

Dora DERADO

University of Split, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

ACCIDENT, ARTISTIC INTENT AND ERROR: A STUDY OF (UN) INTENTIONALITY IN POST-WORLD WAR II CROATIAN ART

An exhibition held in 2005 at the Mayor Gallery in London, intriguingly and aptly named *Ape Artists of the 1950s*, presented the public with the art works of several primates, including a chimpanzee by the name of Betsy, whose work was originally presented to the public in the UK and the US in 1957 and 1958, respectively.¹ Accompanied by a press release explaining the working process of primates (courtesy of anthropologist Desmond Morris), the presented works served to illustrate a significant point: that they were made with intent, despite not being made by a human. What made them even more sensational was their similarity to contemporary Abstract Expressionist works and related artistic practices such as the use of automatism and chance (visible, for example, in the dripping technique and its roots in Surrealist automatism), which, at least to some degree, could also be applied to the works of primates. However, this was not the first time that the eyes of the public and gallerists were caught by the handiwork of primates.²

For the purposes of this essay, the story of Betsy's artistic career serves not to equate artists with chimps in any way. Rather, it serves to point to a theory of art that was introduced by

the philosopher George Dickie in 1974 and was further developed in the 80s: the institutional theory of art. Dickie himself referred to Betsy's paintings (note that the term 'artwork' is not applied here) presented at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago; he explained that, even if they had been situated in an art gallery context, Betsy would merely have been seen as the maker. The title of 'artist' would have been bestowed upon the person who intentionally exhibited the chimp's paintings as artworks, such as the curator or gallerist. Dickie elaborates on this by pointing out that Betsy could not see herself as a member of 'the Artworld' – a term coined by Arthur C. Danto referring to "the broad social institution in which works of art have their place."³ This leads to the relevance of the basic premise of Dickie's theory for this paper: that a work of art is largely defined by the institutional context in which it is presented and that it must be based on *human intent*.⁴ It is precisely this idea of intent – its opposition or perhaps proximity to accident and error in the artistic process given their intentional use – that shall be the focus of this paper.

Artists' fascination with these practices, however, is not confined to Abstract Expressionism:

it can be seen in the works of the Surrealists and Dadaists half a century prior to Dickie's development of the institutional theory of art. Although he did not identify with either of these movements directly, one artist who was closely related to both movements and who was actively engaged in these practices was Marcel Duchamp. His artworks, several of which will be discussed here, speak for themselves. Meanwhile, it is worth setting the foundation for their further analysis in this paper in a concept Duchamp referred to as the "art coefficient." To quote the artist directly:

Consequently, in the chain of reactions accompanying the creative act, a link is missing. This gap which represents the inability of the artist to express fully his intention; this difference between what he intended to realize and did realize, is the personal 'art coefficient' contained in the work. In other words, the personal 'art coefficient' is like an arithmetical relation between the unexpressed but intended and the unintentionally expressed.⁵

This gap, as Duchamp interprets it, provides room for misinterpretation and reinterpretation by the spectator. Thus, it also provides opportunities for error on behalf of both the spectator and the artist (who often uses error as an intentional artistic strategy). This leads to the spectator becoming a co-creator of the artwork through the process of interpretation – an idea that Duchamp was quite fond of. Many of Duchamp's works serve to illustrate his fascination with error and chance.⁶ Not to mention that the entire phenomenon of Duchamp's ready-mades is founded on the idea of artistic intent, by which the nomination of an everyday object as a work of art becomes the primary determinant for the artwork.

Some of Duchamp's better-known works that are based on chance and are worth mentioning include his first ready-made, *Bicycle Wheel* (1913), a product of the artist's procrastination in cleaning out his studio; *Unhappy Readymade* (1919), produced by Duchamp's sister Suzanne on the basis of Duchamp's specific instructions;

and the infamous *Large Glass* (1915–1923), which Duchamp considered finished when it was accidentally broken in transit. It is also worth mentioning the well-known photograph by Man Ray entitled *Dust Breeding* (1920), which depicts a thick layer of dust that Duchamp had allowed to accumulate on the bottom of *Large Glass* with the aim of producing a certain discoloration which was, once again, outside of his control.⁷ All of the aforementioned works can be interpreted as examples of *seemingly* unintentional intentionality, an idea closely related to Duchamp's notion of the "ready-made intention." As the artist explains it, the "ready-made intention" is one for which the artist is not fully responsible but that he/she utilizes and respects.⁸ In Duchamp's case, the intention was that of artistic experimentation, but more importantly that of creating works that are anesthetic and devoid of good or bad taste. Duchamp's utilization of the ready-made intention also served to challenge established ideas of authorship, artworks and art in general. Ideas characteristic not only of this artist's works but also of many anti-art movements of the 20th century include Dadaism, Surrealism, Neo-Dada, Conceptual art and, more broadly, avant-garde and neo-avant-garde practices.

It is worth noting that the Croatian artists that employed strategies similar to those of Duchamp (e.g. Braco Dimitrijević, Goran Trbuljak, Tomislav Gotovac, certain members of the Gorgona group like Ivan Kožarić and Josip Vaništa, just to name a few), which shall be referred to in this text as 'appropriation strategies,' were not influenced by him directly, though they were most probably acquainted with his ideas. Duchamp's avant-garde films were shown at the Zagreb Cinema in the late 1950s (where Gotovac had the opportunity to see them),⁹ and his ideas were discussed at the Genre Film Festival (GEFF) in Zagreb during the 1960s.¹⁰ There is anecdotal evidence of members of the Gorgona group planning a collaboration with Marcel Duchamp shortly before his death in 1968.¹¹ Duchamp's ready-made and similar works were presented at the exhibition *La Boite en Valise* held in Gallery of Contemporary Art

in Zagreb in 1984.¹² In addition to this, his texts were translated and published in Belgrade in 1972,¹³ and then again in 1984,¹⁴ from where they could easily reach Croatia. An entire series of essays was devoted to Duchamp in the Croatian magazine *Quorum* in 1988,¹⁵ and that same year, the exhibition *Ready-mades* was organized in a local bookshop in Zagreb in which several of the aforementioned artists partook.¹⁶

Further individual instances could be noted. However, Duchamp's direct influence on Croatian artists becomes less relevant when one realizes that they commonly arrived at their own appropriation strategies through independent experimentation and thinking, albeit grounded in well-developed theoretical and practical knowledge of art abroad (which they acquired via printed material, but also through direct correspondence with artists from abroad). This suggests their awareness of the trends and ideas dominant on the European art scene despite the specific socio-political climate in Yugoslavia at the time, whose borders had mainly been closed to the outside world until the Tito–Stalin split in 1948. The neo-avant-garde art scene of former Yugoslavia has been and continues to be a well-researched topic among Croatian art historians and historians alike and serves to support the claim that international artistic relations influenced individual artistic paths as well as artistic collaborations. Croatian artists could (even as initiators) often be found at the forefront of such collaborations which provided spaces for the germination of new artistic ideas and their local developments.¹⁷

The art production of the 50s and 60s (e.g. Art Informel, Neo-Dada and Pop Art trends) and even more so the 70s and 80s (for example, Conceptual art) can be considered a part of the broader European art scene thanks to an influx of art-related news, the growing number of artistic contacts, formal and informal gallery spaces and a general liberalization of official attitudes towards art, all of which gradually began to grow in number since 1948. All of these factors combined to produce fertile ground for artistic experimentation that was predominantly technical in nature throughout the 1950s but

leaned significantly more towards institutional criticism and challenging artistic norms/concepts with the development of Conceptual art in the late 1960s and, respectively, the 1970s. However, regardless of the movements with which these artists can be associated (in this case, Art Informel, Conceptual art, and the neo-avant-garde in general), their utilization of chance and accident, their rather playful attitudes toward the creative process, as well as their experimentation with artistic intent or a lack thereof fits into the formula of the art coefficient, as shall be explained further.

For the sake of brevity, the scope of this essay shall consider only four artists, although many more Croatian artists could be mentioned. These artists were chosen primarily because of the intensity with which they experimented with accident and error; they were also chosen to represent the three decades that this paper focuses on and to trace the trajectory of the development of these practices. The artists in question are Ivo Gattin (one of the most fervent practitioners of Art Informel in Croatia), Tomislav Gotovac (a neo-avant-garde artist and experimenter in the media of photography, video, performance art, body art, and collage), Braco Dimitrijević and Goran Trbuljak. In 1969, the latter two artists formed the artistic duo they called “Pensioner Tihomir Simčić,” but their individual work is also valued for their leading roles in the development of Conceptual art in Croatia throughout the 1970s and 1980s.¹⁸

Dating back to 1956, Ivo Gattin became well known for his experimentation with non-painterly materials, as is characteristic of Art Informel, a movement that was prevalent in Europe in the 1940s and 1950s and permeated the Croatian art scene of the 1950s. Some of Gattin's favorite materials included sand, resin and industrial lacquers, often in combination with pure black pigment.¹⁹ Apart from his choice of materials, Gattin's working process deserves special attention. Recordings show him seated or crouched on the ground next to this dark mass of materials using, for the Croatian artistic context, rather untraditional methods such as burning (*Ivo Gattin u Galeriji Adris - YouTube*,

2016) to create works such as *Red Surface with Two Incisions* (1961).²⁰ The use of such materials and techniques demonstrates Gattin's conscious, intentional causation of chance effects wherein he serves as a trigger of sorts, and allows chemical processes to do the rest.

Gattin's interest in the use of chance can also be seen in an anecdote involving John Cage, who was one of the main guests at the Music Biennale Zagreb in 1963. Cage was well-known even at the time of his incorporation of chance into his music. To return to the evening of the Music Biennale in Zagreb, after performing, Cage visited Ivo Gattin's atelier in Zagreb, where they were joined by prominent members of the Zagreb art scene, including artists, art historians, and musicians. According to some accounts of the evening, Gattin handed out marbles to his guests. They were then instructed to dip the marbles in paint and throw them onto paper. Gattin thus relieved himself of his role as a solitary artist, enabled the creation of a collective work of art, and by balancing between art production and child's play he allowed chance to form the outcome of this collective, spontaneous action.²¹ Compared to his Informel works, chance seems to have played a slightly smaller role in this case, since to some degree Gattin performed the role of conductor. He demonstrated his artistic intent by planning out the action and giving over some of his authority to other cocreators. Thus, he somewhat mitigated the effects of chance, but also left room for accidents to happen.

Moving forward to the mid-1960s, Tomislav Gotovac produced his first series of collages in a burst of creative output. In 1964 and 1965 Gotovac created hundreds of collages after several years of collecting fragments from his everyday life such as adhesive bandages, movie tickets, cigarette butts, torn strips of newspaper and other remnants of his personal reality.²² However, these collages were not presented to the public until a 1976 exhibition at the Gallery of the Student Cultural Center in Belgrade. In 1988, an entire exhibition, held at the exhibition salon of the House of the Yugoslav People's Army (Dom JNA) in Zagreb, entitled "Strategies of Collage" (hrv. *Strategije kolaža*), was devoted to them. In the foreword of the catalogue for this exhibition,

art historian Zvonko Maković drew attention to an important characteristic of Gotovac's collages (or rather collages in general): they are only seemingly accidental and are, in fact, very intentional.²³ The latter is also a characteristic of this artist's movies: they are based on the technique of montage, a commonly used film-editing technique, and are thus closely related to collage. According to Benjamin D. Buchloh, montage (and collage) can be seen as the source of artistic appropriation strategies.²⁴ Additionally, Peter Bürger views montage as one of the core principles of avant-garde art. This could be extended to neo-avant-garde art even though, as Bürger notes, the latter had revived avant-garde art, simultaneously causing its acceptance (which is contradictory to avant-gardist antitraditional stances).²⁵ Appropriation strategies can be traced back to the first collages, after which they were radicalized by Marcel Duchamp. Regardless of their origins, the lineage that includes collages, ready-mades, assemblages, often also installation art, artistic environments, and even trash art, form a complex web of relations between the historical avant-gardes and neo-avant-garde practices. All that is antitraditional, in this case, takes on a somewhat ironic undertone.

Coming back to Tomislav Gotovac's movies, he was a proponent of using chance even in this medium. By capturing random people and events with his camera, switching between them as he sees fit and often at a fast pace (like in the movie *Blue Rider (Godard-art)* from 1964), Gotovac uses a montage strategy to create order out of this apparent disorder. Such works demonstrate how much thought he puts into organizing the seemingly accidental, as is typical of all his works: movies, performances, photographs and collages alike.²⁶ Referring to his performances, the artist himself explains that "Every detail of action is prepared and incorporated with similar care and selected semantic relationships: nothing is left to chance (in other words, chance is incorporated); any possible surprises should be anticipated."²⁷ In this case, one might notice a fine balance being struck between chance and intent. By embracing chance and accidents, the artist even more firmly demonstrates his intent.

Throughout his filmmaking career, which began in the early 1960s, Gotovac developed his life-long motto “It’s all a movie!”, which epitomizes his fascination with cinematography.²⁸ He spent much of his time watching films at the Cinema Club Zagreb, where he had the opportunity to see many avant-garde movies, including those of Duchamp, Léger, and others who also employed chance in their works.²⁹ To illustrate Gotovac’s familiarity with his artistic predecessors and contemporaries, he openly expressed his admiration for Jasper Johns’ skillful combination of the “accidental with the strictly programmed.”³⁰ This can be seen, for example, in Johns’ approach to painting, in which he embraced accidental drips, as well as the allusions to Duchamp’s work in his art. The combination of the ‘accidental and programmed’ yet again illustrates the many degrees of chance that can be present in an artwork.

Several Croatian art historians (e.g. Miško Šuvaković and Marijan Susovski) have noticed a hint of Duchamp in the works of the final two artists that this paper will address: Goran Trbuljak and Braco Dimitrijević. These two artists, both of whom are artistically productive to this day, began their collaboration in 1969 and continued to develop their individual artistic careers throughout the following decades. However, the focus here will be on their partnership in the Pensioner Tihomir Simčić group in 1969 and 1970. It is worth recounting the original story of this name as it is telling of the basic artistic principles adopted by this duo. In 1969, they organized an exhibition in their alternative exhibition space “Haustor” in Zagreb, where they strategically placed a lump of clay behind the door at the height of the doorknob. The intention here was to allow an accidental gallery-goer to create their own artwork, which was prepared beforehand by the ‘arranger’ (also called the ‘ex-artist’). The person appointed to push the doorknob into the prearranged lump of clay and accept it as his own work was a man by the name of Tihomir Simčić. The role of accident is central to this and several other artworks of the Pensioner Tihomir Simčić group. Trbuljak and Dimitrijević developed their own view of the creative act and, taking on the

role of the ex-artist/arranger, aimed to provide the circumstances for an accidental artwork to be created. They continued to provoke situations in which a person, often unknowingly and thus unwillingly, could create a visual change in a given material. It was precisely this seemingly banal visual change that Dimitrijević and Trbuljak thought of as the artwork itself because it had the power to change one’s perception of the mundane.³¹ Thus, the roles of artist and observer were inverted: the artist became the ‘anonymous artist’ or ‘ex-artist’ and the observer took on the role of the accidental participant, in turn relieving the ex-artist of their former artistic obligations, at least partially.³² This is somewhat reminiscent of Roland Barthes’ idea of the death of the author as it demonstrates the flexibility of the idea of the artist and rejects the idea of the artist as genius or demiurge.

To underline once more the basic premises of Trbuljak’s and Dimitrijević’s work, through rejecting the concept of a unique work of art and the artist as sole creator, they formed a new concept of art that can be the result of anyone’s “accidental, mechanical, ‘non-artistic’ action inside a certain initial and previously ‘arranged’ creative situation.”³³

Of course, one could draw a parallel between this artistic process and Betsy’s situation elaborated on by Danto (as mentioned at the beginning of this paper), whereby Betsy was hypothetically deemed the ‘maker’ of a painting. However, a curator who presented Betsy’s painting in an artistic context was thought of as the ‘artist’ since only they had the *human* intent necessary to create an artwork. The main issue of drawing such an analogy would be that the people partaking in Trbuljak’s and Dimitrijević’s artistic situations are just that: people. They do indeed have the capacity to see themselves as artists and, more broadly, as members of the Artworld. Some of them even did so by accepting this new role. The core concept here is artistic intent, or nomination in Duchampian terms. That is to say, something can be considered a work of art as long as it is supported by clear artistic intent (not necessarily that of the ‘maker’ of the artwork) and is assigned the status of an artwork by a member/

members of the Artworld. Typically, this would initially be the artist him/herself (to refer back to Dickie's institutional theory of art).

Apart from *The Relief of Tihomir Simčić*, another example that illustrates this point is *Painting by Krešimir Klika* (1969). In this case, Trbuljak and Dimitrijević arranged a situation in which an accidental driver drove over a carton of milk placed in the middle of the street.³⁴ The event and the following exchange were photographically documented. The accidental participant is depicted signing the newly and unintentionally created artwork, thus accepting it as their own and assigning it the status of a work of art. Another noteworthy work in this context is Dimitrijević's *Accidental Sculpture* (1968), which is quite similar in that it was also created by an accidental participant who ran over a package of powdered plaster placed on the street by Dimitrijević. In comparison to *Painting by Krešimir Klika*, however, Dimitrijević did not refer to the entire action as a work of art but rather thought of the gypsum dust cloud as being the artwork.³⁵ The emphasis is therefore placed on the physical outcome instead of the entire process. In addition to this, the 'maker' of the artwork also remained anonymous, in contrast to Krešimir Klika from the aforementioned work, which leads to Braco Dimitrijević taking authorship of *Accidental Sculpture*.

Nicolas Bourriaud explains that "Art, too, is made up of chaotic, chance meetings of signs and forms. Nowadays, it even creates spaces within which the encounter can occur. Present-day art does not present the outcome of a labour, it is the labour itself, or the labour-to-be."³⁶ It may be said of Trbuljak and Dimitrijević that they provided the spaces for such encounters and therefore enabled the sphere of art to expand and become more 'relational', to use Bourriaud's terminology. By surrendering some of their authorship to an accidental participant (a 'chance meeting' in itself), they create a more relational art, one that is based on interactions, taking into account and even incorporating the context. This would be similar to what art historian Ješa Denegri referred to when speaking of these artists' works as artistic causalism, which he closely related to the idea of

appropriation.³⁷ For example, in Trbuljak's work *The Back of a Painting by F. K.* (1969), which was created prior to the duo's collaboration, the artist merely noticed the dusty remnants of a painting that used to hang on the wall and appropriated this space, together with the dust that symbolized the phantasmal painting, as his own work.³⁸

Regardless of their initial similarities, Trbuljak and Dimitrijević developed different interests with respect to the role of chance in their work. As demonstrated in his infamous "Casual Passer-By" series, which began in 1971 and consisted of enlarged photographs of accidental passers-by placed in significant and strategic public locations in several European cities (including Zagreb, Venice, Paris and London, to name a few), Dimitrijević showed a great interest in the accidental subject of an artwork. Furthermore, in this and later works he expressed great skepticism regarding certain cultural and artistic norms, including the role of the artist, art institutions and the notion of an artwork.

Meanwhile, Trbuljak continued to focus significantly more on institutional criticism and challenging established ideas of the 'artist' and anonymity. This can be seen in his actions *Referendum* (1972), and *Anonymous Artist – Goran Trbuljak* (1972–1974), in which he handed out a questionnaire to casual passers-by (or art critics in the latter case), asking them to evaluate his status as an artist. The reason I mention these works, which were clearly intentional from their very conception and did not incorporate chance, is their role in proving the validity of the institutional theory of art. The results of *Referendum* showed that the majority of passers-by deemed Trbuljak, of whom they had not previously heard, an artist in his own right. Trbuljak thus illustrated that an artist is anyone who is given the opportunity to be an artist. This is closely related to his view of art as democratic and his belief that anyone can be an artist. Of course, Trbuljak was not the first artist to take this stance. One may call to mind Joseph Beuys' idea of social sculpture. Like Beuys, Trbuljak also believed in every person's capacity to create art, thus demystifying the artistic process by putting an emphasis on human intent, which is ingrained in every human being.

As was pointed out at the beginning of this paper, its three central notions are those of artistic intent, accident and error. The selected artworks and artists were chosen to illustrate the main idea that artistic intent is inherently human and that the title of 'artist' is rather ambiguous and often institutionally defined. That being said, artistic intent and anti-institutional stances seem to have played a key role in the formation of artistic practices in the context of Yugoslav self-management Socialism (i.e. workers' self-management), in which technocracy and bureaucracy primarily held the reins of production and the distribution of goods.³⁹ In a world where the individual was subject to the collective, artists in search of individual freedom and self-expression may have turned to appropriation strategies in order to affirm their own identity and confuse established notions of 'artist' and 'artworks' as dictated by institutions. Some did so by conflating the deeply personal with the overtly public (Gotovac) or by giving up control of the artistic process (Gattin), while others chose to actively engage the viewer in the art-making process (Dimitrijević and Trbuljak) to further blur the lines between artist and spectator, as well as between artistic intent (and artistic control) and chance.

If any lesson can be learned from Goran Trbuljak and Braco Dimitrijević, it is that any person has the potential to be an artist. Furthermore, these artists' works and those of Ivo Gattin and Tomislav Gotovac serve to point to the fact that accident and error can play a pivotal role in the creative act. If embraced, they can even serve the artwork. Put in Duchampian terms, the art coefficient – the gap between the unexpressed/intended and unintentionally expressed, in which accident, misinterpretation, and error resides – can be conducive to the artistic process. It can even stimulate artistic production, create new art forms based on accident and error, and challenge established artistic norms in the process. These provocations lie at the core of avant-garde and neo-avant-garde art and are, in fact, central to the role of the contemporary artist who has the privilege, or perhaps the obligation, to test the boundaries of art.

Notes

¹ "Ape Artists of the 1950s," *Artnet*; <http://www.artnet.com/galleries/the-mayor-gallery/ape-artists-of-the-1950s/> accessed 13.01.2020.

² Andrew Dodds, "Ape Artists of the 1950s," *Frieze*; published electronically 6.05.2006 <https://frieze.com/article/ape-artists-1950s>, accessed 10.01.2020.

³ George Dickie, "What Is Art? An Institutional Analysis," in *Aesthetics: a comprehensive anthology*, ed. Steven M. Cahn and Aaron Meskin (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2008), 429.

⁴ *Ibidem*, 435.

⁵ Marcel Duchamp, *The essential writings of Marcel Duchamp*, ed. Elmer Peterson and Michel Sanouillet (London: Thames and Hudson, 1975), 139.

⁶ Artistic use of chance and (intentional) error is a complex issue on its own. However, for the purpose of this essay, it is worth emphasizing its role in several artistic movements of the twentieth century, including Dadaism (e.g. Jean Arp's *Collage with Squares Arranged According to the Law of Chance*, 1916–17), Surrealism (the practices of automatic writing and the infamous Exquisite Corpse game), Abstract Expressionism (Pollock's drip paintings), John Cage's musical compositions (his use of the *I Ching* to compose them), and Cage's influence on the Fluxus movement which in general utilized chance (for example, George Brecht's *Chance Paintings* from the late 1950s). Yugoslavian artists were well-aware of these artistic movements and their basic premises, as exhibited by magazines such as *Dada Jazz* and *Dada Tank* (1922) and *Zenit* (1921–1926), the Belgrade Surrealists which were most active in the early 1930s, Edo Murtić's series of paintings *American Experience* (1951–1953), Cage's presence at the Music Biennale Zagreb in 1963, and his compositions being performed a year earlier. This is just to name a few instances to provide a slightly broader context for this essay.

⁷ David Hopkins, *After modern art: 1945–2000* (Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 60.

⁸ Zoran Gavrić, *Marcel Duchamp: izbor tekstova* (Beograd: Muzej savremene umetnosti, 1984), 37.

⁹ Zvonko Maković, *Strategija kolaža, Tomislav Gotovac - kolaži*, (Zagreb: Izložbeni Salon Doma JNA, 1988), Exh. cat., 4; Branka Stipančić, *Mišljenje je forma energije: eseji i intervjui iz suvremene hrvatske umjetnosti* (Zagreb: Arkzin-Hrvatska sekcija AICA, 2011), 91; Vesna Ledić, Adriana Prlić, and Miroslava Vučić, eds., *Šezdesete u Hrvatskoj: mit i stvarnost* (Zagreb: Muzej za Umjetnost-Obrt: Školska Knjiga, 2018), 95.

¹⁰ For more information on the Zagreb Genre Film Festival see: Mihovil Pansini, *Knjiga GEFFA 63* (Zagreb: Organizacioni Komitet GEFF-a, 1967).

¹¹ Ješa Denegri, Ivana Janković, and Željko Kipke, *Gorgona* (Zagreb: Agroinova, 2018), 75–80.

¹² Marijan Susovski, *Marcel Duchamp: La boîte en valise* (Zagreb: Galerija Grada Zagreba, 1984), Exh. cat..

¹³ "Marsel Dišan (Marcel Duchamp)," *Likovne sveske*, no. 2 (1972): 87–99.

¹⁴ Zoran Gavrić, *Marcel Duchamp: izbor tekstova* (Beograd: Muzej savremene umetnosti, 1984).

¹⁵ Maurizio Calvesi, "Duchamp i učenost," *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 324–329; Katarina Martin, "Anemic-cinema Marcela Duchampa," *ibidem*: 309–323; Gloria Moure, "Etant Donnes," *ibidem*: 334–338; "Jezik," *ibidem*: 342–345; "Optički eksperimenti," *ibidem*: 346–347; "Ready-mades," *ibidem*: 339–341; Yoshinki Tono, "Duchamp i 'inframance'," *ibidem*: 330–333; Žarko Vijatović, "Marcel Duchamp," *ibidem*: 304–308; Yves Arman, "Pitanje personaliteta," *ibidem*: 348–352.

¹⁶ See: Žarko Vijatović, ed., *Ready-mades* (Zagreb: Author's edition, 1990).

¹⁷ Further and more recent reading on this topic may include the following: Dubravka Djurić and Miško Šuvaković, eds., *Impossible Histories: Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-avant-gardes, and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918-1991* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003); Ješa Denegri, "Neoavangarda u hrvatskoj umjetnosti 50-tih i 60-tih godina: skupine EXAT-51 i Gorgona," *Republika* 12, no. 5 (2003), 59–69; Miško Šuvaković, *Neoavangarda i konceptualna umjetnost u Hrvatskoj: živjeti izvan svoje glave: asamblaj povijesnih, teorijskih i filozofskih dispozitiva* (Zagreb: DAF, 2019).

¹⁸ In order to better equate the reader with these artists, it is worth providing the approximate pronunciations of these artists' / groups' names: Ivo Gattin (i:vo gati:n), Tomislav Gotovac (tomislav gotov:as), Braco Dimitrijević (bra:so dimitrijević), Goran Trbuljak (goran trbuljak), Tihomir Šimčić (tihomir simtšić).

¹⁹ Ješa Denegri, *Prilozi za drugu liniju 2: dopune hronici jednog kritičarskog zalaganja: EXAT-51, Nove tendencije, radikalni enformel, Gorgona* (Beč-Beograd: Macura, 2005), 78.

²⁰ Adris grupa, *Ivo Gattin u Galeriji Adris*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wCnWiPSsWWg>, accessed 13.01.2020.

²¹ Denegri, Janković, and Kipke, 714.

²² Darko Šimičić, interview by Dora Derado, 2018.

²³ See: Zvonko Maković, *Strategija kolaža, katalog izložbe Tomislav Gotovac - kolaži* (Zagreb: Izložbeni salon Doma JNA, 1998), 5.

²⁴ Benjamin. Buchloh, "Allegorical Procedures: Appropriation and Montage in Contemporary Art," *Artforum* 21, no. 1 (1982): 44–46.

²⁵ Peter Bürger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 73–82.

²⁶ Aleksandar Battista Ilić, ed., *Tomislav Gotovac* (Zagreb: Hrvatski Filmski savez, 2003), 14.

- ²⁷ Vlasta Delimar and Milan Božić, *Apsolutni umjetnik = Absolute artist : Antonio Gotovac Lauer* (Zagreb: Domino, 2012), 109.
- ²⁸ Battista Ilić, 268.
- ²⁹ Vesna Ledić, Adriana Prlić, and Miroslava Vučić, eds., 95.
- ³⁰ Branka Stipančić, ed., *Riječi i slike = Words & images* (Zagreb: Institut Otvoreno društvo - Hrvatska, 1995), 200.
- ³¹ Ješa Denegri and Jasna Galjer, *Prilozi za drugu liniju: kronika jednog kritičarskog zalaganja* (Zagreb: Horetzky, 2003), 429–431.
- ³² Djurić and Šuvaković, 223.
- ³³ Ljiljana Kolečnik and Petar Prelog, *Moderna umjetnost u Hrvatskoj 1898-1975* (Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2012), 396–397.
- ³⁴ Tihomir Milovac, ed., *The misfits: conceptualist strategies in Croatian contemporary art = Neprilagodeni: konceptualističke strategije u hrvatskoj suvremenoj umjetnosti* (Zagreb: Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, 2002), 9.
- ³⁵ "Braco Dimitrijević," Avantgarde Museum, <https://www.avantgarde-museum.com/en/museum/collection/authors/braco-dimitrijevic-pe4444/>, accessed 13.01.2020.
- ³⁶ Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics*, trans. Simon Pleasance, Fronza Woods, and Mathieu Copeland (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2009), 110.
- ³⁷ Denegri and Galjer, 436.
- ³⁸ Slobodan Dimitrijević, "Grupa penzioner Tihomir Simčić. Čovjek i čovjek stvaralac, vizija osjećanje, stvaranje i djelo," *Novine Galerije Studentskog centra 12* (1969/1970): 32–33.
- ³⁹ Gal Kirn, ed., *Post-Fordism and Its Discontents* (aaaaarg.org, 2019), 280.

Bibliography

- "Ape Artists of the 1950's." *Artnet* (2005). Accessed 13.01.2020, <http://www.artnet.com/galleries/the-mayor-gallery/ape-artists-of-the-1950s/>.
- "Marsel Dišan (Marcel Duchamp)." *Likovne sveske*, no. 2 (1972): 87–99.
- "Braco Dimitrijević." *Avantgarde Museum*. Accessed 13.01.2020, <https://www.avantgarde-museum.com/en/museum/collection/authors/braco-dimitrijevic-pe4444/>.
- Adris grupa. *Ivo Gattin u Galeriji Adris*. Accessed 13.01.2020, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wCnWiPsWWg>.
- Arman, Yves. "Pitanje personaliteta." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 348–352.
- Battista Ilić, Aleksandar, ed. *Tomislav Gotovac*. Zagreb: Hrvatski Filmski savez, 2003.
- Bourriaud, Nicolas. *Relational Aesthetics*. Translated by Simon Pleasance, Fronza Woods and Mathieu Copeland. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2009.
- Buchloh, Benjamin. "Allegorical Procedures: Appropriation and Montage in Contemporary Art." *Artforum* 21, no. 1 (1982): 43–56.
- Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Calvesi, Maurizio. "Duchamp i učenost." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 324–329.
- Delimar, Vlasta, and Milan Božić. *Apsolutni umjetnik = Absolute artist : Antonio Gotovac Lauer*. Zagreb: Domino, 2012.
- Denegri, Ješa, and Jasna Galjer. *Prilozi za drugu liniju: kronika jednog kritičarskog zalaganja*. Zagreb: Horetzky, 2003.
- Denegri, Ješa, Ivana Janković, and Željko Kipke. *Gorgona*. Zagreb: Agroinova, 2018.
- Denegri, Ješa. "Neoavangarda u hrvatskoj umjetnosti 50-tih i 60-tih godina: skupine EXAT-51 i Gorgona." *Republika* 12, no. 5 (2003): 59–69.
- Denegri, Ješa. *Gorgona*. Zagreb: Agroinova, 2018.
- Denegri, Ješa. *Prilozi za drugu liniju 2: dopune hronici jednog kritičarskog zalaganja: EXAT-51, Nove tendencije, radikalni enformel, Gorgona*. Beč-Beograd: Macura, 2005.
- Dickie, George. "What Is Art? An Institutional Analysis." In *Aesthetics: a comprehensive anthology*, edited by Steven M. Cahn and Aaron Meskin, 426–437. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2008.
- Dimitrijević, Slobodan. "Grupa penzioner Tihomir Simčić. Čovjek i čovjek stvaralac, vizija osjećanje, stvaranje i djelo." *Novine Galerije Studentskog centra 12* (1969/1970): 32–33.
- Djurić, Dubravka, and Miško Šuvaković, eds. *Impossible Histories: Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-avant-gardes, and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918-1991*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003.
- Dodds, Andrew. "Ape Artists of the 1950s." *Frieze*. Published electronically 6.05.2006. Accessed 12.05.2020, <https://frieze.com/article/ape-artists-1950s>.

- Duchamp, Marcel. *The essential writings of Marcel Duchamp*. Edited by Elmer Peterson and Michel Sanouillet. London: Thames and Hudson, 1975.
- Gavrić, Zoran. *Marcel Duchamp: izbor tekstova*. Beograd: Muzej savremene umjetnosti, 1984.
- Hopkins, David. *After modern art: 1945-2000*. Oxford -New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Kirn, Gal, ed. *Post-Fordism and Its Discontents*: aaaaarg.org, 2019.
- Kolešnik, Ljiljana, and Petar Prelog. *Moderna umjetnost u Hrvatskoj 1898-1975*. Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2012.
- Ledić, Vesna, Adriana Prlić, and Miroslava Vučić, eds. *Šezdesete u Hrvatskoj: mit i stvarnost*. Zagreb: Muzej za umjetnost i obrt -Školska knjiga, 2018.
- Maković, Zvonko. *Strategija kolaža. Tomislav Gotovac - kolaži*. Zagreb: Izložbeni Salon Doma JNA, 1988. Exh. cat.
- Martin, Katarina. "Anemic-cinema Marcela Duchampa." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 309–323.
- Milovac, Tihomir, ed. *The misfits: conceptualist strategies in Croatian contemporary art = Neprilagodeni: konceptualističke strategije u hrvatskoj suvremenoj umjetnosti*. Zagreb: Muzej suvremene umjetnosti, 2002.
- Moure, Gloria. "Etant Donnes." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 334–338.
- Moure, Gloria. "Jezik." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 342–345.
- Moure, Gloria. "Optički eksperimenti." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 346–347.
- Moure, Gloria. "Ready-mades." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* (1988): 339–341.
- Pansini, Mihovil. *Knjiga GEFFA 63*. Zagreb: Organizacioni Komitet GEFF-a, 1967.
- Šimičić, Darko. Interviewed by Dora Derado (2018).
- Stipančić, Branka, ed. *Riječi i slike = Words & images*. Zagreb: Institut Otvoreno društvo - Hrvatska, 1995.
- Stipančić, Branka. *Mišljenje je forma energije: eseji i intervjui iz suvremene hrvatske umjetnosti*. Zagreb: Arkzin-Hrvatska sekcija AICA, 2011.
- Susovski, Marijan. *Marcel Duchamp: La boîte en valise*. Zagreb: Galerija Grada Zagreba, 1984. Exh. cat.
- Šuvaković, Miško. *Neoavangarda i konceptualna umjetnost u Hrvatskoj : živjeti izvan svoje glave : asamblaj povijesnih, teorijskih i filozofskih dispozitiva*. Zagreb: DAF, 2019.
- Tono, Yoshinki. "Duchamp i 'inframance'." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 330–333.
- Vijatović, Žarko. "Marcel Duchamp." *Quorum: časopis za književnost* 19, no. 2 (1988): 304–308.