

KOLIADAE.M., *Dr. yskusstvovedeniya,
RHPU im. A.Y.Hertsena, h.SanktPetersburg, Russia*

MODERN PROBLEMS ARTISTIC STUDIES OF GARDENS AND PARKS

Abstract: park construction showed to the world of the twentieth century many new images that need to be studied, classification, systematization. But the lack of terminology clearly defined modern art history research methods makes these parks blurred picture of the development of landscape art from ancient times to the present day, and prevents adequate assessment of parks and gardens, created in the twentieth century and early twenty-first created centuries. This article analyzes the problems of contemporary art history studies of landscape art.

Keywords: art history, garden, park, modernity

Statement of the problem. Beginning of the XXI century - the time of perfection of art techniques, allowing to adequately assess the modern monuments of landscape art, for what they rightfully took his place in the beautiful and harmonious development of the world picture of park construction. This need arose because traditional methods of analysis and interpretation of works of art do not allow the selection and study of gardens and parks created in the twentieth century and the first decade of the XXI century, to compare these works with historical monuments park construction [1,8]. Usually, art is carried out analysis of individual monuments of modern landscape art, but more often, parks created in the XX - XXI centuries. outside interests are art historians. If the analysis of the current park still carried out, then there is often no comparison with historical objects.

Analysis of recent research. Parks and, history of their origin , characteristics of the spatial composition and various aspects of landscape art in a large number of works, a detailed analysis of which is presented in the studies of the present author [4 ,5]. A large number of publications in recent years devoted to historical and contemporary gardens and parks, as well as creativity parkostroitel different eras can be found on the websites of organizations that occupy the leading position in the field of landscape architecture : is the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA - International Federation of Landscape Architects), European Federation of Landscape Architects (EFLA - European Federation for Landscape Architecture), Guild of Landscape Industry (GiPLI), the Association of Landscape Architects and Engineers (ALAIR), Russian Association of Landscape Architects (ALAROS), Guild of Landscape Architects of Ukraine and other organizations involved in the design, reconstruction and use of gardens and parks. Of particular interest are

materials posted on the website "The Gardens of Russia", which publish their findings in the history of landscape art critics, historians and philologists.

Creativity theorists and practitioners park construction also continues to be the subject of scientific research scientists are confirming what many doctoral research in recent years. Nevertheless, the claim that in modern art history and solve all the problems presented adequate picture of the development of landscape art from ancient times to the present day and still can not . Publication of the last decade a striking confirmation. Among the works which authors seek to portray the evolution of landscape art, including works created in the twentieth century , are of great interest V.V.Dormidontovoy work [2], G.Zyuilen [3], E.S.Ozhegovoy [6] and S.S.Ozhegova [7] , O.B.Sokolskoy [9].

However, analysis of the works of these authors shows that even relatively seemingly established concepts such as "regular "and" infinity" among modern scholars gardens and parks there is no agreement. For example, some scientists, including the author of several publications - O.B.Sokolskaya [9, pp. 350], prefers to call these two concepts of "style", while others - called " character planning "or" planning trend." Problems of style definitions in the gardening art manifested in the fact that these authors tend to view the gardens and parks, grouping it by historical periods, then by region, according to the styles of art.

One of the most important publications in recent years, in which the author extends the analysis of monuments of landscape art and includes a conversation works created not only in the twentieth century , but at the turn of XX -XXI century is E.S.Ozhegovoy book " Landscape Architecture : history of styles." The author of this work provides its name garden styles of the twentieth century [6, pp. 531], introducing scientific use such a thing as " high-tech style." However, problems with the definition of stylistic accessories gardening art this author still can not be avoided, as it is impossible to implement it V.V.Dormidontovoy in her book "The history of landscape gardening styles " [2]. The author of this work and did not give a clear picture of European stylistic park construction of the past, sometimes mixing styles with large areas and aesthetic programs of a particular historical period. Given all the stylistic complexity, another author - O.B.Sokolskaya examines the evolution of landscape art is not in styles, and by country. Many researchers easily mixed styles and periods, without separating one from the other and without specifying the reasons for such an interpretation.

The wording of the purposes of article. The purpose of this article is to identify the range of issues related to the analysis and interpretation of the monuments of landscape art.

The main part. Criticizing someone else's opinion on questions of methodology research in art history landscape art, it must be remembered that the existence of

border styles in the park construction and architecture in general, and in the visual arts do not always coincide. In addition, the specificity of -the-art park construction requires knowledge of researchers in different fields ranging from design issues and dendrologists and finishing with painting and music. As for the range of problems, the most important of them continue to be a problem of terminology and issues still.

To date, the most difficult issue in the study of landscape art is still question. Lack of understanding that there is a style in landscape architecture, leads to difficulties in the view of evolutionary processes in park construction. For example, highlighting S.S.Ozhegov in his book "History of Landscape Architecture" [7] renaissance, baroque, classicism, romanticism and naming their styles avoids stylistic definitions in relation to the parks and gardens of the late XIX and the entire twentieth century. E.S.Ozhegov goes further in identifying chain styles [6], highlighting the revival of Baroque, sentimentalism, romanticism, style architectural eclecticism style "high-tech". But the lack of clear definitions of landscape gardening styles leads to some inconsistencies in the work of this author. Thus, Russian parks in XVIII ., Including those created during the reign of Catherine II, placed in the paragraph on "Parks Russian Baroque" [6 , pp. 533], although the reign of the Empress in architecture and fine art was marked by the formation and development of classicism . Examples are many, in any case, not begging values research conducted by scientists.

Another problem with the study of art history of gardens and parks associated with historically entrenched notions of "Italian garden", "Japanese garden", "French garden ", etc. Is it possible in our time to identify the new park as " Italian garden", "Japanese garden", "French garden", "English Garden", "Dutch Garden", etc. or these terms may be used only for the analysis of gardens and parks of the past? Then why about some of the twentieth century landscape compositions retain their former names, such as "Japanese Garden" near the UNESCO building in Paris is so named not only because Japanese I.Noguchi created, but because the application when it is created methods of organizing the spatial composition corresponding to the historical traditions of Japanese landscape art . But if the design principles of "Japanese Garden " remain valid , and the style name safe in modern landscape art, is it possible to exist in the practice of landscape of our time, "Italian", " French", " English" parks? And, in general, whether these stylistic concepts or definitions is planning principles, do not lose their relevance in our days?

While modern park construction are still some concepts related to the occurrence of which is far from us eras, part common terminology loses its relevance. Does this mean that each new creation park building necessary to select a new definition or better to bring everything under one concept - the style of "high-tech"? And what he is: a hydraulic engineering, illumination, location, rooftop garden house,

etc. ?But does such "high technology" had no place in historic gardens and parks? In addition, and this is not all modern parks are able to surprise constructive or other delights. At the same time artistically -shaped component of many modern parks can be well correlated with the programs of some historic gardens.

However, the use of different terminology will prevent this comparison , because the landscape art of XX - beginning of XXI century has been used for other than the above, the classification of parks. Thus, in the actual park construction of the twentieth century were not the "private " gardens, and "public" parks, which received not only widespread, but very orderly classification of "special purpose parks", "gardens and public parks," "limited gardens use" because of increased complexity and in XX - beginning of XXI century functional bases of landscape art. In this case, took place in the historic park construction design techniques are carefully preserved. But here is the traditional art criticism terminology and methods of analysis used for the study of historical gardens and parks do not always apply in relation to a modern fleet and also impede the implementation of the comparative analysis of the historical monuments of landscape art and creations park building our time.

Thus, the whole experience of designing gardens and parks inevitably divided into two parts: historical and contemporary gardens and parks. This notion of "modern gardens and parks" is somewhat vague in chronological, typological and stylistic terms. Speaking of park construction of the twentieth century, it is necessary to apply the definition, the use of which in relation to the historic parks and gardens impossible. As a result of carried out analysis of individual monuments that being created in our time, not always fit into the historically established methodology artistic studies, as many works of art historians remain unnoticed. This increases the gap between the historic landscape art and park construction XX - beginning of XXI century. Of course, not all modern parks can be considered as outstanding works of landscape art. However, many of them not only worthy of attention, but also a thorough study and promotion of the broad masses of spectators.

A challenge for art history is not merely the absence of the necessary techniques, but also have a place in doubt the possibility of any similarities between the historic and modern parks. Most researchers do not even have thoughts about the possibility of overcoming some disunity in the study of the monuments of landscape art from different periods.

Particular problem is the fact that in landscape design in contrast to the study of art history ancient and modern parks analysis is used, which includes in addition to study the spatial composition, the composition of geodetic plans, taxation, etc.

In art history, and other approaches to the study, including art- shaped characteristics, semantic component, etc. In this rare art take the liberty to use the techniques of traditional landscape design, sometimes causing dissatisfaction among

landscape architects "misunderstanding" the specifics of landscape art. All of the above is not the best way affects the complex artistic studies the history of landscape art.

Conclusions. Modern park building draw inspiration from the past and demonstrate numerous experiments in the field of both private and public gardens and parks. Typology and traditional distinction between "Italian", "French", "English", etc. Parks is in the past. The main types of gardens and parks, regardless of the time of their creation, even while maintaining the integrity of the typological tend to vary according to the progress of the evolution of landscape architecture. In this case, took place in the historic park construction design techniques remain relevant and continue to be used, but to a qualitatively new level. Modern gardens and parks are an indication of the state of evolutionary processes in the modern public consciousness and determine the formation of a coherent picture of the development of landscape art, art history must therefore recognize the existence of stylistic and typological terminological problems in the analysis of works of landscape art and to find ways to overcome them.

Literature

1. Анализ и интерпретация произведения искусства. Учеб. пособие/ Под ред. Н.А.Яковлевой. – М.: Высшая школа, 2005. – 550 с.
2. Дормидонтова В.В. История садово-парковых стилей. – М.: Стройиздат, 2004. – 208 с.
3. Зюилен Г. Все сады мира. – М.: Астрель, 2003. – 176 с.
4. Коляда Е.М. Источники изучения садово-паркового искусства // Известия Уральского государственного университета. Серия 1. Проблемы образования, науки и культуры. №6 (85). Ч.1. – Екатеринбург, 2010. С. 136 – 143.
5. Коляда Е.М. Сады и парки в истории культуры и искусства. – СПб.: Невский институт управления и дизайна, 2011. – 108 с.
6. Ожегова Е.С. Ландшафтная архитектура: история стилей. – М.: Стройиздат, 2009. – 560 с.
7. Ожегов С.С. История ландшафтной архитектуры. – М.: Стройиздат, 2003. – 336 с.
8. Практикум. Учеб. пособие/ Под ред. Н.А.Яковлевой. – М.: Высшая школа, 2004. – 358 с.
9. Сокольская О.Б. История садово-паркового искусства. – М.: ИНФРА-М, 2004. – 350 с.

Коляда О.М., Проблеми мистецьких досліджень сучасних садів і парків.

Паркобудівництво ХХ століття явило світові безліч нових образів, які потребують вивчення, класифікації, систематизації. Але відсутність термінології, чітко визначених сучасних мистецтвознавчих методів дослідження цих парків робить розмитую картину розвитку садово–паркового мистецтва ХХ століття і перешкоджає адекватній оцінці садів і парків, створених на початку ХХІ століття. Стаття присвячена аналізу проблем мистецтвознавчого дослідження творів сучасного садово–паркового мистецтва.

Ключові слова: мистецтвознавство, сад, парк, сучасність

Анотація

Коляда А.Н. , Проблемы художественных исследований современных садов и парков. Паркостроительства ХХ века явило миру множество новых образов , требующих изучения , классификации , систематизации . Но отсутствие терминологии , четко определенных современных искусствоведческих методов исследования этих парков делает размытой картину развития садово - паркового искусства ХХ века и препятствует адекватной оценке садов и парков , созданных в начале ХХІ века . Статья посвящена анализу проблем искусствоведческого исследования произведений современного садово - паркового искусства.

Ключевые слова: искусствоведение , сад , парк , современность