

surrealism and croatian painting

_____ The chronicle¹ of surrealist tendencies in Croatia on the one hand and the efforts to discredit surrealism critically or politically on the other (i.e. the acknowledgment of all successes and failures of the first, second, and third attempts) offers the picture of what the history of a surrealist branch might consist of. But the mentioned branch includes strength, weaknesses, dispositions, and aversions of a cultural circle and is therefore presented as a common and broad, but also too generalized image of the circumstances in which one's work and originality do not always get the attention they deserve. To the extent in which our previous considerations have mostly been those referring to surrealism in Croatia — they will from now on mainly refer to Croatian surrealism. Why this distinction?

The topic of "Surrealism in Croatia" requires the solution of issues focusing on the phenomenon of arrival and expansion of a basically shaped thought, style, or programme from one milieu into another. The aim of the second topic ("Croatian Surrealism") is not to reject the individual psychological premises of surrealist art: the justification of this title is not based on some specific variant within the stylistic repertoire of surrealism, which would be common to the Croatian painters. Thus, we have established that there is no such thing as a Croatian surrealist school: even that, which is common to them, is not common in terms of surrealism, but outside of it: all modernist movements and all modernist art are

marked in Croatia by the tone of the middle way, by accentuated moderateness, caution, and certain conservativeness that excludes all radical positions. That missing margin always implicitly includes elements of clarity, expressiveness, and a bit of dogma. The radical position is regularly illustrative: therefore, it is also necessarily polemical and stands closer to the programmes, manifesto demands, and theoretical tests than all the other works of art. The aversion of our modernist art towards all effective radicalism and theoretical normativity of creative art is absolutely striking. And that corroborates the statement that all radicalism is the incarnation of theory in action. The fact that radicalism did not strike root in Croatia has been attributed to a number of evident reasons; we should like to add the scarcity of philosophical tradition.

All poison provokes its antidotes, while hunger conceives of new foods. "My surrealist glory will be worthless until I have integrated surrealism in the tradition" — as Dali wrote in his Autobiography.

There is a diagnosis of our condition, although Dali's method is not and cannot be ours. But the relationship between the values of tradition and surrealism adopted with Dali a significance that it had never had before. For Breton, the tradition (i.e. the tradition worth mentioning) included only pre-surrealists, the predecessors of the line of surrealists. Breton created a past for the surrealism, whereas we, thinking of our narrow tradition, shrug our shoulders: we do

nadrealizam i hrvatsko slikarstvo

_____ Kronika¹ nadrealističkih nastojanja u nas a, također, i nastojanja da se nadrealizam kritički ili politički diskreditira (tj. uvažavanje svih uspjeha i neuspjeha prvog, drugog ili trećeg nastojanja) pruža sliku onoga što čini povijest jednog nadrealističkog pritoka. Ali prtok o kojemu smo do sada govorili obuhvaća snagu, slabosti, dispozicije i averzije jednog kulturnog kruga pa se prikazuje kao zbirna, široka no i preopćenita snimka prilika u kojoj djelo i posebnost ne dobivaju uvijek zasluženu pažnju. U onoj mjeri u kojoj su se naša dosadašnja razmatranja pretežno ticala nadrealizma u Hrvatskoj — daljnja će se, pretežno, ticati hrvatskog nadrealizma. Što nam znači ova distinkcija?

Tema “Nadrealizam u Hrvatskoj” zahtjeva rješavanje pitanja sabranih oko fenomena prodora i širenje temeljno formirane misli, stila ili programa iz jedne u drugu sredinu. Druga tema (“Hrvatski nadrealizam”) ne ide za tim da opovrgne individualno psihološke pretpostavke nadrealističkog djela: osnovanost ovog naziva ne počiva na nekoj specifičnoj i hrvatskim slikarima zajedničkoj varijanti unutar stilskog repertoara nadrealizma. Kazali smo time da nema hrvatske nadrealističke škole: i ono što je zajedničko nije zajedničko u nadrealizmu nego izvan njega: svi moderni pokreti i sva moderna djela obilježena su u nas tonom srednjeg puta; naglašenom umjerenošću, oprezom, stanovitom konzervativnošću koja isključuje radikalne pozicije. Taj izostali rub sadrži uvijek, implicate, elemente jasnoće, izrazito-

sti i, po malo, dogme. Radikalna je pozicija redovito ilustrativna: ona je, stoga, nužno polemička i od svih djela umjetnosti najbliža programima, manifestnim zahtjevima i teorijskim testiranjima. Tuče u oči zazor naše moderne umjetnosti prema djelatnom radikalizmu i teorijskom normiranju stvaralačke djelatnosti. I to podupire uvjerenje da je svaki radikalizam u djelu inkarnacija teorije. Što u Hrvatskoj radikalizam nije hvatao korijena pripisuje se mnogim jasnim razlozima; mi bismo im rado dometnuli i oskudnost filozofske tradicije.

Otrov izaziva protuotrove, glad izmišlja nove jestvine. “Moja će slava nadrealiste biti bezvrijedna dok nadrealizam ne uključim u tradiciju” — pisao je Dali u Autobiografiji.

Eto termina našega stanja premda Dalijeva metoda nije i ne može biti naša. Ali odnos vrijednosti tradicije i nadrealizma poprima u Dalija značenje koje nije imalo ni u koga prije njega. Bretonu tradicija (tj. spomena vrijedna tradicija) obuhvaća samo pranadrealiste, tvorce loze nadrealista. Breton nadrealizmu pribavlja prošlost, a mi, pomišljajući na užu svoju tradiciju, sliježemo na to ramenima: takve prošlosti mi nemamo. Dalijevski pojam tradicije označava drugo; ono što s nadrealistima nije ni u kakvoj vezi, ono što mu je (po mnogo čemu) suprotno pa predmnijeva napor pomirenja.

Naš drugi početak, oko 1953, sav je u znaku tog napora (samo s obratne strane:

tradicija se uključuje u nadrealizam). Različitost tradicije i nadrealizma ne isključuje i razlikovanje samih tradicija. Na Dalije-

not have such a past. Dali's idea of tradition denoted something else; something that had no connection whatsoever with surrealism and was (in many respects) even contrary to it, implying an effort of conciliation.

Our second beginning, that around 1953, was wholly marked by that effort (only from the opposite side: tradition was included in surrealism). The differences between the tradition and surrealism did not exclude differences within the traditions as such. On Dali's side, there was the stage of Escorial, Cristobal Colon, Ocean armadas, gold of all Americas; pyramids of Inquisition and that sinister Loyola; Santa Teresa de Jesús, San Juan de la Cruz, and a shadow of don Quijote: the greatest adventurers and merchants, the fiercest tyrants, the unattainable saints, and the first fools: everything huge and monumental, conquering: continents on the breasts, scents of India, Africa, fruits of the tropics, precious stones of America, the vegetation of Naples and Sicily, the fuming Flanders of the raving Duke of Alba: all that whirling above the land that had seen all the worlds and the country that did not let itself be seen.

With us, everything is small, narrow, rural, earthen: a sea with no sea routes, no navy; only peasants and brigands and gendarmes; all is withheld in defence, all of us on our own, which is constantly decreasing: fortresses instead of courts, friars instead of saints, literate instead of poets, dummies where fools should have been; all is narrow, squeezed, measured like a tomb: here courage defies strength, simple defies great, defence defies offence, Franciscan defies Jesuit: iron defies gold everywhere, hard rock defies a new idea, modest order defies planimetrics, old experience defies new formula, sparrow in the hand defies pigeon on the roof, Šop's Christ with rye bread defies the ethereal bridegroom of St Theresa.

Virtually all our tradition is realistic and positivistic, with no metaphysical systems or unexpected Americas. That is: almost all our tradition is against surrealism. Therefore, one should not wonder that, as we have mentioned above, Croatian surrealism began to show reluctantly at the time when the movement had already passed the zenith at its French source and when — although painting was precisely then conquering a dominant position in the movement — all innovations, all formal and technical inventions, and all new surrealist methods (or therapies) were already well known (frot-

tage, graphic automatism, decalcomania, "objects", fumage, "Le Cadavre exquis"...) and all techniques adopted since dadaism were thoroughly imbued by surrealist requirements (collage, photomontage...). It is only in the totality of their anti-surrealist tradition that all Croatian surrealists were equal before surrealism. From the very moment, more or less precisely defined, in which surrealism became a historical fact in Croatia — it was objectified: not only that there were different system before and around it, systems with gravitation forces on which his orbit partly depended, regardless of whether it had resisted them or not. There were few systems coming after it that would be able to defy its influence: it was determinant and a part of given space for all those that followed: a historical, objective circumstance. But it was that as an idea and a cluster of ideas (if we speak about the philosophical aspect of surrealism), as a song, a pamphlet, or a novel (if we speak of its literary form), as decalcomania, as collage... (if we speak of its painting techniques), and it was all that (an idea, system, poem, or painting) in the art of hundreds and thousands, it was all that as a spiritual position rather than an object, which means that, for its objective existence, those ideas, poems, and paintings were relevant the way they were, even if they were totally individual and subjective, moreover, if they were totally individualistic and subjectivistic. The fact that works of surrealism were mostly that way, both in the centre and on the margins of its expansion, is corroborated by the most subjective painting movement after World War II, movement which is (for many: ipso facto) also the most surrealist among all post-surrealist tendencies: the so-called lyrical abstraction.

When Breton rejected subjectivism, apparently falsely, it was completely in accordance with this logic of objectification of the subjective, of the legitimisation and historicization of new subjectivism.

How appropriate is it to remind of the fact that the polymorphness of surrealist painting resulted from the excess of individual norms and the lack of objective ones? That is why it was more successfully articulated in (e.g.) the spirit of rebellion against the disintegration of reality than in the achievement of clear stylistic morphology. The impossibility of style, however, did not imply the impossibility of all other definitions of surrealist space: naturally, the

technical and formal arsenal that was crucial for the definition of style remained in the background. In rebelling against the world as it was — and indeed, surrealism did not strive to interpret the world, like cubism did, but rather to change it — everybody could chose any way that would lead to the goal. The common feature of all surrealists was the conscious and voluntary underfulfilment and overfulfilment of that cognitive level, indifferent towards the intuition data. That is why the sub — and super — reality of the surrealists was, in fact, the criticism of empiricism and rationalism.

"It was necessary... that our eyes, our dear eyes should reflect that which is, although not existing, still EQUALLY INTENSE (vers. I. Z.) as that which exists..." as Breton said. In other words: the intensely Non-Existent, that which is beyond our being, cannot deny what is equal to it in intensity.

Therefore, surrealism had taken upon itself one of the two basic tasks: to assert the other side of the human being and to assert the total being. The first did not exclude the second; moreover, the total being was the only goal, while the radicalisation of the beyond-component had, with respect to the aspirations of surrealism, mainly the psychological importance of a temporary pressure in extremis in order to suppress the absolute negation and to force it to give in by means of absolute assertion, in order to use the pressure to achieve that which was truly real.

The surrealist, beyond-like one-sidedness is (theoretically) ideally expressed by "graphic automatism", while the surrealist total being is expressed by a clash between the real and the unreal, the duality of meaning in the presented sign, which is the real image of the real, precisely the way it is in reality ("in nature") and the way it should seem; just like the sound with an echo, which is also a sound, but coming from elsewhere; inverted, different, but only with respect to the first one. The surrealist total being is expressed (in theory) ideally by a "double wall", the surge of the simulacrum from the factum (like in the walls and "walls" of Leonardo, Arcimbold, Tchelitchev, Ristić, Dali, Detoni...).

The thematic, obsessive, symbolic profiling of the beyond and the irrational as polemically unique or, more often, factually complementary to the present and the rational, creates the basic types of surrealist

voj strani scena Escoriala, Cristobal Colon, oceanske armade, zlato svih Amerikâ; piramide inkvizicije i mračni Loyola; Santa Teresa de Jesús, San Juan de la Cruz, sjen don Quijota: najveći avanturisti i trgovci, najljući tirani, nedostižni sveci i prve lude: sve golemo i monumentalno, osvajačko: kontinenti u njedrima, mirisi Indije, Afrike, plodovi tropâ, plemenite rude američke, zeleni Napulj i Sicilija, raskopitana Flandrija mahnitog vojvode od Albe: sve to u kovitlacu nad tlom s kojeg su se vidjeli svi svjetovi i zemljom koja nije dala da bude viđena.

U nas sve maleno, tijesno, pučko, zemljano: more bez putova, bez mornarica; sve težačko i hajdučko i žandarsko; sve ustegnuto sve u obrani, mi svi na svome što se smanjuje: tvrđave mjesto dvorova, fratri na mjesto svetaca, pismeni umjesto pjesnika, glupani gdje bi lude trebale; sve usko, zbito, ko po mjeri groba: ovdje se snazi hrabrost protivni, velikom jednostavno, napadačkome branilačko, jezuitskome franjevačko: željezo zlatu na sve strane: tvrd kamen novoj zamisli, urednost skromna planimetriji, staro iskustvo novoj formuli, vracab u ruci golubu na grani, Isukrst Šopov s kruhom raženim zračnom ženiku svete Tereze.

Gotovo sva je naša tradicija realistička i pozitivistička, bez metafizičkih sistema, bez neočekivanih Amerikâ. To jest: gotovo sva je naša tradicija protiv nadrealizma. Ne čudi zato, da se, kao što je već rečeno, hrvatski nadrealizam neodlučno počinje iskazivati u vrijeme kad je razvoj pokreta na francuskom izvorištu prevalio zenit i kada su — mada je slikarstvo tek osvajalo dominantan položaj u pokretu — sve inovacije, svi formalno-tehnički izumi i sve nove nadrealističke metode (ili terapije) već bile poznate (frotaž, grafički automatizam, dekalkomanija, “objekti”, paljevine, “Le Cadavre exquis”...), a sve od dadaista prihvaćene tehnike do dna prožete zahtjevima nadrealizma (kolaži, fotomontaže...). Samo su totalom svoje antinadrealističke tradicije svi hrvatski nadrealisti jednaki pred nadrealizmom. Od onoga časa, više-manje precizno utvrđenog, od kojega nadrealizam u nas postaje povijesnom činjenicom — i on se sam objektivizira: ne postoje samo pred njim i oko njega inородni sistemi o čijim gravitacionim silama, oteo im se ili ne, djelomice ovisi njegova putanja. Malobrojni će se među sistemima koji se javljaju nakon njega otrgnuti njegovu utjecaju: i on određuje, i on je, za sve naredne, dio zadana prostora: povijesna, objektivna okolnost. Ali on je to kao ideja i kao skup

idejâ (govorimo li o filozofskom aspektu nadrealizma), on je to kao pjesma, kao pamflet, kao roman (govorimo li o njegovoj književnoj formi), on je to kao dekalkomanija, kao kolaž... (govorimo li o njegovim slikarskim tehnikama) i on je sve to (ideja, sustav, pjesma, slika) u djelima stotinâ i hiljadâ, on je sve to kao duhovna pozicija a ne kao predmet što znači, da su za njegovo objektivno postojanje relevantne te ideje, te pjesme, te slike onakve kakve jesu i onda kada su sasvim individualne i subjektivne i, što više, individualističke i subjektivističke. Da su djela nadrealizma bila, uglavnom, takva i u središtu i na rubovima ekspanzije potvrđuje i najsubjektivističkiji slikarski pokret nakon II svjetskog rata, pokret koji je (za mnoge: ipso facto) i najnadrealističkiji među svim postnadrealističkim tendencijama: tzv. lirska apstrakcija.

Kad Breton, naizgled pretvorno, odbija subjektivizam onda se to u potpunosti slaže s ovom logikom objektivacije subjektivnog, ozakonjenja i upoviještenja novog subjektivizma.

Koliko je umjesno podsjećati da polimorfnost nadrealističkog slikarstva potječe od suviška individualnih i manjka objektivnih normi? Zato se on s više uspjeha iskazuje (npr.) duhom pobune protiv raslojavanja stvarnosti nego ostvarenjem jasne stilske morfologije. Nemogućnost stila ne znači nemogućnost svakog drugog definiranja nadrealističkog prostora: tehničko-formalni arsenal odlučan za definiciju stila ovdje je, prirodno, u drugom planu. U pobuni protiv svijeta takvog kakav jest — a nadrealizam doista ne ide za tim da, poput kubizma, svijet interpretira, nego za tim da ga izmijeni — svi imaju pravo na sve načine koji vode cilju. Zajedničko će nadrealistima biti svjesno i hotimično podbacivanje i prebacivanje one spoznajne razine koja je ravnodušna prema podacima intuicije. Tako je pod — i nad — stvarnost nadrealista, zapravo, kritika empirizma i racionalizma.

“Bilo je potrebno... da naše oči, naše drage oči odraze ono što, iako ne postoji, ipak je ISTO TAKO INTENZIVNO (verz. I. Z.) kao ono što postoji...” kazao je Breton. Drugim riječima: intenzivno Nepostojće, onostrano našega bića ne može poreći ono što mu je intenzitetom jednako.

Nadrealizam na se, prema ovome, preuzima jednu od dvije osnovne zadaće: da afirmira drugu stranu ljudskog bića (ono-strano) i da afirmira totalno biće. Prvo ne isključuje drugo; što više, totalno je

biće jedini cilj, a radikalizacija komponente onostranog ima u odnosu na pretenzije nadrealizma najčešće psihološko značenje privremenog pritiska in extremis da bi se apsolutnom afirmacijom suzbila i prisilila na ustupke apsolutna negacija; da bi se pritiskom izborilo stvarno realno.

Nadrealistička, onostrana jednostranost (teoretski) idealno iskazuje se “grafičkim automatizmom”, nadrealističko totalno biće srazom realno-irealnog, dvostrukošću značenja u predočenom znaku koji je stvarna slika stvarnog, upravo onakav kakav realno (“u prirodi”) jest i k tome takav kakav se još mora pričiniti; kao zvuk s jekom koja je i sama zvuk, ali s drugog mjesta; izvnut, drugi ali od onoga, od prvoga. Nadrealističko totalno biće iskazuje se (u teoriji) idealno “dvostrukim zidom”, izranjanjem simulakruma iz faktuma (kao u zidovima i “zidovima” Leonarda, Arcimbolda, Tchelitcheva, Ristića, Dalija, Detonija...).

Tematskim, opsesivnim, simbolskim profiliranjem onostranog i iracionalnog kao polemički jedinog ili, češće, faktički komplementarnog ovostranom i racionalnom, stvaraju se osnovni tipovi nadrealističkih presjeka: fleksibilni, lažni realizam “dvostrukog zida”, koji karakterizira bilo (već opisana) dvojnost realno-irealno, bilo metaforičko prikazivanje takvog procesa pri čemu, naravno, ne dolazi do nehotičnog prividenja drugog, nego videnja predstave prividenog: sva su djela ove inspiracije odlučno obilježena grčem, tjesnacem kroz koji kao da na putu iz jednoga u drugo prolaze oblici. Iz osjećanja praznine, gubitka, neusmjerenosti, uzaludnosti i nihila nastaju vacuum — scene u kojima se odsutnost pokreta ili nejasnost svrsishodnosti i primjerenosti pokreta ili pak izostanak tome pokretu logičnog konteksta daje kao odsutnost ovostranog i prisutnost onostranog budući da pokret simbolizira materiju i materijalnu (“ovu”) stvarnost, a usmjereni pokret svjesno i funkcionalno djelanje. (Napomenimo, uz put, da su majstorima ove grupe stajala na raspolaganju i najofucanija akademska sredstva, kojima su se oni, u mnogoj prilici, bez ustezanja služili). Opišimo prostor trećih kao krivulju noći. Noć je nejasnost, alogičnost, mahnitost, opasnost; djecu plaše mrakom, govori se o “mračnim silama”, “mračnim poslovima”, “mračnim strastima”; za zla čovjeka kažu: “crna duša”; za onoga koji je nestao pod neobičnim okolnostima da ga je “mrak progutao”; za onoga kojemu se na licu vidi da proživljava teške trenutke

cross-sections: the flexible, false realism of the “double wall”, which is characterized either by the (already described) duality of real-unreal or the metaphoric presentation of such process, whereby, of course, it is not about the involuntary and deceptive appearance of the other, but about seeing the presentation of the apparent: all works of this inspiration are positively marked by a cramp, a narrow channel through which forms seem to pass on their way from one to another. The feeling of void, loss, lack of direction, senselessness, and nihil creates the vacuum — scenes, in which the lack of movement or the vagueness of usefulness and appropriateness of the movement (or the lack of it) is attributed to that movement of logical context as the absence of the present and the presence of beyond, since movement symbolizes matter and the material (“this”) reality, while directed movement symbolizes conscious and functional activity. (We should point out, by the way, that the masters of this group also had at their disposal the most worn-out academic tools, which they were using on many occasions without any hesitation). Let us describe the space of the third group as the curve of the night. Night equals vagueness, illogic, raving, danger; one threatens children with darkness, speaks about “dark forces”, “obscure business”, “dark passions”; for an evil man, one says that he is a “black soul”; for the one that has vanished under unusual circumstances that he was “swallowed by darkness”; for the one whose face expression reveals that he is going through difficult times that “his face has darkened”. Night is attributed with the infantile as the unconscious and the senile as descending; it is instinctive and primitive, it is ridiculous, crazy, monstrous, cruel, lecherous, terrifying, cataclysmic; it is erotic. It is associated with dreams, with death.

What remains is to survey the actual material of Croatian surrealism. For this purpose, we shall first offer an explanation for our procedure that might — if left unexplained — be understood as the violation of facts. Our wish to respect the chronological sequence of individual surrealist works of art or — in cases in which that is impossible — the sequence of authors according to the order of their works (greater or lesser, more significant or more modest ones), as well as their orientation — and that wish of ours is by no means stronger than the wish to accentuate the sequence of ideas, to group

works of art and their authors (wherever it is possible) according to their affinity.²

It can be observed that, in the special circumstances of European cultural periphery — which the regions of Croatia indeed are — in an environment that is (when we speak of modern movements in art) primarily receptive — the clashes of these criteria are, despite all, far from being as intensive as we might perhaps expect. What is the reason? Perhaps it is precisely the circumstances of reception: the transfer usually begins from the margins of the new spiritual horizon (since the provincial cultural margin has no strength to accept the core of the new) and with time concentrically approaches the source. What used to be at the beginning in the source environment is usually reached only at the end in the receptive one. For the former, the characteristic process is that of distancing; for the latter, that of converging with the source. The historical aspect of this process is expressed by the formula of retardation, which can finally reach its maximum precisely in the moment of fusion between the derivative and the authentic!

With time, our surrealism was becoming ever more surrealist, although mainly in the extra-temporal sphere, that is, in an outdated sense.

Should it or could it remain unnoticed against such a background of thirty-odd years of production of an outspokenly surrealist (even if marginal) position? (“Producing a position” should be read as: producing an “-ism”). By no means; even less so if such an opus was created a year or two after the technique and the method by which it was created had entered the surrealist art inventory (I am speaking of the “*décalcomanie sans objet préconçu*”).³

Those would be the first and indeed surrealist works of art in Croatia (leaving aside the fact that, about this technique and O. Dominguez one might say what Marko Ristić said about M. Ernst in connection with the *frottage*).⁴

However, history will hardly acknowledge these merits to the *décalcomanias* of Vanja Radauš, as some of his contemporaries did at once. These works of art, which could have, in our opinion, stand at the source of Croatian surrealism — and which a part of contemporary Croatian critics indeed consider as standing at the source of our abstract art — these works of art from 1937 were shown in public as late as 1963. The discovery was accepted rather

uncritically and with time it was attributed a significance that it would, unfortunately, never truly acquire by its walking backwards. To encourage doubts about the date of these pieces certainly would not lead anywhere: and regardless of how belated their entry into life was (when they had no longer any character of novelty and when superior painting opuses, both surrealist and abstract, had been there for some time), its only ambition would probably be to occupy some place in the past, which would even provoke suspicion — nevertheless, no concrete evidence can be found against the possibility of existence of these *décalcomanias* in 1937.⁵ But what is more important than their existence is their significance: if these *décalcomanias* really existed — they meant nothing, to nobody, for an entire quarter of a century.

What could bring them back to those years when they did not exist? Our understanding of the historical dimensions of a creative act (and we have discussed in detail how nothing comes by itself or for itself alone: how the new influences the existing and the existing influences the new) prevents us from acknowledging *post festum* what the cycle of Radauš’s *décalcomanias* needs: their historical significance in the Croatian painting before World War II. (The very same reasons prevent us from considering the otherwise excellent work by Slavko Kopač in the context of post-war Croatian surrealism, since it was created in Paris and, to our regret, remained there. His Zagreb exhibition of 1966 showed us what we had lost in him: for his work had been created in a different tradition, in a different cultural climate and on a different level; thus, it had also found its echo there, an echo that it never had in Croatian painting, or at least not before that exhibition. His surrealist paintings were made in 1949, the year in which we had not even dreamed, so to say, in a surrealist way, and they reached Croatia only now, after seventeen or eighteen years of pure abstraction. If it had only been different... What would he have become, had he remained here? Could he have reached such results so early? Where could he have shown them in those times and to whom? And we could go on this way infinitely...).

Nevertheless, despite its historical deficiency, Radauš’s work, unquestioned by many, has finally obtained its encyclopaedic satisfaction, which motivated us to write these explanations, even if unwillingly. After

da je "smrknut". Noći pripada djetinjte kao nesvjesno i pripada staračko kao silazno; njeno je nagonsko i primitivno, njeno je smiješno, ludo, nakazno, okrutno, razvratno, stravično, kataklizmičko; njeno je erotsko. Njoj pripadaju snovi, njoj smrt.

Preostaje još da pregledamo konkretni materijal hrvatskog nadrealizma. Prelazeći na to pružit ćemo ponajprije, objašnjenje jednog našeg postupka koji bi — nerazjašnjen — mogao biti shvaćen kao ogrešenje o činjenice. Naša želja za poštovanjem kronološkog slijeda nastajanja pojedinih nadrealističkih djela ili — kada je, i u koliko je, to nemoguće — slijeda autora prema prvenstvu njihovih djela (većih ili manjih, znatnijih ili skromnijih) te orijentacije — ta naša želja nije, nipošto, jača od želje da se istakne slijed ideja, da se djela i autori (gdje god je to moguće) grupiraju prema srodnosti.²

Zapaža se, da u posebnim uvjetima evropske kulturne periferije — kao što to jesu hrvatske zemlje — u uvjetima sredine koja je (kad govorimo o modernim pokretima u umjetnosti) primarno receptivna sredina — sudari ovih kriterija, usprkos svemu, nisu ni približno toliko česti koliko se, kadikad, očekuje. Koji je tome razlog? Možda baš uvjeti recepcije: prijenosi obično počinju s ruba novog duhovnog horizonta (jer pokrajinski kulturni rub nema snage da prihvati srž novoga) i s vremenom se koncentrično primiče izvoru. Ono što je u inicijalnoj sredini bilo inicijalno u receptivnoj se sredini dostiže obično tek na kraju razvoja. Za prvu je karakterističan proces udaljavanja, za drugu proces približavanja izvornom. Povijesni aspekt ovog događanja izriče se formulom retardacije, koja može upravo u momentu poistovjećenja sljedbeničkog i autentičnog napokon doseći svoj maksimum!

Dobivajući na vremenu, naš je nadrealizam bivao sve nadrealističkiji ma da, pretežno u vanvremenu, odnosno uzastarjeluznačenju.

Da li bi na takvoj pozadini prosjeka tridesetgodišnje proizvodnje izričito nadrealističke (makar i marginalne) pozicije moglo i smjelo biti nezapaženo? ("Proizvoditi poziciju" čitaj kao: proizvoditi "izam"). Nipošto; to više ako takav neki opus nastaje godinu ili dvije nakon što je tehnika i metoda kojom je stvoren bila uvedena u nadrealistički, likovni inventar (riječ je o "décalcomanie sans objet préconçu").³

Bila bi to prva i zaista nadrealistička djela u Hrvatskoj (na stranu to što bi se za ovu tehniku i O. Domingueza moglo reći ono što je Marko Ristić kazao za M. Ernsta povodom frotaža).⁴

Međutim, teško će povijest dekalkomanijama Vanje Radauša priznati zasluge, koje mu je dio suvremenika odmah priznao. Djela, koja su, po našem mišljenju, mogla stajati na izvoru hrvatskog nadrealizma — a koja po mišljenju jednog dijela suvremene hrvatske kritike jesu na izvoru apstraktne umjetnosti u nas — ta djela iz godine 1937. pokazana su javno istom 1963. Otkriće je dosta nekritički prihvaćeno, pa mu se počelo pridavati značenje, koje, na žalost, ono više neće svojim hodom natraške nikad zbiljski steći. Pothranjivati sumnje oko datiranja tih djela ne bi, razumije se, vodilo ničemu: i ma koliko da je njihovo zakašnjenje uvođenje u život (kad više nisu imala nikakvih oznaka novoga i kada su već odavno postojali superiorniji slikarski opusi nadrealistički i apstraktni) imalo po svoj prilici, samo tu pretenziju da se zauzme nešto prošlo, pa time baš izazivalo rezerve — ipak se nikakav konkretan dokaz protiv mogućnosti postojanja tih dekalkomanija u 1937. ne može naći ni iznijeti.⁵ Ali postojanje nama nije važnije od značenja: ako su ove dekalkomanije postojale — značile doista nisu ništa, ni za koga, čak četvrt stoljeća.

Što je to što ih još može vratiti u godine u kojima ih nije bilo? Naše shvaćanje povijesnih dimenzija stvaralačkog čina (a govorili smo detaljnije o tome kako ništa nije samo od sebe, ni samo za sebe: kako novo djeluje na zatečeno i postojeće na novo) prijeći da ciklusu Radauševih dekalkomanija post festum priznamo ono što traže: povijesno značenje u predratnom hrvatskom slikarstvu. (Tačno isti razlozi priječe nas da u sklopu poratnog hrvatskog nadrealizma razmatramo inače sjajno djelo Slavka Kopača: nastalo i, za nas, nesrećom, ostalo u Parizu. Njegova izložba 1966. u Zagrebu pokazala nam je što smo sve u njemu izgubili: jer njegova djela nastaju na drugoj tradiciji, u drugoj kulturnoj klimi i razini pa u njoj nalaze i odjeka, kojega, barem do vremena ove izložbe, u hrvatskom slikarstvu nisu imala. Njegove su nadrealističke slike iz 1949, iz dana kad se u nas, da tako kažemo, ni sanjalo nije nadrealistički, sada

nakon sedamnaest ili osamnaest godina, čiste apstrakcije. Da je bilo što nije bilo... Kako bi se razvijao da je ovdje ostao? Da li bi mogao tako rano doći do takvih rezultata? Gdje bi ih i kome u to vrijeme smio pokazati? I tako u nedogled...).

Međutim je, od mnogih neosporavano, unatoč svojoj povijesnoj deficitarnosti ovo Radauševu djelo najposlije dobilo i enciklopedijsku zadovoljštinu nakon čega smo, i protiv volje, morali pisati ova objašnjenja. U ostalom digresija je važna u toliko što se odnosi na metodu pa je potrebno da bude shvaćena kao izlaganje jednog načela na konkretnom primjeru. Nadahnut odlomak posvetio je dilemi ove vrsti Georges Mathieu u eseju "Ka novoj konvergenciji umjetnosti, misli i nauke":

"Ja znam vrlo dobro da se može dokazati kako ova umjetnost, mada nije imala tačno određeno porijeklo, ima prethodnika: Picabia mi je pokazao jedan svoj gvaš iz 1907, koji nije ni suvremen (Mathieu time misli reći da ne spada u lirsku apstrakciju, u enformel — op. I. Z.), ni geometrijski, a podstaknut je idejom spajanja umjetnosti i muzike. Znam da su prve apstraktne slike Kandinskoga bile lirske, da je Hartung, još 1921. godine, nacrtao nekoliko vrlo slobodnih crteža i da je Baumeister također slikao slobodno. Pa ipak, čak da ovo i nisu bili potpuno slučajni i kratkotrajni eksperimenti (Picabia se vratio figurativnom, Kandinsky se brzo razvijao u pravcu geometrijskog izraza), oni su bili samo sporadične manifestacije, kojima je nedostajao kontinuitet i utjecajnost.

Gola činjenica da je djelo naslikano ne osigurava mu trajanje i mjesto u povijesti.

Da bi ostavilo svoj trag na kosturu društvenih i kulturnih prilika svoga vremena, umjetničko djelo mora biti stvarano sa sviješću ne samo o tome što ono jest, nego i o tome što znači, što donosi i, na kraju, što ruši. U svakom drugom slučaju ono je fantazija, samo rezultat raspoloženja, prolazno osjećanje bez prave realnosti, bez prave vjere, bez cilja i sudbine."⁶

Nakon što smo pokazivali gdje i kada počinje naš nadrealizam, vjerujemo, da smo pokazali i gdje — ne počinje. ×

Život umjetnosti, 3/4, 1967.

all, digression is important insofar as it refers to methodology and therefore it should be understood as explaining a principle on an actual example. Georges Mathieu has dedicated an inspired passage to this sort of dilemma in his essay "Towards a New Convergence of Art, Thought, and Science":

"I know very well that it can be proved that this art, although it does not have a definite origin, has a predecessor: Picabia has shown to me one of his gouaches from 1907, which is neither modern (Mathieu wants to say that it does not belong to the lyrical abstraction, to the *enformel* — remark by I. Z.) nor geometric, and it was motivated

by the idea of fusing painting and music. I know that the first abstract paintings by Kandinsky were lyrical and that Hartung made a few very liberal drawings back as early as 1921, and that Baumeister was also drawing very liberally. And yet, even if these cases had not been completely accidental and short-lived experiments (Picabia went back to the figurative, Kandinsky developed quickly in the direction of geometrism), they were only sporadic manifestations, lacking all continuity and influence.

The bare fact that a painting has been made does not secure its duration and its place in history.

In order to leave its trace on the skeleton of social and cultural circumstances of its time, a work of art must be created with awareness, not only of what it is, but also of what it means, what it brings, and, eventually, what it destroys. In any other case, it is just a phantasm, resulting from a mood, a transient feeling with no true reality, no true faith, no goal and no destiny".⁶

Having demonstrated where and when our surrealism began, we believe that we have also demonstrated where — it did not begin. ×

PRIJEVOD: Marina Miladinov

¹ Since our space limitations do not allow us to publish this text in entirety, we are bringing only some excerpts. Chapters I and II, which are most closely related to these passages, will be printed in "Kolo" 1/2, 1968.

² This is also difficult because most individuals have passed through several stages in their development, be it gradually or successively, and only few have ever remained satisfied with the place they had conquered from the first.

³ In his two books on surrealism, Patrick Waldberg does not agree with himself on the date of death of O. Dominguez, the inventor of decalomania, so that he disagrees with himself also on the issue of time when this new technique was inaugurated: according to his first book (Surrealism, "Skira", 1962), it was in 1935; according to the second (Chemins du

surréalisme, "Ed. de la Connaissance s. a.," Brussels, 1965), it was in 1936.

⁴ I.e. that this technique, the frottage "... was not discovered by Max Ernst (...), but he still invented it..." ; "Beleške", POLJA, Novi Sad, No. 53/54, 1961, p. 11.

⁵ One could only observe, and with clear consciousness, that - according to the author's statement - in 1937 or 1938, when these phantasmagoric notes were created, no such current had touched his sculpture. However, at the time when the decalcomanias were exhibited (1963), his sculpture had shown explicit surrealist accents for almost four years (cycle "Panopticum croaticum", 1959/61).

⁶ Translation by P. Mužijević (DEL0, Beograd, No. 2/1961, p. 207), adapted by I. Z.

- ¹ Ovaj tekst, zbog toga što je — za ovu priliku i mjesto — preopširan, objavljujemo u izvodima. Poglavlja I i II, najtješnje vezana uz ove dijelove, bit će tiskana u "Kolu" 1/2. 1968.
- ² To je teško i stoga što je većina pojedinaca u svom razvoju prošla kroz razne etape, bilo postupno, bilo sukcesivno, a samo su rijetki ostali zadovoljni prostorom, koji su od prve osvojili.
- ³ Kao što se u dvije svoje knjige o nadrealizmu Patrick Waldberg ne slaže sam sa sobom u datumu smrti O. Domingueza, otkrivača dekalomanije, tako da se sa sobom ne slaže ni u pogledu vrmena inauguracije nove tehnike: prema prvoj knjizi (Surrealism, "Skira", 1962) bilo je to 1935; prema drugoj (Chemins du surréalisme, "Ed. de la Connaissance s. a.", Bruxelles, 1965) bilo je to 1936.
- ⁴ tj. da tu tehniku, frotaž "... Max Ernst nije pronašao (...) ali ju je ipak otkrio..." ; "Beleške", POLJA, Novi Sad, br. 53/54, 1961, str. 11.
- ⁵ Može se, ne griješeći duže, samo primijetiti da 1937 ili 1938, kada su, prema tvrdjenju autora, nastale te fantazmagorične bilješke, slična struja nije dotakla njegovu skulpturu. Naprotiv, u vrijeme kad su dekalomanije bile izložene (1963) u njegovoj su skulpturi već četvrtu godinu postojali izraziti nadrealistički akcenti (ciklus Panopticum croaticum", 1959/61).
- ⁶ Prema prijevodu P. Mužjjevića (DELO, Beograd, br. 2/1961, str. 207) priredio I. Z.