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THE ACADEMIC PAINTER

Walter Graskamp

During the last two decades in the social-historical characteristics of art studies special attention is dedicated to two types of artists: the court artists and artists associated with an exhibition hall. But such a typology would be incomplete if the academic type of artist is not mentioned. This artist socio-historically should be positioned in a different way in comparison with the two already mentioned characteristic groups of artists. If they are to be defined according to their income sources and field of expression then the academic type of artist should be defined according to the type of education he has received. This is true because, on one hand the academic artist shaped his profile by marking a line between him and the amateurs and dilettantes. While on the other – the academic artist is different from the artist-craftsman, which worked among the craftsmen of the Middle Ages and the early period of Modern times. The academic artist as a type, besides everything else, is of as great an importance for the social-historical meaning of art as the court or ‘exhibition’ artist. Because, as a rule, it is he that educated them in the age of Modernity and this explains his great importance for the development of art. At close look the term ‘academic artist’ has two, different in size, but concentric circles of validity, because in the wide sense of the word one can included all artists, that have received academic education, while the narrow meaning might be the professors, that teach at the academies and in this sense they are academic painters.

HOW INTERNATIONAL WAS THE MUNICH ART ACADEMY?

Leon Krempel

The survey evaluates the importance and interprets the participation of many nations, represented in the 19th and 20th century in the Munich Art Academy by its professors and students. The basis of the research are the data from the register books of the Academy in the period 1809-1920 that contain the names of almost 13 000 students. The article begins with a presentation of a detailed statistics of the participation of different nationalities in the artistic life of the Munich Academy. Among those dominate the students from Europe. It is interesting to note, that students from the American continent were mainly of German origin. The non-German students in the Academy came mainly from the eastern part of Europe, the Balkans, Northern Europe and North America.

The study offers also a wide view on university art education of that period mainly in Europe but also in America and the accent is on the role of the Academy in the formation of national schools in the arts and in general on its importance for the development of art during this period. Of great importance are the conclusions as to the reasons for applying to study in Munich. These reasons are quite numerous and highly varied but undoubtedly, noted lecturers, such as Cornelius and Piloti had attracted many students outside the country. The disposition of the political powers in the power structures in Europe favored the flow of specific nationalities. To be able to freely depict themes from the national history and episodes of the liberation struggles, for many artists was an important precondition in the choice of place to study. The disintegration of many states, made up of different nations, such as the Ottoman Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Russian Empire, the processes of coming to consciousness and the forming of nations which at this period was quite strong should also be examined as a key prerequisite for the fact that during the second half of the 19th century the Munich Art Academy became a melting pot of nations.

MUNICH ASPECTS IN THE WORKS OF MRKVÍČKA

Vera Dinova-Ruseva

The study examines essential aspects of the influence of the Munich art school on the key figure of Bulgarian fine arts during the first decades following Bulgaria’s liberation of Ottoman rule (1878) – Jan Václav Mrkvička (1856-1938) – genre painter, portrait artist, illustrator, icon painter, author of ecclesiastic and secular monumental paintings and a pedagogue. These influences had not been so far subject to analysis in Bulgarian publications dedicated to the artist’s works, not even in the one and only Bulgarian monography (1955) on Mrkvička by Andrey Protich, who received German training. The importance of their establishment and examination, as this study shows, is of utmost importance since these influences had determined to a large extent the formation of aesthetic view points and artistic expression of the early post-liberation art of painting in Bulgaria. Due to the fact that the Bulgarian society at the time was hardly aware either of the characteristics or of the contribution of the Munich school, formed during the Gründerzeit period (1870 – beginning of the 1890s), which mainly signifies the art of the painters from the second half of the 19th century in Bavaria, the study gives its main characteristics. The accent is put on the comparative analysis of the works of two types of representatives of the school – those official and nonofficial, who had had the greatest influence on Jan Mrkvička during his study at the Royal Bavarian Academy of Fine Arts in the class of Prof. Otto Seitz most apparent in Mrkvička’s portraits, genre and historical paintings. Highlighted are those innovatory views and plastic components of composition in the historical paintings of Carl von Piloty adopted by Mrkvička either directly from observing Piloty’s works or through the pedagogical instructions of his teacher, Otto Seitz. Established are also the influences picked up by the young Czech student from Franz von Lenbach, mainly in portrait painting, from Wilhelm Leibl in portrait genre painting and from Franz von Defregger in genre painting. Through brief analysis of some of the works by these painters and Mrkvička the author seeks to identify some analogies. However noticeable the influence of some of the leading Munich artists of the time, Mrkvička did not copy them but stroved to creatively reinvent them as he had been inventive enough to create original works of art by himself. The influence of the Munich school, though apparent, is of general character and hardly imitative. Special attention is given to issues of interest to literature and art critics so far ignored completely: the influence on Mrkvička’s art by the classical European painters, mainly
the Flemish from the 17th century, which is noticeable indirectly from the works of the representatives of the Munich school. Due to the abundance of factological errors, vagueness and omissions in the old and recent publications on Mrkvička, on the basis of official documents a number of errors are pointed out in hope that they will not be repeated in the future. For example, the only true teacher of the artist in Munich was the student of Karl von Piloty—Otto Seitz and not, as Protich states, the famous painter Anton Seitz, who has never taught at the Academy—false information that has found its followers in literature. The study also defines more accurately the titles and dates of Mrkvička’s works. Jan Mrkvička is presented as a stable bridge between Northern Europe and Bulgaria where Munich played a vital role.

SOFIA – MUNICH. COMMUNICATION PATH

Ruzha Marin ska

The text tries to focus the problem of the cultural dialogue on the basis of well-known artistic and documentary material about the Bulgarian artists in Munich. Almost a century long—from the middle of the 19th century till the Second World War—dozens of Bulgarian artists studied, specialised or simply sojourned in the capital of Bavaria. What and how they perceived from German culture and art, how they reacted to social events, how they communicated with their German colleagues? These and some other questions are analyzed on the basis of concrete examples. Munich was an art center that offered exceptional as content and form cultural medium. Here are situated the Royal Academy and the private art schools, the museums with their rich collections of world art heritage and the galleries and exhibitions of modern art. Here was published the magazine Simplicissimus and a number of other journals that modeled visual perception. Munich is the European capital that consecutively saw on its artistic scene academism and realism, Bidermaier and symbolism, expressionism, new objectivity. It is the birthplace of abstractionism. In the work of the Bulgarian artists these tendencies are perceived not in a simple manner and not always in synchrony. This communication reveals the true inner mechanism of cultural interactions that refute the model ‘center-periphery’ and sets the analysis on a wider plane, based on the structure of artistic thinking as well as the personal profile of the artist.

FLORENCE AND MUNICH – TWO ALTERNATIVES FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF A BULGARIAN STUDENT AT THE END OF THE 19TH CENTURY

Krasimira Koeva

The article tries to compare two art-education concepts from the end of the 19th century of one of the most famous at that time European art academies—the Florentine and Munich academies through the view point of a Bulgarian student who has studied there. The conclusions are not based on the comparison of the study programs, nor on any administrative rules and norms. The approach is personal, subjective but very sincere and emotional. Their author, Hristo Stanchev, in his memories, has retained the feeling of the atmosphere in the study ateliers, the opinions of some of the noted lecturers. On the basis of these memories two equally strong but quite different teaching concepts are drawn—the Florentine that has sustained the piety for the classical tradition of the strictly academic approach regarding the subject matter and plastic treatment and the other—the Munich one that has apprehended a more tolerant approach to modern artistic approaches in painting from the end of the 19th century.

THE PROJECT BULGARIAN ARTISTS AND MUNICH – CHALLENGES AND NEW DISCOVERIES

Aneliya Nikolae va

The two hundred year anniversary of the Munich Academy provoked us to return again to this important for Bulgarian art studies topic—the topic of Munich as an art city that has attracted the greatest number of Bulgarian artists; the topic of Bulgarian art created by the Munich graduates, about cultural contacts and ties, about mastering European art traditions, about influences and tendencies, that have made an imprint not only on the work of each author but on many directions in the development of Bulgarian art.

The exhibition Bulgarian Artists and Munich, organized by the Sofia City Art Gallery, has a number of focal points. First of all this is the Academy as the space for study, but also as a metaphor of Munich as an artistic center. Of special interest to us was to discover in the depots of Sofia’s galleries copies, made in the pinakoteques by E. Konsulova-Vazova, N. Mihailov, Hr. Kazandziev, St. Egarov, Ivan Enchev-Vidio. Another logical center of the exhibition presented the city of Munich from the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th—with its atmosphere reflected in the photographs and symbolic for the Bavarian capital toposes. They are presented by documentary photos and except from the legendary magazines Simplicissimus and Jugend, by Pascin’s paintings—originals and reproductions in Simplicissimus, made especially for the satirical magazine. The names of the Bulgarian graduates from Munich are of key ones in Bulgarian art. But regardless of how much we think we know about their life, nevertheless we find out that the information we have is either incomplete or sometimes not correct. A starting off point in our work were the register books from the archive of the Munich Academy.

The detailed examination of the manuscripts led to the discovery of new names, such as Teodor Dobrinovitch, Vasil Naidenov, Ivan Vasiliev, Nikola Kanov, Alexander Obretenov, Dimitar Petkov, Konstantin Anelov. I would like to mention also the names of the painters Stefan Egarov, Hristo Kazandziev, Petar Kantemirov that would have to be studied in more detail.

TWO PORTRAIT DRAWINGS FROM THE NATIONAL ART GALLERY, SOFIA BY BORIS GEORGI EV FROM THE PERIOD OF HIS STUDIES IN MUNICH

Plamena Dimitrova-Racheva

The Varna artist Boris Georgiev worked during the first decade of the 20th century at the time when modernist painters removed nature from their paintings. They adopted the theory about ‘art for art’s sake’, of aesthetic individual-
ism and some other academic ideas and notions which in the beginning of the 20th century began to change the psychological atmosphere, the philosophy and interactions of arts in society.

In March 2008 the National Art Gallery in Sofia organized a jubilee exhibition for the 120th anniversary of Boris Georgiev. For the first time researchers and art connoisseurs saw 30 exceptionally interesting drawings of the early period of the artist, connected with his education at the Bavarian Art Academy in Munich and from his first art practice.

The present research is focused on two of paintings created by Boris Georgiev. The first one represents a small portrait sketch of the great Russian composer Igor Stravinsky. The other one is a figure composition, presenting the Russian artist Wassili Kandinsky drawing in his atelier in Murnau. These are important artefacts showing the ties of the Bulgarian artist Boris Georgiev with Russian culture and intellectuals, representative of which are the artist Wassili Kandinsky and the composer Igor Stravinsky.

The portrait sketch of I. Stravinsky is a contour one but with the characteristic for Boris Georgiev preciseness and emotional concentration. The painting of V. Kandinsky is exceptionally masterful in a linear grotesque manner. Both the portrait of Igor Stravinsky as well as the drawing undoubtedly manages to document the close relations between the artist and those personages. This fact has not been commented up to now by researchers but is a good reason for clarifying many lecture notes of Boris Georgiev which he has presented at the time of his exhibitions, interpreting the mission of his art and modern art.

**TO MUNICH AND BACK – THE LIFE EXPERIENCE AND CREATIVE TRAVELS OF IVAN PENKOV (1897-1957)**

*Milena Georgieva*

Ivan Penkov is deeply connected during all of his life with the city of Munich. We could state that Munich has shaped him as a modern creative person. During his mature years it was Munich where the artist informed himself about novelties in art but also the place where in his later years he managed to show and realizes his unique art. The article looks at the perception of what was seen, learnt, comprehended from this city by the Bulgarian artist in three main directions – the bohemia and artistic way of living, the casel art and the applied and monumental project of the artist, connected directly or indirectly with this city.

The studies in Munich in 1922-1923 opened up many new horizons before the young artists Ivan Penkov and Dechko Uzunov. The environment where they found themselves was exceptionally creative. Different activities of Penkov among the Bulgarian art colony are examined – as artistic director of the humorous newspaper Klepalo, founder of a bohemian album, as author of early portrait sketches, oil paintings – landscapes and compositions, conceived and realized in Munich, etc. The study also tries to point out the conceptuality of the influences, materialized in these early Munich works. An attempt is made to understand some of the later works by Penkov in the spirit of Rodno Izkustvo as an echo of the Munich modern tendencies and especially those, connected with primitivism. The author traces a number of Penkov’s visits to Munich – in 1932 (for the work on the stain glass paintings in the Chancellor’s office), 1933 (for the arrangement of the artistic-handicraft exhibition), 1936 (on his way to Breslau), 1942 (on his way to Frankfurt). Analyzed are also some of his projects in the sphere of glass staining, poster, space design from the perspective of their modern visual style – interpreter of information, transformation of the German model and the emancipation of the artist from this model through the national characteristics. Outlined is the cooperation with the German stain glass and mosaic companies Mayer and Wagner for the realization of the stain glass murals in the Court of Law, Bulgarian National Bank, The Ministry of Justice – monumental projects that bear common characteristics with the buildings of the German institutions of the Third Reich, but differ from them by their accent on national statehood and also with their contained national motives, quite different from the garish propaganda and poor taste. Finally after the detailed analysis of the different artistic activities of Ivan Penkov the author reaches the conclusion about the beneficial mediator role of this artist between German culture and Bulgarian art. Through the key metaphor of the Road to the capital and to world art and back – with the accumulated experience of this – we can fully understand the phenomena Penkov.

**PUBLICATION OF BULGARIAN POST CARDS IN GERMANY. GERMAN ICONOGRAPHIC MODELS AND IMAGES OF MODERNITY FROM THE END OF THE 19TH AND THE BEGINNING OF THE 20TH CENTURY**

*Margarita Kuzova*

The academic interpretation and evaluation of post cards in Bulgaria is in an initial stage. The uses of iconographic models for their reproduction are an important research subject which is of importance not only for revealing their essence but also for the establishment of the ties between Bulgarian and Germany. The aim of the research is to mark and introduce in academic circles the names of some major German publishers and printers that have taken part in the publication of Bulgarian post cards on the borderline of the 19th – 20th century. The article is an attempt to characterize their contribution for the documentation and visual interpretation of modern Sofia. Examined are a number of concrete iconographic models that have circulated as initial images in Bulgarian and German post cards. In this way the author traces the mastering of concrete images of modernity in particular and in a wider aspect – the cultural interrelations between the countries that have produced this polygraph product.