

Review scientific paper/Pregledni naučni rad
Paper Submitted/Rad primljen: 18.02.2026.
Paper Accepted/Rad prihvaćen: 09.03.2026.
DOI: 10.5937/SJEM2602032P

UDC/UDK: 316.77:82.09

Komuniciranje i intertekstualnost

Miomir Petrović¹

¹ School of Engineering Management, University “Union - Nikola Tesla”, Belgrade, Serbia,
miomir.petrovic@fim.rs, ORCID: 0000-0002-0329-5292

Apstrakt: Polazeći od teze da je savremeni umetnički izraz kombinacija nekoliko stilskih, narativnih, žanrovskih i estetskih premisa, te da opšta odrednica savremena umetnost (za razliku od termina 'moderna' i 'postmoderna') označava širi luk sintetičkih postulata - od eklekticizma preko omaža, 'patchwork'-a, kolaža s posebnim ili spontanim značenjem... sve do harmonizovane i jasno kontrolisane stilske mešavine, svojevrsnog 'melting pot'-a u izrazu - namera ovog rada nije da demistifikuje savremeni umetnički postupak kao proces dekonstrukcije ili rekombinacije narativnog, već, nasuprot tome, da ukaže na složenu interdisciplinarnu podlogu savremenih umetničkih faktura. Sam termin intertekstualnost potiče od poststrukturalističke teoretičarke Julije Kristeve. Međutim, intertekstualnost se može posmatrati u pomenutom, užem smislu ali i u širem, mnogo slobodnijem smislu. Kritičar Irvin Vilijam kaže da termin ima onoliko značenja koliko je onih koji ga koriste, budući da je u upotrebi kako u onom smislu u kome ga predstavlja sama Kristeva tako i u mnogo širim implikacijama, gde treba da označi bilo kakav uticaj sa strane ili citat u okviru poruke

Cljučne reči: intertekstualnost, znak, originalnost, tekst, naratologija, umetničko delo, medijska slika, poruka.

Communication and Intertextuality

Abstract: Starting from the idea that the modern artistic expression is a combination of several stylistic, narrative, genre and aesthetic premises, and that general guideline of contemporary art (as opposed to the term modern and postmodern) denotes a wider arc of synthetic postulates - from eclecticism through homage, patchwork, a collage with special or spontaneous meaning ... until harmonized and clearly controlled stylistic mixture, kind of melting pot of expression - the intention of this paper is not to demystify the process of contemporary art as a process of deconstruction or reconstruction of narrative, but, on the contrary, to show the complex interdisciplinary foundation of contemporary art invoices. The term intertextuality comes from post-structuralist theorist Julia Kristeva. However, intertextuality can be seen in the above, the narrow sense but also in a wider, much freer sense. Critic William Irvin says that the term has as many meanings as much as those who use it, since it is used both in the sense in which it presents Kristeva and in a much wider implications, which should mark any impact from the side or quote in the message.

Keywords: intertextuality, sign, originality, text, narratology, work of art, media image, message

1. Introduction

The terminology of the aesthetics of contemporary art, as well as of modern and postmodern art, is all too often characterized by newly coined, hermetic, and rigid parameters. At the same time, the theory of contemporary art acknowledges that many of the solutions employed by an author in the course of the creative act arise from the organic nature of creation itself, from the medium, or from technique, and that they often do not have—or need not have—any foundation in previously established poetic guidelines or concepts.

It must nevertheless be acknowledged that the creative act, within a certain domain, presupposes an instinctive selection of means which are often, in stylistic or poetic terms, in contradiction or collision with the given framework or with the author's primary (conceptual) intention. This does not render them any less valuable or any less modern. As the art theorist Miško Šuvaković writes: “The avant-garde is not postmodern, but postmodernism, too, is recognized through many mirrored reflections and representations of the avant-garde. And the avant-garde itself, within its own body, displays its multiplicity of meanings. Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* is precisely that: it is the ultimate instance of the novel, and in that sense it is a modernist work; and it is also the novel after the novel, displaying the historical and psychological fragments of which it is composed, and in that

sense it is a postmodernist work. These are nuances and structural differences. The difference between the modern and the postmodern is not coarse but subtle and nuanced” (Šuvaković, 2006). What he is in fact suggesting is that the very approach to the problematics of postmodernism, and thus to contemporary art more generally, is multilayered and cannot be treated as an unquestionable methodological constant.

There are, therefore, works of art which a later and different analysis might classify as either postmodernist or post-postmodernist, just as such an analysis might also establish that a work conventionally regarded as postmodern in fact represents an eclectic “cocktail” of disparate elements rather than a self-aware and articulated idea of postmodernism or an articulation of postmodern values. Above all, interdisciplinarity—as one of the constitutive elements of the “new aesthetics”—should not be understood as an *ism* prescribed *a priori*, beginning its creative life only once civilizational, ideological, and, finally, technological circumstances have matured, as though disciplines somehow began to intermingle of their own accord and permit mutual creative play.

When speaking of intertextuality, it should be noted that intertextual relations constitute the most appropriate analytical field for examining the presence of the mythical matrix within a work of art. Intertextuality, above all, encompasses all the ways in which one text is connected to other texts. If we attempt to analyze this phenomenon from the perspective of the creative act itself, then the vital presence of the interdisciplinary procedure becomes visible in certain well-known works of art which could hardly be said to belong to the corpus of contemporary art—even in those works which chronology situates in periods long preceding the emergence of modernism and its subsequent sub-identities.

In response to the question of what the principal reasons are for the acceptance or rejection of postmodernism within a given culture, Miško Šuvaković offers the following answer: “That question may be answered in both a modernist and a postmodernist way. The modernist answer would be the following: a culture rejects postmodernism as a movement belonging to the global scene, as something new or different, marked by the characteristics of fashion, and above all as anti-metaphysical. This means that it is excessive in relation to the traditional ways in which the values of art, the artwork, or culture are accepted. Such a movement is regarded as something foreign, different, that is, as a certain rupture with the usual normality of a given environment, its interests, values, and productions. In this way, a provocation is produced, and as such postmodernism is negated. Then, at a certain moment, through schools and universities, it is accepted, academicized, and, with a delay of five, ten, twenty, thirty, or fifty years, accepted as cultural heritage. That is the modernist answer. The postmodernist answer would be that the non-acceptance of postmodernism is a matter of current strategies, interests, and interest groups in a given society. For just as there was no single modernism, there is no single body of postmodernism either. And that very non-acceptance is part of the nature of postmodernism. It problematizes, displays, dismantles, and deconstructs the values into which it is articulated. Postmodernism has the capacity to devour—to consume its environment and transform it. This is the conflict between the postmodern challenge and the normal utilitarian body of society” (Šuvaković, 2006).

2. Intertextuality

What is intertextuality? The term *intertextuality* denotes an approach or model of textual formation in which the essence of a given text corresponds to other texts and directs the reader toward them. The interpenetration of texts may proceed in two directions:

1. it may denote motifs that an author has consciously introduced into a text from another work; or
2. it may refer to quotations and motifs from another text recognized by the reader in the text he or she perceives and analyzes.

With the coinage “intertextual,” Kristeva attempts to connect Ferdinand de Saussure’s structuralist semiotics—the way in which a text acquires an entirely new, implicit meaning on the basis of its structure and inner organization—with Mikhail Bakhtin’s dialogism, that is, the plurality of textual meaning, or heteroglossia. For Kristeva, the intertextual character of a text is operative whenever we perceive that a given meaning within the text does not come directly from the author and is not simply transmitted to the reader, but rather that the author serves merely as the mediator of a certain code originating from a space outside the work itself and outside the author. The intertextual perspective through which we analyze a work thus confirms Roland Barthes’s idea that meaning in a literary work should be sought not so much in the work itself as in its recipient and the recipient’s associative horizon. Some theorists, however, frequently consider the relation between the “intertextual” and the “hypertextual,” the latter functioning as an analytical procedure grounded in intertextuality, one that opens within every text a “mosaic” of citations, itself only a fragment of a larger mosaic of texts. Thus every text becomes merely a part of a universal, planetary text, a kind of “text above texts” from which all texts derive and which is

contained in everything that has been written. We thus arrive at the thesis that no work of art can exist entirely in and of itself; every work is, rather, an interpreted object.

“A work of art is not merely a bare object (painting, sculpture), situation (environment, structure, scene), or event (musical work, performance, ballet, film screening), but is always also an interpreted object—an object that we see articulated within a network of interpretations. The first interpreter is the artist (according to Richard Wollheim), who interprets the object or the arrangement of sounds, words, or bodily acts as a work of art by creating it or by placing it within the world of art and the history of art. All other interpreters participate in this game by producing differences of effects, meaning, sense, and value” (Šuvaković, 2005), emphasizes Miško Šuvaković.

The past century, particularly its first half, brought into art a kind of imperative of originality, according to which every modern work of art is a work unto itself not only in the style of creative expression but also in content and essence. If the modern work must be original at any cost, then what kind of work is one that communicates intertextually with another work, or one that takes another text as its template?

“Esoteric modernism” is the term applied to historical modernism grounded in the ideals of the authenticity and autonomy of high art in relation to culture (everyday life, mass consumption), politics, and religion. The term *esoteric* points to the specificity and exceptional status of modernist art in relation to the mass culture of entertainment, ideology, and consumption. Esoteric modernism is essentially founded on essentialism, meaning that it privileges the specific, exceptional, and essential decisions of artistic disciplines and the differences that derive from them. Esoteric modernism is defined by the idea of the masterpiece: Joyce’s *Ulysses*, Eliot’s *The Waste Land*, Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot*, Schoenberg’s *Five Piano Pieces*, Op. 23, Pollock’s *Autumn Rhythm*, Welles’s *Citizen Kane*, Martha Graham’s *Phaedra*, and the essential non-naturalness of the grounded medium purified through self-reflexive means... We shall see that the ideal of the autonomy of the work of art was elevated to the level of fetish. It is for this reason that we now introduce the term *exoteric modernism*. Exoteric modernism denotes a complex of phenomena in culture and art that appear in the radical realizations of modernism or in ecstatic productions after modernism, and that represent a critique, correction, application, and mass consumption of its effects, inscriptions, and traces” (Šuvaković, 2005).

In this regard, Ana Vujanović’s observation in the book *Razarajućioznačitelj/e performansa* is particularly noteworthy, as she emphasizes that the concept of intertextuality is closely bound to the concepts of signifiability and signifying practice. She further writes: “Intertextuality points to the text as a domain and process of crossing, refraction, conflict, re-reading, contestation, neutralization, and displacement of other surrounding cultural texts among which a given text appears and operates. In this way, the text is placed in an intertextual position, and theoretical attention—which in the previous theoretical generation shifted predominantly from the relation of the text to the object (referent) to the immanent structure of the text—is now redirected toward the relation of the text to other texts. In other words, the dominant view is that the meaning of a text is not established by the relation of the text to a stable referent in the world, but rather through the fact that one text, via other texts, is brought into a complex relation with numerous, including potential, referents. The intertextual referential relation is therefore not direct, immediate, or unmediated, but is established precisely through the surrounding texts of culture” (Vujanović, 2004).

According to the author, however, the concepts of intertext and interdiscourse also explain the relation between conscious authorial intention and the notion of unconscious inscription during the creative act, which is of exceptional importance for the present analysis of all proposed examples. Intertext, as a semantic network, establishes an active relation with other signifying practices of the culture in which it is realized. On the one hand, these practices determine, enable, produce, and inscribe themselves into it. This inscription—and this is crucial for the poststructuralist concept of intertext—does not occur at the level of clear quotations, intentional allusions, or direct textual reference. Rather, intertextuality is realized at the site of the text’s “unconscious,” at its margins, its gaps, its “other scene.” Thus, a text understood as intertext is not a passive medium of communication, nor a neutral place for the manifestation of content, but a process of signification whose elements, effects, and functions include signifieds, subjects, authors, interpretations, readers, and other texts. All of these are drawn into the process of its extended enactment.

Vujanović extends this argument through Michel Pêcheux’s concept of interdiscourse, introduced in the early 1970s within the framework of Althusserian materialist theory. Interdiscourse is employed to explain the mechanisms through which obvious, self-evident truths are constituted—those truisms by means of which discourses assign individuals to subject positions made possible and anticipated by discourse itself. Even when an individual subject attempts to distance itself from the prepared matrix of interdiscursive meaning and to establish a critical relation to it, that subject still enters another already prepared discursive formation. In this way, the

possibility of a fully sovereign and individual critical position outside the interdiscursive network is effectively precluded (Vujanović, 2004).

3. Narratological approach

Narratology is the study of narrative text. It emerged as a semiological and structuralist science of the text within literary theory, and the term itself was introduced by the French-Bulgarian structuralist Tzvetan Todorov.

In doing so, Todorov canonized not only the analytical systems of his immediate predecessors—Claude Lévi-Strauss and Roland Barthes—but also those of the Russian formalists, especially Vladimir Propp and his *Morphology of the Folktale*. In this respect, the previously cited work may be used in order to explain the functioning of narrative within the narrative field: “Todorov, Barthes, Greimas, Genette, Bremond, and others do not share a single ‘theoretical poetics’. Nevertheless, narratology is characterized by its insistence on the dichotomy of story and narration (or discourse), analogous to the formalist dichotomy *fabula*, and by the displacement of emphasis toward the macrostructural, deep organization of narrative text.

For structuralists, the text is a closed and coherent system of signs that expresses a relatively unified meaning. Understood in this broad sense, the concept of text may be applied not only to literary texts but also to any artistic or non-artistic text, as well as to linguistic and non-linguistic sign systems alike: image, fashion, myth, music, film, advertisement, folk costume, theatrical performance, and so forth. Barthes proposes a division of the text into three levels of description:

1. the level of function,
2. the level of action, and
3. the level of narration.

These levels are interconnected through progressive integration: a given function acquires meaning only insofar as it finds its place within the overall action of an actant, while the action itself receives its full meaning through being narrated, entrusted to a discourse with its own code. According to this principle, the basic unit of the narrative text is the function. The totality of the text arises through the gradual hierarchical linking of distributional and integrational functional units, by means of which the text itself—through its structure—guides the reader toward the position from which it can be properly read, that is, from which its immanent meaning may be deciphered.

According to Greimas, the text is determined above all by its deep structure, which is then expressed on the surface or discursive plane of the text. The deep structure of the text may be analyzed through an abstract, schematized actantial model that is realized in numerous different variants in individual texts, but according to the same universal structural logic.

Structuralist text theory is thus based on the text’s determination by its immanent structure, that is, by the interrelations among its elements. This immanent structure—and not external factors such as the author, the surrounding world, the context, or the reader—is primary in the production of textual meaning and therefore also in its reading. As Vladimir Biti observes, by insisting on this immanence structuralists oppose the traditional concept of the literary work, determined by ‘external sources or authorities’, to the concept of the text. In Barthes’s essay *From Work to Text*, the text, as opposed to the work, is understood as grounded exclusively in a convertible set of rules shared with other texts.

For Biti, *story* is the term by which French structuralists and narratologists replace the Russian formalist concept of *fabula*. In their terminology, it designates the basic temporally and causally connected sequence of events, subsequently transformed by literary discourse in terms of duration, order, and frequency, as Genette demonstrates in *Narrative Discourse* (1972). Story is therefore an element of the deep structure of the text, one that is immanent to it and accordingly abstract rather than materially discursive. In deriving story from the concrete text, the narratologist neglects the material aspects of the text: language, style, the institution of art, and even the specific features of the medium itself—film image, sound and tone, written word, color, speech, bodily movement, and so forth. Narratology thereby acquires the possibility of positing narrative text as a universal model that transcends disciplinary boundaries.

As Biti writes, narratologists thus proclaim a universal chronologies of events, normatively inscribed in all human minds regardless of temporal, spatial, historical, civilizational, or cultural situatedness—a logic to which generic, discursive, or stylistic particularities may only subsequently attach” (Vujanović, 2004).

4. An example of mythic explicitness in narrative: Wim Wenders's film *Wings of Desire*

The myth of angels and the heavenly order in Wim Wenders's film *Wings of Desire* is presented in an explicit sense. Nothing is concealed within the context or subtext of the narrative; there is no special system of "ciphers," codes, symbols, or hermeneutic devices through which the presence of the mythical pattern is disclosed. Wenders seeks to narrate a different version of angelic existence and of angels' "rights" within eternity from that offered by the Old and New Testaments.

At the same time, Wenders does not take the mythical story as the basis of the overall narrative structure of the work. Rather, he makes allegorical use of myth only in one segment of the narrative complex. In intertextual terms, myth is only one part of the structure, a story within the story, one part of the diegetic process. *Wings of Desire* is therefore not a film about angels as such, but about Berlin, human suffering, love and longing, and finally about angels within that context.

For this reason, the mythical story functions only as one element of the narrative complex and not as the ultimate purpose of narration. Wenders tells, above all, a story about human beings, employing the motif of the "fallen angel," rather than a story about gods or natural forces with the human being placed at its center. Moreover, he addresses living human beings, unlike prayer or ritual, which constitute an address to some higher authority. The direction is thus reversed, and therein lies the specificity of the substitutive presence of myth in the narrative work as distinct from its explicit presence.

One may, of course, argue that there is no narration intended for anyone other than the human being, and that no work of art ultimately speaks to anything other than the human. Even prayer may be understood as an address to oneself through an address to a higher authority. Nevertheless, the distinction established here is intertextual rather than psychological in nature: a substantial portion of the plot of this film narrative is resolved through the mythical nature of one of its central protagonists (the angel Damiel), rather than through the causality of dramatic action in the realist sense. None of the dramatic characters, by virtue of his or her actions, causes a new action in strictly dramaturgical terms. Someone simply is what he is—an angel—and by virtue of that being, precisely through non-action, further events are set in motion. This is, in fact, a kind of *deus ex machina* rather than a motivational procedure.

The substitutive presence of the mythical pattern often appears in works of art in order to facilitate narration, allowing a story to be told through the genre logic of the fantastic rather than through the procedures of realism or probability. In semiological terms, in Wenders's film the Christian concept of the angel occupies the Plane of Expression, while the broader mythical aspect—the rebellion of the young god (here the angel), that is, Titanomachy as the primal myth—constitutes the Plane of Content. Within the Plane of Expression, the Form of Expression is represented by Damiel's path from his awakened desire to become human to the plan and realization of the fall itself, while the Substance of Expression is represented by the biblical tradition of the angels' closeness to God and their equal distance from the world of living, mortal beings. On the Plane of Content, the Form of Content is represented by the archetype of the struggle between the young and the old gods and the victory of the young, while the Substance of Content is characterized by the idea of the coming-into-being of the world (order) out of Chaos. Finally, the semiological Referent in this work is the concept of an inverted ascension—an "ascension into earthly life" rather than into the divine sphere, becoming human rather than undergoing deification, rebirth in human form.

5. An example of mythic implicitness in narrative: Christoph Ransmayr's novel *Morbus Kitihara*

By *mythic implicitness* we designate a procedure in which the elements of the mythical matrix are only implicitly perceptible. Authorial intention does not manifest itself in mythical names, landscapes, or events explicitly determined in a mythical or mythological sense. The reason for employing mythical or mythological elements in the *fabula* is not utilitarian but poetic-philosophical in nature. As such, the matrix may function in the initiation of a ritual and in its closure, while remaining only implicitly present.

Analyzing T. S. Eliot's procedure in his drama *The Cocktail Party*, Slobodan Selenić concludes: "Already *The Cocktail Party* possesses characters and a plot that are easy to recount—Harry, suspected of having murdered his wife, returns to his family home, where he begins to be haunted by the Eumenides, the Greek Furies who had also haunted his father. From his aunt, who had been his father's lover, he learns the meaning of Christian living,

which brings him peace: he must not flee the Eumenides but seek them out; in other words, suffering is part of God's plan and should not be avoided..." (Selenić, 1971).

As Slobodan Lazarević writes: "The persistent relevance of myth may perhaps best be illustrated by the old but well-known formula: whoever reaches for myth will have it, and whoever does not reach for it will still have it. Eliot's incidental remark regarding *The Cocktail Party* is likewise telling in this respect. Today it sounds almost anecdotal that the author admitted that the inspiration for writing this work was the myth of Alcestis and the plot of Euripides' tragedy of the same name. This admission not only demonstrates that recognizing myth in a work of modern art is by no means a simple matter, but also that even the secondary use of myth in literature and art may act as an inspiration. The fact that no one, apart from the author, knew what lay at the foundation of *The Cocktail Party* did not hinder complete and successful theatrical communication..." (Lazarević, 2001). Lazarević then raises the question: what degree of similarity must exist between a given myth and a modern literary or artistic work for bringing them into relation—without any clearer sign of recognition—to be purposeful, and who is authoritative in recognizing and interpreting that hint: the sender of the message, the author, or its recipient, the audience?

The intention of a writer who adopts a procedure in which the presence of the mythical pattern is implicit is therefore not to illustrate myth nor to use it in order to comment on it, but rather to bind the action of the work and its poetic-philosophical underpinning to a mythical constant. In the chapter "Transformation of Myth," Lazarević argues that the analyzed works of Mann, Joyce, Eliot, Picasso, and Mondrian demonstrate that there are three ways in which artists creatively employ myth: by reworking myth, by using the reflection of the mythical pattern, or by transforming the mythical image. This division, provisional as all such divisions are, reveals not only the relation to a specific mythical plot or idea, but also the relation to the cyclical concept of time, the significance and role of cultural heroes, archetypes, and the organic use of the symbolism of mythological systems (Lazarević, 2001).

In this sense, it may be said that Wenders in *Wings of Desire* engages in the transformation of the mythical image, whereas Christoph Ransmayr in *Morbus Kitihara* works through the reflection of the mythical pattern. In semiological terms, in Ransmayr's novel the notion of war in peace, of struggle in peacetime Germany after the war of "Allied liberation," belongs to the Plane of Expression, whereas the rebellion of the young god (here Bering) against all the old gods—the god of war, his own Father, but also the god of such a peace—namely Titanomachy as the primal myth, belongs to the Plane of Content. Within the Plane of Expression, the Form of Expression is represented by Bering's loss of sight, that is, by the diagnosis of Morbus Kitihara, while the Substance of Expression is represented by a kind of self-blinding, an acceptance of illness merely in order to escape from life. On the Plane of Content, the Form of Content is again represented by the archetype of the struggle between young and old gods and the victory of the young, regardless of the fact that Bering's conditional victory is in fact death. The Substance of Content is characterized by the idea of the re-establishment of the world (order) out of Chaos, even if the price of such a restoration is Bering's sacrifice. Finally, the semiological Referent in this work is the notion of self-destruction, auto-destruction resulting from the refusal to accept this kind of life. In the case of *Morbus Kitihara*, too, one may conclude that what is involved is the transformation of surface structure rather than deep structure.

6. Where, then, is meaning?

As Ana Vujanović (2004) writes: "Structuralism, as a transdisciplinary mode of theoretical thought, may be defined as an interpretive theory concerned with the analysis of social contents by establishing and then applying theoretical models of those contents." "For structuralism, therefore, the central problem in the analysis of any social content, understood as a whole or system, is the structure of that content. Structure, according to structuralists, is understood as the relation among the elements of the whole, founded above all on difference (contrast or opposition) among those elements. The fact that a given content appears as a whole, or as a system, is the effect of its structure. According to structuralists, the meaning of a social content understood as a system of meaning (that is, as a text) is the result of its immanent structure, and not of the process or mode of its exposition, manifestation, cognition, reading, or perception in concrete contextual realizations. In other words, the fact that a system is perceived as unified and that its meaning may be read—indeed as relatively consistent and definitive—is the result of the structure of that very system of meaning, a structure which leads readers to the point from which they become capable of reading it in the proper way. The process of structuration (the linking of the elements of a system into an organized structure) is realized through the horizontal linking of elements on one level of the system and then through the progressive integration of levels, which proceeds from the depth toward the surface of the system and/or the text. The structuralist understanding of the text may be demonstrated, in simplified yet clear form, through Hjelmslev's model of textual interpretation. According to Hjelmslev, the text

may be divided into the plane of expression and the plane of content... Narratological research particularly insists on such a layered or planar textual structure. According to narratologists, two fundamental levels or planes may be distinguished in the structure of the text as a system of meaning: the deep and the surface structure of the text, that is, story and narration (discourse), and analogously, actantial and actorial structure" (Vujanović, 2004).

However, as Emin Pobrić in his study "The Rhythm of the Novel," writes: "narrative technique in its essence is nothing other than the observation of the facts of life in time, which are organized in accordance with the forms of life itself and the laws of its temporality. Such observation always presupposes selection, since only that which is suitable as part of a future story may enter the story" (Pobrić, 2006). It may therefore be asserted that "story is that part of narrative text which narratology defines as a text in which an instance narrates the presented *fabula* in a particular way. Here *fabula* is understood as a series of logically and chronologically connected events caused by actors. An event is the transition from one state to another, while actors are the instances that direct the action toward a particular goal. To perform an action means to cause an event. Time is of primary importance to story, since events always occupy a certain duration and succeed one another in an order whose very principle presupposes succession in time. This order may be identical with the order of the *fabula*, but it may also deviate from it" (Pobrić, 2006).

7. Conclusion

For more than fifty years, the reception of contemporary art has often resembled a blank ontic canvas upon which the inscription of the work's meaning, symbolism, and ideology becomes an end in itself. Modern artistic texture, of course, permits a very high degree of interaction on the part of the consumer, observer, or reader, through which the audience ceases to be merely an audience and becomes a category congenial to the work itself, that is, to the author.

Aware of this fact, we have remained within the horizon of arguments arising from the previously established eschatological planes, striving not to inscribe or project the entire associative arc—subjective by definition—that may be imaginatively constructed in the perception of each of the works discussed.

At the same time, our intention has been to show that even when the contemporary artist seeks to flee from myth (pre-texts) in the broader sense—archetype, cult, ritual—he or she nevertheless returns to the mythical pattern.

The pre-text is therefore incorporated into an expression that aspires to transcendence: either 1) in accordance with, or 2) despite, the author's intention.

References

1. Vujanović, A. (2004). Razarajući označitelji/e performansa, prilog zasnivanju pozno poststrukturalističke materijalističke teorije izvođačkih umetnosti, Beograd: SKC.
2. Lazarević, S. (2001). Preinačenje mitskog obrasca, Kragujevac: Centar za mitološke studije Srbije.
3. Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in Language, A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, Oxford.
4. Pobrić, E. (2006). *Vrijeme u romanu: od realizma do postmoderne*, Sarajevo: Buybook.
5. Selenić, S. (1971). *Dramski pravci XX veka*, Beograd: Umetnička akademija u Beogradu.
6. Saussure, de, F. (1977). *Course in General Linguistics*, Glasgow: Fontana&Collins.
7. Švaković, M. (2006). Čovek se rađa usred jezika, Granične vrednosti modernizma i postmodernizma sa portala <http://www.yuope.com>.
8. Švaković, M. (2005). *Folklor, muzika, delo* Kragujevac: Fakultet muzičke umetnosti.