

Hermann Kappelhoff  
Narrative Space – Plot Space – Image Space

The concept of "narrative space" allows us succinctly to summarize what has long determined film theoretical discourse: the question of the ideological function of the cinema apparatus, the question of the reality effect of filmic perception.

This concept of "narrative space" is based on a hypothesis that marks a decisive turn in this discussion: that is, the insight that the illusionary realism of film cannot be apprehended only looking at the media apparatus, that is, the cinematographic apparatus. It is rather the process of narration that first transposes filmic representation into a form that corresponds to the perception of reality. It is this process that allows the breaks and ellipses of filmic montage to become the seams of an image in which the spatial parameters of cinematographic representation coincide with the space of everyday perception, coincide in the gaze of the spectator.

The filmic mode of narration, with its basic grammatical figures of "invisible editing," the "POV shot," and "shot-reverse shot" structure, articulates this gaze with the geometric perspectivalizations of the image. Thus, in the narrative process the space/time fragments of the film combine to form an illusion of a homogenous space that presents itself to the spectator as a natural relation of perception.

The illusion of homogenous space is the correlate of a spectator, for whom shot for shot the central perspective of the image is translated in a perspective through which he or she sees him or herself indicated. The spectator thus experiences him or herself as the ultimately intended, all-perceiving subject of the diegetic world that develops in the filmic narrative.

Accordingly, the cinema does not orient itself to the authorities of representative depiction (author and plot) but rather simulates in the narrative space a kind of transcendental apperception; it mediates in the spatial illusion the closed vision of a gaze that becomes the origin of a narrative, which presents itself as origin-less speech. This speech, seemingly without origin and therefore mythic, is the heart of what we call realism in the cinema.

Even if debate in film studies long ago distanced itself from the question of ideology critique, the model of narrative space returns in current neo-formalist approaches to film analysis as the concept of diegetic space, or plot space.

This commonality might at first seem surprising; was it not the goal of neo-formalism to develop a formal system of description in opposition to the speculations of cultural critical film theory? In fact, in current models of film analysis the specification of filmic space has been turned around: if "narrative space" understands the illusion of a continuous space as an ideological function of narrative structure, now it becomes as "diegetic space" an a priori pattern of perception that first makes it possible for the spectator to understand the filmic narrative. For the spectator, that is—as the more or less explicit hypothesis conceives it—the parameters of filmic spatial construction are translated to the same vectors that also control his or her spatial orientation under the conditions of everyday perception. The same cognitive activities structure both the pragmatic as well as the aesthetic perception of space. It is this coincidence alone that enables the images of the cinema to be translated into a continual series of plot events, the image space to a realistic plot space.

Let me summarize:

In the model of narrative space, the illusion of a homogenous space is understood as the signature of a specific form of perception dependent on a historical specific mode of mediacy; in the model of plot space, the same structure, the so-called "continuity system" is traced back to a notion of perception as an a priori of film comprehension.

Both concepts share the notion of the classical mode of narration. In relation to this, every aesthetically reflexive special spatialization is a stylistic exaggeration of form, ironic refraction or deconstructive analysis of the narrative conventions, every deviation appears exclusively as a countermove, be it that of the auteur cinema, avant-garde film or art cinema. However, this by and large ignores the semantic potential that lies in the varying spatial constructions themselves.

As I will sketch out in the following, the concept of image space intends to get at this semantic potential. With this, I do not intend to pronounce yet another model of film analysis; instead, this concept makes it possible to relativize film analysis in terms of media history and theory, allowing us to understand the cinema in its historical forms in order to refer it to its aesthetic possibilities.

The notion of classical cinema is not as old as its common usage suggests. Its historical emergence coincides quite precisely with the end of the period of film history that it seeks to describe: the end of Classical Hollywood Cinema.

What then came to an end was first and foremost the belief in the cinema's natural realism. According to this belief, the cinematographic image not the entirety of an ideal world, but rather frames the passing moment of a material reality that steps from the darkness into the light. The screen is a

constantly shifting field of vision that can stretch on all sides in a continuum of the virtually visible. In these terms we can summarize the post-war cinema's concept of realism.

One could speak of an ontological realism, the theoretical conception of which is linked to the names Siegfried Kracauer and Andre Bazin. In it, the wish for a visible reality, removed from the power of the subject, condenses into a poetics of film. It was a European perspective, molded by political experience, that believed to recognize the happiness of naïve classicism in Hollywood's narrative method.

But once this classical cinema is comprehensible as form and the form is understood as a system of narration, all that is left of the realism of the cinema is the reality effect. It is not surprising that the concept of the classical mode of narration coincides historically with its end. In its conception of the classical narrative cinema, however, current film analysis has taken up the heritage of ontological realism without translating its utopian potential in terms of cultural theory.

The question remains of a cinematographic framework that indeed refers to the reality of the perception of everyday life, the aesthetic function of which is not exhausted in its reproduction. In so doing, the dichotomy of reflexive auteur film vs. the entertaining narrative cinema seems to me to confuse the issue just as much as the opposition between stylistic expression and narrative convention.

In Douglas Sirk's *All That Heaven Allows* (1955), Jane Wyman plays a widow who is forced by her grown up children to break up with her lover. As the son and daughter let her know that she will be spending Christmas alone, two moving men appear to deliver the mother's Christmas present: a television. We see the protagonist, her face, an unbelieving surprise and then in reverse-shot the television screen opposite her. It is as if a darkened mirror comes to her from the gray-black depths of her own image.

In a close up, literally placed in the space of a *Plan américain*, the cinema faces its antagonist eye to eye: For the face-to-face between the protagonist and the TV screen not only speaks of the exclusion of the woman from the game of love and sexuality, but also mirrors the loss of another form of the social: with the television screen an antagonist of the cinema is placed in the image that negates a fundamental element of its media apparatus: the dark space of the audience.

At the end of the film *All That Heaven Allows*, we will once again see such a TV-screen image: this time it is an oversized window, before which the protagonist seems quite small, even when standing at full height. The winter idyll of a snow landscape with deer seems in its naïve artificiality to announce the very Christmas programming that the woman's children imagined as appropriate entertainment for lonely widows. At the end of the film, however, the TV screen image functions as a modernized version of the *deus ex machina*: a monitor on which the redeeming message—"The End"—is faded in as if it were an supernatural phenomenon: informing the public of a mere dramaturgic state of affairs takes the place of divine intervention: here you see a happy end.

Thus, the fiction of a continuous homogenous space disappears: if the window does not allow in the same way a realistic "out there" to be seen, as it thickens to form a billboard. The TV screen image countersthe reality effect and absolutizes the represented interior space to the "interior world" of the figure. It places the cinematographic image in relationship to a visuality that no longer corresponds to external perception. It points to another source, a second source of the visible to which there is no direct visual contact.

At this point (at the latest), the classical cinema is aesthetically aware that its images never refer to reality directly, but rather only in a way that is mediated through other images.

In terms of media history, this awareness of difference is marked by the television image. It appears here literally as a kind of audiovisual antagonist in the cinematographic gaze. But even if the cinema has not ceased demonizing its opponents, we should not attribute too much significance to this animosity. At issue is primarily the relationship between two media forms of perception that mutually position and classify one another.

While the film image constantly structures an unseen space—the off-screen—the television screen points back to the source of his messages. It is thus more like a board that translates radio signals into optical acoustic traces to be scanned and decoded—most crucially, want to be read.

In contrast, the cinematographic image constitutes a double movement of perception: on the one hand, it represents a mode of spatial representation to which the spectator reacts in a cognitively closed way. On the other hand, in the tension between the field of vision and the outside of the image, it structures the space of the spectator's imagination. The television image informs us about spaces, shapes, movements and colors; the cinematographic image initiates a spatialization of the imaginative activities of the spectator with the same elements. In the relationship between an on- and an off-screen the represented image space takes on the character of a perception image, a vision in dark space. Filmic vision is thus closer to the dream hallucination of perceived images than the imaginative

activity of the reader.

It seems to me that this hallucinatory function is precisely the essential point of reference for all filmic modes of *mise-en-scène*. It cannot be defined—as in the concept of narrative space—as the illusion of an all-perceiving gaze, nor—as in the concept of diegetic space—as an a priori perceptive scheme. On the contrary: it refers to the level of differentiation of the aesthetic possibilities of cinematographic modes of perception.

We are accustomed to identifying this possibility with auteur cinema: it was in fact the films of the French Nouvelle Vague that first referred ostentatiously to other images, the images of the classical Hollywood cinema, instead of directly to visible reality.

But not only the European cinema produced films that behaved in such a reflexive manner. The star directors of the New Hollywood Cinema developed a new principle of entertainment from this form of cinematographic irony: films, in which complex chains are constructed that reflect images of images of the classical cinema into constantly new images. In this fashion, New Hollywood does not stop at the art of citation and the attractions of special effects. It implies an aesthetic reflexivity, based less on the author than on the intelligible potential of the cinematographic image itself.

Scorcese's 1973 film *Mean Streets* thus not only refers to a figure of the European cinema, Pasolini's *Accatone*, but also clearly shows how the New Hollywood cinema also draws its narrativity from the possibility of new image spaces.

The film begins with a few seconds of black film; we hear two or three half sentences. Later on, these will be retrospectively understood as fragments of a monologue, with which the hero will first be introduced to us a few minutes later:

Here, however, at the beginning of the film: the black image is followed by a half-close up of the protagonist. He awakens with a fright, gets up, steps before the mirror, looks at himself, goes back to bed. The camera frames this action in a gliding pan sequence: the camera pulls back somewhat, and the protagonist sits upright until his profile can be seen in a close up; the camera follows him with a pan, until we see a half-close up of the mirror image.

Due to the gliding *cadrage*, the space is fragmented into partial views that glide from one to the next, without producing an overview. This principle is underscored by the contrasting lighting: it allows the flowing spatial fragments to become fields of light and dark that move in themselves, at the center of which protagonist's face takes shape: first the voice in the dark, then the face in half shadow. In the mirror, it takes on clear contours, but only in the next moment, when the actor turns finally to the camera, only to disappear in the back lighting.

A look out the window, through the blinds of which the light comes, marks the real place in which the subsequent story begins: the small room of a young man in New York's Little Italy.

But it is precisely this clarifying perspective that would define the image space as narrative space that remains denied to us: this gives the room an ambivalent significance. The traffic noises and the light falling through the window might be taken as the sign of a waking large city morning; but if they are linked to the voice in the dark, they appear to be messages from the outside world to the sleeper: they disturb him from his dream, the end of which is caught by the spectator. The spectator soon understands the voice at the beginning of the film as an interior, dreamed speech. The image space thus marks for the spectator a plot space, and at the same time represent the interior view of an ego, whose head not only vibrates with the noise of the street.

Two jump cuts break the gliding movement with a disharmonic chord: a jolt, and then the camera presents a clean close up. The young man sinks back down into the pillow, a pop song begins: in the following cut the opening credits of the film follow: again a dark room, the light stream of a film projector, then the rectangle of a screen. What we see are clips from a Super 8 film. On images of night streets, illuminated by police lights and the garlands of lights at a Catholic street fair, scenes of everyday family life follow.

It is these images of a home movie on which the film *Mean Streets* is based. In brief episodes, the film introduces its male protagonists, the last being Charly, whom we already have met. We see him step into a cathedral: in the off we hear his interior monologue and recognize the dreamed sentences from the beginning of the film. For a moment, it seems as if the monologue actually would split into a conversation: we see the praying man speak. Then, the speech separates itself anew from the image: it develops an acoustic space, which envelops the camera shots and forms of unity that has severed itself from architectonic space.

The camera does not establish a site of action, but rather dissects the space into unlinked perspective shots. Not the figure depicted by the actor, but this multiple perspective image of the "figure in space" functions as the body of the monologue: one can see it as a kind of geometric variation on the topos of the saintly criminal around the *Accatone* figure. The image construction includes the shift from the white light of the cathedral to the red light of a striptease bar: like an echo, the prayer reaches into this other space and links the geometric description of the figure with a coloristic variation on its dark

opposite.

In a slight slow motion, we see the action at the bar in a nightclub: the camera glides past at some distance. Without warning, the protagonist enters the scene. As if being received by an honor guard, he attracts all attention while he crosses the room parallel to the camera. The horizontal emphasis of the parallel movement, the slight slow motion, the over-lapping sound editing allow the image again to drift between a subjective and an objective representation of space.

The interim shot on a dancer seems to reestablish the temporal synchronicity between the acoustic and visual image: the movements are no longer slowed down. Instead, the movement of the camera now overly formed that of the figure: close on the heels of the actor, it seems to follow him into the room. In fact, however, the figure's movement is only simulated. The actor is actually driven in a more or less clearly circular movement through the room, in effect rocking to the beat of the music. He seems to float through the red, floating past the faces.

We witness the hero in a casual, familiar environment and at the same time see his triumphant self-portrait.

The decisive thing about these stagings of space is the indeterminable character of their reality referent: does the image show the space of an active figure or does it develop a subjective interior view?

But this ambiguity precisely does not correspond to the distinction between objective and subjective reality. In *Mean Streets*, the grammar of shot-reverse shot and point of view, with their clear classification of the objective and the subjective, is just as undermined as the melodramatic mood painting. Neither is the image tied to the figure as subjective perception, nor is the dramatic action reduced to the representation of the plot. Instead, the process of representation can be described in a reverse fashion: the figure emerges only through the collaboration of various modes of image subjectification.

One dimension is articulated in the acting, the choreography of movements and gestures, the segmentation of scenographic space. The other dimension is shown in the formations of camera view and the stylizations of the image space in lighting, color, and framing.

These levels could be systematized according to formal parameters: on the one hand, there is the use of architectural spaces. All transitions that serve the illusion of a continuous space are here systematically severed. Instead, in a kind of cubist method, the architectonic spaces are dissected into cuts and reassembled as spatial images with multiple perspectives.

Spatially oriented camera shots are replaced by--this is the second level of design--the light and color contrast of antagonistically ordered image spaces: just as the red light of the night club/bar follows the white light of the cathedral, soon after Marty disappears with his friends into the back room a neon light appears, producing a black and white effect. Similarly, the red is opposed with a very cold blue when the killer follows his victim in the bathroom.

The colorful interiors are contraposed to outdoor shots that obey their own light dramaturgy. They show daylight images, the dimmed colors in two or three cuts intensifies to the almost monochromatic blue of an "American night"; or they lead from nightly streets illuminated by the festive lighting of a Catholic street fair, to the extremely poor lit nighttime shots at the end of the film, in which the gunned down figures are barely recognizable.

A third level is that of acoustic space: the sound design, music and off-screen voices. Just as the voice at the beginning links the darkness of black film to the shadowed face of a dreamer, the monologue briefly afterward links the sacred light space with the red of forbidden sexual desires. In particular, however the songs and opera arias, often almost finished, create an affective mirror that dissects the represented action into a spectrum of reflexive refractions.

This is true of the final level of representation that needs to be mentioned here: the choreographic treatment of the actors. Be it through acceleration or deceleration, be it through a falsifying camera movement, the movement is repeatedly divorced from realistic spatial coordinates. Thus, when the scenographic description of a Mafia deal culminates in a dance-like fistfight, or when the casually depicted hired murder escalates to a grotesque opera finale in which the victim refuses to die.

The architectural spaces, dissected in terms of perspective, the contrasts between the colored interior spaces, the choreographic alienation of the scenic movement, the light dramaturgy of the external shots: seen in the context of the film as a whole, these combine to form a constant modulation of image space. This extends from the division at the start of the film--the black film, the voice, the shadowed voice--through the dissection of the light in the white of the cathedral and the colors of the interior spaces, up to the darkening outdoor shots, which again approach black film.

This movement allows an image space to emerge that only develops as the film continues, and thus also has a temporal dimension. In the temporal fight of the modulation of image space, a "subjective vision" is developed that cannot be harmonized with the unity of the represented figure as a person; although the voice ostensibly refers to the figure's dream world. At issue is an image of the figure's

subjectivity that is only realized in the spectator's real-time perception of the film.

In *Mean Streets*, the cinematographic image is divided into two levels of perception that do not correspond to the scheme of subjective and objective image; they can roughly be distinguished as scenographic space and image space. On the one hand, the acting formulates a description of the figure's subjectivity; on the other hand, in the stylizations of the image space a dimension of this subjectivity is exhibited beyond the figure himself. Understood in its temporal structuration, at issue are two separate, optic-acoustic traces of perception that approach one another and separate one another, that occasionally run synchronically, sometimes overlapping. These two dimensions of representation only coincide in the vision of the spectator.

For the spectator, the figure emerges only in the correlation of various perception spaces; a figure that only comes to life in being seen by the spectators.

In a similar sense, film theory in recent years has returned to the question of phenomenology. Vivian Sobchak, for example, speaks of the double structure of two modes of perception of the filmic image: it mediates to the spectator both the gaze on an external world of objects and at the same time the expression of an intentional, always already meaningful mode of perception.

But even this approach binds the filmic spatial construction to a scheme of everyday perception. The subject that represents itself in the cinematographic image space as a perceptible mode of perception is always conceived in the same way: as an "ego," which in its worldly reference is identical to the corporeal ego of the spectator.

But is not the filmic image always a constructed, an aesthetic subjective view that can be categorically distinguished from the pragmatic patterns of perception? Does not the way in which things are depicted on the screen refer at least just as much to a technical, a nonhuman perceptive body as it does to human perception?

Perhaps by looking to Deleuze we can speak of two correlating acts of subjectivation that are linked to one another in a variable way. Instead of fixed subject positions, these notions offer constructed ways of seeing in which the spectator's everyday perception encounters its own limitations.

It seems to me that the always-different consciousness of such constructed corporealities of cinematographic perception is immanent to the films themselves. The notion of an aesthetic reflexivity of the cinema, not founded on the intentions of the producers, but on the interaction of the spectators with various forms of audiovisual images, rests on this premise.

To this extent, the images of the home movie in the opening credits of *Mean Streets* might allude to the constantly changing practice of image making. It is indeed the ever-increasing individualization of the production of directly recorded images and sounds to which the post-classical cinema refers again and again when it tries to encounter everyday reality.

In the present tense of the hand held camcorder, they have swollen to a boundless stream: recorded acoustic and visual signals, which copied, fragmented, or collaged, serve as the basis for a form of the audiovisual with a grammar and a mode of reception that was developed and rehearsed in the music video and advertising, without which the current cinema would be unthinkable. With the help of video technology and digital image editing, the current cinema effects a mobilization of spatial perception patterns that have long become the central object of aesthetic enjoyment. When one today speaks of filmic spaces, one thinks especially of the genres of fantasy film, science fiction, or the horror-film. Sound design, animation, architectural phantasms have directly become the actors of an aesthetic experience, which serve the purposes of a representation along the lines of a classical narrative cinema. A film like *Titanic*, for example, simulates with all media of electronic image editing "classical cinema," and *Terminator II* presents the phantasm of a new dimension of digitalized images based on a highly conventional scheme of representing space.

Thus, the current cinema proves to be on the one hand a masquerade of video-technically animated fantasies and digitally generated spaces that resembles old narrative cinema. At the same time, there are films that by opposing video and digital image question anew the limits and conditions of our perception in cinematographic visuality. I'm thinking here of films like David Lynch's *Lost Highway* (1996) or Abel Ferrara's *Black Out* (1997)... In these films, where video is the literal other of the cinema, the magnetism of its unconscious is marked. This should be understood in a double sense: on the one hand, the video images in these images point to a work of fantasy which is split off from official culture and suppressed: trash, pornography, the extreme depiction of violence. At the same time, they mark a different level of consciousness, a level of perception and memory traces that indexes a non-human, artificial consciousness. From this combination of optical acoustic traces of perception the films construct a space of audio-visual synaesthesia, which by representing itself to the spectator like the interior view of mental processes begins to lose its human character.

It is no accident that *Lost Highway* was announced as a "psychogenetic fugue," a word that refers to both a pathologic condition and at the same time a form of musical composition.

In an interview with David Lynch, he said about this: original? "Fred and Pete" indicates the main figure, who is divided into two coexisting time levels.

Whether films like these ultimately place their protagonists between the present tense of their actions and the black out of an absolute forgetting, or let them circulate, divided into an ego and a non-ego/alterego, as two independent figures in parallel time loops: cinematographic perception, the dark space of the spectator is always the one place in which the various tracks of perception in their interferences can be experienced as a spatial unity, as an image space:

Such films mediate an awareness of the artificial body of cinematographic perception: a body that emerges from the intersection of the spectator's symbolic and aesthetic activities with the optic-acoustic traces of perception from which the films are constructed. It is an image space structured through time loops and intervals, far more comparable to the acoustic space of symphonic music than the schematics of a homogenous space of everyday perception.

We thus should not be too quickly satisfied by the reference to post-modern citation. Just as the cinema cannot refer to the reality of other image media without changing its own mode of representation, the Classical Hollywood Cinema cannot be cited without taking on a fundamentally new character.

## Glossary

### History of the Cinema

Films, to the extent that what is meant is what is realized in their aesthetic reception, can only be realized as a certain mode of vision and hearing, are thus never again identical after their reception. This applies as much to the films made long ago, the history of the cinema and the classical narrative cinema:

The history of the cinema is neither identical with the ideal totality of the film archive, nor with the development of media technology. It is the history of a an activity of cultural fantasy, in reference to which the films of the classical narrative cinema maintains virtual spaces of representation that at any time can find new currency in the vision and audition of the spectators. Their image spaces are literally seen anew, open new modes of seeing, new spaces of representation that thus have nothing to do with the spatial patterns of representation of a classical mode of narration.

The cinema—in current cinema this also refers to past films, the history of the cinema—is the site where a consciousness of the limits of human perception develops.

### Image Space and Tense

When, however, the cinematographic image is essentially an "image of movement," a moving image, then not because it represents a moving depiction of events; instead, this means in principle that the image is realized only in the temporal dimension, that it is fulfilled and has extension exclusively in time. Every film has its own temporal extension and structure, is itself structured, shaped time. It is precisely in its specific temporality that the cinematographic image becomes the art of the twentieth century. In this dimension, It has also been subject to the most fundamental transformations in this area. It provided the dominant patterns of audiovisual imagery and under the influence of video technology and computer animation constantly engenders new image forms.

### Silent Film – Sound Film

Not the film, but what has returned with sound film to the cinema: the orientation of the filmic representation.

It seems as if in the development of sound film, a mode of vision is merely recognized that had been obvious in silent film. The cinematographic spatial organization in the early sound film might have been more founded in the correlation with the integral corporeality of the speaking actor, as in the photographic likeness, rests, which seem forced though voice and dialogue. (The continuity of speech, the relationship of speaking actors and set as we know the possibilities of the edited person boundaries, which silent-film long thought to have left behind. It reintroduced to plot a space-time unity, which in principle corresponded to the scenic space of the stage of classical drama.

### Concept of the Image

To paraphrase Belting, the image is more the commonality shared by mental image and image object, scenic space and spatial installation, rather than one or the other. Something that is embodied in various media and on which our bodies still can become medium. (for example, in the actor). One aspect of space is to be understood as a literary parallel, just as the space of a film sequence can be summarized in the concept of the image space.)

### Media

Not through the definition of the heterogeneous use between material carrier of information, through

LOSUNGSMITTEL to the embodiment of dead spirits be grasped. A usage that depends on context: here, media are forms of materialization, objectification, embodiment of perceptive, fantasmatic, cognitive activities; The material structures of its becoming culture

Film space, filmic space

Everything that one perceives as spatial structure in film; whether one understands this as narrative space, as a space of the plot or as image space.

Difference between scenographic space and plot space

Bordwell sees them as equivalent. I would differentiate between the level of the represented action and the level of the scenographic description of actions and figures.

Difference to deconstruction, irony, style

The design of the image space does not seek to destroy the conventional perception of space, but to construct a level of perception of the figure through the spectator.

Image Space

The image-like dimension of cinematographic representation: both in the formal sense: a space of colors and forms—compared to painting, but also in the sense of a fiction, comparable for example to a literary parable or the literary description of a house, as so to speak the architectonic structure of an imagination in the sense of a poetics of space. Finally, in the sense of the concept of the image, which not only includes the image object, the spatial installation, but also the mental aspect.

Image

Mental images: metaphors, imagination [Einbildung], fantasies, dreams

Image Objects: Photos, Paintings

Spatial relations: performance, Installation

Synthesizing Image media: theater, cinema, and audiovisual media

What does ontological realism have to do with Hollywood?

The theories of Kracauer and Bazin are only (one?) example of many for the thesis, that at issue is not the facticity of film history; but the development of that what the images are and could be developed as a theory of the cinema, as done by Deleuze.

Difference to Text and Subtext

The spectator experiences the dark room, he or she does not decode a metaphor, but rather immediately interprets his or her aesthetic experience. That is, he or she mediates between audiovision and symbolic activity.

Difference between Text and Subtext and the Correlating Act of Subjectivation

As a reading of a film, this interpretation can be applied to the model of text and subtext. But central for my purposes is the act of perception, which first makes possible such an interpretation.

These modulations are however always at the same time also modulations of his sensations of perception: the black film, the voice constitutes also his or her darkness.

The difference between aesthetic and pragmatic perception

The analysis of audiovisual constructions through schematics of everyday perception is like attempting to understand the reception of a musical composition through model- like schematics of everyday function of hearing.

---

Translation: Brian Currid

end of file - Narrative Space – Plot Space – Image Space

© by H.Kappelhof