



DALIBOR PARAĆ

GALERIJA FORUM

KULTURNO INFORMATIVNI
CENTAR ZAGREB
TESLINA 16, tel. 421-144
11. 2. – 4. 3. 1988.



MUZEJ MEDIMURJA
ČAKOVEC
IZLOŽBENI SALON
5. 4. – 26. 4. 1988.

Izdavač
Published by
GALERIJA FORUM
KULTURNO INFORMATIVNOG CENTRA
Teslina 16, tel. 421-144
MUZEJ MEĐIMURJA
ČAKOVEC
Trg Republike 5, tel. (042) 812-285

Za izdavača
For the publisher
MILAN BREZAK
VLADIMIR KALŠAN

Urednik kataloga
Catalogue editor
VIŠNJA KNEZOCI

Predgovor
Preface
IVE ŠIMAT BANOVIĆ

Grafički urednik
Graphical supervision
IVICA STANČIN

Prijevod na engleski
Translation into english
ELLEN ELIAS-BURSAČ

Fotografije
Photographies
FEDOR LIČINA

Likovna postava
Arrangement of exhibits
IVE ŠIMAT BANOVIĆ
LJUBICA RAMUŠČAK

Plakat
Poster design
IVICA STANČIN
DALIBOR PARAĆ

Tisak plakata
Printing of posters
ŽELIMIR BAKOVIĆ

Tehnička postava izložbe
Technical layout
ŽELIMIR MARTINJAK

Tisak
Printing by
VJESNIK – AGENCIJA ZA MARKETING

Naklada
Edition
700 komada

PARAĆ

Ne treba hrliti u kriptopovijest portreta niti pretendirati k (pa i najnevinijoj) antologiji teme kojoj su preciznost i intuicija, Bronzino (ili Holbein) i F. Bacon, početne i završne točke. To bi svakako bio antologijski napor i on je unutar svjetskih tematskih inventura učinjen nekoliko puta. A ako bi sličnu inventuru pokušali u našem slikarstvu, od našeg slikarskog Adama do njegovog još golobradog potomka, a da se pritom tautološke brbljarije i »oralna namirenja« o portretu koji »otkriva dušu« ili o »tuzi u očima« i »optimizmu čela« . . . ne samo izbjegnemo nego i prezru, dobila bi se zanimljiva fenomenologija pristupa, rukopisnih konfiguracija i suvrstica. Naravno, ta bi povijest poznavala svoje site i gladne klasove, oskudna i bogata vremena u kojima najnovija prepoznajemo kao gladna i žedna ove teme od koje se zazire i koja se – ne bez primisli na tradiciju omlitavljelih konvencija koje ugadaju taštinama – opanjkavaju. Bilo kako bilo, ne treba biti naročito vidovit pa poput Marca Le Bota utvrditi kako su »portret i autoportret kao žanrovi gotovo nestali iz suvremene umjetnosti«.

. . . Mi naravno, nemamo nimalo volje ratovati s nepostojećim dilemama. Mogli smo uzeti iskustvo kolorizma D. Paraća i mogli smo njegovim tragom slijediti slike lišene retoričkih, egzistencijalističkih i mnogih simplificirajućih upita. Ali eto, mi (kao i on) problematiziramo temu načinima slikarstva ne mireći se s mišlju da ona (tema) sama po sebi zaslužuje prezir i ušhit, zasluge i podozrenja. Stoga i ne mislimo od sklonosti umjetnika k ovoj temi stvarati velike »povratke temi« i prizivanja »zaboravljenog«. Jer kakva je to osobita zasluga u naslagama jezika iskopati zaboravljenu temu i stavljati je na počasno mjesto svoje pažnje? Sitničav je to uspjeh. Ali anatomija tog Paraćevog obraćanja leži u drugom: u *problematiziranju teme kao slikarstva*. To je po karakteru isto problematiziranje kao i ranije pitanje odnosa konkretnog i asocijativnog (pejsaža), sinteze figure i krajolika i njihovog morfološkog i filozofskog jedinstva u kojem je misao o dijaloškom konceptu odnosa između prirode slike i prirode same otkrivala tihu, rekao bih i unutrašnju, metamorfozu jezika; promijenjiv i živi scenarij preobrazbe i značenja slike – ničeg izvan nje.

Nije nam do toga da provlačimo misao o Paraćevoj dosljednosti jer ta tvrdnja nosi i (kod nas) moralističke i temporalne, a ponajmanje umjetničke konotacije. Uostalom, postoji i tvrdoglavost u sitničarenju; dosljednost trivijalnog. Ali Paraćevo problematiziranje sadržaja slike dozvoljava da bojom (svjetlošću, linijom, intenzitetima i sl.) izvedemo sve relevantne zaključke. Tu je odnos slike i slikara čist kao sunce. Jer očitovanja točnosti, nabiranja topografije lica sastavljenog od podočnjaka i boje kose, velikog nosa i malog uha . . . slijepo je crijevo slikarstva koje traži da bude napadnuto iz sebe same. Bojom prije svega. To zvuči nemilosrdno ali ne znam ništa bolje reći. Jer nacrt duhovnosti (koji je normalni cilj teme) ne traži preciznost nabrojenog nego prije »samovolju« imaginacije kojoj je (kao i u ranijim Paraćevim djelima) do stalnih mijena unutar slike, a ne na njezinim granicama. A sjećanje »u imaginaciji

a ne u stvarnosti« (L. Jouvet) u kojem je lik prizvan u sjećanje kao u predvorje i čistilište imaginacije, jedan je od principa Paraćevog pristupa. Jer dijelovi ne čine cjelinu i ondje gdje je brojanka detalja sačekivala intuiciju stvari nisu živjele . . . Svjedočim i sam o brisanju s lica zemlje (i o nezadovoljstvu) onog što nije moglo biti prizvano pred oči jednim pogledom. Jer sličnost (s likom) ne »pretendira na identitet« (Gombrich) nego na raspoznavanje u imaginaciji. Istina, deblji neće postati mršav, a široka glava uska . . ., ali intuicija lika stajala je nadmoćnom svakom redu činjenica.

Ako smo problematizirajući ovo slikarstvo otkrili problematizirajuću sliku, recimo da *Daliboru Paraću nije do problema nego do slikarstva* i da je naglasak na »slikarstvu« a ne na »problemu«. Prevedeno na jezik naše teme to je pitanje kako da portret prije svega ostane slikarstvo a tek potom i sličnost i da preživi jezik uvrijeđenih i zadovoljnih i sve pristupe prepoznavanja po oku, kao i sva jednodimenzionalna čitanja »psihologije« o kojoj rado govore linearni duhovi koji u svakom tijelu vide ambalažu duše, otisak lica na Veronikinom rupcu. A da je riječ o složenijoj psihologiji i složenijem čitanju lica može posvjedočiti i činjenica da »motiv« u Paraćevom djelu određuje i naranča koliko i lice, odličje ili knjige, pejsaži i monokromne pozadine . . . koje »indirektnošću« određuju svojstva lika. Pritom, nije problem u tome je li glava u zdjeli ili »u torbi«, je li riječ o Juditi ili Salomi, Holofernu ili Ivanu Krstitelju . . . Plodovi »lukavstva« prekorčenja kao i bogaćenje odbacivanjem (tzv. »redukcija«) nisu nimalo nepoznati D. Paraću. Stoga i naše slaganje i nezadovoljstva poradi većeg ili manjeg nosa, pogleda kojim mi jesmo ili nismo . . . nije od važnosti. Naša raspoznavanja i prepoznavanja potpuno su irelevantna i ne odlučuju o ničemu: ponajmanje u korist i štetu slikarstvu. Uostalom, istina o nama ne pripada samo nama: ona je na pola puta od onog kako se vidimo i kako nas vide. A kako se sličnosti ne daju odvojiti od razlike tako su i drugi vlasnici istine o našem licu. Ali to nije najvažnije . . .

Važnijim mi se čini jedna, nazovimo, »teškoća« djela koja je zavisila od odgovora na pitanje: živi li djelo izvan oka koje raspoznaje znana lica? To je kopalo naš um i tu smo tražili klicu trajnosti i ovog djela. Pitanje posve obično: hoće li sudbina našeg tijela biti i sudbinom slike? Ali u njezino sretno proživljavanje nemam sumnje. Jer unutar jezika ona je uspostavila »razliku između nomenklatura – bilo verbalnih bilo likovnih – i sposobnosti koja je omogućila njihovu tvorbu« – (Saussure). Jer tko je sjedio određenog dana za stolom s Inocentom, Filipom ili Karlom pitanje je sitničavih. Uostalom, koji će to glupan dovesti u pitanje sliku pitanjima o broju i vrijednosti prstenja na ruci ili dužini kose ili košulje po primitivnom načinu utvrđivanja istine: po točnosti i sličnosti?!

. . . Bez obzira na uvrijeđene i polaskane, prepoznate i »nejasne«, treba Paraćevo djelo gledati legitimnim pitanjima slikarstva samog – točnije kolorizma koji je svojim svjetlim dionizijskim i orfičkim karakterom u suvremenoj hrvatskoj umjetnosti postao sinonimom samog slikara.

Ive Šimat Banov
iz eseja; Lice i slika

PARAĆ

One needn't rush into the cryptohistory of portraits or pretend to an anthology (even the most innocent) in which the precision and intuition of Bronzino's (or Holbein's) and F. Bacon's themes are the first and last word. That would certainly be a gargantuan effort and within the world thematic inventory it has already been done several times. If someone were to undertake such an inventory of Croatian painting, Croatian painting from Adam to his still smooth-chinned descendent, and if that someone were to avoid, even despise the tautological gibberish and »oral fulfillment« about a portrait that »discloses the soul« or about »sorrow in the eyes« and »optimism on the brow« . . . it would be an interesting phenomenology of approaches, the configurations of script and subtype. This history, of course, would know its satiated and hungry phases, the thin and the abundant ages within which we can see the most recent as hungry and thirsty for this theme, a theme that has been shunned and slandered, reflecting a tradition of feeble conventions playing up to vanity. No matter what the case may be, one needn't be particularly visionary to claim, like Marc Le Bot, that the »portrait and self-portrait have almost vanished as genres from contemporary art«.

We haven't the slightest intention, of course, of wrangling with nonexistent dilemmas. We could have taken the experience of D. Parać's colorism and could have followed the painting along its path, stripped of rhetorical, existentialist and many simplifying inquiries. But we have approached the problems of the theme with the ways of the painting, never reconciled to the thought that it (the theme) is deserving in itself of either disdain or fervor, merit or suspicion. Our intention is not to forge the artist's bent into a great »return to the theme« or invocation of »what has been forgotten«. After all, is the excavation of some forgotten theme and its installation in the honorary focus of attention something so praiseworthy? Such is a petty success. But the anatomy of Parać's return lies in something different: *making the theme problematic as painting*. This is the same, in character as making problematic earlier questions of the relation of the concrete and the associative (landscape), a synthesis of figure and scenery and their morphological and philosophical unity in which the thought of a dialogue concept of relations between the nature of the painting of nature itself discloses a quiet, underlying, metamorphosis of language; a shifting and lively scenario of transformation and meaning of the painting – nothing outside it.

We are not interested in exploring the idea of Parać's consistency, because this claim implies (in this environment) more moralist and temporal, and less artistic connotation. There is also an obstinance in pettiness; the consistency of the trivial. But Parać's focus on the problems of a painting's content allow us, through color (light, line, intensity and so forth), to make all relevant conclusions. Here the relationship of the painting and painter are as pure as the sun. Because evidencing details, listing the topography of the face consisting of bags under the eyes and the color of the hair, a large nose and a small ear . . . is the gall stone of art and deserves to be attacked from itself. With color, first of all. This sounds merciless but I know nothing better to say. Because the

line of spirituality (the usual objective of the theme) does not seek a precision of list, rather the »self-will« of imagination that strives (as in Parać's earlier works) towards constant changes within the painting, and not along its periphery. Memory »in the imagination and not in reality« (L. Jouvett) in which the figure is recalled to memory as in the vestibule and purgatory of the imagination, one of the principles of Parać's approach. Because parts do not make a whole, and wherever the list of details ambushed intuition, things did not live . . . I can testify myself to eradication from the face of the earth (and to dissatisfaction) with all that could not be called to the eyes at a glance. Because similarity (to a figure) does not »pretend to identity« (Gombrich) rather to recognition in the imagination. It is true that fat people will not be thinner, and broad heads won't become narrow . . . but the intuition of a figure is more powerful than every order of fact.

If in making problematic this painting we have exposed the man behind it, we should add that *Dalibor Parać is interested in painting, and not problems*; the emphasis is on »painting« not on a »problem«. Translated into the language of our theme this is a question of how a portrait can remain painting, and only then can be a similarity and to survive the language of the insulted and the satisfied and all approaches of recognition by eye, such as a single-dimensional reading of »psychology« in which the linear spirits are glad to speak which see each body as a package for a soul: the impression of a face on Veronica's handkerchief. The »motif« in Parać's work is determined as much by orange as it is by the face, decorations or books, landscapes and monochrome background . . . which obliquely determine the qualities of the figure; this is a more complex psychology and in-depth reading of the face. And in the process, the problem is not whether the head is in a dish or »in the bag«, whether this is Judith or Salome, Holofernes or John the Baptist . . . The fruits of the »slyness« of overdoing as well as the richness of rejection

(what we call »reduction«) are hardly unknowns for D. Parać. So our agreement or dissatisfaction due to a larger or smaller nose, a gaze that is or isn't us . . . are not important. Our recognition is completely irrelevant and decides nothing, least of all the success or failure of the painting. After all, the truth about us does not belong to us alone: it is half way between how we see ourselves and how others see us. And since likeness can not be separated from difference, the same applies to the others possessing the truth about our face. But that is not what is most important . . .

More important, it seems, is what I would call, »the difficulties« of the work which depend on the answer to the question: does the work live outside the eye that discerns familiar faces? This has been intriguing us, and here we sought the germ of the durability of Parać's painting. The question is quite ordinary: will the fate of our body be the fate of the painting? But I have no doubts as to its happy merging. Because within language it establishes »a difference between nomenclature – whether verbal or artistic – and the capacity that allows its formation« as Saussure says. Because the question of who was sitting at a table on a certain day with Innocent, Philip or Charles is a quibble for the petty. And furthermore, what idiot would pelt a painting with questions on the number and value of the rings on the hand or the length of the hair or shirt – in a crude form of establishing the truth: in terms of precision and similarity?!

Regardless of the insulted and flattered, recognizable and »unclear«, Parać's work should be considered thorough legitimate questions of the painting itself – more precisely a colorism that with its light Dionysian and Orphic character is becoming a synonym for the painter himself in contemporary Croatian art.

Ive Šimat Banov

English translation: Ellen Elias-Bursać









Samostalne izložbe

- 1974. Zagreb, Galerija Forum
- 1975. Split, Galerija umjetnina
Rovinj, Muzej grada Rovinja
- 1976. Hvar, Galerija »Na bankete«
Karlovac, Umjetnička galerija
- 1977. Zagreb, Galerija Forum
- 1978. Skopje, Centar za kultura i infor-
maciji (sa S. Jančićem)
- 1979. Zagreb, Studio Galerije Forum
- 1982. Zagreb, Galerija Forum
- 1985. Ljubljana, Mala galerija
- 1986. Split, Umjetnički salon
- 1987. Rijeka, Gradina Trsat
Zagreb, Chromos
Karlovac, Zorin dom
- 1988. Zagreb, Galerija Forum
Čakovec, Muzej Međimurja, Izlo-
žbeni salon

DALIBOR PARAĆ, rođen 1921. u Solinu. Akademiju likovnih umjetnosti diplomirao u Zagrebu u klasi prof. Ljube Babića 1948, a 1950. kod istog profesora završio specijalku. Bio je suradnik Majstorske radionice Krste Hegedušića od 1950. do 1951. Profesor je na Akademiji likovnih umjetnosti u Zagrebu.

Dobitnik je Nagrade grada Zagreba za 1977. godinu. Sudjeluje na brojnim skupnim izložbama u zemlji i inozemstvu. Adresa: Dalibor Parać 41000 Zagreb, Akademija likovnih umjetnosti, tel. 041 / 577-300

DALIBOR PARAĆ was born in Solin in 1921. He graduated from the Accademy of Fine Arts in Zagreb in 1948 in the session of Prof. Ljubo Babić. Two years later he specialized his studies. He was a collaborator in the Work shop of Krsto Hegedušić from 1950 to 1951. Now he is a university lecturer at the Accademy of Fine Arts in Zagreb.

He was awarded the prize of »ZAGREB CITY« in 1977. He exposes in YU and abroad. Address: Dalibor Parać 41000 ZAGREB, Accademy of Fine Arts, Ilica 85 tel. 041 / 577-300

Popis radova

1. UZGAJAČ NARANČI, 1987., ulje na platnu, 118 × 97 cm
2. M. C. U GALI, 1987., ulje na platnu, 118 × 97 cm
3. KESER, 1987., ulje na platnu, 118 × 97 cm
4. KRUNO I. 1987., ulje na platnu, 130 × 110 cm
5. KRUNO II, 1987., ulje na platnu, 130 × 110 cm
6. EDO, 1987., ulje na platnu, 118 × 97 cm
7. P. S., 1987., ulje na platnu, 130 × 110 cm
8. SLIKAR I MODEL, 1987., ulje na platnu, 130 × 110 cm
9. FERDO, 1987., ulje na platnu, 130 × 110 cm
10. MARIJA, 1987., ulje na platnu, 118 × 97 cm
11. D. B, 1987., ulje na platnu, 118 × 97 cm
12. V. M., 1987., ulje na platnu, 162 × 130 cm
13. GORANKA, 1987., ulje na platnu, 162 × 130 cm
14. SLIKAR I SLIKA, 1987., ulje na platnu, 130 × 110 cm
15. MLADENKA, 1988., ulje na platnu, 130 × 180 cm
16. MAGI, 1987., ulje na platnu, 130 × 97 cm
17. MARGARITA, diptih 1987., ulje na platnu, 118 × 97 cm
18. IVE, diptih, 1987., ulje na platnu, 118 × 97 cm
19. KUPAČICA, 1988., ulje na platnu, 100 × 224 cm
20. STUDIJA, 1987., ulje na platnu, 70 × 57 cm
21. CRTEŽI – SKICE, 1987/88.



ČLANOVI GALERIJE FORUM MEMBERS OF THE FORUM GALLERY

KOSTA ANGELI RADOVANI
BELIZAR BAHORIĆ
JOSIP DIMINIĆ
IVO FRIŠČIĆ
RAUL GOLDONI (1919–1983)
STANKO JANČIĆ
NIVES KAVURIĆ-KURTOVIĆ
ZLATKO KESER
EUGEN KOKOT
ANTE KUDUZ
FERDINAND KULMER
IVAN LOVRENČIĆ
EDO MURTIĆ
DALIBOR PARAĆ
ŠIME PERIĆ
OTON POSTRUŽNIK (1900–1978)
ZLATKO PRICA
NIKOLA REISER
MARIJA UJEVIĆ-GALETTOVIĆ
GORANKA VRUS-MURTIĆ

U GALERIJI FORUM IZLAGALI SU EXHIBITIONS IN THE FORUM GALLERY

FERDINAND KULMER
GIUSEPPE ZIGANA
LAZAR VOZAREVIĆ
JOAN MIRO
NIKOLA REISER
EDO MURTIĆ
IVAN LOVRENČIĆ
ZLATKO PRICA
IVO ŠEBALJ
VASKO LIPOVAC
ANTE KUDUZ
ŠIME PERIĆ
ACHILLE PERILLI
OTON POSTRUŽNIK
EMILIO VEDOVA
FRANO ŠIMUNOVIĆ
KSENIJA KANTOCI
STEVO BINIČKI
NIVES KAVURIĆ-KURTOVIĆ
RICHARD MORTENSEN
IVO FRIŠČIĆ
VIRGILIJE NEVJESTIĆ
MILIVOJE NIKOLAJEVIĆ
LOJZE SPACAL
TONI BENETTON
BOŠKO PETROVIĆ
LJUBOMIR PERČINLIĆ
GORANKA VRUS-MURTIĆ
JOSIP DIMINIĆ
ANTE JAKIĆ
NIKOLA KOYDL
RAUL GOLDONI
PREDRAG NEŠKOVIĆ
DALIBOR PARAĆ
PETAR HADŽI BOŠKOV
BOGDAN BOGDANOVIĆ
ALBERT KINERT
MILE SKRACIĆ
SPASE KUNOVSKI
BORO MITRIČESKI
FADIL VEJZOVIĆ
PIERO TARTICHIO
VLADIMIR STRAŽA
BELIZAR BAHORIĆ
BRANKO RUŽIĆ
GRAFIČARI IZ HAMBURGA
SUVRREMNI UMJETNICI IZ
SR MAKEDONIJE
MERSAD BERBER
MIODRAG B. PROTIĆ
STANKO JANČIĆ
ANTE KAŠTELANČIĆ
ROBERT RAUSCHENBERG
KOSTA ANGELI RADOVANI
OTO LOGO
MILAN KONJOVIĆ
PETAR MAZEVIĆ
GUALTIERO MOCENNI
LJUBOMIR KARINA
RATKO JANJIC-JOBO
STOJAN ČELIĆ
ISMAR MUJEZINOVIĆ
EUGEN KOKOT
ŽIVA KRAUS
MARIJA UJEVIĆ-GALETTOVIĆ
MAJA DOLENCIĆ-MALEŠEVIĆ

DRAGO TRŠAR
ANDREJ JEMEC
ELIZABETH FRANZHEIM
SUVRREMNA UMJETNOST
KOSOVA
JEAN MESSAGIER
TADEUSZ LAPINSKI
IVO KALINA
MATKO TREBOTIĆ
GRUPA MLADIH AUTORA IZ
ZAGREBA
ANTE MARINOVIĆ
MUSLIM MULLIQI
AGIM CAVDARBASHA
OLGA JANČIĆ
ZLATKO KESER
ĐURO PULITIKA
SLAVKO KOPAČ
SHYQRI NIMANI
LUKŠA PEKO
BORIS DOGAN
DORA KOVAČEVIĆ
SOFIJA NALETILIĆ-PENAVUŠA
GLIGOR ČEMERSKI
JOSIP BIFFEL
KUZMA KOVAČIĆ
STANKO POSAVEC
ENGJELL BERISHA-BEFRE
DUŠKO ŠIBL
LJUBOMIR STAHOV
ĐURO SEDER
ŠIME VULAS
JASNA MARETIĆ
ŠPANJOLSKO KIPARSTVO MULTIPLA
TRINAEST SOVJETSKIH GRAFIČARA
MIRO VUČO
RODOLJUB ANASTASOV
CARLO CIUSSI