

**LEKTIRA**

|

**READER**

# OBRISI VIŠESLOJNE MISTIKE:

## Povijest i vrijeme slike

PAUL KLEE, *ANGELUS NOVUS*

-



ŽARKO  
PAIĆ

# CONTOURS OF MULTI-LAYERED MYSTICISM: The History and Time of a Painting

PAUL KLEE, *ANGELUS NOVUS*

-

### IZVORNI ZNANSTVENI ČLANAK

PREĐAN: 1. 6. 2014.

PRIHVAĆEN: 29. 6. 2014.

UDK: 75 Klee, P.

**SAŽETAK:** Slika Paula Kleea, *Angelus Novus*, zahvaljujući tumačenju Waltera Benjamina, postala je paradigmatikom slikom moderne umjetnosti. Njezina zagonetka ne pokazuje se samo u mogućnosti višeslojnoga razotkrića mističnoga na granici između apokalipse i melankolije. Na temelju Kleeova pristupa ideji moderne umjetnosti u članku se izvodi postavka o simboličkome značenju boje. Riječ je o onome što proizlazi iz „viška imaginarnoga“ u slikarstvu kao svezi „konstrukcije“ i „kompozicije“. Klee je bio jedini, i to je pred kraj života vidio Heidegger u svojim *Dnevnici*ma i *bilješkama*, koji je uputio na umjetnost s onu stranu metafizike nakon Cézannea. Kako i na koji način „danas“ misliti odnos boje i kompozicije u suvremenoj umjetnosti slike ako se ono što određuje suvremenu umjetnost događaja (performativni obrat) zbiva kao kraj povijesti i implozija vremena u tehno-znanstvenoj konstrukciji virtualnih svjetova? Može li se ono mesijansko i ono melankolično u zahtjevu umjetnosti za „viškom imaginarnoga“ iznova vratiti u sliku kao što se vrijeme sabire u trenutku nastanka svijeta?

**KLJUČNE RIJEČI:** boja, događaj, anđeo, mesijansko vrijeme, povijest, Klee

PAUL KLEE  
ANGELUS NOVUS, 1920., 32  
ULJE I AKVAREL NA PAPIRU I KARTONU  
IZRAELSKI MUZEJ, JERUZALEM

PAUL KLEE  
ANGELUS NOVUS, 1920., 32  
OIL AND WATERCOLOR ON PAPER AND CARDBOARD  
THE ISRAELI MUSEUM, JERUSALEM

### ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC PAPER

RECEIVED: 1. 6. 2014.

ACCEPTED: 29. 6. 2014.

UDC: 75 Klee, P.

**SUMMARY:** Owing to the interpretation of Walter Benjamin, Paul Klee's painting *Angelus Novus* has become the paradigmatic work of modern art. Its mystery is not manifest only in the possibility of revealing the mystical on the borderline between the apocalypse and melancholy. Based on Klee's approach to the idea of modern art, the aim of this article is to propose a hypothesis on the symbolic meaning of colour. It is about that which emerges from the "surplus of the imaginary" in painting as a combination of "construction" and "composition". Klee was the only one after Cézanne, as Heidegger has noted late in his life in his *Diaries and Notes*, to have spoken of art as something beyond metaphysics. How should one think the relationship between colour and composition in the contemporary visual arts of "today", if what defines the contemporary art of the event (the performative turn) emerges as the end of history and the implosion of time in the technological and scientific construction of virtual worlds? Can the Messianic and the melancholic in art's demand for the "surplus of the imaginary" return into painting, as time condenses in the moment the world is created?

**KEYWORDS:** colour, event, angel, Messianic time, history, Klee

### Uvod

U *Dnevniku* Paula Kleea nalazi se vjerojatno najznačajnija misao slikovnoga obrata u modernoj umjetnosti. Način kako je slikar iskazao misao posebno je upečatljiv. Dramatski ton pronalaska misli i njezine otvorenosti za svijet i umjetnost gotovo da se može prispodobiti onome istome što Vasilij Kandinski u spisu *O duhovnome u umjetnosti* kaže za umjetničko stvaranje. To je, naime, tek drugi način novoga stvaranja svijeta.<sup>1</sup> Umjesto Boga sada umjetnik preuzima njegovu stvaralačku ulogu. Klee, dakle, piše u *Dnevniku*: „Boja me posjeduje. /.../ Uvijek će me posjedovati, znam to. To je smisao ovog sretnog trenutka: Boja i ja smo jedno. Ja sam slikar.“<sup>2</sup> Slikar ne posjeduje boju. Ona vlada i raspolaže njime. Ali bez njegova udjela u nastanku umjetničkoga djela ni boja ne ulazi u svijet. Opis susreta boje i slikara pokazuje da događaj nastanka umjetnosti pretpostavlja odnos između dvojega. Međutim, ushićenje slikara ne proizlazi iz nečega izvanjskoga. Zašto ushit ne pogađa spoznaju da crta i površina posjeduju slikara, već jedino ono treće koje crti i površini podaruje autonomiju? Boja očigledno nekako prethodi crti i površini, iako ne u logičkome ni u povijesnome smislu. Čak se i ne pitamo tradicionalno ontologijski što jest boja. U ovome slučaju pitamo se samo što jest crta i što jest površina na kojoj crta urezuje sliku. Boja, to je nešto što već pripada tajni. Pitati o boji znači misliti izvan odnosa uzrok–učinak. Ali postoji još nešto zagonetnije od te tajne. To je ono kako boja dolazi u svijet. S kojom

### Introduction

The *Diary* of Paul Klee contains the probably most important thought on the visual turn in modern art. The way in which the painter expressed it is particularly striking. The dramatic tone of the invention of this thought and its openness towards the world can almost be compared to what Wassily Kandinsky said about artistic creation in his essay *Concerning the Spiritual in Art* that it is another way of creating the world anew.<sup>1</sup> Instead of God, it is the artist who takes on His creative role. Thus, Klee wrote the following in his *Diary*: „Color possesses me (...) It will possess me always, I know it. That is the meaning of this happy hour: color and I are one. I am a painter.“<sup>2</sup> A painter does not possess colour. Instead, it is the colour that dominates him and does with him as it pleases. However, without his role in creating a work of art, colour would never enter the world. The description of the encounter between colour and the artist shows that the event of creating art presupposes a relationship between the two. However, the painter's ecstasy does not originate in something external. Why does it fail to impress that the line and the surface possess the painter, and this insight affects only that third element, which endows the line and the surface with autonomy? Apparently, colour somehow precedes the line and the surface, even though not logically or historically. We even do not ask ourselves, in a traditional ontological sense, *what* colour is. In this case, we only wonder what line is, or the surface on which the line

konstelacijom boja može stvoriti nove odnose u svijetu (slike)? Kako „kompozicija“ može promijeniti plan „konstrukcije“, govoreći pojmovima Kleea iz njegova spisa *O modernoj umjetnosti*?<sup>3</sup> Imati boju znači stopiti se s onim što omogućuje slikarstvo uopće. U Kleeovu razumijevanju umjetničkoga stvaranja riječ je o praiskonskome. Imati boju znači prepustiti joj da u oblikovanju svijeta kvalitetom ispuni ili dovrši ono što proizlazi iz zagonetnoga događaja susreta umjetnosti i umjetnika, stvaranja umjetničkoga djela i samoga stvaratelja. U vječnome stvaranju svijeta, kako Klee gotovo neognostički shvaća proces oblikovanja onoga što „jest“, slikarstvo postaje paradoksalan čin događaja. Vremenitost „trenutka“ i bljesak „vječnosti“ proishodi iz događaja. Imenovanje tog susreta postajanja samoga djela označava bit moderne umjetnosti. Praiskonsko i moderno otuda nisu više odijeljeni ponorom. Sjetimo li se da je Kleeov prethodnik u pokušaju razumijevanja slike i čina stvaranja kao onoga što Heidegger naziva ne-metafizičkim načinom mišljenja u modernoj umjetnosti, a riječ je, dakako, o Paulu Cézanneu, stapanje slikara i naslikanoga nazvao „sretnim trenutkom“, vidjet ćemo da se taj *kairos* nalazi u odnosu između boje i oblika. Odnos se ne može ovjekovječiti. Umjesto toga valja promisliti kako nastaje odnos iz sklopa povijesnoga događaja. Je li moguće napustiti klasičnu geometrijsku i linearnu perspektivu kao „simboličku formu“ renesanse<sup>4</sup> i zaputiti se s onu stranu vidljivoga svijeta? U onome što omogućuje da boja „ima“ slikara, a slikar se stapa s događajem kojim vidljivo dolazi u

svijet, nema više iluzije predmetnosti slike (*mimesis i reprezentacija*) kao ni praznine nepredmetnosti slike (*destrukcija i dekonstrukcija ideje slike*). Klee nas, naprotiv, povezuje s „konstrukcijom“ i „kompozicijom“. Svaralački čin otvara svijet u djelatnosti oblikovanja. Što znači boja u procesu objelodanivanja praiskonskoga i nadolazećega u slici? Zašto je u modernoj umjetnosti upravo boja obavijena najvećom tajnom? Odmah valja reći da s Kleeom razlikovanje moderne i suvremene umjetnosti u smislu jaza između estetike djela i estetike događaja gubi značenje spoznajnoga reza. Što danas pragmatično nazivamo vizualnom umjetnošću odnosi se samo na mnoštvo umjetničkih putova, strategija i tehnologija od slikarstva, fotografije, filma do tijela kao ideje u prostoru i vremenu njegove izvedbe. Moderna umjetnost, doduše, nestaje onda kada više ne možemo odrediti granice modernosti uopće. Nestanak se zbiva u prijelazima i obratima u pojmu novoga.<sup>5</sup> Suvremena umjetnost, pak, utoliko je prijeponija ukoliko se njezina usmjerenost na događaje života kao umjetnosti sabire u reproduktivnosti djela bez izvornika. U čistoj formi dematerijaliziranja ona prebiva poput praznine u prostoru.<sup>6</sup> Klee se u slikovnoj umjetnosti 20. stoljeća stoga pojavljuje poput meteora. S onu stranu postojećih granica avangarde i neoavangarde njegova pojava ima crte čuda. Slično je s Kafkom u modernoj književnosti. Kleeov položaj u modernoj slikovnoj umjetnosti nesvodljivost je razlike spram razumijevanja djela i događaja. Njegova teorija slikarstva izložena u zapisima i

aforizmima o umjetnosti zacijelo predstavlja jedinstven primjer stvaralačkoga mišljenja u kojem se dodiruju slika i riječ. Temeljna ideja slikarstva pokazuje se u tome što slikanje ne prikazuje niti predstavlja postojeće predmete svijeta. Već od Van Gogha pa sve do ranoga Picassa iz doba kubizma slikarstvo više ne oslikava predmete-u-svijetu. Svjetovnost svijeta postaje upitnom. To vrijedi kako za sliku tako i za jezik. Razotkriće elementarnih čestica u fizici kao i Einsteinova teorija relativnosti odgovarale su nastanku ideje da slikarstvo mora otvoriti mogućnosti prodora s onu stranu slike i jezika u tradicionalnome značenju sredstva komunikacije. Pitanje o slici i jeziku otada više nije pitanje o medijalnosti medija. Ono postaje odlučujuće pitanje o vjerodostojnosti slike i jezika kao događaja susreta izvan logike subjekta i njegova kraljevstva privida. Slikarstvo dovodi svijet do vidljivosti. Vječno stvaranje novoga pritom preokreće tradicionalnu teologijsku sliku Božjega stvaranja. Nije slučajno Heidegger u dospjeću do krajnjih mogućnosti mišljenja događaja kod Cézannea i Kleea vidio početak jednog ne-metafizičkoga načina mišljenja umjetnosti (*Dichten*). Ono nas oslobađa već spomenutih rezova i pukotina između moderne i suvremene umjetnosti: „Ono što priprema Cézanne otpočinje s Kleeom.“<sup>7</sup> Ako umjetnost otvara mogućnosti brisanja tih granica, tada je očito da Kleeovo udivljenje bojom kao obratom odnosa slikara i njegova svijeta ima više od spoznajno-metafizičke dimenzije razumijevanja samoga čina stvaranja svijeta. Dijametralno suprotstavljanje boja odgovara stoga njihovu uzvišenome značenju.

Polazeći od pojmova vremena kao što su „trenutak“ vremenitosti i „bljesak“ vječnosti, Klee napušta dva međusobno suprotstavljena shvaćanja o biti vremena. Prvo je ono o konačnosti i ograničenosti vremena u epohalnome početku i kraju, a drugo ono o beskonačnosti i bezgraničnosti vječnosti u neprekinutome trajanju. Vrijeme stvaranja nije ni jedno niti drugo. Ako bi bilo ovo prvo, tada bi moderna umjetnost bila pod zakonom avangardne destrukcije i dekonstrukcije vječnosti. No, ako bi bila pod vladavinom božanske nepromjenljivosti svijeta, tada bi postala zamrznutom tradicijom. Više ne bi moglo biti mjesta za ono što Heidegger naziva *drugim početkom*. Klee pokazuje da „vječno djetinje“ u ikonologiji njegovih anđela, ta infantilna igra s oblikom ljudskoga lica u činu praiskonskoga oblikovanja, odgovara istodobno arhajsčkome i eshatologijskome. No, tajna boje i nadalje ostaje u onome što se pojavljuje tek nakon crte i površine. Zašto? Boja se Kleeu primarno pokazuje formalnom kategorijom kompozicije slike. I to u trojstvu: (1) mjere, (2) težine i (3) kvalitete. Kvaliteta odlučuje o tome kako se iskazuje mjera i težina. Ali ne, naravno, u kvantitativnome značenju. Sve postaje stoga simboličko. Svjetlost i odbljesak svjetlosti podaruju duhovnu dimenziju susreta s ljepotom. Eto, ono što preostaje izazovom za suvremenu umjetnost pitanje je odnosa između oblika i boja. Iz tog odnosa nastaje jednokratna konstelacija ljepote.<sup>8</sup> Tajna boje ne skriva se ni u materijalnosti niti u formalnosti odnosa koje slika emanira u svojem značenju. Problem boje od početka je zapadnjačke umjetnosti, a tako je uistinu

inscribes the image. Colour – that already belongs to the sphere of mystery. Asking about colour means thinking beyond the relationship of cause and effect. But there is something even more mysterious than this mystery, and that is how colour comes into this world. What is the constellation in which colour can create new relations in the world (of painting)? How can the “composition” alter the plan of the “construction”, borrowing Klee’s terms from his book *On Modern Art*?<sup>3</sup> Having colour means becoming one with that which painting makes possible in the first place. In Klee’s view of artistic creation, it is the primordial. Having colour means allowing it to perfect or complete, in the act of shaping the world, that which emerges from the mysterious event of encounter between art and the artist, the creation of the artwork and the creator himself. In the eternal creation of the world, as Klee almost neo-gnostically understood the process of informing what “is”, painting becomes an almost paradoxical act of the event. The temporal quality of “the moment” and the flash of “eternity” results from that event. Naming the encounter of coming-into-being of the artwork itself signifies the essence of modern art. The primordial and the modern are thus no longer divided by an abyss. If one recalls that Klee’s predecessor in understanding the painting and the creative act as that which Heidegger called the non-metaphysical mode of thinking in modern art, and that is, of course, Paul Cézanne, called this becoming-one of the painter and the painted a “happy moment”,

one shall see that this *kairos* is situated in the relationship between colour and form. It cannot be eternalized. Instead, one should reflect on the way in which it emerges from the constellation of the historical event. Is it possible to abandon the classical geometric and linear form as the “symbolic form” of the Renaissance<sup>4</sup> and to venture beyond the visible world? In that which makes it possible for the colour to “possess” the painter, while the painter becomes one with the event in which the visible comes into the world, there is no longer any illusion of the objectivity of the painting (*mimesis and representation*) or the lack of its non-objectivity (*destruction and deconstruction of the idea of the painting*). Klee, on the other hand, leads us to “construction” and “composition”. The creative act opens up the world in the activity of formation. What is the meaning of colour in the process of bringing forth the primordial and the future in a painting? Why is it colour, of all things, that is enveloped in such a great mystery in modern art? One should say at once that, with Klee, the differentiation between modern and contemporary art in terms of a gap between the aestheticism of the artwork and the aestheticism of the event loses the significance of an epistemological turn. What one calls today “the visual arts” for pragmatic reason refers merely to a multitude of artistic directions, strategies, and techniques, from painting, photography, and cinema to the body as an idea in the space and time of its performance. To be sure, modern art disappeared when one could no longer define the borders of

modernity as such. This disappearance occurred in the shifts and turns within the notion of the new.<sup>5</sup> Contemporary art, again, is all the more contradictory as its focus on the events of life as art amounts to reproducing the artwork without an original. In its pure form of dematerialization, it persists in space as a void.<sup>6</sup> Klee therefore appeared in the visual art of the 20<sup>th</sup> century like a meteor. Beyond the existing borders of the avantgarde and the neo-avantgarde, his appearance had some features of a miracle. Something similar may be said about Kafka in modern literature. Klee’s position in the modern visual arts reflected the impossibility of retaining the difference between understanding the artwork and event His theory of painting, presented in various essays and aphorisms on art, is most certainly a unique example of creative thinking in which the image and the word come together. The basic idea of painting is revealed in the suggestion that painting does not present or represent the objects that exist in this world. It was already from Van Gogh and up to the early Picasso in his cubist phase that art had ceased to depict objects-in-the-world. The worldliness of the world had already been challenged, both in painting and in language. The discovery of elementary particles in physics and Einstein’s theory of relativity corresponded to the emergence of the idea that painting should create possibilities for a breakthrough beyond the image and the language in the traditional sense of communication instruments. The issue of image and language had ceased to be a question of the mediality

of the medium. Instead, it became a crucial question about the credibility of the image and language as the event of encounter beyond the logic of the subject and its realm of appearances. Painting brings the world to visibility. Thereby the eternal creation of the new subverts the traditional theological image of divine creation. It is not accidentally that Heidegger, having reached the final possibilities of thinking the event, saw in Cézanne and Klee the beginning of a non-metaphysical way of thinking art (*Dichten*). It liberates us from the aforementioned turns and gaps between modern and contemporary art: “What Cézanne had prepared started with Klee.”<sup>7</sup> If art opens up the possibilities of erasing these borders, then it becomes quite clear that Klee’s fascination with colour as the one that subverts the relationship between the painter and his world is more than an epistemic-metaphysical dimension of understanding the very act of creating the world. The diametrical contrasting of colours thus corresponds to their sublime meaning. Starting from the notions of time as the “moment” of temporality and the “flash” of eternity, Klee abandoned two opposed ideas of the essence of time: that of the final and limited nature of time in its epochal beginning and end, and that of the infinite and limitless eternity in uninterrupted duration. The time of creation is neither of these. If it were the first, then modern art would be subject to the law of the avant-garde’s destruction and deconstruction of eternity. And if it were subject to the rule of the divine immutability of the world, it would turn into a

shvaćen i u neoplatonizmu, problem onoga što možemo imenovati simboličkom formom, duhovnim u umjetnosti, ili viškom imaginarnoga na tragu postavke Gottfrieda Boehma o slikovnome obratu (*iconic turn*).<sup>9</sup> O „višku“ se može govoriti samo u odnosu na neki „manjak“. Nije li u modernoj umjetnosti ta operacija dodavanja-oduzimanja sudbinom slikarstva? Što se dodaje mora biti nadomjestak za neki gubitak u samoj „prirodi“ na koju se slika referirala tijekom povijesti umjetnosti. S bojom, dakle, ulazimo u svijet kao događaj koji nas ima, a ne mi njega. A budući da događaj u sebi ima ono kontingentno i podarujuće bez uzvrata, tada se u modernome slikarstvu mora dogoditi još nešto iznenađujuće i naizgled nesuvremeno s obzirom na iskustvo avangarde kao radikalnoga estetsko-političkoga ikonoklazma. S bojom kao simboličkom formom tog nenadanoga i praiskonsko-nadolazećega događaja susrećemo se s tajnom onoga što boja ne prikazuje niti predstavlja. Zagonetka boje kao emanacije božanskoga odnosi se na *mesijansko* u ideji slikarstva. Međutim, prebrzi zaključci o povratku svetoga u modernu umjetnost neće nam pomoći. Jer znamo da se božansko ne iskazuje tek bojom. Čitava tradicija europske umjetnosti neprekinuti je *kristocentrizam*. To se događa čak i u povlačenju božanskoga iz slike. Kandinski o tome kaže: „Slikarstvo je umjetnost, a *umjetnost* općenito *nije nesvrhovito* stvaranje stvari koje se rasplinjuju u prazno, nego svrhovita moć koja mora služiti razvitku u profinjenju ljudske duše – kretanju trokuta. Ona je jezik koji na samo sebi svojstven način govori duši o stvarima,

jezik koji je za dušu *svagdašnji kruh*, jestiv samo u tom obliku.“<sup>10</sup> Problem očito valja sagledati drukčije. Boja ne emanira božansko kao takvo. Umjesto ovoga neoplatonizma za druge svrhe primjerenije je samoj svrsi našega razmatranja ustvrditi da boja nema ni formalno niti materijalno značenje za prikazivanje neprikazivoga, kako to tvrdi Lyotard u analizi suvremene umjetnosti na primjeru Barnetta Newmanna.<sup>11</sup> To nas mora preusmjeriti na drugi put. Vratimo li se Kleeovoj analizi, vidjet ćemo da sada ulaze u igru pojmovi forme izraza i dimenzije slike. Oboje se ne mogu svesti na materijalnost slike. Smisao dobivaju iz simboličke dimenzionalnosti onoga što bojom slici naposljetku podaruje jezik tajne. U svojem tumačenju Walter Benjamin govori preko Kleea o budućnosti kao katastrofi. Anđeo gleda unatrag. Melankolija nužno postaje povijesnom sviješću u znaku tugaljive sjete. I zato se vrijeme ne može uopće prikazati “u” slici, kao što se riječju ne može govoriti više “o” svijetu bez novoga stvaranja svijeta i njegovih boja, oblika i linija. Vrijeme može biti samo simbolička moć boje. Poput rijeke ona ima svoj izvor, ili, pak, više nema ni obale. Anđeo, uostalom, označava svezu *apokalipse* i *aletheie* kao što plava boja u Plotinovu neoplatonskome gnosticizmu upućuje na nadolazeće u čistoj emanaciji vječnosti ideje Boga. Vrijeme se u Kleea zgušnjava do onoga što Leibniz naziva metafizičkim u odnosu na matematičku točku. A to znači da je zlatno-žuta boja u simboličkome horizontu židovsko-kršćanske metafizike Zapada ujedno boja nadolazećega Boga vremena i apokalipse staroga svijeta. Avangarda u Maljeviča

moralu je nužno destruirati svijet boja i uspostaviti ne-boje (crno i bijelo). Nova nepredmetnost konstrukcije formalno je bezoblična. Razlog tome jest što svijet više ne stvara iz čiste ideje. Umjesto toga posrijedi je tehnički plan rasporeda u sklopove. Između sklopova postoji još samo odnos funkcija i struktura, ali ne i međusobno prožimanje jednog s drugime. Nakon Cézannea Klee je bio jedini, a to je pred kraj života zapisao Heidegger u svojim *Dnevnici*ma i *bilješkama*, koji je uputio na umjetnost s onu stranu metafizike. Kako danas misliti odnos otvorenosti u suvremenoj umjetnosti slike ako se performativni obrat u umjetnosti događaja zbiva kao kraj povijesti i implozija vremena u tehno-znanstvenoj konstrukciji virtualnih svjetova? Može li se ono mesijansko i ono melankolično u zahtjevu umjetnosti za „viškom imaginarnoga“ iznova vratiti u sliku kao što se vrijeme sabire u trenutku nastanka svijeta? U ovome razmatranju pokazat će se unutarnja sveza između Heideggerova mišljenja događaja (*Ereignis*) i teologijsko-mesijanskoga tumačenja događaja u analizi Kleeove slike. Na kraju će se pokušati otvoriti pitanje zašto uopće suvremenoj umjetnosti u kinetičkome obratu spram svijeta života boja predstavlja glavni problem s kojim se ono misterijsko i simboličko uvlači u politički i estetski prostor intervencije suvremene umjetnosti u život.

#### Anđeo apokalipse: Klee, *Angelus novus*

Sliku *Angelus Novus* Paul Klee je naslikao 1920. godine. Danas se nalazi u zbirci Židovskoga muzeja u Jeruzalemu. Gershom Scholem

navodi da je slikarev sin Felix Klee u pismu iz ožujka 1972. godine rekao Scholemu da je njegov otac volio slikati Božje glasnike „često i u ljudskoj tragikomici“. <sup>12</sup> Vjerojatno se rijetko događa u povijesti tumačenja neke slike da je tumačenje samoj slici pridodalo još veću „vrijednost“ no što bi je ona imala bez svojega tumača. A uistinu se u tumačenju te slike ne radi ni o kakvome povijesno-umjetničkome pristupu. Štoviše, ono što je slici podarilo tajnu veću no što je čitava povijest modernoga slikarstva nalazi se u jednom fragmentu Waltera Benjamina, točnije, u njegovoj 9. *Povijesno-filozofijskoj tezi*. Fragment ćemo navesti u cijelosti, s mottom pjesme Gershoma Scholema. Razlog je u tome što plastično pokazuje odnos slike i mišljenja kao kazivanja o onome praiskonskome i nadolazećemu:

„Za uzlet mi je spremno krilo  
i sad me povratak veseli,  
jer tu, da stojim život cijeli,  
meni bi malo sreće bilo.

GERSHOM SCHOLEM: *Pozdrav Angelusa*

Postoji Kleeova slika koja se zove *Angelus Novus*. Na njoj je prikazan anđeo koji izgleda kao da se namjerava udaljiti od nečega u što se zagledao. Oči su mu raskolačene, usta otvorena, a krila spremna za let. Anđeo povijesti sigurno tako izgleda. Lice je okrenuto prošlosti. Tamo gdje mi vidimo lanac zгода, on vidi samo

frozen tradition and there would no longer be any place left for what Heidegger called *the second beginning*. Klee shows that the “eternally childlike” in the iconology of his angel, the infantile play with the form of human face in the act of primordial formation, corresponds to the archaic and the eschatological at the same time. But the secret of colour remains in that which appears only after the line and the surface. Why? For Klee, colour is primarily a formal category in the composition of a painting, in a triad of (1) measure, (b) weight, and (3) quality. Quality defines the way in which measure and weight will appear, but certainly not in terms of quantity. Thus everything becomes symbolic. Light and its reflection give the spiritual dimension in encountering beauty. Therefore, what remains a challenge for the contemporary art is the question of the relationship between form and colour. That is the relationship that results in the unique constellation of beauty.<sup>9</sup> The secret of colour is neither in materiality nor in the formality of relations that a painting emanates in its meaning. The problem of colour had been present in Western art from its beginnings, and that is how it was also seen in neo-Platonism, as a problem of what one may call the symbolic form, the spiritual in art, or the surplus of the imaginary, following Gottfried Boehm’s hypothesis on the “iconic turn”.<sup>9</sup> Clearly, a “surplus” always implies some “lack”. Is this operation of adding and subtracting not the destiny of painting in modern art? What is added must be a substitute for some loss in the very “nature” to which the image has been referring throughout art history. Thus, with

colour we enter the world as the event that possesses us, rather than us possessing it. And since the event has the contingent and the giving without return within itself, something surprising and apparently non-contemporary must still happen in modern painting with regard to the experience of the avantgarde as radically iconoclastic in terms of aesthetical policy. With colour, as the symbolic form of that unexpected and primordial-future event, one encounters the mystery of that which colour neither presents nor represents. The riddle of colour as the emanation of the divine refers to the *Messianic* in the idea of painting. However, hasty conclusions about the return of the sacred in modern art will not be help us here, as we know that the divine is not expressed through colour alone. The entire tradition of European art is uninterruptedly *Christocentric*. This happens even when the divine withdraws from the image. Kandinsky said the following: „Painting is an art, and art is not vague production, transitory and isolated, but a power which must be directed to the improvement and refinement of the human soul – to, in fact, the raising of the spiritual triangle.“<sup>10</sup> Obviously, the problem must be approached from a different angle. Colour does not emanate the divine as such. Instead of this neo-Platonism, useful for other purposes, it is more adequate for our purpose here to establish that colour has neither formal nor material significance in presenting the non-presentable, as Lyotard has observed in his analysis of contemporary art on the example of Barnett Newmann.<sup>11</sup> This must direct us to a different path. Coming back to our analysis

of Klee, we shall see that the notions of the form of expression and the dimensions of the painting now enter the discussion. Neither can be reduced to the material nature of the painting. Their meaning comes from the symbolic dimensionality of that which eventually endows the painting with the language of mystery through colour. In his interpretation, Walter Benjamin used Klee to speak of the future as a disaster. The angel is looking backwards. Melancholy necessarily becomes historical awareness in the sense of lamenting nostalgia. And that is why time can no longer be presented “in an image”, same as the words can no longer be used to speak “of” the world without creating the word anew, together with its colours, forms, and lines. Time can only be the symbolic power of colour. Like a river, it has its own source or else cannot have the shores. After all, the angel signifies a link between the *apocalypse* and *aletheia*, in the same way as the blue in Plotinus’ neo-Platonic Gnosticism indicates the future in a pure emanation of the eternal idea of God. For Klee, time condenses to that which Leibniz called metaphysical with regard to the mathematical point – which means that the golden yellow, on the symbolic horizon of the Judeo-Christian metaphysics of the West is also the colour of the coming God of time and the apocalypse of the ancient world. With Malevich, the avantgarde necessarily had to destroy the world of colours and to establish the non-colours (black and white). The new non-objectivity of construction was formally formless and the reason was that the world was no longer created from a pure idea. Instead, there

was a technical plan of cluster distributions. Between the clusters, there was only the relationship of functions and structures, without their interpenetration. After Cézanne, Klee was the only one, as Heidegger wrote towards the end of his life in his *Diaries and Notes*, who wrote of art beyond the metaphysical. How should we think today of the relationship of openness in the contemporary art of the image if the performative turn in art occurs as the end of history and the implosion of time in the technological and scientific construction of virtual worlds? Can the Messianic and the melancholic in the demand of art for the “surplus of the imaginary” be brought back into the image, as the time condenses in the moment when the world is created? In this essay, my aim is to show the internal link between Heidegger’s thinking of the event (*Ereignis*) and the theological-Messianic interpretation of the event in an analysis of Klee’s painting. Eventually, I will raise the question why colour should at all be the main problem for the contemporary art in its kinetic turn towards the world, a problem that involves the mystical and the symbolic in the political and aesthetic space where the contemporary art intervenes into life.

#### The Angel of the Apocalypse: Klee, *Angelus Novus*

Klee painted his *Angelus Novus* in 1920. Today the painting is part of the collection of the Jewish Museum in Jerusalem. Gershom Scholem has mentioned that the painter’s son, Felix Klee, told him in a letter from March 1972 that his father was enticed to paint the

katastrofu koja neprestano gomila razvaline na razvaline i baca ih pred njegove noge. Htio bi još ostati, probuditi mrtve i popraviti razvaljeno. No iz raja dopire vjor koji mu se uhvatio u krila, a tako je jak da ih andeo više ne može sklopiti. Taj ga vjor nezadrživo tjera u budućnost kojoj je okrenuo leđa, dok hrpa razvalina pred njim raste do nebesa. To što nazivamo napretkom, taj je vjor.<sup>13</sup> ……… Zapovijed fenomenologije glasi: k samim stvarima! No, je li to moguće u ovome slučaju? Možemo li, naime, zaboraviti Benjaminov opis i metafizičko tumačenje smisla Kleeove slike i učiniti nešto što bi se moglo nazvati povratkom slici? Kao što je poznato, povratak slici označava geslo jednoga drugoga programa no što je fenomenologija, iako s njom ima dodirne točke. Riječ je o programu interdisciplinarnoga pokreta 1990-ih godina, a u promišljanju istoga razdvojile su se dvije orijentacije: (1) vizualni studiji i ideja *pictorial turna* W.J.T. Mitchella i (2) znanost o slici i ideja *iconic turna* Gottfrieda Boehma.<sup>14</sup> Sažeto rečeno, povratak slici označava oslobađanje slikovnosti slike od moći vladavine jezika. U modernome se slikarstvu u djelima Cézannea i Kleea ta sloboda pokazala nesvodljivom razlikom. Naspram puta kojim je slika nakon razdoblja povijesnih pokreta avangarde krenula u smjeru performativno-konceptualnoga obrata slikarstvo je ostalo posljednjim teritorijem „prirode“. Drugi smjer se danas naslanja na različite pokušaje promišljanja tjelesnosti tijela i njegova okruženja u tehnosferi (od filozofije medija do neuroznanosti, biokibernetike, posthumanizma i transhumanizma).<sup>15</sup> Slika kao boja i tijelo kao

izvedba križaju se u digitalnome dobu konstrukcije same kompozicije. Drugim riječima, nova priroda slike nije više ništa elementarno. Slika se sama tehnički generira. Time nastaje tehnno-estetski doživljaj hiperrealnosti same slike. Doživljaj i privid, tradicionalne kategorije novovjekovne estetike, sada postaju novim kategorijama pristupa događaju kao reproduktivnome djelu. U digitalnome okruženju doživljaj postaje privid realnoga, a privid doživljajem hiperrealnoga.<sup>16</sup> ……… Povratak slici, dakle, čini se da je sliku otputio daleko s onu stranu jezika, u crne rupe dematerijaliziranja. I baš zbog toga potrebno je iznova zaboraviti na ono što je slici navodno imanentno, na ono što se opire naizgled bilo kakvome prodoru zagonetke jezika u njegovu zahtjevu za smislom. Nemoguće je vratiti se slici kao „stvari“ bez istodobnog povratka jeziku kao stvari same. Slika bez svojega jezika tumačenja postoji samo virtualno poput crte i površine u pustinji. Nikakva realnost po-sebi ne postoji za sliku, kao što boja bez refleksije i simboličkoga značenja za promatrača ostaje nešto bezbojno. Monokromatske boje avangarde (crno i bijelo) uvijek su boje za-Drugoga. Same po sebi one nemaju svojstvo niti kvalitete boja. Govor o nepredmetnosti slike, dakle, uvijek je govor o rastemeljenju figurativnoga ili referencijalnoga slikarstva s idejom simboličke konstrukcije svijeta kao boje i oblika. Avangarda s Maljevičem stoga nepredmetni svijet destruirati i dekonstruirati. To čini na taj način što simboličku moć boje svodi na elementarne osjećaje. Monokromatski čin slikanja, za razliku od onoga što tvrdi Klee, crtu

i površinu uzdiže do geometrijskoga lika kao praforme. Dok Klee govori o praiskonskome intenzitetu stvaranja iz preobrazbi oblika i boja, u Maljeviča se, pak, radi o ideji vječne forme kao transcencije slike.<sup>17</sup> Stoga je avangarda paradoksalna u svojem zahtjevu pomirenja racionalnoga i intuitivnoga u umjetnosti. Razaranje slike kao slike predmetnosti određuje racionalnu tvorbu novoga svijeta (bez) slike. Nerazorivost forme pripada prividu vječnosti. Sve je ostalo vrijedno propasti, kako bi rekao Goethe u *Ur-Faustu*. ……… Odnosi između „konstrukcije“ i „kompozicije“, o čemu raspravlja Klee u svojem shvaćanju teorije umjetničkoga stvaranja, sliku postavljaju u svijet, a slikara utjelovljuju u samo tijelo slike. To je značenje one misli iz Kleeova *Dnevnika* kako predmeti gledaju nas, a ne mi njih. Usput, istu je misao u posve drugome kontekstu varirao Jean Baudrillard povodom kritike banalnosti suvremene umjetnosti. Ako predmeti odsad dekonstruiraju nas, umjesto mi njih, na djelu je svojevrсна pobuna objekata nakon kraja subjekta. Sve to otpočinje s idejom Marcela Duchampa o preobrazbi slike kao umjetničkoga djela u estetski objekt (*ready made*).<sup>18</sup> Obrat spram prirode same stvari ujedno znači povratak elementarnim oblicima te iste prirode. Za predokratske Grke priroda je bila temeljem razumijevanja bitka. Ne smije se zaboraviti da moderno slikarstvo prolazi neprestano između dvije prirode i dva tijela. Nije teško zaključiti da to znači prolaz između dva vremena. Prva je pronađena priroda romantike u smislu drugobitka čovjeka, a drugu prirodu avangarda postavlja u

središte novoga svijeta. To je svijet tehnike i tehnologije. Ples na žici između dva svijeta, tijela i vremena, trajna je sudbina suvremene umjetnosti. No, pitanje o odnosu vremena i tehnosfere sada prožima novu prirodu slike nakon uvida Benjamina o karakteru anđela povijesti. Zagledan u prošlost kao katastrofu, budućnost mu se ne čini nimalo spasonosnom. Kada govorimo o slici Paula Kleea *Angelus Novus*, već unaprijed mislimo na sliku kojoj je presudno značenje utisnulo navedeno kratko tumačenje 9. *Povijesno-filozofijske teze* Waltera Benjamina. Sve drugo bilo bi nasilje nad poviješću i vremenom same slike. Bez nje bi, napokon, čitava moderna umjetnost slikarstva ostala praznim imaginarnim muzejom crta, površina i boja. ……… Slika Paula Kleea *Angelus Novus* jedan je od primjera teorije umjetničkoga stvaranja u praksi, kakvu je zastupao sam slikar. Vidjeli smo već da razlikovanje „konstrukcije“ i „kompozicije“ odgovara razlikovanju plana stvaranja i oblikovanja svjetovnosti svijeta. Kada boja ima slikara, tada se svijet oblikuje kao doživljaj i izgled (*eidōs*) biti u pojavi. Osjećaji i forma dva su pojma povijesne avangarde. Unutar nje ekspresionizam ima svoje jasno određeno mjesto. Klee polazi od praiskonskoga kao uvjeta mogućnosti nadolazećega. Otuda djetinje u crtanju zahtijeva jednostavnost izraza. Boje su elementarne poput osjećaja i forme u kojoj su iskazani. „Konstrukcija“ pretpostavlja nešto unaprijed zadano, neku svrhu bez svrhe, ideju stvaranja, dok „kompozicija“ smjera u oblikovanje svijeta kao slučaja. Mogućnosti slike polaze od mogućnosti razlike

messengers of the gods “often even in human tragicomedy.”<sup>12</sup> It does not happen all too often in art history that an interpretation has added to a painting’s “value”. And in fact, this interpretation has nothing to do with an art-historical approach. Moreover, it has endowed the painting with a greater mystery than that which the entire history of modern painting has found in a single fragment from the work of Walter Benjamin, more precisely in his 9<sup>th</sup> *Thesis on the Philosophy of History*. I will quote the fragment in full, together with the motto from a poem by Gershom Scholem, as it illustrates well the relationship between the painting and thought as a narration on the primordial and the future:

“My wing is ready for flight,  
I would like to turn back.  
If I stayed [in] timeless time,  
I would have little luck.

GERSHOM SCHOLEM: *Gruss vom Angelus*

A Klee painting named *Angelus Novus* shows an angel looking as though he is about to move away from something he is fixedly contemplating. His eyes are staring, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how one pictures the angel of history. His face is turned toward the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to

stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such violence that the angel can no longer close them. This storm irresistibly propels him into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. This storm is what we call progress.”<sup>13</sup> ……… The mandate of phenomenology is: back to the actual things! But is it possible in this case? For can we forget Benjamin’s description and metaphysical interpretation of Klee’s painting and undertake something that might be considered as a return to the image? It is known that the “return to the image” has been a motto of another programme beside phenomenology, albeit close to it. It was an interdisciplinary movement during the 1990s, with two different currents: (1) the visual studies and the “pictorial turn” of W.J.T. Mitchell and (2) research in the image and the “iconic turn” of Gottfried Boehm.<sup>14</sup> Briefly, the return to the image meant liberating its pictorial quality from the power and domination of language. In modern painting, in paintings by Cézanne and Klee, that freedom proved an irreducible difference. Contrary to the path that the image took after the historical avantgarde movements, namely in the direction of a performative-conceptual turn, painting remained the last domain of “nature”. Another current today relies on various attempts at thinking the corporeality of the body and its environment in the techno-sphere (from the philosophy of the media to neuroscience, bio-cybernetics, post-humanism, and

trans-humanism).<sup>15</sup> The image as colour and the body as performance intersect in the digital era of constructing the very composition. In other words, the new nature of the image is no longer elementary. The image generates itself technically, which creates a technological-aesthetical experience of its hyperreality. Experience and appearance, the traditional categories of early modern aestheticism, have now turned into the new categories of approaching the event as a work of reproduction. In the digital setting, experience has turned into the appearance of the real, and appearance into the experience of the hyperreal.<sup>16</sup> ……… Thus, the return to the image seems to have launched it far beyond language, into the black holes of dematerialization. And it is for this reason that we must again forget what is supposed to be inherent to the image, what seems to resist any penetration of the linguistic riddle in its search for the meaning. It is impossible to return to the image as a “thing” without also returning to language as a thing in itself. Without its language, the image exists only virtually, like a line and a surface in the desert. No reality in-itself is there for the image, in the same way as colour, without a reflection and a symbolic meaning, remains something colourless for the observer. The monochromatic colours of the avantgarde (black and white) are always colours for-the-Other. In themselves, they have neither the properties nor the quality of colours. All discourse on the non-objectivity of the image is thus a discourse on depriving the figurative or referential painting of its *raison-d’être*, with the idea of

symbolically constructing the world in terms of colours and forms. Malevich’s avantgarde therefore destroyed and deconstructed the non-objective world by reducing the symbolic power of colour to elementary emotions. The monochromatic act of painting, contrary to what Klee stated, elevated the line and the surface to a geometrical form as a proto-form. Whereas Klee spoke of the primordial intensity of creation from a transformation of forms and colours, Malevich adhered to the idea of the eternal form as that which transcended the image.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, the avantgarde was paradoxical in its demand of reconciliation between the rational and the intuitive in art. Destruction of the image as an image of objectivity determines the rational creation of the new world of/without the image. The indestructibility of form belongs to the appearance of eternity. Everything else is worthy of perishing, as Goethe said in his *Ur-Faust*. ……… The relations between “construction” and “composition”, discussed by Klee in his view of the theory of artistic creation, place the image into the world and embody the painter in the very body of the image. That is the meaning of that phrase from Klee’s *Diary* where he says that the objects look at us, not we at them. By the way, the same thought, although in a completely different context, was expressed by Jean Baudrillard in his critique of the banality of contemporary art. If the objects now deconstruct us instead of vice versa, it is a sort of rebellion of the objects following the end of the subject. All that began with Marcel Duchamp’s idea of the transformation of image

u stvaranju svijeta. Što je veća mogućnost različitih svjetova to su manje mogućnosti slike. Kako objasniti taj paradoks? Jednostavno, kao što se izvornik slike umnožava u svojoj reprodukciji, tako se umnažanje svjetova svodi na nesvodljiv zajednički nazivnik stvaranja. A budući da je stvaranje uvijek ili ulančani niz istoga ili prekid kontinuiteta, onda se mogućnosti slike različitih svjetova svode na razliku između izvornika i kopije. U Benjaminovu razumijevanju umjetničkoga djela s dolaskom novih medija poput fotografije i filma glavni problem nije u tehničkoj reproduktivnosti djela, nego u gubitku aure samoga djela. Auru ne čini ništa drugo nego ono sveto u prostoru-vremenu slike. Nestankom kulta kao događaja svetosti u prostoru-vremenu aura se nastoji vratiti u modernoj umjetnosti različitim strategijama nadomjeska.<sup>19</sup> Film je tako sekularna profanacija izgubljene svetosti umjetničkoga djela. Nakana mu je uspostava viška zbiljskoga nad imaginarnim.<sup>20</sup> Stoga su današnji filmovi vizualizacija hiperrealnoga. Tehnički proizvedene boje nadomještaju „prirodu“ izgubljene svetosti. Nije slučajno filmska estetika 1920-ih godina bila u znaku ekspresivne gestualnosti snova i ludila namjesto viška zbilje. Nedostatak zbilje nadoknađivan je monokromnom (crno-bijelom) estetikom transgresivnoga. Ludilo i san pripadaju toj crno-bijeloj gestualnosti filmova europske avangarde 1920-ih. Umjetnost slikarstva, prema Kleeu, jest u tome da ono nevidljivo (kaos i neoblikovno) dovede do vidljivosti (poretka i smisla). Kada se to ima u vidu, tada ono što u pismu Scholemu kaže Felix Klee, kako je njegov otac

volio slikati anđele i zato što je u njima vidio „tragikomiku“, dobiva novo značenje. Povijest se pojavljuje u dvostrukome značenju. Ponajprije, povijest se zbiva kao događanje iskonske vremenitosti, i, drugo, povijest se odigrava kao doživljaj samoga događaja unutar simboličkih formi umjetnosti. Za Kleea se umjetnost jedina može prisposobiti ideji vječnoga stvaranja. Razlog je u tome što umjetnost ne oponaša (*mimesis*) zbilju. Slikarstvom se uzdiže do oblika nove zbilje. A ona predstavlja (*representatio*) istinsku prirodu stvari. No, oblikotvornost svijeta u simboličkome značenju duhovnoga susreta umjetnika i božanskoga u ideji vječnoga stvaranja nemoguće je uspostaviti bez tajne dolaska do vidljivoga (svijeta). Boja nužno preuzima ulogu tajne. Oblik (*eidos*) znamenjuje otuda svijet u njegovoj višeznačnosti. Pogledajmo kako Klee objašnjava zašto se boja smješta u ono što označava pojam dimenzionalnosti. Trodimenzionalni prostor slike obuhvaća crta, površina i boja. Dubina slike u ekspresionističkome shvaćanju nije ništa drugo negoli odnos crte i površine bez dodatne iluzije perspektive. Kada u takav prostor praiskonskoga shvaćanja stvaranja kao oblikovanja svijeta dolazi boja, više ništa nije isto. Može se čak reći da boja crta likove, a ne da ih estetizira ili ukrašava. Boja ne može nipošto biti svedena na ornament jer bi slika time izgubila duhovni smisao, ono što nadilazi prikazivost-predstavljivost u-slici. Realizam nastoji oko pseudovidljivosti predmeta. Slikarstvo koje ima u vidu Klee ulazi u tajnu prirode tako što se ne služi ni mikroskopom, a niti iskustvima povijesti prirode

kao paleontologije. Lik i crta ne mogu biti u suprotnosti ako ih povezuje nešto treće. Jednako tako površina i dubina kao dimenzije gube na oprečnosti kada dimenzija visine sklapa dužinu i širinu u duhovni sklop kojim se slika očitava u otvorenosti tajne bez dodatka svetoga. S bojom se stoga nalazimo na poprištu „golemih fragmenata značenja“. Što odlikuje stil kakvim se razlikuje od klasicizma i romantike jest kompozicija boja. Bogatstvo značenja koje boje emaniraju u kompoziciji slike za Kleea je pouzdan dokaz da slika proizlazi iz „svetoga trojstva“ otvorenosti trodimenzionalnoga prostora spram onoga tko gleda. Biti-gledan u otvorenosti svijeta znači biti oslikan ili obojan ljepotom samoga stvaranja. U trenutku simultanosti vremena slike stapaju se ono gledano i promatrač. Trenutak kojim slikar postaje umjetnikom kao stvarateljem svijeta za Kleea može biti samo onaj sretni čas kada ga boja ima ili posjeduje. Oproštaj od lažnoga kraljevstva novovjekovnoga subjekta nastaje upravo u tom času. Slikar ne slika više predmete u-svijetu kao osamostaljene objekte pogleda. Naprotiv, sada se događa otvorenost prirode u njezinoj fenomenologijskoj čistoći. Priroda ulazi u sliku bojom iskonske svjetlosti. To je ono što uopće omogućuje nastanak svijeta. Ali isto tako time nastaje razlika slike i oslikanoga, bitka i bića. Opreke figurativnoga i apstraktnoga slikarstva, kako je to vidio Heidegger u shvaćanju ne-metafizičke otvorenosti slike, gube na važnosti. Sve su to tek izvanjske značajke modernoga slikarstva. Kleeovo slikarstvo može se nazvati „figurativnom apstrakcijom“, ili,

Heideggerovim riječima, „polu-apstrakcijom“. Tako je i sa zagonetnom slikom *Angelus Novus*. Postoji jedno mjesto u ogledu Gershoma Scholema o Benjaminu i njegovome tumačenju Kleeove amblematske slike koje zaslužuje osobitu pozornost. Čini se da ono dotiče začudnu svezu između jezika same slike i Benjaminova tumačenja u 9. *Povijesno-filozofijskoj tezi*. Na neizravan način pokazuje se ključnim za razumijevanje boje u modernoj i suvremenoj umjetnosti. Razlog zašto boja i u prijelazu između estetike djela u estetiku događaja – od slike kao okvira do slike kao reprodukcije i tjelesne virtualne prisutnosti – ima toliku važnost u životnome svijetu estetiziranja tijela zacijelo se nalazi u njezinome kompozicijskome ustrojstvu. Možemo čak reći, kleeovski, da se u suvremenoj umjetnosti dokidanja granica između života i umjetnosti sama kompozicija svijeta događa kao konstrukcija boje. Pritom boja poprima estetsko iskustvo „doživljaja“ i „privida“ nove stvarnosti. Ovdje više ne vrijede kategorije klasične, a ni moderne filozofije umjetnosti poput mjere, harmonije, proporcije, ljepote i uzvišenosti. No, ono što preostaje i u tom činu virtualizacije zbiljskoga jest „višak imaginarnoga“. Wittgenstein je to nazvao pojmom mistike faktičnosti. Nije svijet mističan zbog toga što u sebi ima višak neiskazivoga u smislu transcendencije. Mistika, naprotiv, proizlazi iz tako-bitka samoga svijeta. Umjesto pitanja o „što“ (*quidditas*), pravo je čudo u „da“ (*quodditas*) svijet uopće jest.<sup>23</sup> Za Jamesa Joycea se bit umjetnosti skriva u mističnoj riječi *epifanija*.

as a work of art into an aesthetical object (a *ready-made*).<sup>18</sup> This turn regarding the nature of things as such also meant a return to the elementary forms of that very nature. For the pre-Socratic Greeks, nature was a basis for understanding the being. One should keep in mind that modern painting constantly oscillated between two natures and two bodies, and it is not difficult to conclude that it also meant oscillating between two times. The first nature was the nature of romanticism in the sense of man's other-being, while the second was placed by the avantgarde into the centre of the new world, which was the world of technology. Dance on the wire between two worlds, bodies, and times is the permanent fate of all contemporary art. However, the issue of the relationship between time and the techno-sphere now permeates the new nature of the image, after Benjamin's insight about the character of the angel of history. Staring at the past as a catastrophe, the future seems anything else but salvific. When speaking of Klee's *Angelus Novus*, we already think of a painting that was crucially determined and imprinted by the brief interpretation in Benjamin's 9<sup>th</sup> *Thesis on the Philosophy of History*. Everything else would mean violating the history and time of the painting as such. After all, without it all modern painting would have remained merely an empty imaginary museum of lines, surfaces, and colours. Klee's *Angelus Novus* is an example of the theory of artistic creation in practice, such as endorsed by the painter himself. It has been said above that differentiating between

“construction” and “composition” corresponded to differentiating between the levels of creation and formation of the worldliness of the world. When colour possesses the painter, the world is formed as the event and the form (*eidos*) of the essence in appearance. Emotions and form are two notions from the historical avantgarde, within which expressionism has a clearly defined place. Klee started from the primordial as a condition for the possibility of future. That is why the childlike quality of his drawing demanded the simplicity of expression. The colours are elementary, such as the emotions and the form in which they are expressed. “Construction” presupposes something that is given in advance, a purpose without a purpose, an idea of creation, while “composition” aims at forming the world as an accident. The possibilities of an image start from the possibilities of a difference in creating the world. The greater the possibility of various worlds, the fewer the possibilities of the image. How can we explain this paradox? Simply, it is because the original image is multiplied in its reproduction, and thus the multiplication of worlds is reduced to the irreducible common denominator of creation. And since creation is always either a chained series of the same or an interruption in continuity, the possibilities of the image of various worlds are reducible to the difference between the original and its copy. In Benjamin's understanding of the work of art after the arrival of the new media, such as photography and film, the main problem is not the possibility of its technological reproduction, but

the loss of aura in the artwork as such. The aura is nothing else but the sacred in the space-time of the image. With the disappearance of the cult as the event of the sacred in space-time, the aura seeks to return in modern art by using various strategies of substitution.<sup>19</sup> Thus, cinema is the secular profanation of the artwork's lost sacredness. Its aim is to establish the surplus of the real over the imaginary.<sup>20</sup> It is for this reason that today's films are visualizations of the hyperreal. Technologically generated colours substitute the “nature” of the lost sacredness. It is not perchance that the aesthetics of the cinema in the 1920s was marked by expressive gestures of dreams and lunacy instead of the surplus of reality. The lack of reality was made up for by the use of the monochrome (black and white) aesthetics of transgression. Lunacy and dreams belong to that black and white gestuality of the European avantgarde cinema in the 1920s. The art of painting, according to Klee, is in bringing the invisible (chaos and the unformed) to visibility (order and meaning). When keeping that in mind, what Felix Klee wrote to Scholem in that letter, namely that his father liked painting angels also because of the “tragicomedy” that he saw there, acquires a completely new meaning. History appears in a double sense. First of all, it occurs as the event of primordial temporality, and secondly, it takes place as the event of the event itself within the symbolic forms of art. For Klee, only art can be compared to the idea of eternal creation. The reason is that art does not imitate (*mimesis*) the reality. Painting elevates to the

forms of a new reality, which represents (*representatio*) the true nature of things. However, the formation of the world in the symbolic sense of a spiritual encounter between the artist and the divine in the idea of eternal creation cannot be established without the mystery of reaching the visible (world). Colour necessarily takes on the role of the mystery, while form (*eidos*) marks the world in its multiplicity of meanings. Let us see how Klee explains why colour belongs to that which is defined as dimensionality. The three-dimensional space of the painting consists of lines, surfaces, and colours. For the expressionists, the depth of the image was nothing else than the relationship between the line and the surface, without the additional illusion of perspective. Once colour enters this space of primordial understanding creation as the formation of the world, nothing remains the same. One may even say that colour draws the figures, rather than aestheticizing or decorating them. Colour can by no means be reduced to a mere ornament, as the painting would then lose its spiritual meaning, that which surpasses the presentability/representability-in-image. Realism seeks to establish a pseudo-visibility of the object. Painting as seen by Klee penetrates the secret of nature although it uses neither a microscope nor the insights of the history of nature in terms of palaeontology. The figure and the line can never be opposed if linked through something else. By the same token, surface and depth cease to be oppositions once the dimension of height combines length and width into a spiritual complex in which the painting reveals itself in the openness of mystery



Scholem o tome kaže sljedeće: „Stoga je primjereno uputiti na aspekte Benjaminove ličnosti i mišljenja koje njegovi današnji interpretatori nisu dotakli ili su ga zbunjeni gurnuli u stranu. A tome pripada, možda najprije, njegova veza s mističnom tradicijom i mističnim iskustvom, a što nipošto nije iskustvo Boga koje mnogi simplifikatori proglašavaju kao jedino koje zaslužuje naziv mistično. Benjamin je znao, da je mistično iskustvo višeslojno, a upravo ta višeslojnost igra tako veliku ulogu u njegovu mišljenju i njegovoj produkciji.“<sup>24</sup> O mističnome iskustvu Benjaminova odnosa spram Kleeove slike *Angelus Novus* sam je Scholem napisao nenadmašan ogleđ. Ta slika nije, dakle, tek jedna slika moderne umjetnosti koja zaslužuje posebnu pozornost. Posve suprotno, za Benjaminu je ta slika paradigmatikom slikom ideje povijesti kao katastrofe. Mesijansko vrijeme na kraju povijesti kao „tragikomike“ pretpostavlja bitno dovršenu povijest svijeta s onu stranu razlike profanoga i svetoga. Mistično iskustvo utkano je u povijest tumačenja ove slike toliko dramatski da se život jednog filozofskoga esejista u mračna vremena razaranja povijesti dolaskom nacizma na vlast u Njemačkoj pretvorio u ahasversko lutanje između dviju postaja u neizmjerne pustini. Stoga govor o „višeslojnosti“ iskustva mističnoga u Benjaminovu razumijevanju umjetnosti prije svega valja shvatiti naputkom za daljnje istraživanje uloge boje u slikarstvu i nadomjesnim medijima kao što su fotografija i film. Ako Bog nije početak i kraj mističnoga iskustva, tada preostaju raznolike forme u kojima neiskazivost slike dolazi na

vidjelo. U jeziku kontingencije i performativnosti to je osobito uočljivo. Ovdje se nećemo baviti iskustvom mističnoga u Kabali. Scholem je na tom polju udario pečat filozofijskome pristupu židovskome misticizmu 20. stoljeća.<sup>25</sup> Mnogo nam je važnije pokazati kako se mistično iskustvo u analizi jedne slike sabralo u razlikovanju povijesnoga od mesijanskoga vremena. Prije no što izvedemo daljnje mogućnosti čitanja Benjaminove analize Kleeove slike, valja se fenomenologijski ograditi od slici neprimjerenih asocijacija. Klee, naime, slika svojega anđela izabirući boje izvan ikonologijske tradicije. Umjesto plave boje bestjelesnosti i nevinosti bića kao glasnika Božje riječi u kršćanstvu, Klee dekonstruira simboličku tradiciju. Njegov *Novi Anđeo* oslikan je u nijansama žuto-zlatne boje. Lik mu je upravo onaj o kojem u vlastitoj teoriji umjetničkoga stvaranja govori kao o „vječnom djetinjem“. Nije riječ o djetetu kao anđelu. Anđeoski lik sveden je na figuru djeteta, ali bez značajki infantilnosti. Štoviše, figura anđela u Kleea srodna je onome što u Maljevičevu suprematizmu označava ideja forme. Figurom se apstrakcija dovodi do ideje praforme. Na slici se ne prikazuje lik. Naprotiv, ideja same slike jest u „kompozicijskoj konstrukciji“ razlike između tradicije i modernosti. U toj razlici ono što povezuje razdvojeno jest sama figura anđela u žuto-zlatnome. Ali to je već bitno dovedeno do „tragikomike“ povijesti zbog toga što anđelu krila stoje obješenima i što je zagledan u prošlost. Melankolija proizlazi iz tragikomike povijesti. Naprijed se više ne može jer je ono nadolazeće u znaku

katastrofe, a natrag je ionako ispunjeno ruševinama i smrću. Kleeov se anđeo pokazuje uistinu čistom idejom *novoga* kao bezuvjetnoga napretka. To je slika u kojoj je oslikana bit vremena modernoga doba. Benjamin ju je otčitao u znakovima melankolije i apokalipse. *Angelus Novus* je anđeo apokalipse. Njegova je boja ona koja dolazi iz zemlje, iz mističnoga iskustva susreta neba i podzemlja, božanskoga i smrtnoga. To je hibridna boja gnijileži i zlata, onoga što usahnjuje i nestaje u ništavilu svega i onoga što podaruje događaj života. Nendarativnost slike, međutim, govori više od priče poznate iz različitih izvora židovske i kršćanske eshatologije i soteriologije. Anđeo se uvijek pojavljuje glasnikom Božje riječi. To je figura kazivajućega poslanstva u smislu znamenovanja onoga nadolazećega. Dvije su mogućnosti znamenovanja: uništenje/propast i spas. Samoizvjesno je otuda da se glasnik nadolazećega nužno pojavljuje u slici, a ne u govoru koji ima apofantičke crte. Hermetička je tradicija kršćanstva kao i židovskoga misticizma bliska grčkome shvaćanju hermeneutike slike, budući da glasnik bogova, Hermes, istodobno povezuje dva svijeta, onaj neba i onaj podzemlja. Apokalipsa, dakle, pretpostavlja cilj i svrhu povijesnoga razvitka. I sam Krist u *Knjizi Otkrivenja* kaže: „Jer stari svijet prođe: Gle, sve novo činim!“ No, Benjaminovo je tumačenje „tragikomike“ Kleeove slike višeznačno i višeslojno. Uostalom, takva je i sama slika u svojoj zatvorenoj otvorenosti. Njezine su boje u znaku ugasloga sjaja, usahnuća i jednolikosti. No, kako dolazimo do toga da slici pripisujemo ozračje i tonalitit apokaliptičnoga ugođaja?

Odgovor se skriva iznova u faktičnosti mističnoga iskustva. Do mističnoga iskustva ne dolazimo izravno, nego posredno. Uostalom, figurom anđela imenujemo medij onoga što se slikom usmjerava u neprikazivost. Istina slike sabire se u izvan-slikovnosti, kao što se bit jezika pokazuje u kazivanju događaja, kako to kaže Heidegger.<sup>26</sup> Bit slikovnoga u slici *Angelus Novus* leži u mističnome iskustvu događaja kraja povijesti kao apokalipse same istine o smislu povijesti. No, sve je to slici pripisano. Ima li sama slika nešto autonomno, navlastito svoje, ili je Klee tek slikar simboličkoga u ruhu „figurativne apstrakcije“? Čini se da je odgovor u onome što sam Klee u već navođenim mislima o modernoj umjetnosti tvrdi o boji. Riječ je o „kompoziciji“ kao konstrukciji svijeta iz praiskonskoga razumijevanja odnosa crte i površine. A boja ne pridolazi slici naknadno, kao „treća ruka“ s kojom se slika dovršava u svojem značenju. Boja *Angelusa Novusa* odlučuje o smislu slike. Slici kao novome svijetu boja daruje samo ono što povijest i vrijeme sabiru do događaja slikovnosti svijeta. Scholem upravo to naziva višeslojnim mističnim iskustvom. Slika tek sada ima svoje dostojanstvo. Više se ne svodi na priču ili ukras. Anđeo je u „novosti“ istodobno svagda nov i uvijek već onaj isti. Vrijeme u kojem se njegovo poslanstvo događa za Kleea predstavlja „tragikomiku“ povijesti. Da parafraziramo Borgesa iz *Apokrifnoga Evandjelja* gdje kaže da vrata biraju, ne čovjek: boje slikaju, ne slikar! Uostalom, Klee je ovu misao epifanijski zapisao u *Dnevnik* kao *credo* slikarstva i umjetnosti. Sada vidimo da boja u

without the addition of the sacred. Thus, with colour we are truly in the realm of the “tremendous fragments of meaning.”<sup>21</sup> What is characteristic of the style, in terms of difference with regard to classicism or romanticism, is the composition of colours. For Klee, the richness of meanings that colours emanate in the composition of a painting are a positive proof that the painting results from the “holy trinity” of openness of the three-dimensional space toward the observer. To be-observed in the openness of the world means to be painted or coloured with the beauty of creation. In the moment of temporal simultaneity of the image, the observed and the observer merge. For Klee, the moment in which the painter becomes an artist as the creator of the world can only be that happy moment when colour possesses him. This is the very moment of abandoning the false kingdom of the early modern subject. The painter no longer paints objects in-the-world as the autonomous objects of the gaze. Quite the contrary: what occurs now is the openness of nature in all its phenomenological purity. Nature enters the painting with the colour of primordial light. That is what makes the creation of the world possible in the first place. But that also creates a difference between the painting and the painted, the essence and the being. The opposition between figurative and abstract painting, as seen by Heidegger in his understanding of the non-metaphysical openness of the image, lose their importance. They are only the external features of modern painting. Klee’s painting may be characterized as “figurative abstraction” or, borrowing the term from Heidegger,

“semi-abstraction”.<sup>22</sup> The same can be said of the mysterious painting *Angelus Novus*. There is a place in Gershon Scholem’s essay on Benjamin and his interpretation of Klee’s emblematic painting which deserves special attention. It seems to touch upon the striking connection between the language of the painting itself and Benjamin’s interpretation in his 9<sup>th</sup> *Thesis on the Philosophy of History*. In an indirect way, it proves crucial for understanding colours in modern and contemporary art. The reason why colour has such an importance in the life world of aestheticizing the body, even in the passage from the aestheticism of the artwork to the aestheticism of the event – from the image as a framework to the image as a reproduction and the corporal virtual presence – is certainly its compositional structure. We may even say, following Klee, that in the contemporary art, which erases the borders between life and art, the very composition of the world occurs as a construction of colour. Thereby colour acquires the aestheticism of the “experience” and “appearance” of the new reality. The categories of classical or modern philosophy of art, such as measure, harmony, proportion, beauty, and sublimity, no longer apply here. However, what remains even in this act of virtualizing the real is the “surplus of the imaginary.” Wittgenstein described it as the mysticism of the factual. It is not that the world is mystical because it contains the surplus of the unutterable in terms of transcendence. On the contrary, mysticism comes from the thus-being of the world as such. Instead of the question of “what” (*quidditas*), the true miracle is in

“that” (*quodditas*) the world is at all.<sup>23</sup> For James Joyce, the essence of art resided in the mystical word “epiphany”. Scholem says the following: „It is, therefore, appropriate to point to aspects of Benjamin’s person and thought that are neglected by his current interpreters, or cast aside embarrassedly. To these belong, and perhaps above all else, his ties to the mystical tradition and to a mystical experience which nevertheless was a far cry from the experience of God, proclaimed by so many oversimplifying minds as the only experience deserving to be called mystical. Benjamin knew that mystical experience is many-layered, and it was precisely this many-layeredness that played so great a role in his thinking and in his productivity.”<sup>24</sup> On the mystical experience of Benjamin’s relation to Klee’s *Angelus Novus*, Scholem has written an unsurpassable essay. That painting is, therefore, not merely a painting of modern art that deserves some special attention. Quite the contrary: for Benjamin, this painting was the paradigmatic image of the idea of history as a catastrophe. The Messianic time in the end of history as “tragicomedy” supposes the essentially completed history of the world, beyond the difference between the profane and the sacred. Mystical experience has been interwoven into the history of interpretation of this painting to such a dramatic extent that the life of a philosophical essayist in the dark age of historical destruction after the rise of Nazism in Germany was transformed into an Ahasuerian wandering between two points in an immense desert. Thus, the discourse of the “multi-layeredness” of mystical

experience in Benjamin’s understanding of art must be understood primarily as an instruction for further exploration of the role of colour in painting and its substitute media, such as photography and cinema. If God is not the beginning and the end of mystical experience, then there are many other forms in which the unutterable nature of the image comes to the fore. That is particularly evident in the language of contingency and performativity. I do not intend to address here the mystical experience in Kabala. In that regard, Scholem has made a seminal contribution to the philosophical approach to Jewish mysticism in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>25</sup> For our purpose, it is far more important to show how the mystical experience condensed in an analysis of a painting, in differentiating the historical time from the Messianic one. Before making any conclusions on the further possibilities of reading Benjamin’s analysis of Klee’s painting, one should express some phenomenological reservations with regard to any inadequate associations. For Klee painted his angel with colours chosen outside of the iconological tradition. Instead of using blue, the colour of immateriality and innocence characteristic of the messenger of God’s word in Christianity, Klee deconstructed the symbolic tradition and painted his *New Angel* in hues of yellow and gold. His figure is precisely what his own theory of artistic creation referred to as the “eternally childlike”. It is not about a child as an angel. The angel’s figure has been reduced to that of a child, but without any infantile features. Moreover, Klee’s angel-figure comes close to that which was in Malevich’s

modernome slikarstvu ne služi opisu predmeta ni u klasičnome niti u realističkome prosedeu. Njom se ništa više ne prikazuje niti predstavlja. Vidjet ćemo da boja nadsvođuje putove u promišljanju umjetnosti na navlastit način. I to tako da modernu umjetnost povezuje s mističnim iskustvom u suvremenoj umjetnosti. To je posebno isticao videoumjetnik Bill Viola u vlastitome odnosu spram iskustva *mističnoga oka* u španjolskome baroknome shvaćanju kompozicije slike od El Greca do Goye.<sup>27</sup> Tihi razgovor između slikara ujedno je spor i razrješenje spora u nastavku razgovora. Boja posređuje spor i razgovor između Paula Kleea i Anselma Kiefera s obzirom na mistično iskustvo neprikazivoga i melankolično razumijevanje povijesti. ……… U tom smislu valja se prisjetiti Kleeova stava iz spisa *O modernoj umjetnosti* da slikar s obzirom na odnose „konstrukcije“ i „kompozicije“ u slici dovodi u svezu ono neiskazivo i ono iskazivo kao što filozof svojim idejama konstruira novu zbilju. Boje su slikaru ono što pojmovi znače za filozofa. Naposljetku, sve to okončava s mišlju da točke u povijesnome kontinuitetu nisu ovdje u funkciji prve i posljednje istine na putu. Neognostički čin *vječnoga stvaranja* sjedinjuje simboličko iskustvo boje od onoga praiskonskoga do nadolazećega. Mistika se skriva u višeslojnosti onoga što iz nevidljivoga dolazi u vidljivi svijet. Zato boja ne prikazuje (*mimesis*) i ne predstavlja (*representatio*) nešto i nekoga. Isto tako, bojom se ne emanira značenje vječnoga i nepromjenljivoga (bitka). Klee jasno pokazuje da je boja završni čin. Njime crta na površini dolazi do

oblika slike. Stoga kompozicija označava stvaranje svijeta, dolazak u-svijet iz ništavila (ne-boje) u svjetlost otvorenosti gdje sve što jest ima svoje boje i svoje mjesto u postajanju svijetom umjetničkim djelom.<sup>28</sup> U izreci od predslikovnoga do praslikovnoga (*vom Vorbildichen zum Urbildlichen*) Klee govori o vlastitome putu slikanja. Okret spram iskonskoga prisutan je u toj izreci. Kada više nema predmeta na koje se odnosi boja, preostaje tek nepredmetnost suprematizma kao u Kazimira Maljeviča, ili, pak, nadomještanje umjetničkoga predmeta estetskim objektom kao u Marcela Duchampa. Obje su putanje odredile sudbinu suvremene umjetnosti. Kleeovo rješenje ostalo je poput stanja-između. Možemo ga nazvati „trećim putem“. Tek sada kad smo ušli u stanje dematerijalizacije slike u tehnosferi virtualnosti taj put iznova postaje izazovom. Ništa se, ipak, ne može vratiti na ishodište. U tome je veličina kako Kleeove tajne slikarstva i slike *Angelus Novus* tako i Benjaminova tumačenja odnosa povijesnoga i mesijanskoga vremena „nakon oluje“.

#### Povratak Düreru: Melankolija sadašnjosti

Nije sve završeno s Benjaminovim tumačenjem Kleeove zagonetne slike. U posljednje vrijeme jedan put tumačenja otvorio je drukčije viđenje već nazrijetih problema. Riječ je o čitanju Giorgia Agambena. Usmjerenost je analize na simboličko značenje anđela u tumačenju povijesne avanture čovjeka. Obnova pojma melankolije u suvremenoj filozofiji i vizualnoj umjetnosti kao da se podudara s propitivanjem

granica iskazivosti dvaju diskursa suvremenoga doba. Agamben u svojoj analizi upućuje tako na anđela iz Dürerove *Melankolije I* iz 1514. godine. Pritom se poziva na poznato ikonologijsko tumačenje Panofskoga. Anđeo je shvaćen idejom umjetnosti. No, ono što izaziva posebnu pozornost jest Agambenov stav da Kleeov anđeo ne može biti svjedokom oluje napretka. To je ono što se kosi s Benjaminovim stavom. U 9. *Povijesno-filozofijskoj tezi* pokazuje se, naime, da između prošlosti i onoga nadolazećega više nema spona. Može biti riječi samo o posvemašnjem prekidu između tradicije i modernosti. Furija novoga stoga nužno mora biti apokaliptički udes povijesti. Agamben, naprotiv, vidi u umjetnosti nešto bitno spasonosno.<sup>29</sup> Utoliko je njegovo čitanje Benjaminove analize Kleeove slike mnogo više izvedeno hajdegerijanski negoli se to može na prvi pogled vidjeti. Radi se o postavci Heideggera o umjetnosti kao spasonosnome začetku *drugoga početka*. U opsesivnome bavljenju Kleeom pred kraj života, Heidegger je vidio ono isto što i u pjesništvu Hölderlina – mogućnost prebolijevanja metafizičkoga horizonta povijesti. Umjetnost mu je postala istinskom mogućnošću drukčijega mišljenja iz koje ono spasonosno omogućuje nadolazećega Boga s onu stranu čitave metafizičke tradicije.<sup>30</sup> ……… Agamben tvrdi da anđeo koji povezuje figuru u Dürera i Kleea nije drugo negoli anđeo nemogućnosti veze između prošlosti (tradicije) i sadašnjosti (modernosti). Ali ta se nemogućnost pojavljuje samo zato što je vrijeme u modernome svijetu postalo mjerom vremena čitave povijesti. Bezuvjetni napredak u vulgarnoj

ekstazi aktualnosti sve je stvari sveo na kvantitativnost i težinu onoga prolaznoga i promjenljivoga. Zato Agamben u Dürerovu anđelu prepoznaje bit melankolije, jer u njemu znanje ima prednost nad istinom, a volja za patnjom nastaje iz estetske prakse. Tako se svako stvaranje novoga zbiva kao već uvijek čin neprestanoga ponavljanja staroga. Problem koji otvara Agamben u svojem tumačenju nije više problem Benjamina. Umjesto razlike između povijesnoga i mesijanskoga vremena sada je sama razlika, ono stanje-između, dovedena u pitanje. Kraj povijesti s kojim dolazi anđeo Apokalipse najavljuje „novo“ vrijeme. No, što ako je to spasonosno vrijeme koje dolazi iz umjetnosti postalo i samo apokaliptičko? Što ako umjetnost više nema u sebi nikakve mogućnosti spasonosnoga obrata povijesnoga tijeka vremena? Upadljivom se čini istovjetnost boje u tumačenju dviju slika iz povijesti umjetnosti u kojima se pojavljuje lik anđela, u Dürera i Kleea. Nesumnjivo se radi o alegorijskome prikazu. Ikonologijski je bjelodano da je riječ o žuto-zlatnome preljevu boje. Izbor upravo tog tonaliteta ne samo da je simbolički konzistentan onome što izaziva osjećaj refleksivne tuge za prošlošću, nego se čak i ozračje slika pokazuje u prožetosti psihološkim dojmom ugasnuća i nestanka svjetlosti. Bez obzira na sve to, jedno preostaje odlučujućim za daljnje bavljenje alegorijom o anđelu, apokalipsi, melankoliji i vremenu. A to je da bez boje u simboličkome kontinuitetu s poviješću nema ni spasonosnoga vremena niti uopće ideje moderne i suvremene umjetnosti. S bojom se uzdižemo u nove dimenzije obezbožene zbilje.

suprematism described through the idea of form. The figure is used to bring abstraction to the idea of the proto-form. The painting does not show the figure. To the contrary, the idea of the painting is in the “compositional construction” of the difference between tradition and modernity. In that difference, what connects the disconnected is the very figure of the angel clad in yellow and gold. But that is already essentially brought to the “tragicomedy” of history, as the angel’s wings are hanging and he is staring at the past. Melancholy has its source in the tragicomedy of history. One cannot progress, as the future indicates a catastrophe, and going back would mean facing the ruins and death. Klee’s angel indeed seems as the pure idea of the *new* as an unconditioned progress. It is a painting depicting the essence of the modern age, which Benjamin interpreted in terms of melancholy and apocalypse. *Angelus Novus* is the angel of the Apocalypse. His colour comes from the earth, from the mystical encounter between heaven and the underground, between the divine and the mortal. It is a hybrid colour of rottenness and gold, that which withers and disappears in overall nothingness and that which offers the event of life. ……… The non-narrativity of the painting, however, tells more than the story, which is known from various sources coming from the Jewish and Christian eschatology and soteriology. The angel always appears as the messenger of God’s word. He is the figure that pronounces the message in the sense of signifying the future. And that signification has two possible forms: destruction/damnation and salvation. It is self-understandable that

the messenger of the future should appear in the picture, rather than a discourse with apophanic features. The hermetic tradition of Christianity, as well as that of Jewish mysticism, stands close to the Greek understanding of the hermeneutic image, as the gods’ messenger, Hermes, links two worlds, that of heaven and that of the underground. Thus, the Apocalypse presupposes the goal and the purpose of historical evolution. Even Christ himself says in the *Book of Revelation*: “Behold, I am making all things new!” However, Benjamin’s interpretation of the “tragicomedy” in Klee’s painting is ambiguous and multi-layered. After all, so is the entire painting, in all its closed openness. Its colours indicate dimmed glare, withering and uniformity. But how do we come to ascribing the atmosphere and the tonality of the Apocalypse to this painting? The answer resides, again, in the factual nature of the mystical experience. We do not reach a mystical experience directly, but indirectly. After all, the angel’s figure serves us to name the medium of that which is directed into non-representability through the image. The truth of the picture is condensed in the extra-pictorial, in the same way as the essence of language is shown in telling the event, as Heidegger said.<sup>26</sup> The essence of the pictorial in *Angelus Novus* resides in the mystical experience of the event of the end of history as the apocalypse of the very truth about the meaning of history. However, all that has been ascribed to the painting. Does the painting actually have something autonomous, something specifically its own, or is Klee merely a painter of the symbolical under the guise of “figurative

abstraction”? ……… The answer seems to be in that which Klee himself said about colour in his abovementioned reflections on modern art. It is “composition” as the construction of the world in accordance with the primordial understanding of the relationship between line and surface. And colour does not come to it subsequently, as a “third layer” that serves to complete the painting in its meaning. In *Angelus Novus*, colour decides on the painting’s meaning. To the painting, as the new world, colour gives only that which history and time have condensed until the event of the world’s pictoriality. This is what Scholem has called the multi-layered mystical experience. It is only now that the painting acquired its dignity, no longer reduced to a story or an ornament. In his “novelty”, the angel is always new and at the same time his old self. The time in which his mission occurs is, for Klee, the “tragicomedy” of history. Paraphrasing Borges in his *Apocryphal Gospel*, where he says that it is the door that chooses, not the man: it is the colours that paint, not the painter! After all, Klee epiphanically noted down this thought in his *Diary* as the credo of painting and art. One can now see that colour, in modern painting, does not serve to describe an object neither in a classical nor in a realist procedure. It no longer presents or represents anything. We shall see that colour bridges the roads in reflecting on art in a specific way, by linking modern art to the mystical experience in the contemporary art. That has been especially emphasized by video-artist Bill Viola in his own attitude towards the experience of the *mystical eye* in the Spanish baroque

understanding of composition as seen in paintings from El Greco to Goya.<sup>27</sup> The silent dialogue between the painters is both the controversy and its solution in the continuation of the dialogue. Colour possesses the controversy and the conversation between Paul Klee and Anselm Kiefer concerning the mystical experience of the non-representable and the melancholy understanding of history. ……… In this regard, one should recall Klee’s position as expressed in his essay *On Modern Art*, where the painter, regarding the relationship between “construction” and “composition” in painting, links the unutterable and the utterable, same as a philosopher may construct a new reality with his ideas. For a painter, colours are what ideas may be for a philosopher. Eventually, he ends with the thought that points in historical continuity are here not functioning as the first and the last truth on the path. The neo-gnostic act of *eternal creation* merges the symbolic experience of colours from the primordial to the future. Mysticism resides in the multi-layeredness of that which passes from the invisible world into the visible one. That is why colour neither presents (*mimesis*) nor represents (*representatio*) anything or anyone. Moreover, colour does not emanate the meaning of the eternal and the immutable (being). Klee clearly shows that colour is the final act, which brings the line on the surface to the form of the painting. Thus, composition means creating the world, the coming-into-world from nothingness (non-colour) into the light of openness, where everything that is has its colours and its place in the world as it becomes a work of art.<sup>28</sup> In his phrase “from the pre-pictorial to the proto-pictorial” (*vom*



## Zaključak

Ako je istina alegorije u tome da je ona u prikazivoj neprikazivosti mističnoga iskustva, na što je pronicljivo uputio Scholem u analizi Benjaminova mišljenja, tada se ono spasonosno u slici anđela kao ideje umjetnosti ne skriva u prikazu niti u predstavi lika anđela, nego u onome što uopće omogućuje da nešto bude prikazano i predstavljeno kao simbol bestjelesnosti i čistoće. Anđeo apokalipse u Kleeovoj slici zadobiva svoju alegorijsku „tragikomičnost“ u tome što je njegova posljednja istina u nemogućnosti povratka i nemogućnosti odlaska. Njegovo je kretanje nalik onome iz Kafkine parabole o čovjeku kojeg težina sprečava da krene prema naprijed jer ga ujedno tjera prema natrag. Snažan pritisak sadašnjosti je toliki da je svako kretanje u oba smjera nemoguće. Tu prisporodu uzima Hannah Arendt za svoje tumačenje odnosa između tradicije i modernosti.<sup>31</sup> Usuprot Agambenovoj vjeri u spasonosno nadolazeće iz same ideje umjetnosti, a to je nesumnjivo plod njegove, premda izričito neiskazane, okrenutosti Heideggerovu čitanju Kleeova slikarstva, čini mi se da je stvar u ovome. Kleeova se slika bavi sadašnjošću. Ona je alegorijski kontrapunkt ideji kako povratka u prošlost tako i usmjerenosti budućnosti. Anđeo raskolačenih očiju gotovo da nema više kamo. Gubitak orijentacije vremena proizlazi iz toga što bezuvjetna moć sadašnjosti ne pruža više nikakvu nadu u otkriće tradicije kao preporoda za modernu umjetnost. Jednako tako puko tehničko svodenje umjetnosti na funkciju napretka ne ostavlja mnogo izgleda za spasonosnu

moć umjetnosti. … Slika je to, i tu je Agamben posve u pravu, simboličke sveze s Dürerom kao ishodištem melankoličnoga odnosa spram vremena. Što preostaje jest „višak imaginarnoga“. Ali taj „višak“ ujedno je svijest o „manjku“ mogućnosti u doba kada slika prelazi u stanje dematerijaliziranja. Boja kao kompozicija postaje konstrukcija tehno-slike s kojom svijet virtualno ima svoj „doživljaj“ i „privid“. Ali slikar više nema svoju boju. Umjetnost je u praiskonsko-nadolazećem smislu izgubila vjerodostojnost. Anđeo apokalipse u zlatno-žutome ozračju stoji sam usred ništavila. Ono savršeno funkcionira i kroz anđela gleda kako se povijest nepovratno odmiče od svojih ciljeva i svrha. Ovo je slika mesijanskoga vremena bez Posljednjega suda. Istinska „tragikomika“ povijesti naposljetku se pokazuje u tome da slika više ništa ne prikazuje suvremenima tehnosfere. Umjesto nje još uvijek upečatljivo govori Benjaminova 9. *Povijesno-filozofijska teza*. Slika je tako postala jezikom apokalipse bez kraja, istinom koja oslobađa u otvorenosti tajne. Boja je tajne zlatno-žuta. S njom moderna umjetnost poput Kleeova *Novoga Anđela* lebdi iznad vlastitih granica.

---

<sup>1</sup> Vasilij Kandinski, „O duhovnom u umjetnosti“, u: Marcel Bačić (prir.) *Duh apstrakcije*, Institut za povijest umjetnosti, Zagreb, 1999. S njemačkoga prevela Jasenka Mirenić Bačić.

<sup>2</sup> Paul Klee, *The Thinking Eye: The Notebooks of Paul Klee*, Georg Wittenborn i Lund Humphries, New York–London, 1961.

<sup>3</sup> Paul Klee, *On Modern Art*, Faber and Faber, London, 1966.

as representing the idea of art. However, what attracts particular attention is Agamben’s opinion that Klee’s angel cannot be a witness to the storm of progress, which is opposed to Benjamin’s hypothesis. In his 9<sup>th</sup> *Thesis on the Philosophy of History*, he has shown, namely, that there is no longer any link between the past and the future. One can only speak of the overall break between the tradition and modernity. The fury of the new must therefore necessarily be the apocalyptic catastrophe of history. Agamben, on the contrary, sees something essentially salvific in art.<sup>29</sup> Therefore, his reading of Benjamin’s analysis of Klee’s painting is much more Heideggerian than it might seem at the first glance. It is based on Heidegger’s premise on art as the salvific germ of the *second beginning*. In his obsessive preoccupation with Klee towards the end of his life, Heidegger saw in his painting the same as in Hölderlin’s poetry – the possibility of overcoming the metaphysical horizon of history. Art had become a genuine possibility of different thinking, from which it salvifically created the possibility of a future God beyond the entire metaphysical tradition.<sup>30</sup> … In Agamben’s opinion, the angel linking the figure in Dürer and Klee is nothing else but the angel of the impossibility of a link between the past (tradition) and the present (modernity). However, this impossibility emerges only because time has, in the modern world, become the measure of time for the entire history. In the vulgar ecstasy of the present, unconditioned progress has reduced all things to the quantity and weight of the transient and the mutable. That is why Agamben has identified Dürer’s angel with the essence of

<sup>4</sup> Hans Belting, „Zu einer Ikonologie der Kulturen. Die Perspektive als Bildfrage“, u: Gottfried Boehm i Horst Bredekamp (ur.), *Ikonologie der Gegenwart*, W. Fink, München, 2009., 9–20.

<sup>5</sup> Boris Groys, *Über das Neue: Versuch eine Kulturökonomie*, C. Hanser, München, 2007.

<sup>6</sup> Juliane Rebentisch, *Theorien der Gegenwartkunst (Zur Einführung)*, Junius Verlag, Hamburg, 2013. i Žarko Paić, *Slika bez svijeta: Ikonoklazam suvremene umjetnosti*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2006.

<sup>7</sup> Günter Seubold, *Das Ende der Kunst und der Paradigmenwechsel in der Ästhetik: Philosophische Untersuchungen zu Adorno, Heidegger und Gehlen in systematischen Absicht*, K. Alber, Freiburg/München, 1997., Günter Seubold, *Kunst als Enteignis: Heideggers Weg zu einer nicht mehr metaphysischen Kunst*, DenkMAL Verlag, Bonn, 2005. 2. izd., 124. i Žarko Paić, „Otvorenost i plavetnilo: S Heideggerom na putu prema drukčijoj umjetnosti“, u: *Treća zemlja: Tehnosfera i umjetnost*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2014.

<sup>8</sup> Pod pojmom konstelacije valja razumjeti ono što Benjamin kaže da pod određenim kozmologijskim uvjetima zvijezde oblikuju sliku sazviježda (*Sternbilder*). Ta slika upućuje na suodnos prošlosti i budućnosti. Pojam konstelacije odnosi se na prostorni i vremenski kontinuum. Nakon što sazviježda iščeznu iz zone vidljivoga, nastaje problem razmjешtanja i ponovnoga oblikovanja onoga što je bilo vidljivo i određivalo povijesno događanje. Vidi o tome: Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften, IV*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/M., 1991. 1. izd.

<sup>9</sup> Gottfried Boehm, „Jenseits der Sprache? Anmerkungen zur Logik der Bilder“, u: *Wie Bilder Simm erzeugen: Die Macht des Zeigens*, Berlin University Press, Berlin, 2007., 19–33.

<sup>10</sup> Vasilij Kandinski, nav. djelo, 217.

<sup>11</sup> Jean-François Lyotard, *Le différend*, Minuit, Pariz, 1993.

<sup>12</sup> Gershoh Scholem, „Walter Benjamin i njegov Anđeo“, u: Walter Benjamin, *Novi Anđeo*, Izdanja Antibarbarus, Zagreb, 2008., 141. S njemačkoga prevela Snješka Knežević.

<sup>13</sup> Walter Benjamin, „Povijesno-filozofijske teze“, u: *Novi Anđeo*, 117–118.

<sup>14</sup> W.J.T. Mitchell, *Pictorial Turn*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1994. i Gottfried Boehm (ur.), *Was ist ein Bild?*, W. Fink, München, 1994. Vidi o tome: Žarko Paić, „Povratak slika?“, u: *Slika bez svijeta: Ikonoklazam suvremene umjetnosti*, 158–176.

<sup>15</sup> Vidi o tome: Dieter Mersch, *Ereignis und Aura: Untersuchungen zu einer Ästhetik des Performativen*, Edition Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/M., 2002., Ingeborg Reichle, *Art in the Age of Technoscience: Genetic Engineering, Robotics, and Artificial Llife in Contemporary Art*, Springer, Wien–New York, 2009. i Žarko Paić, *Posthumano stanje: Kraj čovjeka i mogućnosti druge povijesti*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2011.

melancholy, as there knowledge is preferred to the truth, while desire for suffering emerges from the aesthetic practice. Thus, each creation of the new occurs as an act of the endless repetition of the old. The problem raised by Agamben in his interpretation is no longer that of Benjamin’s. Instead of the difference between the historical and Messianic times, it is now the very difference, the in-between state, that has been challenged. The end of history, which brings the angel of the Apocalypse, heralds the “new” time. But what if that salvific time coming through art has itself become apocalyptic? What if art no longer contains any possibility of making a salvific turn in the historical flow of time? There is a striking similarity of colour in the art-historical interpretation of the two paintings in which the figure of an angel appears, namely in Dürer and Klee. These are undoubtedly allegorical images. In terms of iconology, the tone is obviously golden-yellowish, and its choice is not only symbolically consistent with that which triggers a contemplative nostalgia for the past; even the atmosphere of the two paintings is permeated with the psychological impression that light has been extinguished and disappeared. Regardless of all this, one thing remains crucial in all further research on the allegory of the angel, the Apocalypse, melancholy, and time. It is that, without colour, there is no salvific time or even the idea of modern and contemporary art in the symbolic continuity of history. It is with colour that we rise into the new dimensions of godless reality.

<sup>16</sup> Vidi o tome: Florian Rötzer (ur.), *Digitaler Schein: Ästhetik der elektronischen Medien*. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/M., 1991.

<sup>17</sup> Kazimir Malevič, *Nepredmetni svijet*, Centar za kulturnu djelatnost SSOH, Zagreb, 1981. S njemačkoga preveo Nenad Popović.

<sup>18</sup> „Revolucionarna ideja suvremene umjetnosti sastojala se u tome da bilo koji predmet, bilo koji detalj ili fragment materijalnog svijeta može imati istu neobičnu privlačnost kao i ona koja su nekoć bila rezervirana za neke rijetke, aristokratske forme, koje su se nazivale umjetničkim djelima. /.../ S posljedicom preobrazbe umjetnosti i samog umjetničkog djela u predmet, bez iluzije i transcendencije, čisti konceptualni acting out, u generatora dekonstruiranih predmeta, došlo je do toga da, zauzvrat, predmeti dekonstruiraju nas.“ Jean Baudrillard, *Inteligencija zla ili pakt lucidnosti*, Naklada Ljevak, Zagreb, 2006., 100. S francuskoga preveo Leonardo Kovačević.

<sup>19</sup> Walter Benjamin, *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/M., 1996. Vidi o tome: Žarko Paić, „Smjerkazai melankolije: Walter Benjamin i mišljenje onkraj povijesti“, u: Walter Benjamin, *Novi Anđeo*, Izdanja Antibarbarus, Zagreb, 2008., 173–191.

<sup>20</sup> Siegfried Kracauer, *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge–Massachusetts, London, 1995.

<sup>21</sup> Paul Klee, *On Modern Art*, 41.

<sup>22</sup> Vidi o tome: K. Porter Aichele, *Paul Klee:Poet/Painter*, Camden House, New York, 2006.

<sup>23</sup> Dieter Mersch, „Performativnost i događaj. Razmišljanja o reviziji performativnog koncepta jezika“, u: *Tvrda*, 1-2/2012., 151–170. S njemačkoga preveo Boris Perić; Žarko Paić, „Događaj i razlika: Performativno-konceptualni obrat suvremene umjetnosti“, u: *Filozofska istraživanja*, god. 33, br. 129, 1/2013., 5–20.

<sup>24</sup> Gershoh Scholem, „Walter Benjamin i njegov Anđeo“, u: Walter Benjamin, *Novi Anđeo*, 130.

<sup>25</sup> Gershoh Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, Schocken Books, New York, 1995.

<sup>26</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Unterwegs zur Sprache*, Klett-Cotta, Stuttgart, 2007. 14. izd.

<sup>27</sup> Bill Viola, „Das Bild im mir – Videokunst offenbart die Welt des Verborgenen“, u: Christa Maar i Hubert Burda (ur.), *ICONIC TURN: Die Neue Macht der Bilder*, DuMont, Köln, 2005. 3. izd., 260–282. i Victor Stoichita, *Visionary Experience in the Golden Age of Spanish Art*, Reaktion, London, 1995.

<sup>28</sup> Paul Klee, *On Modern Art*, 45. i Heinrich Petzet, *Encounters and Dialogues with Martin Heidegger*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1993.

<sup>29</sup> Giorgio Agamben, *The Man without Content*, Stanford University Press, Stanford–California, 1999., 64–71.

## Conclusion

If the truth in an allegory is that it is in the presentable non-presentability of the mystical experience, which Scholem has ingeniously indicated in his analysis of Benjamin’s thought, then the salvific in the image of an angel as the idea of art is not in the presentation of representation of the angel’s figure, but in that which makes it possible in the first place to present and represent something as a symbol of immateriality and purity. The angel of the Apocalypse in Klee’s painting acquires his allegoric “tragicomedy” because his final truth is in the impossibility of his return and the impossibility of his departure. His movement resembles that from Kafka’s parable on a man whose weight prevents him from going further as it pulls him backwards at the same time. The forcible pressure of the present is such that movement proves impossible in any direction. This is the image that Hannah Arendt adopted for her interpretation of the relationship between tradition and modernity.<sup>31</sup> Despite Agamben’s belief in the salvific future coming from the very idea of art, and that is undoubtedly a result of his (albeit inexplicit) inclination towards Heidegger’s reading of Klee’s painting, it seems to me that the point is that Klee’s painting deals with the present. It is an allegorical counterpoint to the idea of both returning to the past and striving into the future. The angel, his eyes staring, seems to have nowhere to go. The loss of temporal orientation is a consequence of the fact that the unconditioned power of the present leaves no hope for the discovery of the tradition as

*Vorbildlichen zum Urbildlichen*), Klee speaks of his own path as a painter. The turn to the primordial is also present in this phrase. When there are no longer objects that colour would refer to, there is only the non-objectivity of suprematism, as in Kazimir Malevich, or the substitution of the object of art through an aesthetic object, as in Marcel Duchamp. Both trajectories defined the fate of the contemporary art, whereas Klee’s solution remained some sort of an in-between state, which may perhaps be understood as the “third way”. It is only now, with the new dematerialized image in the techno-sphere of virtuality, that this path has again become a challenge. However, nothing can be brought back to the starting point. That is the greatness of Klee’s mystery of painting and his *Angelus Novus*, as well as of Benjamin’s interpretation of the relationship between the historical and Messianic times “after the storm.”

### A Return to Dürer: Melancholy of the Present

Not everything ended with Benjamin’s interpretation of Klee’s mysterious painting. Recently, another way of interpreting painting has opened up new views on the already discussed issues: that of Giorgio Agamben. His analysis focuses on the symbolic meaning of the angel in interpreting the historical adventure of man. Restoring the notion of melancholy to the contemporary philosophy and visual arts seems to coincide with testing the borders of utterability in these two discourses of our age. In his analysis, Agamben writes about the angel in Dürer’s *Melancholy I* (1514), referring to Panofsky’s famous iconological interpretation. The angel is here understood

<sup>30</sup> Vidi o tome: Žarko Paić, „Otvorenost i plavetnilo: S Heideggerom na putu prema drukčijoj umjetnosti“, u: *Treća zemlja: Tehnosfera i umjetnost*, Litteris, Zagreb, 2014.

<sup>31</sup> Hannah Arendt, Tradition and the Modern Age“, u: *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought*, The Viking Press, New York, 1961.

a possibility of renewal for modern art. By the same token, a merely technical reduction of art to the function of progress does not leave much hope for the salvific power of art. … It is an image, as Agamben has quite accurately observed, that shows a symbolic link with Dürer as the source of this melancholy view of time. What remains is the “surplus of the imaginary.” But that “surplus” is also the awareness of the “lack” of possibilities in an age when painting passes into a state of dematerialization. Colour as composition becomes the construction of a techno-image, in which the world virtually has its “experience” and its “appearance”. But the painter no longer has his colour. In terms of primordial future, art has lost its credibility. The angel of the Apocalypse, in his golden-yellowish atmosphere, stands alone in the midst of nothingness, which functions perfectly and watches through the angel how history moves away irreparably from its goals and purposes. It is an image of the Messianic time with no Last Judgement. The true “tragicomedy” of history is finally revealed in that the painting no longer shows anything to the contemporaries of the techno-sphere. Instead of it, Benjamin’s 9<sup>th</sup> *Thesis on the Philosophy of History* still speaks powerfully. Thus, the painting has become the language of the endless apocalypse, the truth that liberates in the openness of mystery. The colour of mystery is golden yellow. With it, modern art rises above its own limitations like Klee’s *New Angel*.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Wassily Kandinsky, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art* (1911), trans. Michael T.H. Sadler (New York: Dover Publications, 1977).
- <sup>2</sup> Paul Klee, *The Thinking Eye: The Notebooks of Paul Klee* (New York and London: Georg Wittenborn and Lund Humphries, 1961).
- <sup>3</sup> Paul Klee, *On Modern Art* (London: Faber and Faber, 1966).
- <sup>4</sup> Hans Belting, “Zu einer Ikonologie der Kulturen. Die Perspektive als Bildfrage,” in *Ikonologie der Gegenwart*, ed. Gottfried Boehm and Horst Bredekamp (Munich: W. Fink, 2009), 9-20.
- <sup>5</sup> Boris Groys, *Über das Neue: Versuch eine Kulturökonomie* (Munich: C. Hanser, 2007).
- <sup>6</sup> Juliane Rebentisch, *Theorien der Gegenwartkunst (Zur Einführung)* (Hamburg: Junius Verlag, 2013); Žarko Paić, *Slika bez svijeta: Ikonoklazam suvremene umjetnosti* [Image without the world: Iconoclasm in the contemporary art] (Zagreb: Litteris, 2006).
- <sup>7</sup> Günter Seubold, *Das Ende der Kunst und der Paradigmenwechsel in der Ästhetik: Philosophische Untersuchungen zu Adorno, Heidegger und Gehlen in systematischen Absicht* (Freiburg and Munich: K. Alber, 1997); Günter Seubold, *Kunst als Ereignis: Heideggers Weg zu einer nicht mehr metaphysischen Kunst* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Bonn: DenkMAL Verlag, 2005), 124; Žarko Paić, “Otvorenost i plavetnilo: S Heideggerom na putu prema drukčijoj umjetnosti” [Openness and blueness: With Heidegger toward a different art], in *Treća zemlja: Tehnosfera i umjetnost* (Zagreb: Litteris, 2014).
- <sup>8</sup> Constellation should here be understood as that which Benjamin implies when he writes that under the particular cosmological circumstances stars form images (*Sternbilder*). This image indicates the correlation between the past and the future. The term “constellation” refers to a spatial and temporal continuum. Once the stars have disappeared from the zone of visibility, the problem of rearrangement and reformulation of what used to be visible and defined the historical events re-emerges. Cf. Walter Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften IV* (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991).
- <sup>9</sup> Gottfried Boehm, “Jenseits der Sprache? Anmerkungen zur Logik der Bilder,” in *Wie Bilder Sinn erzeugen: Die Macht des Zeigens* (Berlin: Berlin University Press, 2007), 19-33.
- <sup>10</sup> Kandinsky, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art* (as in n. 1), 110.
- <sup>11</sup> Jean-François Lyotard, *Le différend* (Paris: Minuit, 1993).
- <sup>12</sup> Gershom Scholem, “Walter Benjamin and His Angel,” in: idem, *On Jews and Judaism in Crisis: Selected Essays*, trans. Werner J. Dannhauser (New York: Schocken, 1976), 208.

<sup>13</sup> Walter Benjamin, “Theses on the Philosophy of History,” in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Random House, 2007), 257-258.

<sup>14</sup> W.J.T. Mitchell, *Pictorial Turn* (Chicago, MI: University of Chicago Press, 1994) and *Was ist ein Bild?* ed. Gottfried Boehm (Munich: W. Fink, 1994). Cf. Žarko Paić, “Povratak slika?” [A return of images?]” in: idem, *Slika bez svijeta* (as in n. 6), 158-176.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Dieter Mersch, *Ereignis und Aura: Untersuchungen zu einer Ästhetik des Performativen* (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2002); Ingeborg Reichle, *Art in the Age of Technoscience: Genetic Engineering, Robotics, and Artificial Life in Contemporary Art* (Vienna and New York: Springer, 2009); Žarko Paić, *Posthumano stanje: Kraj čovjeka i mogućnosti druge povijesti* [The posthuman condition: The end of man and the possibilities of another history] (Zagreb: Litteris, 2011).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Digitaler Schein: Ästhetik der elektronischen Medien*, ed. Florian Rötzer (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1991).

<sup>17</sup> Kazimir Malevich, *The Non-Objective World: The Manifesto of Suprematism* (New York: Courier Dover Publications, 2003).

<sup>18</sup> “The revolutionary idea of contemporary art was that any object, any detail or fragment of the material world, could exert the same strange attraction and pose the same insoluble questions as were reserved in the past for a few rare aristocratic forms known as works of art. *!...!* With, as a corollary, the transformation of art and of the work into an object, without illusion or transcendence, a purely conceptual acting-out, generative of deconstructive objects which deconstruct us in their turn.” Jean Baudrillard, *The Intelligence of Evil, or: The Lucidity Pact*, trans. Chris Turner (London, New York, and New Delhi: 2013), 85.

<sup>19</sup> Walter Benjamin, *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit* (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 1996). Cf. Žarko Paić, “Smjerokazi melankolije: Walter Benjamin i mišljenje onkraj povijesti” [Signposts of melancholy: Walter Benjamin and thinking beyond history], in: Walter Benjamin, *Novi Andeo* (Zagreb: Antibarbarus, 2008), 173-191.

<sup>20</sup> Siegfried Kracauer, *The Mass Ornament: Weimar Essays* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1995).

<sup>21</sup> Klee, *On Modern Art* (as in n. 3), 41.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. K. Porter Aichele, *Paul Klee: Poet/Painter* (New York: Camden House, 2006).

<sup>23</sup> Dieter Mersch, “Performativität und Ereignis. Überlegungen zur Revision des Performanz-Konzeptes der Sprache,” <http://www.dieter-mersch.de/download/mersch.performativtaet.und.ereignis.pdf> (last accessed on October 28, 2014); Žarko Paić, “Dogadaj i razlika: Performativno-

konceptualni obrat suvremene umjetnosti” [Event and difference: The performative-conceptual turn in the contemporary art], *Filozofska istraživanja* 33/129, 1 (2013), 5-20.

<sup>24</sup> Scholem, “Walter Benjamin and his Angel” (as in n. 12), 201.

<sup>25</sup> Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1995).

<sup>26</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Unterwegs zur Sprache* (14<sup>th</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2007).

<sup>27</sup> Bill Viola, “Das Bild im mir – Videokunst offenbart die Welt des Verborgenen,” in *ICONIC TURN: Die Neue Macht der Bilder*, ed. Christa Maar and Hubert Burda (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Cologne: DuMont, 2005), 260-282; Victor Stoichita, *Visionary Experience in the Golden Age of Spanish Art* (London: Reaktion, 1995).

<sup>28</sup> Klee, *On Modern Art* (as in n. 3), 45; Heinrich Petzet, *Encounters and Dialogues with Martin Heidegger* (Chicago, MI: Chicago University Press, 1993).

<sup>29</sup> Giorgio Agamben, *The Man without Content* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), 64-71.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Paić, “Otvorenost i plavetnilo” (as in n. 7).

<sup>31</sup> Hannah Arendt, “Tradition and the Modern Age”, in *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought* (New York: The Viking Press, 1961).