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Modern sculpture and its chronological, spatial, and terminological (re)defining poses a permanent challenge to researchers. Hence, this conference is conceived as a platform for considering wider contextual boundaries in sculptural production between the last decades of the 19th century and the mid-1970s such as: social conditions, historico-political events, economic circumstances and aesthetic demands. Special attention will be given to the phenomena in the field of sculpture excluded from the dominant art historical narratives, such as gender issues and similar particular perspectives. Furthermore, the conference will include a discussion on a variety of forms in which sculpture is manifested and produced; from traditional models and procedures such as casting, chiselling, carving, to conceptual turns and the creation of a brand new visual language of sculpture as well as terms used to describe it. Thus, the platform will support critical evaluations and analyses of the approaches employed in modern sculpture production up to now, and attempt to suggest or define new art historical insights as well as methodologies used in research and analyses of modern sculpture.

Furthermore, the focus of attention will be on geographic and national spaces outlining various influences, exchanges or clashes in which the movements of sculptors and their work through different European and global political and cultural geographies can be tracked (in the form of exhibitions, acquisitions, and public reception). It will be important to highlight the category of “publicness” and “visibility” of sculpture and ways in which it is achieved; from public monuments as the most representative mediators of complex socio-political and economic factors, to chamber sculptures most frequently mediated via temporary exhibitions and means of technical reproduction (catalogues, books, newspapers, etc.), from their making and installation in public spaces, to their destruction and potential rehabilitation/historisation.

Agata Jakubowska:
En-gendering Post-war Modern Sculpture. Maria Pinińska-Bereš and Jerzy Bereš

Božo Kesić:
Echoes of Socialist Modernism in Croatian Public Monuments of the ’90s and 2000s

Shahar Knafo:
New Material, New Techniques, New Terminology

Ljiljana Kolešnik:
The Politics of Kineticism and the “Ideology” of New Tendencies

Ana Kršinić Lozica:
Beyond Visible: The Different Modernism of Vera Dajht Kralj

Ivana Mance:
Art Colonies and Art Symposia in Late Socialist Yugoslavia – the Factory of Sculpture for Communal Use

Tarquin Sinan:
The New Generation; Behind or Ahead of the Times. What Is the Place of This Sacrificed Generation in British Sculpture?

Vinko Srhoj / Karla Lebhaft:
Public Sculpture: The Symbolic in the Gap Between the Figurative and Abstract

Svjetlana Sumpor:
The Unusual Kinship of the Modern and Naive / Petar Smajić

Ferenc Veress:
Escape from the Communist Block: Victor Roman’s Case (1937-1995)

Barbara Vujanović:
Art, Friendship and Politics. Meštrović’s Contacts with Czech Politicians and Artists

Davorin Vujčić:
Sculptures by Antun Augustinčić in the Function of Cultural Diplomacy

Hélène Zanin:
A Heated Argument: The Quarrel Between Albert Elsen and Rosalind Krauss about Rodin’sMultiples and Posthumous Casts in the 1980s

Daniel Zec:
Typological Classification of Portrait Sculpture as a Contribution to the Research of the Manifestations of Modern Sculpture in Croatia

Olga Žakić:
The Representation of the Concept of Darwinism in Sculpture in the Works of Simeon Roksandić
The themes of the conference presentations will be related to the following issues:

— how to define modern sculpture’s temporal boundaries;
— which political, social and economic factors determine modern sculpture production and in what ways;
— where sculpture stands in relation to dominant cultural concepts in specific socio-political paradigms and what happens to it after a paradigm shift;
— what comparative models of sculptural production exist in Europe and the world and how and why connections are established between some geographical and cultural territories;
— in which specific geographical locations the greatest exchanges between the sculptors’ ideas in the designated period took place;
— how to perceive the idea of a dominant centre and a passivized periphery today and in what measure and how it is possible to transgress this idea on the examples of sculptural works in specific national and/or cultural spaces;
— what the role and nature of modern portrait sculpture is and to what extent it is possible to consider it a reflection/generator of social and political networking and cultural diplomacy;
— which specific narratives are related to sculpture and in what degree they are important for its comprehension and “orientation” in the process of translation between different semantic contexts;
— what kind of language is used to describe modern sculpture and what kind of thesaurus can be generated in that sense;
— how sculpture is mediated to the public, i.e. what systems of mechanic and virtual reproduction mean for its reception;
— how to approach sculpture as a “mediator of memory” and how the knowledge about it relates to archives and databanks, i.e. defining the connection between sculpture, archives and databanks;
— how conceptual turns in the field of artistic activity reflect on the understanding and language of sculpture and its manifestation.

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

DAY 1
26/10/2017 (Thursday)

15:00 Location: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split / Filozofski fakultet u Splitu, Conference Hall of the Centre Studia Mediterranea / Konferencijska dvorana Centra Studia Mediterranea (Poljana kraljice Jelene 2/III. floor, 21000 Split)

15:00 – 15:40 Welcome speeches, introductory notes, conference opening.
15:40 – 16:40 Keynote presentation + discussion: Penelope Curtis
Modern Sculpture: Beginnings and Ends
(Moderator: Dalibor Prančević)
16:40 – 17:00 Coffee break
17:00 – 18:00 Keynote presentation + discussion: Catherine Moriarty
Sculpture on the Crossroad: Object, Context and Inquiry
(Moderator: Dalibor Prančević)
18:00 – 18:20 Coffee break
18:20 – 19:55 Modernist Sculpture and Criticism; Modernist Sculpture Beyond its Time Frame and Formal Task
> Hans Bloemsma: Giotto and Modernist Sculpture
> Tarquin Sinan: The New Generation; Behind or Ahead of the Times. What Is the Place of This Sacrificed Generation in British Sculpture?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19:55 – 20:00</td>
<td>Day 1 closing speech</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td>27/10/2017 (Friday)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>PART 1 – MORNING SESSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: Meštrović Gallery / Galerija Meštrović (Šetalište Ivana Meštrovića 48, 21000 Split)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:15</td>
<td>Gender and modernist sculpture</td>
<td>75 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Darija Alujević: Women Sculptors at the Spring Salon 1916-1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Agata Jakubowska: En-gendering Post-war Modern Sculpture. Maria Pinińska-Bereš and Jerzy Bereš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Ana Kršinić Lozica: Beyond Visible: The Different Modernism of Vera Dajht Kralj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Moderator: Ljiljana Kolešnik)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 10:35</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:35 – 12:10</td>
<td>Art and politics</td>
<td>95 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Barbara Vujanović: Art, Friendship and Politics. Meštrović’s Contacts with Czech Politicians and Artists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Davorin Vujčić: Sculptures by Antun Augustinčić in the Function of Cultural Diplomacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 – 12:30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Olga Žakić: The Representation of the Concept of Darwinism in Sculpture in the Works of Simeon Roksandić</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Svetlana Sumpor: The Unusual Kinship of the Modern and Naïve / Petar Smajić</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Margarida Brito Alves and Patricia Rosas: From Poetry to Sculpture: Salette Tavares</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Moderator: Darija Alujević)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45 – 14:45</td>
<td>Lunch break</td>
<td>60 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45 – 14:45</td>
<td>Guided tour of Meštrović Gallery</td>
<td>60 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>PART 2 – AFTERNOON SESSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split / Filozofski fakultet u Splitu, Conference Hall of the Centre Studia Mediterranea / Konferencijska dvorana Centra Studia Mediterranea (Poljana kraljice Jelene 2/III. floor, 21000 Split)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45 – 18:00</td>
<td>The monument question</td>
<td>75 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Vinko Srhoj and Karla Lebhaft: Public Sculpture: The Symbolic in the Gap Between the Figurative and Abstract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Dalibor Prančević, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split

Croatian Science Foundation research project [IP-2016-06-2112]:
Manifestations of Modern Sculpture in Croatia: Sculpture on the Crossroads between Socio-political Pragmatism, Economic Possibilities and Aesthetical Contemplation

The primary aim of this project is to gain a thorough perspective on the complex of modern sculpture in Croatia and define key changes in the domain of sculptural morphologies and production methodologies, as well as future consequences for approaching and redefining of the medium of sculpture. The aim is to determine „modernism” in the area of sculptural activity and to find out how sculpture relates to the broader context of modernist culture. One of the goals also is to investigate every available source that would illuminate new properties of modern sculpture in Croatia and its mobility [archival, museum and library records, artists’ personal archives etc.]. During the preparation of the project proposal, the fact has been acknowledged that a reasonable part of Croatian sculptural production was created extraterritorially, attracting great deal of attention from Europe and the world. This research will investigate how and in what measure Croatian sculptors disseminated new approaches to sculptural activity, who the specific protagonists are, and how and is it really possible to establish a discourse frame dealing with the “de-provincialisation” of Croatian cultural space.

This research aims to critically observe and analyse systematisations of Croatian modern sculptural heritage presenting solid platform for new art historical perspectives and dialogues. Special mention should go to the following authors and titles published in the last 50 years or more: Oto Bihalji Merin, 20th Century Yugoslav Sculpture, Belgrade: „Jugoslavija” journal, 1955;
and contemporary points of view (an encounter between the pre-existing knowledge about the topic and changes made by future one). Sculpture is one of such „places“, changing its contextual drapery that should be subjected to more detailed observation and analysis in order to generate new information and insights.

The desired consequence of the research project is the publication of the monographic edition that would introduce and explain, in a contemporary manner, the manifestations of modern sculpture in Croatia and discover completely new knowledge in the subject area. Furthermore, the special part of the project proposal is creating a 20th century sculpture lexicon in order to generate a thesaurus of concepts that are related to the manifestation of sculpture and its articulation, i.e. production. It would be one of the first examples of such publications in Croatia, certainly of interest to the international audience as well.

**Biography:**

Dalibor Prančević’s research interests focus mainly on art and visual culture of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. He is an assistant professor and chair at the Art History Department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split, Croatia, where he teaches Contemporary Art, Visual Communication, and Art through Contemporary Exhibition Practice. He has developed a particular interest in the life and work of Ivan Meštrović. His doctoral dissertation was on important aspects of Meštrović’s oeuvre and his artistic and social milieu. He has also published widely on the artist and curated several exhibitions of his work. Dalibor Prančević regularly publishes articles on modern and contemporary art and visual culture and is the author of numerous monographic exhibition catalogues.
Ivan Meštrović making his *Large Crucifix*, Geneva, 1916

From the sculptor Iva Despić Simonović's studio

[archive photo, photograph library of the Ivan Meštrović Gallery in Split, FGM-2272]

[copy from the *Svijet* journal, no. 14, vol. II, October 2, 1926, p. 281]
Sculptor Mila Wod with her recently completed monument to Stjepan Radić, Petrinja, 1929

Marin Studin posing in the process of preparing the wood for a sculpture in front of his parents' home in Kaštel Novi in the company of his daughter Sunčana, 1940
Oscar Nemon making a portrait of Sigmund Freud, Pötzleinsdorf, 1931

In Antun Augustinčić's studio during the making of Monument of Gratitude to the Red Army, Zagreb 1947

(photographed by Milan Pavić, photo archive of the Antun Augustinčić Gallery, Klanjec)
Vanja Radauš moulding a portrait of August Cesarec

Antun Augustinčić sculpting Female torso, Zagreb 1950s

[copy from Ilustrirani Vjesnik, Zagreb, October 7, 1945]

[photographed by Tošo Dabac, photo archive of the Antun Augustinčić Gallery, Klanjec]
Carpenter V. Bašić, sculptors A. Augustinčić and V. Mačukatin in front of the clay model of the monument Peace, Zagreb 1954

Ivan Kožarić (photographed by Branko Balić in the mid-1960s, Institute of Art History in Zagreb, photo archive of Branko Balić)
PLenary talks

[archive photo from the Estate of Vasko Lipovac, the Vasko Lipovac Association – VAL, Split]
One of the many and various topics suggested for this conference was the timeline of modern sculpture, and I decided for this introductory lecture to address this provocation head on. My paper will look both at dates, and at content. If we understand what we mean by modern sculpture, the timeline is perhaps consensual. But in recent years many of the historians gathered here have been engaged in expanding the parameters of modern sculpture. Does a wider definition entail a different timeline? Might a stricter timeline help us with our definitions? Can a more rigorous understanding of the beginnings and the ends of modern sculpture help us to arrive at a conclusion, and thus at a more clearly defined field? Here I will try to unpick what is already more or less established from what is still in flux and suggest that we might need to accept the need for retrospection.

Biography:
Penelope Curtis began her career in art history at the Courtauld Gallery where she studied Modern Art. She went on to Paris to develop her doctoral thesis Monumental Sculpture in France c.1870–1930. Her first job in the field was in the Tate Gallery, Liverpool (1988). From 1994–2010 she worked at the Henry Moore Institute in Leeds. In 2010, she became the director of Tate Britain. She was the chair of the Turner Prize during this time and was also the co-curator of the Barbara Hepworth exhibition which was held at the gallery in 2015. Her field of interest primarily includes inter-war art and architecture as well as contemporary art. She is a renowned researcher and scholar who has given many talks and lectures (Yale, Nationally Gallery in London) and the curator of related exhibitions and many relevant publications, including Sculpture 1900–1945 in the Oxford History of Art (Oxford 1999) and Patio & Pavilion: the place of sculpture in modern architecture (Ridinghouse/Getty 2007). Her Mellon Lectures (held at the National Gallery in London and at Yale University in 2015) have just been published with Yale. She is currently the director of the Calouste Gulbenkian Museum in Lisbon, Portugal.
PLENARY TALK

Sculpture on the Crossroads: Object, Context and Inquiry

Catherine Moriarty, Ph.D.
Curatorial Director, University of Brighton Design Archives
C.Moriarty@brighton.ac.uk

The notion of “sculpture on the crossroads” can, of course, be considered both literally and metaphorically. This paper commences with a focus on the development of scholarly interest in the public monument and how this ran parallel and only rarely intersected with the study of sculpture in a gallery context. Despite the fact that many sculptors necessarily engaged with both areas of activity, scholarship has focused on concepts rather than commissions, the cerebral rather than the contractual.

This paper explores how the study of the public monument provided a nexus for the widening of sculpture studies from its art historical base towards the fields of social history, memory studies and material culture for example, and as a site for exploring the dynamics of post-colonialism, the representation of gender, and religious or national identity. Consequently, despite its unfashionable status when the appreciation of modern sculpture was at its zenith, the monument has come to play an important role in the continuing relevance and significance of sculpture as a field of enquiry. Despite the importance of the monument to the work of earlier art historians, Alois Riegl most particularly, it was not until later in the twentieth century that public sculpture regained its visibility and became perhaps one of the most powerful sites for debate about the role of culture in shaping conceptions of the past and in the formation of evolving national and transnational identities.

Biography:
Catherine Moriarty is a professor of Art and Design History at the University of Brighton and the curatorial director of the University of Brighton Design Archives. She writes and curates exhibitions on the history of British art and design and she is particularly interested in cultures of commemoration, ceremony and the relationship between sculpture and design. Interested in the archive as a site of enquiry, Moriarty has directed a variety of research, exhibition and publication initiatives including the Arts and Humanities Research Council funded collaborative doctoral projects with the Chartered Society of Designers and the Design Museum. She is the co-editor of Sculpture Journal.
Pan-Slavic Photography Exhibition Display, 1935

[plaster casts of monuments of Gregory of Nin in Split and Equestrian Indians in Chicago]
Women Sculptors at the Spring Salon 1916-1928

Darija Alujević
Senior Associate, Fine Art Archives of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb
dalea7@gmail.com

The Spring Salon (Proljetni salon) society of artists had an important role in the Croatian art scene from 1916 until 1928. The exhibitions organized by the society were a place of affirmation of the new generation of artists. During a period of twelve years, the society organized twenty-seven exhibitions in which several progressive artists participated; mostly painters who brought new styles to Croatian painting. Although the quantity and quality of painters at the Spring Salon exhibitions were way above that of the sculptors, among the small number of sculptors, we find a few women sculptors. Around 1910, we see the emerging first generation of sculptors which attended the Zagreb Temporary School for Applied Arts and Crafts (today the Fine Arts Academy) founded in 1907. Part of that generation were two women sculptors: Iva Simonović Despić (1891-1961) and Mila Wood (Ludmila Wodsedalek, 1888-1968), who both participated at the Spring Salon. The fact that female pupils were allowed to attend the Temporary School for Applied Arts and Crafts caused discriminatory reactions. Among the most severe critics was the art critic Kosta Strajnić (1887-1977), who believed female artistic work should remain a hobby or something for one’s spare time. The question of female artistic qualities and abilities was reopened once more in 1916 during the second exhibition of the Croatian Spring Salon, the joint exhibition of two female artists: sculptor Iva Simonović Despić and painter Zdenka Pexidr Sieger, which was held at Salon Ullrich. During the exhibition, Kosta Strajnić held a lecture entitled “Women and Art”. In his lecture and booklet of the same name, he discussed female artistic capacities in general, reopening the question of gender equality and giving a brief history of female art in Europe. Although affirmative towards women artists, he was against complete equality considering that women’s creative skills were different than men’s. The art critics in the newspaper reviews of the Spring Salon exhibitions usually neglected the female artists or mentioned them only in one sentence. That attitude surely contributed to the fact that the majority of women sculptors are now forgotten and their œuvres left unknown. Iva Simonović Despić was a member of the Spring Salon from the beginning; she participated at the first Salon in 1916 as the only women sculptor among the four sculptors, and she exhibited regularly at the Salon until 1920. Mila Wood participated at the Spring Salon exhibitions twice: in 1922 and 1923. Besides Simonović and Wood at the Spring Salon, we find three other women sculptors: the almost forgotten Ludovika Valić, who exhibited at the 15th salon in 1922, Ivan Meštrović’s first wife Ruža Klein Meštrović, who exhibited at the 17th Salon in 1923, and Mare Sreća (Pexidr), who took part in the 7th Salon in 1919 and the 8th Salon in 1920 (although she was listed as a member of the Salon, today she is completely unknown). In the last four years of the Salon (1924-1928), there were no women sculptors. The Spring Salon was not a place of great affirmation for women artists, but their contribution, especially that of the Simonović – Pexidr Sieger exhibition, brought the question of „women and art” into focus once again.

Biography:
Darija Alujević earned her MA in art history and Italian language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb in 1999. She is currently a Ph.D. student at the Art History department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Since 2010, she has held the position of Senior Associate at the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts – Fine Arts Archives of the Cabinet for Architecture and Urban Planning, Zagreb. Her research interests include: Croatian modern sculpture, public sculpture, gender studies and female sculptors. Since 2013, she has been the president of the gallery committee at the Milan and Ivo Steiner Gallery in Zagreb. In addition, since 2017, she has been a participant in the research project entitled Manifestations of Modern Sculpture in Croatia: Sculpture on the Crossroads Between Socio-political Pragmatism, Economic Possibilities and Aesthetical Contemplation.
Giotto and Modernist Sculpture

Hans Bloemsma, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, University College Roosevelt, Utrecht University, Netherlands
h.bloemsma@ucr.nl

Modernist sculptors such as Henry Moore, Barbara Hepworth and Alberto Giacometti have acknowledged their indebtedness to the work of the Italian artist Giotto di Bondone (1276-1337). While Moore wrote of Giotto’s painting as “the finest sculpture I met in Italy”, Giacometti described receiving “a body blow full on the breast” in front of Giotto’s work. These sculptors admired in Giotto’s paintings primitive and abstract qualities that fuelled their own modernist ambitions and ideals. This view of the “primitive” Giotto has its roots in nineteenth and early twentieth-century art historical studies of this Italian artist. In the case of the British sculptors, it was familiar to them through the writings of John Ruskin, Clive Bell and Roger Fry. While scholars of modernist sculpture have acknowledged these connections, the complex relationship between modernist artistic practices and developments in the history of early Italian art remains largely unexplored, and its implications unacknowledged. In my paper, I intend to examine this relationship and its consequences in more detail.

My paper is meant as a case study, focusing on the work and writings of Henry Moore. The goal is two-fold. First, I will consider how art historical research on Giotto informed the practice of Moore. What was Moore’s understanding of the Italian artist, and how did this understanding as well as the direct encounter with his work affect his own work? Second, I will assess how in turn the works of Moore have altered the perception and interpretation of Giotto’s art. To what extent have Moore’s sculptures not merely reflected art historical trends, but also shaped, and perhaps irrevocably changed the way art historians as well as the public at large look at Giotto’s paintings?

From Poetry to Sculpture: Salette Tavares

Margarida Brito Alves, Ph.D. / Patricia Rosas
Assistant Professor, Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas of Universidade Nova de Lisboa / Curator, Gulbenkian Museum
margaridabritoalves@gmail.com / patrosas25@gmail.com

With a background in philosophy/aesthetics, Salette Tavares (1922-1994) was a Portuguese artist who began to develop her work in the scope of the Portuguese New State dictatorship (1933-1974). Having started her trajectory as a poet, she attracted attention during the 1960s in the context of the Experimental Poetry Group’s activities which established connections with an international dynamic that questioned the dimensions of language and was particularly influenced by Brazilian visual and concrete poetry.

In articulation with a continuous and committed theoretical reflection, her work combined literary production with artistic practice, creating a dually contaminated field – that extended to visual poetry, to the spatial occupation of that poetry by means of a three-dimensional investigation, and to the production of objects.

In fact, Salette Tavares developed a consistent research, persistently exploring the notion of communication and challenging the relation between text and image by addressing language as potential “matter”, or even as an “object”, suitable for various expressions – expressions that extended words into different materialities, such as ceramics, tapestry, sculpture or installation.

Furthermore, driven by an interest in text as a creative visual element, but also in the phenomenological and performative dimensions of the work of art, she elaborated pieces that insistently addressed the viewer, inciting participation – as testified not only by several sculptures that, in different ways, activated the beholder but also by her collaboration in the first happenings in Portugal in 1965.

For Salette Tavares, the work of art par excellence, in transcending time, would be an ever-renewed space of encounter with the spectator.

Taking into consideration the multiple ways her pieces question the relation between poetry and sculpture, or the tensions that they establish between bidimensionality and three-dimensionality – or even between art and life –
this paper aims to discuss Salette Tavares’s trajectory by presenting and analyzing the different ways in which her work unfolded.
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The moment the first readymade was created, there was no turning back. The artworld was rudely confronted by these objects which brought into question the very nature of art, or more specifically sculpture. It is fascinating to view the post-readymade life of art from our present perspective and note in what way the concept of sculpture and visual art changed as well as how this entire paradigm shift affected other artists. Precisely this is the primary area of concern of this work. Its purpose is to present and interpret important issues noted by other art historians, art theoreticians and philosophers alike, such as John Roberts’ ideas of the deflation of labor, the role of the artist’s hand and the notions of skill/deskilling/reskilling; Baudrillard’s idea of avantgarde art “shedding the mask of figuration”; Walter Benjamin’s thoughts on reproduction and so on. However, these theories and notions alone are not enough to understand the aftereffects of the readymade, which is why several case studies shall be presented (readymades and assisted readymades, as well as what Jaimey Hamilton Faris calls “affectual readymades” or variations thereof) with a focus on Croatian art such as that of the art group Gorgona or chosen pieces from artists like Josip Stošić, Damir Sokić, Ivan Ladislav Galeta, Josip Vanjića and Tomislav Gotovac to name a few. Transferring Duchamp’s original idea of the readymade into a slightly later context (both practical and theoretical) may shed some light on the changes that occurred after 1913 and which, as this work shall attempt to prove, have affected art and sculptural production to this day. Of course, the context itself has greatly changed since the invention of the first readymade – influenced by globalization, consumption, capitalism and new media forms, the sculptural format of the readymade was forced to undergo its own transformation while simultaneously causing a paradigm shift in the artworld. It is fascinating to render the evolution of the readymade in a chronological fashion so as to put into perspective its adaptations to the new commodity culture as well as the way commodity culture was incorporated into artworks. By noticing the extremes to which contemporary sculpture stems and the ways in which readymades radically morph, it becomes apparent that the lines between media and art, and even life and art have become blurred. In this blurriness, the
Rethinking the Monument. Dialogical and Anti-monumental Strategies of Yugoslav Memorial Practices
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The term “counter monument”, coined by James E. Young in the early 1990s, has become one of the central theoretical concepts in the field of memory studies. Beside the fact that the term has often been uncritically adopted by art historians in order to explain and “label” formal and conceptual innovations that occurred in the field of memorial practices in the wake of the post-modern shift, its negative prefix and thus constructed, binary semantic field of “monument” can also be understood as a product of the West-oriented narrative of the history of modern art. This is especially the case with twentieth-century monumental sculpture/architecture, burdened with overt ideological/political functions. Although the term “counter monument” originated from the need to address specific socio-political circumstances of the 1980s in Western Germany, it soon came to be understood as the breakthrough in the history of twentieth-century memorial practices, which limited the recognition of similar strategies which had occurred before the term was officially inaugurated in the early 1980s, especially those originating in former socialist countries, such as Yugoslavia. This is further complicated by the implicated binary relation between the term “monument” and “counter monument”, which seems to echo and perpetuate a binary ideological worldview inherited from Cold War cultural politics (East vs. West, democratic vs. totalitarian, etc.). Consequently, the official narrative (the “canon”) seems to suggest that the introduction of dialogical and anti-monumental strategies in the field of memorial practice could only have been possible within Western democracies (Western Germany, the USA). This paper will show that features recognised as characteristic of “counter monuments” [Q. Stevens, et al., “Counter-monuments: the anti-monumental and the dialogic”, Journal of Architecture, Vol 17, 2012/6] can be recognised in projects, realisations and discussions about monuments in socialist Yugoslavia already in the late 1950s/early 1960s. Although the application of such strategies did not “counter” or challenge the official WWII narratives, intense rethinking of the monument by

notion of art itself begins to collapse under the weight of this newly-provoked paradigm shift.

Biography:
Dora Derado was born on April 16, 1993 in Split, Croatia and received her primary education in Kingston Upon Hull in England. In September of 2016, she graduated at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split with a double major (from the departments of Art History and English Studies). Later that year, she enrolled in the Postgraduate (doctoral) program of Art History at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb where she is currently working on her doctoral thesis entitled Provoking Art History: Readymades and Changes in the Perception and Status of Artworks (Reflections on 20th Century Art and Visual Culture in Croatia). She is also currently an associate on the research project Manifestations of Modern Sculpture in Croatia: Sculpture on the Crossroads Between Socio-political Pragmatism, Economic Possibilities and Aesthetical Contemplation (IP-2016-06-2112). She has intensely focused her attention towards art history in the field of which she has presented several papers at symposiums/congresses, has taken part in organizing several symposiums herself and has also taken part in organizing several exhibitions as well as writing their prefaces. Her current scientific and research interests include art theory, twentieth-century art (with a focus on sculpture), contemporary art and visual culture.
artists and art critics resulted in radical inversions of formal and conceptual premises of the “traditional” monument.
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Shaping of modernist sculpture created in the sixth decade of the twentieth century in Croatia moved in the direction of abstract representation, exploration of new materials and technical solutions, and experimentation. To one group of authors, figuration was a short-term stage in their work, and they quickly abandoned recognisable modelling patterns and the use of traditional materials and techniques. Their interest went towards exploring the form, volume, space and surface of the sculpture, which they took to abstract forms. In doing so, they reached out for new materials, as well as new morphology and technical procedures. However, a few of them strived to continue dealing with the traditional theme of human figure, however, not in the sense of the continuity of modelling tradition in this area, but they problematized the representation of human figure in a new way. Thus, they would achieve an autonomous contribution to the development of anthropomorphic forms by modernising traditional themes, materials and shaping procedures.

In the presentation, we will show on the examples of selected sculptures the turn of the traditional paradigm in shaping the human figure in the art of the sixth decade of the twentieth century. Emblematic for the aforementioned theme is the work of Kosta Angeli Radovani who, during his whole creative oeuvre, insisted on two themes – portraits and female nudes. Despite the reduction, simplicity and tectonicity of the mass, he never entered the area of abstraction. We will analyse the influences on his sculptural formation, his key works, and the possible causes of his consistent persistence in perpetuating the same themes. We will contextualize Radovani’s opus in relation to the artistic production of his contemporaries based on cognate poetic principles.
En-gendering Post-war Modern Sculpture.
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Maria Pinińska-Bereś and Jerzy Bereś, Polish sculptors, a married couple, graduated from the Cracow Academy of Fine Arts in the second half of the 1950s. They entered the artistic scene during the so-called Thaw – the post-Stalinist period that in Poland brought the end of socialist realism and the development of the modern idiom in art. Dissatisfied with the directions of the development of sculpture, they sought alternative formulas which resulted in the creation of distinct styles characteristic for each of the artists and strongly gendered. This presentation aims to analyze a process of transformation of their art that took place in the 1960s and led from the standardized modern formula, typical among Polish sculptors in the second half of the 1950s, to individual styles. What will interest me most is how gender emerged as a factor that strongly defined their art and what role it played in establishing their positions in the art world. This analysis will take into account a radical transformation of sculpture in the 1960s that could have been observed in many parts of the world, yet it will also “provincialize” it. “Provincialize” in a positive sense, that is, it will take into account local and personal conditions that, in their case, influenced these fundamental shifts in sculpture, e.g. the Cracow art milieu concentrated around the strong figure of Tadeusz Kantor, dominant cultural idioms that defined gender roles in Poland at that time, turbulent political events in 1968 (known in Poland as March 1968), or social conditions in which these artists worked and lived.
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The monument question has been considered a particularly delicate one in Croatian art and public spheres at least since the end of the Second World War. This complex issue has involved considerations and attitudes in relation to aesthetics, meaning and reception of public monuments, concerning both the critics and the community. The latter is quite understandable as ideological changes have on numerous occasions affected people’s relationship towards monuments representing certain ideologies and individuals, in some cases leading to their defacement or complete destruction. This further expands on W.J.T. Mitchell’s idea that no visual medium is purely “visual”, as its reception depends on their wider, non-visual context.

In terms of public monuments, the second Yugoslav period in Croatia (between the World War II and the Homeland War, i.e. Croatian War of Independence in the ‘90s) generally produced two very different sculptural aesthetics. In short, it could be said that the dominant one was based on the foundations of socialist realism, as in excessively dramatic or oversized figurative scenes and motifs often dedicated to known and unknown partisan heroes or war casualties. On the other hand, the socialist modernist aesthetic relied heavily on symbolism (and the use of “clear-cut”, abstract visual language) and has been described in most cases as being more balanced in terms of formal-aesthetic qualities. However, the difference meant almost nothing as hostility towards Yugoslav monuments increased significantly during and immediately after the Homeland War, and any public monument associated with the former federation, regardless of its individual qualities, was [and unfortunately still is] facing threat as “unwanted heritage” (A. Rieggl).

Ironically, in comparison to their immediate historical context, the ‘90s in Croatia failed to yield any significant changes in terms of sculptural language. Instead, there was a recurrence of pre-existing patterns that were put into function of signifying the nation of Croatia and the new societal and political order. The public monuments in question were mostly austere, figurative sculptures underlined with mass-appealing, “understandable” narrative. In a sense, the consequent trend of “nationalist monumentalism” existing both in Croatian and in Yugoslav contexts benefited from the accessibility and educational potential of the plastic medium in order to create and maintain perception of great national histories (Nietzsche’s concept of Monumental History). However, despite sharing many similarities with their Yugoslavian counterparts, most Croatian public monuments erected after the Homeland War were downgraded both in size and in quality, embodying, to paraphrase Ivo Štim Banov, the “revival of socialist realism, however, without fundamental craftsmanship and plastic credibility of the earlier examples”.

On the opposite side of the uninterrupted art historical tradition reflected in production of sculptural themes such as statesmen statues, graphic war-themed monuments and memorials, a type of public monuments drawing from Yugoslav socialist modernist heritage [re]appeared in Croatia towards the end of the ‘80s onwards. Despite the remark that the modernist concept of abstract, symbolic monumental form had reached its peak and consequent exhaustion in the ‘80s with the introduction of counter-monuments and anti-monuments, alongside its inability to resist commercialisation of the spaces of memory (Lj. Kolešnik), its re-emergence on the geography of Croatia may have been a needed one in order to restore a balance disturbed by the imposed sculptural conservativism and offer a modern take on portraying metaphysical values such as freedom, justice and sacrifice, more so because the categories of counter-monuments or anti-monuments were scarce and barely existent in the post-war Croatia (i.e. Wall of Pain in Zagreb). Thus, the recovering of the socialist modernist sculptural legacy and its various manifestations aided in tempering the influence of wide-spread traditionalism and formed a healing bridge towards postmodern monument production in Croatia.
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This paper focuses on the variability of working processes of the Israeli sculptor Yehiel Shemi (1922-2003). Shemi was a member of the leading artistic group at the time entitled “Ofkim Hadashim” (New Horizons), which espoused the idea of international art – art which denied any kind of narrative and locality. Shemi made his experiments to achieve this purpose through sculpture.

Shemi sculpted in stone using direct carving techniques until he discovered the advantages of working with iron. His first iron sculptures demonstrated the concept of building a mantle. This approach changed when he started working with ready-mades using the technique of assembling.

During the 1960s he salvaged iron from shipwrecks located in one of the main marine ports in Israel. In using these shipwreck remnants he implemented what he termed as a method of “working from the beginning”. He used this term to indicate a creative process devoid of pre-mediation or preliminary procedures. The working process started with a “maternal form” – a primary basic form that is sufficiently large but incomplete, “inviting” a secondary form – that would supply another dimension and meaning. Through this process, he would create a main structure. The process continued up to a saturation point. At that stage Shemi worked in high speed – from one sculpture to the other, while the sketches were made after the work ends. Shemi described his sketching as a pause from thinking: “letting the brain rest”. In the framework of this process he created dozens of expressive abstract sculptures.

The next process demonstrated a new visual concept – geometric abstract sculptures containing constructivist elements. The sculptures became formations of balances and tensions between planks and the profiles they were built from. In this series, Shemi began a process of reduction that continued through the 1970s until it became so reduced that he called the series Syllables. The name was chosen to describe this new minimalistic concept although it was not pure minimalism – Shemi found it too rigid and he couldn’t give away elements of expression. Shemi defined it as “net art” – not in the meaning of form and materials but in the way of interpretation through politics or any narrative.

Shemi’s innovation was not only the product of transiting from stone to iron – it also emanated from changes he made in the working process itself, the new methods he used and the creation of new terms that described these procedures – terms that can be helpful in analysing and understanding concepts of modern sculpture.

Biography:
Shahar Knafo obtained his MA in art history at Tel-Aviv University in 2010. From 2014-2017, he worked on his MA thesis entitled Yehiel Shemi: Between the Intuitive and the Rational at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva. Prior to this, from 2007-2010, he was immersed in advanced studies in sculpture under the mentorship of Oleg Kuklin at the College for Visual Arts, Beer-Sheva. He currently holds several job positions. Since 2002, he has worked as an art teacher at “Ramot” High School, Beer-Sheva. Since 2012, he has been a pedagogical instructor at the Arts Department of Kaye College. Since 2015, he has been a tutorial teacher in the project Academy in Class of the Education department, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva.
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The international art movement New Tendencies is perceived by contemporary art history first and foremost as an art phenomenon which interconnects the early media art history with the social and political issues of the 1960s and 1970s. Following such a perspective, the main features of New Tendencies – collaborative group projects, a renewed confidence in the transformative powers of technology, an understanding of art as a socially responsible activity strongly involved with the patterns of scientific and social transformations – are also understood as fundamental characteristics common to early manifestations of European media art. A relatively recent interest in New Tendencies is also indicative of rather important and substantial changes regarding the centre-periphery dichotomy that, in the last fifty years, was strongly affecting the perception of that international art movement which – in spite of its long lifespan, and an extraordinary spatial/personal dynamic – almost fell into oblivion. Apart from attracting a new generation of researchers in media art history, the side effect of the restored interest in New Tendencies is a reduced engagement with the historical trajectories of other, “analogue” art phenomena involved in building up the theoretical and ideological foundations of the Movement, which also includes the conceptual framework of the new media paradigm described in the mid-1960s as a “Computer Assisted Visual Research”.

In this paper, we shall follow the historical trajectories of the most vital among those “analogue” visual art practices – namely of kinetic art – describing the most important post-war developments, problems and theoretical disputes surrounding a complex relation among art, science and technology, critically marking kinetic art production. Positioned already in the late 1920s at the intersection of light, movement and matter, in the period between late 1940s and mid-1960s, kinetic art still made other advancements towards immateriality, but also towards a more intense involvement with its immediate social reality, which is also echoed in the programmatic texts of New Tendencies. Along with the explanations of selected artworks documenting a diversity of authorial approaches, we shall also describe the formation and development of trans-continental artists’ networks that were facilitating the exchange of information between the representatives of kinetic art active at different European and Latin American locations, as well as theoretical frameworks and socio-cultural circumstances that were conditioning and affecting research on kinetic art in Italy, France, Holland, Brazil and Argentina in the 1950s and 1960s. Those explanations will be supplemented by the analysis of political positions shared by artists and art groups from these, and other countries who were participants of New Tendencies between 1961 and 1965, aiming to identify the nature of their involvement with the articulation of the Movement’s key objectives, working procedures and theoretical propositions.
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In the context of events on the Croatian art scene of the second half of the 20th century, the work of sculptor Vera Dajht-Kralj is specific and distinguished from the dominant streams. At the time of her appearance on the art scene in the 1950s, she was one of the rare woman sculptors in the field that was dominated by her male colleagues and where the discourse on the conflict between the two fundamental paradigms, figuration and abstraction prevailed. She remained outside of that binary opposition by following her own line of a different version of modernism. In this different modernism, traditional and modern are not conflicting, but instead, they form a specific amalgam in which figuration is based on tradition/s (the Jewish tradition, Greek mythology, folk art, art history – especially the modern art of the early 20th century). At the same time, these very different traditions are distorted through free and experimental treatment of textures, materials and colours and, through the influence of surrealism, visible in characteristic metaphorical and associative processes of meaning production. Experimentations with specific techniques of sculpture making led to the development of Dajht-Kralj’s recognisable personal poetics. Furthermore, by abolishing the opposition between representational and non-representational art, her sculptural forms are built on numerous literary, mythical, religious and musical references through a specific blend of narration and symbolism in which history and contemporaneity intertwine. While referring to other media in her work, she went further from simple thematic references by applying some of the procedures characteristic for that media (text, sound), thus expanding the field of the sculpture. Although Vera Dajht-Kralj was one of the most important Croatian women sculptors from the second half of the 20th century, her work stayed almost invisible to the art history discourse and thus was left out from the dominant narrative on Croatian modern sculpture. The aim of this paper is to analyse the main characteristics of her personal poetics and place it in the social and political context of her time.
Art Colonies and Art Symposiums in Late Socialist Yugoslavia – the Factory of Sculpture for Communal Use
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The paper will present the specific model of artistic production initially established and developed during the period from the late 60s up to the late 80s in the former Yugoslavia, familiar as art-colony or art-symposium. This model of artistic production resulted in the embellishment of the neighbourhood environment and, up to the present day, secured a major part of sculptural artworks of non-commemorative character in public areas – mostly arranged as sculpture-parks but also placed as single pieces situated on appropriate public sites. These art colonies and art symposiums were organized on local initiative and were primarily bound to certain industrial production or natural resources that might have been used as the material in the process of art fabrication. The number of approximately 80 colonies and symposiums that were active in the mentioned period in all Yugoslav republics (among them, around 15 were exclusively dedicated to sculpture) speaks for the wide acceptance of this kind of art production. In the paper, the historical context of this phenomenon will be thoroughly explained: its specific conceptual and ideological background in the circumstances of late socialism, its typical manifestations on the level of organization, the constitutive problems and their discussion. Their sculptural legacy will also be briefly presented: the type of artworks as well as their fate in the present time – on the level of public policies and on the level of communal consciousness. Finally, some conclusions for the understanding of modernism will be drawn: primarily, on the diversity of its social and ideological meaning in different historical contexts, on the flexibility of its time-duration as well as on the historical conditionality of its comprehension and evaluation.
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The New Generation holds an interesting yet complicated place in British art history. This group initially designated David Annesley, Michael Bolus, Philip King, Roland Piché, Christopher Sanderson, Tim Scott, William Tucker, Isaac Witkin and Derrick Woodham (in addition to more loosely associated artists such as Garth Evans, Francis Morland, John Dee, Brian Wall, Justin Knowles and even William Turnbull). In the context of this paper, we shall focus on Anthony Caro’s former students King, Scott, Tucker and Witkin who attended St Martin’s School of Art between 1957 and 1962.

These sculptors took part in a ground-breaking dialogue Caro had initiated which rejected traditional models in order to shape new forms of modernity in England during the first half of the 1960s, culminating in the New Generation exhibition of 1965. But, as many art historians have observed, 1965 already marked the end of this group’s momentum, side-lined and stifled by Caro’s formalist language. As a coherent “group”, the New Generation was thus short-lived.

Today, the sculptors of the New Generation tend to be studied in one of two ways: either as strict followers of Caro’s adopted formalism, based on the apparent homogenous aesthetic of their collective early works, or as independent artists with minimal ties to their former teacher – in which case authors tend to solely study their later pieces. But focusing on the extremes does not allow us to properly gauge what The New Generation truly brought to British sculpture. During the 1970s, most sculptors of the group went through a period of crisis resulting in a substantial shift in their respective works. These shifts reveal shared underlying notions and themes, such as the body as a perceiving tool (Tucker), the return of the human figure (King, Tucker), “thingness” (Scott, King, Tucker) and a general acceptance of sculpture’s historicity and recent tradition by adopting “obsolete” subjects, techniques and materials; such as bronze casting or stone carving.

Studying these shifts offers an insight into a period of transition in British sculpture, where Caro’s abstraction is challenged by Richard Long’s corporal experiences. Considering the re-introduction of the human body as a subject within a larger sculptural tradition and its conception as a perceiving tool, this paper proposes to consider the New Generation’s post-crisis production as a bridge between Caro’s progressively inhabitable spaces and Long’s self-sufficient physical efforts through the prism of the perceiving body. The New Generation’s overlooked evolution – between modernist and early post-modernist practices – hints at fundamental elements of the conceptual transition underway in the 70s and can help art historians better situate them in Britain’s sculptural history.
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Sculpture intended for symbolic purposes in the public space, as a feature signifier of particular events or individuals of importance (to the community, society as a whole, politics, ideological verification, a secular or religious date), or generally as a means of representation of that which one society is identified by, is a frequent motive for discussion that always exceeds the question of art. Furthermore, it can even be said that there is a certain and very deep gap between the symbolizing sculpture content and its aesthetic value, namely that the marking of the event is usually placed in the foreground, whereas the way it is elaborated is sometimes rather irrelevant.

Just as, for comparison, a picture of a saintly figure or event in religious themes is prior to its form. Because of the refashioning of the sacred in the statue, or its sanctification and spiritualization, the statue is sanctified itself; independent regardless of the mode of representation. Just as a believer who is not an art lover is mostly interested in the sacredness of a statue, the person who places the statue in the sphere of a socially important event is commonly less interested in its layout than any symbolic attributes it possesses, or its representation of desired content. Therefore, it can be said that, from a political-ideological point of view, the act of planting or demolishing public sculptures is not concerned with how valuable that piece of art is. In these circumstances, that is completely irrelevant; there, public art often plays the inferior role of a useful servant to the enforced idea from another sphere (political, religious, etc.).

The struggle between the figurative and the abstract approach – as two models that are only models of artistic poetics, and have no special attributes, virtues or deficiencies for representation of some content – actually speaks of the forceful penetration of what we call ideology from another sphere; one that wants to dominate over that which art presents as its own ideology and its own rules, all the way from the formative to the poetic.

This study will take a closer look at the case of the award-winning, but never built, monument of The Victory in the Croatian Homeland War; a fifteen-meter tall obelisk made from stainless steel by Branko Siladin which was intended to enrich the public space in Zadar. The above-mentioned monument was the unfortunate victim of a bitter dialogue about the essential nature and values of the concepts of abstraction and figuration. Consequently, the so-called abstract solution for this project has lost the battle against the advocates of the figurative approach. Sadly, Siladin’s case did not lead in the direction of provoking a debate about the immanent value or lack of value of the monument in question, or the sculpture’s inadequacy, but rather to the question of whether an abstract form can symbolize concrete content adequately or at all. For instance, one war veteran had poignantly proclaimed that the abstract monument would then surely signify that the battles and victories he himself fought along with his fellow fighters were probably abstract too. We could say that this proclamation seems to utilize the typical substitution of non-existing but “kind of expecting” elements of the “abstraction” thesis and pushes them into the foreground; because this model, the abstract one, “must” be intrinsically linked to something that does not exist, which is not real, which is, colloquially speaking, – abstract. The abstract then starts to become synonymous with the absence of content, a model that is not capable of any symbolization. However, there was hardly any discussion about the essentiality of the monument’s design. The problem of Siladin’s obelisk is not that it is lacking any symbolization – that is the power of the theme’s representation – but it lays, rather, in its insufficiency of form. It is a piece of steel that has remained halfway between sculpture and architecture. By its shape and dimensions, it crudely resembles some architectural building element (some may be reminded of the silhouette of a skyscraper), whereas as a minimalist sculpture it has no expression at all, even the minimalistic one. Actually, it seems to be a design solution, a form that has not reached sculpturality, one which has remained simply at the level of design. The example of Siladin’s monument, as used in the sphere of a wide circle of consumers in society, is therefore mainly being observed at the symbolization level of the figurative versus abstract approaches opposition. Its plastic value is highly neglected, suppressed in the background or hardly discussed at all.
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The paper discusses some relations between naïve and modern art by means of presenting the particular case of sculptor Petar Smajić. Smajić (1910–1985) is the greatest Croatian naïve sculptor. His artistic potentials were recognized in the early thirties of the 20th Century, first by Slavan Vidović, who collected his works and organized his first exhibition, and then also by artists’ association Zemlja, who included his works in their exhibition. Due to unfortunate circumstances, from the end of the thirties to the beginning of the fifties, Smajić was virtually forgotten. He was rediscovered in 1952, when his works entered the collection of the newly founded Gallery of Peasant Art (today Croatian Museum of Naïve Art). New critical acclaim followed. In re-establishing Smajić as an artist, exceptionally fervent and continuous support came from Radoslav Putar and Mića Bašičević. It is interesting that, as art critics, both Putar and Bašičević made themselves renowned as keen promoters of avant-garde tendencies. They were very sensitive to the values of modern art and also very well informed about new trends. It is also striking that many other critics compared Smajić’s works to the works of the greatest modern artists such as Brancusi, Modigliani, Marini, Picasso, Barlach, Moore and others. Furthermore, the terminology in which his work is usually described reveals itself as derived from writings associated with attempts to define the aesthetics of modern art. For example, in their accolades and endeavours to describe Smajić’s art, critics keep stressing its geometrical clarity of forms; simplicity; purism; simultaneous monumental and intimate quality; his faces are said to be like masks; form and theme are assessed to be primordial in essence; it is noticed that his works are characterized by individuality, creativeness and marked monumentality; that the artist’s interest was invested in the whole, and not the picturesque details; so that his sculptures are elementary in form, primary in working. A conclusion follows that a special sensibility attuned to the qualities of modernity was needed to enable one to recognise Smajić’s value in its full scope. In addition, the paper aims to stress a curious discrepancy between the artist’s life, spent apart from typical modern times’ experiences and current trends, and his sculptures, so curiously kindred to the essence.
of modern art. The story of modern art is usually related to the great changes that occurred in the 20th century, mainly in the way of urban living, introduction of new technologies, new means of traffic, changes in cities’ scenery and infrastructure, great social and cultural upheavals, great innovations in scientific and philosophical thought etc.; to which art mainly responded with re-examining its own tradition and basics. Smajić, on the other hand, spent all his life in isolation, illiterate, closer to country than city life, always tending to the most basic needs of survival, unaware of the temptations and challenges of modern times, in a social microcosm where it was incomprehensible that any object could have any other value besides a practical one.
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Born in Martinis (Romania), Victor Roman was the second son of a Hungarian peasant couple. His artistic talent manifested at an early age; in 1950 he was admitted to the Art School in Târgu Mureş, later he was a student at the “Nicole Brîncuşi” Academy of Arts in Bucharest. His early exhibitions from 1962 and 1965 testify to his detachment from social-realist aesthetic principles as well as to his effort to create an authentic sculptural language based on the vernacular traditions of his homeland. In this, he may well have been influenced by his great compatriot Constantin Brâncuşi.

In 1965 Roman was prized in Geneva at the international competition to commemorate the 100th anniversary of telecommunication. This offered the first occasion for Roman to leave Romania and organize individual exhibitions in Geneva and Lausanne. In Switzerland, the works of Alexander Calder made a great impression on him. Soon after in 1967, he received a one-year scholarship in London due to the support of Sir Robin Darwin, director of the Royal College of Art. In April 1968, Victor Roman was the first artist to exhibit in the rooms of the newly-founded *East European Center* which aimed to promote cultural exchange between Great Britain and the countries of the Soviet Block.

During his stay in Great Britain, Victor Roman met the chief exponents of contemporary sculpture such as Lynn Chadwick and Kenneth Armitage. The most important moment for him was the encounter with Henry Moore, the doyen of modern sculpture. In 1963, his compatriot, the Transylvanian sculptor Miklós Borsos [1906–1990] living in Hungary, also visited Henry Moore’s Much-Hadam studio. Borsos belonged to an older generation than Roman’s. As a consequence, Moore’s influence manifested differently in his oeuvre. Critics agreed that the exhibitions of Henry Moore in Budapest [1967] and Bucharest [1968] had a great impact on contemporary sculpture in these countries.
Instead of turning back to Romania, Victor Roman settled in Paris (1968) where he created ties with some important members of the Hungarian and Romanian emigration, for example, the film director Paul Barba-Negra and the Hungarian sculptor Ervin Pátkai. His older compatriot, Étienne Hajdu (1907–1996) accepted him into his studio as a collaborator. Roman and Hajdu shared a common tradition: Hajdu was born in Turda (Romania) from where he took his first, life-long impressions about nature and the works of local artisans. Roman’s first individual exhibition was organized in the Galérie de l’Université, introduced by Denys Chevalier. In 1984, another important solo exhibition was dedicated to him, this time by the Galérie Gérard Laubie, introduced by José Pierre.

Due to his collaboration with architects, a series of monumental works by Victor Roman have been carried out in various French town centers – 1974: Le Victoire (Bobigny, town hall square); 1978: Dragon (Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines); 1985: Porte (Noisy-le-Grand); 1986: Le Messager (Nancy, Centre Régional des Postes); 1987: Le Char (Paris, CFACE); 1989: Le Signal (Bobigny, Carrefour), Porte (Villiers-le-Bel). In his book entitled La sculpture moderne en France (Paris, 1982), Ionel Jianou characterized some of Roman’s major works as “opened structures bristling with sharp points, made of plates, shafts, circles or ellipses that surround empty spaces, signs that jump off into space as if they wanted to carry mysterious messages to an individual world.”

Especially in his works executed in the 1970’s, Roman betrays his indebtedness to the art of Henry Moore. Using nature-formed organic shapes as sources of inspiration is a common feature of the two sculptors, though the most important characteristic of Roman’s oeuvre is that he conveyed a profound spiritual content to the instruments used by Transylvanian peasants. He was able to create a synthesis between tradition and modernity, vernacular and universal. Even if the importance of Victor Roman from the point of view of modern Romanian sculpture has been recognized, his oeuvre needs further investigation, especially through its relationship to modern European sculpture. This leads to a better understanding of how modern East European sculpture has been formed by exiled artists through a close contact with the art of Henry Moore.
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Ivan Meštrović used his art to promote his current political position and vice versa, he used his widespread web of political (and social) contacts to promote his art. We will, therefore, observe his role as a cultural and political diplomat on the example of his friendship with the Masaryk family. Meštrović and Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk first met in Rome in 1914, and they remained in contact until the end of Masaryk’s life. Their friendship was marked by Meštrović’s making of the portraits of the politician, his daughter and wife in 1923. Ten years later, on the occasion of the artist’s 50th birthday, Meštrović’s exhibition was organized in Prague under the patronage of President Masaryk. Meštrović kept in contact with Alice Masaryk during their dissident years in the USA.

We will also mention his encounters with Czech artists, and comment the stylistic and thematic concordances of Meštrović’s works and those of his Czech colleagues. This is particularly interesting in the context of Meštrović’s remarkable presence in the collection of the National Gallery in Prague. The overview of these connections between this Croatian artist and the most known Czech political family, and Czech artists will give us insight into historical and cultural events of the two countries in the first half of the 20th century, and into artist’s intention to mould them.
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Sculptures by Antun Augustinčić in the Function of Cultural Diplomacy
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This article refers to the phenomenon of using sculpture as a medium for cultural diplomacy, featuring the example of works by the Croatian sculptor, professor and academic Antun Augustinčić (Klanjec, 1900 – Zagreb, 1979). His sculptures and monuments from the 1930s until today have had not only an aesthetic, but also a strong diplomatic dimension and they – having gone through the changes of all the political and governmental arrangements in this area – contributed to the establishment and enhancement of international relations. Whether they are monuments ordered by governments or sculptures intended as a protocol gift, the opus of Antun Augustinčić is a paradigmatic example of the interference of art and socio-political relations.

A Heated Argument: The Quarrel Between Albert Elsen and Rosalind Krauss about Rodin’s Multiples and Posthumous Casts in the 1980s
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After the death of the major French sculptor Auguste Rodin (1840-1917), interest for his works got overshadowed by the rise of avant-garde movements. Yet, in the second part of the 20th century, a new generation of academics and curators from The United States – Leo Steinberg, Athena Tacha Spear, John Tancock, Albert Elsen, Kirk Varnedoe and others – began to study Rodin with a renewed interest. Based on a thorough observation of Rodin’s sculptures and drawings from American museum collections, they brought Rodin solidly into the modernist canon. The peak was reached in 1981 with a catalog and exhibition entitled Rodin Rediscovered which was organized in the National Gallery of Washington and curated by the professor Albert Elsen. This exhibition had a distinctive feature – it was organized around a recent and posthumous cast of Rodin’s Gates of Hell, intended for the collections of the museum of the University of Stanford, currently known as the Cantor Art Center.

Rosalind Krauss, the post-modernist theoretician and art historian, published an exhibition review in the magazine October n°18, where she raised the issue of Rodin’s posthumous casts. She took the opportunity to criticize the modernist “cult of originality” and to build the post-modernist idea of sculpture as “a copy without origin”. Elsen answered with a four-page letter published in October n°20 in 1982 where he defended the artist’s copyright and asserted his consideration of the technical and historical process. This provoked another article from Krauss who refined her ideas. In 1982, the symposium Rodin et la sculpture moderne organized by Musée Rodin brought them together, but they definitely remained in disagreement. The numerous and very heated debates in the post-Second World War period about the status of Rodin’s multiple casts involve, on the one hand, a complex terminology which mixes aesthetic, technical and legal issues, and...
on the other hand, a conceptual nebulousness that remains to be clarified. If the argument drew public attention to Rodin’s corpus, the issue of art multiples is actually concerned with the general production of sculpture in the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, as well as the scholars who started this heated quarrel.
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The presentation proposes a typology and a typological classification of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century portrait sculpture using, as an example, the portrait sculpture of Oscar Nemon (1906-1985), together with examples of portraiture in Croatian modern art. The typology is established according to the following main classification parameters: function, form and content; location and purpose, as well as series of other classification categories and sub-categories that create a branched and intertwined network of typological classification.

I propose to investigate the aim and value, as well as the feasibility of applying this discipline of typological classification, which is yet to be deployed within the methodology of Croatian art history. Is its application meaningful in the research of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century art – a period of multiplicity of styles and individual expressions and their fast, sequential, and cyclical shifts? Specifically, does this kind of typology enable art-historical interpretations and is it useful in the research of the manifestations of modern sculpture? Does it lead to a better understanding of the portrait sculpture of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, or does it create an unnecessarily complex classification system that becomes a means unto itself? One of the benefits of typological classification of portrait sculpture is that it establishes the thesaurus of specific sculptural concepts and terms – typological classification thus becomes the basis for plastic portrait nomenclature.
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The Representation of the Concept of Darwinism in Sculpture in the Works of Simeon Roksandić
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Simeon Roksandić was one of those Balkan sculptors of the late 19th century who found the perfect haven for artistic training at the Munich Academy of Fine Arts. His representative works of European sculpture, the Fisherman fountain (1906) and Victory (1931) – both mounted at Kalemegdan Park in Belgrade, were created under the influence of the local intellectual climate. While Fisherman was defined as a specific unity of modern and classical value systems and postulates the revival of the original, pre-classical Hellenism as embodied in the vigorous formal expression, the ambivalence of modern European currents and antiquity was once again repeated in the interwar sculpture Victory. The concepts that link these two sculptures are Darwinist lessons, which caused the recognizing of natural selection and the idea of eternal struggle of reason and instinct. The conceptual postulates of the British naturalist’s theory of evolution increasingly penetrated into the European scientific community and in the end they found their place in the philosophical discipline and art in the 19th century. Fruitful German ground was particularly favorable to the acceptance of such concepts, thanks to the work of materialist scientists in the mid-century, and numerous archaeological, anthropological and paleontological discoveries in the area, which initiated major scientific debates, encouraged by Darwin’s theory.

The notional concept of Fisherman and Victory was largely shaped by the idea of a primeval origin of man who, under the glaze of civilization, shares the same instincts for survival as the rest of the animal world. As a paradigmatic example of cultural currents of the time, Freud’s archeology of the unconscious had a great impact on Roksandić’s phenomenological formation of the theme of struggle between man and beast – expressed in the depiction of proto human and sea monster in Fisherman. It encouraged the search for a universal world of sensuousness of nature and the rediscovery of the repressed parts of the human soul. The sculpture Victory, which shows a muscular male figure taming a lion, and inevitably reminisces
a mythological narrative – again in the spirit of late symbolism – reveals Nietzschean concepts of the Apollonian and Dionysian. This is embodied in the athletic figure of the represented man who is restraining the lion stylised in the archaic manner. The composition represents the idea of eternal, archetypal dichotomy between the classical principle and the effect of animal, wild instincts. Hence, these sculptures are part of the Munich milieu, in which the symbolist artists often portrayed the conflict between man and beast, packed inside a mythological form. Through the suprahistorical, archetypal narrative, both artworks represent the unique superiority of civilization over the wild forces of nature and revitalisation of contemporary man.

Biography:
Olga Žakić was born in Belgrade in 1992. She received her BA at the History of Art department of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade. Her thesis is entitled Darwinism and the Struggle for Survival: František Kupka’s Antropoides. At the same academic department, she completed her master’s thesis, Art in the service of Darwinism in France during the second half of 19th century. She has written several original research papers, and one monographic work dealing with the relationships between art and natural sciences. In 2016, she participated in the Interdisciplinary Conference of Art Theory and Philosophy in Istanbul. The specific area of her research is European art of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, with a particular emphasis on the influence of the natural sciences and theory of evolution on visual art representations.