

Sedova Maria

Faculty of History, Department of Theory and History of Arts, Lomonosov State
University of Moscow

**Creativity of the artist Nikolai Polissky in the context of Russian Land art. The
problem of self-determination of Russian Land art.**

In my Ph.D. work, I see the work of Nicholas Polissky as a land-art artist and answer the following questions: Why do we need the art of Polissky? Why do we need Land art and Polissky as its representative? Was the Russian culture of the 20th century poorer and why Land art appeared in it later than in Europe and America?

To do this, you need to look at this art from the side, build it into the general picture of art history, apply the methodology of art history, description and analysis of monuments. And to answer the main question that stands before me as to the student of this art: why is this art necessary and whether it is unique, not borrowed, and whether it makes any sense. This leads us to apply semiotics to the study of this art. The analysis of a work of art is based on descriptive research, where the value of individual signs and symbols is unquestionable. The work of Nikolai Polissky and the work in the field of land art are filled with signs and have already acquired their own language in almost 20 years of history.

It is not always important for the artist that the viewer understands what he wants to say, but rather it is important for the viewer to come up with the meanings. Most importantly, the number of meanings that the reader-viewer will see in an object depends on his education, his outlook, his social group, his nationality.

There is nature: fields, forest, trees, rocks and mountains in the forest and one can see it every day and just enjoy it. But a person comes and collects a composition from the trees and now the spectator begins to think, and in what sense does it exist there.

There is already a language and symbols. And this new art overgrown with its myths and stories.

Many believe that land art in Russia is the politicization of social and cultural events, radicalism, shocking, the predominance of the irrational beginning, pessimism, intolerance and permissiveness, total pluralism, eclecticism reflecting the real

discreteness of the social life of the country in transition. This is not true, it is the art of Nikolai Polissky, although he draws his ideas in the surrounding world, news, conversations and people's fears, with all the same, very positive. Everyone sees in it his own value. Every spectator who came to look at the huge, "architectural" installations of the artist begins to invent his own story about them.

But still the questions remain: can the art of Nikolai Polissky be a reaction to the result of the collapse of the Soviet Union, reflection on this topic and as a result the creation of large-scale installations in which the symbols of empires are hidden: forgotten, lost, real existed and invented.

In all objects of Nikolai Polissky there is carnivalism, it is visible in the materials. On the one hand - they are very national, for example, a tree. On the other hand, these objects are slightly unreal. Yes, and all this is built at first glance deliberately ridiculous - again, very Russian, with a mockery of himself, with a postmodernist grin of a man who knows the history of art from Egypt through the Renaissance to the Russian avant-garde, but with great love, again to all us. The artist laughs at himself, over technological progress, over the new world, over science, over time.

Nikolai Polissky is an artist of the 21st century, his land art is a piece of the postmodernism, and he himself considers himself a postmodernist. All objects refer to Russian history or rituals and fairy tales, but they seem to send a mockery to the whole of this Russian history, although mockery is given with love and even trepidation. In Russia, before Polissky land-art in private, no one was engaged.

It is difficult to call Polissky's projects are back to the roots and are national, although, of course, they have a part of the national character: a little "looseness", a lot of wide "mysterious" soul, a lot of fiction. Behind the apparent simplicity in them is the second, third, and sometimes the tenth meaning. To find them is the task of the viewer.

Contemporary art should be done in such way, it should allow reasoning at all levels, and no matter how educated you are, well-read and whether only in Russia or traveled the whole world. The people turned out to be the main consumer of art, he often has to look for his hidden meaning wandering around the fields. It is the art of infinite space, freedom. The main question that is asked in the articles of critics and I would like to ask in my work: is Nikolai Polissky a contemporary artist or is it local, Russian art? Is this a great art or will it be forgotten in 30 years?

We can say that Land-art objects can be read as sign systems and the artist uses Russian and Soviet cultural codes that are known to his viewer and may be read by him. But these codes can often be understood not only by the inhabitants of Russia, but also by a wide circle of people in the post-Soviet space and abroad, which makes Polissky's art so popular all over the world. The very phenomenon that people talk about the meaning of Land-art objects suggests that Land-art can bring into the natural environment, which had almost no meaning before, it brings meaning from the person who created it. Land-art shows exactly the human layer of these meanings: there was hay, and then there is art, there was a twilight, a natural moment, and here the twilight of an entire civilization began.