

Organizator izložbe i nakladnik kataloga / Exhibition Organization and Catalogue Published by
Muzej Matija Skurjeni
Aleja Đure Jelačića 8, 10 290 Zaprešić, Hrvatska

Tel: + 385 (0) 1 33 10 540
E-mail: muzej.m.skurjeni@zapresic1.tcloud.hr
www : Muzej-Matija-Skurjeni.hr

Za nakladnika / For the Publisher
ANTE ŽAJA
Koncepcija izložbe / Exhibition Concept
ANTE ŽAJA
Urednik / Editor
ANTE ŽAJA

Predgovor / Foreword
NIKOLA ALBANEŽE
Likovni postav / Exhibition Design
MARIJAN RICHTER, ANTE ŽAJA
Fotografija / Photography
GORAN VRANIĆ

Prijevod na engleski / English translation
GRAHAM McMASTER
Tehnički postav / Technical Production
MIRJANA ŠOŠTAREC
**Grafičko oblikovanje kataloga i plakata
Catalogue and Poster Design**
ANTE ŽAJA


Tisak / Printed by
KERSCHOFFSET-ZAGREB D.O.O.
Naklada / Print Run
200

Izložba je realizirana sredstvima Ministarstva kulture RH,
Zagrebačke županije i Grada Zaprešića

MUZEJ
MATIJA
SKURJENI



Na naslovnici:
Fragments, 2019. ambijentalna instalacija, detalj, Muzej Matija Skurjeni
Foto: Goran Vranić
On the cover:
Fragments, 2019. ambijentalna instalacija, detalj, Matija Skurjeni Museum
Photo: Goran Vranić

 Facebook.com/Muzej.Matija.Skurjeni
www : muzej-matija-skurjeni.hr

MARIJAN RICHTER
Fragmenti

1. veljače 2019. - 10. ožujka 2019.

MUZEJ
MATIJA 
SKURJENI



U potrazi za slikarskim smislom

Slika i diskurs o slici nisu - napose nakon iskustva postmoderne - u jedno-smjernom, pa stoga i jednostavnom odnosu predmeta i njegova tumačenja, nego su u tolikoj mjeri isprepleteni da se i slika može naći u ulozi tumača¹; ukratko, ti složeni međuodnosi tvore ogromno strukturirano zdanje koje nazivamo slikarstvom (unutar još većeg koje poznajemo kao *svijet umjetnosti*², štoviše svjetovi umjetnosti čime naznačujemo svu disparatnost povijesnih mijena, napose pak aktualnoga stanja), što ga ne čini samo svekolika produkcija svih slika kroz povijest, već i različita teorijska (filozofska, semiotička, antropološka i ina) očitovanja o toj specifičnoj umjetničkoj praksi koja participira - još uvijek na dominantan način - u pojmu umjetnosti. Pretpostavke na koje ukratko podsjećam, kako bih s tih pozicija započeo govor o radu Marijana Richtera, vrijede u većoj ili manjoj mjeri za svaku relevantnu umjetničku produkciju, a kamoli ne za autora koji je toliko predano uključen u problematiku propitivanja smisla slikarstva, autoritativno³ zastupajući interakciju prakse i teorije. Riječ je, konkretno, o poetičkim i perceptivnim "istraživanjima" koja je proveo na vlastitom radu - tretirajući slike iz prethodnih ciklusa na način uklanjanja naslikanih slojeva i njihova načelnoga pikturnalnoga utišavanja primjenom bijeloga pigmenta - te iz njih izvedenim konkluzijama svedenima na zaključnu misao: "djelo (...) jest između izgleda i pogleda"⁴. I možda upravo zato - jer je sklon toj poziciji "između" - Richterova idealna krajnja slika ne postoji, ona se rasipa u beskraj, u neizmjeran broj potencijalnih realizacija iz kojih se tek neke - neumoljivim ograničenjem konkretnih vremensko-prostornih koordinata - doista i ostvare, barem privremeno.

U svojoj otvorenosti ka iskušavanju novih pristupa i mogućnosti destabiliziranja slike (a da pritom ona to i nadalje ostane, da njena materijalnost ne bude ukinuta), Marijan je ovom prilikom ponovo otišao korak dalje, nastavljajući pritom samo-referencijalnost primjenom materijala iz dosadašnjega vlastitog opusa. Budući da se radi o nizu tehničkih novina,

¹ Do koje mjere su izbrisane granice između umjetničke produkcije i govora o njoj, vidimo iz "iskaza Charlesa Harrison i grupe *Art&Language* (koji glasi) 'stvaranje umjetnosti i neke vrste teorije umjetnosti često je isti proces'". Citirano prema Sonja Briski Uzelac *Umjetnost u doba teorije*, u knjizi Miško Šuvaković: , str. 12

² Riječ je, dakako, o sintagmi koju je u optjecaj lansirao Arthur C. Danto, *The Artworld, Journal of Philosophy*, 61, 1964.

³ Marijan Richter, *Slika između izgleda i pogleda*, 2016.

⁴ "Bitna realizacija nije u njihovu (riječ je o slikama Marijana Richtera koja je on sam od-slikao, nad-slikao i pre-slikao, op.aut.) izgledu. Nije ni u pogledu. Prije i poslije svakoga izgleda uvijek je bio i uvijek će biti neki pogled. Izgled i pogled čine okvir (grč. *parergon*) ovoga istraživanja. Ergo, djelo (grč. *ergon*) jest između izgleda i pogleda." Isto, str. 95

neće biti zgorega pobrojati ih: korištenje pozadine već oslikanoga platna samo po sebi ne bi bilo novost da nije uloge podokvira koji zadobiva funkciju konvencionalnoga ukrasnog okvira. Već na toj osnovnoj razini daje nam do znanja da propituje prezentaciju, ne tek sam i izdvojen rad. Takvi okviri, sada nerazdvojni dijelovi cjeline, postaju važniji od uobičajenih okvira koji mogu, ali i ne moraju biti granica koja razdvaja prizor i/ili materiju slike od okruženja.⁵ U Richterovu slučaju oni su način interpretacije slike. Kada tome pridodamo činjenicu kako autor ne razmatra pojedini takav rad izdvojeno (osim u samom trenutku njegova nastanka), nego upravo kao dio ansambla, onda takva aglomeracija radova kao proizvoljno, to jest privremeno oformljenih prostornih raspoređivanja ukazuje na osobitu pozornost udijeljenu kompoziciji višega reda - izložbenoj. Njegov interes nije više usmjeren na to kako će promatrač doživjeti njegove radove kao zasebne entitete (no uvijek je moguće usmjeriti pozornost na detalje), nego kako oni u međusobom jukstaponiranju tvore novi, cjeloviti entitet ("slike vidimo simultano, s distance one postaju jedna apstraktna slika"⁶ - riječi su koje opisuju sličan postupak Gerharda Richtera). Nadalje, podloga koju je dobio okretanjem poledine omogućuje apliciranje (jednostavnim umetanjem u procjepak između letvice okvira i platna koje naliježe na nj) različitoga materijala: fragmenata drugih radova, isječaka fotografija i dekolaziranih publikacija itd. Potvrda je to neizmjenosti slikovnih varijacija i improvizacijske lakoće s kojom one nastaju. Kako bi čitavu strukturu još više usložnio, Marijan je razgranatosti sastavnica po plohi - njihovom aranžiranju po visini i širini - pridružio uslojavanje po dubini - osim kolažiranja unutar podokvira i njih same smješta na veća oslikana platna. Realizacije su mu, valja i to zapaziti, neočekivano rasterećene, posjeduju opuštenost koja napose dolazi do izražaja ako recentne radove usporedimo s njegovim ostvarenjima iz devedesetih koja redovito nose težinu i određeni trag vidljivoga napora.

„Stvarnost slike je zrcalo misli, a ne, kako se vjeruje, zrcalo stvarnosti“ – upozorava Bernard Noël⁷ – i to je Richteru ne samo jasno, nego on nastoji neprestance aktualizirati svoju misao; a ona je - kada shvatimo namjeru da se ono što teži konačnosti (slika), jer mu je to u prirodi,

⁵ Premda slikari nerijetko smatraju okvir integralnim dijelom svojih slika - dovoljno je prisjetiti se Van Goghova stava o slici koja je dovršena tek kada dobije okvir ili Matissove izjave o četirima stranama okvira kao "najvažnijim dijelovima slike" - on je ipak nešto što može, u principu, biti odabrano i promijenjeno (osim u pojedinim, deklarativnim primjerima kao što je slučaj Howarda Hodgkina). Iako nisu toliko općepoznati, i brojni naši slikari potvrđuju to isto: Šestić je bijelio svoje okvire, Radić je odabrao specifičan profil itd. neuokvirenost - prirodno stanje suvremenih slika zbog širokog prostora oko njih

⁶ Dieter Schwarz, *Gerhard Richter Survey*, Koeln 2000, str. 14

⁷ Bernard Noël, *Dnevnik pogleda*, MH Zagreb, str. 64



nastoji "izbaviti iz definitivne forme"⁸ - upravo patetično velika. Ta zamisao i namjera – samo na prvi pogled paradoksalna za čovjeka kojemu je patetika potpuno strana – dovela je slijedom toga i do poduhvata koji se pokazuje utopijski neuhvatljivim; svjestan kako nije moguće sve prikazati, svaki "izgled", odlučuje se za jedan u jednome trenutku. No ono na čemu se nedvojbena mora odati priznanje našem autoru jest činjenica da je iznašao još jedan put za realizaciju nagona za smrću (*death drive*) slikarstva – i to nakon svih mogućih i nemogućih staza koje su, njime pogonjeni, prokrčili Kazimir Maljevič et comp. (društvo velikih gesta čine Piet Mondrian, Rodčenko, Ad Reinhardt, Robert Ryman - da nabrojam samo neke rodonačelnike - te mnogi drugi nastavljači). Ali ne treba kritizirati umjetnost zbog njenog nagona za smrću - ističe Bruno Haas te pritom izdvaja Hegela kao prvog mislioca koji je pojmiio umjetnost u smislu njenoga okončanja - jer "smislenije je nastojati shvatiti nagon za smrću nego ga kritizirati"⁹. To nastojanje dovodi do zaključka kako je pretpostavka za "otkriće" umjetnosti kao umjetnosti (*art as art*) bilo omogućeno onoga trenutka kada je "umjetnost spoznata u svojoj apsolutnosti"¹⁰ te je istodobno razotkriven i njen, upravo spomenuti, nutarnji nagon.

Pa ipak, s imanentno slikarske pozicije moguće je uputiti kritiku. Naime, kako su reprezentativna slikarska ostvarenja postajala sve rjeđa (a time i njihova tradicionalna stvaralačka aura), tako je na značenju sve više dobivalo to osebujno područje njihova prebivanja – svijet umjetničkoga, svijet čiste umjetnosti (*pure art*). Klasično slikarstvo (i općenito ono koje je orijentirano na predodžbu - ne nužno i figuraciju) su velikim učinila djela, ona koja se označavalo kao remek-djela, no tijekom 20. stoljeća, shvaćenog kao prijelazno razdoblje i ujedno najveće emancipacije umjetnosti, pojam se je oteo ranijem značenju koje je podrazumijevalo i vještinu (ali nipošto ne samo nju), postao je sadržaj sam po sebi kojem se priključila psihologija, filozofija, svaki *logos* (umjetnost je osvojila autonomiju po Adornu) pa je sad moguće da se iz kontekstualnih razloga - utvrdivih pitanjima: kad je djelo nastalo, u kojim okolnostima, kakve su bile autorove namjere, njegovo stanje, uvjerenja itd. - ono nazove remek-djelom što je, mišljenja sam, suvišno i nepotrebno. Tako su, primjerice, sva djela i u Richtera jednakovrijedna, njihova unikatnost ih ne izdvaja iz roda kojemu pripadaju.

⁸ Marijan Richter, isto, str. 94

⁹ *On Art and Painting*, razgovor između Hartwiga Fishera i Bruna Haasa, u: Katalog izložbe *Painting on the Move*, Basel 2002, str. 98 i dalje

¹⁰ isto, str. 99

Velikih tema više nema, dopuštamo mogućnost da u najmanjem detalju otkrijemo spoznaju ili da barem budemo na njenom tragu. Tako je i slikarski proces usmjeren na stvaranje predodžbe koju ne možemo doseći ni na koji drugi način, a ne na to da reprezentira samog sebe. Svojom prezentacijom djela izvan ustaljenih medijskih okvira Marijan Richter potiče nas da umjetničkome djelu pristupimo izvan ustaljenih domena traženja ugode i iskazivanja ljepote kako to jest na tragu tradicionalno shvaćenih lijepih umjetnosti. Međutim, umjetnost je također, daleko od prethodnoga poimanja, i prostor promišljanja čija je narav „jedan od najnedostižnijih tradicionalnih problema ljudske kulture“¹¹.

Među nevelikim brojem pojedinaca koji na hrvatskoj sceni beskompromisno ustraju u takvom problemskom pristupu slikarstvu izdvaja se Marijan Richter; njegovo umjetničko propitivanje koje dosljedno u svome radu provodi, napose tijekom protekla dva desetljeća, ne samo da ne posustaje, nego dobiva na intenzitetu. Nepopustljiv u svojim traženjima još neispitanih mogućnosti koje slikarstvo pruža, istodobno oslonjen na tradiciju – ponajprije hrvatsku, a preko nje i svjetsku (što znači da mu oni aspekti svjetske tradicije koji nisu kod nas bili prisutni, nisu ni zanimljivi) - ali i u neprekidnom kritičkom odnosu prema njoj, Richter se potvrđuje kao nadasve zahtjevan autor. Zahtjevan prema samome sebi (kao autor iznimno svjestan povijesti slikarstva, toga sve većega bremena koje pritišće nadolazeće generacije njegovih adepata), ali i prema promatraču od kojega očekuje – dakako, u nekakvom idealnom smislu – da osvijesti čitav kreativni proces kako bi u potpunosti doživio rad i sve ono što je dovelo do njegove aktualne realizacije.

Nikola Albaneže

¹¹ Izjava Richarda Wolheima (*The nature of art as "one of the most exclusive of the traditional problems of human culture"*) stekla je široku popularnost i često se navodi u literaturi i medijima.













In Search of Painterly Sense

The painting and discourse about the painting do not, particularly after Postmodernism, have a one-way and hence simplistic attitude to object and interpretation of the object. Instead, they are interwoven to such an extent that the painting can find itself in the role of interpreter.¹ In brief, these complex interrelationships create the enormous, structured edifice that we call painting (within a still greater that we know as the artworld,² indeed artworlds, thus indicating all the disparate natures of historical changes, and particularly of the current state of affairs). Thus refers not only to the whole of production of all paintings in history, but also of different theoretical (philosophical, semiotic, anthropological and so on) responses to the specific art practice that participates – still in a dominant manner – in the concept of art. The premises to which I refer briefly, as prolegomenon to discussion of the work of Marijan Richter, hold true to a greater or lesser extent for every worthwhile artistic production, let alone for an author who is involved with such dedication in the problem of examination of the point and purpose of art, authoritatively³ representing the interaction of practice and theory. In concrete terms, this means the poetic and perceptual research that he has conducted in his own work, treating the paintings from previous series in such a way as to remove the painted layers and their, in principle, pictural quiescence, with the application of white pigment – and the conclusions derived from them that are reduced to the concluding idea: “the work... lies between appearing and looking”.⁴ And perhaps for this very reason, for he is fond of this in-between position – Richter’s ideal of ultimate painting does not exist, but scatters off into infinity, into an immense number of potential productions of which just a few, given the implacable restriction of concrete temporal and spatial coordinates, can be achieved in reality, at least temporarily.

In his openness to the examination of new approaches and possibilities of destabilising the painting (while still leaving it in existence, its materiality not being abolished) Marijan has on this occasion once again gone a step

¹ The extent to which the borders between artistic production and talk about it have been elided can be seen from the statement of Charles Harrison and the Art & Language group ‘the creation of art and some kind of theory of art are often the same process’. Quoted after Sonja Briski Uzelac *Art in the Age of Theory*, in the book of Miško Šuvaković, p. 12.

² A phrase put into circulation by Arthur C. Danto, *The Artworld*, *Journal of Philosophy*, 61, 1964.

³ Marijan Richter, *Slika između izgleda i pogleda*, 2016.

⁴ “The essential realisation is not in their [this is about the paintings of Marijan Richter that he has himself unpainted, overpainted, repainted] *appearing*. It is not in looking at them, Before and after every appearing there has always been and always will be some kind of looking. Appearing and looking make the framework of this research. The work, then, is located between appearing and looking.” Op. cit. p. 95

further, continuing the self-referentiality with the application of material from his own oeuvre to date. Since this is about a number of technical new departures, it will not be out of place to list a few: the use of the back-ground of a canvas already painted on would not in itself be a novelty were it not for the role of the stretcher that takes on the function of the conventional decorative frame. Right at this basic level he lets us know that he is testing out presentation, not just the selected work. Such stretchers, now inseparable parts of the whole, become more important than the usual frames that can, although they do not have to, be a border that separates the scene and/or material of the painting from the environment.⁵ In the case of Richter they are a way of interpreting the painting. When to this we add the fact that the author does not consider an individual such work in detachment (except at the very moment of its creation) but precisely as part of an ensemble, and, accordingly, an agglomeration of works as arbitrary, that is, temporarily formed, spatial dispositions, indicates a particular attention devoted to a higher order composition, that of the exhibition. His interest is no longer oriented to how the observer is going to experience his works as entities on their own (although it is always possible to direct attention to details), but how they create, in their juxtapositions, a new and complete entity (“we see the paintings simultaneously, from a distance they become a single abstract painting”⁶ – words that describe the similar procedure of Gerhard Richter). Then, support that he has obtained by turning the backs enables the application (by simple insertion into the crack between the laths of the frame and the canvas tacked onto them) of diverse material: fragments of other works, cutouts of photographs and décollaged publications and so on. This is a confirmation of the immensity of the variations of paintings and the improvisational facility with which they come into being. To make the whole structure still more layered, Marijan has added to the ramification of the components on the surface – their arrangement up and down and crosswise – a depthwise complication – apart from collaging inside the stretchers, he locates them on larger painted canvases. His productions are, it is worth observing, unexpectedly relieved, they have a relaxation that comes out particularly if we compare the recent works with his productions from the nineties, which tend to have weight, and a certain trace of visible effort.

⁵ Although painters will not infrequently consider the frame a part of their paintings – and it is enough to recall Van Gogh’s view that a painting is complete only when it gets a frame or Matisse’s assertion that the four sides of the frame are “the most important parts of the painting” – it is after all something that can, in principle, be selected and changed (save for some declarative examples as in the case of Howard Hodgkin). Although they are not so generally well known, numerous Croatian painters confirm this. Šestić whitened his frames; Radić chose a specific moulding and so on. However, it is certainly interesting to observe that being unframed, or the use of only thin laths, became the natural state of contemporary paintings, which is the consequence of the gallery manner of exhibition – with a broad space being left around them.

⁶ Dieter Schwarz, *Gerhard Richter Survey*, Cologne, 2000, p. 14



“The reality of the painting is a mirror of thought, and not, as is believed, a mirror of reality,” points out Bernard Noël⁷. To Richter this is not only clear, he incessantly endeavours to make his thinking actual. When we understand the intention that that which aspires to finitude (the painting), for that is in its nature, “should be redeemed from definitive form”⁸ – this thinking is actually poignantly large. This idea and intention – only cursorily paradoxical for a man to whom poignancy is totally alien – led sequentially to an undertaking that turns out to be utopianly elusive; aware that he cannot show everything, every appearance, he has determined on one at a given moment. But what certainly has to be acknowledged our painter is the fact that he has found out one more way to the realisation of the death drive of painting – after all the possible and impossible paths that, driven by it, have been blazed by Kasimir Malevich & Co. (the society of big gestures consists of Mondrian, Rodchenko Ad Reinhardt, Robert Ryman, to list just a few of the founding fathers, and many successors). But there is no need to criticise art because of its thanatotic urge – says Bruno Haas, while identifying Hegel as the first thinker who thought of art in the sense of its ending – for “it is more sensible to try to understand the death drive than to criticise it”⁹. This endeavour leads to the conclusion that the premise for the discovery of art as art was made possible the very moment when “art was understood in its absoluteness”¹⁰ and that at the same its just mentioned inner urge was also discovered. Still, from an immanently painterly position, it is possible to address criticism. Since grand achievements in painting have become ever more rare (and their traditional creative aura with them), so the particular area in which they dwell has gained in importance – the world of the artistic, the world of pure art. Classical painting (in general that with is oriented to the idea, if not necessarily to the figural) was made great by works, those that were labelled masterpieces, but during the 20th century, understood as a transitional period, and at the same time the greatest emancipation of art, the concept got away from the earlier meaning, which took for granted skill (although by no means only that), and became content, or substance, in and of itself, joined by psychology, philosophy, all kinds of *logos* (according to Adorno art won its own autonomy) and it is now possible from contextual reasons – ascertainable from questions: when the work was produced, in which circumstances, what the author’s intentions were, his state of mind, conviction and so on – to call that a masterpiece that, I am of the opinion, is superfluous and

⁷ Bernard Noël, [*Diary of Regard*], MH Zagreb, p. 64

⁸ Marijan Richter, op. cit. p. 94

⁹ *On Art and Painting*, a conversation between Hartwig Fischer and Bruno Haas, in the catalogue of the exhibition *Painting on the Move*, Basel 2002, p. 98 ff.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* p. 99

and unnecessary. For example, all the works of Richter are of equal value, their uniqueness does not pick them out from the genre to which they belong.

There are not any big themes any longer, we might permit the possibility that in the smallest detail we shall discover a perception or at least be on its track. And so the painting process is directed to the creation of the concept that we cannot achieve in any other way, and not to representing itself. With his presentation of work outside the settled media frameworks Marijan Richter encourages us to approach the work of art outside the settled domains of the search for pleasure and the statement of beauty, in the footsteps of traditionally understood fine arts. However, art is always far from the previous conception, and the space of thinking whose nature is "one of the most elusive of the traditional problems of human culture"¹¹. Among the not very large number of individuals who persist without any compromise on this kind of problematic approach to painting, Marijan Richter is one on his own. His artistic interpretation, which he carries out consistently in his work, and has done so, in particular during the last decades, not only does not falter, but is gaining in intensity. Unrelenting in his search for the untested possibilities that painting offers, and at the same time drawing on the tradition, primarily the Croatian, and via it the world's (which means that those aspects of the world tradition that have not been present here are not interesting to him) but in an uninterruptedly critical relationship with it, Richter makes good his claim to be a supremely demanding artist. He makes demands on himself (as author of an exceptionally aware history of painting, that ever greater burden that presses down on the up and coming generations of adepts) but also on the observer, from whom he requires – in some ideal kind of sense, of course – awareness of the whole creative process so as to be able fully to experience the work and everything that led up to its current embodiment.

Nikola Albanež

¹¹ This statement of Richard Wolheim has achieved wide popularity and is often quoted in literature and the media.





ŽIVOTOPIS:

Marijan Richter, slikar, esejist, i likovni pedagog, rođen je 1957. u Zagrebu. Nakon osnovne škole upisuje Školu primijenjene umjetnosti u Zagrebu, a dvije godine kasnije i glazbenu školu „Vatroslav Lisinski“. Maturirao je na slikarskom odjelu Škole primijenjenih umjetnosti u Zagrebu gdje je usvojio pouku prof. Josipa Biffela o crtežu kao načinu mišljenja. Na Akademiji likovnih umjetnosti u Zagrebu, studirao je u klasi prof. Nikole Reisera, da bi na četvrtoj godini prešao u klasu prof. Raoula Goldonija pod čijim mentorstvom je i diplomirao na petoj godini. Od prof. Reisera je baštiniio slikarski sluh za likovno muziciranje bojom, a od prof. Goldonija analitički pristup i pregalaštvo u iznalaženju oblikovnih sredstava za slikarsku realizaciju.

Maturirao je i na gudačkom odjelu Muzičke škole „Vatroslav Lisinski u Zagrebu. Usporedno sa završnom godinom srednje muzičke škole i trećom godinom studija slikarstva na ALU, kao stipendist Zagrebačke filharmonije upisuje i završava prvu godinu studija kontrabasa na Muzičkoj akademiji u Zagrebu, te osvoja 3. nagradu na državnom natjecanju za muzičke umjetnike do 30 godina starosti. Prvu godinu studija glazbe završava istodobno kad i treću godinu studija slikarstva, a potom studij na MA stavlja u status mirovanja te se posvećuje isključivo studiju slikarstva. Komparativno iskustvo glazbe i likovnosti ugrađeno je u njegovo slikarstvo kao i u cjelokupan njegov umjetnički, znanstveni i pedagoški rad.

Nakon dvadeset pet godina umjetničkog djelovanja, iz potrebe za rezimiranjem dotadašnjih slikarskih realizacija i otvaranjem novog poglavlja u umjetničkom radu, 2008. godine upisuje poslijediplomski doktorski studij na Akademiji likovnih umjetnosti sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Doktorsku dizertaciju s temom *Slika između izgleda i pogleda* obranio je 2013. godine.

Od 2013. godine u zvanju docenta predaje kolegije iz umjetničkog područja na Odjelu za nastavničke studije Sveučilišta u Zadru.

Izlagao je na više od sedamdeset izložbi od čega je ostvario četrdesetak samostalnih. O umjetničkom radu Marijana Richtera pisali su: Marijan Špoljar, Đuro Vandura, Darko Glavan, Damir Grubić, Stanko Špoljarić, Darko Schneider, Vladimir Rismondo ml., Enes Quien, Spomenka Nikitović, Dorotea Jendrić, Damir Demonja, Goran Blagus, Margarita Sveštarov Šimat, Antonija Škrtić, Nikola Albaneže, Sonja Švec Španjol, Ivica Župan, Sonja Briski Uzelac, Miško Šuvaković i drugi. Recentnim Richterovim opusom najviše sa bavio Ivica Župan.

Prvo razdoblje njegovog stvaralaštva (1983-2010.) obrađeno je u monografiji RICHTER autorice Margarite Sveštarov Šimat. Knjigu je 2012. godine objavio ArTresor naklada uz financijsku podršku Ministarstva kulture RH. Drugo razdoblje obilježava svojevrsno „obrnuto slikanje“ – od naslikane slika prema njenom ishodištu. O slikarskom poricanju definitivnog izgleda naslikane slike i o poetici „raslikavanja“ kojom se bavi posljednjih godina Marijan Richter je napisao knjigu *Slika između izgleda i pogleda* koja je uz podršku Ministarstva znanosti RH objavljena u izdanju ArTresor naklade 2017. Recenzije za knjigu napisali su dr. Sonja Briski Uzelac i dr. Miško Šuvaković.

O Richterovom radu snimljeno je nekoliko televizijskih priloga: *Slikanje fotografije* (OTV, 2004.); *TV izložba* (autorica priloga Snježana Samac, HTV 1995.). Izbor radova iz opusa postavljen je u na internetskoj stranici www.marijanrichter.com

Popis samostalnih izložbi:

- *Fragmenti*. Muzej Matija Skurjeni, Zaprešić, 1. veljače – 10. ožujak 2019.
- *Intonacija bjelinom*. Galerija Hrvatsko slovo, Zagreb, 6. veljača – 6. ožujak 2018.
- Samostalna izložba - *Site specific*. KD Vatroslava Lisinskog, 22. siječanj 2018.
- Samostalne izložbe *La peinture entre image et regard 1 i 2*, Cité internationale des arts, Paris, 2017.
- *Što je naslikana slika?* Zorin dom, Karlovac, 16.-20. 2017.
- Samostalna izložba *Assemblage – instalacija*. Mala dvorana KD Vatroslava Lisinskog, Zagreb, 2016.
- *Slika poslije naslikane slike*, Galerija Zrinski hotela Palace, Zagreb, 2016.
- *Novostare slike*, Galerija K, Križevci, rujanj 2016.
- *Slike poslije naslikanih slika*. Galerija Karas HDLU, Zagreb, 2015.
- *Naslikavanja i raslikavanja 2*. Izložbeni prostor Sveučilišta u Zadru, 2014.
- *Naslikavanja i raslikavanja 1*. Galerija Branko Ružić, Slavonski Brod, 2014.
- *Svako na svojoj strani*. (s Vukom Jeremićem) Galerija sveučilišne knjižnice, Split, 2013.
- *Slikarska poricanja i odricanja*. Galerija Vjekoslav Karas, Karlovac, 2012.
- Mala dvorana KD Vatroslava Lisinskog, Zagreb, 2012.
- Mala dvorana KD Vatroslava Lisinskog, 2011.
- Galerija Zvonimir, Zagreb, 2010.
- Likovni salon Vladimir Becić, Slavonski Brod, 2010.



- Galerija Zvonimir, Zagreb, 2010.
- Likovni salon Vladimir Becić, Slavonski Brod, 2010.
- Galerija ZILIK, Karlovac, 2009.
- Mala dvorana KD Vatroslava Lisinskog, Zagreb, 2009.
- Slike 2006. Galerija Stančić, Zagreb, 2006.
- Općinska vijećnica, Dugi Rat, 2006.
- Dom kulture, Blato, 2006.
- Slike 2004. Europski dom, Zagreb, 2004.
- Gradski muzej Vinkovci, 2002.
- Izložbeni prostor ministarstva financija, Zagreb, 2001.
- Metastaze. Galerija Izidor Kršnjavi, Zagreb, 2001.
- AGM Art point centar, Zagreb, 2000.
- Galerija Idealni grad, Zagreb, 1999.
- Galerija Magis, Osijek, 1999.
- Muzej grada Trogira, 1999.
- Galerija CEKAO, Zagreb, 1997.
- Gradska kavana, Sisak, 1997.
- Galerija SC, Zagreb, 1996.
- Galerija Ars, Križevci, 1996.
- Gradski muzej, Sisak, 1996.
- Galerija Ulrich, Zagreb, 1995.
- Izložbeni prostor centra za kulturu, Čakovec, 1994.
- Galerija Miroslav Kraljević, Zagreb, 1994.
- Galerija Izlog LIKUM, Zagreb, 1994.
- Studio galerije Karas, Zagreb, 1987.

BIOGRAPHY

Marijan Richter, painter, essayist and art educator, was born in 1957 in Zagreb. After elementary school, he enrolled in the School of Applied Art in Zagreb, and two years later in the Vatroslav Lisinski Music School. He graduated from the Applied Art School, having internalised the teaching of Josip Biffel about drawing being a manner of thinking. At the Academy of Fine Art in Zagreb, he studied in the class of Nikola Reiser, and in the fourth year switched to the class of Raoul Goldoni, in which to produce his fifth-year graduation work. From Nikola Reiser he took a painterly sense for visual music making with colour, and from Goldoni an analytical approach and a zeal for finding out formal means for the painting production.

He also graduated in the string section of the Vatroslav Lisinski Music School; in parallel with the final year of secondary music school and the third year of the painting course at the Academy of Fine Art, and with a grant from the Zagreb Philharmonic Orchestra, he enrolled in and completed the first year of studies in the double bass at the Zagreb Music Academy, taking the third prize at a national composition for musicians up to the age of 30. He completed the first year of music studies in the same year as the third year of painting, and then let his studies at the Music Academy lie fallow while he devoted himself exclusively to the study of painting. Comparative experience of music and visual art is, however, instinct in his painting and in the whole of his artistic, scholarly and educational work.

After twenty-five years of an artistic career, out of the need to round off his previous work in painting and to open up a new chapter in his work in art, in 2008 he enrolled in the doctoral course in the Academy of Fine Art in Zagreb. In 2013 he defended his doctoral dissertation "Painting between Image and Gaze". From 2013 he has been assistant professor teaching classes from the domain of visual art at the educational department of Zadar University.

He has exhibited at more than seventy exhibitions, some forty of them being one-man shows. The artwork of Marijan Richter has been discussed in print by Marijan Špoljar, Đuro Vandura, Darko Glavan, Damir Grubić, Stanko Špoljarić, Darko Schneider, Vladimir Rismondo ml., Enes Quien, Spomenka Nikitović, Dorotea Jendrić, Damir Demonja, Goran Blagus, Margarita Sveštarov Šimat, Antonija Škrtić, Nikola Albaneže, Sonja Švec Španjol, Ivica Župan, Sonja Briski Uzelac, Miško Šuvaković and others. Recent Richter work has been discussed most often by Ivica Župan.

The first period of his work (1983-2010) has been handled in the monograph Richter by Margarita Sveštarov Šimat, published in 2012 by ArTresor with the help of funding from the Ministry of Culture. The second period is marked by a kind of inverted painting, from the painted, he paints back to its origins. Marijan Richter has written the book "Painting between Image and Gaze" concerning the disavowal of any final appearance of the painted picture and concerning the poetics of "unpainting" that he has been engaged with in recent works. It was published by ArTresor in 2017, and publishers' reports were written by Dr Sonja Briski Uzelac and Dr Miško Šuvaković.

Several television features about Richter's work have been made: *Painting the Photography* (OTV, 2004); *TV Exhibition* (story by Snježana Samac, HTV 1995). A selection of works from the oeuvre is available at his personal Internet site, www.marijanrichter.com