

est shadow,” art leaves behind the neutral horizon of the aesthetic and recognizes itself in the “golden ball” of the will to power (Agamben, 1999: p. 2).

This is, of course, one of the possible articulations marking a basic shift in the very position of art at the time, which followed many social, political and spiritual turbulences of the 19th Century. In a way, it is also explaining how it had become possible to talk about the rules of art, as in the case of Bourdieu. This *turn from the spectator to a creator* could not ultimately succeed in its unilateral sense. Even *l’art pour l’art* mostly reflected more a hopelessness of its “project” than any serious ambition. However, what was left of it has been an idea that a work of art might and can contain a statement, or that it even could be above all a statement – no matter how appalled any advocate of the original meaning of the concept would be. Such ponderings played very visible role in the mid-20th century and ever after – as it seems. The residue of the heroic attempt of *l’art pour l’art* are many annoying questions, repeated, rephrased, connoted and asked: if art is about statements that artists utter, what happens then to the cherished aesthetics? To answer such question we should take into account Benjamin’s observation, which probably most conclusively wrapped up the contribution of the concept of *l’art pour l’art*:

With the advent of the first truly revolutionary means of reproduction, photography, simultaneously with the rise of socialism, art sensed the approaching crisis, which has become evident a century later. At the time, art reacted with the doctrine of l’art pour l’art, that is, with a theology of art. This gave rise to what might be called a negative theology in the form of the idea of “pure” art, which not only denied any social function of art but also any categorizing by subject matter. (In poetry, Mallarmé was the first to take this position) (Benjamin, 1969: p. 224).

Agamben’s and Benjamin’s quotations point to the same direction. *L’art pour l’art* through these two (or any among many similar) readings becomes just an instance in art’s and society’s history. Agamben makes his point by way of a rather metaphorical mean in a more deep sense than it seems at first sight, as the point is caught in a dialogue with Nietzsche. Therefore, his observation of art that “recognizes itself in the ‘golden ball’ of the will to power” could be clearly joined with Benjamin’s hint that actually the instance of *l’art pour l’art* achieves the total opposite of the in-