

monumentalism as a current in croatian modernism and mirko rački

1

In the early 20th century, monumentalism was a prominent and relevant current in European art, especially in Germany, or rather the German-speaking countries. Its ideological background, goal, and the moving spirit was the idea of the nation, the effort to express what was “German in itself,” to magnify the significance of German Reich in the international context and to create a specifically German style for that purpose. In other words, it was nationalism in art. However, it was nationalism that “superseded mere particularism and reactionarism with its spiritual and artistic aspirations”, to use the words of Richard Hamann and Jost Hermand — authors of the book entitled “Epochen deutscher Kultur von 1870 bis zur Gegenwart”.¹

Within the current of monumentalism, there was an evident wish to create supra-temporal monuments of symbolic significance, which would contain the religious and ethic factor of education and suggest the sense of superiority. This orientation frequently based itself on models from the past (Egyptian, Assyrian, or classical art), which probably gave birth to the idea of designing temples or palaces intended for festivities, which was the task of architects, sculptors, and even painters as their “Gesamtkunstwerk”. Their aspirations were concentrated on style, on “the typical”, and they even created the Amazonians and the ideal athletes that lacked all features of style in their “forced formalism”. “Despite

what was said, one can feel here the wish to re-establish the personal cult that would counter the levelling of modern ‘Sachkultur’. Therefore, the demand for new German monumentalism was actually a protest against the dangers of democratisation.”²

Such art favoured architecture that was superior with respect to sculpture and painting. Individual space and objects of applied art were outside the scope of interest, what mattered was only the collective and the public. Almost all architects of the monumentalist current dreamed of towers and temples that practically turned into fantastic constructions, but — as Hamann and Hermand have pointed out — “most of the plans remained in the drawer” and therefore the time around 1900 was called “the era of unrealized projects and romantic dreams...”

Thus, for example, Peter Behrens dreamed of a building for festivities that would stand on a hill “as a temple of national culture and surpass the world of everyday life.”³ Numerous fantastic plans are known from that period, but few or none of them were ever realized. “Some of this spirit is evident in the monument of the ‘Battle of the Nations’ in Leipzig,”⁴ work of Bruno Schmitz and Franz Metzner.

One encounters the same characteristics in sculpture. Sculpture is closely related to architecture, it follows the same logic of the relationship between volumes and forms that express ideas, rather than adorning the representative spaces of palaces and museums or “standing around in niches

monumentalizam kao struja hrvatske moderne i mirko rački

1

Monumentalizam je na početku 20. stoljeća markantna i relevantna struja unutar europske umjetnosti, a posebice umjetnosti Njemačke, odnosno njemačkoga govornog područja. Njezina ideologijska podloga, cilj i pokretačka snaga jest ideja nacije, težnja da izrazi ono “njemačko po sebi”, da uveliča značenje Njemačkog Reicha u svjetskim relacijama i da za tu svrhu stvori specifično njemački stil. Drugim riječima, to je nacionalizam u umjetnosti. Nacionalizam, međutim, što “svojim duhovnim i umjetničkim težnjama nadmašuje puki partikularizam i reakcionarnost”, kažu Richard Hamann i Jost Hermand — autori djela “Epochen deutscher Kultur von 1870 bis zur Gegenwart”.¹

Unutar struje monumentalizma postoji evidentna težnja za oblikovanjem izvanvremenskih spomenika simboličnog značenja, koji bi sadržavali religiozno-etički faktor odgoja i sugerirali osjećaj nadmoćnosti. Taj smjer često poseže za uzorima iz prošlosti (egipatska, asirska, klasična umjetnost) odakle vjerovatno potječe ideja hrama ili palače namijenjene svečanostima, čime se bave arhitekti, kipari pa i slikari kao “Gesamtkunstwerk”. Težnje su bile usmjerene na stil, na “ono tipično”, a stvorene su amazonke i simbol-atleti, kojima u njihovu “forsiranom formalizmu” nedostaju svojstva stila. “Usprkos riječima osjeća se ovdje želja za ponovnim uspostavljanjem kulta ličnosti koji bi se suprotstavio nivelaciji moderne ‘Sachkulture’. Zahtjev za novonjemačkim monumentalizmom bio

je stoga zapravo protest protiv opasnosti demokratizacije.”²

Takva umjetnost favorizira arhitekturu nadređenu plastici i slikarstvu. Prostor pojedinca, predmeti umjetnog obrta izvan su interesa, a zanimljivo je samo ono kolektivno i javno. Gotovo svi arhitekti monumentalne struje sanjaju o tornjevima i hramovima koji najčešće prelaze u fantastične konstrukcije, ali — kako kažu Hamann i Hermand — “većina planova ostaje ležati u ladici”, te je stoga vrijeme oko 1900. “era neizvedenih nacrti, romantičnih snova...”

Tako na primjer Peter Behrens sanja o zgradi za svečanosti koja će stajati na brijegu “kao hram nacionalne kulture i nadmašivati svijet svakidašnjeg života”.³ Poznat je niz fantastičnih planova, ali je ostvareno malo ili ništa. “Nešto od tog duha vidljivo je na spomeniku ‘Bitke naroda’ u Leipzigu”⁴ Bruna Schmitza i Franza Metznera.

U skulpturi se također javljaju navedene značajke. Ona je usko povezana s arhitekturom, prati njezinu logiku odnosa masa i oblika koji izražavaju ideje, a ne ukrašavaju reprezentativne prostore palača ili muzeja stojeći “okolo po nišama i na postamentima”. Grandiozni, mahom izvedeni planovi arhitekata uključuju po pravilu skulpturu. Niču brojni spomenici Bismarcku, mnogi kao tornjevi ili kolumne. Izvedba se “često protegla u prvo desetljeće 20. stoljeća, ili do nje uopće nije došlo”.⁵ Među spomenicima Bismarcku najkarakterističniji je kao primjer monumentalizma spomenik u Hamburgu iz 1906. godine (Hugo Lederer, Ernst

and on postaments." Grandiose, mostly realized architectural plans regularly include a sculpture. There are numerous monuments honouring Bismarck, many shaped as towers or columns. The construction "often lasted into the first decade of the 20th century or never happened at all."⁵ Among the Bismarck monuments, the most characteristic example of monumentalism is that in Hamburg, made in 1906 (Hugo Lederer, Ernst Schaudt), while among the large realized monument ensembles, a characteristic one is the above-mentioned monument depicting the "Battle of the Nations" from 1913, which stands in Leipzig and is 91 meter tall.

Certainly, the painting shared all the basic features with other branches of art. The principle of public significance pushed the "easel painting" into the background, since it was associated with the private bourgeois interior, and preferred large formats, such as the wall painting. Large oils on canvas, conceived as elements of spatial design like frescoes, could be placed only in large public spaces, that is, a framework that was especially planned for them in terms of architecture. The simplification of visual procedures elevated the topic from the concrete sphere into that of general humanity. "Instead of aesthetic pleasure... there was the ethicization of artistic spirit... and the depicted object was supposed to mediate a general ideal, which reflected a firm set of values."⁶ Aspirations aimed at goals that were above reality, heroic, or god-like, while artists often resorted to allegoric illustrations of ideas by means of large, monolithic forms, great and powerful heroicized acts, expressive movements, hermetic forms, strict linearity, and symmetry in composition. Among the most outspoken and greatest representatives of this current in painting was Ferdinand Hodler. Just like the other artists, he was mostly interested in national and historical themes, which mostly "stand under the sign of symbolically exaggerated patriotism"⁷; good examples are the composition of the "Retreat from Marignano" from 1900, painting "Wilhelm Tell" from 1898, and further pieces by other authors, such as the "Nibelungen" fresco from 1909, work of Albin Egger-Lienz. At the time of their appearance in the 19th century and within the painting poetics of the age, these phenomena were usually termed "historical painting".

In the early 20th century, the monumentalist current included a rather wide geographic area, but it was not yet identified everywhere as an artistic orientation characteristic of the period. The taste and affinity of the public, as well as the curiosity of scholars and theoreticians, were tied to the easel painting for some more time, to the so-called "pure painting", whereas large decorative ensembles were largely rejected as a subject of interest precisely because of their decorativity, narrativity, or allegory. Therefore, it is difficult to gain an exhaustive view of the less famous pieces.⁸ An opportunity was offered, among other occasions, at the interesting exhibition "Ottant'anni di allestimenti alla Biennale" within the Venetian Biennale of 1978⁹, which presented some very instructive documentation material. The chronological overviews and reconstructions made for some exhibitions of the Biennale offered a large quantity of art-historically relevant data. For example, the Seventh Biennale, which took place in 1907, commissioned Giulio Aristide Sartorio with painting a decorative cycle for the central pavilion, comprised of four large and ten smaller compositions of allegorically presented topics of light, darkness, love, and death.¹⁰ As for its purpose, date, format, theme, motifs from classical mythology, and certain general topics taken from life (*vita umana*), the monumentalization of nude figures, succinctness, linearity, and its general features of design, this cycle belongs to the current of monumentalist art. The cycle is only one example from Sartorio's opus and one must keep in mind that in he worked as professor at the Weimar Academy in the period from 1896 until 1899.

An attempt to present the appearance of German monumentalism in a wider European context of similar phenomena has been made by J. A. Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth. He has listed examples of parallel currents in France and Scandinavia, mentioned our Ivan Meštrović, and generalized by stretching the time limits, thus including expressionism: "Sculptural and architectural monumentalism in European art between 1890 and 1930 is a legitimate parallel current between symbolism, Jugendstil, and expressionism, with which it shares the same features of national and exotic archaism."¹¹

However, it is significant that monumentalization was not reserved for large formats, decorative cycles, and architectural

monuments; it can be observed in other types of painting, from a simple easel painting to the graphic leaflet and poster to book illustration, plaques, medals, etc. That, again, speaks of the stylogene elements of this current, which was not just a sum of overdimensioned works of art.

2

It is not difficult to identify the appearance of the current of monumentalist art in Croatian modernism. Passages from the book by Hamann and Hermond constantly evoke our "local" associations. It is as if all its descriptions were referring to the movement developed within the Yugoslavia-oriented Croatian Artists Association "Medulić", in particular to Meštrović, but also to several other artists. The movement did not include the entire Association, but only a narrow circle around Meštrović, whereas the Association as a whole included a whole range of currents, same as Hrvatski Salon (Croatian Salon) and Lado, which fact was documented by the contemporaries as well.¹² There is a tendency to call Meštrović and artists around him, whose art is stylistically and thematically homogeneous, by the name of "Medulić" Group, whereas "Medulić" Association would denote and encompass all artists belonging to the Artists Association. This tendency results from the need to distinguish this radical group from the Association as a whole, but the differentiation of the term, which is apparently not well reflected, is neither practical, nor consistently applied in practice.

Croatian Artists Association "Medulić"¹³ had no artistic agenda and was drawing its cohesive force primarily from political ideas. In brief, those were the ideas of unifying all South-Slavic peoples opposed to the policy and goals of Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Artists were joining the Association gradually, by exhibiting at collective exhibitions, and abandoned it silently, which makes it difficult to establish any boundaries regarding the number of its members. The situation is even more complex when it comes to their work and its characteristics, since - as we have already pointed out - there were different currents within the Association and sometimes even art of different character within the opus of one and the same artist. Mirko Rački, for example, exhibited with "Medulić" his cycle for Dante illustrations parallel to his cycle of Kraljević Marko. The dating of these works of art is in this case

Schaudt), dok je među velikim izvedenim spomeničkim arhitektonsko-skulptorskim ansablama karakterističan već navedeni spomenik "Bitke naroda" u Leipzigu iz 1913. godine, visok 91 metar.

Slikarstvo, dakako, ima jednake bitne značajke kao i ostale grane umjetnosti. Načelo javnosti potiskuje "štafelajnu sliku" primjerenu građanskom privatnom enterijeru i preferira povećani format, odnosno zidno slikarstvo. Velika ulja na platnu zamišljena poput fresaka kao elementi prostornog oblikovanja moguće je smjestiti samo u velike javne prostore, odnosno arhitektonski za tu svrhu projektiran okvir. Tema se simplifikacijom likovnih sredstava diže iz konkretnog u općeljudske sfere. "Umjesto estetičkog užitka... dolazi do etiziranja umjetničke volje... a prikazani predmet treba posredovati općim idealima u kojima se manifestira čvrsta skala vrijednosti".⁶ Težnje smjeraju prema nadstvarnim, herojskim ili božanskim ciljevima, često se upotrebljavaju alegorijski prikazi ideja s pomoću velikih monolitnih oblika, velikog snažnog heroiziranog akta, izražajnih pokreta, zatvorene forme, stroge linearosti i simetrije u kompoziciji. Jedan je od najizrazitijih i najvećih predstavnika ove struje u slikarstvu Ferdinand Hodler. Kod njega kao i kod drugih zauzima istaknuto mjesto nacionalno-historijska tematika "koja najčešće stoji u znaku simbolično pretjeranog patriotizma";⁷ na primjer kompozicija "Povlačenje kod Marignana" iz 1900, slika "Wilhelm Tell" iz 1898. ili slični primjeri drugih autora, kao freska "Nibelungen" iz 1909. Albina Egger-Lienza. Te smo pojave uobičajili nazivati historijskim slikarstvom, kad su se javljale u 19. stoljeću u slikarskoj poetici onoga doba.

Smjer monumentalizma na početku 20. stoljeća obuhvaća geografski prilično široko područje, ali još nije svugdje identificiran kao karakteristična struja umjetnosti toga razdoblja. Ukus i sklonost publike, te znanstveno-teorijska znatizelja dugo su bili vezani uz štafelajnu sliku, uz takozvano "čisto slikarstvo", a veliki su dekorativni ansambli upravo zbog dekorativnosti, narativnosti ili alegoričnosti bili otklonjeni kao predmet interesa. Stoga se teško probija sveobuhvatniji pogled na ova slabo poznata djela.⁸ Jedan od primjera, i ne samo jedan, pružila je zanimljiva izložba "Ottant'anni di allestimenti alla Biennale" u okviru venecijanskog Bijenala 1978. godine,⁹ prezentirajući vrlo instruktivan dokumentacioni materijal.

Kronološki pregled i rekonstrukcija pojedinih izložaba Bijenala dala je niz podataka relevantnih za povijest umjetnosti. Primjerice na 7. bijenalu, održanom 1907. godine, Giulio Aristide Sartorio radi za centralni paviljon dekorativni ciklus od četiri velike i deset manjih kompozicija s alegorijski prikazanim temama: svjetlost, tama, ljubav i smrt.¹⁰ Po namjeni, vremenu nastanka, formatu, temi, motivima klasične mitologije i nekim općim temama iz života (vita umana), po monumentalizaciji akta, sumarnosti, linearosti i uopće oblikovnim karakteristikama taj ciklus pripada struji monumentalne umjetnosti. Ciklus je samo jedan od više primjera iz opusa Sartorija, koji je, ne valja zaboraviti, boravio u Weimaru kao profesor na akademiji od 1896. do 1899. godine.

Pokušaj da se pojava njemačkog monumentalizma smjesti u širi europski kontekst istorodnih pojava učinio je J. A. Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth. On navodi primjere paralelnih strujanja u Francuskoj i Skandinaviji, spominje našeg Ivana Meštrovića, generalizira razmaknuvši vremensku granicu i proširivši ga na ekspresionizam: "Skulpturalni i arhitektonsko-spomenički monumentalizam u europskoj umjetnosti između 1890. i 1930. legitimna je usporedna struja između simbolizma, Jugend-stila i ekspresionizma, u kojima sudjeluje i s kojima dijeli crte kako nacionalnog tako i egzotičnog arhaizma."¹¹

Značajno je međutim kako se monumentalizacija ne zadržava samo na velikim formatima, dekorativnim ciklusima, arhitektonsko-skulpturalnim spomenicima, nego se može prepoznati i na djelima drugih slikarskih vrsta: od uobičajene štafelajne slike preko grafičkog lista i plakata do ilustracije knjiga, plaketa, medalja i dr. To ipak govori o stilogenim elementima ove struje koja nije naprosto zbir dimenzijom velikih umjetničkih djela.

2

Nije teško identificirati pojavu struje monumentalne umjetnosti Moderne u Hrvatskoj. Deskripcije iz Hamann-Hermondove knjige neprestano izazivaju "domaće" asocijacije. Opisi kao da se često odnose na pokret što se rasplesao unutar jugoslavenski orijentiranog Društva hrvatskih umjetnika "Medulić", posebice na Meštrovića, ali i nekolicinu drugih umjetnika. Taj pokret ne zahvaća cijelo Društvo, već samo najuži krug oko Meštrovića, dok Društvo u cjelini pruža sliku raznovrsnih strujanja, kao što je bio slučaj s Hrvatskim salonom i Ladom,

što su primjećivali i suvremenici.¹² Može se zamijetiti tendencija da Meštrovića i umjetnike oko njega, čija djela čine jednu stilsko-tematsku cjelinu, nazivamo Grupa "Medulić", dok bi Društvo "Medulić" označivalo i obuhvaćalo sve umjetnike koji pripadaju Društvu. Tendencija potječe iz potrebe da se udarna grupa razlikuje od cijelog Društva, ali diferencijacija termina, čini se nesvjesna, nije najsretnija, ni u dosadašnjoj praksi konzekventna.

Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika "Medulić"¹³ nema umjetničkog programa, a kohezionu snagu daju mu političke ideje u prvom redu. To su — najkraće rečeno — ideje o ujedinjenju južnoslavenskih naroda suprotstavljene politici i ciljevima Austro-ugarske Monarhije. Umjetnici pristupaju Društvu postupno, izlažući na skupnim izložbama, i napuštaju ga prešutno, pa se stoga teško postavljaju granice u pogledu broja članova. Situacija postaje zamršenija kad je riječ o djelima i njihovim osobinama, jer, kao što je već napomenuto, postoje različite struje, a ponekad i djela različitog karaktera unutar opusa jednog umjetnika. Mirko Rački, na primjer, izlaže s "Medulićem" ciklus za ilustracije Dantea paralelno s ciklusom Kraljevića Marka. Vrijeme nastanka tih djela, u ovom slučaju efemeran podatak, ne pomaže pri stilsko-tematskoj orijentaciji.¹⁴

Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika "Medulić" osnovano je u Splitu na Prvoj dalmatinskoj umjetničkoj izložbi (30. IX. - 31. XI 1908) jednostavno pretvorivši relativno velik broj izlagača u svoje članove.¹⁵

Središnja je ličnost u društveno-organizacijskom smislu Emanuel Vidović, na čiji nagovor pristupa Vlaho Bukovac, prvi predsjednik Društva.¹⁶ Otkupljeni radovi znače početak skupljanja fundusa današnje splitske Galerije umjetnina. U povodu izložbe objavljena je revija "Split i Prva dalmatinska umjetnička izložba 1908" u izdanju Duje Balavca; nisu zaboravljeni ni društveno-zabavni aspekti manifestacije i, može se ukratko reći, pothvat je uspio dobivši velik publicitet.

Daljnje izložbe Društva "Medulić"¹⁷ kontinuirano okupljaju velik broj umjetnika, a profil se Društva naglo proširuje od regionalnog na jugoslavenski. Već na trećoj izložbi (Zagreb 1910) s "medulićevcima" izlažu slovenski i srpski slikari, i gosti iz "eške, u Rimu su u srpskom paviljonu pomiješani sa Srbima (1911), a u Beogradu nastupaju zajedno s drugim južnoslavenskim nacijama na izložbi koja, uostalom, nosi jugosla-

ephemeral and does not help determine their stylistic or thematic orientation.¹⁴

Croatian Artists Association "Medulić" was founded in Split, at the First Dalmatian Art Exhibition in 1908 (30 September - 31 November), simply by adopting a relatively large number of exhibitors as its members.¹⁵

The central figure in social and organizational sense was Emanuel Vidović, who persuaded Vlaho Bukovac to join the Association as its first president.¹⁶ The acquired works of art were the beginning of collecting the fundus for today's Art Gallery in Split. On the occasion of the exhibition entitled "Split and the First Dalmatian Art Exhibition, 1908", the publication of satirical journal *Duje Balavac* presented the social and entertainment aspects of the manifestation; briefly, the event was successful and enjoyed great publicity.

Further exhibitions of "Medulić" Association¹⁷ regularly gathered a large number of artists, while its profile quickly changed from regional to all-Yugoslav. The third exhibition (Zagreb, 1910) already included Slovenian and Serbian painters, as well as Czech guests exhibiting together with the "Medulićians"; in Rome, the latter were joined with the Serbs in the Serbian pavilion (1911), while in Belgrade they participated together with other South-Slavic nations at an exhibition that was even given a name of "Yugoslav". However, the "Dalmatian" character of the Association was often emphasized in order to differentiate it from the Zagreb Art Association and to accentuate the opposition between Split and Zagreb, between Dalmatia and Continental Croatia. It was a skilful political manipulation, to which Matoš reacted immediately.¹⁸

Ivan Meštrović became the prominent, central figure and the nucleus around which the Association had formed ("our head", as he was called by Krizman¹⁹). A large apparatus of propaganda supported the manifestations. There were increasingly many texts in daily newspapers: reviews, polemics, and numerous brief, but very efficient notes. Journals were founded, spokesmen and supporters gave their statements... and even the sum of these dry bibliographical data clearly shows today that it was a successfully promoted cultural and artistic boom in the service of political goals. It was a "political action" in art disguise - as one would say today - initiated, organized, financed, etc. on the territory of K&K Monarchy and against it.

During World War I, the activity of the group ceased within the country and its core - somewhat diminished, without Vidović and Krizman - was living abroad: Meštrović in Rome, Paris, and London; Rački in Geneva after a short stay in Rome; Kljaković also in Geneva (working with Hodler), while Rosandić worked in Italy, Switzerland, and England after a brief period of working for the military censorship at Niš. Dešković was also moving between Rome, Switzerland, and Paris. The artists were debating each in his own way, mostly in accordance with the Yugoslav Committee. Rački continued developing his Kosovo cycle, while Meštrović - a member of the Yugoslav Committee - abandoned the Yugoslav nationalists for the sake of general humane ideas and religious themes.

In the meantime, Vidović was working on his paintings in empty Split, while Krizman was living in Zagreb, where he proposed the establishment of "Proletni Salon" (Spring Salon) in 1915.²⁰

After the war, "Medulić" Association (with Meštrović as its president) once again organized an exhibition for the sake of propaganda. Rashly put together, this exhibition had explicit political goals, rather than artistic ones.²¹ Each artist had gone his own way in the meantime, the time of youthful enthusiasm was over, and the "guiding ideas" had lost their *raison d'être*; soon they were even — compromising themselves. "And so it occurred that Meštrović decorated that ridiculous monument to the Balkanian state megalomania...,"²² and not only Meštrović.

3

If one could reconstruct today the exhibitions of the Croatian Artists Association "Medulić" by putting together all works of art exhibited there, the general picture would be very colourful, which would also be the case with Hrvatski Salon and all other similar phenomena in larger European centres. Still, an artistic current was crystallizing within "Medulić" that would find its adequate expression in Yugoslav nationalist ideology. At the head of this current, and to its luck, there was Ivan Meštrović, who managed to overcome its formulas by his exquisite talent for sculpture in the prime of his youth and — despite the tendentious poetics —

accomplish supreme works of sculpture. His Kosovo cycle, which had been thematically present in Croatian art since the historical painting of Quiquerez and Iveković,

inspired an idea of a large temple, a unique architectural and sculptural concept. For this temple, Meštrović was making sculptures, which were exhibited first in Vienna and then in Zagreb and Rome. The central figure of the ensemble was Kraljević Marko, who was also the theme of a painting cycle of seven compositions in huge format (Mirko Rački, Ljubo Babić, Tomislav Krizman). Meštrović and his group of young artists were working for several months of 1910 in the Art Pavilion²³ and virtually in one breath composed an exhibition that became famous for Vojnović's slogan "Against the Unheroic Times". A large number of artists presented works of different character, but the basic tone was set by the historical themes of the Kosovo cycle. Most parts of the cycle would be transferred to the Pavilion of the Kingdom of Serbia at the International Exhibition in Rome, where Meštrović would win an award for sculpture.

It is indubitable and evident at first sight that Meštrović's Vidovdan Temple belongs in its idea, concept, and details to the current of monumentalist art as defined and described by the authors of "Epochen deutscher Kultur von 1870 bis zur Gegenwart". All characteristics are present: the ideologized and politicised concept, national mythology, architectural and sculptural idea of the monument/temple "as a temple of the religion of extreme sacrifice", the influence of ancient cultures (Egypt, Rome), legends, allegorical and symbolic presentation, monumentalization and heroization of human deeds, titanism, stylisation... even the fact that the temple was never built fits well into the complex phenomenon of the cultural and historical system of monumentalism. Therefore, one may define it as monumentalism within the Yugoslavia-oriented fraction of Croatian modernism, which has an obvious source.

One of the distinguished representatives of monumentalism in Germany and Austria was Franz Metzner. His activity in Vienna covers the period from 1903 until late 1906. Meštrović was there from 1900 until 1907, when he left for Paris, although he did not break all ties with Vienna and continued exhibiting with the Vienna Secession.²⁴ Thus, he had the opportunity to see fourteen pieces by Rodin at the IX Exhibition of the Secession in Vienna, which took place in 1901. His situation was almost identical to Metzner's, since the latter, after moving away, also "remained in contact with the

sko ime. Ipak se često ističe "dalmatinski" karakter Društva čime se hoće naglasiti njegova suprotstavljenost zagrebačkom Društvu umjetnosti, odnosno, suprotstavljenost Splita i Zagreba, Dalmacije i uže Hrvatske, što je spretna politička manipulacija, na koju vrlo brzo reagira Matoš.¹⁸

Ivan Meštrović postaje istaknuta središnja figura, i oko njega se formira jezgra Društva ("naša glava", kako Meštrovića naziva Krizman¹⁹). Velik propagandni aparat prati manifestacije. Raste broj tekstova u dnevnim listovima: kritike, polemike, mnogo kratkih ali vrlo efikasnih bilježaka. Osnivaju se časopisi, javljaju glasnogovornici, zagovornici... i već suma suhih bibliografskih podataka može danas jasno pokazati da je uspješno provociran kulturno-umjetnički zamah u službi političkih ciljeva. Umjetnošću maskirana "politička akcija" - kako bi se danas reklo - inicirana, organizirana, financirana itd. Na tlu i protiv - K.u.K. Monarhije.

U tijeku prvoga svjetskog rata djelovanje grupe u zemlji prestaje, a jezgra - nešto smanjena, bez Vidovića i Krizmana - živi u inozemstvu: Meštrović u Rimu, Parizu i Londonu; Rački, nakon kratkog rimskog boravka, u Ženevi; Kljaković također u Ženevi (radi kod Hodlera); Rosandić nakon kraćeg rada za nišku vojnu cenzuru radi u Italiji, Švicarskoj i Engleskoj. Dešković se također kreće na liniji Rim - Švicarska - Pariz. Umjetnici politiziraju, svaki na svoj način, uglavnom u skaldu s Jugoslavenskim odborom. Rački dalje razvija svoj kosovski ciklus, dok Meštrović - član Jugoslavenskog odbora - napušta jugo-nacionalizam za volju općeljudskih ideja i religiozne tematike.

Vidović dotle radi svojete slike u opustjelom Splitu, a Krizman u Zagrebu godine 1915. predlaže osnivanje "Proljetnog salona".²⁰

Poslije rata opet će jedanput Društvo "Medulić" (predsjednik Meštrović) organizirati izložbu iz propagandnih razloga. Na brzinu formirana, imala je eksplicitno više političke nego umjetničke ciljeve.²¹ Putovi su se umjetnika u međuvremenu razdvojili, prošlo je doba mladenačkih zanosa, a "ideje vodilje" izgubile su svoj raison d'être, i uskoro se čak — blamirale. "I tako se dogodilo da je Meštrović dekorirao jednu smiješnu balkansku državotvornu megalomaniju..."²² i ne samo Meštrović.

3

Kad bi bilo moguće danas rekonstruirati izložbe Društva hrvatskih umjetnika

"Medulić" prikupivši sva na njima izlagana djela, opća bi slika bila vrlo šarena, što je uostalom također slučaj s Hrvatskim salonom, i sličnim pojavama u većim europskim centrima. Ipak se unutar "Medulića" iskristalizirala jedna umjetnička struja koja je našla adekvatni izraz jugoslavenskoj nacionalističkoj ideologiji. Na čelu te struje, i na njezinu sreću, stoji Ivan Meštrović, koji je u punoj mladenačkoj snazi svojim izrazitim kiparskim talentom prevladao formule i — tendencioznoj poetici usprkos — ostvario najviše kiparske domete. Kosovski ciklus, tematski prisutan u hrvatskoj umjetnosti već historijskim slikarstvom Quiquereza i Ivekovića, inspirira ideju velikog hrama, jedinstvenog arhitektonskog i skulptorskog koncepta. Za njega Meštrović radi figure, najprije izložene u Beču, a potom u Zagrebu i Rimu. Centralna ličnost ansambla jest Kraljević Marko, tema i slikarskog ciklusa od sedam kompozicija golemih dimenzija (Mirko Rački, Ljubo Babić, Tomislav Krizman). Meštrović i grupa mladih radili su nekoliko mjeseci 1910. godine u Umjetničkom paviljonu,²³ i tako reći u jednom dahu načinili izložbu poznatu po Vojnovićevu geslu "nejunačkom vremenu usprkos". Izlagao je velik broj umjetnika djela različitih značajki, ali temeljni ton daju historijske teme kosovskog ciklusa. Veći dio tog ciklusa bit će prenesen u paviljon Kraljevine Srbije na međunarodnu rimsku izložbu, gdje Meštrović dobiva nagradu za skulpturu.

Neosporno je i na prvi pogled vidljivo da Meštrovićev Vidovdanski Hram, po ideji, konceptu i detaljima, pripada struji monumentalne umjetnosti, kako je definiraju i deskribiraju autori djela "Epochen deutscher Kultur von 1870 bis zur Gegenwart". Sve karakteristike su tu: ideologizirani i politizirani koncept, nacionalna mitologija, arhitektonsko-skulptorsko shvaćanje spomenika-hrama "kao hrama religije krajnjega požrtvovanja", utjecaj starih kultura (Egipat, Rim), legenda, alegorijsko-simbolični prikazi, monumentalizacija i heroizacija ljudskog akta, titanizam, stilizacija... pa čak se i činjenica da hram nije izveden uklapa u kompleks fenomena kulturnopovijesnog sklopa monumentalne struje. Riječ je, dakle, o monumentalizmu jugoslavenski orijentiranog dijela hrvatske Moderne, kojemu je porijeklo evidentno.

Jedan od istaknutih predstavnika monumentalizma u Njemačkoj i Austriji bio je Franz Metzner. Njegovo se djelovanje u Beču odvija od 1903. do kraja 1906. godine.

Meštrović ondje boravi od 1900. do 1907, kad odlazi u Pariz, ali ne prekida veze s Bečom, izlažući s bečkom Secesijom.²⁴ Imao je, dakle, prilike već u Beču vidjeti četrnaest Rodinovih djela na IX izložbi Secesije 1901. godine. Situacija je sasvim podudarna s Metznerovom: i on poslije odlaska "ostaje u kontaktu s bečkim milieuom. Njegov je utjecaj na bečku umjetnost trajao do 1911. godine, a vezu sa secesionistima je održavao i kasnije".²⁵ Franz Metzner u tijeku svoga bečkog perioda radi pod utjecajem Rodina, u doba kad 1904. godine nastaje nacrt i model zdenca "Nibelungen". Imao je biti smješten na trg pred glavnom fasadom "Votivkirche" u Beču. Centralnog tlocrta, uzdiže se stepenasto - otprilike onako kako je Meštrović želio postaviti "Zdenac života" — s prstenastim frizom reljefa na povišenom dijelu. Reljefe sačinjavaju aktovi u različitim položajima; pojedinačne figure i parovi. Zdenac "Nibelungen" svojim smještajem u ambijent, centralnim tlocrtom, motivima i obradom reljefa neizbježno podsjeća na Meštrovićev sjajan "Zdenac života" pred Hrvatskim narodnim kazalištem u Zagrebu (1905).

Kao što je već rečeno, nacrti i gipsani modeli za zdenac "Nibelungen" nastaju 1904. godine, ali do definitivne izvedbe dolazi tek poslije Metznerove smrti, kad je postavljen u Jabloncu, dok danas stoji u bavarskom mjestu Neugablonz.

Iste, 1904. godine, Metzner izlaže na XX izložbi bečke Secesije čiji je redoviti član od 1903., a koju će napustiti zajedno s Klimtom 1905., kad se grupa secesionista odvojila od Secesije. To je dakle bila "druga secesija", kako bi se u nas reklo. Na spomenutoj izložbi Metzner dobiva odvojeni prostor, i tu već oblikuje svoje "plastične i arhitektonske predodžbe". Iz predvorja s dekorativnim nizom atlanta ulazi se u centralni glavni prostor, gdje je na sredini smještena alegorijska figura "Zemlja", dok su na zidu visoko uokrug postavljeni također atlanti, kao fingirani nosači vijenca (kakve će Metzner izraditi za Plečnikov "Zacherlhaus" u Beču 1905). Maria Pötzl-Malikova, koja je u najnovije doba svojim istraživanjima i tezama pridonijela revalorizaciji Metznerova opusa, misli da je "stroga, opora rotunda, oblikovana kao arhajski hram", anticipirala "osnovnu koncepciju spomenika Bitke naroda".²⁶

U razvitku Metznerove ideje arhitektonsko-skulpturalnog spomenika značajno mjesto zauzima berlinska Palača Rheingold

Viennese milieu. His influence on Viennese art lasted until 1911 and also later he kept his links with the Secessionists.”²⁵ During his Viennese period, Franz Metzner worked under the influence of Rodin, at the time when, in 1904, he made the plan and the model for his “Nibelungen” well. It was to be placed on the square in front of the front façade of Votivkirche in Vienna and had a central ground plan, gradually ascending - approximately as Meštrović wanted to position his “Well of Life” — with a ring-shaped frieze, made in relief and placed on its elevated part. The reliefs consisted of nude figures in various positions, individuals and couples. In its environmental setting, its central ground plan, and the style of its reliefs, the “Nibelungen” well inevitably reminds of Meštrović’s brilliant “Well of Life”, which stands in front of the Croatian National Theatre in Zagreb (1905).

It has already been established that the plans and plaster models for the “Nibelungen” well were made in 1904, but its definite construction took place only after Metzner’s death, when it was situated in Jablonec, whereas today it stands in the Bavarian town of Neugablonz.

In the same year of 1904, Metzner participated at the XX Exhibition of Vienna Secession, whose regular member he had been since 1903, and which he would leave together with Klimt in 1905, when a group of Secessionists split off from the Secession. It was what we might call the “Second Secession”. At the afore-mentioned exhibition, Metzner obtained his own space, where he put into practice his “sculptural and architectural ideas”. Through a hall, lined by decorative atlantes, one comes into the central space, in the middle of which stands an allegorical figure of “the Earth”, while all around the wall, high above the ground, there are further atlantes acting as carriers of wreaths (like those that Metzner would make for Plečnik’s “Zacherlhaus” in Vienna in 1905). Maria Pötzl-Malikova, who has recently contributed to the re-evaluation of Metzner’s opus with her research and hypotheses, is of the opinion that this “austere and hard rotunda, shaped as an archaic temple,” anticipated the “basic conception of the ‘Battle of the Nations’ monument.”²⁶

In the development of Metzner’s idea of architectural and sculptural monument, a significant role was played by Rheingold Palace in Berlin, work of architect Bruno Schmitz (demolished in World War II). It

was made in 1906 and conceived as public space for meeting and making music, with several halls and lavish sculptural decoration made by Metzner. “For reasons of fire hazard, this ‘sacred space of elevated socializing’ was eventually turned into a wine cellar.”²⁷ Photographs of the interior and exterior, as well as plaster models resemble strikingly the sculpture of Ivan Meštrović and Tomo Rosandić. Nude figures in characteristic positions, hypertrophic muscles, and even that well-known stylisation of drapery and hair, might even mislead us to attribute these reliefs to Ivan Meštrović. A similar case is that of the photograph showing Metzner’s hall at the Vienna exhibition of 1908: one could easily mistake it for a photograph of some Meštrović’s exhibition!

The first stage of constructing the “Battle of the Nations” monument, on which Metzner also cooperated with architect Bruno Schmitz, took place in 1906 in Vienna.²⁸ This means that there was still a possibility of direct contact with Meštrović.

Some earlier critics used to take the impact of Metzner on young Meštrović for granted, while others, mostly modern critics, have denied it altogether. Some have allowed for a possibility of “reciprocal” influence, although Meštrović personally “did not appreciate Metzner’s sculptures.”²⁹

It is difficult to believe that Meštrović, who was thirteen years younger and still a student at the time when Metzner became professor at the Academy of Arts and Crafts, could reply with a stylogene influence. Besides, one should not forget that Metzner had come to Vienna from Berlin and Meštrović from Split! And his opinion on Metzner can hardly be taken as decisive for the research of the genesis of forms.

After World War I, Metzner was among those artists who were politically and artistically discredited by German art historians³⁰ and that might be the reason why there was an effort to detach Meštrović’s name from his. However, the fact remains that both Metzner and Meštrović belong to the same artistic current and that Meštrović had most probably joined it through Metzner, although he later, despite the similarities, managed to achieve his own, powerful expression. Despite the “stylism”, his sculpture is far more realistic than Metzner’s and lives, in its best moments, with a full sculptural suggestive power. Accepting the fact that Meštrović belonged to the current of monumentalist art, together with Metzner, does not mean

devaluating his art. On the contrary, with Meštrović’s monumentalism, Croatian art participated in European cultural processes on an equal footing and up to date. However, the fact that Meštrović used an outspokenly German, that is, Austrian politicized stylistics in order to serve Yugo-nationalist, anti-German and anti-Vienna goals, is indeed a paradox! Krleža commented it as early as 1916³¹ and repeated it after World War II: “When Lord Robert Cecil, on the occasion of opening Meštrović’s exhibition at the Albert and Victoria Museum in London (24 June 1915) exclaimed that ‘barbaric Germany should first produce an artist of Meštrović’s format before asking of Britain to discuss its demands,’ as politician he had no idea that, with Meštrović’s art, he was also celebrating the typical Viennese sculpture of the Secession.”³² And we might add: not only Viennese, but essentially German, Prussian!

Modern interpretations of visual arts in the early 20th century have undoubtedly confirmed in their periodization and classification the old judgments and evaluations of Miroslav Krleža about the developments in Croatian art, of which he was a superior witness.

However, one should not forget that, in his essay “Ivan Meštrović Believes in God”, where he was settling accounts with Meštrović’s political concept, Krleža wrote amazing pages on the artist’s sculpture. Those pages mean for Meštrović undoubtedly much more than all the countless panegyrics of his various spokesmen and laudators. Later on, Krleža also separated — both orally and in written form — the political physiognomy of Ivan Meštrović from the artistic one, evaluating each of them separately.

The core of “Medulić” Association had its roots in Viennese art at the turn of the century. Almost all artists spent some time in Vienna and probably it was then that they came into contact with one another. Characteristics of Austrian art can be recognized in the opus of almost each and every one of them, be it in motifs, certain phrases in painting, or general spirit. Certainly, all this is valid also for Mirko Rački. Without these premises, it would be impossible to understand what was actually happening with his art.

4

Mirko Rački belongs to the current of monumentalism in Croatian modernism owing to his numerous artworks with historical themes or topics from folk poetry. Many

arhitekta Bruna Schmitza (uništena u drugom svjetskom ratu). Nastala 1906. godine, zamišljena kao javni prostor okupljanja i muziciranja, imala je više velikih dvorana čiju bogatu plastičnu dekoraciju izvodi Metzner. "Iz vatrogasnih razloga bio je ovaj 'posvećeni prostor više društvenosti' na kraju pretvoren u vinski lokal."²⁷ Fotografije enterijera i eksterijera kao i gipsanih modela pokazuju reljefe frapantno slične djelima Ivana Meštrovića i Tome Rosandića. Aktovi karakterističnih pokreta, hipertrofirana muskulatura, pa čak i ona nama dobro poznata stilizacija draperija i kose, lako bi zaveli na pogrešnu atribuciju tih reljefa Ivanu Meštroviću. Slična je situacija s fotografijom što prikazuje Metznerovu dvoranu na izložbi u Beču 1908. godine; mogla bi figurirati kao fotografija neke Meštrovićeve izložbe!

Rad na spomeniku Bitke naroda, što ga je Metzner također izvodio s arhitektom Brunom Schmitzom, odvijao se u svojoj prvoj etapi 1906. godine u Beču.²⁸ Mogućnosti direktnog kontakta s Meštrovićem još su, dakle, postojale.

Utjecaj Metznera na mladog Meštrovića uzimali su neki raniji kritičari kao po sebi razumljivu činjenicu dok su drugi, među njima i suvremeni stručnjaci, ograđivali Meštrovića od tog utjecaja. Dopuštaju doduše ponekad mogućnost "recipročnog" djelovanja, premda Meštrović sam "nije cijenio Metznerove skulpture".²⁹

Teško se može pretpostaviti da trinaest godina mlađi Meštrović, još student, kad Metzner postaje profesorom Akademije za primijenjenu umjetnost, može uzvratiti stilogenim utjecajem. Ne treba, osim toga, zaboraviti da Metzner dolazi u Beč iz Berlina, a Meštrović iz Splita! Njegovo pak mišljenje o Metzneru ne bi nikako moglo biti mjerodavno za istraživanja geneze oblika.

Metzner je, i ne samo on, poslije prvoga svjetskog rata politički i umjetnički diskvalificiran od njemačke povijesti umjetnosti,³⁰ pa je možda stoga učinjen napor da se ime Meštrovića odvoji od njega. "injenica je, međutim, da i Metzner i Meštrović pripadaju istoj umjetničkoj struji, da je Meštrović najvjerojatnije ušao u tu struju posredstvom Metznera, i da je, usprkos sličnosti s njim, ostvario potentan vlastiti izraz. Njegova skulptura unatoč "stilizmu" ostaje znatno realističnija od Metznerove, a u svojim najboljim trenucima živi punom sugestivnom skulptorskom snagom. Prihvatiti činjenicu da Meštrović pripada struji monumentalne umjetnosti zajedno s Metznerom

ne znači devalvirati njegovo djelo. Dapače, s Meštrovićevim monumentalizmom hrvatska umjetnost ravnopravno i ažurno sudjeluje u europskim kulturnim kretanjima. Što se Meštrović služio izrazito njemačkom, odnosno austrijskom, politiziranom stilistikom u službi suprotnih, jugo-nacionalističkih, protu-njemačkih i protu-bečkih ciljeva, doista jest paradoks! Krleža ga već 1916. godine zapisuje,³¹ a ponavlja poslije drugoga svjetskog rata: "Kada je lord Robert Cecil, prigodom otvaranja Meštrovićeve izložbe u londonskom Albert and Victoria Museum (24. VI 1915), zatražio od 'barbarske Njemačke da najprije proizvede jednog umjetnika kao što je Meštrović, a tek onda da će Velika Britanija moći da diskutira o germanskim zahtjevima' R. Cecil kao političar nije imao pojma da u djelu I. Meštrovića slavi tipičnu secesionističku bečku skulpturu."³² Mogli bismo dodati: ne samo bečku, nego u svojoj biti njemačku, prusku!

Moderne interpretacije likovnih umjetnosti ranog 20. stoljeća, njihova periodizacija i klasifikacija, nedvojbeno potvrđuju davne prosudbe i ocjene Miroslava Krleže u odnosu na zbivanja u hrvatskoj umjetnosti kojima je bio superiornim svjedokom.

Ne valja, međutim, zaboraviti da je Krleža u eseju "Ivan Meštrović vjeruje u boga", gdje se razračunava s Meštrovićevim političkim konceptom, napisao zanosne stranice o njegovoj skulpturi. Stranice, koje za Meštrovića nedvojbeno znače više od svih nepreglednih panegirika njegovih glasnogovornika — laudatora. Krleža kasnije — usmeno i pismeno — također odvaja političku od umjetničke fizionomije Ivana Meštrovića i različito ih valorizira.

Jezgra Društva "Medulić" ima svoje korijene u bečkoj umjetnosti prijeloma stoljeća. Gotovo je svaki pojedinac boravio u Beču, a kontakti su već ondje među njima uspostavljeni. Karakteristike austrijske umjetnosti mogu se prepoznati u opusima gotovo svakoga od njih, bilo da je riječ o motivima, pojedinim likovnim frazama ili općem duhu. Sve to vrijedi, dakako, i za Mirka Račkoga. Bez tih premisa nije moguće razumjeti što se zapravo zbivalo s njegovom umjetnošću.

4

Mirko Rački pripada struji monumentalizma hrvatske Moderne svojim brojnim djelima na povijesne teme, odnosno teme iz narodne poezije. Mnogima od tih djela ne znamo sudbinu, ali je moguće rekonstruirati liniju razvitka pomoću skica i fotografija.

Monumentalna faza, ili jugonacionalistička faza, ili faza nacionalne romantike, nacionalne mitologije itd., obuhvaća kod Račkoga desetak godina rada, koje se gotovo poklapaju s trajanjem drugog desetljeća našeg stoljeća. Vremenske granice moraju dakako biti shvaćene elastično, jer uvod u taj smjer i njegovo napuštanje prelaze granice desetljeća. Uz to valja neprestano imati na umu da je monumentalizam dominantan, ali nije jedini način izražavanja tog razdoblja, jer Rački kontinuirano paralelno radi djela drukčijeg karaktera. Paralelizmi i prepletanja, generalno uzevši, karakteristični su za doba Moderne, što se vrlo jasno očituje u opusu Mirka Račkoga. Ipak, može se reći, stanovitim razdobljima dominira jedan oblik ekspresije, a u slučaju monumentalizma ta je dominacija prilično snažna. Međutim, iako je razdoblje relativno kratko, ono se raspada na dva, vremenski gotovo jednaka, dijela. Razgraničuje ih početak prvoga svjetskog rata, odnosno odlazak Račkoga iz Münchena i dolazak u Genèvu (1910-1914 i 1915-1920).

Za boravka u Münchenu Rački se počeo baviti tematikom Mažuranićeva epa "Smrt Smalage Čengića". Godine 1907. piše Kršnjaviju:³³ "Držim da je to lijep posao — da se je vrijedno njime baviti — mislim: ilustracije Čengića. Ona jadna 'raja' budi u mene smilovanje i ogorčenje — a pogotovo jer ta 'raja' još i danas žive svuda po našim krajevima. Crnogorci i Hercegovci što vuku na svojim suhim leđima dasku za Francesku i Afriku u Gružu na parobrod — koji su nekoliko puta došli k meni u Rijeku moleći za koru kruha — izgladnjeli, bez posla — po 3-4 dana hoda daleko od gladne kuće — doveli su me na ideju da crtam Čengića".³⁴ Smisao za socijalne probleme vidljiv je kod Račkoga više u pismima nego u slikarstvu, no javljat će se povremeno, naročito kasnije, kao idejna podloga nekim djelima. Socijalne su tendencije inkompatibilne monumentalnoj struji Moderne, pa se povlače pred snažnim nadiranjem nacionalističke ideologije jugoslavenstva. Rad na "Smalagi" neka je vrsta uvoda u nacionalnu tematiku, koja započinje motivima iz narodnih pjesama, a u našoj se javnosti bučno javlja ciklusom Kraljevića Marka na izložbi Društva "Medulić" 1910. godine.

Politička orijentacija Račkoga jasna je već sudjelovanjem na izložbi "Lade" u Sofiji 1906, a posebice 1907. godine, kad on šalje svoja djela na izložbu Jugoslavenske kolonije u Beogradu. Koloniji su pripa-

of his works have disappeared without trace, but it is possible to reconstruct the line of development with the help of sketches and photographs. The monumentalist phase, or Yugo-nationalist phase, or the phase of national romanticism, national mythology, etc. lasted with Rački for ten working years, which basically coincided with the second decade of the 20th century. These time limits must, of course, be understood flexibly, since the introductory period to monumentalism and its abandonment transcended the boundaries of the decade. Besides, one must keep in mind that monumentalism was the dominant, but not the only way of expression at the time and that Rački was continuously creating art of different character. Parallelisms and overlappings were, generally speaking, characteristic for the period of modernism, which is clearly reflected in the opus of Mirko Rački. However, one may say that certain periods were dominated by particular forms of expression and that, in case of monumentalism, that dominance was rather strong. But even though the period was relatively short, it can be divided into two sections, which cover almost equal periods of time. The boundary between them is the beginning of World War I, when Rački left Munich and arrived in Geneva (1910-1914 and 1915-1920).

During his stay in Munich, Rački began to preoccupy himself with the theme of Mažuranić's epic "Death of Smailaga Čengić." In 1907, he wrote the following words to Kršnjavi:³³ "I think it's nice work — I mean, that it is worth spending time with — illustrating the Čengić. That poor 'folk' provokes my sympathies and bitterness — especially since that same 'folk' still lives all around our country. Montenegrins and Herzegovinians that drag planks for France and Africa on their back in order to pack them on the steamliner in Gruž — and who have come to me several times in Rijeka begging for a piece of bread — hungered, jobless — sometimes at 3-4 walking days from their hungry homes — brought me to the idea of drawing 'Čengić'."³⁴ Sensitivity for social problems is manifest in Rački's letters rather than in his painting, but occasionally it would shine through, especially later, as the basic idea of some pieces. Social tendencies were incompatible with the monumentalist current within modernism and they retreated before the powerful wave of Yugoslav nationalist ideology. Working on "Smailaga" was a sort of introduction

into the national theme, which began with motifs from folk poetry and announced itself loudly to our public with the cycle on Kraljević Marko, presented at the exhibition of "Medulić" Association in 1910.

Rački's political orientation became clear when he participated at Lada's exhibition in Sofia in 1906, and especially in 1907, when he sent his works to the exhibition of the Yugoslav Colony in Belgrade. The Colony included artists from Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, and Bulgaria, linked by the common Yugoslav idea. Nadežda Petrović was persistently working on the promotion of the Colony, i.e. that its artists should obtain ateliers in Belgrade; she went from ministry to ministry and held extensive correspondence with her colleagues, especially Jakopič. "Nadežda's wish to gather the Colony members in Belgrade suited the tendency of the regime in Serbia, which strove to transform Belgrade into an all-Yugoslav centre, and that is why Nadežda's requests met with the approval of public personalities," Katarina Ambrozić concluded in her study on the Yugoslav Colony of Artists, written in 1958.³⁵ Whether these "tendencies of the regime" in Serbia were Yugoslav or pro-Serbian, that is not the topic of this study, but certainly presents an interesting problem.

The exhibition of the Colony took place at the National Museum of Belgrade, early in 1907. It was organized by Grohar and Meštrović. Among the Croatian artists, there were the future members of "Medulić" Association: Meštrović, Krizman, Rački, and Katunarić. Rački exhibited two of his illustrations for Dante's "Divine Comedy" and the diptych entitled "Good and Bad Woman", which had a new title for this exhibition: "Reality and Poetry". Matoš compared Slovenian and Croatian artists in an extensive review published in *Hrvatska Smotra*, in which he stated that the Slovenes were realists, impressionists, and painters, while the Croats were idealists, symbolists, illustrators, and poets; "the Slovenes observe, the Croats dream."³⁶

In Matoš's opinion, the most characteristic artist in this respect was — Mirko Rački. He wrote passionate words on his diptych "Good and Bad Woman", interpreting its content in detail. However, it is obvious that he lacked some pieces of the "story", which we get to know only from the correspondence, namely the above-cited Rački's letter to Kršnjavi. About the four exhibited artworks of Rački, Matoš stated that they were

in fact "depicting one and the same idea: the conflict between idealism and reality."

Late in 1908 — as we have already said — the First Dalmatian Art Exhibition took place and the "Medulić" Association was established. Rački participated in all these events, although he lived all the time in Munich and came home only occasionally. He exhibited with "Medulić" in Ljubljana, in 1909/10. In spring of 1910, he organized an exhibition at the Art Pavilion of Zagreb together with Meštrović. The Croatian Writers Association published its catalogue with a preface by Ivo Vojnović and biographic notes by Andrija Milčinić. Rački exhibited some forty pieces, among them two drawings from his "Death of Smailaga 'engić'", while the rest were drawings and paintings on the topic of the "Divine Comedy" and landscapes, mostly of Rijeka Dubrovačka. Still there was no trace of Kosovo mythology or monumentalism. The exhibition met with great interest of critics and the public, provoking a debate on Meštrović's national motives. "Pokret", the main journal of the Croatian United Independent Party, published news, notes, or articles on it almost every day. The exhibition remained open throughout May and June (1 May - 25 June) and then the preparations for the next exhibitions of "Medulić" Association began.

The group around Meštrović had been speedily working all summer and the exhibition entitled "Against the Unheroic Times" was opened at the Art Pavilion in 1910, "on the eve of All Saints... with a nice speech held by the ban's representative, Mr Vladimir Mažuranić."³⁷ Kraljević Marko, the heroicized symbol of Yugoslav spirit, was the main hero of the exhibition. Rački dedicated to him a cycle of five huge paintings, 4-5 meter wide and about 3 meter tall. The paintings were entitled "Kraljević Marko and Mina of Kostur", "Kraljević Marko and Musa Kesedžija", "Turks Come to Marko's Slava", "Kraljević Marko Abolishes the Bridal Toll" i "Kraljević Marko Tells Whose the Empire Is". Three of them were made in a powerful movement of large figures with hypertrophic muscles, while two were relatively tranquil compositions with an ensemble of numerous figures. Rački accepted Marko as a man of great physical strength, as he was depicted in the folk epic, and as a man that the ideology, or rather the art turned ideology, needed at that moment. In his cycle, he followed the same ideas as Meštrović and created a painted counterpart to the

dali umjetnici iz Srbije, Hrvatske, Slovenije i Bugarske, a vezala ih je ideja jugoslavenstva. Nadežda Petrović je uporno radila na realizaciji Kolonije, tj. na tome da umjetnici Kolonije dobiju atelijere u Beogradu; obilazila je ministarstva i vodila opširnu korespondenciju s kolegama, poglavito Jakopičem. "Nadeždina želja da se članovi Kolonije okupe u Beogradu odgovarala je tendenciji režima u Srbiji, koji je išao za tim da od Beograda stvori jedan jugoslovenski centar, te su zato Nadeždine molbe i nailazile na odziv zvaničnih lica", konstatira Katarina Ambrozić u studiji o Jugoslavenskoj umjetničkoj koloniji iz 1958. godine.³⁵ Jesu li "tendencije režima" u Srbiji bile jugoslaven-ske ili velikosrpske, nije tema ovoga rada, ali jest zanimljiv problem.

Izložba Kolonije održala se u beogradskom Narodnom muzeju na početku 1907. godine. Pripremali su je Grohar i Meštrović. Od hrvatskih umjetnika izlažu budući članovi Društva "Medulić": Meštrović, Krizman, Rački i Katunarić. Rački je izložio dvije ilustracije iz Danteove "Božanstvene komedije" i diptihon "Dobra i zla žena" koji je na ovoj izložbi nosio naziv "Zbilja i pjesma". Matoš opsežnom kritikom u Hrvatskoj smotri uspoređuje slovenske i hrvatske umjetnike, smatrajući Slovence realistima, impresionistima, slikarima, a Hrvate idealistima, simbolistima, ilustratorima i pjesnicima; "Slovinci gledaju, Hrvati sanjaju".³⁶

Matošu je najkarakterističniji u tom smislu — Mirko Rački. Piše temperamentno o njegovu diptihonu "Dobra i zla žena" detaljno tumačeći sadržaj. Očito je, međutim, da su mu nedostajali neki elementi "fabule", za koje saznajemo tek iz korespondencije (već citiranog pisma) Račkoga Kršnjaviju. Za četiri izložena djela Račkoga Matoš kaže da u biti "prikazuju jednu misao: borbu idealizma s realnošću".

Potkraj 1908. godine — kao što je već rečeno — održana je Prva dalmatinska umjetnička izložba i konstituirano Društvo "Medulić". Rački sudjeluje u svim tim zbivanjima, živeći sve vrijeme u Münchenu, a tek povremeno boraveći u domovini. Izlagao je s "Medulićem" u Ljubljani 1909/10. godine. U proljeće 1910. priređuje s Meštrovićem izložbu u zagrebačkom Umjetničkom paviljonu. Društvo hrvatskih književnika izdaje katalog s predgovorom Ive Vojnovića, te biografskim bilješkama Andrije Milčinovića. Rački izlaže četrdeset djela, među kojima su dva crteža iz "Smrti Smailage Čengića", sve ostalo crteži i slike na teme "Božanstvene

komedije", te pejzaži, pretežno Rijeke Dubrovačke. Kosovske mitologije i monumentalizma još nema. Izložba je pobudila veliko zanimanje kritike i javnosti, izazvavši polemiku o Meštrovićevim nacionalnim motivima. "Pokret", glavno glasilo Hrvatske ujedinjene samostalne stranke, objavljuje gotovo svaki drugi dan vijesti, bilješke ili članke. Otvorena je cijelog svibnja i lipnja (1. V - 25. VI), a zatim odmah počinju pripreme za narednu izložbu Društva "Medulić".

Grupa oko Meštrovića užurbano radi u tijeku cijelog ljeta, pa je izložba pod nazivom "Nejunačkom vremenu usprkos" otvorena u Umjetničkom paviljonu 1910. godine "uoči Svih svetih... lijepim govorom banovog zamjenika g. Vladimira Mažuranića".³⁷ Kraljević Marko, heroizirani simbol jugoslavenstva, postaje glavnim junakom izložbe. Rački mu posvećuje ciklus od pet golemih slika širine četiri do pet metara i visine oko tri metra. Slike nose nazive: "Kraljević Marko i Mina od Kostura", "Kraljević Marko i Musa Kesedžija", "Turci u Marka na slavi", "Kraljević Marko ukida svadbarinu" i "Kraljević Marko kaže na komu je carstvo". Tri su rađene u jakom pokretu krupnih likova hipertrofirane snage mišića, a dvije su relativno mirne kompozicije s brojnim ansablom figura. Rački prihvaća lik Marka kao čovjeka velike tjelesne snage, kako ga narodna pjesma prikazuje i kakav je tog trenutka potreban ideologiji, odnosno ideologiziranoj umjetnosti. On je tim ciklusom slijedio iste ideje kao Meštrović radeći slikarski pandan skulpturi "Kosovskog hrama". Slikama golemih dimenzija, snažnog zamaha, nadnaravne veličine ljudskih figura s napatim mišićama, divlje pokrenutih konja... stvorio je Rački cjelinu kojoj pripada jedno od najznačajnijih mjesta unutar struje monumentalnog slikarstva hrvatske Moderne. Velike reljefne forme, jasnih lineariziranih obrisa, djeluju poput udara, dovedene u prvi plan. Iznenaduju "pointilističkom" tehnikom i živim koloritom. No, pointilizam je znatno modificiran; kist nemiran, kraćim ili dužim nervoznim potezima gradi vibrantne površine. Potezi međutim ne stvaraju atmosferu, nego grade plastične forme, pa je njihov oblik podređen strukturi i karakteru predmeta. Oni su, na primjer, kratki raznosmjerni kad prekrivaju površinu neba, nešto duži vertikalni kad opisuju tratinu, ovalni na zaobljenim dijelovima figure, a dugi i valoviti — poput tipične dekorativne linije Jugendstila — na partijama konjske grive ili repa. Njima Rački oblikuje plastic-

itet figura i reljefnost cijele scene, te tako spaja različite pa i raznorodne elemente likovnog govora: tehniku pointilizma, linearni obris, plasticitet forme, živi kolorizam i težnju k monumentalizaciji. Iznenadujući konglomerat, koji, sudeći po fotografijama i dvije sačuvane, ali prepravljene slike, ima neočekivano djelovanje. Nabujala energija, snažni pokreti koji postoje pod površinom čak i ondje gdje je scena smirena, sugeriraju doista gigantiziranu i heroiziranu idolatriju, tipičnu za struju monumentalne umjetnosti.

Porijeklo duhovnih pretpostavki i oblikovnih elemenata moguće je jedino ponovo smjestiti u kretanja bečke umjetnosti prijeloma stoljeća. Godine 1902, nakon neostvarenih ideja o izložbi fresaka, organizirana je 14. izložba, "jedan od najvažnijih događaja"³⁸ izložbene djelatnosti bečke secesije uopće (15. IV — 27. VI). Izložen je Klingerov "Beethoven" kao i Klimtov friz posvećen Beethovenu, kojih se Rački još danas dobro sjeća. U desnom postranom prostoru bilo je smješteno veliko horizontalno ulje "Hrabrost i borbeno veselje čovjeka" Ferdinanda Andrija, poznato samo po fotografiji.³⁹ Slika je prikazivala ponešto "rustikalno mnoštvo jahača i konja"⁴⁰ u olujnom galopu, a odjek joj nalazimo već na Račkijevoj vrlo zanimljivoj skici za plakat izložbe u praškom Rudolphinumu 1905. godine. Teško je danas vjerovati da ta slika, i ne samo ona, nije sudjelovala u formiranju umjetničke volje naših "medulićevaca", iako uzeta egzemplarno, samo kao izraz općeg duha određene struje.⁴¹ Što se pak tiče modificiranog pointilizma i živog kolora, primjeri su brojni u slikarstvu Adolfa Böhma, Ferdinanda Andrija, Carla Molla, Maxa Kurzweila, Wilhelma Liszta i drugih. Djelovanje Franza Metznera, posredno preko Ivana Meštrovića, također je nedvojbeno.

Svih pet slika Rački izlaže na Međunarodnoj izložbi u Rimu 1911. godine. Tri su otkupljene od Ministarstva prosvjete Kraljevine Srbije, a svima se zametnuo trag poslije izložbe. Godine 1962. ustanovila je dr. Vesna Novak Oštrić, radeći retrospektivu Društva "Medulić", da se u beogradskom Narodnom muzeju nalaze slike "Kraljević Marko i Mina od Kostura", te "Turci u Marka na slavi", pa ih je Rački sudskom odlukom dobio natrag.⁴² Ostale tri, one otkupljene, dosad nije bilo moguće pronaći. Poznate su po relativno dobrim reprodukcijama u katalogima zagrebačke i rimske izložbe. Vraćene slike autor je popravio, no promijenivši im, na žalost, uz neke detalje, i fakturu.

sculpture of the “Kosovo Temple”: paintings of huge dimensions, powerful momentum, and overdimensioned human figures with tensed muscles, wildly rushing horses... Rački created an ensemble that deserves one of the most prominent places in the current of monumentalist painting within Croatian modernism. Large forms in relief, with clear, linear contours, are pushed into the foreground with such power that they feel like a blow. They surprise with their “pointilistic” technique and their lively colours. But this kind of pointilism is significantly modified; the brush is restless and creates vibrant surfaces with shorter or longer, nervous movements. However, these lines do not create an atmosphere, but rather construct sculptural forms, and their form is subjected to the structure and the character of objects. Thus, they are short and go in many directions when they cover the surface of the skies, somewhat longer and vertical when they described the meadow, oval at the rounded sections of figures, and long and undulating — like a typical decorative line of Jugendstil — in some sections of horse manes or tails. With these lines, Rački formed the plasticity of figures and the relief structure of the entire scene, thus merging different and even contrary elements of visual language: the pointilist technique, linear contour, the plasticity of form, lively colourism, and tendency towards monumentalization. It is an amazing conglomerate, which, judging from the photographs and the two remaining, though modified paintings, had a surprising effect. The bursting energy and powerful movements that lurk under the surface even where the scene is tranquil, suggest a truly giganticized and heroicized idolatry, typical for the current of monumentalist art.

In order to find the source of these spiritual premises and elements of design, one should look again and only to the currents in Viennese art at the turn of the century. In 1902, after the idea of an exhibition of frescoes had failed, the Fourteenth Exhibition was organized as “one of the most important events”³⁸ in the exhibition activity of the Vienna Secession as such (15 April — 27 June). Klinger’s “Beethoven” was exhibited, as well as Klimt’s frieze dedicated to Beethoven, which Rački still remembers very well. In the right side space, a large horizontal oil on canvas by Ferdinand Andri was located, entitled “Courage and the Fighting Joy of Man”, known only from a photograph.³⁹ The painting presented a somewhat

“rustic multitude of horsemen and horses”⁴⁰ in a stormy gallop and its echo is found as early as Rački’s very interesting sketch for the poster of the exhibition at Prague Rudolphinum, which took place in 1905. Today, it is difficult to believe that this painting, and not only this one, did not participate in the formation of the artistic willpower of our “Meduličians”, even if taken only exemplary, as a mere expression of the general spirit of certain movement.⁴¹ As for the modified pointilism and lively colours, one can find many examples in paintings by Adolf Böhm, Ferdinand Andri, Carl Moll, Max Kurzweil, Wilhelm Liszt, and others. The influence of Franz Metzner, though indirectly, through Ivan Meštrović, is also unquestionable.

Rački exhibited all the five paintings at the International Exhibition in Rome in 1911. Three of them were purchased by the Ministry of Education of the Kingdom of Serbia and all of them were lost without trace after the exhibition. In 1962, while working at a retrospective of “Medulić” Association, Vesna Novak Oštrić established that the “Kraljević Marko and Mina of Kostur” and the “Turks Come to Marko’s Slava” were located at the National Museum in Belgrade and they were returned to Rački on court decision.⁴² The remaining three, those that were purchased in Rome, have never been found. They are known only from excellent reproductions in the catalogues of exhibitions in Zagreb and Rome. The author restored the returned paintings, but unfortunately he changed some details and also their structure.

The Serbian Pavilion in Rome was dominated by the sculptures of the Kosovo cycle by Ivan Meštrović and paintings by Mirko Rački, Ljubo Babić, and Tomislav Krizman, all of them from the cycle of Kraljević Marko. However, it happened that Croatian artists were not presented as a “separate group”, neither in the structure of the exhibition, nor in any catalogue data, so that many reviews — be it on purpose or by mistake - were proclaiming them Serbs. This immediately resulted in fierce debates.

Croatian critics evaluated the exhibition in accordance with their own political orientation; thus, there were various opinions on Rački’s paintings. Matoš, whose statements were always unusual and original, wrote about Rački with sympathies. Having called him a year before the poet of our elite and the painter of “our intellectuals, of their pains and infernal sufferings,”⁴³ he now accepted his interpretation of Kraljević Marko, which

he considered closer to the folk epic than Meštrović’s. Otherwise, the cycle was evaluated in different ways, but mostly acknowledged as original and valued for its powerful composition.

After the stormy events around the exhibitions of Zagreb and Rome, that is, after the cycle of Kraljević Marko, Rački was simultaneously engaged with Dante and with motifs from folk poetry, which also morphologically meant two-tiered work. On the one hand, there was the second series of drawings for the *Inferno* (mostly done after the first series), the lyrically refined gouaches for the *Purgatorio* and the *Paradiso*, a large and unusual *Francesca da Rimini*, as well as three paintings for *Kršnjavi*, close to *Jugendstil* and early *Kandinsky*.

On the other hand, Rački informed *Kršnjavi* on 8 May 1912 that he was working with national motifs: “I do not recall whether I mentioned last time that I am working on a large painting of ‘Mother of Jugovići’”;⁴⁴ and two years later: “They asked me from *Matica Hrvatska* to illustrate ‘Smailaga “engić” for them. That is what I am doing at the moment. But I am also working in three large pieces: ‘Death of the Mother of Jugovići’, ‘The Building of Skadar’, and ‘Kosovka Maiden’, according to folk songs.”⁴⁵

But Rački had been preoccupied with *Mažuranić’s* epic much earlier than that, talking about it and exhibiting copperprints with the theme,⁴⁶ and he also exhibited an oil on canvas and several drawings at the *Meštrović—Rački* exhibition in 1910; apparently, he was also working on some new drawings for *Matica Hrvatska*. Probably those presently known and preserved at the Cabinet of Graphics at JAZU were made as book illustrations, perhaps according to some earlier studies. They were obviously created in a single breath, one for every section. Decorative zones at the header and the footer of the sheet reveal in their motifs and stylisation a somewhat later stage in development, closer to the second part of Rački’s monumentalist phase. The famous copperprint that was purchased at the First Dalmatian Art Exhibition in 1908 was still characterized by a concept corresponding to the illustration cycle for Dante’s “*Inferno*”. However, the five mentioned drawings to the epic “Death of Smailaga Čengić” reveal the need to surpass the framework of usual formats, to liberate the contours, subjected to the construction of contrasts between light and shade, from the discipline of “copperprint”, and to make

Srpskim paviljonom u Rimu dominirale su skulpture kosovskog ciklusa Ivana Meštrovića, te slike Mirka Račkoga, Ljube Babića i Tomislava Krizmana, sve iz ciklusa Kraljevića Marka. Dogodilo se, međutim, da hrvatski umjetnici nisu izlagali kao "odjeljena grupa", ni postavom izložbe, a ni bilo kakvim podacima u katalogu, pa su ih mnogi napisali — namjerno ili zabunom proglašavali Srbima. O tome su se odmah razbuktale žučne polemike.

Kritika je pratila rimsku izložbu ocjenama ovisnim o vlastitoj političkoj pripadnosti, pa i o slikama Račkoga izriče različita mišljenja. Matoš, uvijek spreman na neobičan i samostalan sud, piše o Račkom sa simpatijama, nazivajući ga godinu dana ranije pjesnikom naše elite i slikarom "naše inteligencije, bolova i paklenih muka njenih",⁴³ te prihvata njegovu interpretaciju Kraljevića Marka, koju smatra bližom narodnoj pjesmi od Meštrovićeve. Inače je ciklus ocijenjen različito, ali mu se uglavnom priznaje izvornost i snaga kompozicije.

Poslije burnih događaja s izložbama u Zagrebu i Rimu, odnosno poslije ciklusa Kraljevića Marka, Rački se paralelno bavi Danteom i motivima narodne pjesme, što u morfološkom smislu također znači rad na dva kolosijeka. Na jednoj je strani druga serija crteža Pakla (uglavnom prema prvoj seriji), lirske profinjene akvareli za "istilište i Raj, velika neobična Francesca da Rimini, te tri slike za Kršnjavija bliske Jugendstilu i ranom Kandinskom.

Na drugoj strani, Rački piše Kršnjaviju 8. svibnja 1912. o radu na nacionalnim motivima: "Ne znam da li sam Vam spomenuo posljednji puta da se bavim jednom velikom slikom 'Majkom Jugovića'",⁴⁴ a dvije godine kasnije: "Zatražili su od Matice Hrvatske, da im ilustriršem 'Smailagu Čengića'. Time se sada bavim. Međutim radim na trim velikim stvarima 'Smrt majke Jugovića', 'Zidanje

Skadra' i 'Kosovka djevojka', po narodnim pjesmama."⁴⁵

Mažuranićevim epom Rački se bavio već mnogo ranije, spominjao i izlagao bakropise s tom tematikom,⁴⁶ zatim ulje i neke crteže na izložbi Meštrović—Rački 1910, a za Maticu hrvatsku, čini se, radi nove crteže. Vjerojatno su ilustraciji knjige bili namijenjeni poznati primjerci danas u Kabinetu grafike JAZU, nastali možda prema ranijim studijama. Oni su očito rađeni u jednom dahu, po jedan za svako pjevanje. Dekorativne zone na vrhu i dnu lista pokazuju motivima i stilizacijom nešto kasniji trenutak razvitka, bliži drugom dijelu monumentalne faze Račkoga. Poznati bakropis otkupljen na I dalmatinskoj umjetničkoj izložbi 1908. karakterizira koncept još podudaran s ciklusom ilustracija Danteova "Pakla". Međutim, pet spomenutih crteža za "Smrt Smailage "engića" prožima potreba da se razmaknu okviru uobičajenih formata, da se linija podvrgnuta građenju svijetlo-tamnih kontrasta oslobodi "bakropisne" discipline, te da realistički shvaćene figure budu nosioci emocije, potencirane verističkim momentima izabranih scena. Tih pet crteža čine uspjelo cjelinu u likovnom, umjetničkom i kulturno-povijesnom smislu. Motivi iz "Smailage" javljat će se i kasnije na inozemnim izložbama za vrijeme prvoga svjetskog rata.

Velike slike spomenute 1914. godine najvjerojatnije su tri platna golemih dimenzija u beogradskom Narodnom muzeju.⁴⁷ Riječ je o ideološkom nastavku ciklusa Kraljevića Marka, ali, koliko je bilo moguće ustanoviti, sa znatnim morfološkim promjenama. Dramatika se smirila, nestala je velika gesta, kolorit potamnio, pointilizam sasvim izostao i neće se više uopće vratiti u opusu Račkoga. Te slike, s još nekim izgubljenima, čine prijelaz grupi djela nastalih u Genèvi. Rački ondje dolazi u gravitaciono polje Ferdinanda Hodlera, čiji rad vjerojatno shvaća kao potvrdu svog stava.

Ne pada direktno pod Hodlerov utjecaj, barem što se tiče nacionalne tematike, ali duh kojim joj prilazi podudaran je s duhom nekih Hodlerovih djela. Paleta se Račkoga potpuno promijenila, pretežu tamni tonovi smeđe ili plave boje s eventualno ponekim kolorističkim akcentom ili bez njega. Motiv nije smješten u određeni, realistički shvaćen prostor, nego izoliran neutralnom plošnom pozadinom. On postaje reprezentant ideje; nije više narativan. Takve su slike uglavnom poznate po reprodukcijama u izložbenim katalogima,⁴⁸ kao primjerice "Mučenici" i druge, o čijim značajkama možemo zaključivati na temelju grupe tempera otkrivenih prilikom priprema retrospektive Račkoga 1970. godine, i nedavno pronađene slike "Otmica". Ona ima pokrenutost i energiju ranijih djela, ali konceptom povećanja jednog detalja dovedenog u krupni plan i akordom tamnih boja pokazuje drugu orijentaciju. Spomenute tempere odstupaju još više od realističke obrade materije, te sumarnim zahvatom, plošnošću i pomalo uglatom stilizacijom otvaraju put novom oblikovnom području.⁴⁹

Mogućnosti su bile naznačene u smjeru art decoa i ekspresionizma ili metafizičkog slikarstva, anticipativno imanentne strujama monumentalizma i simbolizma, ali ih Rački ne prihvaća. On se — kao što je već rečeno — povlači iz suvremenih likovnih zbivanja, a ideologiziranoj umjetnosti izriče osudu u pismu Izidoru Kršnjaviju već 1920. godine: "Kod posljednjih radova ostavio sam nacionalizam jer vidim da je to samo na štetu umjetnosti. Umjetnost ne poznaje granica — ona zbližava ljude a ne rastavlja ih. Kod nas razmahao se nacionalizam (politički) pa je povukao i nas artiste za sobom. Meštrović mu je najveći propagator. Ja ne znam koliko se ljepota time obogatila. Vanitas vanitatum — moda — moda i politika."⁵⁰

Život umjetnosti, 29/30, 1980.

the realistically conceived figures the carriers of emotion, potentialized by the verist moments of selected scenes. These five drawings constitute a successful unit in the visual, artistic and cultural-historical sense. Motifs from "Smailaga" would reappear later, at the international exhibitions during World War I.

Large paintings mentioned in 1914 were probably the three canvases of huge proportions preserved at the National Museum of Belgrade.⁴⁷ In terms of ideology, they are a continuation of the Kraljević Marko cycle; however, as far as it could be established, they reveal significant morphological changes. The dramatism has calmed down, the pompous gesture is gone, the colours are darker, and pointilism has vanished completely, never to return to Rački's opus. These pieces, along with some others that have vanished, mark the passage towards the group of paintings created at Geneva. There Rački entered the gravitation field of Ferdinand Hodler, whose work he probably experienced as a confirmation of his own attitude. He was not influenced by

Hodler directly, at least with respect to the national themes, but the spirit in which he approached them corresponded to the spirit of some of Hodler's paintings. Rački's palette had changed completely and was now showing prevalence of the dark shades of brown or blue, with an occasional colouristic accent or without it. The motif was no longer set into a definite, realistically conceived space, but rather isolated on a neutral, flat background. It was now representing an idea rather than a narrative. These paintings are known from reproductions in exhibition catalogues,⁴⁸ e.g. the "Martyrs" and others, and we can conclude about their features on the basis of a group of tempera paintings, discovered during the preparations for a Rački retrospective in 1970 and the recently restored painting entitled "The Abduction". Although possessing the movement and the energy of his earlier pieces, this painting shows another orientation with its concept of magnifying a single detail, pushed into the foreground, and its accord of dark colours. The afore-mentioned tempera paintings show an even greater detachment from

the realistic treatment of the subject, opening the way to a new field of visual expression with their summary procedure, flatness, and a somewhat angular stylisation.⁴⁹

There were possibilities in the direction of art deco and expressionism or that of metaphysical painting, all expectedly immanent to the currents of monumentalism and symbolism, but Rački rejected them. As mentioned above, he retreated from the contemporary artistic events and condemned all ideological art in a letter to Izidor Kršnjavi as early as 1920: "In my latest work, I have abandoned nationalism, for I see that it is only harmful to art. Art knows no boundaries - it connects people rather than separating them. In Yugoslavia, the (political) nationalism has gained on power and drawn us artists along. Meštrović is his greatest promoter. I am not sure how much richer beauty has become by that. Vanitas vanitatum - fashion - fashion and politics."⁵⁰ ×

PRIJEVOD: Marina Miladinov

1 Richard Hamann and Jost Hermand. *Epochen deutscher Kultur von 1870 bis zur Gegenwart*. Vol. 1-5. Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, Munich, 1959-1967. Vol. 4: *Stilkunst um 1900*, p. 180.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 353.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 355.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 356.

5 Volker Plagemann. *Bismarck-Denkmäler*. (In:) *Denkmäler im 19. Jahrhundert*. Prestel-Verlag, Munich, 1972, p. 230.

6 Richard Hamann and Jost Hermand, as in n. 1, p. 364. — This turn to the ethical and the supra-individual was linked to the sharp opposition to solipsism in the late 90s, which provoked an outright cultural war, resulting, for example, in Slevogt and Corinth being virtually proclaimed foreigners.

7 *Ibid.* p. 374.

8 A very interesting and similar opinion on representative historical painting is endorsed by Olga Maruševski in her manuscript "Kulturni i prosvjetni program Ise Kršnjavija na zidovima Palače u Opatičkoj ulici 10" [Cultural and didactic programme of Iso Kršnjavi on the walls of the Palace at No. 10 Opatička Street], p. 13. "Today, it seems that precisely Medović's historical painting suits the style of the festive Golden Hall. Almost until recently, it has been considered of little value, since it was judged from the point of view of modern, present-day conceptions. This style of painting, marked by denial and refusal, was classified as the representative and therefore less valuable part of Croatian painting (unlike an intimate note or a landscape), but its critics neglected its link with

representative architecture and the spaces for which it was intended." On the issues of "historical painting" in the view of historiographic methodology, especially interesting is n. 29 in: Zlatko Posavac. *Estetički nazori hrvatskog realizma* [Aesthetic Positions of Croatian realism]. Rad JAZU, book 380, Zagreb, 1978, chapter 5, p. 385: "On the genre of 'historical painting' in Croatia there are no systematic, let alone analytical or critical studies. The general attitude towards it is full of prejudice, both in positive and negative sense; both in lay and scholarly circles. In our times, these paintings are neither reproduced nor exhibited, they are neither evaluated with aesthetic arguments (only as ideology) nor viewed in a way that would be free from art-historical doctrines, which renders them virtually less and less accessible to the scholarly and critical judgment, as well as popular and lay judgment of the public. For this field, one should introduce a number of different, more objective, more modern and manifold criteria into the Croatian historiography of visual arts. Ignoring and neglecting the 'non-elitist' visual production is neither scientifically objective nor reliable in terms of critical selectivity, let alone justified on sociological or aesthetical grounds."

9 The exhibition took place at Ca' Corner della Regina from 2 July until 15 October 1978. The author was Giandomenico Romanelli and the institution Archivio storico delle arti contemporanee.

10 Reproductions in: *Modelli d'Arte decorativa*, 1/1908, plates 22-26.

11 J. A. Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth, Franz Metzner und der Monumentalismus seiner Zeit. Catalogue of the exhibition: Franz Metzner, ein Bildhauer der Jahrhundertwende in Berlin—Wien—

- 1 Richard Hamann, Jost Hermand. *Epochen deutscher Kultur von 1870 bis zur Gegenwart*. Bd. 1-5. Nymphenburger Verlagshandlung, München 1959-1967. Band 4: *Stilkunst um 1900*, str. 348.
- 2 Isto, str. 353.
- 3 Isto, str. 355.
- 4 Isto, str. 356.
- 5 Volker Plagemann. *Bismarck-Denkmal*. (U.) *Denkmäler im 19. Jahrhundert*. Prestel-Verlag, München 1972, str. 230.
- 6 Richard Hamann, Jost Hermand, blješka 1, str. 364. — S ovim okretom u etičko i nadindividualno povezano je oštro suprotstavljanje solipsizmu kasnih devedesetih godina, što je izazvalo pravi kulturni rat, u kojem su, na primjer, Slevogt i Corinth gotovo proglašeni strancima.
- 7 Isto, str. 374.
- 8 Vrlo zanimljivo i slično mišljenje o reprezentativnom historijskom slikarstvu zastupa Olga Maruševski u rukopisu "Kulturni i prosvjetni program Ise Kršnjavija na zidovima Palače u Opatičkoj ulici 10", str. 13. "Danas nam se čini da je stilu svečane zlatne dvorane primjereno upravo Medovićeva povijesno slikarstvo. Ono je tako reći sve do nedavno bilo osporavano kao vrijednost, jer se o njemu sudilo sa stajališta suvremenog, današnjeg poimanja. To je slikarstvo s prizvukom poricanja i odbijanja svrstavano u reprezentativni i zbog toga manje vrijedan dio hrvatskog slikarstva (za razliku od intimne bilješke ili pejzaža), a zaboravljalo se pri tom na reprezentativnu arhitekturu i prostore kojima je bilo namijenjeno." O problemima "historijskog slikarstva" u aspektu historiografske metodologije zanimljiva je bilješka 29 teksta: Zlatko Posavac. *Estetički nazori hrvatskog realizma*. Rad JAZU, knj. 380, Zagreb 1978, poglavlje 5, str. 385: "O genreu 'historijskog slikarstva' u Hrvata nemamo nikakvih sustavnih, a još manje analitičkih i kritičkih studija. Prema njemu je odnos pun predrasuda, i kad je pozitivan i kad je negativan; i u laičkim, a podjednako i u stručnim krugovima. U novije doba ta se djela ne reproduciraju, ne izlažu, niti estetički (a ne tek ideološki) argumentirano interpretiraju, izostali su pristupi bez likovnjačke doktrinarnosti, pa su stoga praktično sve nedostupnija i stručno-kritičkom i plebiscitarno-laičkom sudu javnosti. Za ovo područje nužno je također uvesti niz drugačijih, objektivnijih, modernijih, raznolikijih kriterija u hrvatsku likovnu historiografiju. Mimoilaženje i prešućivanje 'ne-elitističke' likovne produkcije nije znanstvenjački objektivno, a ni kritički selektivno pouzdano, niti opravdano sociološko-estetički."
- 9 Izložba je održana u Ca'Corner della Regina, od 2. VII do 15. X 1978. Autor je Giandomenico Romanelli, organizacija Archivio storico delle arti contemporanee.
- 10 Reprodukcijske u *Modelli d'Arte decorativa*, 1/1908, table 22-26.
- 11 J. A. Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth, Franz Metzner und der Monumentalismus seiner Zeit. *Katalog izložbe: Franz Metzner, ein Bildhauer der Jahrhundertwende in Berlin—Wien—Prag—Leipzig, München, Museum Villa Stuck, 1977*, str. 11.
- 12 "Zna se da kod *Medulića* kao i kod *Lade* ima najrazličitijih umjetničkih struja, jer to nisu dvije škole, već dva društva..." *Antun Gustav Matoš, Kritika ili pamflet? Šport i umjetnost, 1/1912, br 5, str. 9-10*.
- 13 Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika "Medulić" prva je organizirana hrvatska umjetnička grupacija kojoj je priredena velika retrospektivna izložba prije gotovo dva desetljeća; u organizaciji Moderne galerije održana u Umjetničkom paviljonu u Zagrebu 1962. godine. Autor izložbe i kataloga dr Vesna Novak Oštrić. Katalog sadrži temeljne informacije i dokumentaciju, te bi se moglo reći da je djelovanje Društva znanstveno obrađeno. Ostalo je ipak dovoljno otvorenih pitanja koja obično ne može riješiti jednokratno, k tomu još pionirski, znanstveni zahvat. U prvom redu pitanja stilske, odnosno stilističke naravi, geneze oblika i njihova podrijetla; zatim koordinate položaja unutar hrvatske umjetnosti i njezina "europskog konteksta". Poslije izložbe došlo je do procvata svjetske stručne i znanstvene literature posvećene problemima umjetnosti s početka 20. stoljeća, što je donijelo i niz novih pogleda, koncepata, nove klasifikacije, valorizacije i revalorizacije, koje nesumnjivo utječu i na odnos spram paralelnih pojava i u hrvatskoj kulturi.
- 14 Mirko Rački, koji pripada jezgri Društva, od samog početka, izlaže dvaput na izložbama "Medulića" svoje crteže za Danteovu "Božanstvenu komediju", premda su oni nastali po narudžbi i uputama Ise Kršnjavija, mahom prije osnutka Društva "Medulić" i potpuno mimo njegove ideološko-političke strukture. Njih je čak na rimskoj izložbi 1911. otkupila talijanska vlada pa Rački u tijeku 1911. godine radi drugu seriju, dakle u vrijeme postojanja Društva "Medulić". Ovu pak seriju izlaže najprije u Amsterdamu 1912. a zatim, po želji Ise Kršnjavija, u "suprotnom taboru" — na izložbi Društva umjetnosti u Zagrebu 1913. godine.
- 15 "Glede osnivanja našeg društva gotova je stvar... Sada smo odabrali odbor od 6 lica." Pismo Emanuela Vidovića Ivanu Meštroviću od 22. XII 1908, Arhiv Ateljea Meštrović, br. 834.
- 16 "Bukovac u početku nije htio pristati i u opće bio je hladan za stvar, ali kada sam mu kasnije prikazao svrhu bio je oduševljen", isto.
- 17 Ljubljana 1909-1910, Zagreb 1910, sudjelovanje na međunarodnoj izložbi u Rimu 1911. i "etvrtjoj jugoslavenskoj umjetničkoj izložbi "Lade" u Beogradu 1913. godine.
- 18 "Već odavno postoji nastojanje da se omalovaži i osramoti ne samo ono što je u Zagrebu trulo, već i ono što je lijepo i korisno u Zagrebu. Već davno postoji tendencija da se sistematski hvale i uzvisuje Meštrović i njegovo društvo *Medulić*, i da se sistematski grdi i napada zagrebačka umjetnost." Antun Gustav Matoš, *Kritika ili pamflet. Šport i umjetnost 1/1912, 5, 9-10*.
- 19 Pismo Krizmana Meštroviću od 22. II 1913. Arhiv Ateljea Meštrović, broj 1320.
- 20 Slavko Batušić, *Djelo Tomislava Krizmana, Katalog retro spektivne izložbe, Izdavački zavod JAZU, Zagreb 1954*, str. 8.
- 21 "Nakon rata došle su izložbe s političko-propagandnim karakterom. Udruženje 'Medulić', pod predsjednikom Meštrovićem i potpredsjednikom Vidovićem, organiziralo je 1919. u Splitu 'Izložbu jugoslavenskih umjetnika iz Dalmacije'. Izložba je imala značaj kulturno-umjetničke manifestacije dalmatinske umjetnosti, orijentirane prema kopnu (Zagreb, Beograd), nasuprot talijanskoj propagandi o nedjeljivosti dalmatinske umjetnosti i kulture od lava sv. Marka. Italija je tada zauzela veći dio naše obale; došla je D'Annunzijeva riječka tragikomedijska, i ovakav manifest i protest dalmatinskih umjetnika, na čelu s već svjetski poznatim Meštrovićem, bio je potreban, naročito s obzirom na savezničke flote, koje su se upravo nalazile u Splitu." Duško Kečkemet, Emanuel Vidović. *Matica hrvatska, Zagreb 1959*, str. 31.
- 22 Miroslav Krleža, Ivan Meštrović vjeruje u boga. *Književnik, 1/1928, br. 3, str. 73—85*.
- 23 "Zajedno smo radili u Umjetničkom paviljonu, zajedno se hranili, a za pokriće materijalnih troškova, za platno, boje i sadru, dali smo ja i Rački od zarade na našoj izložbi... Kuhale

- Prag—Leipzig, Munich, Museum Villa Stuck, 1977, p. 11.
- 12 "It is well known that both *Medulić* and *Lada* included most diverse artistic currents, for they were not two schools, but two associations..." Antun Gustav Matoš, *Kritika ili pamflet?* [Criticism or pamphlet?], *Šport i umjetnost*, 1/1912, No. 5, pp. 9-10.
- 13 Croatian Artists Association "Medulić" was the first organized Croatian association of artists presented at a large retrospective exhibition almost two decades ago; it was organized by the Modern Gallery and took place in 1962, at the Art Pavilion in Zagreb. The author of both the exhibition and the catalogue was Vesna Novak Oštrić. The catalogue contains basic information and documentation; thus, it may be said that the activity of the Association has been scientifically evaluated. However, there are still many open questions, such as can rarely be solved by a single scholarly enterprise, moreover a pioneer one. These are primarily the issues of style, or rather stylistics, of the genesis of forms and their origin; as well as those of their coordinates within Croatian art and its "European context." After the exhibition, there was a boom of scholarly and expert literature dedicated to the problems of early 20-th century art throughout the world, which resulted in a number of new attitudes, concepts, classifications, and evaluations; that has undoubtedly influenced the view on the parallel phenomena in Croatian culture.
- 14 Mirko Rački, who belonged to the nucleus of the Association from the very beginning, exhibited two times with "Medulić" his drawings for Dante's "Divine Comedy", even though they had mostly been made before the establishment of the Association and completely independent of its ideological and political structures, at the commission and according to the instructions of Iso Kršnjavi. They were even purchased by the Italian government at the exhibition that took place in Rome in 1911, after which Rački made a new series during the same year, that is, at the time when "Medulić" Association was already in existence. This series was first exhibited in Amsterdam in 1912 and then in the "opposite camp", respecting the wish of Iso Kršnjavi — at the exhibition of the Artists Association in Zagreb, in 1913.
- 15 "As for the foundation of our association, it is a settled thing... We have appointed a committee of six persons." Letter of Emanuel Vidović to Ivan Meštrović from 22 December 1908, Archive of Meštrović Atelier, No. 834.
- 16 "In the beginning, Bukovac did not want to agree and he was generally cool about the whole thing, but later, when I explained the purpose to him, he was thrilled," *ibidem*.
- 17 Ljubljana in 1909-1910, Zagreb in 1910, participation at the international exhibition in Rome in 1911 and at the Fourth Yugoslav Art Exhibition of "Lada" in Belgrade in 1913.
- 18 "There has been tendency for some time to deprecate and dis credit not only what is rotten in Zagreb, but also what is beautiful and useful. There has been tendency for some time to systematically glorify and extol Meštrović and his *Medulić* Association, while reviling and attacking Zagreb art equally systematically." Antun Gustav Matoš, *Kritika ili pamflet?* [Criticism or pamphlet?], *Šport i umjetnost* 1/1912, 5, pp. 9-10.
- 19 Krizman's letter to Meštrović from 22 February 1913. Archive of Meštrović Atelier, No. 1320.
- 20 Slavko Batušić, *Djelo Tomislava Krizmana* [Work of Tomislav Krizman], Catalogue of the retrospective exhibition, Izdavački zavod JAZU, Zagreb 1954, p. 8.
- 21 "After the war, there were the exhibitions of political and propaganda character. In 1919, 'Medulić' Association, with its president Meštrović and vice-president Vidović, organized in Split the 'Exhibition of Yugoslav Artists from Dalmatia.' It was a cultural and artistic manifestation of Dalmatian art oriented towards the mainland (Zagreb, Belgrade), in opposition to the Italian propaganda of the indivisibility of Dalmatian art and culture from St Mark's lion. At that time, Italy ruled over most of our coastline; it was the time of D'Annunzio's tragic comedy of Rijeka and such a manifesto and protest of Dalmatian artists, led by the already world-famous Meštrović, was indeed necessary, especially with regard to the fleet of the Allies, which was at that time stationed in Split." Duško Kečkemet, Emanuel Vidović. *Matica hrvatska*, Zagreb, 1959, p. 31.
- 22 Miroslav Krleža, Ivan Meštrović vjeruje u boga [I. M. believes in God], *Književnik*, 1/1928, No. 3, pp. 73-85.
- 23 "We worked together at the Art Pavilion, ate together, and as for the painting expenses, the canvas, colours, and plaster, Rački and I both contributed from our exhibition profit... Krizman's mother and sister cooked for us and sent us meals, and we only had to pay for the ingredients. It was a real small commune." Ivan Meštrović, *Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje* [Memories of political personalities and events]. *Matica hrvatska*, Zagreb, 1969, p. 17.
- The cycle consists of a colossal figure of Kraljević Marko and other sculptures meant to constitute the Vidovdan Temple, as well as the afore-mentioned large paintings, likewise depicting themes with Kraljević Marko.
- 24 ... [H]is link with the Secession remained typical of the entire early phase, and would be felt for some time longer after its essential features had disappeared." Željko Grum. Ivan Meštrović, 2nd ed., Zagreb, 1969, p. XIV.
- 25 Maria Pözl-Malikova, Franz Metzner, *Leben und Werk*. Catalogue of the retrospective exhibition, Munich, 1977, p. 18.
- 26 *Ibid.*, p. 16.
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 66.
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- 29 Duško Kečkemet. Ivan Meštrović. *Spektar*, Delo, Zagreb, Ljubljana, 1970, p. 14.
- 30 Wilhelm von Bode, *Die Grossmannssucht in der deutscher Kunst*. *Kunst und Künstler*, 19/1920-21, pp. 140ff.
- 31 "In the late spring of 1914, when Ivan Meštrović appeared at the Biennale of Venice in the role of a Prophet with his Vidovdan Temple, the bay window of the 'Pariz' Cafe included: Lujo Thaler, Đuro Szabo, Juraj Demetrović, and Zofka Kveder Jelovšekova. Topic of conversation: Ivan Meštrović as a Messiah. Was Ivan Meštrović the prophet of the Dinaric race, the priest of Vidovdan, some sort of our racial superman that had brought all of Europe on its knees? The ideas, methods, and themes of Kosta Strajnić, Mitro Mitrinović, Ivo Vojnović, Milan Marjanović, Andrija Milčinović, Rački, Dragan Prohaska, etc. Everybody was unanimously against "erina, against Vihor, as too noisy, a sort of revolver journalism.
- My hypotheses in the conversation with these adepts of a weird aesthetic sect had lasted for several months, and they consisted in the negation of this confused rhetoric. Negation that was not entirely mechanical, but nevertheless consistent and firm: there is no racial ideology, no such ideas, no mystery of Vidovdan, no Messiah, it is primarily the Vienna Secession and, unfortunately, even an ordinary and quite banal version of it, and then it is essentially Metzner and Bourdelle. Debates were taking place almost every day, at the coffee table. I was fed up with that provincial, fetishist babble and that is why, one fine day, I

su nam i slale hranu Krizmanova majka i sestra, samo uz naplatu stvarnih troškova. Dakle, jedna mala komuna." Ivan Meštrović, Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje. Matica hrvatska, Zagreb 1969, str. 17.

Ciklus se sastoji od kolos-figure Kraljevića Marka i drugih skulptura fragmenata za Vidovdanski hram, te već navedenih velikih slika, također s temom Kraljevića Marka.

24 ... njegova povezanost sa secesijom ostaje karakteristična za čitavo rano razdoblje, a osjećat će se još dugo, kad već njenih bitnih značajki neće biti." Željko Grum. Ivan Meštrović, 2. izd., Zagreb 1969, str. XIV.

25 Maria Pözl-Malikova, Franz Metzner, Leben und Werk. Katalog retrospektivne izložbe, München 1977, str. 18.

26 Isto, str. 16.

27 Isto, str. 66.

28 Isto, str. 18.

29 Duško Kečkemet. Ivan Meštrović. Spektar, Delo, Zagreb, Ljubljana 1970, str. 14.

30 Wilhelm von Bode, Die Grossmannssucht in der deutscher Kunst. Kunst und Künstler, 19/1920-21, str. 140 i dalje.

31 "Kasnoga proljeća godine 1914, kada se je na mletačkom Biennalu pojavio Ivan Meštrović u ulozi Proroka sa Vidovdanskim hramom, u izlogu kavane 'Pariz' prisutni: dr. Lujo Thaler, dr. Đuro Szabo, Juraj Demetrović i Zofka Kveder Jelovšekova. Tema razgovora: Mesijanstvo Ivana Meštrovića. Da li je Ivan Meštrović prorok dinarske rase, vidovdanski žrec, neka vrsta našeg rasnog nadčovjeka pred kojim je pokleknuła čitava Evropa? Misli, način i teme Koste Strajnića, Mitra Mitrinovića, Ive Vojnovića, Milana Marjanovića, Andrije Milčinovića, Račkoga, Dragana Prohaske itd. Svi su unisono protivu "erine, protivu Vihora, kao suviše glasne, revolver-žurnalističke galame.

Moje teze u razgovoru s tim adeptima čudne estetske sekte, traju već nekoliko mjeseci, a glase kao negacija ove zbrkane retorike. Negacija ne posve mehanička, ali dosljedna i postojana: da tu nema rasne ideologije ni ideja, ni vidovdanskog misterija, ni mesijanstva, nego da se radi u prvom redu o bečkoj Secesiji i to, na žalost, sasvim običnoj i sasvim banalnoj Secesiji, a zatim o Metzneru u prvom redu i o Bourdelleu. Diskusije traju gotovo svakog dana kod crne kave.

Dosadila mi je ta provincijalna fetišistička brbljarija i tako sam jednoga dana donio svoj mefistofelski đavolski stroj, i postavio ga na stol kavane Pariz. Iz jednog broja njemačkih nekakvih ilustracija i nekih kataloga, montirao sam u jednoj mapi na kartone detalje Metznerovih heroja, udovica, junaka, u gestovima patetičnim onog monstruoznog spomenika, podignutog u slavu bitke kod Leipziga godine 1813.

Demonstrirajući na kartonima, pitam gospodu: šta je u ovim stvarima rasno, jer sam taj svoj preparat bio montirao kao snimke velikog proročkog vidovdanskog hrama Meštrovićevog u detaljima. Stvar je bila dobro kaširana. Domobranski nadporučnik Branko Knežević, pjesnik i moj prijatelj iz djetinjstva, ne znajući o čemu se radi, montirao je te Metznerove figure u neku vrstu albuma savršeno. On se kao cacheur u to razumio, bio je neka vrsta talenta za takve stvari.

Lujo i Zofka, Đuro i Juro unisono: patos, melankolija, emfaza bola, grčeviti zamah, volja za rasnom pobjedom, arhaizirani ilirski praslavenski tipovi, rasna dinamika, duboka bol nad vjekovnim porazima, vjera u nacionalno uskrsnuće, rasna, genijalna inspiracija, prkos potlačene južnoslovenske rase obasjane Lazarskim nimbusom, kosovsko mlijeko (a to je upravo ono mlijeko, koje mi Zagorci nismo sisali), misterij ove

tragedije, koja znamenuje naše političko i kulturno Uskrsnuće itd. itd.

Pustio sam gospodu da me pljuskom svojih poetskih dokaza, ad oculos, dobro zavittlavaju. Sve nas, kod tog kavanskog stola, ponio je iskreni zanos ovog dokaznog postupka, jer tu nije bilo nikakve mogućnosti uzmaca. "itav répertoire kobnih zabluda duha i ukusa, in statu nascendi a našalost i političkih programa.

I kada se sve to svršilo po principu, po starom generalskom austrijskom principu: 'Die Herren bitte aussprechen lassen', došlo je do obrata. Onda sam ja otvorio svoj špil sa vlastitih šesnaest asova. Tableau! — Naime, sve bi to, što su gospoda tako lijepo 'odkrasnoslovila', kagbirekli, štimalo, priznajem, samo jedna stvar ne štima, a ta je, na žalost, elementarna: ne radi se o Ivana Meštrovića Vidovdanskom Hramu, nego o spomeniku Leipziške Pobjede, od Metznera. Nije to, našalost, Vidovdanski Hram, nego 'Valker-schlacht-Denkmal'! Gospoda mi nijesu povjerovala, dakako, a onda su se, ne znam zašto, svi korporativno uvrijedili, i što je najžalosnije: ostali su da dalje dosljedno deru svoju kozu.

Paradoksalno je, da se ti tipovi naše inteligencije i danas smatraju clair-voyantnim ideolozima naše rase. Kada sam neki dan objašnjavao jednome od ovih svojih partnera što je zapravo austrijska kasarna i kakvu ulogu igra u toj austrijskoj kasarni i naša bijedna inteligencija, on se uzvišeno smješkao. Ja da negativno preuveličavam epizode! Sve su to potpuno neznatne epizode! Treba vjerovati u vječnost. Eto, nisam imao, veli, pravo! Meštrović je u Londonu pobijedio, a ja ne razumijem, veli, o čemu se radi. Ja sam kao Zola: zanima me samo negativna strana života, tj. blato!"

Miroslav Krleža, Davni dani, Zapisi 1914-1921. Sabrana djela, Zora, Zagreb 1956, str. 132-135.

32 Enciklopedija likovnih umjetnosti. Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod, Zagreb 1964, sv. 3, str. 445.

33 Izidor Kršnjavi je u rukopisnim bilješkama, koje se nalaze u Arhivu Hrvatske, deklinirao svoje prezime "Kršnjavi, Kršnjavija" a ne "Kršnjavi, Kršnjavoga", stoga je uputno zadržati oblik koji je on sam preferirao unatoč kolebljivoj pravopisnoj praksi.

34 Pismo Račkoga Kršnjaviju od 27. III 1907, Arhiv Hrvatske.

35 Katarina Ambrozić, Prva Jugoslovenska umetnička kolonija. Zbornik radova Narodnog muzeja, 2/1956-57, Beograd 1958, str. 261-286.

36 A. G. Matoš, Izložba Jugoslavenske umjetničke kolonije u Beogradu. Hrvatska smotra, 2/1907, str. 372-373, 514-518. Citrano prema: Sabrana djela, JAZU, Liber, Mladost, 1973, sv. XI, str. 30.

37 A. G. Matoš, Povodom izložbe "Medulića". Savremenik 5/1910, br. 11, str. 803-812. Citrano prema: Sabrana djela, sv. XI, str. 89.

38 Robert Waissenberger, Die Wiener Secession. Jugend und Volk, Wien, München, 1971, str. 79.

39 Objavljena u knjizi: Christian M. Nebehay, Gustav Klimt — Dokumentation. Galerie Christian M. Nebehay, Wien 1969, str. 282, slika 394. Također u: Ver Sacrum, V/185.

40 Robert Waissenberger, op. cit. (bilješka 38), str. 83.

41 Zanimljiva je učestalost motiva konja i konjanika u struji monumentalne umjetnosti. Također isticanje ledne muskulature muških aktova koji nerijetko okreću gledaocu — leđa.

42 Poslije retrospektivne izložbe Mirka Račkoga u Umjetničkom paviljonu 1970. godine, na kojoj su bile izložene obje slike, autor ih je poklonio gradu Zagrebu. Nalaze se u Škupštini

brought along my devilish device of Mephistopheles and placed it on the table in Cafe Pariz. From an issue of some illustrated journal and some catalogues, I had assembled a folder with details of Metzner's heroes and widows, with all their pathetic gestures of that monstrous monument that had been erected to glorify the Battle at Leipzig in 1813, all there, on sheets of cardboard.

Demonstrating my cardboards, I asked the gentlemen: what is racial in these things, for I had assembled my device as if it were shots of the great Vidovdan Temple of prophet Meštrović, presented in details. The whole thing was well camouflaged. Branko Knežević, senior lieutenant of Domobran Army, poet and a friend of mine from childhood, not knowing what it was all about, had assembled those Metzner's figures perfectly into a sort of album. He was an expert cacheur, really gifted for such things.

Lujo and Zofka, Đuro and Juro, in unison: pathos, melancholy, emphasis on pain, convulsive momentum, will for racial victory, archaicized Illyrian ancient Slavic types, racial dynamics, deep suffering over the centuries of defeat, faith in national resurrection, racial, ingenious inspiration, obstinacy of the suppressed South-Slavic race illuminated by Lazar's nimbus, the mother's milk of Kosovo (which is precisely that sort of milk which we, people from Zagorje, have never sucked), mystery of this tragedy, which signified our political and cultural Resurrection, etc. etc.

I let the gentlemen brandish me well with the shower of their poetic proofs ad oculos. All of us, there at that coffee table, were exalted by the true fervour of this proving procedure, since there was no way out of it. There was the whole répertoire of fatal illusions of spirit and taste, in statu nascendi, but unfortunately also some political programmes.

And when it was all over, after that good old motto of Austrian generals: 'Die Herren bitte aussprechen lassen', there came the turn of the screw. I revealed my pack of cards with my own sixteen aces. Tableau! — That is, all that the gentlemen had so nicely and 'eloquently exposed', so to say, would have been correct, I agreed, had it not been for that one little detail, which was, unfortunately, quite elementary: it was not the Vidovdan Temple by Ivan Meštrović, but the monument to the Victory of Leipzig by Metzner. Unfortunately, it was not the Vidovdan Temple, but the 'Völkerschlacht-Denkmal'!

The gentlemen did not believe me, of course, and then they were all collectively offended, I have no idea why, and moreover, and that was the saddest thing of all, they persisted in skinning themselves to the bone.

It is a paradox that such types among our intellectuals are still considered the clairvoyant ideologists of our race. As I was explaining the other day to one of those partners of mine what this Austrian casern actually was and what role our miserable intellectuals played in it, he was only smiling his superior smile. I was only negatively exaggerating those mere episodes! Those were all completely insignificant episodes! One should believe in eternity. There, I had not been right! Meštrović had won in London, and I had no clue, he said, what it was all about. I was like Zola: interested only in the negative side of life, i.e. mud!" Miroslav Krleža, *Davni dani, Zapisi 1914-1921*. *Sabrana djela* [Bygone times, Memoirs 1914-1921. Collected Works], Zora, Zagreb, 1956, pp. 132-135.

³² Enciklopedija likovnih umjetnosti [Encyclopaedia of Art].

Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod, Zagreb 1964, vol. 3, p. 445.

³³ In his manuscript notes, preserved at the Croatian State

Archives, Izidor Kršnjavi declined his family name as "Kršnjavi, Kršnjavija" instead of "Kršnjavi, Kršnjavoga"; therefore, I have chosen to preserve that form despite the ambiguous orthographic practice.

³⁴ Rački's letter to Kršnjavi from 27 March 1907, Croatian State Archives.

³⁵ Katarina Ambrozić, *Prva Jugoslovenska umjetnička kolonija* [First Yugoslav Artistic Colony]. *Zbornik radova Narodnog muzeja*, 2/1956-57, Belgrade, 1958, pp. 261-286.

³⁶ A. G. Matoš, *Izložba Jugoslavenske umjetničke kolonije u Beogradu* [Exhibition of Yugoslav Artistic Colony in Belgrade]. *Hrvatska smotra*, 2/1907, pp. 372-373 and 514-518. Cited from: *Sabrana djela* [Collected Works], JAZU, Liber, Mladost, 1973, vol. XI, p. 30.

³⁷ A. G. Matoš, *Povodom izložbe "Medulića"* [On the occasion of "Medulić" exhibition]. *Savremenik* 5/1910, No. 11, pp. 803-812. Cited from: *Sabrana djela* [Collected Works], vol. XI, p. 89.

³⁸ Robert Waissenberger, *Die Wiener Secession. Jugend und Volk*, Vienna, Munich, 1971, p. 79.

³⁹ Published in the book by Christian M. Nebehay, *Gustav Klimt — Dokumentation*. *Galerie Christian M. Nebehay*, Vienna, 1969, p. 282, ill. 394. Also in: *Ver Sacrum*, V/185.

⁴⁰ Robert Waissenberger, *op.cit.* (n. 38), p. 83.

⁴¹ The frequency of the motifs of horse and horseman in monumental art is highly interesting, as well as its emphasis on the back muscles in male nudes, which often turn their backs to the spectator.

⁴² After the retrospective exhibition of Mirko Rački in 1970 at the Art Pavilion, where both paintings were exhibited, the author donated them to the city of Zagreb. They are preserved at the City Council, but not exhibited, since it is not easy to find an appropriate place for them. Which shows clearly and in an everyday context that monumental painting is intended for an especially designed architectural framework.

⁴³ A. G. Matoš, *Povodom izložbe "Medulića"* [On the occasion of "Medulić" exhibition]. *Savremenik* 5/1910, No. 11, pp. 803-812. Cited from: *Sabrana djela* [Collected Works], vol. XI, p. 97.

⁴⁴ Rački's letter to Kršnjavi from 8 May 1912, Croatian State Archives.

⁴⁵ Rački's letter to Kršnjavi from 25 February 1914, Croatian State Archives.

⁴⁶ He exhibited them in 1908, at the First Dalmatian Art Exhibition in Split, and in 1909, at the "Medulić" exhibition in Ljubljana.

⁴⁷ The inventory of the National Museum in Belgrade lists three canvases with the following names: "Kosovka Maiden", "Jug Bogdan and the Nine Jugovići", "Kraljević Marko and the Sister of Captain Leko". — "All three paintings are of very large proportions, over 3 meter wide and just as tall, and they are not preserved in blind frames, but in rolls, which makes their photographing impossible." Letter of the National Museum, No. 48/1, from 16 January 1970.

⁴⁸ For example, the catalogue of the exhibition of Yugoslav artists in Geneva (1918), etc.

⁴⁹ These are elements of "art deco" observed by Željka "orak": "... with his firm line, angular contours, and the strong stylisation of figures, he apparently joined the currents that were anticipating the style of the 20s and 30s" (Telegram, 27 March 1970, p. 17). — As an example, she has mentioned the poster of "Medulić" exhibition from 1910, but the tempera painting of the "Martyr" would be far closer to the "style of the 20s and 30s."

⁵⁰ Rački's letter to Kršnjavi from 3 March 1920. Croatian State Archives.

grada i nisu izložene, jer nije jednostavno naći prikladan prostor. I time svakodnevna praksa pokazuje da je slikarstvo monumentalne struje namijenjeno jasno određenom arhitektonskom okviru.

⁴³ A. G. Matoš, Povodom izložbe "Medulića". *Savremenik* 5/1910, br. 11, str. 803-812. Citirano prema: *Sabrana djela*, sv. XI, str. 97.

⁴⁴ Pismo Račkoga Kršnjaviju od 8. V 1912, Arhiv Hrvatske.

⁴⁵ Pismo Račkoga Kršnjaviju od 25. II 1914, Arhiv Hrvatske.

⁴⁶ Izlagao ih je 1908. na Prvoj dalmatinskoj umjetničkoj izložbi u Splitu, 1909. na izložbi "Medulića" u Ljubljani.

⁴⁷ U beogradskom Narodnom muzeju inventirana su tri platna pod ovim nazivima: "Kosovka djevojka", "Jug Bogdan i devet Jugovića", "Kraljević Marko i sestra Leke kapetana". — "Sve tri slike su veoma velikih dimenzija, preko tri metra širine i

isto toliko visine, nisu na blind ramovima već u rolnama, te je njihovo fotografisanje nemoguće." *Dopis Narodnog muzeja*, br. 48/1, od 16. I 1970.

⁴⁹ Na primjer katalog izložbe jugoslavenskih umjetnika u Genevi 1918. godine i dr. Riječ je o elementima "art decoa", koje zamjećuje Željka "orak": "... tvrdom linijom, uglatim obrisom i snažnom stilizacijom likova moglo bi se reći da se uključio u ona kretanja koja su anticipirala stil dvadesetih i tridesetih godina" (*Telegram*, 27. III 1970, str. 17). — Kao primjer Željka "orak" navodi plakat za izložbu "Medulića" iz 1910. godine, međutim, na primjer tempera "Mučenica" bila bi znatno bliža "stilu dvadesetih i tridesetih godina".

⁵⁰ Pismo Račkoga Kršnjaviju od 3. III 1920. Arhiv Hrvatske.