

ПРОБЛЕМИ НА ИЗКУСТВОТО

ТРИМЕСЕЧНО СПИСАНИЕ ЗА ТЕОРИЯ, ИСТОРИЯ И КРИТИКА НА ИЗКУСТВОТО

ART STUDIES QUARTERLY

ИНСТИТУТ ЗА ИЗСЛЕДВАНЕ НА ИЗКУСТВОТА
ПРИ БЪЛГАРСКА АКАДЕМИЯ НА НАУКИТЕ – СОФИЯ

4

ISSN 0032-9371

ГОДИНА 48-ма 2015

СЪДЪРЖАНИЕ



Емануел Мутафов. Къде е Византия в края на XVIII в.? Пъзел за изкуствоведи.....	3
Елена Генова. За някои особености в тематичните предпочитания на дебърските и самоковските зографи	9
Ненад Макулъевич. Делатност дебърских и самоковских зографа у Босни и Херцеговини, Црној Гори и Северној Србији у XIX веку.....	19
Ирена Ћировић. Зографске радионице и зидно сликарство XIX века у храмовима Врањске епархије	25
Иванка Гергова. Православно изкуство във Видинско. Предварителни наблюдения.....	38
Дарко Николовски. Црквата Св. Никола во село Крајници, Велешко	50
Мария Митева. С вкус към живота. Виолета Василчина на 70 години.....	58
РЕЦЕНЗИИ	
Елисавета Мусакова. Нова книга за един рядък илюстриран ръкопис	60
SUMMARIES.....	63



Emmanuel S. Moutafov. Where is Byzantium in the End of the Eighteenth Century? Puzzle For Art Historians.....	3
Elena Genova. On Certain Particularities of the Thematic Choices of Icon-Painters from Debar And Samokov	9
Nenad Makuljević. Activities of Icon-Painters of The Art Schools of Debar and Samokov in Nineteenth-Century Bosnia, Herzegovina, Montenegro and North Serbia ..	19
Irena Ćirović. The Nineteenth-Century Ateliers and Mural Painting in the Eparchy of Vranje	25
Ivanka Gergova. Orthodox Art in the Region of Vidin. Preliminary Observations.....	38
Darko Nikolovski. The Church of St. Nicholas in the Village of Krajnici Near Veles ...	50
Maria Miteva. With taste for life. Violeta Vassilchina turns 70	58
REVIEWS	
Elissaveta Moussakova. A New Book for an Unknown Illustrated Manuscript.....	60
SUMMARIES.....	63

нето, посветено на вярата в чудотворството на св. Богородица по време на българското Възраждане¹³, са привлечени всички познати ръкописи, повечето от тях почти непроучвани, които свидетелстват както за литературната страна на култа, така и за източниците, ползвани от зографите в създаването на богородичните образи и циклите, представящи чудесата на Божията майка. Затова без преувеличение може да се каже, че с познанията си за ръкописната книга, в която тя търси и извлича информация, Иванка Гергова закръгля представата за себе си като учен, за когото изследването на дадена епоха или конкретен артефакт означава да разгърне максимално хоризонта на своите способности и интереси и който, поради тези си качества, носи с чест академичното звание „член-кореспондент“, което ѝ беше присъдено през същата паметна 2015 година.

Бележки:

1 Мустафин, Харис. Лицевой летописный свод – это послание об ответственности.

– Благотворительный фонд Святителя Григория Богослова, <http://www.fondgb.ru/index.php?ss=33&s=51&id=34314> [ползван на 01.07.2014].

2 Вж. описанието в каталога на издателство „Актеон“: „Духовные образы. Синодик из Национальной библиотеки им Св. Св. Кирилла и Мефодия в Софии“. Научное факсимильное издание, 145 л., полноцветная печать, твёрдый переплёт, формат 18×26 см, <http://akteon-sale.ru/catalog/book/68> [ползван на 01.07.2014].

3 Цонев, Беньо. Опис на славянските ръкописи в Софийската народна библиотека. Т. II. С., 1923, 504-505.

4 Пак там, 505.

5 Физическото описание на ръкописа, заедно с дигиталните изображения за първото факсимилно издание остават отгук нататък единственото свидетелство за това как е изглеждал ръкописът преди реставрацията. Както споменава и авторката, тези данни са извлечени преди реставрацията. Трябва да се добави, че на това обстоятелство се дължат някои разминавания в номерацията на посочени листове в изследователската и в илюстративната част.

6 Срвн с Бит. 2: 19-20, текстът, обикновено илюстриран със сцената, в която Адам назовава животните.

7 Сукина, Л. Первое научное издание русского лицевого синодика XVII в. в

Болгарии (Иванка Йорданова Гергова. Духовни образи. Руски илюстриран синодик. София, 2013. – 340 с.). – Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики, 2 (60), 2015, 133-136, вж www.drevnyaya.ru/vyp/2015_2/part_11.pdf [ползван на 19.XI.2015].

8 Вж Мусакова, Е. Духовни образи. Руски илюстриран синодик: изследване. – Библиотека, XXI (LX), 2014, № 3-4, 221-225.

9 Поменици от Македония в български сборки. София, 2006; Gergova, I. Das älteste Gedenkbuch des Rila-Klosters. – Bulgarian Historical Review, 1-2, 2009, 164-179.

10 Боянският поменик като свидетелство за историята на храма. – В: Боянската църква между Изтока и Запада в изкуството на християнска Европа. С., 2011, 48-55.

11 Култът към св. крал Милутин „Софийски“ в България. – Проблеми на изкуството, 4, 2000, 10-18 (по-специално 13-14).

12 Зографът като писател и читател. – В: Филология, история, изкуствознание.

Сборник изследвания в чест на проф. Стефан Смядовски. С., 2010, 269-287

(по-специално 273-274); Самоковската художествена школа и украсата на ръкописната книга. – Проблеми на изкуството, 2, 2009, 42-47.

13 Чудесата на Пресвета Богородица в културата на българското Възраждане. С., 2012.

SUMMARIES

WHERE IS BYZANTIUM IN THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY? PUZZLE FOR ART HISTORIANS

Emmanuel S. Moutafov

An icon of All Saints produced in 1771 was recently published in Bulgaria. It is owned by the National Archaeological Museum in Sofia and comes from the region of Samokov. Its composition is not unknown to Orthodox iconography, but the signature of Zograph is of particular interest: $\alpha' \psi' \alpha' \Delta\acute{\iota}\alpha \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{o}\varsigma \text{ Κωνσταντίνου αμαρτωλού του Βυζαντίου}$. What could Byzantium be for a Greek artist from the end of the eighteenth century, when researchers call this period Post-Byzantine? Certainly Βυζάντιο in combination with the image of St Constantine the Great marks eighteenth-century Constantinople or Konstantinyie as the capital of the Ottoman Empire. Even more puzzling is why the artist did not use the Greek

name of the city or its Ottoman version. Arguably, the answer is to be sought in the sociopolitical situation in the empire and the Eternal City in 1771.

After a brief and critical presentation of the development of Christian Orthodox art between fifteenth and twentieth century the author notes another possible explanation of the icon's appearance exactly in the region of Samokov. Prior to 1766-67, this ethnic Bulgarian territory belonged to the diocese of the Serbian church, or of the Patriarchate of Pec, and after the destruction of the latter, Samokov came under the jurisdiction of Constantinople. Thus, it cannot be ruled out that the icon had been brought over from the Ottoman capital as a symbol of the transition of the local Metropolis to the rule of the Greek Patriarchate, which still considered itself as Byzantine, or more precisely, as a Byzantine institution functioning in the Ottoman Empire. The first arch-shepherd of Samokov ordained by Constan-

tinople was Philotheos, who was elected in Kurucesme in April 1778. Despite his Bulgarian origin, he became a monk at Mount Athos, studied in Istanbul and served as a deacon at the Patriarchate. Before Philotheos took over, the Bishoprpic of Samokov had been ruled by Neophitos Joanovich, exiled in Silivria, who was elected by Ipek. Upon his arrival in Samokov, the new Metropolitan Philotheos, probably as a political act, brought with him the icon painted by Constantine in 1771. More importantly, the artist who created the icon of All Saints believed that he still worked in the Orthodox tradition established in the Middle Ages and designated by western European scholars as Byzantine; he did not see himself as a satellite of a parallel visual world lost after the Fall of the multinational Eastern Orthodox Empire. Relying on a religious term, Christian Orthodox, to talk about a type of art with hardly any secular manifestations, instead of using an artificial po-

litical and economic designation such as Post-Byzantine art, would in addition prevent misunderstandings during contacts with experts from other fields.

ON CERTAIN PARTICULARITIES OF THE THEMATIC CHOICES OF ICON-PAINTERS FROM DEBAR AND SAMOKOV

Elena Genova

This paper contains observations of the authors and concise notes on certain particularities of the thematic choices of two of the most significant art schools in the Southern Balkans, that of Debar and Samokov. The roads taken by Zographs or teams of icon-painters, the shared models they have used and often the different directions from which they have arrived to them, the contacts between the painters—often indirect—that have worked at the same place, but in different periods, set the dynamism of the phenomena and their expression. The ongoing processes in both schools were synchronous and the leading icon-painters worked, водещите зографи работят с едно десетилетие дистанция. The notes on their thematic choices are based mainly on the leading painters from Debar, Dičo/Dimiter Krstev and his son Avram Dičov. The conceptual, iconographic and stylistic changes, determinative of the nature of church painting at the turn of the post-Byzantine period and the modern times are evidenced best at the same area, within the same architectural and symbolic space of an Orthodox church: the narthex and the porch. These are where all the quintessence of social relations, the morality and the faith of a Renaissance man are concentrated. Moral, didactic and eschatological subjects were intended to prepare the worshipers to gear themselves up for rethinking their lives and sins and correspondingly, for their expectations for the end of the age (The Last Judgment; The Ordeals; A Righteous and Sinful Confession; Going to a Witchdoctor for a Cure; The Wheel of Life; Michael the Archangel Takes the Soul of the Rich Man, etc.). The conceptual and thematic innovations in the decorative and iconographic programme of the altar space (Ecce Homo; Christ Great Hierarch from The Communion of the Apostles; Allegory of the Eucharist) and such rare subjects as The Trial of Jesus Christ Before Pilate; The Holy New Testament Trinity/Synthronon and The Coronation of the Most Holy Mother

of God became emblematic of the nineteenth-century Orthodox painting. The same is true of the image of the Winged Virgin Mary. And, last but not least, the new moments in the development of the cult of the enlighteners of the Slavs.

ACTIVITIES OF ICON-PAINTERS OF THE ART SCHOOLS OF DEBAR AND SAMOKOV IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY BOSNIA, HERZEGOVINA, MONTENEGRO AND NORTH SERBIA

Nenad Makuljević

Works by icon-painters of the Art Schools of Debar and Samokov are found in the nineteenth-century Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sandžak, Montenegro and the emerging Kingdom of Serbia. This fact stemmed from the Ottoman imperial context, in which the painters worked as well as from geographical reasons allowing for their movement and translation of icons. A specific cultural model of the Orthodox Christians developed within the Ottoman Empire uninfluenced by ethnic or national borders, but conforming to the millet system of the Ottoman Empire. The Orthodox Christians from across the Balkans and the Empire shared the same views of their religious and cultural life, rendered in similar solutions to all aspects of the visual culture and to the design and decoration of the Orthodox churches. That allowed for icon-painters and builders to move across the entire Ottoman Balkan territory, which is evidenced by such examples as the iconostasis by the Ginovski brothers in Novi Pazar, the icon of St Stephen by Petar Debranec from the village of Tresonče and the iconostasis painted by the Dičić brothers in Štitkovo. Icon-painters from Debar and Samokov worked in the nineteenth-century Principality/Kingdom of Serbia. Despite the changes in the top clergy's idea of church art, icon painters worked in frontier areas such as Negotinska Krajina. Some of them such as Teofan Isailović Bužarovski and Zachary Dimitrov settled in Serbia.

THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY ATELIERS AND MURAL PAINTING IN THE EPARCHY OF VRANJE

Irena Ćirović

During the nineteenth century many churches were constructed and renovat-

ed within what is now the Eparchy of Vranje, which necessitated to commission many icon-painters for their decoration. These were mostly from what is now Macedonia and Bulgaria, led by masters from workshops based in such major art centres as Debar and Samokov. The painters were mainly commissioned to make iconostases though some of them worked also on murals. Among the former was Emmanuel Isakov, followed by the painters from Debar Veno Iliev and Zafir Vasiljković, as well as Evstatij Pop Dimitrov. Dimitrije Andonov Papradiški, born in the vicinities of Veles, also painted several churches, alone or with Peter Nikolov. Teofan Isailović Bužarovski from Galičnik and Krsta Avramov Dičić from Tresonče used to work in the region at the turn of the twentieth century, while in the inter-war period, such painters as Teodosije Nikolić from Lazaropolje and painters, who had arrived from the Bulgarian lands, such as Georgi Pop Alexov from the region of Pernik and Vasil Pop Rađoikov from Samokov have received commissions to paint murals.

ORTHODOX ART IN THE REGION OF VIDIN. PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

Ivanka Gergova

The monuments of Christian art in the region of Vidin are understudied. Most of the extant churches in that region have been built in the nineteenth century. In the second half of the eighteenth century, high-class icons by anonymous Athonite icon-painters appeared, meant in all likelihood for two iconostases in Vidin, a seat of a metropolitanate. Other icons from Jerusalem-based workshops were donated by worshipers. Late Russian icons pique researchers' interest with some replicas of venerated wonderworking icons of the Most Holy Mother of God kept at churches and museum collections across the region. A great deal of the icons and part of church murals in the region of Vidin have been painted by masters of the Art School of Triavna with some of them signed by Georgi Dimitrov and Nikola Genkov and his sons Nikolay and Georgi. The Wallachians living in the local villages used to commission painters from Craiova to decorate their churches. There are extant icons signed by Constantin, Petre and Costache Petrescu from Craiova. Painters of the Art School of Samokov would work in the region of Vidin rather episodically:

famous icon-painter Dimter Hristov made an iconostasis for the Metropolitan Church of St Demetrios in the 1850s. It was painters of the Art School of Debar that have more often than not worked in the area since the 1860s: Dičo Krstev from the village of Tresonče, later his son Avram and grandson Krsta; Petre Debranec from the same village; Evgenij Pop Kuzmanov from Galičnik, Danail Nestorov from the same village among others. Master builders from the region of Debar were commissioned for the construction of some of the churches. As the region of Vidin failed to form a local school of painting in its own right, it became a venue for painters from across the Balkans.

**THE CHURCH OF ST. NICHOLAS
IN THE VILLAGE OF KRAJNICI
NEAR VELES**
Darko Nikolovski

The church of St. Nicholas in the village Krajnici is a monumental three aisle edifice from the 19th century. The fresco painting was accomplished during two periods (1875 and 1889) by different painters. In 1875, the fresco painting in the upper section of the central aisle, the dome, and the large part of the iconostasis was made by the painter – zograph Petre and his son Gligor of Tresonce in 1875, establish with the inscription on iconostasis beam.

Together with Petre and his son Gligor, appears the name of the painter Krste zograph from Veles, the author of the Despotic icons (Jesus Christ and the Holy Virgin).

Alongside the other icons, a mention deserves two graphic prints kept in the altar space. The print of the Holy Virgin and Christ of the iconographic type – The Virgin Unfading Rose. The print from Krajnici is identical to the Virgin Unfading Rose from the monastery of Saint Efraxia, the work of the engraver Giannantonio Zuliani from Venice in 1820, under the expense of the painters Stephanos and Neophytos from Mount Athos.

АВТОРИТЕ В БРОЈ:

доц д-р Емануел Мутафов, директор на Института за изследване на изкуствата – БАН, moutafov1@gmail.com
Assoc. Prof. Emmanuel Moutafov PhD, Director of the Institute for Art Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

проф. д-р Елена Генова, Институт за изследване на изкуствата – БАН, ecig@abv.bg
Prof. Elena Genova PhD, Institute for Art Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

проф. Ненад Макулевич д-р, Философски факултет на Белградският универзитет, n.makuljevic@f.bg.ac.rs
Prof. Nenad Makuljević Ph.D., Chairman of the Department of Art, University of Beograd

д-р Ирена Чирович, Институт за историја при САНУ Белград, irenazaric@gmail.com
Irena Ćirović PhD, Institute of History Belgrade

чл. кор. Иванка Гергова д.изк. Институт за изследване на изкуствата – БАН, v.gergova@yahoo.com
Corr. Mem. Ivanka Gergova DSc, Institute for Art Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Дарко Николовски, Републички завод за заштита на спомениците на културата, Скопие, nikdarko@kalamus.com.mk
Darko Nikolovski, Zavod za zastita na spomenicite na kulturata, Skopje

гл. ас. Мария Митева д-р, Институт за изследване на изкуствата – БАН, maria_miteva@abv.bg
Asst. Prof Maria Miteva PhD, Institute of Art Studies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

доц. Елисавета Мусакова д-р, Национална библиотека „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“, emoussakova@gmail.com
Assoc. Prof. Elissaveta Moussakova PhD, National Library of Bulgaria „SS Cyril and Methodius“