

STORYBOARD INTENDED

While expecting and constructing a final structure, the form of pre-visualization commonly used as a mid-phase based on a simple narrative string of images, a sequential depicting, is a storyboard. The Board here means a base, a whole, in which the sequences of a story are structured for a future form, and in the meantime, a mid-story should announce, order, depict the next one, the complete and self-sufficient one (the Story). For the purpose of the preparation of a film, or a comic strip, but also media forms, often as a pitch – offer and sale of the future film to producers, future comic strip to publishers, future commercial to the clients, a storyboard shows the future, it anticipates and exposes a potential. A Storyboard can be the book of shooting, and its suggestive power is derived from that practice: as an instruction, an order, a recommended activity.

What kind of a storyboard do Nenad Malešević and Miodrag Manojlović offer here: a sketch and anticipation, or an instruction? Both of those functions of a storyboard suggest the postponed end, expected final result, and that is why a storyboard, just like a movie trailer in films, can be perceived as a threat that something will happen, with one half of the content, and one half of the expectation and imagined development. Considering the fact that in this case we deal with a pile of images which are brought together by their authors only under the principle of analogical creation, the focus moves to their past and the meaning is searched in their beginning. The

sound offered to the observer while meeting with these images indicates the transfer of suspense from the future into the past, into the process of the creation of images, inviting to reconstruction.

As the observers, the only help we get from the authors who joined these images together is direction to the plane of a common fragmented experience, which brings us into the field of a symbolic representation of the common past and memory. If it was an individual ensemble of this kind we had to face, it would be a case of an analysis of a logic of an inner world, but by joining these images made by the two authors, we get a more complex task: the authors suggest a commonness of the story, of the past, from which its fragments take their origin from. By the title Storyboard, we can connect the group of images into a structured sequential narrative only based on the intention of the two authors, which is contained in the title. In literary science, such focus on author's intention is connected to the notion of the intentional fallacy¹, which would in this case mean that we could be tempted to reconstruct the intentions of the authors relying on our habits gained through the dominant cultural form of narrative which requires a clear linear causal string, communicable and comprehensible. However, the image of the fragments on a work-in-progress board does not contain a promise of such a result.

In formal sense, the works of Nenad Malešević and Miodrag Manojlović are realized in the technique of drawing by various means: pencil, tempera, ink, pencils in color and acrylic on paper foundation, which in some cases give an impression of materials which were on hand for the authors to

instantly record an idea, a fragment, atmosphere, images which also instantly appeared.

In that sense, in some works were used the foundations which had already been used, on which one could see the notes, the layers of previously initiated drawing or stains, remains of layers and shapes which were incorporated into the new drawing. This modus operandi corresponds with the intention of the authors of the exhibition – their wish to encompass complex fragments of existing memories which are random and make their way through the recordings of blazes of emotional states, segments of events and parts of stories in an attempt to be connected. The process of pre-visualization is developing not only in every drawing particularly, but also in the field of their mutual gravitation, which points to the attempt to make memories visible, to give them a visual language and consistence, the causality of the visual narration. Therefore the tension of the intention, a pure potential of the initial trigger and the force of yet unrealized, unfinished and unpetrified act.

The morphology of drawing encompasses the characteristics of the children's visual language over the surrealist, almost automatic act of creation, to the „growing wild“ drawing, known from underground comics. The above mentioned procedures have been used through history as ways of direct communication with the subconscious contents and estranged issues, but also as ways of critique of the established cultural and ideological narratives and systems of thought through an attempt to form new contents unmediated by the existing matrices. Ever since the twentieth century avant-garde movements, after the war destruction and questioning of the fundamental structures of the civilization, the

artists have drawn the potential from a field which we could call unadopted, wild, subconscious flows embodied in the absurd. By appropriating of these models of expression extracted from the historical coded phenomena of culture, Miodag Manojlović and Nenad Malešević create a language comprehensible in the analysis of a fragmented memory through the form of a storyboard, in which their works are synthesized through the setting of the exhibition.

Considering the fact that the main characteristic of a storyboard is the sequentiality, the causal-consequential string of images which is expected to generate and point to a clear narration of a final future piece, a storyboard is made of static frames which are connected by the causal relation of events, with a distinction which understands that the sequentiality of a storyboard is realized in space, while the sequentiality of a finished film piece is developed in time. This distinctive point brings storyboard closer to the comics as a form, with the difference that a comic strip is considered a finished piece, and a storyboard remains a handy technique, like a drawing work-in-progress table, a try out before the realization and visualization of the final piece. By suspending of a future finished product, the emphasis is put on the open process of possible constitution and generating of a narrative in present, of a creation of a consistent memory out of fragments, while the particular drawings can be linked in different ways, depending on the exhibition space and by means of the setting of the exhibition, so that they can function as triggers of introspective thoughts, thus liberating the potentialities of a still unestablished narration.

Such kind of the procesual work involves the audience as participants needed in forming of the art piece by their reception, where the insights and conclusions are achieved in constant interaction and complex relation of the individual and collective, in the relation of an individual and the discourse of the society. The works of Nenad Malešević and Miodrag Manojlović are not exhibited separately, they even involve the space of phone they are layed on, where the artists additionally write the fragments of sentences, signes as a kind of records, possible instructions or intentions which could connect the works. They present the joint, mixed fragments of memory, just like the ambient sound accompanying the exhibition is the result of their joint work, which in the same way creates a trigger offered to the audience in the process of connecting and structuring of the seen. Through the way of the realization of the works, their connecting of the works through the setting of the exhibition which by its structure is at the same time out and on the verge and in potential of the form of a storyboard, the means and the existing models of culture are contextualized in a distinctive way for the purpose of a new intention of the process of pre-visualization which happens on the way of bringing back dignity to memory.

Is it then a storyboard? Maybe this storyboard is an intentional failure and an illustration of a general mechanism of the process of artistic creation in the sense of the Bachtin's description:

„A visual inner form is experienced in an emotional-voluntary way as if it would be finished and ended, but its finishness and endingness can never be really achieved by a representation.“²

The intention and the effort to structure and interpretate a residue of images, records, hypnagogic appearances in causality, the logics of narrative, is not a promise of a future, final, proclaimed and culturally recognizable, comprehensible and vincible form. This can be a demonstration of a mid-phase achieving its independence, a refusal to close a work-in-progress map for the purpose of an easier reading. The board where the evoked, suppressed, self-sufficient, inexplicable, undignified fragments are ordered is the only firm base, while all the linear and logical structures are changeable and liberated from an immediate and prescribed future, anticipatory or instructive. After the board, there doesn't need to be anything more, it represents only an intention, and therefore the work realized on it is open for all those new images, suppressed, unwanted, unrecognized, undignified, untouched by the language or forethought. On the storyboard they can get their rectangle. They are given the possibility to be imagined as sequences, parts of a group, a string, at least in intended discovery of a potential link and to get an attribute of a sign in constructing a complex, uninterpreted and unrecognized story.

Relying on the „invitation to the form“, a highly modified pattern of expectation which a community brings into the interaction, that story will develop, even based on the fragile noted and sketched relations in the space of imaginary, unrevealed complex past or future overall form. And maybe that is the reason for joining the two corpses of individual visual residues. Their directness, authenticity of the sketched sparks from the depths of the unbearable, is the trigger for recognizing the

attribution of a sign and significance of those pre-images, and the only thing this eluding story allows is the mechanism of a work-in-progress board. In this gesture of „openly temporary“ is contained the structure we usually look for in that which happens after the storyboard, exactly the same structure which „owes its tendency for liberation to its immanent un-liberty“³. The inertia in understanding a sequential art form initiates a quest for the sequence and the empty space, for the rhythm of a story and a dynamics of revealing the connection. „Since the effort is – overcoming a resistance (using muscles), the space is a scheme of a complete firmness of the world. However, as the efforts are separated by pauses, the firmness must be from time to time interrupted by something that doesn't require a special effort, by emptiness.“⁴. A storyboard is a formal paraphrase of this rhythm. A constatation of that state, the decision to expose not before or after the articulation of a story, but in the process of its construction, is an image of an effort to find the disponible elements „which don't have their own will“ in connections, to inscribe the links, but that cohesive power immanent to the story is not exhausted in the interiorization into an absolute space. That lack burdens the observer and produces that anxiety which Daniil Kharms would describe in the following way: „Reader, read this story again and you will feel very uncomfortable.“

Aleksandra Sekulić, Maida Gruden

¹ Originally „intentional fallacy“ (W. K. Wimsatt and M. Beardsley)

² Mihail Bahtin: „Autor i junak u estetskoj aktivnosti“, *Bratstvo i jedinstvo*, Novi Sad, 1991, p. 104.

³ Vladimir Biti: „Bajka i predaja, povijest i pripovijedanje“, *Liber*, Zagreb, 1981, p. 88.

⁴ Leonid Lipavski: „Razgovori“, *Logos*, Beograd, 2007, p. 94.