

želimir
košćević

franjo pommer / ivan kukuljević sakcinski, 1856.

▼ Sve je više argumenata u prilog razumijevanja i sagledavanja nagomilane fotografske baštine kao cjeline koja, doduše, ima svoj početak u izumu obznanjenom 1839., a svršetak u digitalnoj slici, ali koja se već duže vremena pokazuje u posve drugačijem svjetlu. Posebna, monografska i tematska istraživanja, kao i ciljani kritički diskurs, uvijek su dobro došli, ali bez razumijevanja cjeline, tj. svih ikad učinjenih fotografija, takva će istraživanja u pravilu ostati bez krvi i mesa, da se ne kaže bez duše. Usprkos svim medijskim specifičnostima koje fotografiju od njezina početka do danas s dosta razloga čine posebnom, slike nastale u okviru ovog medija nije više moguće cjelovito razumjeti izdvojeno izvan konteksta našeg sveopćeg vizualnog iskustva i kulture stečene na tom iskustvu te, dakako, i novijih kritičkih i teorijskih dostignuća.

Recepcija svake slike, pa tako i fotografske, slojevit je proces. U osnovi tog procesa nalazi se sve ono što se očigledno vidi, ali i sve ono što intelekt, kultura i osjećaji pokreću na svjesnoj i nesvjesnoj mentalnoj razini, a nalazi se skriveno u dubljim slojevima slike ili - čak - izvan kadra. Drugim riječima - i sve ono što se očigledno ne vidi. Studije o fotografiji sve više postaju rasprave o općoj vizualnoj kulturi, psihologiji percepcije, društvenoj praksi, ideološkoj pozadini, kulturnoj produkciji i njihovim institucionalnim okvirima. One, dakako, proširuju interpretativni registar ne samo povijesnih pregleda fotografije, već i kritičkog pristupa modernoj, odnosno suvremenoj fotografskoj slici. U tom kontekstu nema nezanimljive fotografije. Svaka nešto govori i o svakoj se može zanimljivo raspravljati. Nije riječ o poremećenoj hijerarhiji sustava vrijednosti; riječ je o njegovu obogaćenju. Ili igri skrivača. U kontekstu studija i rasprava o vizualnoj kulturi, posebno nakon "lingvističkog obrata" do kojega je došlo u zadnjih pedesetak godina, kao i istraživanja hermeneutike slike, ne iznenađuje novo viđenje Vermeera¹ ili van Goghovih cipela,² pa tako nije neobično da i fotografija - premda se čini da se o njoj znade manje-više sve - postane predmet kritičkog preispitivanja.

Svi pregledi kojima su se do sada obično oblikovale i predstavljale, kako povijest fotografije uopće, tako i povijesti nacionalnih fotografija, započinjali su i završavali u uredno poslaganoj kronološkoj progresiji. Ona danas nije sporna, ali

● One hears increasingly many arguments in favour of understanding and surveying the huge photography heritage in its entirety. Its beginnings are certainly to be placed with the invention that became public in 1839, while its end coincides with the dawn of the digital image, though the latter has been revealing itself for some time in an entirely new light. Specialized monographs and studies, focusing on particular topics, are undoubtedly useful, but without understanding the whole, i.e. all photographs that have ever been made, such research is bound to remain bloodless, or perhaps we should say soulless. Despite all media-related specificities, which have justly defined photography as something special from its beginnings until today, it is no longer possible to comprehend images generated in this medium without the context of our general visual experience, as well as culture acquired on the basis of that experience, or without considering recent achievements in theory and criticism.

The reception of any image, including the photographic one, is a multilayered process. It is based on all that is obvious, but also all that our intellect, culture, and emotions are stirring at both conscious and unconscious mental level, and which lies hidden in the deeper layers of image - or even outside the frame. In other words, it includes all that is not obvious. Studies on photography have increasingly turned into debates on visual culture in general, on the psychology of perception, on social practice, ideological background, cultural production, and their institutional frameworks. Certainly, such debates enlarge the interpretation register, not only in terms of historical surveys of photography, but also regarding the critical approach to the modern - or contemporary - photographic image. In this context, all photography is interesting. Each image has something to say and each can spark off an interesting debate. We are not speaking here of a twisted hierarchy in the system of values, but rather of its enrichment. About playing hide-and-seek. Taking into consideration studies and discussions on visual culture - particularly those after the "linguistic turn" that occurred some fifty years ago - as well as those on the hermeneutics of image, new views of Vermeer¹ or of van Gogh's shoes² are hardly surprising. Therefore, it is logical that photography - even though one might think that all has been said about it - should become an object of critical investigation.

▼
¹ SVETLANA ALPERS, *The Art of Describing - Dutch Art in Seventeenth Century*, London, 1983.

² JACQUES DERRIDA, *Istina u slikarstvu*, Sarajevo, 1988.

●
¹ SVETLANA ALPERS, *The Art of Describing - Dutch Art in Seventeenth Century*, London, 1983.

² JACQUES DERRIDA, *The Truth in Painting*, Translated by Geoffrey Bennington and Ian McLeod, Chicago, IL, 1987.



je taj poredak pod velikim znakom pitanja. Osim saznanja o tijeku događanja, glavnim strujama, složenim pitanjima prioriteta, smjени pravaca i njenim protagonistima te lijepim opisima, ti se pregledi - ma kako korisni bili - nisu udaljili od propedeutičke razine. Tu razinu, dakako, ne bi trebalo smatrati bezvrijednom. Naprotiv. S te razine mogu se sakupiti korisne informacije, ali od nje, osim uvodnog znanja u opću ili posebnu povijest fotografije, ne bi trebalo mnogo više očekivati. Tom predanom radu vrsnih stručnjaka s pravom se duguje zahvalnost, jer se bez njega ne može očekivati bilo kakva kompleksnija kritička interpretacija i svestranija dublja analiza fenomena. Prijelaz od fotografije kao reproduktivne tehnike prema fotografiji kao mediju, a zatim preko fotografije kao - konačno - umjetnosti i prema kontekstualizaciji globalne kulture slika te sagledavanja pozicije fotografske slike unutar tog golemog univerzuma, nemoguć je bez te osnovne baze podataka, pa ma kako bila dosadno poslaga, ali isto tako i bez njena napuštanja kao sterilna tla koje ne može dati više nikakva ploda.

Onaj tko pažljivo pročita gornje redove zacijelo će razumjeti da ovdje nije riječ o obezvrjeđivanju napornog istraživačkog i studijskog rada. Poteškoće tog rada dobro su poznate, naročito u sredinama u kojima nacionalna fotografska baština još uvijek nije sredena i ispravno čuvana, a javnost s njome najšire najšire upoznata, u kojima ne postoji poseban, specijaliziran muzej fotografije, a stručnjaka koji se fotografijom ozbiljno bave ima koliko i prstiju na jednoj ruci. Nije, međutim, stvar u tome. Stvar je u tome da se nakon osnovne obrade i kakve-takve primarne zaštite, mogu i trebaju postaviti pitanja druge kvalitativne razine i na ta pitanja potražiti odgovore.

Ovdje je riječ o nacionalnoj fotografskoj baštini. U Hrvatskoj, prema onom što je od te baštine do danas sačuvano, ona nije ni posebno bogata, a niti siromašna. Fotografije nastale u Hrvatskoj, od prvih slika nastalih u tehnici dagerotipije do danas, uključivši i sve one slike koje su nastale u krugu obiteljskih ili prijateljskih privatnosti, sastavni su dio globalne civilizacije slika modernog razdoblja. Ta baština ravnopravno podliježe propitivanju, kako o semantici slike, tako i o poetikama koje skriva. Ona ravnopravno podliježe estetskim kriterijima vrednovanja koji su se vremenom formirali na teorijskoj razini.

All surveys that used to create and represent the history of photography in general, as well as the history of national photographs in particular, began and ended in neatly ordered chronologies. These chronologies are not contested, but such way of looking at things is highly questionable. Apart from offering information on the course of events, main currents, complex issues of priority, changes of direction, and their protagonists, as well as pretty descriptions, such surveys - as useful as they may still be - never went further than the propaedeutical level. One should not disregard that level as worthless, quite on the contrary. It is possible to gather heaps of useful information there, but apart from an introductory insight into the general or specific history of photography, one should not expect much more from them. We certainly owe gratitude to all those valuable experts, because no complex critical interpretation or all-encompassing analysis of the phenomenon would be possible without such an insight. The passage from photography as a reproductive technique to the photography as a medium, and further, through the final perception of photography as art, to the contextualisation of the global culture of images, or understanding the position of the photographic image within that huge universe, would not be possible without that fundamental database, however boringly ordered it may seem today. Still, it is of crucial significance to abandon it as sterile ground on which nothing new can thrive.

Whoever reads carefully these first few lines will certainly understand that my intention is not to disparage anyone's hard work done in researching photography. Difficulties of such work are well known, especially concerning those areas in which national photographic heritage has not been ordered and properly preserved, let alone presented to the public. I am referring to those places, which lack a museum of photography and where experts in this field can be counted on the fingers of one hand. However, this is not the main problem. It is rather the fact that, after settling the issues of basic processing and preservation of some sort, one should deal with the questions of the next qualitative level and try to find the appropriate answers.

I am referring here to the national heritage of photography. In Croatia, judging from what has been preserved, it is neither particularly rich, nor especially poor. Photogra-

Osim što je nacionalna, dakle hrvatska, ništa je drugo ne izdvaja iz općeg kvalitativnog i kvantitativnog konteksta fotografskog medija. Riječ je, dakle, o umjetnosti, ne samo o mediju. Stoga pitanja kao: Koji joj kontekst pripadaju? Koji su njeni relacijski stratumi: sociologija, psihologija, tehnologija, ekonomika, masovni mediji, moć i tako dalje? Postoji li nešto što je prevideno? Postoji li potreba za ponovnom valorizacijom, ili, bolje reći, novim i drugačijim kutem gledanja? Čime nas je fotografija zadužila? Čime obogatila? I na kraju: Što joj, na primjer, duguju Vlaho Bukovac³ i Bela Csikos Sesia, a što popularni zagrebački slikar Antun Mateš i u čemu se njihov dug fotografiji razlikuje? - mogu samo proširiti razumijevanje vlastite fotografske baštine i opće vizualne kulture te upotpuniti cjelokupnu povijesnu dimenziju jednog razdoblja mnogo sočnijom problemskom i estetskom komponentom.

Da bi se dobio kakav-takav odgovor na postavljena pitanja - a ovdje se za sada ne može čak sa sigurnošću tvrditi da su to sva - nužno je proširiti granice specijalističke metode istraživanja medija. Sigurno je da će i nadalje fotografija ostati u središtu interesa, jer o njoj je na kraju ovdje riječ, ali će se ubrzo vidjeti kako ova kolokvijalna riječ za slike koje nastaju u mračnoj komori specifičnom tehnikom i u kombinaciji barem četiriju agensa - optike, fizike, kemije i osjećaja za "odlučujući trenutak" - naprosto ne obuhvaća sve što bi se o tim specifičnim slikama moglo reći. One su u svim svojim slojevima mnogo bogatije porukama nego što se to na prvi pogled čini. Jer, kamo da se smjesti diskurs o slikama koje su nastale fotografskom tehnikom, a nisu fotografija, kao što su to, na primjer, slike u masovnim tiskanim medijima nakon izuma autotipije 1881. godine? Što je s očigledno fotografskim slikama na propagandnim porukama automobilske industrije, osiguravajućih društava, političkih stranaka i turističkih agencija? Ili, što je s onim "fotografijama" koje, suprotno općem uvjerenju da je fotografija "istinita", očigledno lažu? Što s onim slikama koje su bez sumnje "fotografija", a služe samo da bi se i vizualnim dokumentom potvrdilo određeno iskustvo ili spoznaja, kao što su, na primjer, slike s etnografskih ili arheoloških istraživanja te one nastale uz pomoć teleskopa ili mikroskopa? Kamo smjestiti naše albume? Ili fotografije u policijskoj dokumentaciji? Na kraju, što je sa slikama

phs made in Croatia, from the first images done in the daguerotype technique until today, including all those that were made in family circles or among friends, constitute the global civilization of images belonging to the modern age. This heritage must be equally examined with respect both to the semantics of the image and the poetics it conceals. It is equally subject to the aesthetic criteria of assessment, which have gradually developed at the theoretical level. Except the fact that it is national, that is, Croatian, nothing keeps it separated from the general qualitative and quantitative context of photography as a medium. But it is also art and not merely a medium. Therefore, questions such as: Which contexts does it belong to? What are its relational strata: sociology, psychology, technology, economics, mass-media, power, and so on? Is there something that we have overlooked? Is there a need for reassessment or - to say it better - for a new and different angle from which one should look at it? In what ways has photography indebted us? In what ways has it enriched us? And finally: What do painters such as, for example, Vlaho Bukovac³ and Bela Csikos Sesia, or the popular Zagreb painter Antun Mateš, owe to it and what are the differences? - can only contribute to our understanding of our own photography heritage and our general visual culture, complementing the overall historical dimension of an era with a far more succulent topical and aesthetic component.

In order to obtain some sort of answer to the above questions - and one could not even claim that the list is complete - it is necessary to shift the methodological borders of media research. It is evident that photography will remain in the focus of interest, for it is our central topic here, but it will soon become clear that this colloquial word denoting images produced in the dark chamber, using a specific technique and by combining at least four factors - optics, physics, chemistry, and a feeling for that "crucial moment" - simply does not cover all that could be said about the individual images. They are far richer in messages in all their layers than it might appear at first sight. For where should we place the discourse on images which are produced by using the photography technique and yet they are no photographs, such as those in printed mass-media after the invention of the autotype in 1881? Where should we place the obviously photographic images from the advertise-

▼
3 "S portaitom sam se dugo mučio, dok je napokon i moj brijač bio zadovoljan mojim djelom. Reče, da je sličnost pogodena, a to isto potvrdi i neki njegov stari klijent, koji je dobro znao starog mu oca. Taj isti gospodin kasnije me posjetio i naručio portraite za čitavu obitelj. Bilo ih je ravno 7, a svaka slika po 25 dolara. Poveo sam ih kod jednog poznatog mi fotografa i na moje platno s "camerom obscurum" projektirao njihove likove, u prirodnoj veličini. Zabilježih konture dotičnih osoba, a kasnije sam ih iz pameti izradio u boji; osim toga još mi svaka osoba sjedila samo jedanput, i slika bila je gotova". Dalje: "Do tada sam izrađivao slike samo pomoću fotografija." VLAHO BUKOVAC, Moj život, Zagreb, 1992., 81, 103.

●
3 "I had been suffering with that portrait for a while, until even my barber was pleased with my work. He said that I have got the resemblance and this was confirmed by an old customer of his, who had known his father well. The same gentleman visited me later and ordered portraits for his entire family. They were no less than seven and each painting costed 25 dollars. I took them to a photographer I knew and projected their silhouettes onto my canvas using the "camera obscura", life-sized. I noted down the features of each particular person and then I worked them out in colour from memory; after that, every person had to sit for me only once and the portraits were ready." And below: "Until then, I had painted only from photographs." VLAHO BUKOVAC, Moj život [My life], Zagreb, 1992, 81 and 103.

nastalim u tehnici fotografije koje se svojim estetskim i duhovnim svojstvima mogu ravnopravno staviti uz bok remekdjela umjetničke baštine koja su pohranjena u nacionalnim muzejima moderne i suvremene umjetnosti? Ili, da se spomene rubni primjer iz muzejske prakse: kako promatrati i valorizirati brojne fotografije konceptualnih akcija? I da se završi ovo propitivanje: a digitalna slika?

Sve fotografije nastale u Hrvatskoj od časa izuma ovog izražajnog medija 1839., uključivši i one koje nisu hrvatskog porijekla, već su snimljene od strane putujućih dagerotipista, preko portreta hrvatskih književnika koje je snimio Franjo Pommer 1856. i klasičnog razdoblja Toše Dapca iz četrdesetih godina 20. st., do radikalnih eksperimenata Željka Jermana i/ili svojevrsnih dnevnika Petra Dapca, Zorana Filipovića, Željka Jermana, Jasenka Rasola ili Borisa Cvjetanovića, omogućuju potragu za odgovorom na ta pitanja. Izazov i uzbuđenje potrage za odgovorima na ta pitanja mogući su pod uvjetom oslobođenja od nagomilanih inhibicija male nacije i, sukladno tomu, skromne (u odnosu na englesku, njemačku ili francusku) fotografske baštine. Drugo, ovdje nije u pitanju povijest hrvatske fotografije koja kao medij pripada univerzalnoj baštini, već fotografije kao dijela hrvatske kulturne proizvodnje koja pripada samo nama. Toliko se puta već ponavljalo i uporno dokazivalo kako u osnovi nema razlike između fotografije nastale u Irskoj i one nastale u Transilvaniji, kako je fotografija medijski i umjetnički fenomen bez identiteta,⁴ nacionalno neutralna i bez nekih specifičnih kodova koji bi je karakterizirali kao tipično britansku, hrvatsku ili tipično argentinsku.

Odmjeren sentimentalni diskurs kad je u pitanju nacionalna, dakle naša, fotografska baština, ne mora biti smetnja općem promišljanju. Konačno, nije li Barthes svoju utjecajnu knjigu o fotografiji *Camera Lucida* napisao potaknut fotografijom svoje preminule majke.⁵ John Tagg je pak svoje polu-marksističke eseje o fotografiji napisao izazvan Barthesovim "regresivnim fantaziranjem". Nije li S. Sontag započela "jednim esejem - o nekim problemima, estetskim i moralnim, koje postavlja sveprisutnost fotografskih slika", a R. Krauss svoje izvanredne rasprave o fotografiji općinjena nadrealizmom? Mary Price prizna je u uvodu svoje knjige o fotografiji⁶ kako je na pisanje bila potaknuta općom inter-

ments of car industry, insurance companies, political parties, and tourist agencies? What about those "photographs" which, contrary to the established belief that photographs are "truthful", obviously lie? What about those images which are doubtlessly "photographs", but serve only to document visually some experience or insight, such as images from ethnological or archaeological field research or those created by telescopes and microscopes? Where should we place our personal photo-albums? Or photographs from the police files? After all, what about those images, created in the technique of photography, with aesthetic and spiritual features which make them equal to the masterpieces of artistic heritage preserved in national museums of modern and contemporary art? Or just to mention a marginal example linked to the museum: How should we treat and evaluate numerous photographs documenting conceptual actions? And then perhaps one last question: What about the digital image?

We can start searching for these answers by looking at all those photographs that were made in Croatia after the invention of this expressive medium in 1839 - including those of non-Croatian origin, produced by travelling daguerotypists - from the portraits of Croatian writers made by Franjo Pommer in 1856 and the classical period of Tošo Dabac in the 1940s to the radical experiments of Željko Jerman and/or diaries of some sort created by Petar Dabac, Zoran Filipović, Željko Jerman, Jasenko Rasol, and Boris Cvjetanović. We will experience the challenge and the excitement linked to this search if we shake off the accumulated inhibitions, which are characteristic for our small nation and the correspondingly modest (compared to English, French, or German) heritage of photography. Besides, we are not speaking here of the history of Croatian photography within the universal heritage of photography as a medium, but about photography that makes part of Croatian cultural production, which is ours alone. It has been repeatedly claimed that there is basically no distinction between a photograph made in Ireland and one made in Transylvania, that photograph is a medium and an artistic phenomenon with no particular identity,⁴ nationally neutral, and lacking all specific codes that would characterize it as typically British, Croatian, or Argentinian.

A reasonably sentimental discourse on the national, that is, our heritage of photog-

pretativnom zbrkom koja je na području teorije ovog medija zavladała nakon uvođenja "postmodernog stanja" kojem nije promakao izazov ambivalentnosti fotografskih slika. Michel Frizot kaže da se razljutio na "modernistički" koncept historiografije medija i da ga je to navelo da napiše, zajedno sa suradnicima, svoju velebnu povijest fotografije.⁷ Dakle, može se, ako se zna. Na slikama se prepoznaju likovi prabaka ili pradjedova i premda danas živi najčešće nisu imali s njima direktnog dodira, pa im tako nisu poznate njihove geste, miris, ljudska toplina, ni boja očiju i boja glasa, ništa ne umanjuje svojatanje tih fotografskih slika u obiteljskoj ili društvenoj memoriji. Takve se slike ne čitaju samo kao slike. Dešava se upravo obratno; slika, fotografska slika sa svim svojim medijskim svojstvima karakterističnim za, recimo, rane kalotipije, pomalo blijeđi, da bi njeno mjesto zauzela jedna druga vrsta predodžbi, sigurno manje stabilnih od fotografije, ali u određenom trenutku mnogo snažnijih od onoga što je samo pred očima. U slojevitom i vrlo kompleksnom procesu stvaranja na mentalnoj razini takve predodžbe, fotografija se pojavljuje u funkciji upaljača i izvršenjem svoje funkcije gotovo da i nestaje. Ne potpuno, ali dovoljno da joj se značenje promijeni i da u stvaranju mentalne slike obojene sentimentalnim fluidom bude potisnuta izvan fokusa na razinu perceptivne fusnote. To je razlog zbog čega se na starijim, ali i novijim fotografijama, često nalazi rukom dopisana pobliza identifikacija ili opis onoga što se na fotografiji vidi kao, recimo, ona kakva je krasopisom ispisana na kalotipiji koju ju je 1856. načinio Franjo Pommer (1818.-1879.), a predstavlja Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog. Verbalna dopuna vizualnog sadržaja slike na kojoj je predstavljen proćelavi muškarac u naslonjaču glasi: "Ivan Kukuljević Sakc. umro 1. kolovoza 1889. 73 god." U lijevom, koso odrezanom donjem uglu još istim rukopisom piše "Rodio se 1816."

Nadrealizam je u fotografiji prepoznao njen revizionistički potencijal prevrednovanja cjelokupne vidljive stvarnosti. Zbog tog svojstva nikada ju nije i odbacio. Konačno Man Ray je bio fotograf. Franjo Pommer, koji je načinio poznati portret Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog bio je daleko od nadrealizma, ali mu se baštinjena fotografija, danas u zbirci Muzeja za umjetnost

raphy need not be an obstacle to more general considerations. After all, R. Barthes wrote his influential book on photography *Camera Lucida* moved by a photograph of his deceased mother.⁵ John Tagg, again, wrote his semi-Marxist essays on photography provoked by Barthes's "a nostalgic and regressive phantasy". And did not S. Sontag begin with "an essay - on certain problems, aesthetic and moral, imposed by the omnipresence of photographic images," while R. Krauss wrote her exquisite treatises on photography enthralled by surrealism? Mary Price has admitted in the introduction to her book on photography⁶ that she was inspired to writing by the overall interpretative confusion in the field of theory related to that medium, brought about by the introduction of the "post-modern state", which was far from indifferent to the challenge presented by the ambivalence of photographic images. Michel Frizot says that he was enraged by the "modernist" conception of the historiography of media, which led him to write, together with a team of experts, his magnificent history of photography.⁷ Therefore, it is possible to do it if one knows how. We recognise the faces of our great-grandmothers or great-grandfathers even if those who are still living today have rarely known them personally. The fact that we are not familiar with their gestures, smell, or human warmth, the colour of their eyes, or the tone of their voice, in no way obstructs the appropriation of such photographic images in family or social memory. Those images are not read only as images. Quite the contrary: the image or photograph, with all its features of a medium which are characteristic for, let us say, the early kalotypes, tends to become somewhat vague, only to be replaced by another sort of image, which is undoubtedly less stable than a photograph, but can sometimes exert much stronger impact than what we merely see in front of us. In this gradual and very complex process of creating such images at the mental level, the photograph plays the role of a trigger and practically vanishes after it has fulfilled its function. Not entirely, of course, but sufficiently in order to change its meaning and be banished - in the process of creating a mental image coloured with the fluid of sentimentality - from the focus of attention and reduced to the level of a perceptive footnote. That is why older, but also some recent photographs often bear a handwritten, more detailed identification or description of what they are

▼

⁴ To je teza koju zastupa britanski kritičar i teoretičar John Tagg. Vidi: JOHN TAGG, *The Burden of Representation - Essays on Photographies and Histoires*, University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

⁵ Zanimljivo je primijetiti da ta fotografija u spomenutoj knjizi uopće nije reproducirana. Barthes kaže: "Ona postoji samo za mene. Za vas, ona ne bi bila ništa drugo do jedna od brojnih neodređenih slika, jedna između tisuća običnih; ona ne može biti vizualni predmet znanosti; ne uspostavlja objektivnost u pozitivnom smislu tog termina; u krajnjoj liniji može potaknuti vaš interes za "studium", razdoblje, odjeću, fotogeničnost; ali u njoj, za vas, nema rane." ROLAND BARTHES, *Camera Lucida*, New York, 1987., 73. Hrvatski prijevod: ROLAND BARTHES, *Svijetla komora - bilješka o fotografiji*, Zagreb, 2003.

⁶ MARY PRICE, *The Photograph: A strange Confined Space*, Stanford, 1994.

⁷ Frizot se inače zainteresirao za fotografiju svojim bazično znanstvenim interesom za fotografije Etienne Jules Mareya.

●

⁴ This hypothesis has been endorsed by the British critic and theoretician John Tagg. Cf. John Tagg, *The Burden of Representation - Essays on photographs and Histoires*, London, 1987.

⁵ It is interesting to observe that this photograph has not been reproduced in the mentioned book. Barthes says: "It exists only for me. For you, it would be nothing but one of those many vague images, one among the thousand and ordinary; it can not be a visual object of scientific investigation; it does not establish objectivity in the positive sense of the term; at most, it might awaken your interest for the "studium"; for the age, the clothes, or being photogenic; but you will not feel the wound there." ROLAND BARTHES, *Camera Lucida*, New York, 1987, 73.

⁶ MARY PRICE, *The Photograph: A Strange Confined Space*, Stanford, CA, 1994.

⁷ Frizot was interested in photography because of his scholarly interest in the photographs of Etienne Jules Marey.

i obrt u Zagrebu, otela iz konteksta njegove plemenite namjere da posebnom serijom ovjekovječi likove petnaestorice hrvatskih književnika i da posredstvom Danice kao priloga Gajevih Narodnih novina distribuiraju njihove likove u hrvatskoj kulturnoj javnosti. Bez bliže identifikacije za koju se može smatrati da je doista autentična, koju je najvjerojatnije dopisao svojom rukom Gjuro Szabo,⁸ slika Ivana Kukuljevića vraća se svojim primarnim značenjem u domenu medija, to jest, fotografije, a zatim, s onim što fotografija predstavlja u širi kontekst građanskog naslikanog ili fotografiranog portreta s početka druge polovice 19. st. Na razini mentalnog čitanja spomenute kalotipije i s određenim obrazovanjem čuju se zvuci jednog turbulentnog razdoblja hrvatske povijesti: budnice, razgovori o nacionalnom osvještenju, saborske rasprave o pitanju Vojne krajine, začecima povijesne i povijesno-umjetničke znanosti, Matici ilirskoj i, kasnije, Matici hrvatskoj te hrvatskom "narodnom jeziku". To, dakako, više nije fotografija, već rasplinuta slika nejasnih i uglavnom nepotpunih sjećanja, često začinjjenih emotivnim nabojem. Ne možemo vidjeti jedno, a da ne poništimo drugo - kaže na jednom mjestu svoje poznate knjige *Umjetnost i iluzija* E. H. Gombrich.

Ako se u umjetnosti uvijek i u pravilu može barem djelomično dešifrirati neki opći "izraz vremena" i "stanje duha", kako se onda s tim kontekstualnim kodom umjetničkog djela nosi fotografska slika? U spomenutom slučaju nikako. Na kalotipiji 20 x 17,5 cm, koso odrezanih uglova, predstavljen je *en face* blago pročelav muškarac kako sjedi, najvjerojatnije u fotelji Pommerova studija, oslonjen jednom rukom o naslon, dok mu druga ruka počiva na koljenu prebačene noge. Lice mu krasi mala bradica. Pogled mu je neznatno pojačan retušem, uperen ravno u objektiv. Odjeven je u raskopčanu surku ispod koje se vidi bijela košulja. Fotografija je blagog oker tonaliteta. Zna se da slika predstavlja Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog zato što tako piše. Rukom zapisan podatak i Pommerova datacija također govore da je osoba na slici u tom času imala četrdeset godina i da su joj još ostale trideset i tri godine života. Ali da ne piše?

Strogo centrirana fotografija i namještena poza muškarca, potpis autora fotografije i godina njezina nastanka koji se

showing. Such is the calligraphic note written on the kalotype representing Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, which was made in 1856 by Franjo Pommer (1818-1879). This verbal complement, attached to the visual content of the image showing a balding man in an armchair, runs as following: "Ivan Kukuljević Sacc., died 1 August 1889, age 73." In the lower left corner, obliquely cut, the same hand has written: "Born in 1816".

Surrealists have recognised the revisionist potential of photography and its tendency to re-evaluate the entire visible reality. That is the reason why they never rejected it. After all, Man Ray was a photographer. Franjo Pommer, who made the famous portrait of Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, was far from being a surrealist, but his collection, today preserved at the Museum of Arts and Crafts in Zagreb, shows that his photography managed to evade all his noble intentions to eternalize the images of fifteen Croatian writers in a special series and to distribute them in Croatian public through the journal called *Danica*, attached to Gaj's *Narodne Novine*. Without their identification, which can be considered authentic and was probably a personal addition by Gjuro Szabo,⁸ the image of Ivan Kukuljević returns with its primary meaning to the domain of the medium, i.e. photography, and - with all that photography represents - to the broader context of the mid-nineteenth century bourgeois portraiture, painted or photographed. At the level of mental reading of the mentioned kalotype, at least if one possesses a specific type of education, one can hear the sounds of a turbulent period in Croatian history: reveilles, talks about national revival, debates in the Croatian parliament about awakening national awareness, and discussions on the issues of the Military Zone or the beginnings of historical and art-historical disciplines, Matica ilirska, and - later on - Matica hrvatska and the Croatian "national language." Certainly, that is no longer photography, but rather a diffused image of vague and mostly incomplete memories, often spiced up with charged emotions. We can not see one and fail to annihilate the other - as E.H. Gombrich has said in his famous book *Art and Illusion*.

If one can always and as a rule identify some general "expression of the age" and "state of mind", at least partially, how does the photographic image fit into that contextual code of works of art? In the above-mentioned case, it does not fit at all. The kalotype

naziru na naslonu naslonjača govore o studijskoj portretnoj snimci jedne osobe načinjenoj u Pommerovu gornjogradskom ateljeru u današnjoj Kuševićevoj ulici. Njegovo visoko čelo i pogled odaju, čak i da nije poznato zato što tako piše, pametnog čovjeka koji je upravo tada radio na sakupljanju i objavljivanju hrvatske pjesničke građe 15. i 16. st. Ali takvih je osoba na istim ili sličnim poslovima, u istim pozama i istim ili sličnom naslonjačima, sudeći po brojnim fotografijama iz tog vremena koje su objavljene u studijskim obradama fotografske baštine širom Europe, bilo mnogo. I kako onda znati koja je prava? Zbog toga što tako piše.

Konvencionalnost spomenute fotografije također je naizgled posebno ne izdvaja. Može se reći kako ideja Franje Pommera, tog prvog stalnog zagrebačkog fotografa, da u tada novom mediju ovjekovječi petnaest znamenitih muževa onog vremena u Hrvatskoj te da njihove likove distribuira kao prilog *Danice ilirske*, a sve to prije famozne Nadarove "galerije" znamenitih Francuza, na što je u domaćim studijskim obradama posebno skrenuta pažnja, ima nesumnjivu težinu i značenje, ali za koga?⁹ Za historiografiju i opću nacionalnu kulturnu povijest zacijelo da, ali ostaje da se vidi što to može značiti za povijest medija i povijest umjetnosti stvorene posredstvom tog medija.

Fotografija, kao i svaka umjetnička disciplina i tehnika, podrazumijeva primarno estetički diskurs unutar polja opće vizualne kulture. Osoba od kulture proširit će referentni raspon svoje percepcije spomenute kalotipije zauzimanjem holističke pozicije i reći kako, doduše, slika Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog baš i nije predmet za estetsku raspravu, ali da se u njoj mogu na semantičkoj razini odčitati druge datosti i kontekstualna značenja. Na rubu takve pozicije, odnosno čitanja fotografske slike, nazire se postromantična teorija *Einfühlunga* koja povezuje u ovom slučaju emotivno iskustvo s psihološkim i dalje, intelektualnim saznanjem. Te osobe, međutim, previdaju jednu činjenicu - zavedene jezičnom referencom "Ivan Kukuljević Sakc. umro 1. kolovoza 1889. 73 god." zaboravljaju da je diskurs o fotografiji, ako se o njoj želi govoriti s pozicije njenog autonomnog umjetničkog i medijskog statusa, isključivo estetske naravi. Krene li se tim putem, tragom jezične reference, skreće se s pravca na koji

type sized 20 x 17.5 cm, of obliquely cut-off corners, shows a slightly balding man, *en face* and sitting in an armchair, probably in Pommer's atelier. One of his arms is reposing on the back of the chair, while the other is placed on his knee, his legs crossed. He is wearing a neatly trimmed beard. His gaze, slightly intensified through retouch, is directed straight to the lens. He is dressed in an unbuttoned jacket called *surka*, under which he is wearing a white shirt. The photograph is slightly hued in ochre. We know that the photograph presents Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski because it says so. The handwritten note and Pommer's date also tell us that the person on the photograph was at that moment forty years old and had thirty-two more years to live. But what if nothing had been written?

The painstakingly centred photograph and the man's formal pose, author's signature and the date that can be discerned on the back of the armchair - all that tells us that the portrait was made in Pommer's atelier in the Upper Town of Zagreb, in today's Kuševićeva Street. The man's high forehead and his eyes reveal certain facts that would have perhaps been understood without the note: that he was an intelligent man, who was at that time collecting and publishing Croatian poetic heritage of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. But there were many persons of the sort, doing the same or similar work, sitting in the same pose and in similar armchairs, at least as far as we can judge from the numerous photographs from the period, published as the preserved heritage of photography all over Europe. So how do we know which is the right one? It is because the note says so.

Apparently, the conventionality of the mentioned photograph does not make it exceptional either. One might say that the idea of Franjo Pommer, the first permanent photographer of Zagreb, to eternalize fifteen memorable Croatian men of the period with the help of the new medium and to distribute their images as an attachment to *Danica ilirska* - before the famous "gallery" of memorable Frenchmen by Nadar, which fact has been especially emphasized in Croatian documentation - is doubtlessly important, but for whom?⁹ Certainly, it is important for historiography and general national cultural history, but its meaning for the history of media and art history created with the help of that medium still lacks proper assessment.

As all art disciplines and techniques, photography includes a primarily aesthetic

- ▼
- ⁸ Ovo mišljenje dugujem kolegici Mariji Tonković, voditeljici odjela za fotografiju Muzeja za umjetnost i obrt u Zagrebu.
- ⁹ U navođenju prioriteta često se zaboravlja pothvat D. O. Hilla i R. Adamsona koji su sredinom četrdesetih godina 19. st. u Škotskoj kalotipijskim portretima zabilježili gotovo sve zaslužne Škote.
-
- ⁸ I owe this information to my colleague Marija Tonković, chief curator of the Department for Photography at the Museum of Arts and Crafts, Zagreb.
- ⁹ When speaking of the beginnings of photographic portraiture, one often neglects the enterprise of D. O. Hill and R. Adamson, who commemorated almost all famous Scotsmen in kalotype portraits in the 1840s.

upućuje spomenuta fotografija, a Franju Pommera zasjenjuje osoba naknadno identificirana kao Kukuljević Sakcinski. Drugim riječima, želi se znati i saznati što je - pod pretpostavkom da je Franjo Pommer bio umjetnik, o čemu vjerojatno ni sredina niti on sam nisu tada mislili - pri tom umjetnik mislio, kakve su mu bile namjere i stavovi i na koji je način svoja razmišljanja o mediju, estetsku namjeru i uvjerenja izručio vremenu na kasnija - čak i postmoderna - kritička razmišljanja i estetska vrednovanja. Osim toga, jezici umiru, slike ne.

Poticajnu osnovu potonjeg razmišljanja pruža monografska obrada fotografije u Hrvatskoj u 19. st.¹⁰ u kojoj se, ne bez razloga, navodi onovremeni citat pohvale Pommerovu radu. U njemu se kaže: "Što se vrijednosti umotvorah tiče, to možemo uvjeriti, da slike, već bolje ispasti nisu mogle... Pisac ovih redaka vidio je dosta sličnih tvorinah, domaćih i drugih kojekuda po našoj domovini verljajućih umjetnikah, ali tako šta savršena nije za celo nigdje dosele opazio." U ovom citatu treba izdvojiti dva detalja. Zapaža se da anonimni autor navedene pohvale raspolaže komparativnim saznanjima o lokalnim, a i širim, dosezima fotografije. Drugo, u navodu je korišteno nekoliko riječi referentnih za estetsku prosudbu. Govori se o vrijednosti umotvorina, govori se o umjetnicima, a dodana je i kvalifikacija koja govori o - očito - izvedbenom savršenstvu. Zanimljivo je da se načinjene kalotipije imenuju "slikama". Na toj osnovi i - dakako - pregledom preostalih kalotipija i fotografija iz Pommerova atelijera, Nada Grčević, autorica spomenute monografije, upušta se 1981. u pomnu estetsku analizu kojoj je u središtu pažnje medij, a ne poruka. Reći kako je za Pommerove prve radove, a to se odnosi i na kalotipiju koja prikazuje Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog, "bio karakterističan izvjesni slikarski tretman portreta" te da je "to zapravo nastavak krihuberovskog bidermajerskog minijaturnog portreta, izveden fotografskim sredstvima"¹¹, ili da je upravo u to vrijeme ili nešto kasnije "Pommer slikar ustupio mjesto Pommeru fotografu"¹² zaključci su inteligentne analize vizualnih kodova, a ne lingvističkih referenci.

Danas, dvadeset godina kasnije, u kontekstu proširena polja vizualne kulture, fotografija koja još ne silazi s uma ne može više biti čitana na isti način. Novo

discourse within the field of general visual culture. Someone dealing with culture might enlarge the referential scope of his or her perception by adopting a holistic position and say that the image of Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski is not really a topic for aesthetic debate, though other given facts and contextual meanings could be drawn from it at the semantic level. Bordering with that position or interpretation of photographic images, one can discern the post-romantic theory of the *Einführung*, which in this case links emotional experience with psychological and further with intellectual knowledge. Those who endorse such positions, however, tend to overlook one fact: seduced by the verbal reference "Ivan Kukuljević Sakc., died 1 August 1889, age 73," they will soon forget that all discourse on photography, as long as one speaks of it from the position of its autonomous status as art and medium, is of an exclusively aesthetic nature. If one walks that path, following the verbal reference, one will be led astray from the way shown by the photograph and Franjo Pommer will be overshadowed by the person retrospectively identified as Kukuljević Sakcinski. In other words, one will want to know what the artist - presuming that Franjo Pommer was one, which is probably not what he or his environment thought at the time - thought, what were his intentions and attitudes or how he imparted his thoughts about the medium, his aesthetic intention, and his convictions to the future generations with their - perhaps post-modern - critical reflection and aesthetic evaluation. Besides, languages die, whereas images live on.

The motivating ground for my present reflections was a monograph on nineteenth-century photography in Croatia,¹⁰ which quotes a deserved contemporary praise of Pommer's work. It says: "Regarding the value of these designs, we can guarantee that the pictures could not have turned out better The author of these lines has seen many such pieces, of local and foreign production, made by artists travelling around our country, but certainly such perfection he has spotted nowhere until now". In this quotation, two details must be pointed out. Firstly, it can be observed that the author of the praise possessed comparative knowledge about both local and general achievements of photography. Secondly, he uses several words which indicate an aesthetical assessment. He speaks of the value of designs and of artists, and also adds a qualification that

čitanje, dakako, ne može zaobići i neće osporiti spomenuto vrednovanje, ali ono više neće biti isto nakon svih onih tekstova o fotografiji koji su se pojavili u posljednjih dvadesetak godina.¹³ Nešto se nužno treba dodati. Fotografija je i nadalje ostala u središtu pažnje, ali je diskurs proširen širokim interpretativnim saznanjima iz suvremenih medijskih studija i uvida u vizualnu kulturu u cjelini. Fotografiska se slika tako našla u drugačijem kontekstualnom okviru, kao dio ikonosphere modernih vremena i sadašnjeg trenutka. Taj okvir, dakako, podrazumijeva bazično poznavanje oblika i institucija produkcije, tehnologije, distribucije i potrošnje fotografske slike. Ali onog časa kada se pokušava razabrati poruka slike, u ovom slučaju kalotipije Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog koja je iz 1856. ođasлана u 2001. godinu, njena višeznačnost postaje intrigantnom.

Ovdje se ne radi samo o promjeni optike. Radi se o primjeni različitih optika koje dopunjuju semantičku vrijednost fotografije. Kontinuitet smjenjuje diskontinuitet, konstrukciju dekonstrukcija, problem mehaničke reprodukcije postaje sporedan, strukturalizam evoluira u poststrukturalizam, a u središte interesa postavlja se informacija i njeno značenje, njena distribucija, komunikacija i masovni mediji. U tom kontekstu, dakle, primjenom različitih optika, može se zapaziti da je Pommerova kalotipija označena dvjema jezičnim oznakama; prva je da je kalotipiju izradio Franjo Pommer, a druga je da slika predstavlja Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog. Treća, vrlo zanimljiva, skrivena je u drugoj, jer naznaka "umro 1. kolovoza 1889. 73 god." nedvosmisleno upućuje na to da je identifikacija osobe na slici načinjena nakon njene smrti. Rečeno je, nema razloga da se sumnja u autentičnost oznaka, ali bez njih slika ne bi "govorila" i upućivala na analogiju između slike i njena predložka, odnosno "govorila" bi nešto drugo. Prema tome, ono što određuje sliku nije slika i ono što se vidi, već ono što opisuje i objašnjava viđeno, a vizualne elemente slike pretvara u koncept i ideje. Primjenom stručne i znanstvene rekonstrukcije na vidjelo izlaze podaci koji govore o ideji prvog zagrebačkog stalnog fotografa da serijom (i potencijalnim "albumom" za one koji su u ono vrijeme te kalotipije skupljali) fotografija uglednih i zaslužnih ljudi bude "koristan našem nar-

speaks of - evidently - perfection of craft. It is interesting that he speaks of kalotypes as "pictures". On the basis of that, as well as the results of her scrutiny of other kalotypes and photographs from Pommer's atelier, Nada Grčević, the author of the monograph, performed a detailed aesthetic analysis in 1981, in which she focused on the medium instead of the message. She concluded that Pommer's early pieces, which include the kalotype showing Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, "were characterised by certain painter-like treatment of the portrait" and that "it is actually the continuation of the Krihuberian miniature portrait of Biedermeier, executed in photographic technique",¹¹ or that, precisely at that time or somewhat later, "Pommer the painter was substituted by Pommer the photographe",¹² which was the result of a resourceful analysis of visual codes, not of verbal references.

Today, twenty years later and within the enlarged field of visual culture, that photograph still arouses interest, though it can no longer be interpreted in the same way. Certainly, new interpretations can neither avoid nor neglect the mentioned assessment, but it is not the same thing after all those texts on photography which have appeared in the past twenty years.¹³ Something must be added. Photography has remained in the focus of attention, but the discourse has expanded to cover the visual culture as a whole, along with broad interpretative knowledge of modern media studies and insights. Thus, photographic image has been situated in a different contextual framework, as a part of the iconosphere of modern times and the present moment. That framework certainly includes some basic knowledge of forms and institutions of production, technology, distribution, and consumption of photographic images. However, the very moment one tries to make out their message, in this case the message of the kalotype presenting Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, transferred from 1856 into 2001, one stumbles upon intriguing ambiguity.

It is not merely about the change of perspective. It is about the application of different perspectives, which complement the semantic value of the photograph. Continuity has been replaced by discontinuity, construction by deconstruction, the problem of mechanical reproduction has become secondary, structuralism has evolved into post-structuralism, while the spotlights have focused on the information and its meaning,

▼
¹⁰ NADA GRČEVIĆ, *Fotografija devetnaestog stoljeća u Hrvatskoj*, Zagreb, 1981., 32-51. Franju Pommera je monografski obradila ista autorica u studiji: NADA GRČEVIĆ, Franjo Pommer prvi stalni zagrebački fotograf, u: *Iz starog i novog Zagreba*, sv. V, Zagreb, 1974., 151-161.

¹¹ Ibid., 47.

¹² Ibid., 40.

¹³ Pri tom se misli na i na S. Sontag (*On Photography*, 1977.), i R. Barthesa (*Camera Lucida*, 1980.), ali i na V. Burgina (*Thinking Photography*, 1982.), R. Kraussa (*The Originality of the Avant Garde and other Modernist Myths*, 1986.) te na važne priloge novom razumijevanju fotografije autora kao što su: J. Tagg, K. Honneff, D. Crimp, W. Naef, A. Sekula, D. Davis, P. Bourdieu, A. Sayag, M. Kozloff, U. Eco, M. Price i tako dalje i tako dalje.

●
¹⁰ NADA GRČEVIĆ, *Fotografija devetnaestog stoljeća u Hrvatskoj*, Zagreb, 1981., 32-51; NADA GRČEVIĆ, Franjo Pommer prvi stalni zagrebački fotograf, in: *Iz starog i novog Zagreba*, V, Zagreb, 1974., 151-161.

¹¹ Ibid., 47.

¹² Ibid., p. 40.

¹³ This includes S. Sontag (*On Photography*, 1977), R. Barthes (*Camera Lucida*, 1980), but also V. Burgin (*Thinking Photography*, 1982), R. Krauss (*The Originality of the Avant-Garde and other Modernist Myths*, 1986), and important contributions to the new understanding of photography by authors such as J. Tagg, K. Honneff, D. Crimp, W. Naef, A. Sekula, D. Davis, P. Bourdieu, A. Sayag, M. Kozloff, U. Eco, M. Price, and many others.

odu". Nije poznato je li Pommer platio pravo korištenja kalotipijskog procesa Talbotu ili Talbotovim agentima u Austro-Ugarskoj, kao što je to bilo pravilo, barem u početku korištenja tog procesa, ili je koristio njegovu modifikaciju i usavršenje kakvo su nešto kasnije razvili u Francuskoj. Istim postupkom utvrđuje se kulturnopovijesna pozicija Pommerove ideje i ekonomika realizacije. U tom se kontekstu nazire i sjena slikara Vjekoslava Karasa koji u jesen 1856. dolazi iz Karlovca u Zagreb ne bi li i on svojim umijećem dao doprinos "na polju umjetnosti za naš narod". Čita se, ukratko, ono što R. Barthes naziva *studium*, čime se otvara komunikacijska veza. U postupku dekonstrukcije, to jest raščlambe svega onoga što je na slici očigledno, ali i onog što nije, slika se odjednom otkriva kao bogat resurs znanja, novih i drugačijih saznanja, i u pravu su oni koji o fotografiji govore kao fantazmagoričnoj informacijskoj vremenskoj kapsuli. To je *punctum*, kako ga definira Barthes, ili *aura* o kojoj je govorio W. Benjamin.¹⁴ To je međuprostor u kojem se odvija tranzicija prostora u vrijeme i sadašnjosti u prošlost i prošlosti u sadašnjost, a sve skupa u neizvjesnu budućnost.

U vrijeme kada se Pommer odlučio da fotografijom ovjekovječi petnaest zaslužnih Hrvata, portretna je fotografija u svijetu bila izuzetno popularna, a fotografiranje znamenitih osoba iz društvenog života česta praksa. Je li Pommer došao na tu ideju samostalno, na nagovor prijatelja, ili je o toj praksi dočuo preko tadašnjih medija, i nije toliko važno. Mnogo važnija je njegova istodobna pripadnost toj zajednici obrtnika-umjetnika koji posredstvom novog medija ne djeluju samo na promjene u vizualnoj kulturi, već medijem sudjeluju i u širim društvenim i političkim procesima. To je kulturološka činjenica od lokalnog značenja, no istodobno naprosto nadopunjuje ideološku, ekonomsku, socijalnu, tehnološku i estetsku panoramu povijesnih početaka fotografije kada je slika u medijima još uvijek bila podređena tekstu. Pommerova samosvijest razabire se u njegovom potpisu na fotografiji. On se, po ugledu na umjetnike, potpisuje malo koso u donjem desnom uglu. To se može uzeti kao njegovo očijukanje s konvencijom tada još uvijek prisutnog portretnog minijaturnog slikarstva. To se slaže s primjedbom N. Grčević koja

its distribution, communication, and the mass media. In those terms, that is, if we apply different perspectives, we will note that Pommer's kalotype is marked by two verbal notes: firstly, that it was made by Franjo Pommer; secondly, that it represents Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski. The third, highly interesting note, is concealed in the second one, for the indication that the man "died 1 August 1889, age 73" undoubtedly implies that he was identified after his death. As I have said before, there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the note, but without it, the image would not "speak", it would not indicate its analogy to its model, which means that it would "speak" of something else. Therefore, an image is not defined by itself, by the visible picture, but by that which describes and explains the perceived, turning visual elements into concepts and ideas. Professional and scholarly reconstruction has resulted in data which speak about the idea of the first permanent photographer of Zagreb that he should be "useful to our nation" and create a series of photographs (and possibly an "album" for those who collected such kalotypes in those times) of famous and important persons. It is not known whether Pommer bought the rights for using the kalotype technique from Talbot or his agents in the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, as it was the custom, at least in the beginnings of using the technique, or he simply used some variant or an improved version of the same, such as was developed somewhat later in France. The same procedure can be used to establish the cultural and historical position of Pommer's idea and the economy of its realization. In this context, one can also discern the silhouette of painter Vjekoslav Karas, who came in autumn 1856 from Karlovac to Zagreb in order to contribute to the craft with his skills "in the field of art and for our nation". One briefly recognizes what R. Barthes has termed *studium*, which opens up the communication link. In the process of deconstruction, that is, the analysis of all that is obvious in the image, but also of all that is not, the image suddenly reveals itself as a rich source of knowledge, of new and different insights. Thus, those who speak of the photograph as a phantasmagoric time capsule of information might be right. It is the *punctum* as defined by Barthes, or the *aura* of which W. Benjamin has spoken.¹⁴ It is the space in between, in which transition of space into time is taking place, as well as

zapaža "izvjesni slikarski tretman portreta". Sam portret je, naravno, daleko od slikarstva; ono je mrtvo, ubijeno vlastitim oružjem, budući da je svom zanatskom vještinom težilo realističkoj fatamorgani. Vjerna slika ručne izrade bit će stvarna "kao na fotografiji", a stvarnost fotografije neće više biti "kao da je naslikana". I sama N. Grčević, nije naodmet ponoviti, uvida kako je radom na tim portretima "Pommer slikar ustupio mjesto Pommeru fotografu". U tom svijetu, čiji su se nadolazeći obrisi već mogli razaznati, Vjekoslav Karas je već bio zastario.

Gleda li se slika ili se čita tekst? Gleda li se Pommerova kalotipija ili Ivan Kukuljević? Nitko ovdje ne može osporiti, niti je to ovdje namjera, da je spomenuta kalotipija povijesni dokument. To je pitanje žanrovske klasifikacije koja je potrebna za snalaženje općih korisnika. Ali ovo nije povijesna rasprava, već diskurs o fotografiji. Ovdje se, dakle, više treba i može govoriti o kalotipijskom procesu, o tome kako Pommer prihvaća i koristi jedan tada već pomalo zastario tehnološki postupak umnažanja slika uz pomoć negativa.¹⁵ Međutim, čak i diskurs o tehnici i tehnologiji ostaje na margini središnje teme, jer je riječ o slici. Tehnika ne objašnjava sliku, ona je pravi, ali ono što ostaje, nedvosmisleno upućuje pogled i misao prema fenomenološkoj razini, ma što to značilo. Možda u pravcu njene reproduktivnosti i stavljanja fotografije u širu društvenu funkciju tadašnje svakodnevnice, premda bi taj pravac skrenuo misao na područje socijalnih znanosti i ekonomike paleopotrošnje. Označena slikom i tekstom između kojih se uspostavlja analoški odnos, slika, kalotipija, upućuje na raspravu o prividu i istini, a to je, dakako, mnogo različitiije od rasprave o tehnici, tehnologiji, dokumentaciji i socijalnim implikacijama umnažanja dotične slike. Ovdje se ne govori o hijerarhiji diskursa između ideologije i estetike, već o njegovu smjeru.

Za razliku od slikarstva i u Pommerovo vrijeme raširenog minijaturnog portretiranja, fotografska slika prikazuje točno ono što je na slici, to jest osobu visoka čela, oslonjenu na ručku naslonjača, ras-kopčane surke. To je jedina stvarna istina spomenute kalotipijske slike. Slikarsko portretiranje moglo je uvijek malo uljepšati stvarnost, podebljati usne, obojiti obraze, dodati kosu na ćelavoj glavi. Foto-

transition of the present into the past and the past into the present, and of all that into an unforeseeable future.

At the time when Pommer decided to eternalize fifteen memorable Croats in photograph, the photography of portraiture was extremely popular in other countries, while photographing famous people was common practice. Whether Pommer came to that idea by himself or it was suggested to him by his friends, or perhaps he had heard of the practice through the media, is of minor importance. What is far more important is the fact that he was also member of the community of craftsmen-artists, who not only brought about changes in the visual culture by applying the new medium, but also participated in crucial social and political processes. Though a cultural fact of local significance, it also complements the ideological, economical, social, technological, and aesthetical panorama of the historical beginnings of photography, when image was still subordinated to the text in the media. Pommer's self-awareness can be discerned in his signature. Imitating the painters, he signed the photograph in the lower right corner, somewhat obliquely. One might understand it as flirting with the convention of miniature portrait painting, still strong at that time. That would fit well to the remark of N. Grčević, who observes "certain painter-like treatment of the portrait ". Such a portrait is, of course, far from being a painting; there, the painting is dead, killed by its own weapon after it has used up all its craft in order to achieve a realistic fatamorgana, but that pattern will soon be changed. A faithful, hand-made picture will become real "like a photograph," while the photograph will cease to be "as if painted." It should be pointed out once again that N. Grčević has recognized that, by working on those portraits, "Pommer the painter was substituted by Pommer the photographer". It was a new world, in which Vjekoslav Karas had fallen out of fashion.

Do we actually look at the picture or rather tend to read the text? Do we gaze at Pommer's kalotype or at Ivan Kukuljević? Nobody can deny, and it is not my purpose here, that the mentioned kalotype is a historical document. It is a question of genre classification, which common users need for their orientation. However, this is not a historical debate, but a discourse on photography. Therefore, one could and ought to speak here primarily about the kalotype pro-

▼
14 "Što je zapravo aura? Čudesna preda od vremena i prostora: jednokratna pojava daljine, ma koliko bila bliza." WALTER BENJAMIN, Uz kritiku sile - Mala povijest fotografije, Zagreb, 1971., 45.

15 Kalotipijski proces izrade fotografskih slika patentirao je Henry F. Talbot 1841. U upotrebi je do oko 1850., kada ga zamjenjuje stabilnije albuminsko procesuiranje pozitivna.

●
14 "What is in fact aura? Miraculous fabric of time and space: a singular appearance of distance, no matter how close it might be." WALTER BENJAMIN, A Short history of Photography [1931], Translated by Stanley Mitchell, Screen 13 (Spring 1972), 5-26.

●
15 The kalotype procedure of making photographic images was patented in 1841 by Henry F. Talbot. It was in use until about 1850, when it was replaced by the more stable albumin processing of positives.

grafija ni u kojoj tehničko-tehnološkoj verziji to nije mogla. Ne da nije htjela; nije mogla. Ograničena izražajnim potencijalom medija i općom vizualnom kulturom vremena, da se ne kaže ukusom, Pommerova kalotipija postupno gubi svoju simboličku kvalitetu, ali ne i svoje ikoničko svojstvo. Spomenuta kvaliteta teoretski je pod sumnjom, jer slika je slika, a ne tekst. Slika, međutim, ne govori isto što i tekst, pa ako se promatra slika, svi pokušaji interpretacije slike započinju i završavaju u slici. Lik koji sjedi u naslonjaču jedina je stvarnost Pommerove kalotipije i on je, budući da je stvoren uz pomoć kamere, vjerno prikazan. Određena estetska namjera uočljiva je u izvlačenju lika u prvi plan potpunom neutralizacijom pozadine, a budući da su svi portreti zaslužnih Hrvata rađeni na isti način, spomenuto ikoničko svojstvo kalotipije može se smatrati oblikovnim konceptom, dakle i prosudbenim elementom kvalitete načinjene slike. Koncentracijom na lik neznatno pomaknut iz geometrijskog središta kadra Pommer je učinio nešto više od standardnog fotografskog portreta karakterističnog za ono vrijeme. Model, lik čovjeka koji je naknadno identificiran kao Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, zrcali intelektualnu samosvijest. Njegov pogled, neznatno retuširanih zjenica, usmjeren je ravno u instrument njegova ovjekovječenja i posrednika prijenosa njegova lika u budućnost. Premda je očigledno ne vidi, on u nju gleda. Ako se danas misli u slikama, tada taj detalj vraća sliku njenom tekstu koji je opisuje i identificira, ali možda još više Pommeru, jer o njemu je ovdje sa sigurnošću riječ. U neprestanoj potrebi da se stvarnost definira ovisno od kuta gledanja i interpretativnog registra (a povijest je u tom slučaju vrlo izložena), jedina konkretna i nepobitna stvarnost s kojom se objektivno ovoga časa raspolaže jest slika. Nikakav "prozor" i nikakvo "zrcalo". Slika. Sve ostalo su opisi. Sa slikom u džepu opisi počinju i završavaju. Njena aura, naprotiv, kao prvotni fenomen slike, dozvoljava nadilaženje njena vizualnog činjeničnog ograničenja i usmjeruje pažljivog promatrača prema spekulativnom prostoru metafora. Njeno zračenje, pa ma kakvo bilo, čudesna je pređa od vremena i prostora - jednokratna pojava daljine, ma koliko bila bliza - kaže W. Benjamin. Ono uspostavlja vezu kojom pogled Ivana Kukuljevića Sakcinskog nije

cedure, about the way in which Pommer adopted and used a somewhat old-fashioned technique of image multiplication with the help of negatives.¹⁵ Nevertheless, even a discourse on techniques and technologies will remain on the margin of our central theme, for we are speaking here of an image. The technique will produce the image rather than explain it, and what remains will unambiguously draw our gaze and thought to the phenomenological level, whatever that means. Perhaps to the reproducibility of the photograph and the fact that a wide-ranging social function was assigned to it in the everyday life of the period; but that direction would draw the attention towards the field of social sciences and the economics of paleo-consumption. Defined by the analogy between the image and the text, this picture or kalotype will start a debate on the outward appearance and the truth, which is certainly very different from the debate on techniques, technologies, documentation, and social implications of multiplying the mentioned image. It is not about the hierarchy of discourse between ideology and aesthetics, but about its direction.

Unlike the paintings or miniature portraits which were popular in Pommer's times, the photographic image shows exactly what we can see on our picture: a man with high forehead, leaning on the back of an armchair, wearing an unbuttoned *surka*. That is the only true reality of our kalotype. Painted portraits were able to embellish the reality: fill the lips, colour the cheeks, add some hair to a balding head. Photography could not do that in any of its variants, regardless of the technique or technology used. Not that it did not want to; it just could not. Limited by the expressive potential of the medium and by the overall visual culture of the time, not to say by the taste, Pommer's kalotype gradually lost its symbolic quality, though not iconic feature. This quality can be theoretically doubted, for an image is an image and no text. But an image does not say the same as a text; so, if one looks at it, all attempts at interpreting it will begin and end there. The figure sitting in an armchair is the only reality of Pommer's kalotype and, since it has been produced with the help of a camera, it is faithfully reproduced. Certain aesthetic intention is evident in the fact that the figure has been drawn to the front by completely neutralising the background. Since all portraits of memorable Croats were done in the same way, the

uperen u neku neodređenu budućnost, već i ta budućnost iz točno određenog mjesta i vremena usmjeruje svoj pogled prema njemu. Ali ne samo to. Mi njega ne gledamo; mi ga vidimo! Ta činjenica dovoljno je fascinantna da joj se posvete ovi redovi. ▼

Studija je dio knjige o hrvatskoj fotografiji koju uskoro objavljuje Školska knjiga u Zagrebu.

above-mentioned iconic feature of the kalotype can be considered its formative concept and thus the decisive element for evaluating its quality. By concentrating on the figure, which is only slightly shifted away from the geometrical centre of the image, Pommer did something more than a standard photographic portrait, characteristic for his time. The model, subsequently identified as Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, emanates intellectual self-confidence. The gaze of his slightly retouched pupils is directed straight at the instrument of his eternalization and the medium that will transfer his figure into the future. Although he evidently can not see that future, he is looking at it. If one thinks today in terms of images, then this tiny detail brings the image back to its text, which describes and identifies it, or perhaps rather to Pommer himself, for it is him that we are certainly speaking about here. In our eternal need to define the reality depending on the viewpoint and interpretation register (and history is in that case extremely exposed), the only stable and irrefutable reality that we are objectively having at our disposal at the moment is the image. No "window" and no "mirror". Just the image. All the rest is just descriptions. They begin and end with the image in our pocket. Its aura, however, as the original phenomenon of the image, permits us to surpass its limits in terms of visual facts and directs the careful observer towards the speculative space of metaphors. Its emanation, whatever it might be - the miraculous fabric of time and space: the singular appearance of distance, however close it might be, as W. Benjamin has said - establishes a connection in which the gaze of Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski is not directed towards some undefined future; the future, from its precisely determined space and time, directs its gaze towards him. And not only that. We are not merely looking at him; we are seeing him! That fact is fascinating enough to merit these lines. ●

This chapter is a part of the author's manuscript on Croatian photography, soon to be published by Školska knjiga, Zagreb.

prijevod / translation: Marina Miladinov

→ Želimir Košćević - povjesničar umjetnosti i etnolog, voditelj Galerije Studentskog centra, a od 1980.-2004. viši kustos i muzejski savjetnik Muzeja suvremene umjetnosti u Zagrebu. Djeluje kao programski savjetnik Foto galerije Lang u Samoboru. Objavio brojne studije, kritike te nekoliko knjiga, među kojima: EXAT 51, Galerija Nova, Zagreb (1979.); Biennale u Veneciji i jugoslavenska moderna umjetnost 1895-1988, MSU, Zagreb (1988.); Tošo Dabac, ATD, Zagreb (1994.); Fotografiska slika, Školska knjiga, Zagreb (2000.).

Želimir Košćević - art historian and ethnologist, former head of the Studenski centar Gallery. Senior curator and advisor at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Zagreb (1980-2004). Active as programme advisor at the Foto Lang Gallery, Samobor. Published numerous articles and critical studies, as well as several books, e.g. EXAT 51, Gallery Nova, Zagreb (1979); Venice Biennale and Yugoslav Modern Art 1895-1988, MSU, Zagreb (1988); Tošo Dabac, ATD, Zagreb (1994); Photographic Image, Školska knjiga, Zagreb (2000).