities of two literature magazines, *Delo* and *Savremenik*. But, we must admit that this antagonism had a stronger presence in literature than in artistic sphere. All these elements reflect the main

aspects of the Yugoslav society, so to say — the broader context which influenced the reception of American art and even its absence.

These two American exhibitions can be regarded as manifestations of wider cultural propaganda that the USA realized in Europe during the days of Truman and Eisenhower in the period of Cold war. Abstract expressionism, once underground art, was recognized and elaborated by American critics as Clement Greenberg and Harold Rosenberg as original American product. The further destiny of that product was marked by the US struggle for political and cultural domination and about that we now have serious studies offering many details from politics, just to recall Frances Stonor Saunders's studies about links between CIA and "cultural Cold war" propaganda. The reception of American art is waiting for it further and more precise analyze, but at this moment we can surely say that these two exhibitions in Belgrade, as a part of important process, in literature called Americanization of modernism enabled by political situation after the Second World War, didn't have big impact on our artistic scene. But, the dimension of American influence in our culture can be found in the other place, in the fact that Museum of Contemporary Art, opened in 1965 was structured according to the conception of Museum of Modern Art in New York. Miodrag Protic, one of the best Serbian historians of modern art, an artist and a critic, as an important scholar, went to the US in 1963, holding Ford's stipend and spent there some time examining American art, especially setting of MoMA. All new ideas Protic brought from his trip to America, can be felt in the first setting of our Museum of Contemporary art. If we recall that the 6th decade brought American film, fashion, music, especially rock-and-roll, we can surely say that both artistic and popular culture in socialist Yugoslavia, were passing through liberation in which both American and west European influences had the main role.

Literature

1. *Ambrozić K.* Izložba američke umetnosti // Književne novine, br. 154. – 22. Septembar 1961.
2. *Arnason H.* Savremena američka umetnost: katalog izložbe. – Beograd, 1961.
3. *Cockcroft E.* Abstract Expressionism: Weapon of the Cold War // Artforum. – June 1974.
4. *Cocroft E.* Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War // Art in Modern Culture: An anthology of critical texts / eds. F. Frascina, J. Harris. – Phaidon Press, 1992.
5. *Denegri J.* Jedna moguća istorija umetnosti: Beograd kao internacionalna umetnička scena, 1965–1998. – Beograd, 1998.
6. *Denegri J.* Pedesete: teme srpske umetnosti (1950–1960). – Novi Sad, 1993.
7. *Dimitrijević B.* Utopijski konzumerizam: nastanak i protivrečnosti potrošačke kulture u socijalističkoj Jugoslaviji (1950–1970): doktorska disertacija. – Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu, 2011.
8. *Đorđević D.* Izložba savremene američke umetnosti // Borba. – 1. oktobar 1961.
9. *Gatalović M.* Darovana sloboda. Partija i kultura u Srbiji: 1952–1958. – Beograd, 2010.
10. *Guilbaut S.* How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
11. *Kozlof M.* Izbor tekstova. – Beograd, 1986.
12. *Kozloff M.* American Painting During the Cold War // Artforum. – May 1973.
13. *Lorejn L.* Održavanje Tita na površini. Sjedinjene države, Jugoslavija i hladni rat. – Beograd, 2003.
14. *Marković P.* Beograd između istoka i zapada, 1948–1965. – Beograd, 1996.
15. *Merenik L.* Ideološki modeli: srpsko slikarstvo 1945–1968. – Beograd, 2001.
16. *Pavlović Z.* Savremeno američko slikarstvo // Danas. – 27. Septembar 1961.
17. *Petković R.* Jedan vek odnosa Jugoslavije i SAD. – Beograd, 1992.
18. Savremena umetnost u SAD: katalog izložbe. – Beograd, 1956.
19. *Shapiro D., Shapiro C.* Abstract Expressionism: the Politics of Apolitical Painting // Prospects 3 / ed. J. Salzman. – 1977.
20. *Stonor S.F.* The Cultural Cold War. The CIA and the World of Art and Letters. – New York, 2000.
21. *Trifunović L.* Američko slikarstvo. NIN, 24. Septembar 1961 // Trifunović L. Studije, ogledi, kritike. – Beograd, 1990.
22. *Vučetić R.* Koka kola socijalizam. – Beograd, 2012.