Lisensiaatintutkielma hyväksytty humanistisen tiedekunnan tiedekuntaneuvoston kokouksessa 17.12.1991 arvolauseella magna cum laude approbatur.

ASPECTS OF CINEMATIC VISUALITY

- JARMO VALKOLA -

ASPECTS OF CINEMATIC VISUALITY

JARMO VALKOLA

Jyväskylän yliopisto
Taidekasvatuksen laitos

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

"Why do people go to the cinema? What takes them in to a darkened room where, for two hours they watch the play of shadows on a sheet? The search for entertainment? The need for a kind of drug? All over the world there are, indeed entertainment firms and organisations which exploit cinema and television and spectacles of many other kinds. Our starting-point, however, should not be there, but in the essential principles of cinema, which have to do with the human need to master and know the world. I think that what a person normally goes to the cinema for is <u>time</u>: for time lost or spent or not yet had. He goes there for living experience: for cinema, like no other art, widens, enchances and concentrates a person's experience - and not only enchances it but makes it longer, significantly longer. That is the power of cinema: 'stars', story-lines and entertainment have nothing to do with it."[1]

The above shows how the Russian director Andrei Tarkovski has looked at the cinema. For Tarkovski the aim of art is connected with the explanation of being a human, so art is one of the ways to approach the world. As Gerald Mast has pointed out "any work of art is a selfcontained little universe, a microcosm complete in itself".[2]

And an interest in universes like that is based on the fact that they offer us something which is different compared to natural universes. The universe of a work of art is finite and ordered, and its order is perceptible and comprehensible, because it functions under certain laws, it has a logic of its own .[3]

One can understand cinema's universe as a kind of microcosm, a world with its own order and logic, and when a spectator puts his soul into that world, he or she sees, that it is a "picture" of that world; one can feel itself "inside" that picture, but in a second one can move "outside" that picture and observe the whole process.[4]

To experience cinema is based on a two-way tension of that kind. Thus as we watch films we are at same time under many simultaneously appearing stimuli. Cinema is composed of visual images (whether colored or black and white ones), spoken or written words, music, actors, sets and so on, of many ways of telling its emotions and ideas to the public.

Furthermore cinema is also one way of telling a story and in building a film the directorial decisions aim toward a "drama of the cinema", as Stefan Scharff has stated.[5] Cinema has developed and evolved from photographic story telling into more sophisticated forms of expression. Scharff makes a further distinction between "easy" films and the "complex" cinema of stylistic organisation.[6] So the difficulty comes from the critic's ability or inability to "read the cinematic text" that lies below the hypnotic effect of the narrative.[7]

The narrative elements of cinema chiefly consist of themes, a plot, place and time settings,

characterizations, and relationships in conflict or harmony. One can say that the subject matter of a narrative originates as a concept in the mind of a creator and becomes concrete and dramatic through the modes of expression of a certain medium; now, the medium used to communicate a developed sequence of events profoundly affects the nature of the emotions and ideas conveyed to an audience by the narrative. These similar elements can also be found in other art forms, but what makes cinema unique is the way in which these narrative elements are utilized, how they are transformed into the dramatic reality seen on the screen, because for example our apprehension of a character seen on the screen depends on how camera-editing dynamics and elements of presentation are explored.

In approaching the structure of art Rene Wellek has pointed out that "structure is a concept including both content and form so far as they are organized for aesthetic purposes".[8] And he continues: "The work of art is then considered as a whole system of signs or structures of signs, serving a specific aesthetic purpose." [9]

In cinema systems of this kind are based on the artist's choices from elements of construction. According to Juri Lotman every image on the screen is a sign: it has meaning, it carries information.[10] And while doing that, there are two kinds of meanings: first of all, images on the screen reproduce some sorts of objects of the real

world, and then a semantic relationship is established between these objects and the screen images (objects become the meanings of the images reproduced on the screen); on the other hand, the images on the screen may be augmented by some additional, often totally unexpected meanings. One can call them additional meanings, which can be symbolic, metaforical, metonymical and so on.[11] Cinema has been called a chain of visual impressions running and interlocking in an uninterruptible succession of graphic bombardments.[12] What this is to say, is that visual thinking and cinema language have to be understood as a certain kind of intellectual activity, because in a creative cinema a most simple kind of scene involves a massive series of directorial decisions that go far beyond the realistic situation behind the scene.[13] Cinema has been labelized as a kind of mixture of arts, a kind of synthesis, which is to say that cinema in addition to its own modes of expression (like montage), has a certain way of utilizing familiar elements from other forms of art (like acting, lighting, dressing and so on), and of combining them into a syntax of its own.[14] A spectator, who is used to looking for realistic acting, location settings and detailed psychology, might be lost with films that are composed largely of visual images. And often the fact that most films also tell stories, like novels, accelerates the aims to look at the cinema and its core from a literary point of view. That is why the debt coming from literary criticism leads to conclusions by which the literary core of cinema is

connected with psychological understanding, exact definitions, search for motive and so on. That is how the search for visual qualities of the cinema can be omitted by referring indefinitely to the aspects of style, and by doing so, not to define what the concept of style is in that connection.[15]

According to David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson:

> "A film will tend to repeat and develop specific techniques in patterned ways. This unified, repeated, developed, and significant use of specific film techniques we shall call style."[16]

Bordwell and Thompson point out that "film style interacts with film narrative in many ways".[17] So style and narrative are not isolated from each other, because often film techniques - which are not usually connected with the definition of style - support and enchance the narrative form.

> "Mise-en-scène, camera framing and movement, continuity editing, and other devices can function to advance the cause-effect chain, create parallels, or manipulate story/plot relations. But also, film style may become separated from narrative form, attacking our attention in its own right. Unusual camera movements, discontinuity editing, and other uses of film technique can call our attention to the techniques as a somewhat independent system."[18]

As Durgnat has stated:

> "Style is simply those pieces of content which arise out of the way the artist makes his basic points."[19]

So, accordint to this definition, the question whether style is more important than content is a misleading one, and that is why the distinction between "literary content" and "visual style" is particularly misguided because even in literature much of the "content" comes from the "style", as Durgnat has further pointed out.[20]

My aim in this study is to research how cinema and cinematic processes of meaning develop and evolve according to certain qualities and epithets. I shall define the entities connected with cinema and its perception against cinema's essential background, which according to my view lies in the visual organisation of the whole. That is why I understand cinema and the outlinings risen from it to be a vast and extensive visual system. How it produces meanings is a prevailing question? How the issue of meaning and the ways of its definition, function and importance vary within different filmmaking practices, is one of the eternal interests of my approach. But in my opinion the visual and stylistic meanings are an essential part of my emphasises. As the main interest lies in the visual qualities of the image, cinema's aural qualities are left in the background, though they also form an interesting area in approaching the essence of the cinema.

Anything that mediates information can be called language, which leads us to the problem: How to define a language? There is a temptation to call everything

language, although one might want to restrict the term solely to verbal language, which, in a way, is too tight a restriction.

On one level film resembles reality, and on another it resembles language, and both of those analogies are so wide and rich that they have expanded film theory to the degree of paralyzing it. Between the years 1930-1960 the relationships between film and reality were controlling the intellectual dialogue around the cinema and its essence, because it was felt that cinema's nature as a medium was photographic. That is why its essence was based on realism, and if one had been very strict with this meaning, there would have been great difficulties in defining cinema's fantasy and its dimensions; but luckily enough, the fantasy was not totally excluded (it had its chances in Disney cartoons and musicals). Yet, if those who really believed in cinematic realism had taken their analysis very seriously, they would have been in great troubles.

Between the years 1970-1990 the academic discussion of cinema's essence has been profiled by the comprehension of film as language, the paradigms borrowed from structural linquistics, semiology and structuralism, the ideas of how cinema is amalgamated by ideology, and how film form is manipulated by certain code systems and so on.

So, as for cinema and its essence, the analogies to language have been versatile. Following Raymond Durgnat's formulation[21], I suggest that film is not language in any other way than metaphorically, and that its its nature is not a realistic one, this being one leading viewpoint in this study.

One possibility in approaching the cinema's essence is the idea of film as a dream with certain audiovisual forms. Dreams take abstract ideas - like emotions, which are abstract - and use memories in putting them into an audiovisual way of presenting things, so the audiovisual forms of film and dream are taken from reality, but they are very soon liberated from that reality into the smallest unit of perception, for example into colour patches.

Film or cinema is not purely a dream, but a visual mental process. One way of noticing that is to watch films like Norman McLaren's Begone Dull Care, which uses colour patches. There you have the same kind of effect, as if you were rubbing your own eyelids, and you would see colour patches floating here and there. They are images, but not photographic or realistic ones, they are solely produced by our nervous system.

It is obvious that films do resemble dreams; maybe films also resemble images of the mind, while we are awake, let

us say a certain kind of visual memories, as in many Tarkovski's films.

But there are also viewpoints according to which film is not a dream, because as soon as you say that film is a dream, the danger lies in the fact that people think you are saying: film is hallucination, it hypnotizes you, it is an extremely powerful way of presentation, it confuses the spectator's mind in relationship between film and dream.

There are differences: first of all a dreamer always writes his or her own script, which he or she considers an extremely exciting one. So a dreamer has made up a dream for him or herself, and while we are watching a film, it is always someone else's story about other people. While watching a film, we do completely understand that film is separated from us, it is fiction and we are in a cinema. So there is a contradiction between the image on the screen and our being there, although in principle we are not blurred by the existence of the film, by the existence of the images on the screen.

Film is a set of ideas which are presented by the help of images and sounds.[22] Film is remarks about the external reality, and the structure of an image is pictorial, so it is a question of the structure of human visual perception. The structure of sounds is acoustic, it is

the structure of acoustic perception. The visual perception is built around light, it is the question of how light behaves and what kind of information it can produce and how it produces that. An aural perception builds itself around sounds and it behaves very differently from light and gives us very different information.

Let us take an example: a light reflecting from a table gives us information about its shape and position, but the sound of a table gives us no information whatsoever, because you can hear no sound from it. But if you make a sound by knocking it, you get information about its material (whether it is made of wood and so on), but no information about its shape.

That brings us to the conclusion that information given to us by picture and sound is based on different structures. And when light moves inside a camera very straightforward, the camera cannot see behind the corner, as cannot our eyes, but the sounds are moving in all directions, so our ears can hear sounds behind the corner.

It is difficult to define the differences between these structures, because they have no similarities, and that is why the difficulty of theory in that sense lies in the fact that you cannot define the differences, because the things are so different by nature.

As a conclusion one can say that the structure of cinema is the structure of two sensory systems, sight and sound, and also it is the structure of thinking, because you need that to co-ordinate the whole process.

There is no single method covering this study, but as I understand film as a mental, visual process, and as the emphasis lies in the exploring of cinema's visual and stylistic meanings, so the semantic processes according to film visuality are crucial to my point-of-view.
The concept of semantics refers in its origins to philology, where it means the research of meanings with words, and from where it has gradually slided into the meanings itself and into the research connected with it. There is a willingness to connect it with natural verbal language, as linquistics call it, and then it can be either a special area inside linquistics or a wider feature of it. The general semantics are not be restricted only to words, but also to syntactic meanings and wider references.

Extensions of these kind can change into exceptions or break totally and gain independence through that, and then we can refer with semantics to all kinds of meanings. We can also talk about visual semantics and we can think, not only of signs and symbols, but of the structures of the meaning inside the mind itself.

As Rudolf Arnheim puts it:

"My contention is that the cognitive operations called thinking are not the privilege of mental processes above and beyond perception but the essential ingredients of perception itself."[23]

So it is a question of treating cognitive material on any given level and every process, that may be included in thinking, takes place at least in principle, in perception. Visual perception is visual thinking, confirms Arnheim.[24] A difference between passive reception and active perceiving is contained even in elementary visual experience:

"As I open my eyes, I find myself surrounded by a given world: the sky with its clouds, the moving waters of the lake, the wind-swept dunes, the window, my study, my desk, my body - all this resembles the retinal projection in one respect, namely, it is given. It exists by itself without me having done anything noticeable to produce it. But is this awareness of the world all there is to perception? Is it evenits essence? By no means. That given world is only the scene on which the most characteristic aspect of perception takes place. Through that world roams the glance, directed by attention, focusing the narrow range of sharpest vision now on this, now on that spot, following the flight of a distant sea gull, scanning a tree to explore its shape. This eminently active performance is what is truly meant by **visual perception.**"[25]

One can refer to smaller parts of that visual world, or one can refer to its whole framework, so it is a changing, developing and evolving process, while all the aspects are subject to continued confirmation, reappraisal, change, completion, correction, deepening of understanding.[26]

One can speak of **cinematic semantics**, with which we can understand the exploration of cinematic meanings, concentrating on specific cinematic things like exploring the meanings of moving images, succession, montage-combinations and camera-effects. So in this connection the interest focuses on all kinds of visual and stylistic meanings of cinema.

Thus the question is of the perception of phenomena and thinking (logic), in which there lies a human being's chance of gaining information about reality by perceiving it with the help of experience and thinking.[27]

With the help of these understatements I shall make an attempt to define cinematic essentials, the nature of cinematic meaning process, the visual meanings in perception of cinema and the meaningful dimensions of cinematic style related to theoretical thinking and to cinematic examples.

2. CINEMA AND VISUAL THINKING

2.1. In search of cinematic essences

Visual perception, as I emphasized in the introduction, is not a passive recording of the stimulus material, but an active concern of the mind. When we are interpreting the functioning of the senses thoroughly, we must keep in mind that they did not come out as instruments of cognition for cognition's sake, but evolved as biological aids for survival, so perception is purposive and selective; it has certain aims, and as Rudolf Arnheim[28] has emphasized, active selectivity is a basic trait of vision.[29]

When something appears or disappears, moves from one place to another, or changes its shape or color, it also changes the perceiver's role, and in watching films with moving visual images, that kind of connection brings out new information, changes the previous positions. Raymond Durgnat has pointed out that the reading of a picture is a sequence of mental events exactly like reading some other reality.[30]

Juri Lotman has stated that:

> "The world of the cinema is extremely close to the visible appearance of life. The illusion of authenticity, as we have seen, is one of its integral properties. But this world has one rather strange feature; it always consists, not of all reality, but of a segment carved into the shape of the screen."[31]

From the above we can draw the conclusion that the world of the cinema is a divided and segmented world. That is why there exists a possibility of emphasizing one thing in relation to other things, and the artistic world of cinema arises from all those combinations and possibilities, which the different, but suddenly brought-together unities will produce.

This is one way of creating an independent world, and it may be that the value of this kind of object lies in how it is able to reveal the feelings and emotions of its creator, or how an artist can produce meaningful characteristics to the materials he or she is working through.[32]

These feelings and emotions can be pure abstractions, and the result may be totally fictious. According to Ian Jarvie,[33] it is not the material object that is being addressed, when we consider the very possibility of thinking about film in general, we can loosely speak of content, referring usually to a form of narrative. The object of this kind of thinking is not material, and it is not immaterial or mental either. The people and the

objects in the cinema are concrete, but the relationships between them are abstract. Therefore, the stories in films, the plots, themes and meanings are also abstract objects.

For Ian Jarvie the fundamental question of methodology in philosophic aesthetics is: How can we think, write and talk about arts?[34] This notion leads further to questions about the nature of art itself; are films art, what is cinema and so on. Throughout the history of the cinema aestheticians have tried to define the essence of the cinema, the purity of the cinema. Raymond Durgnat has stated that cinema is a "mongrel muse".[35] The "purity" of the cinema only lies in the way in which it combines diverse elements to its own "impure" whole.[36] So the cinematic essence is in the interaction - how it integrates other art forms - and then there is the possibility of cinema to exist "between" and "across" their boundaries.[37] And this is the way how cinema can gain its own dignity by being a mixture.

Traditional aesthetics saw that the essence of cinema was in movement and cutting, but if cinema is a mongrel medium, then we must relate movement and cutting to all its affinities. Consequently, we have to take a new look at the cinema, to look at screen editing in a new way. Traditionally there has been very little talk about cinema's theatrical affinities, because of the heavy burden on montage and cutting. But a visually minded

theater director can also guide the spectator's eye by controlling the whole stage and using cinematic effects, manipulating the space between actors; thus theatre-space can also be very fluid and pictorially interesting.

During the silent period the miming in cinema was very effective, there was no use for picture or words. The basic element of theatre is not setting, it is the presence of the actor. And cinema uses actors, because the story film depends upon the actor's personality, his ability to use gestures, postures, atmosphere and physiognomy. So it is a way of showing things, and cinema is an act of showing, art of mise-en-scéne.

But cinema is also an art of visuals in motion, and Durgnat has further defined that "apart from current avantgardes (e.g. kinetic art) the only other arts of visual movement are ballet and mime - both theatrical arts".[38] But the director with a strong and sophisticated visual sense can make most of what we call pictoriality, the ability to cast and read sophisticated messages in a visual form. In other words it is a question of nuancing the elements of cinema.

André Bazin spoke of cinema as an idealistic medium,[39] which was one way of creating an illusion of reality through some aesthetic and other choices. That is how Bazin's view shows how film theory either implicitly or explicitly posits the question of cinema's basic nature

as a medium or language - in general, how cinema produces meanings, and also a question of the relationship of cinema and reality.

> "Achieving the truth of a film image - these are mere words, the name of a dream, a statement of intent, which, however, each time it is realised, becomes a demonstration of what is spesific in the director's choice, of what is unique in his position. To seek one's own truth (and there can be no other, no 'common' truth) is to search for one's own language, the system of expression destined to give form to one's own ideas."[40]

The above is how Andrei Tarkovski has classified his thoughts about the role of the cinema. Tarkovski feels that cinema has its poetic meanings, although the methods might change, the only objectivity is the subjectivity of the author.[41]

When we think of film history and theories around it, we can look at it as if its different phases could be some kind of answers to the basic question of cinema's language (nature and structure) and cinema's relation to reality as a kind of photographic form of reproduction and a form of expression. That is how we can think of certain important phases from that point of view, certain "moments" in film theory and history, which have defined the basis of cinema. We can think of the ideas of Bazin, Eisenstein, Epstein, Vertov, Pudovkin, Arnheim, Mitry etc. They all have tried to clarify cinema's conceptual dimensions, but according to Gerald Mast, they haven't succeeded well enough:[42]

"True, they have defined some kinds of cinema; they have defined some of the qualities unique to those kinds of cinema; they have defined the characteristics and devices they find most valuable in some of those kinds of cinema; they have simply not defined cinema."

Mast says as follows:[43]

> "A work of cinema is an integrated succession of projected images and (recorded) sounds."

Mast feels that the appeal of the cinema is some kind of cumulative kinetic hypnosis of the uninterrupted flow of film and time. It corresponds to Tarkovski's central idea of cinema as a time-art.

> "The dominant, all-powerful factor of the film image is rhythm, expressing the course of time within the frame. The actual passage of time is also made clear in the character's behaviour, the visual treatment and the sound - but these are all accompanying features, the absence of which, theoretically, would in no way affect the existence of the film. One cannot conceive of a cinematic work with no sense of time passing through the shot, but one can easily imagine a film with no actors, music, décor or even editing."[44]

Mast sees that the flow of film moves steadily, but within that forward flow one can distinguish between three kinds of "movement", three kinds of succession: (1) literal (the succession of frames), (2) imagistic (the succession of shots) and (3) structural (the succession of "events").[45] Mast also thinks that Eisenstein was one of the classical film theorists who built their theories on the premise that the imagistic succession of shots

(rather than the literal succession of frames) was the essence of the cinema art.[46]

According to Mast:[47]

> "Visual succession in a film is an optical illusion, the illusion of wholeness and continuity produced by the movement of celluloid through the projector. Cinematic succession makes whole out of mere pieces: (1) an apparently fluid whole out of obviously disparate frames; (2) an apparently spatial or temporal or imaginative whole out of obviously disparate shots; (3) an apparently structural whole out of obviously individual 'events'."

The photographing of reality is an essential trait of some kind of cinema, but it is not the essence of cinema itself, although Siegfried Kracauer has claimed that "the basic properties of film are identical with the properties of photography. Film, in other words, is uniquely equipped to record and reveal physical reality and, hence, gravitates toward it".[48]

Eisenstein and Arnheim had slightly different opinions on that subject, because they felt that the cinematographic process was not mere copying of reality, but - as Arnheim stated[49] - the cinema reduces three-dimensional life to a two-dimensional surface, and through that it alters our perception of it with lenses, which see unlike the eye, and with camera angles, which see as the artist wants to see.

Eisenstein among other Russian theorists was the first to see the full possibilities of the early fragmentations of

space and time in cinema. The emphasis was on cutting, which depended on showing. That is how Eisenstein brought to film an eye as 'painterly' as that of the German expressionists, and Eisenstein-type of editing became part of film language generally and featured particularly in the work of film theoreticians and documentarists, who were often the same people. As Durgnat has stated,[50] the theoriticians wanted to prove that the cinema was a fine art, with its own "purity", even if the "passive" camera had to content itself with passively recording reality. And the documentarists tended to take what they were photographing as "given", as something which they were not creating so much as interpreting. According to Durgnat, the formal language of cutting can be analysed into four elements:

> "There is the 'collison' of one composition against another - as in Dreyer's La Passion de Jeanne d'Arc, and of course, in Marker's La Jetée, which is cut from still images, and shows how cutting can exist as forcefully between static images as between moving ones. Often again, the static elements of the image can be 'carried away' by bold movement, which becomes the predominating element, so that images can be cut as movement-against-movement (as in the example from Intolerance and in the Odessa steps). In the films of Jean Renoir, the individual image is often so loose and free as hardly to exist as an entity, and a whole view of man is implied in their cameras's continuous movements, through 'free', 'continuous' space. In other films again, the composition of individual images is merely not displeasing, or comparatively neglected; yet the central action is strongly and carefully modulated (as in the metronomed sequences from Our Daily Bread and Queen Christina).[51]

So we can think that all these different styles are merely a matter of emphasis, and they can be counterpointed in various ways. Juri Lotman has demonstrated that there are two tendencies present in the language of cinema. One, based on the repetition of elements or on the everyday or artistic experience, which establishes expectations, and another, which violates this system of anticipations, singles out semantic bundles in the text. According to Lotman, furthermore, at the basis of film meaning we find a displacement, a deformation of customary orders, facts or appearances of objects.[52]

2.2. Selectivity and continuity

The first step in analyzing a film is to segment it to sequences. A sequence is a major part of the film, consisting of at least one shot and usually more than one shot. The sequence is not an arbitrary division, but rather it is demarcated by certain cinematic devices (fades, dissolves, cuts, black screen, sound shifts and so on). Moreover, a sequence has a conceptual coherence, and sequences form meaningful units. In different sorts of films we may find different sorts of sequences; most sequences in a narrative film are called scenes.[53] From about 1924 till the forties the typical visual structure of a scene in a Hollywood cinema would be something like Durgnat has suggested.[54] It would open with an establishing shot, setting the scene and

stimulating the atmosphere. The next would be a two-shot of the protagonists, usually in what the French call 'Le plan americain', i.e. a head-to-knees, although this gradually tended to give way to a head-to-waist. Close-ups would be reserved for the climax of the scene - first a close 'two-shot', then a close-up of each character - briefly returning in the mid-shot or establishing shot to reconnect the climax to the dramatic context. A title or a fade would precede the establishing shot of the next sequence.

Consequently, for a spectator many kinds of shifts in viewpoints (through variated camerawork) might be completely invisible, because he or she looks through the images, not at them, and therefore has little or no idea where one shot ends and another one begins. A sense of the image appears to a spectator only when the film draws attention to itself, or when a spectator has made a close study of the medium.

For Kracauer the motion picture's filmic qualities were connected with spatiality and its compositional values,[55] and for Arnheim uniquely cinematic properties were actually filmic ones, equally applicable to still-photography as to motion pictures.[56] Arnheim dealt with the absence of space-time continuum, which for him meant the way how editing alters spatial and temporal continuity, but according to Mast, as we speak of the

term "cinema", we are dealing with a unique way in which the cinematic process uses film material:

> "It adds the vector of time to the filmic dimension of space; it complicates the simple spatiality of the still photograph by adding elements of continuousness (of movement, of sound) and succession (of frames, of events)."[57]

Further on Mast stresses that film (still photography) is a spatial art; its elements exist **simultaneously** in space, whereas cinema is a temporal art; its elements appear **sequentially** in time.[58] So we can think, that one essential filmic operation is this sequential linking of spatial images.

As we have seen previously, cinema is labeled by selectivity, viewpoints, which are developed through choices. Even the shortest documentary contains a lot of organizing, a point of view of fiction. So the essential cinematic strategy contains the idea by which one can hide things in a film, in order to gradually reveal them. Through this kind of mechanism a series of cinematic shots shape into a series of emphasises, throughout the selective and manipulative role of the camera. That is why film is not a reproduction of reality, because once a scene has been cut into shots, we are not working anymore with the reproduction of reality, instead, we are working with the statements referring to that reality.

In cinema it is possible to work with small, restricted regional series. A good example is the musicals of the 1930's with Busby Berkeley, who worked at them. He had this idea of monocular vision, which was not based on any film theory, but was a very analytical approach. He felt, that the world of cinema was completely fictional; and according to Hollywood-thinking the public was not interested in cuts inside the cinema, so its attraction had to be concentrated on other matters in a film-image, so that it would be possible to make the transitions between shots look as smooth and elegant as possible. A very strong fixation of visual perception inside an image is movement and all the meanings connected with it. That is why in a Hollywood-film cutting was mostly connected with movement, because it has a controlling meaning for the eye and the look, and then the attention moves away from the shifting image, which makes cutting look "softer". But if, instead, we cut into strong, fixed and planned lines, the visual perception becomes more "fragmentary" and cutting more manifested.[59]

In a way this kind of viewpoint was based on the continuity rules, which were usually followed in Hollywood, although they were no absolutes. The basic reason for these rules was that real space - the space which the screen picture suggests to the spectator - has 360 degrees. And when we move through real space, we know where we are, because we have just moved through real space to get there. But the cinema spectator looking at a

screen picture has to remain facing the screen; he or she does not move through real space, and each cut is (by definition) a sudden omission of space. Now, some shifts the spectator can work out quickly, but when the camera moves round to "the other side" of an action - from whichever side it started - all the rights and the lefts of the action reverse the direction. It's rather like a mirror-image in that respect. This sudden jump around of every movement and position into its opposite can be (a) a visual shock and/or (b) more or less confusing: "Where am I?"[60]

The basic continuity rules are:

1) The exit / re-entry rule, or "Rule of opposite re-entry", which means, to carry a movement, look, or space in a straight line across a cut, to have it re-enter from the side of the screen opposite of the side which it left. Similarly for top/bottom and opposite corners etc.

2) "Don't cross the line", the line - the 180 degrees line - the action line - the action axis, which you find (a) in any shot, draw a line along the camera's line-of-view to meet: (b) a line drawn between the furthest apart most prominent objects in or near the action, and (c) the line is the 180 degrees line, so (d) don't let the camera cross it and then turn around to watch the action from the other side. But you can cross the line to get closer to something (e.g. to pick out someone in a close-up); still you must not turn the camera round. But on this side of that 180 degree line, the camera can turn right

around up to the 180 degrees. So, this allows you to usetwo different methods: (a) Reverse angles, a shot at more than 90 degrees to the previous - anything up to 180 degrees. To that extent, it is the other way, a "reverse direction", as you come right up towards the 180 degrees. (b) Over-shoulder shots, which are a common case of the near 180 degrees. Reverse angle to see in a corner of the screen the back or the side of the head or shoulder of the person facing the face, which you are centring on. It is often useful as a quiet reminder of the presence, the dramatic potentialities of the "silent partner".

3) **Cut on movement**, because movement pre-empts the eye's attention and softens any clashes that might occur between strong static shapes.

4) **Change the angle**, when you cut between shots of the same scene or object from different distances, change the camera-position by absolute minimum 15 degrees. The same reason, as for rule 3, plus actors can not repeat movements absolutely exactly, and the angle-change distracts the eye just enough.

There are also various other points. E.g. when cutting between two faces, slant each at a different angle to the other, to avoid the clash of a flat-on-face shapes. The angle-change changes the perspectives, and therefore also the face-shapes.[61]

According to Bordwell & Thompson,[62] the basic purpose of the continuity system is to control the potentially disunifying force of editing by establishing a smooth

flow from shot to shot. All of the possibilities of editing are directed to this end. Firstly, graphics are kept roughly similar from shot to shot. The figures are balanced and symmetrically deployed in the frame; the overall lighting tonality remains constant; the action occupies the central zone of the screen. Secondly, the rhythm of the cutting is usually made dependent on the camera distance of the shot; long shots are left on the screen longer than medium shots, and medium shots are left on longer than close-ups.[63]

In cinema montage is thinking through images, because cinema is the only form of art, which is a succession of images in the same space. All the other visual forms of art consist generally of one image only, and all the aspects related to editing are made inside that one image. So the composition of an image or the succession of points of interest, or the structure of the image related to looks, colours or other aspects, are organised into one image, and the eye moves in the space inside this image.

Although cinema is montage between images, the cinematic image is a compilation of different elements; thus as in painting, there are also visions inside one single image. And the complexity of cinema is not so much based on the fact that the cutting between images would replace the montage inside an image, than on the fact that that we are dealing with both things at once: we are controlling

the movements of the spectator's eye, and what's more important, we are controlling the movements of the spectator's thoughts inside one image, and then we put them against the following image.

But because cinema is also an art of movement, there can not be just a question of montage inside or between images, but also the vision how movement relates to the lines of the look, how it transforms and guides them. The spectator's thoughts tend to follow the line of the look, if there is a strong look; and if there is an element of surprise, then the thoughts of the spectator tend to move with the look. Thus the cutting in cinema will not happen only between the pictorial points of interest, but also according to the action lines and directions in a film. There are many things happening similarly, and no simple rules to explain it all.

The Americans developed a storytelling, which was based on the dynamic thinking of the story, sharp dialogue and a plot, which explains as little as possible and maximies the speed of the narrative. The story is full of surprises, swifts, little shocks. This is one point of editing, because under the Hollywood-speciality, when we are choosing the elements of the film, we leave out all other things except the ones which are definitely needed. According to that kind of thinking , it was a question of "the story point-of-view". And while we are always speaking about the story and its qualities, we omit the

extent of how this kind of thinking about cinema demands also certain kind of editing.[64]

The montage-tradition in the history of the cinema is often called dynamic or visible editing, so then we have cutting, which is self-evident and graphically dynamic. According to the Hollywood point-of-view we undermine the cutting with the story, so we concentrate on the narrative and try to make the cutting as invisible as possible. The Russians specialized on dynamics, the collisions between shots, and the American interest concentrated on creating different kinds of relations, so the story is a relationship between people in time and space. This was the so-called **Classical Hollywood Syntax**,[65] an idea about montage being a syntax; so in a similar way as we are joining words according to certain kinds of syntactical rules, we are also joining shots according to some cinematic rules.

One problem with the cinematic continuity is that it is not a syntax, and there are from time to time reasons (for example if one wants to create an illusion or effect about dramatic explosion) to break the continuity lines or cross them. Then the visual shock which emerges might be apropriate, but if you're thinking about syntax, and the question rises of breaking it, people won't understand you. But if doing a thing differently has some kind of meaning, then it is not a question of syntax, but a question of discourse, a way of telling things. So

continuity is not a syntactic question, but a question of how you choose the things you have to say.

According to the montage theories, cutting is always a positive factor: the conflict between shots, the collision between shots creates a kind of lyrical effect, part of the whole structure of the film.[66] The deletions in a Hollywood way of thinking about cinema tend to become passive, but it is rather difficult to put the Hollywood-model and the Russian way opposite each other, because Hollywood very quickly learned and made up all the things the Russians were doing, and partly because "The Golden Age of Russian Montage" lasted, maximally thinking, only ten years.[67] Very typical of montagecutting is to break a scene into short cuts, so in a way the impression is cubist; the sections of the space come forward, they are cut away and thrown into the screen one after another, because the decisions in compiling a film will determine the shots that are included, and the action is made up by the way the shots are chosen. So, in a way, there is a riddle of what kind of visuality is needed, and then we work back, split the action and the writing of the story, in order to get the final effect.

A more "European" way of thinking about cinema for example in the late twenties was called pictoriality,[68] because the European directors were not just thinking about relationships between images, but their interest

was in the image itself. Although the interest lies in a single image, there is also the question of how to compile images in a way that conveys the mood. Continuity is important when we are telling stories, when people are moving, doing things, changing places etc. But when we are dealing with streams of consciousness, like the German expressionists,[69] there is an almost constant need for discontinuity, because the story is often told as a series of brief flashes. Accordingly, there lies a need for developing an almost conscious discontinuity.

2.3. An example of synthesis: Fritz Lang's M (1931)

In the cinema of the late twenties one can see certain kinds of emphasises, that were condensing at the beginning of the next decade, when there were emerging films that in a syntectic way condensed many present tendencies. One example is Fritz Lang's film M (1931), which used the American way of dynamic storytelling, the Russian way of montage and ideas, and which also had a very architectonic, pictorial structure of images with all its monumentalistic and expressionistic references.

M opens with the case of Elsie Beckmann, a schoolgirl who disappears and after a while is found slain in the woods. Since her murder is preceded and followed by similar crimes, the city lives through a veritable nightmare. The police work feverishly to track down the childmurderer, but succeed only in disturbing the underworld. The city's

leading criminals therefore decide to ferret out the monster themselves. For once, their interests coincide with those of the law. This is a motif which was also used in Bertolt Brecht's Dreigroschenoper: a gang of criminals enlists the help of a beggars' union, converting its membership into a network of unobtrusive scouts. Even though the police meanwhile identify the murderer as a former inmate of a lunatic asylum, the criminals, with the aid of a blind beggar, steal a march on the detectives. At night, they break into the office building in which the fugitive has taken refuge, pull him out of a lumber room beneath the roof, and then drag him to a deserted factory, where they improvise a "kangaroo court", which eventually pronounces his death sentence. The police appear in time to hand him over to the authorities.

Fritz Lang (1890-1976) was originally an architect and became famous as a film director already in the early twenties due to his strong visuality. When we think of the cinema of those days, we can distinguish the three traditions: (1) Russian influence, which concentrated on montage, (2) Hollywood-influence, which concentrated on narrative, and a kind of (3) "European" influence especially in German cinema, which was heavily concentrated on the visual qualities of an image. While the Americans were dynamic in storytelling, the Germans were during the silent period much slower, and many German films at that time were melodramatic according to

the story and naive when compared to American films. The Germans emphasized the meaning of the image, and one form, a way to emphasize the image's meanings was German Expressionism. Films like Robert Wiene's The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari (1919) or Karlheinz Martin's Von Morgens bis Mitternacht (1920) pulled out an expressionism, which was one form of pictorialism, and there are also other German traditions such as monumentalism, which is a very useful point of view related to the aesthetic of Lang's films.[70]

Being originally an architect, Lang had that way of thinking through large, heavy, squarelike forms; so he built his images in a geometrical, architectonical manner. One of the strong cinematic developements in the 1930s was the breakthrough of realistic cinema, and Lang's M can also be considered an example of social realism, when it deals with social (political) organisations. It can also be called poetic realism, because during that time in France Rene Clair and Marcel Carné were doing their own soft, pessimistic and realistic films in a poetical way, while the Germans were doing their rather harsh, monumentalistic and a bit more cynical films according to certain realistic moods.[71]

Fritz Lang has noted:

> "Everybody says that I'm dull and pessimistic. Of course some of my films show gloomy things about people and life, some of the later ones might even be pessimistic. Although I think that my films are portraits of time, when they have been made ... I did always films about persons, who were fighting against the circumstances and

traps, which they were driven into. I don't see it as pessimism."[72]

Amongst Hollywood-scriptwriters there was at that time a general idea to write a film in three acts,[73] and one point of view according to the structure of a film deals with that: we can ask ourselves, if a certain film fits in with the three-act structure, and if it does, then what are the acts? Because it is a surprising thing to notice how often films fit in with three or five acts, as in an Antique tragedy.[74]

The first act of M is concerned with the antagonism of the murderer and police. Before that Lang shows in a tight proloque the initial push of the story, the tragedy of Elsie Beckmann. The first act deals with a kind of detective story, which includes a stop, and then the hunting of the murderer fails, and what begins to happen is that the underworld feels alert, because of the police-hunt. That is why the criminals are reacting, because they must find the murderer, so they can keep their own peace in criminal activities.

This is the reason why the second act of M deals with the underworld activities and the race to catch the murderer, it is a race between the police and the underworld. The third act of M starts approximately, when they catch the murderer, so the third act of M deals with the captivation of the murderer and the improvised trial, which follows.

The moral theme of the first act is clear: the bad murderer is haunting innocent children, so he has to be caught. The moral theme of the second act is more complex, because the question - Whos is going to catch the murderer? - expands into questions:
Which one of the organisations, police or the criminals, is stronger? Who is controlling the city, law and order or the queer underworld? So there is a lot of tension in the second act, because it is a bit confusing if the criminals will succeed. It is a contrast of methods, because the police seems uneffective, they are dealing with the wrong tracks, working behind papers, when the criminals seem to take advantage.

In the third act there is a new moral point of view: Who has the right to convict the murderer? Do the criminals have the right to do it? We are dealing with the vision of lynching, which the control of the police will resume at its tracks, and we know that the murderer will gain normal trial. The childmurders are only a catalyst, neither is the film a depiction of the murderer's psychology. M deals with the ideas that there is something bad turning the whole social structure upside down, into turbulence and chaos, and that the criminal organisation, a force of anarchy is competing with the police about the control of the town.

Let us think of the social background in Germany at that time: The Weimar republic was under collapse, the Nazi party and the Communist party were both well organized groups, revolutionary forces, and they were fighting with the police over the control in the streets; furthermore, the depression in 1929 had brought with it a sense of losing control, unefficiency into society.[75] Therefore, in a way, Lang's film is using the atmosphere of the time.

In his two-part Dr. Mabuse -film (Dr. Mabuse, Der Spieler / Inferno des Verbrechens, 1922) Lang had created a poetic thriller and melodrama of an evil master criminal, who controlled the whole underworld, was fighting an open war against all institutions. Dr. Mabuse's agents were creating social chaos and he himself was performing under different disguises.

As Siegfried Kracauer manifested:[76]

> "The world it pictures has fallen prey to lawlessness and depravity. A night-club dancer performs in a décor composed of outright sex symbols. Orgies are an institution, homosexuals and prostitute children are everyday characters. The anarchy smoldering in this world manifests itself clearly in the admirably handled episode of the police attack against Mabuse's house - an episode which through its imagery intentionally recalls the tumultuous postwar months with their street fights between Spartacus and the Noske troops. Circular ornaments emerge prominently time and time again. Both the tricky floor in a new gambling club and the chain of hands formed during a spiritualist séance are shown from above to impress their circular appearance upon the spectator. Here, as in the case of Caligari, the circle denotes a state of chaos."

We can find this kind of circle also at the beginning of M, in the first image of M, which shows us children in a backyard, and later there will be other shots with similar kind of circle shapes. Those shapes are very powerful, and although a shape has not got only one particular meaning, what is important is how one shape contrasts with the shape from another (the following or previous shot), and what is essential is that every shot has its own pictorial unity. In this opening shot the circle refers to a certain kind of innocence, and one can think that this kind of circle is a democratic shape (like a round table), although there is a leader in the middle; but later on in M we see men sitting at a round table, and then the circle does not refer to innocence at all.

There is also this feeling of hierarchy, which is a constant factor among German films during the twenties. One can say that if Americans believe in laughter and good will, Germans again think that order and hierarchy will keep the world going. Thus, is this a feature common to German culture, or is it a natural way of approaching its goals through films like M or The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari? Anyway, it is well done in M, where every picture has its own structure. Besides, in a way, architecture is a very natural way of depicting social structures, because architecture clarifies the shapes that people will follow, and M uses architectorial

shapes, because the images of M have a certain kind on monumentalistic nature.

The first image of M has a fatalistic nature, due to the shadows. There is also something else besides innocence. The camera pans up and there we can see a woman (somehow edgy). In this scene there is a strong feeling, that the working class is trapped, exhausted inside this heavily-built community, so we have the whole philosophy of social relationships revealed to us in the very first shot. And there are these barriers that leave the people inside a cage, so it is a repetition of motives in different forms.

And then we have this two-shot with women, with the same feeling of worriedness, but when one of them thinks of her child, it cheers her up a bit, because the child brings joy into her life.

There is the sudden omission of continuity, when the woman goes through the door into the apartment: Lang crosses the action line. There is also the European kind of camera movement, when the camera tracks the woman inside the apartment.

How does Fritz Lang tell us that the woman has a daughter? At first we have the image of the woman's face and the next image is from the school. Both of those images are geographically thinking in totally different

places, but when they are connected, there is a strong analogy between them. The woman is watching a clock and looking happy, we see the happiness before we know the reason for it. This is a common way in films: to show the reaction before we have the motif; and often in films the information presented comes in the upright order, so we start with some action and give the reason for it later on.

Next comes this very architectural shot of the school front entrance. If Lang had had some other philosophy, then the alternative method would have been a straight cut from a woman's face in a close-up to an image of a happy child running towards the school door. So we can cut from one person to another, but Lang cuts from a person to architecture, and this is a selective choice with a certain kind of feeling. And where the child is waiting, we have this hard shot concrete wall; yet, in a way, it is a happy shot, because we do have this woman in the mind. There is a feeling that we are in the thoughts of that woman, the way she was thinking of this situation, the child coming from the school. So although it is an objective shot, it is also a mental shot, like a mental image in the woman's mind. Then a policeman comes and helps the girl to cross the street. This is a kind of reference to later things, because in this situation the police are very capable of handling things, but later we do have problems with the police activities.

One problem in M is that a certain amount of the story must already be told at a very early stage, and commonly in films nothing will happen unless there is the presentation of the possible happenings before, unless we do have the preparation for happenings. In M we move with the child in to a poster, which is there telling us what might be happening. So there is a preparation of the situation before the murderer arrives. However, if we think of the whole story, this kind of information is not necessary; but here we have this whole trouble taken care of, and it is a very economic way of seeing things. In terms of reliability it is a very artificial matter that the child is throwing a ball against the poster many, many times and then comes the shadow of a murderer. Still it all works and seems quite natural.

In M there is a general feeling that the children are under threat of many kinds of dangers. So, first we have this shadow image of the murderer, which is a close reference to German expressionism, because the use of shadows was one of the big sensations in The Cabinet of Dr. Caligari in 1919.

As Kracauer puts it:[77]

> "Caligari also mobilizes light. It is a lighting device which enables the spectators to watch the murder of Alan without seeing it; what they see, on the wall of the student's attic, is the shadow of Cesare stabbing that of Alan. Such devices developed into a specialty of the German studios ... this emphasis upon light can be traced to an experiment Max Reinhardt made on the stage shortly before Caligari. In his mise-en-scene of Sorge's

> prewar drama The Beggar (Der Bettler) - one of the earliest and most vigorous manifestations of expressionism - he substituted for normal settings imaginary ones created by means of lighting effects."

And this shot in M with the murderer's shadow can be seen as an expression of what M owes to expressionism and the Caligari tradition, although in fact in M there are not many strong shadowshots of this kind. The tune that the murderer is whistling (Grieg's 'In the Hall of the Mountain King') is a clue and leitmotif throughout the whole story, as Lotte Eisner has noted:[78]

> "The murderer's whistling is both a motif and a psychological quirk. It is resumed when he perceives a new victim in front of the window with the knives. We first see the murderer still munching his apple calmly, as he looks at his reflection in the window (the scene provides a parallel to the moment in his room when he grimaces at himself before his mirror). Suddenly he stares mesmerised into the pane, as the little girl's figure appears in the frame of the knives. Now he follows the child, whistling the Grieg theme tunelessly."

The home-sequences with Frau Beckmann have a feeling of long morning, and there is much strongly felt realism in these shots. Lang can show us the mother's preparations in few shots, so in a way it is a question of dynamic storytelling, and that is one peculiarity inside the cinema that a film can show in a four-second shot the feeling of four hours.

In a shot with the children coming from school we have again a very architectural design: it is a low-angle shot and the children are quite small; there is a blank wall

which gives the feeling of space, and later there will be more staircase shots in this film.

This staircase continues the formulations that were in the first shots with the women behind those balconies. The children look down, so the woman is downstairs, and the woman looks up, so the children must be upstairs. This is good continuity, through which the spectator knows the positions of the characters in the shot. Lang cuts into the next shot just before the door of Elsie's mother is completely closed. One cinematic strategy is to cut just before the action ends, so that next image can come forward a bit stronger.

A careful chiaroscuro-lighting[79] controls the shot in which the murderer is buying a balloon for Elsie. It is happening in a different part of the town from the school's concrete surroundings. In here there lies more joy, even exaggerated joy, and that is partly due to the lighting. The camera shows the man who sells balloons, which are already somehow metaphorically strangled, a bit longer when the murderer and Elsie leave the scene. This is for the spectator to remember the man, because he has got an essential part later in the film when the beggars try to catch the murderer. It is Lang's way to give little hints and clues to the spectator.

One of the oddities in filmic strategy is that it is fairly simple to show a character being somewhere, but a

bit more difficult to show that someone is not there. First one needs a bit of a story, so the public can guess that the person is there, and then one can show that he or she is not there. That is how we can work out that Frau Beckmann is bothered, when Elsie does not come home at the usual time from school. So it is a very powerful shot, which has a kind of philosophy: it tells us about a labyrinth, absence, about hopeless emptiness and so on. And in the shot with the mother one can notice the careful lighting around the mother, which makes the shot more dramatic, and there they show us the closing of the door. In the shot in which the mother is calling Elsie's name, there is an interesting series of absence pictures, and it is hard to define whether it is an antirealistic combination of sound and space or a narrational ellipse. In a way Lang is showing us a series of places where Elsie is not. And then we can see Elsie's balloon rolling in another place, which is an effective sign of absence. This was a kind of prologue, the first part of the first act; in the second part of the first act there will be an extension of the theme, which was until now very personal, so now Lang shifts the interest towards the crowds, because the news is spreading fast.

Then come the shots of the murderer writing a letter to the press. The character of the murderer gains more sympathy in the course of the events, because the attitudes toward the main characters are shifting, moving and changing. The beginning is very clear (one must catch

the murderer), but the end is more complex, varied and nuanced. In the shot in which the murderer is writing we can sense a strong feeling of loneliness: the murderer is writing a letter to the press, accordingly there exists that theme of loneliness through the crowd. M has a lot of flowing, slightly musical sounds, and the way in which the mother calls Elsie is a bit of a musical fairyland call and the way the murderer whistles his tune has also a bit of a lonely sound that goes with him. Throughout this film the murderer's character is connected with things to eat and drink, and in his character there is childish indulgence and many subliminal references to the murderer's activities.

In the next shot of the crowd, the camera is tracking slightly backwards and it shifts the emphasis from the document (the poster on the wall) to the crowd. Then comes another little circle in a shot where the men are sitting at a table; even in that previous shot the crowd are sort of mourning if whether what they see is real, and now this sort of disagreement starts exploding; we are talking about a secondary chaos, the story goes on through a clear visual architecture in shots. M has not much individual psychology, it is concerned more with social psychology, a sense of group against group; and the smoke that keeps blowing across the screen in many Fritz Lang's films has a kind of visual turbulence usually in the form of cigars and pipes; it is a way of causing mental tension in visual terms. The next shot

with a man towards the camera is like a shot from Pudovkin's Mother (1926), because in Pudovkin's film there is a great deal of into-camera and head-on-acting. It is quite a segmented, little scene. The previous shot is like a first phase of a master-shot establishing the general lines of the scene and showing the positions of the people inside the scene; after a little bit of that Lang cuts to one of the close-ups. Then comes a bit of primitive but inventive 1920s type of social psychology, in which, within the group, you have contrasted types: one is a sort of impulsive, animal-kind of character, who is quick to physical violence, and the other character opposite him is a more intellectual type. Similarly you have again this feeling of little hierarchy, contestation of power. One thing that happens again and again in M and also in this scene is this slight cruelness, the people are not very kind to each other. In M every segment of society is alert: amongst the rich people where are fights in cafés and amongst the poor people there is a sort of suspicion bursting out in unjustified paranoia.

In the crowd scenes there is this contrast of angles: low-angles and high-angles are frequently contrasted; the crowd builds itself up instantly into another little circle, the ripples go wider and wider, the trouble is spreading and once again the police make a beneficial intervention. In the scene where the young man holds a book for a signature from the older man, there is a kind of hierarchy too, a taste of upper social power: The

police have to do a lot of work with documents and files, when, incidentally, in the next scene the voice of the man on the telephone is explaining all the things they have been doing. So once again the image and the voice are completely separate units; it happens a few times in M that the voice and the image go different ways.

However, as we can see in the next few shots, the police are not completely confined with their documents, they do go out interviewing people and working on the field. In a way, Lang is saying in M that life has become more difficult for the police and the state and that is why the police and the state seem weak. But they are still the best law and order that this world has, so the film wants the spectator to wish the police to succeed, even though it seems hopeless. As we can see the police have to be patient with their own superiors, and in M everybody seems to panic except the police. In the shots with police activity, there is a great deal of variety in viewpoints: There is a strong high-angle shot and then comes the next shot that describes the same action but much more low-down, and as the shot ends the group of people come right over the screen. Then comes the shift from the country to the town, and while the police efforts are impressive, they are also pathetic, because they are trying everything, while they get nothing definitive. There are new actions developing, but the spectator does not quite know what they will be, because there is no voice-over to tell him about them. The

operations are rather enigmatic and spectacular with more of those high-angle shots. Then comes another kind of shot with a staircase, heavy arches and tables, a feeling of real underworld. Next after that there is excitement caused by everybody rushing;it is done by having people rush in opposite directions, struggling against each other; once again we have the crowd in a bit of panic. Shots of panicking crowds are quite common in German films of the twenties.

Then comes Lohman, the police commissioner, a character that appeared alreay in Lang's Mabuse-films. In The Testament of Dr. Mabuse (1932-33) he was the man who hunted down the mastermind who was causing the inflation. In M he is also a sort of rough and ready lawman, not very scrupulous, because he plays some nasty tricks on the bad guys. Part of the excitement in these scenes comes from the fact, that the spectator propably wonders what difference that new man is going to make. the presentation of him builds up a kind of suspense, because until now the police have been rather vague and then comes Lohman with a more efficient approach. At the same time as the film is telling us something about the methods of Lohman's operations, we also see him disturbing the underworld and keep catching the underworld out for different things; this is what is going to provoke act two, in which the underworld organises itself to catch the murderer. The film is really rattling through a world of different kinds of

away expressionist smokes. The black gloves are already a symbol of Nazism and the bowler-hat is a kind of emblem of petty-bourgeoisie; there is also a skilled workman's toolcase, and we notice this case later in the film again, so one of the things is to connect the case with the guy who is sitting behind it. The cut comes just before the leader of the underworld completes his gesture; it is a strong movement with the hand, which the spectator can pretty fairly guess, so Lang does not want to show it; he just gives an elliptical hint to the viewers. Gestures like that are very interesting, because they have maximum strength, yet they are very, very short, which reveal a kind of mixture of brutality and control, because if you make that gesture, it is completely unnatural.

Then comes the cut from one board meeting to another with almost the same gestures and almost the same graphic part of the screen, and Lang goes into intercutting between the two organisations. In a way this cut is the beginning of second act; this sequence begins by revealing equality between these two groups. It quite often occurs that in the first shot of a scene you do not really know which scene you are in, which is an interesting kind of confusion of power. The wealthy citizens have their four lamps up in the air, and the crooks have their circle of lamps up in the air. It is almost if the two sets of people were talking to each other in the same room, which a bit like Elsie's mother's voice being in all sorts of

different places. There is almost like a little orchestration of hand movements through this scene, and while Lohman does not move, it makes him very strong. There is a certain point of interest: previously we saw Lohman dealing with the people from the lower class and here he is behaving with the upper-class characters in another way. Lohman does not seem quite natural in this environment as he was in the other one. In the shot with the crooks there is an implication that lighting is coming from the lamp, but as you can see the real light is coming from everywhere around the crooks. The cuts between the different groups are not only cutting the movement, but cutting the same movement from different angles. That is why the shots match so well, they are almost going two-by-two.

The underworld is getting organized, while the citizens are still in diffusion and getting more and more scattered as the sequences go on. There are some peculiarities, for example in the scene where somebody is making a long speech, and Lang does not show the speaker at all. The spectator wants to know who the speaker is, but it is not allowed. And then there are shadows as if the murderer was in the shadow. There is also a bit of mystery, because it a couple of minutes to know what the plan really is and how it is going to work.

In the scene with the price list of foods there is a reminder of the depression and inflation, prices going up

every day, a little allusion to the social monetary chaos. Then the camera goes one store up in the architectural and social structure and the view is very organized, bureaucratic, which at first glance looks like a labour exchange; but as soon as the camera tracks the man in the corner the picture is getting clearer. The physiques of the characters are peculiar with all those semi-dwarf shrunken characters. The shot of the beggar includes a corny point associated with the plot, because he is very sensitive to music, which refers to the point later on that he is going to recognize the tune which the murderer is whistling. The big glass in front of the beggar and the balloons all over him hint to the childish nature of the murderer and the beggar as well. The danger theme with the children continues in the next brief flashes.

Lohman is drowned in bureaucracy, but he also gets some hints about the murderer. The sympathy towards the police is increasing, due to the actual showing of their working methods. The crooks can go crashing anywhere, and the police can be almost stopped by a deaf woman in a doorway. Then comes another of the film's circles in the shot where the policeman is investigating the murderer's apartment, and then a parallel action-cut to the murderer munching an apple with all those juicy, bright fruits around him. The intercutting between inside and outside continues, and there is a feeling of gradual working towards the next possible murder. It is really a suspense

construction about whether the police are going to find the clue and having found the clue, if they will get to him before he kills another girl. But later we find out that the criminals reach him before the police, which is an interesting moral point, because the criminals have then actually saved a life.

Lang does not use background music in M and the silences are felt strongly. The things that are moving in the window also refer to expressionistic inheritance, and in the scenes in which the murderer is seeking another victim, we start to feel a sort of horrified pity for the murderer. In the shot where the murderer is in the café the hedge in front of him looks like a jungle and he is the animal, so nervous and out of control, locked inside the jungle, but ready and willing to jump away from there. In the scene there is a powerful pressure on insanity: one can see hardly anything of him, and he makes some kind of changes a few times inside the shot.

In the shot with Lohman thinking, there are some little hints, sort of mental efforts of the mind, whether he can put two things together and solve the riddle. Then comes a shot with the beggar and with that some spotty, chiaroscuro-visuals, a bit messy but effective.
The sign of the letter M in the shot refers to hope; the knife that the girl ironically gives to the murderer refers to danger; so at that point there is a strong element of moral conflict or moral reversal, in which the

spectator wants the criminals to follow that sign and save the girl's life, but at the same time we do not want Lohman to catch the murderer. So, as usual in suspense, it is not good vs. evil, or hope vs. fear, it is hope against hope. Good structures of suspense are always paradoxical. One could easily take the script of M and by putting different phases on the characters, one could make the police look like bumbling villains and the gangsters look like the saviours of decency without changing a word of the script; even in the trial-scene the words can be made to read differently.

The street-scenes in M are quite limited in their perspectives. Lang often shows only a bit of the street, and there are not many over-shoulder shots, which might give a fairly good idea of the length of the street or of the views in general. Lang wants to keep the spectator in a state of tightness, anxiety and suspense by providing those narrowed views.

The building, where the criminals chase the murderer is a kind of kafkanesque labyrinth and the frightened murderer is like a trapped mouse in a corner, where he knows of no escape, and the sounds of him rubbing the door with a nail add a special aural and tensioned element into the created suspense of that sequence. There is also a shot with a circle of light, that has a reminiscence of expressionism.

In the trial-sequence there is a strong, shifting tension between the jury of the criminals and the murderer, whom they drag and push into the shadowy basement. There is a strong point-of-view shot at the beginning of that sequence, when the murderer enters and looks at the silent, powerfully stagnatic jury. The murderer is just frantically saying that it is a mistake, when a hand enters and the camera tracks down showing the blind beggar, who has a balloon in his hands, and the camera shifts down into an upward position and shows both the balloon and the murderer. Lang shifts views between the murderer and the jury's headman Schraenker; there is a strong light coming from the left when the murderer is in the frame, and more upwardly from the right, when Schraenker is in the frame. When Schraenker shows the picture of poor Elsie and another girl, the murderer panics and starts to run towards the door. There is a powerful close-up taken from above with the murderer in, and a lot of shifts between objective and subjective angles. Now the position of the murderer is weakening every moment; Lang's camera moves a bit further up showing the murderer in a trapped and hopeless situation. Elements of Russian montage and image design appear frequently when Lang shows the crowd activities, and a strong dreyerlike (compare The Passion of Joan of Arc, 1926) pan wipes the faces of the crooks, which are static and serious when Schraenker talks about their jail sentences. Peter Lorre's hypnotic acting gets into more expressionistic areas, when the murderer starts talking

about his unability to control his inner forces. Lorre makes his gestures in a slower and lonelier manner, and the shot with him talking continues for quite a while. Now the light comes heavily from the right side of the screen, and then comes the shift to a semi-close-up of the murderer: the feeling of time inside the shot is extensified when camera moves from the murderer to the crooks and back. When the murderer talks about children and women, Lang picks up women from the audience; before that the main close-ups were taken of men. The atmosphere intensifies between comical laughter and strong judgments, and the crowd's feelings are more and more intense when the final is approaching. The heavy close-ups taken from the criminals make an atmosphere of continued menace with a heavy visual energy blurring from them.

Raymond Durgnat has stated:[80]

> "The very triviality of the objects helps to diffuse and deepen the atmosphere (it also helps to explain why Lang's atmosphere can so effectively survive a 'nonsense' story). His early films make a great deal of architectural masses, but in his later films the emphasis is not on masses so much as on space. The style of M is a splendid example. His images are often built on broad, rectangular shapes (arches, windows, shadows) laid at fairly shallow angles to each other (sharpening at climaxes). Shadows underscore important forms with a brooding, heavy immobility, creating a kind of generalised menace, something in the air. And Lang has always known how to position his figures in light and space so that, however immobile or innocuous they seem, a kind of visual energy, often malignant, radiates from them."

3. VISUAL PERCEPTION. SIGNS, SYMBOLS AND CONCEPTS

3.1. Meanings and textures

Visual perception is not passive recording of the stimulus material, but an active concern of the mind, and reading a picture is a sequence of mental processes exactly like reading some other reality. And because the sense of sight operates selectively, then the perception of different shapes consists of the application of form categories, which one might call visual concepts. As Raymond Durgnat has pointed out, the theory of visual perception as coordination, assumption and estimation, was gradually developed by gestalt psychologists and their successors from about 1920, and was taken from perceptual and cognitive psychology into art theory through the 1950s. The most notable developers in that process were Rudolf Arnheim, E.H. Gombrich, György Kepes and Anton Ehrenzweig.[81] For example for Arnheim "every element of a work of art is indispensable for the one

purpose of pointing out the theme, which embodies the nature of existence for artist."[82] In this sense Arnheim finds symbolism even in works that, at first sight, seem to be little more than arrangements of fairly neutral objects.

The size of a retinal projection varies with the distance of the physical stimulus object from the observer. That is how the distance dimension distorts the perception. An object which is actually maintaining its size may be seen by the eye as changing it during the movement. So there are these perceptual modifications, which effect and vary depending on the object's location relative to the observer. When the image of an object changes, the observer must know whether the change is due to the object itself or to the context or to both, otherwise he understands neither the object nor its surroundings. The observational object must then be abstracted from its context, and this can be done differently: one thing is perhaps the way of performing an abstraction, because the observer may want to peel off the context in order to see the object as it is, in complete isolation, and the other way is to observe all the changes it undergoes and induces because of its place and function in its setting.[83]

According to the gestaltpsychologist way of perception the meaning of the stimulus is to function as an interface between two kinds of texts, the one being the

object itself and the second being the spectator's mind, which alone contains the meaning which it associates with the text's otherwise empty signifiers. So the picture is merely forms signifying nothing, but awaiting a mind which contributes the connection between signifiers and signifieds.[84] That is why the meaning in cinema's visual perception is constructed in the mind, because the emphasis on the active and constructive operations of the mind will in gestaltpsychological thinking go far beyond the notion of "the production of meaning" by a "text".[85] In spite of retinal variations and environmental influences, the mind's image of the object is constant. And if a single image is rich in its complications, then the multiplicities according to it are based on the points for our attention through perception. As our gaze, and independently of it our thoughts move over an image, they discover a variety of centration points.[86] The image and its associations may tempt, tease and lure or provoke us although the artist might have anticipated the maneuvers of our attention, but pictorial reading of an image or pictorial appreviation of an image gives us further encouragement to look for the graphics. This gives us a new way of looking through the configuration of pictorial elements in an image, because the eye rarely fixes on a certain point for very long. The essence of the process is more like some kind of patrolling over an image.[87]

Noël Burch sees that "our contention that all the elements in any given film image are perceived as equal in importance runs counter to a fondly cherished notion of nineteenth-century art critics later embraced by a number of twentieth-century photographers: the belief that the eye explores a framed image according to a fixed itinerary, focusing first on a supposed 'center of compositional focus' (generally determined by the time-honored 'golden rectangle'), then traveling through the composition along a path supposedly determined by the disposition of its dominant lines."[88]

Burch thinks that this kind of conception is outdated, because the modern eye sees things differently.[89] There are elements in a film image that call attention to themselves more strongly than others, but at the same time the spectator is also aware of the compositional whole, because looking is a mental process. That is why the artist cannot direct our attention as closely as certain traditional analyses, based on compositional level, are firmly to believe in, but as Durgnat has pointed out, "powerful structures can exist without a one-way, linear order".[90] And in the way that our visual attention moves across an image, its major configurations and relationships will keep recurring and reorganizing. Our visual attention moves across an image as if we were redirecting a more or less real scene, at least to the extent that an image can be a real object and a depiction of something.

When talking about the varieties of visual coherence, Leo Braudy has suggested[91] that a representational art always re-creates the world around us as a new form of visual organization. And movies, because they exist in time, expand the shaping possibilities available to painting and sculpture. And since their methods are in part so subliminal, movies can constitute a generally available method of creating visual coherence, the effect of which we can see around us every day in paintings, photographs, comic strips, sculpture, life-style, and even the "scenes" our eyes pick up when we walk down the street, across a field, or into a room.[92]

Durgnat has stated that[93]

> "The main structural similarity between the eye and the camera is that both have lenses, and that isn't very significant, since everything in their perspective systems is entirely different. The camera captures on film a superficial and momentary impression of a scene, with an allover evenness which is as unanalytical as it is impartial, and with a fixity which renders it incapable of interrogation, correction and re-vision. In comparison, human vision, or rather human attention, entail the operations of the mind's eye; that is to say, it works like a rough-and-ready but versatile and self-correcting computer, which can summate and integrate a variety of glances, and for which 'I see' means 'I understand' since it functions by feedback between seeing and knowing, between seeing-as and interrogation."

The visual world around us is rarely at rest: and if it is then we are not, because our eyes move so that the image on the retina is constantly unstable. And when objects do pass us, they change their form constantly;

even the most static objects are in a visual movement, when we approach them or move our heads. When we are moving through visual spaces, the exact definitions are usually less important than some kind of rough perception and spatial location.

> "In visual and pictorial perception there's a powerful element of analogue approximation:'It looks roughly like one, so it propably is one.' For analogy is elastic (just as similarity is a matter of degree) and selective (it operates even when limited to certain aspects."[94]

In a way cinema has a skill of redoubling the effect of light's motion, because film images are actually moving, and a single image in a film never stands still, just as light never does, and just as the eye never does. The moving eye is the other half of moving light. And as Anne Hollander has suggested:[95]

> "The fixed gaze is the property of death; the living eye is in motion, always ranging for food. Again modes of art using human experience for their subject that both engage the scanning eye and suggest its analogy to the inner life can rely on a raw emotional pull. In movies the camera itself is the seeking gaze, demanding enlightenment, and its choices can demonstrate its superior insight: good cinematography and editing give the effect of satisfying the eye's immediate prior longings at every instant. Ideally, the camera unerringly finds what the bodily eye and the mind's eye are both unconsciously lusting for or perhaps dreading."

Our visual system has been built up so that local space is heavily controlled by subjective perspective. This was true even before pictorial perspective's development, which includes a reference to the fact, that

perspective's pictorial development is, in a way, a rational, objective thing, and does not involve subjectivism. There is also a question of a point-of-view, which marked visual perception even longer before it appeared in images. In visual perception perspective is necessary, because we cannot deal with the object's forms, places, and where they are heading for, without the help of perspective.[96]

3.2. Pictures, symbols and signs

Raymond Durgnat has suggested that the term "syntax" normally implies the bringing together of distinct units, and from this angle pictures are nothing but syntax, the only pure syntax there is.[97] That is why the form of each and every object is adjusted by its viewpoint, and by their relationship with one another.

> "For example, a basic rule, not only of pictorial but also of visual perception is: If two objects seem to overlap, then the completed one is in front of the other."[98]

Rudolf Arnheim has demonstrated that images can serve as pictures or as symbols; they can also be used as mere signs.[99] The three terms (picture, symbol, sign) do not stand for kind of images, they describe three functions of the images. A certain image may be used for each of these functions, and will often serve more than one at a

time. An image serves merely as a **sign** to the extent which it stands for a particular content without reflecting its characteristics visually. To the extent which images are signs they can serve only as indirect media, for they operate as mere references to the things for which they stand. Not analogically, and therefore not for thought in their own right, but numerals and verbal languages are true signs. Images are **pictures** to the extent to which they portray things located at a lower level of abstractness than they are themselves. They do their work by grasping and rendering some relevant qualities (shape, color, movement) of the objects or activities they depict. Abstractness is a means by which the picture interprets what is portrays. A picture is a statement about visual qualities, and such a statement can be complete at any level of abstractness. Only when the picture is incomplete (ambiguous or inaccurate) with regard to the abstract qualities, the observer is called upon to make his own decisions about the features of what he sees. An image acts as a **symbol** to the extent to which it portrays things which are at higher level of abstractness than is the symbol itself. A symbol gives particular shape to types of things or constellations of forces. As symbols, fairly realistic images have the advantage of giving flesh and blood to the structural skeletons of ideas.[100] Arnheim has stated:[101]

> "The human mind can be forced to produce replicas of things, but it is not naturally geared to it. Since perception is concerned with the grasping of

> significant form, the mind finds it hard to produce images devoid of that formal virtue."

Symbolic interpretations that make one concrete object stand for another equally concrete one are almost always arbitrary. We cannot really tell whether a certain association was or is on the conscious or unconscious mind of the artist or beholder unless we obtain direct information, which needs analysis. The work of art itself does not offer the information, except in the case of symbols standardized by convention, or in those few individual instances in which the overt content of the work appears strange and unjustified, unless it is considered as a representation of different objects of similar appearance.

When Eisenstein wrote about montage within the shot he was pointing out that the screen constitutes an organized pictorial composition, in principle like a Renaissance painting.[102] Durgnat has remarked that "we would demur with very many details in Eisenstein's analysis, but this does not affect the correctness of the principle."[103] When Eisenstein spoke of the conception of the organic, he was outlining that the organic spiral finds its internal law in the golden section, which marks a caesurapoint and divides the set into two great parts which may be opposed, but which are unequal (in Battleship Potemkin this is the moment of sorrow where a transition is made from the ship to the town, and where the moment is reversed). But it is also each twist of the

spiral, or segment, which divides up in its turn into two unequal opposing parts. And there are many kinds of opposition: quantitative (one-many, one man - many men, a single shot - a salvo, one ship - a fleet); qualitative (sea-land); intensive (dark-light); dynamic (movement upwards and downwards, from left to right and vice versa). So in Eisenstein's thinking the montage of opposition takes the place of parallel montage.[104]

André Bazin emphasized deep focus in seeing the image as a graphic structure, although Bazin thought that Orson Welles and William Wyler did not direct the spectator's gaze, which was an unfortunate mistranslation according to Durgnat,[105] who continues that "it was a first step on the same slippery slope down which the primitive Bolsheviks had rushed in the 1920s, when they, too, restricted manipulation to montage, removed it from mise-en-scene, and reduced the shot to an unarticulated, inarticulate unit - merely 'raw material' with which film-editing could have its will".[106] Lev Kuleshov and in certain moments also Bazin were overlooking the complex structure of an image, and later on "critics went to contrast the metteur-en-scene with the auteur and stressed camera movements but overlooked the richness of the pro-filmic operations, of the mise-en-scene, which the shot exists to show, often from the angle which showing requires".[107]

A shot in a film is a series of images, a series of frames, but it is also a serial image, a new kind of pictorial entity, and even if there are no camera movements in a shot, on the level of the image there are many kinds of movements, which allow the shot to be covered. A movement (objectional or camera movement) does not undermine the image, but develops it. What the graphic qualities lose in the sense of economy, they will regain through tempo, rhytmics, choreography and orchestration.[108]

3.3. Orchestration and points of visual organization

The concept of orchestration is interesting in relation to the creation of cinematic sentences. Stefan Scharff has suggested that "the cinematic chain is a rigorous movement, merciless in its push and pull ... it is the function of orchestration to keep this movement under control, tying together a film's various elements and distributing them properly".[109] It is intended to achieve some kind of organic harmony and continuity, which is to emerge from the inner sources of the medium itself. "Orchestration is the guardian of the overall harmonies in a cinematic continuum."[110]

Beyond orchestration Scharff has isolated eight basic models of filmic structure:[111]

(1) **Separation**, which means the fragmentation of a scene into single images in alternation - A, B, A, B, A, B etc.
(2) **Parallel Action**, which means, that there are two or more narrative lines running simultaneously and presented by alternation between scenes.
(3) **Slow Disclosure**, which means the gradual introduction of pictorial information within a single shot or several.
(4) **Familiar Image**, which is a stabilizing anchor image periodically reintroduced without variations.
(5) **Moving Camera**, which is used in scenes without cuts.
(6) **Multi-angularity**, which is a series of shots of contrasting angles and compositions (including reverse and mirror images).
(7) **Master Shot Discipline**, which refers to the more traditional, Hollywood film structure.
(8) **Orchestration**, which is the arrangement of the various other elements of structure throughout the film.

This is some kind of basic schema, which allows variations and subdivisions, but although there is some overlapping and combining between these elements, they also gain their strength through their speciality. These are the basic cinesthetic elements, and their very source lies in a significant form, which conveys narrative information with weight, and as Scharff puts it:[112]

> "At the juncture of well-chosen shots with such forms, something mysterious happens, which resembles a chemical reaction. Images fit together so magnificently thet they ascend to a higher level of visual meaning."

The first task of orchestration is to present during the film's first scenes, some kind of basic iconography of the work, to lead the spectator into the film's "way of speaking", into the cinesthetic method of the film.[113] When talking about the next function of orchestration, which is to control the overall graphic order of things, Scharff takes one aspect, which he calls directional thrust.[114] The concept refers to the distribution of significant movements troughout the film. A film might have one directional thrust before the climax is reached near its middle and then take another direction.[115] One trend which one can notice amongst the works of filmic masterminds is the opposite leanings of general movements and stationary compositions. Through this method one controls the internal graphic tension of the film. Scharff notices that in great Westerns, the general movement and action have a left to right tendency, while the compositions of significant stills (medium shots and close-ups) are right-handed, as if facing the general movement.[116] Dreyer,for example has a left-handed tendency for both movements and stable shots, while Hitchcock, Eisenstein and Bresson are linked with the playing of opposites. The moving and stationary shots do not necessarily, however, follow each other immediately, because the graphic bombardments occur throughout the whole film and work cumulatively.

The next function of orchestration, that Scharff points out is linked with : the tying together of units of action (scenes).[117] Those significant movements or forms, which create directional thrusts in a film, cause transitions from one situation to another. So orchestration's one function is to determine how this will be done by creating transitional shots, or optical effects (fades, dissolves etc.), or using soundtrack or music, sounds, or combining these.

When shots are changing and transitions occur orchestration relates to creative editing, because as the chain of scenes is formed, it brings out new ideas from the material, which were not in the original script. And if one remembers that cinematic syntax has creative forces, since it invents "sentences" which have not been used before, the need to create new transitions is obvious. And after the filmic material has been piled up together according to some sense of continuity, all the additions, changes and adjustments are necessary for the cinesthetic impact to be strong enough.

Scharff points out that orchestration plays an important part in the formulation of a master plan.[118] In this sense, its functions are related to those of editing because, in a way, the writing of a script also starts the editing process: it deals with the thinking through images and an image is always a mixture of various elements with many things happening simultaneously. But

for Scharff it seems that orchestration is some kind of superstructure, which refers to the elements of the cinema, and has to do with the quality of the film.

Consequently, structures are not simply forms, they also generate content, and it is a mixture of images that creates the synthesis; thus the cinematic experience has this feeling of several processes operating together and visual forms converge with the factors of meaning to create tensions. Cinema functions on many perceptual levels simultaneously through its own specific structures.

One view according to the principles of visual organization deals with Eisenstein's thinking, when he speaks of conflicts, graphic conflicts, conflicts of planes, conflicts of volumes and spatial conflicts, according to Durgnat,[119] he deals with nothing esoteric, but the same principles of visual organization which were regularly used by Hollywood editors and anticipated in the mise-en-scene of Hollywood directors. Partly that kind of one-dimensional ideas are due to thinking that for example Eisenstein's concept of intellectual montage is reduced to something iconographic, non-graphic and plastic juxtaposition. Quite like Eisenstein, many Hollywood directors also utilized graphic and plastic qualities between images, and the relations were based on the structures of a single image by forming a view where there were two or more configurations inside one image.

So Durgnat thinks:[120]

> "Hence dynamic editing doesn't just begin and end a shot. By contrasting shots it intensifies the pictorial dynamism of each... from Griffith onwards, editing has played the closest attention to graphic structures, operating first within images and also between images - and finally across intervening images."

Therefore it is clear, that a pictorial analysis of a film cannot stop on the level of a single shot or an image, because every image and every shot works pictorially together with many other shots and images. Cinema is also an art of movement, and movement in a film is concrete, unreal movement in depicted space. It is also graphic movement in real space, and there are tensions between both of them.

Durgnat thinks, that one would be reduced to a very specialized prose, if one tries to describe a film shot with a visual precision with which it presents itself as it is, and with no importations.[121]

He also maintains that the visual and verbal functional equivalence depends on very different semantic contents, because, before a deep focus, many shots correspond, not to a sentence, but to a paragraph of description: "landscapes rich in detail, the panoramic battle scenes in The Birth of a Nation, fixed-focus shots with two-plane action, physiognomies in Bresson and Dreyer".[122]

This is just one way to show how many problems the linguistic analogies in film produce, because film shots have no equivalents in other media, and the structures of film are functions of our knowledge of the world, of how things operate in the world, so we can know what the consequences that follow are, and what our expectations are. As Durgnat points out further on:[123]

> "While films compromise between film form and knowledge of the world, these compromises permit an infinite variety of forms, corresponding not to syntactic, prescriptive rules, but to alternative utterances."

4. DREAMING VISUALLY

4.1. Film as dream: the mental imagery of images

In visual thinking there is an unlimited number of possibilities, so every pictorial form of it is just a simplified outcrop. The richness of filmic meanings relates to the extent in which the series of edited images follow our thoughts in relation to the world. This was, for example, how surrealists emphasized cinema in relation to our mental imagery and the associations provoked by it. A surrealistic film deals with the basic illusionism of the image of a film itself, concentrates on the fictive unity of man created by the image. Thus a surrealistic film is a visual art form taking care of both the subject and the relations of the image and also a very sophisticated attempt to fight against the identification process connected with that relationship.[124]

In the first surrealistic manifesto André Breton relates that it was a visual hallucination of a man cut in two by a window that inspired his subsequent exploration of the relation between unconscious thought and poetic production.[125] Linda Williams notes that this kind of exploration resulted in Breton and Soupault's experiments in automatic writing and the ultimate development of the

notion of the surreal, which was a reformulation of Pierre Reverdy's idea of the poetic image.[126]

Reverdy wrote as early as 1918:[127]

> "The image is a pure creation of the mind. it is not born from a comparison but from a juxtaposition of two or less distant realities. The more distant and true the relationship between the two realities, the stronger the image will be - the more emotional power and poetic reality it will have. The emotion thus provoked is poetically pure because it is born outside of all imitation, all evocation, all comparison."

Poetry and the visual arts were connected through surrealism stronger than ever, because surrealists believed in the force of the visual images. What surrealists ached of the cinema was the impossible, the unexpected, dreams, surprises which efface the baseness in souls and rush them enthusiastically to the barricades and into the adventures, into mysteries and miracles.

So we can think like J.H. Matthews that the ideal film for a surrealist is like a storehouse of visual images upon which his imagination will satisfy the marvelous.[128] Robert Desnos, Antonin Artaud and Jean Goudal emphasize that the model of dream is an essential part of the surrealist discourse on film. Artaud and Goudal point out the structural and formal resemblance between film and dream; their theory of surrealist cinema is based on the exploitation of film's ability to imitate the special language of dream.[129] And Desnos points out the

importance of surrealist cinema on the development of the wish-fulfilling content on **amour fou**. Desnos thinks that a film, like a dream, should reverse our expectations of the real world by presenting the accomplishment of our most secret desires for passion, adventure and even murder. Desnos thinks that the identification of a spectator with a character is intentionally disturbed through the introduction of formal similarities. The spectator's belief in the previous reality of place, time and character is quite literally obliterated by the mysterious and all-engulfing round shapes that first arise out of and finally take over the narrative.[130]

Desnos made his scripts in the mid-twenties, and perhaps it is not an incident that only a few years later Luis Buñuel and Salvador Dali made up in Un Chien Andalou (1928) similar breaks between time and place, with round, formal analogies between the moon and the eye of the woman. Buñuel and Dali broke the spectator's identification with character through analogy, in which the clouds "cut" the round moon and a razor cuts the eye. According to surrealist logic an emotionally touching, strong film experience goes straight into the deepest and more primitive levels of our personality. So it is natural that the activation of these levels is possible only through means which correspond the often manysided, obviously irrational language of those levels. When surrealists talk about dreams and dreaming, they are referring to their own ambitious thoughts in bringing

those aspects forth, because dreaming is a way of creating a chance for delicate stimulus, through which one can change human reality.[131]

In a film as in a dream, the narrative elements are beyond the elements of space and time. When someone is watching a film in a darkened place, there is this feeling of an isolated dreamer. The film seems "real" on the level of the mind, as dreams do. The model for dreaming gives a possibility to throw oneself back to the past, childhood, or to some other dimension. This forms a complex psychic process, the fictional world called "the dream screen".[132]

In a poem William Wordsworth describes that the growth into adulthood robs us of our ability to maintain a sense of oneness with our perceptions.[133] According to Wordsworth our "birth" is "a sleep and forgetting" - an entrance into a world that will deprive us of the integrative vision we have as infants and as children. Our experience of film permits us to return to the state of perceptual unity between consciousness and dreams. "The sleep" in our experience of film makes it possible, and "the forgetting" is connected with the fact that, although we feel the sense of unity, we have difficulties in remembering various events and details in the narrative. The longer we are away from film, the more confused our memories of it become.[134]

There are similar difficulties in returning dreams into mind. The worlds in films and dreams are expansions of our being, and when they disappear from our mind's eye, we do not only lose the actuality of events and characters, but we also lose the space in which those characters are performing. And when we try to return them into our minds, we notice that we are returning them into a space that does not exist any more.[135]

Sigmund Freud thinks that a dream is ultimately an infantile wish that emerges during sleep. It contains features like condensation (the merging of people and places), displacement, the shifting of psychic attention from important to apparently irrelevant or minor details. It also contains secondary revision, the means by which connections and structure are built into the disjointed memories of the dream, and considerations of representability, by which the abstract materials of the dream are given the form of pictorial presentation.[136] The final dream that we remember presents only its manifest content to us. And when a dream is analysed, the task is to find the latent content, by exploring all the associations that the analyst has in regarding dream and daily life. The elements of dream are seen to be overdetermined; many features are products of a number of influences and memories. And dreams are, as Freud sees it, "the royal road leading back into the unconscious".[137]

Carl G. Jung has responded to Freud's themes by saying that a dream is a compensatory activity on the part of the individual rather than a disguised wish. Dreams emerge from the buried psychic life of the dreamer as well as of the human race and display in their content archetypal elements common to all cultures.[138]

In film one can show a dream in many ways, for example by using voice-over narration, through fades, dissolves, optical shifts or just showing first a sleeper and then the dream. No matter what form the dream takes in a film, the spectator understands it as a psychic projection of the mind presented on a screen. And at the moment when the dream starts, we are entering into a new phenomenological relationship between the screen and a dreaming mind presented on that screen.[139]

A film and a dream are above all visual hallucinations when the subject is in a physically passive state in a darkened environment. Dreams are called films which the dreamer develops and watches in a theater of brains, and films are called dreams developed by the artists.[140] Although the dreamer is more active than the filmgoer, the dreamer is not usually aware of the dream when it is processing; in consequence (on the level of the consciousness) both the dreamer and the filmgoer feel quite passive observers taking part in a fictive, pseudoautonomic world of images.

On a conventional level dream sequences in films are often separated quite clearly from the the rest of the film world. But these signs are not necessarily needed, as can be seen in many Luis Buñuel's films. The attention attracts itself to the subjectivity of the characters; sometimes the same imagery can be seen as an outside performance of a character or a world, sometimes as a dream of the character and sometimes as a dream of some other character.

The passing of filmic experience deals with the contradiction of realistic impressions and the vanishing of the experience: the reality of the screen is so genuine that it closes us in, and when we dive into it, at the same time we also close ourselves out of it. Two self-evident worlds meet briefly, and then rush to their different ways. Nevertheless, the so-called Kuleshov experiment demonstrates that no more filmic reality than the spectator's reality are self-evident. Every film in itself is meaningless, like every novel and poem; the connections between symbols, the elements of thoughts are mixed in spectators' minds. At that point the film and the spectator are linked together, the spectators are passionately connected with the images of the film, laughing, crying, using the film as a reference to their everyday life. The birth of meaning, with all its routines, is not necessarily language bound or logic, conscious or unconscious, archetypal or dreamlike,

culturally oriented or private, but flexible, responsive and assertive.

4.2. Magical illusions: some notes on Luis Buñuel

Film with its unending flow of images is an ideal medium for surrealism. J.H. Matthews has pointed out[141] that surrealists were interested in movies as spectators, members of the audience. Personal interpretation of what was happening on the screen was necessary to the experience and was part of the creative act from which new insights into life were obtained. Thus films were judged by them, not according to style, skill or form, but by how greatly they stimulated the imagination into new ways of seeing. The basic form of cinema itself holds great attraction for surrealists because of its ability graphically to exhibit the products of the unconscious, a chance and spontaneity in the form of dreams and hallucinations. And because film can distort and manipulate time and space, it can create magical illusions.[142]

A film can be considered surrealistic if it adheres to three tenets: revolution, awakening to surreality (an extension of reality); automatism, free association of ideas arising from the subconscious; and if it has a new evaluation of Breton's "marvelous", wonderous discoveries.[143]

The filmic medium often employs surrealistic thinking of style. For example, in editing the juxtaposition of shots through powerful montage gives endless possibilities. Time can be used psychologically by lenghting or contracting it; locations can be altered instantaneously and one can jump back and forth in time. Surrealism can mix together fiction and documentary, the unreal and the real; it can play with the feelings of the audience, and create a super reality.[144]

In Luis Buñuel's (1900-1983) case it is a question of understanding mental associations, of gliding into the world into which he dived very instinctive, by understanding the filmic possibilities of depicting human consciousness. This is one of the aspects that might explain the odd moving of Un Chien Andalou, which is some kind of unattainable dream image, because the movement into something is continuing, and at the same time many things are vanishing into somewhere. One essential factor in that film is the playfulness of things, which make the feelings deeper and more forceful. And there are also these contradictions and ironies, a way of seeing the world through turnup images.

In the beginning we are in a world of fairytales, of innocence, and the film is constructed around a series of surprises, which is a structure that the Americans have invented - a model that emphasizes the story as a series

of surprises. But very soon comes the clash that moves us away from innocence. The image, with the hands, a razor and a clock, can be seen as some kind of microcosm of the whole film, because the hands reoccur later on, and the clock is also in the last scene of the film. It points out the graphic structure of the film: the hands are cut away, the window makes a diagonal line, the camera is looking from up, and the whole-set up is modern, futuristic in a way. But the next shot (with Bunuel) is more flat and even, there are shadows in an atmosphere of night, of dream, of passion. The segmentation between these shots is strong; it could have been done in one shot, but this strong segmentation refers to Russian montage, in which the tension is created by separation. There is also a bit of romantic association, a kind of registeration of the rhythm of breathing. If we follow Eisentein's terminology, we can say the second shot is dominant in reference to the first shot. Then comes the movement with the razor, which makes a directorial decision, creating a tension between the razor and the window. It is a balanced shot, with the man on the left, the curtains, and the feeling of moonlight. Nobody else is there, and there is a lot of patience in Bunuel's figure. There are these two flat surfaces, the balcony and the wall. The man (Buñuel) comes through the balcony door, which causes a big visual event, his going from one visual space to another. Another possibility is to end up like in Buñuel's El Angel Exterminador (1962), where they cannot leave the space.

According to classical stylization, when one enters a new space, some kind of adjustment must be made to it in the previous shot, like in the shot with the man where the moonlight is making an adjustment to the next shot. Every spectator watching Un Chien Andalou associates the shot with man who cuts the girl's eye, although there are some contradictions (for example the clock is missing); the continuity of the action, however, is so strong that the sequence seems very consistent. So the mind is mixing up all the ingredients, which makes it hard to remember all the details. In the film the pulse is created by different rhythms: there is the sharp rhythm of editing, the rhythm of happenings and also the rhythm of the spectator's understanding. The purpose of the dreamlike qualities and romanticism in these early scenes is to create a kind of sensitive feeling before the brutal explosion, a moment of horror into which the spectator is also lowered. Later in the film there are more precise timings than in the beginning, where there is that fable reference. And a kind of odd thing in the filmic form is the fact, how quickly the brain catches the information, which makes it possible for the spectator to move from one shot to another. So Buñuel's strategy changes, but the spectator adapts to it.

One noticeable thing in this film is the variety of angles, especially in the scene in which the man is riding a bicycle. There is a mixture of different styles,

clothes and worlds: a man with feminine intuitions, clownlike clothes, and the long shadows in buildings, which make these images visually strong. Very clearly the center of interest lies in the cyclist. If we have a cut with strong movements between the different images, then the eye does not have to wander and look for new centres of interest, because the movement softens the clash between the images, so the eye does not hesitate to move from one point to another. When the cyclist is in the mid-shot, the camera tracks backwards along with him, and we get a different kind of mood. The thing that he has on his head resembles a kind of nun's hat, and another association that we get refers to an angel with wings. On his neck there is a striped box hanging, and this box will have more significance later on. The fades are made in the camera, not with optical printers, and there are also these overlapping cross-fades, which are longer than usual images. (A possible reference to Josef von Sternberg's Marlene Dietrich films and also to George Stevens's A Place in the Sun).

Then comes the cyclist's visual angle with swift changes between subjective and objective perspectives, which hints to a later Buñuel film Le Phantome de la Liberté (1974) and its Episode 3: The Nurse.[145] In that episode the nurse is going to visit her father and she is driving a small car along a stormy forest road, where she encounters a group of military men in tanks incongruously hunting foxes. At that moment Buñuel's camera changes the

angle of vision, and later makes these shifts between different perspectives.

In moving into another perspective related to this scene Raymond Durgnat has suggested[146] that the exchange between the nurse and the military men in the forest has no direct or overt connection with any previously stated issues in the film, and the matter ends there, except that when the nurse subsequently arrives at an inn, the camera notices (she does not) a stuffed fox in a glass case.

And Durgnat continues:[147]

> "To be sure, the "fox" theme does reappear in the film; we consider the fox as a special example of a wider class ot theme "animal". Earlier a character has dreamed of unexpected animals, including a kiwi, stalking through his bedroom, and the film ends with animals in the zoo, including an ostrich, menaced in some way by a riot. But Nothing in the film clearly instructs or encourages us to link the fox with other animals, so as to make a thematic issue out of animals generally, or some subclass to them - for example, four-legged mammals, or animals other than humans (to include the kiwi and the ostrich), or animals (including humans). Certainly all these classifications exist in the film (as in the general culture or set of cultures of which it is a part). But the choice of any such set as significant to this film is entirely optional."

So in a way in Buñuel's films animals appear as bipeds, they link with his "obsession" or "fetish" concerning feet and crutches - including the artificial leg of his other film's beautiful heroine Tristana (1970). To this set we can, according to Durgnat,[148] attach bicycles

(present in Le Phantome de la Liberté, and so prominent in Un Chien Andalou, since the bicycle emphasizes feet through pedals and doubles their rotation by its double wheels). "In the structure of Buñuel's imagery, the ostrich is first cousin to the bicycle. And very precisely, the rider of the bicycle has pieces of cloth like wings on his shoulder. Because an angel is also a kind of bird", Durgnat continues.[149]

In the pictorial sense Buñuel refers with his use of subjective views in Un Chien Andalou to the skism between avantgardism and old professionalism in films in general, because avantgardists favour subjective shots with their strong identification. But the problem lies in the fact, that in using subjective shots, there lies a danger, because these shots do not give enough information about the environment, so it is possible to float into an empty space, where the mood and sense of the space around people is, in a way, unclear and unbalanced. That is why traditional professionalists in cinema are more skeptical in using subjective shots, because they feel that the imagery could be more varied by using a lot of facial images and so on.

4.3. Dreamlike personalities: A film by Maya Deren

Maya Deren (1917-1961) made her first film Meshes of the Afternoon together with Alexander Hamid in 1943. Hamid and Deren had met through Katherine Dunham, and they were married, so filmmaking was a kind of continuity in their togetherness, Hamid being already known as a director, photographer and editor.[150]

Meshes of the Afternoon is a 14-minute phantasy, which was made in two weeks and it was shot with 16 mm equipment in the home of Deren and Hamid in Hollywood.[151] The exceptional quality and power of this film is based on strong symbolics, sudden, surprising and shocking transitions, graphical, architectonic compositions, dreamlike atmosphere and the sensual, splitted characters, performed by Maya Deren, which wander in their own spacelike spheres.

The structure of the film is spiral and based on repetition with different variations of the initial ideas. In the first shot of the film a long, thin hand reaches down from the top of the screen and puts a flower on the road. A young woman, played by Maya Deren, walks along the road, picks up the flower and catches a glimpse of the back of a figure turning the bend ahead of her. The woman goes to the door of a nearby house, knocks and tries the locked door, then takes out her key, which

falls and bounces in slow motion down the stairs. She follows, grasps the key and tries it to the door. The door opens (with the camera already inside), and her dark shadow is reflected in the room, while the camera is panning across the floor and the walls. The panning is ended in a dolly up to the dining room table; in the middle of it there is a cup and a loaf of bread, with a knife in it - but when the camera tracks down to a close-up of them, the knife pops out. The camera rolls over to the left and shows the stairs, where there is a telephone lying with the receiver off.

The woman's shadow climbs the stairs, and the camera moves across to show the view subjectively. Then follows a view of the upper bedroom, where the wind is blowing a curtain. In a subjective shot, the woman's hand comes across from the right side of the screen and turns off an unattended record player. Then follows a swift, left-turning transition, when the woman returns to the lower room, and the camera tracks down to a close-up of a chair, on which the woman is seated. She puts the flower of the first shot, onto her arms, and starts caressing herself. Then follows a shot of her eye, which slowly closes, and an intercut of a view of the window, and they are both clouded over, and the dream is ready to start. These are the basic movements in that film, and they are varied differently later on.

From the window in front of the easy chair, we can see the initial setting of the film, the road. The view is

now restricted with a strong, cylinderlike thing, and a backwards-tracking camera movement. In the middle we can see a black figure, like a nun, with a mirror for a face, walking in the same direction as the woman had in the beginning. The figure has the initial flower in her hand. The woman, performed by Maya Deren (again in a shadow) starts following the black figure, even runs after, but cannot catch the figure. The woman gives up and once more climbs the stairs to the house (now we see her face for the first time). She enters without a key, looks around the room, noticing the knife now on the stairs where the telephone had been. She climbs up in slow motion: the close-ups of the feet are changing into a high-angle, and suddenly the woman moves through a black gauze curtain into the bedroom, where the wind is moving her hair.

The woman sees the phone receiver on the bed, pulls off the bed cover, again revealing the knife, and sees the distorted image of her face reflected on its blade. She quickly pulls back the cover, replaces the receiver on the telephone, and glides backwards through the veil down the stairs, as the camera does a somersault to dislocate her motions in space.

The woman dashes through an arch downstairs, where the camera pans subjectively into a view of herself sleeping in an easy chair. Now the second Maya Deren goes and turns off the phonograph next to her own sleeping figure. After that the second figure goes to the window from which she sees the black figure chased by the same woman,

which is now the third version of herself. After this the woman looking through the window presses her hand softly against the window and looks out, with wonder.

This image is the best known single image of Maya Deren. Deren's uncanny likeness in the photograph to the venus of Botticelli's Primavera has been remarked.[152] This image has become Maya Deren's symbol, sign, and it seems that Deren also wanted it that way, because she always used this image to publicize her screenings and film business.[153] Anais Nin said in the mid-forties:[154]

> "Maya, the gypsy, the Ukrainian gypsy, with wild frizzy hair, like a halo around her face. Sasha Hammid placed her face behind glass and in that softened image she appeared like a Botticelli."

P. Adams Sitney has compared that Deren-image to another image taken from Luis Buñuel's and Salvador Dali's Un Chien Andalou with Pierre Batcheff looking through a window.[155]

According to Sitney one contrast between these images is clear. It tells about the difference between the American avantgarde "trance film"[156] and its surrealistic precursors. In Meshes of the Afternoon the heroine undertakes an interior quest. She encounters objects and sights as if they were capable of revealing the erotic mystery of her own self. And in another way, the surrealistic cinema depends on the power through which it

can evoke mad voyeurism and imitate discontinuity, horror and irrationality of the subconscious.

P. Adams Sitney sees[157] that Batcheff, leering out of the window, is an icon with repressed sexual energy, and Deren, with her hands ligthly pressed against the window pane, embodies a reflective experience, which is heavily marked in the film by the consistent use of mirrors.

The story of Meshes of the Afternoon continues: As the woman is looking through the window, the black figure disappears behind the bend of the road. The third woman turns in frustration towards the stairs of the house. Then follows a close-up of the woman's face, her mouth opens and she takes a key from her mouth. The key is shown in a close-up in her hand. In the next shot, the third woman enters the house, while the wind is blowing her hair. The camera pans subjectively to the right and sees the black figure inside the house, now climbing up the stairs with the initial flower in her hand.

The woman follows, while the camera is moving from left to right and back. She presses her face against the wall of the stairs, while the climbing is getting more and more difficult. Upstairs the black figure puts the flower on the bed and disappears through stop-motion photography. After fast and static-edited images the woman moves in the stairs up and down, until returning downstairs. Through the window we can see the same pursuit and its frustrations. The key comes out of the

woman's mouth, but this time it turns immediately into a knife in her hand. The woman enters with the knife, goes into the room, where there are two Maya Derens seated at the dining room table. The third woman joins them, puts the knife on the table, and the knife turns into a key.

The first woman feels her own neck, reaches for the key and holds it in her palm for a moment. The second does the same. The third reaches without feeling her neck; her palm is black. The key turns into the knife when she holds it. Two other women raise their hands to their faces, and the woman sleeping in the chair makes a slight movement. In the next shot we see the woman wearing goggles, she rises and holds the knife aggressively. We see her feet step on the beach sand, mud, grass, pavement and rug in five different shots.

This sight was described by Maya Deren in a letter to James Card in the year 1955 as follows:[158]

> "...Meshes was the point of departure. There is a very, very short sequence in that film - right after the three images of the girl sit around the table and draw the key until it comes up knife - when the girl with the knife rises from the table to go towards the self which is sleeping in the chair. As the girl with the knife rises, there is a close-up of her foot as she begins striding. The first step in sand (with the suggestion of sea behind), the second stride (cut in) is in grass, third is on pavement and the fourth is on the rug, and then the camera cuts up to her head with the hand with the knife descending towards the sleeping girl. What I meant when I planned that four stride sequence was that you have to come a long way - from the very beginning of time - to kill yourself, like the first life emerging from the primeval waters. Those four strides, in my intention, span all time. Now, I don't

think it gets all that across - it's a real big idea if you start thinking about it, and it happens so quickly that all you get is a suggestion of a strange kind of distance traversed ... which is all right, and as much as the film requires there. But the important thing for me is that, as I used to sit there and watch the film when it was projected for friends in those early days, that one short sequence always rang a bell or buzzed a buzzer in my head. It was like a crack letting the light of another world gleam through. I kept saying to myself, 'The walls of this room are solid except right there. That leads to something. There's a door there leading to something. I've got to get it open because through there I can go someplace instead of leaving here by the same way that I came in.'
And so I did, prying at it until my fingers were bleeding..."

The story of the film continues. Just as the woman is about to stab her sleeping self, the sleeper's eyes open to see a man (performed by Alexander Hammid), who is waking her. The man, with the initial flower in his hand, picks up the woman, goes to the stairs, puts the receiver of the phone in its proper place. The woman follows the man, with a sudden glance at the table, where everything is in order. The man and the woman go upstairs. The man puts the flower on the bed, looks at himself in a shaving mirror, and the woman sets herself lying besides the flower. The man sits next to the woman and caresses her. We see a close-up of the woman's mouth and another of her eye. The flower suddenly becomes the knife, the woman grasps it and stabs him in the face, which turns out to be a mirror. The glass breaks and falls, not on to the floor, but on a beach. The tide approaches and touches it. Then follows a view of a man walking on the pavement; the man enters the house, picks up a flower, opens the

door with a key, goes in and sees the disordered room and a woman, torn up by pieces of glass, in an easy chair. That is the final image of the film.

In its dramatic powerfulness Meshes of the Afternoon represents the pure sights of an avantgarde film. In her first film Maya Deren was able to join together a kind of Eisensteinian montage thinking and a kind of Cocteauish (why not also Buñuel and Dali) dream world into a complicated palette.

For Eisenstein the dialectical conflicts between frames and the movements, the cumulative synthesis of organic and rational form that was growing from the relationship between them, were essential.[159] Dialectics can be seen to justify the theory of movement and framing in cinema; Eisenstein also broadened his dialectics by saying that it also covers the principle of composition - for example "the conflict of volumes was due to come through the internal contrasts of a frame.[160]
In Deren's film the question is of how through human movement, the intensive, inner life of the film's characters are broadened.

That is why the film has levels which go far beyond the characters and their activities, into synecdochic presentation with perspective and other variations. In Eisenstein's "tonal montage" the movement is considered to exist in an extended sense; the concept of the

movement grasps in all the influences, and the montage is based on the natural, emotional sound, the one that controls, the general sound of the part. In Deren's framing of the image, the outside, potential field of the image is absorbed in. The unseen meanings behind the expressive feelings are brought along through the whole body and fertilized so that they also create meanings.

One noticeable thing in this film is how these movements create a kind of cinematic choreography, which is connected with the means that a filmmaker can use. Expressive stylization and the dancelike choregraphic sights are joined together with intuitive delicateness. In her later films A Study in Choreography for the Camera (1945) and Ritual in Transfigured Time (1945-46) Deren communicates sights, by which the choreography in film is not considered only by the dancer's individual movements and their planning, but also by those models, through which a dancer and its movements relate as a homogenous unit with the space around them. When a film camera is brought into the recording of a dance, the filmmaker trust into the mobility of it. This is followed by the the fact that, however successfully a choreographer has planned his or her sights, the more easily these wellplanned models are in danger to be destroyed because of the restlessness of the camera, since the camera has the ability to get wings under it and jump suddenly from a long-shot to a close-up and so on.

One aim that Maya Deren had, was to free the camera from theatrical traditions and especially from spatial limitations.

As she said in planning of Meshes of the Afternoon:[161]

> "These unique capacities of the camera, and many, many others - including slow-motion which, through the agony of its analysis, transforms a casual incident into a moving experience; or the inter-cut of long-shot and close-up, playing the intimate emotion against the objective perspective; all of these abilities almost dictate, it seems to me, not only a unique art form but a whole philosophy of camera aesthetics; and it is my intention to realize this form to the best of my ability by the use of those camera capacities of which I am already aware, by the search for more of them, and by their integration into an organic unity."

That is why it is natural that Deren's film theorical speculations concentrate largely around the formal questions related to cinema. The characters in her films live in a world which is not controlled by material or geographical boundaries, instead, they move in a totally fictive universe, and just as in our dreams (when a person is first in one place and then in another, without travelling between them) they speak to us through their own spatial choreography. In Deren's films the scene of a performer is a purely abstract, formal area, which makes new relationships between the performer and the space possible, because it is a stylized world.

Deren wrote about Meshes of the Afternoon as follows:[162]

> "This film is concerned with the interior experience of an individual. It does not record an event which could be witnessed by other persons. Rather, it reproduces the way in which the subconscious of an individual will develop, interpret and elaborate an apparently simple and casual incident into a critical emotional experience."

And later on:[163]

> "... The very first sequence of the film concerns the incident, but the girl falls asleep and the dream consists of the manipulation of the elements of the incident. Everything which happens in the dream has its basis in a suggestion in the first sequence - the knife, the key, the repetition of stairs, the figure disappearing around the curve of the road. Part of the achievement of the film consists in the manner in which cinematic techniques are employed to give a malevolent vitality to inanimate objects..."

Although Meshes of the Afternoon resembles a dream experience, Maya Deren warns against a psychoanalytical reading of the film:[164]

> "The intent of this first film, as of the subsequent films, is to create a mythological experience. When it was made, however, there was no anticipation of the general audience and no experience of how the dominant cultural tendency toward personalized psychological interpretation could impede the understanding of the film."

The symbolics of the film have certain straightforward dimensions:

THE KEY	THE TELEPHONE	THE KNIFE
I	I	I
I	I	I
CONTROL	COMMUNICATION	VIOLENCE

The spatial outline of the film is fluid, rounded and not linear as in her next film At Land (1944). In that film, there is a sequence, photographed on a beach sand, where the camera is stopped for a while, and gives a character in the picture a chance to move over before the actual shooting continues (although it seems to be like a continuous movement). This gives the idea that a character who is framed in the picture, is getting smaller during the advancing, and that brings with it an emotional effect. It is a happening that cannot be taken away from its cinematic factors. The same can be said about techniques, where one can relate two distant places by the continuing movement of a character, or about a sequence in Meshes of the Afternoon, where the woman runs past the times. This interest in time and space is not purely technical, because the vision angle will ramify emotionally. The main element that Deren tries to reflect in her film, is the individual's sudden dislocation in a hurried and proportional world, and his or her inability to a gain constant and ordered relationship with the elements of that world.

In her theoretical writings[165] Maya Deren takes the indexical relationship between reality and the photographic image for granted.[166] She sees that a film is based on photographic realism in the way that Siegfried Kracauer also pointed out in his time.[167] Deren analyzes film camera's functions as "discovery" and "invention".[168] The former refers to visions of space and time beyond the capabilities of the human eye, including telescopic or microscopic cinematography on one hand and slow motion, freeze-frame or time lapse photography on the other. Among these methods she continually admits her predilection for slow motion. As an instrument of "invention", the camera records imaginative constructs in reality and reconstructs them through the illusions of editing. She believes on the principle of recognition rather than graphic composition:[169]

> "In a photograph, then, we begin by recognizing a reality, and our attention knowledges and attitudes are brought into play; only then does the aspect become meaningful in reference to it. The abstract shadow shape in a night scene is not understood at all until revealed and identified as a person; the bright red shape on a pale ground which might, in an abstract, graphic context, communicate a sense of gaiety, conveys something altogether different when recognized as a wound. As we watch a film, the continuous act of recognition in which we are involved is like a strip of memory unrolling beneath the images of the film itself, to form the invisible underlayer of an implicit double exposure."

Maya Deren was an example of a person who could join together film making and theoretical thinking. A certain paradoxality is involved with the fact that in the beginning of her career Deren was totally in opposite

against the reproduction of reality; later on (after the years spent in Haiti), Deren end up in recording of the reality. She was a prophet in her time, and her originality was meaningful, in many ways.

4.4. Hollywood day dreams: Some sequences by Busby Berkeley

My next examples for analyzing filmic sequences are taken from some sequences created by Busby Berkeley in Hollywood-musicals during the thirties. According to Rick Altman[170] among the early practitioners of the musical Busby Berkeley alone understood the extent to which the audio dissolve liberates the picture plane of all diegetic responsibilities. By placing the camera directly above his performers, Berkeley was able to destroy perspective and thus concentrate on the picture plane.

4.4.1. Monocular visions

There are many reasons why these sequences are interesting: first of all, the semantic operations are relaxed; they are not logical, or poetic, and they do not form archetypal dimensions. These sequences are meant to be watched by large audiences, and they were planned to arise the interest of many kinds of spectators, from sophisticated audiences to uneducated people. These Berkeley-sequences consist of non-narrative episodes,

which include narrative elements, but they are clearly subordinated to the stylistic thinking of these sequences, and that is why they are useful in regarding cinema also as something else like a narrative medium. The relationship between the Berkeley-sequences and films around them, raises some questions related to relevance and structures, which appear inside the sequences. These sequences are splendid examples of the rare fusion of fantasy and inventiveness; it is Hollywood film at its most professional stage that allows avantgardistic form solutions in the middle of a conventional story, and through that gains strange, surprising and inspired effects.

The selective role of the camera is very important to Berkeley.[171] He was not a theorist; instead, he found everything by doing and planning. He had a term called monocular vision[172], which meant this selectiveness done by the film camera. All the sequences are so called "production numbers"[173]

Jerome Delamater has stated:[174]

> "In many respects Busby Berkeley seems the consummate surrealist of the American screen. The numbers which Berkeley did for his many films seem manifestations of his own inner fantasies more than signs of the inner feelings of the characters in the films. Working as they most often do with their own diegesis, separate from and only tangentially related to the diegesis of the rest of the film, the numbers provide Berkeley with the opportunity to express himself in a manner which gives a stylistic and thematic unity to the films -

> regardless of who directed the regular narrative elements - and assuredly make him seem the auteur. Strictly speaking, Berkeley was probably unaware of the Surrealist movement per se, but that does not negate the surrealistic qualities which imbue his films and provide them with that unity and consistency which can only be inferred but, indeed, are evident throughout his entire career. Other writers have occasionally called Berkeley's numbers surrealistic, but little serious analysis of that catchall term has been applied to his work. Yet it seems that the most fruitful and comprehensive analysis of his material can be achieved working with the assumption that he was an unwitting surrealist, for it explains the nature of his dance creations, their relationship to the totality of the films and the relationship of his contribution to the development of cinematic dance in a way that no other approach can."

In a way 42nd Street (1933) was Berkeley's first film in which he analytically thinks through this kind of variation in shots. This leads to a general theoretical approach to cinema,[175] according to which it is very hard to understand a film, if you think about it as a reproduction of reality. Once you cut a scene into shots, you are not dealing anymore with the reproduction of reality, but instead you are giving statements about it. Berkeley planned and directed all his sequences in a film, but many times all the other sequences (outside the dance numbers) were written and directed by someone else. The relationships between the whole and the parts of the film are in this way especially interesting, because in a way this kind of model escapes the assumption that a film should have some kind of organising mind.[176] In a Hollywood-film it was possible, that some dance numbers were developed entirely loose from that filmic frame to which they were later adjusted.

Durgnat has noticed that the contrasts between production numbers and films around them are so sharp that spectators, far from associating them, disassociate them into separate entities,[177] and that is one reason why inside film-culture, Busby Berkeley is defined as an individual filmmaker, an auteur of his own world.

And Durgnat continues:[178]

> "For excellent reasons, high culture normally tries to maximise an artwork's semantic yield, but sometimes it might be useful to reinforce certain uncertainties in aesthetic theories. There are uncertainties as to when two ideas so mesh as to constitute a structure or theme, when their affinity remains merely incidental, when it makes an echo but generates no further ideas of much substance or consequence, when the similarities in a metaphor stop. There are uncertainties as to how far unity proposes a structural intentionality of some sort. For Eisentein's theory of montage might seem to strenghten the opposite view, that the fact of juxtaposition within an artwork is sufficient to turn any two spots, local events, into a structure provided even the slightest, vaguest or most general affinity between the exists. If montage exists between shots, as Eisenstein assumed, it must also exist between sequences or indeed ideas."

And this is one way how Berkeley pushes his ideas forward. Once camera movement and subject movement were restored to the sound films, filmmakers continued to use many of the stylistic characteristics that were already developed during the silent days of cinema. Diegetic sound provided a powerful addition to the system of continuity editing, because then it was possible to use sound overlaps, and in this way establish spaces outside the frame and create temporal continuity.[179] Hollywood-film also borrowed a lot from Broadway musicals, by

sticking to theatrical stagings, but Busby Berkeley offered no solutions, because he did not waste time in broadening his stage numbers from theatrical circles to space-time continuities, which cinema could offer. And the spectator was expected to notice these transfusions and also enjoy them. In Berkeley's production numbers, the virtuosity was one major emphasis, just as in earlier montage sequences and dream sequences. Durgnat has stated, that in a real sense these sequences are upsurges of pure film and avantgarde aesthetics, because the interest lies in a special sense of popular avantgarde.[180] In these numbers virtuosity grows into formalism, kinetic speed and the movement's serial segmentation narrows into a kind of cubist futurism, and the splitting of ideas from their normal phenomenal envelope has affinities with constructivism.[181] Even when the symbols are sentimental, like hearts and violins, there is this open spirit, this modern, optimistic way of looking, a kind of lyrical formalism.

Jerome Delamater has noticed the link between surrealism and experimental dance films of the 1920s, like Fernand Leger's Ballet Mécanique and Rene Clair's Entr'acte.[182] According to Delamater, Berkeley's work also includes most of the major forces implicit in surrealism, though it lacks the force and power which was behind the Surrealist movement.[183] On the other hand, the controlling factors in Berkeley's work, i.e. fantasy,

irrationality and eroticism, are equally important to Surrealists.

> "More specifically, major elements of surrealism also evident in Berkeley's films are the idolization of female eroticism; the concretization of dream experience and its corollary, the absurdity and illogicality of reality; the relativity of time and space; the mechanization of life and the freedom of imagination."[184]

4.4.2. 42nd Street

The production numbers of 42nd Street (1932) are: "You're Getting To Be A Habit With Me", "Shuffle Off To Buffalo", "I'm Young And Healthy" and "42nd Street". Their context deals with a show première being rehearsed during the Depression. The last three numbers come in succession with very brief interludes and suggest some kind of thematic unity. The first number is set apart from the others, because it occurs during the rehearsals before the dramatic climax, and there is no spectacular aspect in it, although it has stylistic similarities with the others.

The Depression had its effects on filmmaking, as John Baxter has noted:[185]"At Warner Brothers ... films were made for and about the working class. Their musicals, born of the depression, combined stories of hard-working chorus girls and ambitious young tenors with opulent production numbers. ... Lighting was low key. ...Cutting corners became an art. Stars were contracted at low salaries. ... Directors worked at an incredible rate,

producing as many as five features per year. The basic film at Warners ... was a melodrama ... which ran for 70 minutes. Pace was more than Warner's trademark - it was a necessity."

Thomas Schatz has found similar kinds of notions: "But the Depression, coming after Harry Warner's heavy spending for sound conversion, theater acquisition, and studio expansion, forced Warners to adopt a more conservative, cost-efficient strategy. Low-budget production was stepped up and budgets for A-class features were reduced. Harry declared a moratorium on musicals, which not only were costly but had glutted the market in the early talkie era."[186]

Despite Harry Warner's edict against the musical-genre, musicals were made. On August 15, 1932, Warners closed a deal with novelist Bradford Ropes for the movie rights to his as-yet-unpublished novel 42nd Street, the story of an obsessive stage director who mounts a Depression-era musical despite heavy odds and his own declining health.[187] According to Schatz, the decision to bring in Busby Berkeley was as significant as the decision to try a Warner-style musical in the first place. Berkeley was a stylist in his own right, with a distinctive approach to musical production that became as important a defining characteristic of Warners backstage musicals as the established house style.[188]

The story was not that exciting, because the dialogue was full of lines that became clichés so quickly that the so-called sophisticates would line up simply for a chance to laugh when Warner Baxter as the musicals how director told his ingénue understudy Ruby Keeler, "You're going out a youngster. But you got to come back a star."[189] The first Berkeley-number in 42nd Street is the simplest of them all, with the musical's star (Bebe Daniels) singing: 'You're Getting To Be A Habit With Me'. The staging is not just formalistic, because of the chorus boys' active participation, which includes tapping and rhytmic punching. Finally a sprightly old man, dressed in tatters, appears, and the woman dances away with him. The musical star is older than one of the chorus girls (Ruby Keeler), who later becomes the star of the film. The lyrics suggest a certain maturity. The older woman deliberately teases the show's rich and fat backer (Guy Kibbee), and hides her feelings towards her real love, a less successful vaudeville artist (George Brent). The woman's deception is worth while, because through that she can procure backing for the the whole company. But she also shows her jealousy, when her boyfriend has a date with Peggy (Ruby Keeler). She gets angry and drunk and breaks her ankle. One might think that she is jealous of Peggy, who gets her part in the show, but instead she wishes her every success and is satisfied with herself. Meanwhile the show's backer concentrates his attention on Anytime Annie (Ginger Rogers) and Peggy starts dating with the show's male lead Brad (Dick Powell).

This number has some kind of relevance to the whole plot of the film, because in here a woman is monopolizing both men and celebrity, which she finally agrees to share.[190] She has to struggle with two men, one being rich but unattractive, and the other being poor but attractive. The choice that she makes is a moral issue.

Jerome Delamater thinks, that the most evident surrealistic aspect in Berkeley's work is his use of the female form as an object.[191] The erotic element in Berkeley's sequences deals with his choice of scantily-clad chorus girls in most of the routines. Sometimes Berkely pushes the idea into a realm of voyeurism and sexual symbolism.[192]

Patricia Mellencamp has drawn her conclusions about the Berkeley-routines. According to her, cinema is an institution that relays and constructs objects of desire.[193] That is why the representation of the erotic promenaded female body - the figure of exploitation and the source of pleasure - then the denial and containment of that dangerous and unacceptable eroticism by death, marriage, or German expressionist lighting is both a paradox and an obsession of classic film. And Mellencamp continues: "In fact the Berkeley sequences are spectacles of the glories of capitalist technique and hence visual demonstrations of the narrative."[194]

But in a way Berkeley does deal with genetic and formal similarities, with some knowledge of the general plot, and as Durgnat has noticed, the gold-digger was already a phenomenon of the 20s, linking the flapper with the movement of women to the cities, and the early 30s mark an abundance of gold-digger films.[195] In the so-called 'confession' films of the 30s sympathetic women become gold-diggers, prostitutes or fallen women of a kind. The gold-digger films treat female rapacity cynically or comically, while the confession films treat it differently, respectably or tragically. Both seem to paraphrase the despairs of Depression.[196] And at the same time, there is also a strong feeling of female emancipation and a the whole film is more oriented towards hard work than easy fun, because the characters in the story are taking risks all the time.

In the next Berkeley-number, 'Shuffle Off To Buffalo', Ruby Keeler's Peggy Sawyer gets her chance. Buffalo was a popular honeymoon resort, and what we see is the honeymoon couple going there on their Pullman car. In the middle of the journey, the car splits in two and stretches across the stage. The honeymoon couple has to communicate with all kinds of knowledgeable smiles coming from young ladies. They are interrupted by the black Pullman porter, and the young ladies croon and smile with sarcastic singing and friendly mockery. Finally everyone retires to their berths, and their shoes are left out to be polished. When Peggy places hers out, her arm is

caught by the groom and it disappears behind the curtains. The porter collects the shoes and starts polishing them - the sound of the brush mixes with the swoosh of the steam train.

In a way this is a song of innocence, with the chorus parts representing experience, the more saturnine norms of society and divine pre-science. It is like the chorus in a Greek tragedy.[197] Of course the link between the chorus girls singing and a Greek tragedy is somewhat tenuous, and most of the commenting they make through their singing, deals with a sort of moral commentary on issues around the honeymoon couple's journey.

There are also contrasts: the number has been gradually built up towards sexual intimacy, and then it slides down towards the lonely porter. The fascinating ladies' world turns into the world of a snoring black man, so we are moving from one kind of content into another one. There are also several dimensions incorporating with the honeymoon couple which bring out contrasts. The couple represents young, middle-class innocence, and it would have been possible for the film to run through these points of interest with a structural logic including no major opposites. But the tones are changing, because the porter is the opposite in relation to the couple's innocence and the chorus girls' awareness.

The opposition may seem vague, because Berkeley has planned the sequence with certain ruptures. It is a question of tonal rupture, when a joyful atmosphere gets melancholic with partly comical dissonances.[198] It has been predicted even in the sequence in which Bebe Daniels is dancing off stage with the old man, and it gets a new recapitulation in the final climaxes.

As I have already earlier observed, Berkeley's use of camera is based on selectivity, working through details. And all those details can be structured. The ticket-collector is an intermediate between white passengers and the black porter.[199] The sudden, strange and realistic details are chosen to change the tone, to irritate new surprises. It is not a question of pure realism, or photophenomenal realism, but everyday eloquent reality, evocated by surprises.

Durgnat has pointed out that literary theory quickly attributes resonance and profundity to archetypal or deep symbols, but correspondingly underestimates such very ostensible recall of everyday experiences as might be superficial, but nonetheless recall vast areas of experience and associated thoughts.[200] Isolated within this stylised continuity, they become, not symbols but emblems.[201] And they can be in that meaning, outside art, just referring to some realistic situations.

"I'm Young and Healthy" -number gives more assured and confident continuation with youth. Now it is Dick Powell singing in a white tuxedo with smooth exuberance. The sexual structure of this number is a mirror-image of "You're Getting To Be A Habit With Me" -number. The lyrics point out to one woman, and everything begins as a serenade sung to one lady, but soon there are a lot of them. So, in a way, there is also the theme of onlookers, who frequently misinterpret what the main characters are doing.[202] The girl to whom Dick Powell addresses his serenade is not Ruby Keeler, but a blond with a sensual face, who wears a peroxide white fox-fur wrapped around her arms. The misty kiss between Dick Powell and the lady brings out a formal surprise, the appearance of a line of girls similarly dressed. The change of lighting is scheduled with the kiss and the girls' appearance. Their bodies have soft and creamy, pasteurised immaculacy.[203] The choreography has very little to do with dance, it is more like a sort of rhythmical movement, running into a certain spot.

The contrast between intimacy and plurality, kissing and the chorus line, transforms the scene into a series of formal surprises. At the same time it gives possibilities to the spectator, who can waver between different alternatives, and it is not a question of simple dualities. In one shot Powell is singing and the girls are gliding in front of him: he addresses each in turn, and each of them reacts in a different way, and finally

the first girl reappears and closes the scene. The camera diagrams and patterns use the Berkeley-top-shot[204] in a manner which reflects the cubist experiments in the twenties, which pushes the feeling of abstraction further.

With the title number "42nd Street" we move from a merry and healthy world into the middle of a seamy underworld. In the beginning Ruby Keeler is dancing on the roof of a taxi (which however is not revealed until later on). She smiles with a middleclass sweetness, invites everybody to join with the reality, where 'the underworld meets the elite'. It is a question of streetlife glorification, where there are hints to Depression. In a way this sequence is pure fantasy, but still it has features of time, features of reality. Because in this reality, the apple venders can throw a blanket over their goods and grab golfbags. This delirious zone makes everybody move, including the police horses and a wooden Indian in front of a tobacco store, in a rhythmic stride between dancing and walking. Through Berkeley's stylized abstraction we approach the synthetic tensions included in these scenes. There are some disturbing details in this sequence. In the window of a beauty parlour a male is taking care of a smiling client's cheeks, and the camera moves laterally to a door, where a welldressed man extends his arm into a female midget, and they go together hand by hand. They pass a nurse, who is taking a baby (doll) out of a pram; she smiles and spanks the baby to the tempo of the music.

Berkely broadens the viewpoints; he can start with an image from the frontpage of a paper, and then move to a deeper view with graphical qualities.
In one part of the scene a group of welldressed young ladies is entering a house, probably a speak-easy, with an Italian-looking bouncer in front of it. He lifts his hat in the tempo. The rhythmics are juxtaposed with the camera's strong and handy swifts, which combine the other spatially disparate elements. During the Prohibition law 'the elité really met the underworld', because gangsters were handling the delivering of boose. So, when people could not drink publicly, they drank privately, especially in speak-easies.

Then suddenly the situation bursts into violence, when the camera tracks upwards into a room where a young woman is escaping from a brutal man. The man looks like a heavy physical type, an Irish-looking gangster with curly hair. The woman slips past the man, straight out of the window, which is a surprise, and one theme in this scene is the surprises connected with the activities of the people. Somehow it is a question of mixing different stories in brief flashes, because first we see cheerful women going into a building, then we see moments of violence occurring in the same building.

When the woman jumps out of the window, we hear shots, but the dance continues, so it is a justification of

violence which is part of the activities in the street. When the woman jumps, the camera follows her so that it really shows her jumping. The woman falls into the arms of a man, and they dance a passionate tango, without losing a beat. But, when this 'underworld pastorale'[205] is in real swing, the gangster comes and stabs the woman with a knife.

Still the scene does not relax or change its style, and the camera pans upwards to a window, where Dick Powell is holding a glass, and behind him we can see an elderly Italian barman, who mixes cocktails with rhythmic gestures. Thinking of Depression, we could say that either the scene is celebrating the end of the Prohibition or the disregard of law-and-order among average people.[206] At the beginning of that number Ruby Keeler was dancing alone on top of a taxi, and now we have the theme expanded, while a group of girls burst into the street. It is a variation between intimacy and spectacle, including shot-variation and the direction of movements. It is also a kind of Berkeleyan semi-abstraction, a thematic enlargening composed by surprises. When the group of girls splits up and disappears, it is followed by a group of chorusboys, carrying some cut-out shapes. After several ranks filling the screen, they turn, and the shapes become a skyscraper with a perspectively improbable horizon. We are moving towards a bigger surprise, and the director does not want us to realize it too early. Instead, he wants us

gradually to take an interest in it, and then this orchestration takes place, and it leads us to a final revelation. The significant part of directing a scene deals with how you are directing the spectator's attention to the different parts of the same shot, and in a way this scene deals with the interior montage inside an image.

As Rudolf Arnheim puts it:[207]

> "In the perception of shape lie the beginnings of concept formation. Whereas the optical image projected upon the retina is a mechanically complete recording of its physical counterpart, the corresponding visual percept is not. The perception of a shape is the grasping of structural features found in, or imposed upon, the stimulus material... Perception consists in fitting the stimulus material with templates of relatively simple shape, which I call visual concepts or visual categories. The simplicity of these visual concepts is relative, in that a complex stimulus pattern viewed by refined vision may produce a rather intricate shape, which is the simplest attainable under the circumstances. What matters is that an object at which someone is looking can be said to be truly perceived only to the extent to which it is fitted to some organized shape. In addition, there generally is an amount of visual noise, accompanying and modifying the perceived shape with more or less vaque detail and nuances, but this contributes little to visual comprehension."

After a moment of immobility, there is another revelation, a perspective of a street, and then the cut-outs disappear, the camera moves and shows us the side of a skyscraper. The camera climbs along the facade of the skyscraper, and as it reaches the top of it, Dick Powell and Ruby Keeler are there waiting and smiling. This is a crazy perspective, a futuristic, modernistic Metropolis-

innocence to experience, with some amoralistic moments, until the final synthesis is reached. All the four numbers form a new kind of development; they go quite loosely from one experience back to another.

A Hollywood craftsman knows enough to be able to invent little surprises, or whatever they started with, and because these surprises must function, they make variations and transformations from that original idea and produce structures around it. Durgnat has noticed that this kind of thinking is connected with Eisenstein's primitive idea of montage, 'the montage of attractions', where 'attractions' mean musichall or circus attractions, and where the acts follow one another with a showlike contrasts and variety.[210] This is one way of seeing a film a s a circus program, and that idea fits with many organic unities, and then the more sophisticated thematic structures seem to be woven around changes.

Berkeley's different kinds of formations can be seen in manner of using time and space in his narratives. In some numbers he concentrates more on the visual possibilities to expand the space around the performers and to create numbers with abstract patterns and formations. In some other numbers Berkeley creates another time within the film's world, which brings in more surrealistic qualities, elements of non-rationality and illogicality.

A good example is "Lullaby of Broadway" from Gold Diggers of 1935. It begins with a black frame, singer Wini Shaw's head appears very small in the distance; as the camera, on a specially-built monorail, dollies slowly into a large closeup. Her head turns upside down and becomes an image of Manhattan, the setting for the number's diegesis. This is followed by a 'city-symphony' of Manhattan waking up, the surreal quality emphasized by tilting the camera at certain moments in the montage. Wini Shaw, The Broadway Babe, arrives home from her all-night revels and sleeps during the day - presented by the turning hands of a clock - only to wake up for another night in town. She and Dick Powell attend a nightclub performance being the only members in the audience. Here is the only genuine dancing number, based on variations of the title-song, including a couple doing a Spanish dance and lots of male and female dancers performing a musically unaccompanied tap dance. The elaborate routines are shot from every possible angle: front, back, top, side and bottom and in longshots and closeups. Present, too, is the Berkeley motif of dancers doing action in succession as a line of girls, one after the other, fall back into their partners' arms and, reversing the process, the guys throw them back again into an upright position. Powell and Shaw, observers throughout most of the number, participate briefly in the dancing, but Shaw, running inexlicably from the action after its climax, falls to her death from the heights of the building. The circularity of the number is completed as the sequence

returns to her apartment with the awakening New York montage - accompanied by a softly-sung reprise of the song itself. It concludes with the reverse of the opening shot; Wini Shaw's head becomes smaller and smaller as the camera dollies back and the screen fades to black. In this sequence Berkeley is using connotative hints with a formal deliberateness to a whole nexus of ideas about Manhattan sophistication and glamour. These kind of morbid elements were also one flavor in the shooting and stabbing of 42nd Street, and they can be found elsewhere too.[211]

4.4.3. Dames

Dames (1933) includes three production numbers: "The Girl At The Ironing Board", "I Only Have Eyes For You" and "Dames". The themes of those production numbers are quite different compared to the 42nd Street -numbers. Now we are moving in the world of sights and looks.
"I only Have Eyes For You" takes place on a theater stage. Dick Powell and Ruby Keeler are walking in a traffic-jam, which however vanishes mysteriously. In the underground every advertisement presents the face of his beloved. Again Berkeley experiments with a kind of cubist phantasm, when the time and space dimensions develop fully paradoxally. The lyrics of "Dames" urge to tell the truth about beautiful women, while Dick Powell is performing the part of a theatre agent, who interviews beautiful girls and gives them all jobs immediately. Of

course one thing to be remembered in this connection is the time of Depression. The women are looking after themselves, having baths, sitting at their dressing tables, sleeping in their double beds and so on. The rooms consist of identical furniture, which have been arranged according to a certain formal line. And the sequence also features some huge alarmclock faces.

The surrealist, illogical dreamworld[212] is present in these images. In the diegesis of this scene the camera follows the different actions of the women in the manner of Berkeley's shifting surprises. At one stage a ball is covering the screen, and the mosaic of girls is dancing on a flat plane to a kind of erotic and surrealist rhytm.

The Berkeley-pattern and his characteristic style revolves in alternation between eye-level shots and top shots, between dominance of diegetic material and independent musical material, between the screen as a window (the object plane) and the screen as a frame (the picture plane).[213] From flat planes the images move forward through the interior of a kaleidoscope with sides as mirrored lines of girls, and then the screen freezes into a still photo, which is broken by Dick Powell's suddenly appearing smiling face.

"The Girl At The Ironing Board" features Joan Blondell moving in the backyard of her oldtime laundry amongst men's clothes and communicating with them. This number

includes comical vaudeville realism, intimacy and a touch of closeness, which is very different from the rest of the numbers. There is also a kind of proletarian overtone, when Blondell's lonely spinster contrasts with the modern couple in "I Only Have Eyes For You". It is also a question of a "city pastorale"[214] and the spaces connected with that. The space of "The Girl At The Ironing Board" is very limited, but with "I Only Have Eyes For You" the space is much more enlarged: it begins with a camera under a car, and then it moves into a theatre box-office counter. Next we move on to the streets with Powell and Keeler and go down to the subway with them. Suddenly the spaces break, and we are in a limitless black space, which changes into a kind of garden, a technocratic, constructive, three-dimensional wonderland with suprises followed by each other, until we move back to realism through the windows of a subway train.

"Dames"-number includes multilevel climaxes with difficulties for verbal synopsis. It moves from street sets to broken level effects, camera effects and eteric cubo-futuristic multiperspectives, as we move through different views in planes and space of the screen. We move inside and outside into all possible directions, so that the serial focuses of situations are constantly overspread. The screen rectangularity and kineticity are precisely perceived and strongly developed.

The theme consists of a bunch of ideas, as well as of an intersection of ideas.[215] Many things have some kind of meaning or an association with many other things, and aleatory procedures often create juxtapositions like meaningful connections. It is reasonable to assume that the real themes involve multiple affinities, and in Dames the autonomity of the production numbers is clearly loose from the cinematic structure around them. Berkeley operates more with elliptical than thematic structures. The local surprises have more value than the more subtle themes. In a cinematic text there are always more meanings than it is useful or appropriate to work out. In normal reading we tend to notice the formal characteristics, if we think intuitively that they have meanings for us, and we pass over them, if we do not.[216] For example, a most simple scene may contain a vast number of possible configurations of the elements within it, and our mind passes most of them, and stops for those which often seem to be the most obvious ones. This kind of preliminary selectivity makes correlations between form and content a principle obscured by the meanings. One feels that a cinematic text is rich in meanings, and one might think that everything we notice, has a meaning, so we end up with a kind of genetic determinism.

4.4.4. Meanings

According to David Bordwell:[217]

"Meaning-making is a psychological and social

> activity fundamentally akin to other cognitive processes. The perceiver is not a passive receiver of data but an active mobilizer of structures and processes (either 'hard-wired' or learned) which enable her to search for information relevant to task and data at hand. In watching a film, the perceiver identifies certain cues which prompt her to execute many inferential activities - ranging from the mandatory and very fast activity of perceiving apparent motion, through the more 'cognitively penetrable' process of constructing, say, links between scenes, to the still more open process of ascribing abstract meanings to the film."

Every cinematic text should be as it is, full of clues, which allow us to deconstruct the assumptions, gaps, disconnections and points of breakdown. But the notions against it are clearly shown in cinematic texts that are based on streams of consciousness, dreams or free associations. The riddles and gaps connected with them, offer us a chance with so many explanations that the confidence is lost. Of course we can think that every gap in a cinematic text can be explained by some code. But if every cinematic text is characterized by an interaction of many kinds of structures (which break down each other), then it is not possible to generate fully and clearly which structure is responsible for a certain gap in a cinematic text.

Rudolf Arnheim thinks that a human mind can be forced to produce replicas of things, but it is not naturally geared to it, since perception is concerned with the grasping of significant form. The mind finds it hard to produce images devoid of that formal virtue.[218] And as symbols, fairly realistic images have the advantage of

giving flesh and blood to the structural skeletons of ideas. "They convey a sense of lifelike presence, which is often desirable. But they may be inefficient otherwise because the objects they represent are, after all, only part-time symbols."[219]

We might get further with Berkeley-patterns by following graphic or plastic forms and relating them with symbolism. Durgnat has pointed out that we have to renounce immediate metaphorical meanings along literary chains in order to do so.[220] This is because all study of meanings involves the renunciation of meanings. And talking about plastic or graphic forms leads us to talk about rhythms inside and between images. The semantic structures of Berkeley-patterns are very kinesthetic and psychosomatic substantially, and structurally different from the kind of meaning which purely verbal semantics can handle.

According to their formal originality the sequences created by Busby Berkeley demand autonomic, auteuristic interpretation, although they are special climaxes inside other films. The auteuristic approach has its dangers, because a special cinematic text is so vague, that it is easy to look for wider views, treat the director as an auteur.[221] That is why it is worth while to notice the aspect according to which the ultimate determinant of content can be less the artist himself, than studio policy, the production unit, the target audience, culture

generally or subcultures specifically, or market and so on. This kind of thinking develops easily into a certain kind of identification-auteurism, when we are desperately trying to look continuity between films, and leave out the differences. This leads to a situation where every film is torn apart from its identity.

With Berkeley-patterns it is useful to see the contradictions and complementary balances inside his sequences, and so a certain sequence might look very different from another one. Through this kind of thinking a part cannot be a cross-section of the whole, and that is why Berkeley-sequences have their own, separate existence, loose from each other, because every text exists in a pluralistic context.

Lucy Fischer has pointed out that Berkeley's production numbers involve an implicit theme of film as a voyeuristic spectacle.[222] Fischer thinks that although Berkeley is handling the camera voyeuristically, he nevertheless hides the presence of it. Although the mirrors are clearly depicting the imagery of the numbers (the women's "mirror" in "I Only Have Eyes For You", the mirrors of the dressing tables in "Dames"), they are often wrong surfaces, which refuse to reflect the image of the camera, or the man behind it.[223] When Fischer is talking about "the image of the woman" in that context, she says that the Berkeley-numbers are based on a purely imaginative universe, which turns Berkeley's groups of

women into stereotypes. This is significant in Berkeley's mise-en-scène, through which women lose their identity in a much deeper sense than just through the similarity of their physical appearance. Fischer thinks that their identities are rather perfectly consumerized in this abstract spectacle.[224]

The arguments related to voyeurism are specifically problematic in connection with cinema, which depends on looking. To underline Berkeley's sequences as a voyeurism leaves out many psychosocial processes. Part of Berkeley's voyeurism comes from the extent through which the world connected around women closes out the male lead. Berkeley balances this with a free withdrawal to straight address: he lets the women, not men, look straight to the spectator, and by doing so renews the intimacy of things and gives the spectator a chance to take part of the action. It is an opposite of alienating things, because the look restores sympathy, and we understand that point of view, which is part of the whole social outlook. When Berkeley reveals the machinery of illusions, he points out that by reflecting straight to it is not the same as the alienation or demystification of happenings. It is something else: more like a promising spectacle, a show, which increases the media's own virtuosity, uniting it with a kind of cinematic attraction montage. And it also shows the film's capability as a tool to fly away Berkeley's women to different places. It is cinematic fantasy, a blend of

modernistic fusions. Berkeley also gives possibilities for high culture's abstract and constructive tendencies to approach the populist level. It is a theme of transformations from individuality to more collective ideas, and not a revelation of the camera or the man behind it. While cinematic virtuosity is a positive delight, the director and his camera usually are much less present to the film's target audience than to that cinematic subculture, whose "mental notebook"[225] treats the director as an auteuristic persona with camera movements and voyeurism. What we see on the screen is felt actively not passively. It is a question of how much the performers are controlling the screen, and instead of feeling like being under surveillance. This explains to which degree, let us say, Ruby Keeler dancing in 42nd Street is actively in our consciousness. One idea related to Berkeley's women is that they actually hardly dance at all, they are more like moving. It is a phenomenon which emphasizes their role as visual decorations. In a Berkeley world the architecture is controlling the movements, the rhythmic pulse is related to common facts. Although many of the Berkeley numbers require active and brisk movements, it is a common fact, that Berkeley did not require anything more from his dancers than what they were capable of.[226] If, for example, "I'm Young And Healthy" in 42nd Street offers a series of surprising, swift effects of brisk movements, it happens largely for architectural reasons, Berkeley's style of editing, which

handily shortens time and makes the number more round than edgy.

David Bordwell points out, that:[227]

> "To interpret a film is to ascribe implicit or symptomatic meanings to it. The critic aims to present a novel and plausible interpretation. The task is accomplished by assigning one or more semantic fields to the film. Such fields are distinguished by substantive features (reflexivity or 'active/passive') and by internal structures, clusters, oppositions, proportional series, graded series or hierarchies). Operating with broad assumptions and hypotheses (for example the unity hypothesis), the critic maps semantic fields which she judges pertinent onto cues identified in the film. The identification of cues, and the judgment of pertinent, depend upon conventional knowledge-structures, or schemata, and inductive inferential procedures, or heuristics. The critic deploys category schemata (gejres or periods, for example), personification schemata (such as director, narrator, or camera), and schemata for overall textual structure (the concentric-circle schema for synchronic relations, the trajectory schema for diachronic progression). The heuristics that translate these schemata into action allow the critic to show the film enacting the pertinent semantic values. The critic must also present the interpretation by means of standard rhetorical forms - ethical, pathetic, and pseudological proofs, familiar patterns of organization, and stylistic maneuvers."

So interpreting a film sets up many traps, but also confirms the belief to the flexibility of connotations

and the substance of meanings. A critical reading cannot be an automation, as Durgnat thinks,[228] because the objects that we call "texts", are just tiny fragments in a larger text that no mind can fully read. This is a text of the meanings and interactions produced and developed by social history. "Theory is not, of course, wholly a matter of propositional knowledge; it too is a practice, with its own procedures of reasoning and rhetoric."[229] The stronger hypotheses are usually preferred in relation to weaker ones, the more complete explanations to partials and so on. Still erroneous explanations might open the workings of a mind, bring out new dimensions, which we have not thought of. So, with Berkeley we function in a flux of ideas, in a criss-cross of semantic operations. And following Durgnat's notion we can say that "close reading doesn't eliminate ambiguities; often, indeed, it reveals or multiplies them."[230]

5. CONCLUSION

On a level of abstraction, the cinematic image is merely space presented over time. The space/time - abstraction is structured into cinematic mimesis by technique, which is a product of technology. So technique makes space and time significant in a film. The style of the film is a relation, a pattern of techniques that produces meanings. The techniques of the image include those of space (mise-en scene) and those of time (editing). Mise-en-scène applies to all the visual elements of the shot, and it exists both in a single frame and in the succession of frames.

The final effectiveness of a single film depends on many things. When one tries to achieve a rhythmic totality in a film, one does not have to separate form (techniques) and content (story) from each other, since all the artistic elements of film have been mixed so totally that a single deletion would evidently harm the whole.

One way of describing mental content, inner life, is of interpreting objective realism through subjectivity. A filmmaker can achieve stylistic unity through many ways; one way is to simplify things, turn an idea into a symbol, and give space to abstraction.

When the filmic sequences are tied up with the overall cinematic structure, the necessity of abstraction can be achieved, and so a filmmaker can step over the fence of naturalism in his/her media. The mind gives a possibility of changing the sights of the eye into visions. The process works in two ways: On one hand, a filmmaker builds up the images in harmony with his/her visions by rejecting the reality that has inspired him/her, and on the other hand, in the reality that he/she has reconstructed there must be something that an audience can recognize and believe in.

When we are watching a film, the continuous process of perception and recognition is like a strip of memory unrolling beneath the images of the film itself, in order to form the invisible underlayer of an implicit double exposure.

Watching a film includes, of course, some kind of involvement into the world of a work of art. This involvement often includes a kind of meditative aspect, which is the aesthetic purpose of the vibration awakened by the work of art. A spectator is allowed to

some degree of intervention in the form which he/she will contemplate. This kind of viewing activity may also be directed towards notions (which includes a process), where as a rule of thumb, lies the eagerness to follow the work of art to those paths where it is willing to lead its spectator, by triggering off processes in our minds.[231] Those processes are the kinds which we, at least partially, recognize as emotions, ideas, feelings, atmospheres and so on, as a content of the work of art in question. And the more strenuously we follow that path, the more liberated, the more involved with the artwork we are. The mind is looking out, observing, understanding, appreciating a new experience, and bending into a new form, space, which has the possibility of opening new channels.

Neoformalist thinking jettisons a communications model of art, which includes sender, medium and receiver.[232] Through neoformalism art is a realm separate from all other types of cultural artefacts, because it presents a unique set of perceptual requirements.[233] Therefore, with films we are in a nonpractical, playful type of interaction, because films renew our perceptions and other mental processes, and they have no immediate implications for us. Watching a film is a process, an experience, totally separate from our everyday being. And by renewing our thoughts and perceptions, it works as a kind of process, a mental exercise for our mind with emphasizing the viewing activity.

Films achieve these effects through defamiliarizing the usual perceptions of our ordinary life, ideologies, other works of art, taking material from these sources and transforming them. "The transformation takes place through their placement in a new context and their participation in unaccustomed formal patterns."234

An artist communicates through a work of art some experiences to other people. He/she may think that she is creating something which she thinks might fascinate and stimulate other people's minds. By doing so he/she may use her own experience, but if she wants to express herself to her audience rather than to herself, she may suppress her personal feelings, thinking that they would jeopardize her artistic aims. An artist may feel that he/she is a communicator between herself and the spectator's mind, by making, through her work the spectator more aware of her own unconscious or repressed emotions.

A creative process includes an idea which is clear enough on the level of the mind, and which can later be visualized. It can turn into a flux of sounds and images, and enter the continuous changing jungle of rhythmics, a network, which tries to catch the original idea, to put it into some form. This kind of process can also direct to other dimensions, kick off the original idea and direct towards views which lead to

other territories. So the relationship betweeen the final product and the original idea can be totally different.

One often makes a distinction between literary content and visual forms, but there are no generally acceptable critical approaches to the structures of a narrative, as there are for example in painting.[235] In cinema the most convincing approaches are based on the idea of seeing films (either narrative or non-narrative ones) as a set of ideas, recombinations, repetitions, transformations and metamorphoses: it is always a question of adapting ideas. The artist produces features into his/her work which reflect the topics, that appeal to her. In that sense originality is a more or less problematic issue. There are, of course, examples in both directions, and it is clear that an artist has to be original in some way, to produce meaningful works of art.

Film art provides an example of a romantic art situation, where the spectator sits in the dark, confronting dreams. In this way it is possible for the spectator to involve him or herself loosely in the views coming from the narrative. The filmic pleasure is based on the idea that one links oneself with the illusions of the film, and at same time, one is free to adjust to personal feelings.

Between the art situation and the media that it carries, there is the concept of form to be considered. A form does not have to be of a shape or a structure, like the actual physical existence of the work of art itself, devoid of any meaning. In film the form means the patterns of light and sound on the screen, which the spectator perceives, analyzes and makes conclusions as to the form, and in that way becomes conscious of it. A spectator might feel unified with it, melt into a part of the form. The content of a work of art might be felt as a total summary of its awakened stimuli, ideas, emotions and mental processes.

Another aspect lies in the idea that the content of a work of art happens as a kind of unconscious synthesis, which the spectator becomes aware of. In cinema the screen is "over there somewhere", but the content is still "here" in my head. The content, then, is a combination of reactions, emotions and ideas produced by the form.[236]

Film resonates in our minds on many levels. At least it puzzles, gives something new to think about, changes our normal patterns of thought. Film is also re-creation, an interplay of perceptions, mind, and emotions in a situation where all the elements have been mixed in a spontaneous and free way. And from a psycho-analytical stand-point one can say that cinema gives a rare chance to mix together highly

sophisticated and primitive ingredients. Film is also about learning, moving into a world of experiences created by some other person. A film has its strong ritualistic elements as in the case of Maya Deren (Ritual in Transfigured Time, 1945-46), for example: If some party shooting were cut out all the long discussions, there would be left only the constant patterns of smiling, a model of social anxiety and claustrofobia, as the people try to reach some other person in the same room. Movements, friendly huggings and slidings from something boring towards something interesting.

The Expressionists, Futurists, Surrealists and many others are constantly searching their own rhapsodies of passion, of mechanization, or spontaneity or libido. Cinema offers one way to edit, organize and evaluate our experience, and one can say, as Raymond Durgnat has suggested:[237]

> "Maybe the aesthetic situation is, in essence, a model, a series of spiritual exercises for the delicate and difficult task of relating to one's own experience, and to that of others, in a fluid, complex, plural, artificial society."

What our filmic examples (especially with Maya Deren, Luis Buñuel and Busby Berkeley) show is that the film itself is a magnificent "machine of illusions" with a repertoire of devices, all of which it deploys to gain its aims. In a film, even the most simple idea is a

complex interacting with others, and it can move in many directions. This is made possible through the selective role of the camera, and a film can unify many visual styles and approaches as Fritz Lang's M does.

My approach emphasizes film as a visual mental process. Therefore, the producing of meanings is an active, complicated metamorphose that operates through the mind. Furthermore, it is a view to a situation in which the message of the work of art is not solely emphasized, since the whole viewing situation is part of the entire process under constant interplay between different sections.

[1] See Tarkovski, Andrei, Sculpting in Time. Reflections on the Cinema, p. 63.
[2] Gerald Mast, Film/Cinema/Movie, 25.
[3] Ibid.
[4] This kind of emphasisis can be found in the thinking of Juri Lotman. In Finland we can find references to that in Jukka Sihvonen's study Kuva ja elokuvan merkkikieli, Turun yliopisto, Yleisen kirjallisuustieteen laitos, Turku 1984.
[5] Look at for example Stefan Scharff, The Elements of Cinema, 2-4.
[6] Ibid., p. 8.
[7] Ibid., p. 9-11. See according to cinematic texts, phrases and sequences also Karl-Dietmar Möller-Nass, Filmsprache, MAks, Publ. Munster, 1986, pp. 57-60.
[8] Ibid., p. 6.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Lotman, Semiotics of cinema, 41.
[11] Ibid., p. 3.
[12] Scharff, The Elements of cinema, 9.
[13] Raymond Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign", p. 8.
[14] Lotman, Semiotics of cinema, 42.; Scharff,The Elements of Cinema, 9-17.
[15] See, Durgnat on Film, pp. 22-28; and also from the concept of style and theorizing of it, see, Berel Land (ed.), The Concept of Style, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979.
[16] David Bordwell & Kristin Thompson, Film Art: An Introduction, p. 74.
[17] Ibid., p.
[18] Ibid.,p.
[19] Durgnat, Durgnat on Film, p. 22.
[20] Ibid., p. 24.
[21] Raymond Durgnat's lecture, Jyväskylä University 10.4.1988.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Rudolf Arnheim, Visual thinking, p. 13.
[24] Ibid., p. 14.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., p. 15.
[27] See Lauri Olavi Routila, Miten teen tiedettä taiteesta, Clarion, Keuruu 1986, p. 22.
[28] See Rudolf Arnheim, Visual Thinking, p. 19.
[29] See Arnheim, Rudolf, Art and Visual Perception, pp. 319-321.
[30] Durgnat, Durgnat on Film, p.19.
[31] Lotman, Semiotics of cinema, p. 23.
[32] See Arnheim, Film as Art, pp. 8-34, see also Kawin, How Movies Work, pp. 50-51.
[33] See Jarvie, Philosophy of the Film, pp. 2-3.
[34] Jarvie, Philosophy of the film, p. 151.
[35] Durgnat, Durgnat on Film, pp. 17-28.
[36] Ibid. p. 19.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Durgnat, Images of the Mind, p. 5.
[39] Bazin, What is Cinema?, pp. 12-24, 26, 52 etc. See also about Bazin, in J. Dudley Andrew's book The Major Film Theories, pp. 134-178.
[40] Tarkovski, Sculpting in Time, p. 85.

41 Ibid. p. 150.
42 Mast, Film/Cinema/Movie, p. 4.
43 Ibid., p. 111.
44 Tarkovski, Sculpting in Time, p. 113.
45 Mast, Film/Cinema/Movie, pp. 112-113.
46 Ibid., p. 122.
47 Ibid., p. 137.
48 Kracauer, Theory of Film, p. 28.
49 Arnheim, Film as Art, pp. 8-34.
50 Durgnat, "Images of the Mind", pp. 5-7.
51 Durgnat, "Images of the Mind, Part Two," p. 13.
52 Lotman, Semiotics of Cinema, pp. 31-32.
53 See Bordwell & Thompson, Film Art: An Introduction, p. 60.
54 Durgnat, "Images of the Mind, Part Two", p. 14.
55 See Kracauer, Theory of Film, pp. 37-40.
56 See Arnheim, Film as Art, pp. 154-160.
57 Mast, Film/Cinema/Movie, p. 10.
58 Ibid.
59 See for example Durgnat, Raymond, "Images of the Mind, Part Two", pp. 14-17.
60 See about continuity in film: Bordwell & Thompson, Film Art; An Introduction, pp. 163-173.
61 Raymond Durgnat's lecture, University of Jyväskylä, 8.6.1987.
62 See Bordwell & Thompson, Film Art; An Introduction, pp. 163-64. See about continuity also in Barry Salt's book, Film Style & Technology: History & Analysis, pp. 162-170.
63 Ibid.
64 See for example Bordwell, Staiger & Thompson, The Classical Hollywood Cinema, p. 55-59, 152.
65 See Bordwell, Staiger & Thompson, Classical Hollywood Cinema, p. 175-193.
66 See about montage for example Deleuze, Gilles, Cinema 1:The Movement-Image, The Athlone Press, London, 1986, pp. 25-59.
67 Raymond Durgnat's lecture at the University of Jyväskylä 8.6.1990.
68 See about pictoriality Hollander, Moving Pictures, pp. 4-5, 13-15.
69 See about German Expressionism: Lotte H. Eisner, The Haunted Screen, Secker & Warburg, London 1969.
70 See about German Expressionism and Fritz Lang: Siegfried Kracauer, From Caligari to Hitler; A Psychological History of the German Film, Princeton University Press, 1947, pp. 149-151, 218-219, and Lotte H. Eisner, The Haunted Screen, pp. 223-240.
71 See about French Poetic Realism for example Turim, Maureen, "Poetic Realism as psychoanalytical and ideological operation: Marcel Carné's Le Jour se leve (1939)", in French Film: Texts and Contexts, edited by Susan Hayward and Ginette Vincendeau, Routledge, London, 1990, pp. 103-116.
72 See about Lang's autobiography in Lotte H. Eisner, Fritz Lang, Da Capo Press, New York, 1976, pp. 9-16.
73 Raymond Durgnat's lecture at the Jyväskylä University, 8.6.1987.
74 Ibid.
75 See about Weimar Republic in Lotte H. Eisner, The Haunted Screen, p. 9.
76 Kracauer, Siegfried, From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film, pp. 82-83.
77 Ibid., p. 75.

78 See Lotte H. Eisner, Fritz Lang, Secker & Warburg, London, 1976.
79 Chiaroscuro-lighting means that you can leave some areas of the screen darker than the others, so you can make goo lighting contrasts. See about chiaroscuro lighting: Eisner, Lotte H. The Haunted Screen: Expressionism in the German Cinema and the Influence of Max Reinhardt, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973, pp. 285-293.
80 See Durgnat, Images of the Mind, Part Four, p. 16.
81 See Arnheim, Art and Visual Perception, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1960; Ehrenzweig, The Psychoanalysis of Artistic Vision and Hearing, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963, Gombrich, Art and Illusion, New York Pantheon Books, 1960; Kepes, Sign, Image, Symbol, London Brazilier, 1966.
82 Arnheim, Art and Visual Perception, p. 374.
83 See Arnheim, Visual Thinking, pp. 156-162.
84 Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign", Quarterly Review of Film Studies, Fall 1983, pp. 6-7 (offprint). Durgnat thinks that theoreticians like Arnheim gain a powerfully dynamic and sensual way of analyzing pictorial forms.
85 Ibid.
86 Durgnat uses an example for analysis, it's a still from Michelangelo Antonioni's film Cronaca di In Amore, 1951, which gives possibilities for fifferent kinds of point-of-view variations and also for many ways of interpreting a picture. See Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign, p. 7.
87 Ibid., p. 6.
88 Burch, Theory of Film Practice, p. 34.
89 Ibid.
90 Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign", 7.
91 See Braudy, The World in a Frame, What we see in Films, p. 23.
92 Ibid.
93 Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign", p. 8.
94 Durgnat, "Mind's Eye, Eye's Mind: Transformation by Context", Quarterly Review of Film Studies, Spring 1984, p.93.
95 Hollander, Moving Pictures, pp. 20-21.
96 See Arnheim, Visual Thinking, pp. 288, 293.
97 Durgnat, "Mind's Eye, Eye's Mind: Transformation By Context", p. 97. See also about cinematic syntax, Scharff, The Elements of Cinema, pp. 21-35, and the chapter "Form" in Arnheim's Art and Visual Perception.
98 Durgnat, "Mind's Eye, Eye's Mind: Transformation by Context", p. 97.
99 See Arnheim, Visual Thinking, 135.
100 Ibid., pp. 136-141.
101 Ibid., p. 140.
102 See about Eisensteinian concepts in Aumont, Jacques, Montage Eisenstein, BFI, London, 1987, pp. 26-72. Also about Eisenstein in Eisenstein S. M., Selected Works, vol. 1.: Writings, 1922-1934, edited by Richard Taylor, BFI, London, 1988. Also in J. Dudley Andrew's book The Major Film Theories: An Introduction, pp. 42-75.
103 See Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign", p.
104 See Aumont, Jacques, Montage Eisenstein, pp. 55-56.
105 See Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign", p.
106 Ibid.
107 Ibid.
108 See Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign", p.

[109] Scharff, The Elements of Cinema: Toward a Theory of Cinesthetic Impact", p. 167.
[110] Ibid.
[111] See Scharff, The Elements of Cinema, p. 6.
[112] Ibid., p. 7.
[113] Ibid., p. 167.
[114] Ibid., p. 168.
[115] Ibid. Scharff sees that like in the films of Ophuls, Renoir or Godard it may circular.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Ibid., p. 169.
[119] See Durgnat, "Through the Looking Sign", p. 11.
[120] Ibid.
[121] See Durgnat, "Film Theory: From Narrative to Description", Quarterly Review of Film Studies, Spring 1982, p. 113.
[122] Ibid., p. 114.
[123] Ibid., p. 115.
[124] See about theorizing over surrealist film: Aranda, Francisco, Luis Buñuel: A Critical Biography, New York, Da Capo Press 1976; Balakian, Anna, Surrealism: The Road to the Absolute, New York, Dutton 1970; Durgnat, Raymond, Luis Buñuel, Berkeley, University of California Press 1968; Goudal, Jean, "Surréalisme et Cinéma", The Shadow and It's Shadow (ed. Paul Hammond), London, BFI 1978; Matthews, J.H., Surrealism and Film, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press 1971; Williams, Linda, Figures of Desire: A Theory and Analysis of Surrealist Film, Chicago, University of Illinois Press 1981.
[125] Manifestoes of Surrealism, (trans. Richard Seaver and Helen R. Lane), Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press 1974, pp. 21-22.
[126] See Williams, Figures of Desire, p. 10.
[127] Reverdy, "L'Image," Nord-Sud, 13, trans. Linda Williams in Figures of Desire, p. 3.
[128] See Matthews, Surrealism and Film, p. 14.
[129] See Goudal, "Surréalisme et cinéma", pp. 51-53, and Artaud, Collected Works, vol.3, pp. 11, 60.
[130] See Desnos, Cinema, pp. 21-28.
[131] See for example Matthews, Surrealism and Film, pp. 6-9.
[132] See Lewin, Bertram, The Image and The Past, International Universities Press, Inc., New York 1968, 39.
[133] See Wordsworth's poem in the collection Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood. Wordsworth's poem is also printed in the introduction chapter of Robert T. Eberwein's book Film and The Dream Screem: A Sleep and Forgetting.
[134] Ibid.
[135] See Kawin, "Right-Hemisphere Processing in Dreams and Films", Dreamworks 2, n:o 1, Fall 1981, pp. 13-17.
[136] See Freud, The Interpretation of Dreams, pp. 565-566.
[137] Ibid.
[138] See Jung, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, pp. 139-161.
[139] See Eberwein, Film and the Dream Screen, pp. 53-55.
[140] See Kawin, "Right-Hemisphere Processing in Dreams and Films", p. 13.
[141] See Matthews, Surrealism and Film, pp. 11-50.
[142] Ibid.

143 See Klinge, Peter and Sandra, Evolution of Film Styles, pp. 144-145.
144 Ibid.
145 Linda Williams has segmented this film into seven episodes; see Williams, Figures of Desire: A Theory and Analysis of Surrealist Film, pp. 151-185.
146 See Durgnat, "The Quick Brown Fox Jumps Over The Clumsy Tank", Poetics Today: Film, Intertextuality, Reception, Reader, Psychoanalysis, vol. 3, n:o 2, Spring 1982, pp. 5-30.
147 Ibid.
148 Ibid, p. 26.
149 Ibid.
150 See more about their relationship in The Legend of Maya Deren: A Documentary Biography and Collected Works, vol I, Part Two: "Chambers (1942-47)" by Vévé A. Clark, Millicent Hudson and Catrina Neiman, Anthology Film Archive / Film Culture, New York City 1988, pp. 19-33.
151 Ibid. See also Sitney, P. Adams, Visionary Film: The American Avantgarde 1943-78), p. 8.
152 See Clark, Hodson, Neiman, The Legend of Maya Deren, p. ix.
153 Ibid.
154 Ibid.
155 See Sitney, Adams, P., Visionary Film, pp. 11-17.
156 Ibid., p. 11.
157 Ibid.
158 A letter to James Card, April 19, 1955, in Film Culture, No. 39, p. 30. Also reprinted in Clark, Hodson, Neiman, The Legend of Maya Deren, pp. 98-99.
159 See Eisenstein, S.M., Selected Works, Vol. 1., Writings, 1922-34, edited by Richard Taylor, BFI Publishing, London 1988, pp. 14-19.
160 Ibid. See also pp. 144-146.
161 See Clark, Hodson, Neiman, The Legend of Maya Deren, pp. 245-246.
162 Ibid., pp. 77-78.
163 Ibid., p. 78.
164 Deren, Maya, "Introduction to the Films", Bleecker Street Cinema screening, February 20 and 21, 1961; published as "Statement of Principles" in Film Culture, No:s 22-23 (1961), pp. 161-163.
165 The most important of them are: 1) An Anagram of Ideas on Art, Form and Film, Alicat Bookstore, Yonkers 1946; 2) "Cinema as an Art Form", New Directions, 9, 1946; 3) "Creating Movies with a New Dimension", Popular Photography Magazine, 1946; 4) "Creative Cutting", Movie Makers Magazine, 1946; 5) "Cinematography: The Creative Use of Reality", Daedalus (American Academy of Arts and Sciences), Visual Arts Special Issue edited by György Kepes, Winter 1960.
166 See for example: Deren, "Cinematography: The Creative Use of Reality", pp. 154-156.
167 See Kracauer, Theory of Film, 41-59.
168 Deren, "Cinematography: The Creative Use of Reality", pp. 152-154.
169 Ibid., pp. 154-155.
170 See Altman, Rick, The American Film Musical, BFI Publishing, London, 1987, pp. 70-71.
171 Raymond Durgnat's lecture, Jyväskylä University, 4.7.1987.
172 Ibid.

173 See Altman, Rick, The American Film Musical, pp. 27, 61.
174 See Delamater, Jerome, "Busby Berkeley: An American Surrealist", Wide Angle, Vol.1.,No.1.(2nd Edition), 1974.
175 I have referred to this general idea also earlier in the introduction part of this study.
176 This assumption came into the film culture sometimes in mid-sixties according to Raymond Durgnat. (A statement made during the lecture in the Jyväskylä University, 9.6.1987.
177 Raymond Durgnat's lecture, Jyväskylä University, 9.6.1987.
178 Ibid.
179 See about dimensions of sound in the cinema, for example in Bordwell & Thompson, Film Art; An Introduction (3rd ed.), pp. 247-273.
180 Raymond Durgnat's lecture, Jyväskylä University, 9.6.1987.
181 Ibid.
182 Delamater, Jerome, "Busby Berkeley: An American Surrealist", Wide Angle, vol.1., n:o 1 (2nd ed.), 1974, pp. 24-25.
183 Ibid.
184 Ibid.
185 Baxter, John, Hollywood in the Thirties, A.S. Barnes & co, New York, 1968, pp. 50-51.
186 See Schatz, Thomas, The Genius of the System: Hollywood filmmaking in the Studio Era, Pantheon Books, New York, 1988, p. 136.
187 Ibid., p. 148.
188 Ibid., p. 149
189 See also Freedland, Michael, The Warner Brothers, Harrap, London, 1985, pp. 67-70.
190 A notion made by Raymond Durgnat, during his lecture at the Jyväskylä University 10.6.1987.
191 See Delamater, Jerome, "Busby Berkeley: An American Surrealist", Wide Angle, vol.1., n:o 1., (2nd ed.), 1974, p. 25.
192 Ibid., p. 26.
193 Mellencamp, Patricia, "The Sexual Economics of Gold Diggers of 1933", Close Viewings: An Anthology of New Film Criticism, Peter Lehman (Ed.), The Florida State University, Tallahassee, 1990, p. 182.
194 Ibid., p. 188.
195 Raymond Durgnat's lecture, Jyväskylä University 10.6.1987.
196 Ibid.
197 A notion made by Raymond Durgnat during his lecturing at the Jyväskylä University, 10.6.1987.
198 Ibid.
199 Ibid.
200 Durgnat, Raymond, Jyväskylä University, 11.6.1987.
201 Ibid.
202 This is a point reflected for example in Nathan Leites and Martha Wolfenstein's book Movies: A Psychological Study,
203 A notion made by Raymond Durgnat during his lecturing at the Jyväskylä University 10.6.1987.
204 A special kind of shot, taken directly from above of the performers.
205 A notion made by Raymond Durgnat during his lecture at the Jyväskylä University, 11.6.1987.
206 Ibid.
207 Arnheim, Rudolf, Visual Thinking, p. 27.

208 A notion used by Jerome Delamater in his article "Busby Berkeley; An American Surrealist", Vol. 1., n:o 1 (2nd ed.), 1974, p. 27.
209 See Altman, Rick, The American Film Musical, p. 71.
210 Raymond Durgnat's lecture at the Jyväskylä University, 11.6.1987.
211 For example in Wonder Bar.
212 A notion emphasized by Jerome Delamater.
213 See Altman, Rick, The American Film Musical, p. 71.
214 A notion made by Raymond Durgnat during his lecture at the Jyväskylä University, 11.6.1987.
215 Ibid.
216 Ibid.
217 See Bordwell, David, Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema, p. 3.
218 Arnheim, Rudolf, Visual Thinking, p. 140.
219 Ibid.
220 A lecture held at the Jyväskylä University, 12.6. 1987.
221 See about auteur-theory for example in Peter Wollens, Signs and Meaning in the Cinema, pp. 74-115.
222 Fischer, Lucy, "The Image of Women as Image: The Optical Politics of Dames", Film Quarterly, Fall 1976, p. 9.
223 Ibid. p. 10.
224 Ibid. p. 5.
225 A notion made by Raymond Durgnat during his lecture at the Jyväskylä University, 10.6. 1990.
226 See for example Danny Peary writing about 42nd Street in his book Cult Movies, pp. 102-106.
227 Bordwell, David, Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema, pp. 249-250.
228 A notion made by Raymond Durgnat during his lecture at the Jyväskylä University, 10.6. 1990.
229 Bordwell, David, Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema, p. 250.
230 Durgnat, Raymond, "Theory of Theory - and Bunuel The Joker", Film Quarterly, Vol. 44, n:o 1, Fall 1990, p. 35.
231 See Durgnat, Raymond, "The Fantastic Voyage", Symposium Humanities, A Journal for the Humanities as Community Resource, Florida Atlantic University, 1972, pp. 33-75.
232 See Thompson, Kristin, Breaking The Glass Armor: Neoformalist Film Analysis, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1988, p. 7.
233 Ibid., p. 8.
234 Ibid., p. 11.
235 See for example Hollander, Anne, Moving Pictures, pp. 13-25.
236 For example, David Bordwell states: "Significantly, most of the basic concepts for understanding the resources of the film medium have not issued from contemporary interpretive projects. Arnheim, Kuleshov, Eisenstein, Bazin, Burrch, and others defined the parameters of film style and structure with which all the critics still work. Perhaps most interpreters believe that form and style are now well understood. This is a useful fiction to keep 'readings' rolling along. Film interpretation charges its debts to the account of classical aesthetics, but it pays very little back. In sum, contemporary interpretation-centered criticism tends to be conservative and coarse-grained. It tends to play down film form and style. It leans to an unacknowledged degree upon received aesthetic categories without producing new ones." Bordwell, David, Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema, p. 261.
237 See Durgnat, Raymond, "The Fantastic Voyage", Symposium Humanities, A Journal for the Humanities as Community Resource, Florida Atlantic University, 1972, p. 75.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altman, Rick, The American Film Musical, BFI, London 1987.

Andrew, J. Dudley, The Major Film Theories: An Introduction. Oxford University Press, New York 1976.

Andrew, Dudley, Concepts in Film Theory. Galaxy Books, Oxford University Press, New York 1984.

Aranda, Francisco, Luis Bunuel: A Critical Biography. Secker & Warburg, London 1975.

Arnheim, Rudolf, Art and Visual Perception: The Psychology of a Creative Eye. University of California Press, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1954.

Arnheim, Rudolf, Film as Art. Faber & Faber, London 1969. (orig. 1933).

Arnheim, Rudolf, Visual Thinking, University of California Press, Berkeley - Los Angeles, 1972 (2nd ed.).

Aumont, Jacques, Montage Eisenstein. Translated by Lee Hildreth, Constance Penley and Andrew Ross. BFI, London 1987.

Balakian, Anna, Surrealism: The Road to the Absolute. Dutton, New York 1970.

Balázs, Béla, Theory of the Film - Character and Growth of a New Art. Dover, New York 1970.

Baxter, John, Hollywood in the Thirties. A.S. Barnes & co, New York 1968.

Bazin, André, What is Cinema? 2 vols. Trans. Hugh Gray. University of California Press, Berkeley 1971.

Beaver, Frank. E., Dictionary of Film Terms. McGraw-Hill Paperbacks, New York 1983.

Belton, John, "Bazin is Dead! Long Live Bazin!", Wide Angle, vol. 9., no. 4, 1987, pp. 74-81.

Bordwell, David, Narration in the Fiction Film. Methuen, London 1985.

Bordwell, David, Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema. Harward University Press, London 1989.

Bordwell, David & Thompson, Kristin, Film Art: An Introduction. Addison - Wesley, London 1979.

Bordwell, David, Staiger, Janet & Thompson, Kristin, The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style 6 Mode of Production to 1960. Routledge & Kegan, Paul, London 1985.

Braudy, Leo, The World in a Frame; What We See in Films?, Anchor Paperbacks, New York 1977.

Burch, Noël, Theory of Film Practice. Transl. by Helen R. Lane. Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1981. (orig. 1969).

Burgin, Victor, The End of Art Theory: Criticism and Postmodernity. MacMillan, London 1986.

Clark, VeVe A., Hodson, Millicent, Neiman, Catrina, The Legend of Maya Deren: A Documentary Biography and Collected Works, Vol. 1, Parts One and Two, Anthology Film Archives, Film Culture, New York 1984 and 1988.

Cornell, Peter, etc. (ed.), Bildanalys. Gidlunds, Malmö 1985.

Crittenden, Roger, Film Editing. Thames and Hudson, London 1981.

Delamater, Jerome, "Busby Berkeley: An American Surrealist", Wide Angle, vol. 1., no. 1. (2nd ed.), 1974, pp. 24-29.

Deleuze, Gilles, Cinema 1: The Movement - Image. Transl. by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Happerjan. The Athlone Press, London 1986.

Deren, Maya, An Anagram of Ideas on Art, Form and Film. Alicat Bookstore, Yonkers 1946.

Deren, Maya, "Cinema as an Art Form", New Directions,. no. 9. 1946. Reprinted in Charles T. Samuels's, A Casebook on Film. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.

Deren, Maya, "Creating Movies with a New Dimension", Popular Photography Magazine, December 1946.

Deren, Maya, "Creative Cutting", Movie Makers Magazine, May & June, 1947.

Deren, Maya, "Cinematography: The Creative Use of Reality", Daedalus, Visual Arts Special Issue, Gyorgy Kepes (ed.), Winter 1960.

Deren, Maya, "Introduction to the Films", Bleecker Street Cinema screening, February 20 and 21, 1961; publ. as "Statement of Principles", Film Culture, No:s 22-23 (1961), pp. 161-163.

Deren, Maya, "A letter to James Card", 1965, reprinted in Kary Kay and Gerry Peary (eds) Women in the Cinema: A Critical Anthology. Dutton, New York 1977.

Deren, Maya, Divine Horsemen, Vanguard Press, New York 1950.

Durgnat, Raymond, Films and Feelings. Faber & Faber, London 1967.

Durgnat, Raymond, The Crazy Mirror. Faber & Faber, London, 1969.

Durgnat, Raymond, Luis Buñuel. University of California Press, Berkeley 1968.

Durgnat, Raymond, The Strange Case of Alfred Hitchcock. M.I.T. Press, Boston 1975.

Durgnat, Raymond, Durgnat On Film, Faber Paperbacks, London 1976.

Durgnat, Raymond, "Images of the Mind, Part One: Throwaway Movies", Films and Filming, July 1968, pp. 4-10.

Durgnat, Raymond, "Images of the Mind, Part Two: Ebb and Flow", Films and Filming, August 1968, pp. 12-17.

Durgnat, Raymond, "Film Theory: From Narrative To Description", Quarterly Review of Film Studies, Spring 1982, pp. 109-129.

Durgnat, Raymond, "The Quick Brown Fox Jumps Over The Clumsy Tank", Poetics Today: Film, Intertextuality,

Reception, Reader, Psychoanalysis, vol. 3, no. 2, Spring 1982, pp. 5-30.

Durgnat, Raymond, "Psychoanalysis and Cinema", Film Quarterly, Winter 1982-83, pp. 59-65.

Durgnat, Raymond, "The Language of Film and Problems in Cinesemiotics", The British Journal of Aesthetics, vol. 22, no. 3. Summer 1982, pp. 264-269.

Durgnat, Raymond, "The Fantastic Voyage", Symposium Humanities, A Journal for the Humanities as Community Resource, Florida Atlantic University 1972, pp. 33-75.

Durgnat, Raymond, "Through The Looking Sign", Quarterly Review of Film Studies, Fall 1983, (offprint).

Durgnat, Raymond, "Mind's Eye, Eye's Mind: Transformation by Context", Quarterly Review of Film Studies, Spring 1984.

Durgnat, Raymond, "Theory of Theory - and Bunuel The Joker", Film Quarterly, Vol. 44, no 1. Fall 1990.

Durgnat, Raymond, Lectures a The Jyväskylä University, 8-12.6. 1987, 4.7. 1987, 10.4. 1988, 10.6.1990. (Unpublished material).

Dyer, Richard, Stars. BFI, London 1982.

Eberwein, Robert, T., Film & The Dream Screen: A Sleep and a Forgetting. Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1984.

Ehrenzweig, Anthony, The Psychoanalysis of Artistic Vision and Hearing. Routledge & Kegan, Paul, London 1963.

Eisenstein, S., M., Selected Works, Volume 1., Writings, 1922-34. Edited and translated by Richard Taylor, BFI, London 1988.

Eisner, Lotte H., The Haunted Screen. University of California Press, Berkeley 1974.

Fischer, Lucy, "The Image of Woman as Image: The Optical Politics of Dames", Film Quarterly, Fall 1976, pp. 2-11.

Freedland, Michael, The Warner Brothers. Harrap, London 1983.

Gombrich, E. H., Art and Illusion, Pantheon Books, New York 1960.

Goudal, Jean, "Surréalisme et cinéma", La Revue hébdomadaire 8 (February 21, 1925). Reprinted in Paul Hammond (trans. and ed.) The Shadow and Its Shadow, BFI, London 1978.

Heath, Stephen, Questions of Cinema. MacMillan, London 1981.

Hollander, Anne, Moving Pictures, Alfred A. Knopf, New York 1989.

Jarvie, Ian, Philosophy of the Film: Epistemology, Ontology, Aesthetics. Routledge & Kegan, Paul, New York 1987.

Kaplan, E. Ann, Women & Film: Both Sides of the Camera. Methuen, New York 1983.

Kawin, Bruce, F., "Right- Hemisphere Processing in Dreams and Films", Dreamworks 2, no. 1., Fall 1981.

Kawin, Bruce, F., How Movies Work. MacMillan, new York 1987.

Kepes, Gyorgy, Sign, Image, Symbol. Brazilier, London 1966.

Klinge, Peter and Sandra, Evolution of Film Styles. University Press of America, London 1983.

Kracauer, Siegfried, From Caligari to Hitler: A Psychological History of the German Film, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1947.

Kracauer, Siegfried, Theory of the Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality. Oxford University Press, London - New York 1960.

Kuleshov, Lev, Kuleshov On Film. Transl. and ed. by Ronald Levaco, University of California Press, Berkeley 1974.

Lewin, Bertram, The Image and the Past. International Universities Press inc., New York 1953.

Langer, Susanne, K., Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art. Routledge & Kegan, Paul, London 1979. (orig. 1953).

Lapsley, Robert & Westlake, Michael, Film Theory: An Introduction. Manchester University Press, manchester 1988.

Lotman, Juri, Semiotics of Cinema. Transl. by Mark E. Suino. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor 1976.

Mast, Gerald, Film/Cinema/Movie: A Theory of Experience. Harper & Row, New York 1977.

Mast, Gerald & Cohen, Marshall (eds), Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings. Oxford University Press, New York 1979.

Matthews, J. H., Surrealism and Film. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor 1971.

Mellencamp, Patricia, "The Sexual Economics of Gold Diggers of 1933", in Close Viewings: An Anthology of New Film Criticism, Peter Lehman (ed.). The Florida State University, Tallahassee 1990.

Metz, Christian, Film Language. Oxford University Press, New York 1974.

Monaco, James, How To Read a Film? The Art, Technology, Language, History and Theory of Film and Media. Oxford University Press, New York 1981.

Möller-Nass, Karl-Dietmar, Filmsprache: Eine Kritische Theoriegeschichte. MAkS Publikationen, Münster 1986.

Nichols, Bill, Ideology and the Image: Social Representation in the Cinema and Other Media. Indiana University Press, Bloomington 1981.

Nichols, Bill (ed.), Movies and Methods; An Anthology. University of California Press, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1976.

Peary, Danny, Cult Movies. Vermilion, London 1981.

Perkins, V. F., Film as Film: Understanding and Judging Movies. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1972.

Peters, Jan, M., Pictorial Signs and the Language of Film. Editions Rodopi N.V., Amsterdam 1981.

Reisz, Karel & Millar, Gavin, The Technique of Film Editing, (2nd edition). Focal Press, Kent 1968.

Routila, Lauri, Olavi, Miten teen tiedettä taiteesta: Johdatusta taiteentutkimukseen ja teoriaan. Clarion, Keuruu 1986.

Salt, Barry, Film Style & Technology: History & Analysis. Starword, London 1983.

Scharff, Stefan, The Elements of Cinema: Toward a Theory of Cinesthetic Impact. Columbia University Press, New York 1982.

Schatz, Thomas, The Genius of the System: Hollywood Filmmaking in the Studio Era. Pantheon Books, New York 1988.

Sihvonen, Jukka, Kuva ja elokuvan merkkikieli. Turun yliopisto, kirjallisuuden ja musiikkitieteen laitos, sarja A, no. 11, Turku 1984.

Sitney, P. Adams, Visionary Film: The American Avantgarde 1943-78, (2nd edition). Oxford University Press, London 1974.

Sitney, P. Adams, (ed.), The Avant-garde Film: A Reader of Theory and Criticism. Anthology Film Archives, Series: 3, New York 1987.

Tarkovski, Andrei, Sculpting in Time: Reflections on the Cinema. Transl. Kitty Hunter-Blair. The Bodley Head, London 1986.

Thompson, Kristin, Breaking The Glass Armor: Neoformalist Film Analysis. Princeton University Press, New Hersey 1988.

Tudor, Andrew, Theories of Film. Cinema One, London 1974.

Tyler, Parker, Magic and Myth of the Movies. Cinema Two, Secker & Warburg, London 1970.

Tyler, Parker, The Three Faces of the Film. Yoseloff., New York 1960.

Valkola, Jarmo, "Miten elokuva resonoi mielessämme? Elokuvan maailmojen hahmotuksellinen, symbolistinen

moninaisuus: pohdiskelua elokuvan katsomisen estetiikasta." Kulttuuritutkimus 4, Jyväskylän yliopisto, Jyväskylä 1987, pp. 3-12.

Warwick, Margaret, "At Land", Monthly Film Bulletin, June 1988, vol. 55, no. 653, BFI, London 1988.

Williams, Linda, Figures of Desire: A Theory and Analysis of Surrealist Film. University of Illinois Press, Urbana 1981.

Wollen, Peter, Signs and Meaning in the Cinema. Cinema One, Thames & Hudson, London 1970.

APPENDIX I: Terminology

A

absolute film An abstract film that is nonrepresentational, using form and design to produce its effect and often describable as visual music.

abstract film A film that uses mass, line, and color to create shifting and changing patterns. Also, loosely, any nonrepresentational film.

accelerated montage A sequence edited into progressively shorter shots to create a mood of tension and excitement.

actual sound A sound whose source is an object or person in the scene.

adaptation The movement to the screen of a story, novel, play, or other work suitable treated so as to be realizable through the motion picture medium.

aerial shot A shot taken from a crane, plane or helicopter.

affective theory Theory that deals with the effect of a work of art rather than its creation.

alienation effect Essential to Brecht's theory of theater; keeps both audience and actors intellectually separate from the action of the drama. It provides intellectual distance.

ambiguous time Time on the screen that is either inadvertently or intentionally unclear. Dissolves, fades, and other transitional devices are not precise in their indication of the extent of the passage of time. Often used in montage sequences to create mood and atmosphere.

angle of view The angle subtended by the lens.

animation Methods by which inanimate objects are made to move on the screen, giving the appearance of life.

art Originally the word was used to refer to any kind of skill, but gradually took on more specific meanings having to do with aesthetic activity. It now refers generally to those endeavors that are not strictly

useful. Includes the practical arts of design, environ mental arts such as architecture, pictorial arts (painting, sculpture, drawing), dramatic arts, narrative arts, and musical arts.

art film In the mid-fifties a distinction grew between the art film - often of foreign origin - with distinct aesthetic pretentions, and the commercial film of the Hollywood tradition. Now the dichotomy has largely died out.

attraction Eisenstein's theory of film analyzes the image as a series or collection of attractions, each in dialectical relationship with the others. Attractions were thus basic elements of film form, and the theory of attractions was a precursor to modern semiotic theory.

auteur theory A theory that says there is a person primarily responsible for the entire style and treatment of the content of the film. Generally used in reference to a director with a recognizable style and thematic preoccupation. The theory also covers other production personnel (writers, performers, cinematographers, editors) who are seen as the major force behind a given film. More particularly, film auteurs function within the boundaries of studio production systems and are distinguishable from film artists, who have nearly total control over all aspects of production.

avant-garde A movement toward innovation in the arts in the 1920s, encompassing such approaches as cubism, surrealism and dadaism, and including experimentation in filmmaking. Avant-garde films are generally non-narrative in structure.

B

background music Nonindigenous music that accompanies a film, usually on the sound track.

backlighting The main source of light is behind the subject, silhouetting it, and directed toward the camera.

bridging shot A shot used to cover a jump in time or place or other discontinuity.

C

camera angle The physical relationship between camera and subject. If the camera is low, tilted up toward the subject, the result is a low-angle shot. If the camera is high, tilted down toward the subject, the result is a high-angle shot. If the camera is tilted neither up nor down, the result is a normal-angle shot. If the camera is not tilted but is placed at the eye-level of

a person standing or seated, the angle is called an eye-level shot. If the camera is tilted off its horizontal and vertical axes, the result is a tilt angle or dutch-tilt angle.

camera movement Any motion of a camera during a shot, such as panning, tilting, dollying, craning, rolling, or wobbling.

characters The fictional people within a narrative film, not to be confused with the actors who play them.

chiaroscuro The technique of using light and shade in pictorial representation, or the arrangement of light and dark elements.

cine-structuralism The application of semiotics to cinema in an essentially sociological or ethnographic way.

close-up A shot in which the image of the subject or its most important part fills most of the frame. A close-up shot of a person usually includes the head and part of the shoulders.

code the rules or forms that can be observed to allow a message to be understood, to signify. Codes are the rules operating on the means of expression (and thus are distinct from the means of expression).

composition The distribution, balance, and general relationship of masses and degrees of light and shade, line and color within a picture area.

connotation The suggestive or associative sense of an expression (word, image, sign) that extends beyond its strict literal definition.

contextual criticism A form of criticism that sees film in relation to the context in which it was created and in which it is shown.

continuity The appearance in a fiction film of an autonomous, temporal flow of events. Standard Hollywood editing practices to hide the fact that film scenes are built up out of shots which are normally filmed out of sequence.

contrast Used to refer to both the quality of the lighting of a scene and a characteristic of the filmstock. High-contrast lighting shows a stark difference between blacks and whites; low-contrast (or soft-contrast) lighting mainly emphasizes the midrange of grays.

convention A recurrent unit of activity, dialogue or cinematic technique that is used in films and is

familiar to audiences, for example, the shoot out in a western, the editing of a chase scene etc.

cross-cut A cut from one line of action to another.

cubism An art movement, beginning about 1910, in which people and objects were broken down into their geometric components.

cut 1) The instantaneous change from one shot to another. 2) A command used to stop operation of the camera, action, and sound recording equipment. 3) To sever or splice film in the editing process. Also to eliminate a shot, sequence, or some sound from a film. Loosely, to edit a film.

D

dada An art movement of the 1920s, which predated surrealism. Like surrealism, it promoted incongruity, illogic, and shock. Its aims were anarchic and nihilistic.

decor The furnishing and decorations used in a motion picture action field, especially set furnishing and decorations.

deep-focus A technique favored by Realists, in which objects very near the camera as well as those far away are in focus at the same time.

denotation The strict literal definition of an expression (word, image, sign) as opposed to its connotation.

depth of field The range of distances from the camera at which the subject is acceptably sharp.

detail shot Usually more magnified than a close-up. A shot of a hand, eye, mouth, or subject of similar detail.

diachronic In linquistic theory, a phenomenon is diachronic when it consists of or depends upon a change in its state, usually across time.

dialectics The system of thought that focuses on contradictions between opposing concepts; in the Marxian sense of the term, historical change occurs through the opposition of conflicting forces and ideas,

dialogue Lip-synchronous speech in film with the speaker usually, but not always, visible.

diegesis The denotative material of film narrative, it includes, according to Metz, not only the narration itself, but also the fictional space and time dimensions implied by the narrative.

director The individual who interprets the script in terms of performances and cinematic technique, and who supervises all phases of the work involved in achieving a coherent, unified film presentation.

disorientation cut Two pieces of film edited together for their disorienting or dislocating effect on the viewer. The cut is made to confuse the viewer as to content, space, or time.

dissolve The superimposition of a fade out over a fade in.

documentary A nonfiction film. It uses images of life as its raw material and may be of many different types with many different purposes.

dominant The controlling code or attraction in an image or montage.

dramatization The acting out and the realization of that acting out in images on the screen of a fictional or factual event. Narration tells us what happened, dramatization shows it to us as it happens.

E

editing Similar term to cutting. The process of assembling, arranging, and trimming film, both picture and sound, to the best advantage for the purpose at hand.

effects Depending on context, either sound effects, optical effects, or special effects.

epic A film that stresses spectacle and large casts, often with a historical or biblical plot.

establishing shot Usually, a long shot that shows the location of the ensuing action, but may be a close-up or even a medium shot which has some sign or other clue that identifies the location.

experimental film An independent, noncommercial film that is the product of the personal vision of the filmmaker.

expressionism Fantasy and distortion in sets, editing, lighting, and costumes used as a means od expressing the inner feelings of both filmmaker and characters.

extended image Composition within the film frame that draws the viewer's eye and consciousness beyond the frame itself and suggests the completion of the image outside the camera field, for example, an image of half a face in the frame will provoke the viewer to complete

the image mentally, and so to extend the face beyond what is shown in the actual image.

extreme close-up See **detail shot.**

extreme long shot A shot that shows considerable distance. Usually used only in reference to outdoor shots.

F

fade An optical or a sound effect in which the screen or sound track gradually changes from black to an image or silence to sound (fade-in) or the reverse (fade-out).

film 1) A strip of flexible, transparent base material, usually cellulose triacetate, having various coatings such as photographic emulsions and iron oxide, and usually perforated. 2) To photograph a motion picture. 3) The cinema in general. 4) A movie, a motion picture.

film artist Generally, a filmmaker who has as much control over the idea, production, realization, and final form of a released film as is possible, given the collaborative nature of the commercial medium. Unlike the film auteur, who faces many studio-determined obstacles in realizing his or her personal vision on the screen, the film artist often works independently and with hand-chosen collaborators.

film criticism The analysis and evaluation of films, usually in relation to theoretical principles including both aesthetics and philosophy.

filmic space A phrase not in wide use, which refers to the power of the film medium that makes possible the combination of shots of widely separated origins into a single framework of fictional space.

film movement The films and filmmakers who constitute a cinema (usually national) at a given period of historical time. Most often, social and political factors cause a film movement, bringing together artists who have common aesthetic and political goals and who recognize themselves as a group.

film noir Originally a French term, now in common usage, to indicate a film with a gritty, urgan setting that deals mainly with dark or violent passions in a downbeat way. Especially common in American cinema during the late forties and early fifties.

film speed 1) The general term used to indicate a film emulsion's sensitivity to light; the higher (or faster) the film speed, the better it is able to record an image with low illumination. 2) The rate of speed at

which the film progresses through the camera and the projector, measured in frames per second or feet or meters per minute.

film theory General principles that explain the nature and capabilities of film. The ongoing discourse that attempts to uncover such principles.

flashback A shot or sequence (sometimes quite long) showing action that occurred before the film's present time.

flash-forward A shot or sequence that shows future action or action which will be seen later in the film.

focal lenght The distance from the lens to the film plane when the lens is focused at infinity. A lens with a long focal lenght is a telephoto, a short focal lenght, a wide angle.

focus 1) The sharpness or definition of the image. 2) To adjust the sharpness and clarity of the image by adjusting the lens or light source so as to create sharp or soft focus or to change focus.

formalism 1) Concern with form over content. 2) The theory that meaning exists primarily in the form or language of a discourse rather than in the content or subject. 3) The Russian movement of the twenties that developed these ideas.

forms, open and closed Closed forms suggest that the limits of the frame are the limits of artistic reality, while open forms suggest that reality continues outside the frame.

frame 1) Any single image on the film. 2) The size and the shape of the image on the film, or on the acreen when projected. 3) The compositional unit of film design.

freeze frame A freeze shot, which is achieved by printing a single frame many times in succession to give the illusion of a still photograph when projected.

futurism An art movement around the time of World War I, emphasizing speed and dynamism in its forms as a response to modern life in the machine age.

G

genre A film type, such as western or science fiction film, which usually has conventional plot structure and characters; loosely a formula film.

German Expressionism A film movement in Germany from 1919 through the 1920s, peaking about 1925. Following earlier expressionist movements in fine art and

literature, filmmakers used decor, lighting, and cinematic technique to express interior states of being and feeling rather than to record an objective reality.

H

hand-held A shot with a camera by a camera operator. Also, the somewhat wobbly image on the screen, which results from such shooting.

high key A type of lighting arrangement in which the key light is very bright.

I

icon An object, landscape, or performer who accrues a symbolic as well as particular meaning and conveys that meaning through recurrent presence in a group or genre of films.

image Both an optical pattern and a mental experience. 1) A single specific picture. 2) Generally, the visuals of film or media as opposed to sound. 3) A visual trope. 4) By extension, often a nonvisual trope; hence, we speak of aural, poetic, or musical "images".

intellectual montage An assembly of shots through editing that results in conveying an abstract or intellectual concept. A group of people being menaced and beaten by mounted police next to a shot of cattle being slaughtered in an Eisenstein film provides an example, provoking an idea.

intercutting Insertion into a series of related shots of other shots for contrast or other effect.

invisible editing A cut made during the movement of a performer, achieved either by overlapping the action, or by using two cameras and then matching the action during editing. Such cuts make shifts of camera position less noticeable. Conventional Hollywood narrative structure.

iris A circular masking device, so called because of its resemblance to the iris of the human eye.

J

jump cut An instantaneous advance in the action within a shot or between two shots due to the removal of a portion of film, to poor pictorial continuity, or to remind intentionally the viewer that editing is taking place.

K

key light The light source that creates the main, brightest light falling on a subject.

L

language, language system Unwieldy English equivalents of the French terms langage and langue, respectively. Cinema is called language, because it is a means of communication, but it is not a language system because it doesn't follow the rules of written or spoken language.

long shot A shot that shows all or most of a fairly large subject (for example, a person) ans usually much of the surroundings.

long take A single shot (or take, or run of the camera) that lasts for a relatively lenghty period of time before it is juxtaposed with another shot. It reveals information within an unbroken context of space and time, and through camera and subject movement rather than through editing.

low key 1) Pictures in which the majority of tones lie toward the darker end of the scale. 2) In lighting, a generally low level of illumination of subject, with relatively short-scale tonal rendition.

M

master shot A long shot or moving shot that includes all of the action in a particular sequence, with the camera fairly distant. After it is made, if only one camera is being used, medium shots and close-ups are made of the repeated action and are inserted into the master shot during editing.

medium shot A shot that shows part of a person or object.

melodrama In Aristotle's terms, a work of literature or film that treats serious subject matter (often life and death situations), but is distinct from tragedy because the ending is always happily resolved with the protagonist overcoming all obstacles to achieve his or her desired goal. In those cases where the protagonist does not fully have the audience's sympathy (that is, the socially unacceptable ambitious female of the 1940s or the gangster hero of the 1930s), the happy ending for society, not the protagonist, may be somewhat ambiguous. Also used as a term for women's pictures, that is, the family melodrama.

mimesis Th Greek word for "imitation", a term important to the definition of realism.

minimal cinema A type of experimental film that attempts to reduce film to its basic properties (its recording of actuality in continuous space and time) with minimal intervention by the filmmaker.

mise-en-scène 1) A term generally used to describe those elements of the film image placed before the camera and in relation to it, rather than to the process of editing that occurs after the interaction between camera and subject. 2) Also, the images in which context and relationships are revealed in units that preserve continuous space and time.

montage 1) Simply editing. 2) Eisenstein's idea that adjacent shots should relate to each other in such a way that A and B combine to produce another meaning, C, which is not actually recorded in the film. 3) "Dynamic Cutting": a highly stylized form of editing, often with the purpose of providing a lot of information in a short period of time.

motif An object or sound that becomes linked to a film's narrative in a meaningful way so that it becomes symbolically identified with a character or action.

multiple image Having several images, not superimposed, within the frame.

N

narration Spoken description or analysis of action.

narrative Story; the linear, chronological structure of a story.

naturalism A theory of literature and film which supposes a scientific determinism such that the actions of a character are predetermined by biological, sociological, economic, or psychological laws. Often wrongly used as synonymous to realism.

nonfiction film Any film that does not use an invented plot or characters.

O

objective camera Camera coverage that places the audience in the position of an observer of the action.

off-screen space Space that is out of the camera field, but is implied by the film through the movement of the camera and subject movement into and out of the field of vision.

overlap sound A cut in which the cut in the soundtrack is not synchronous with the cut in the image.

over-the-shoulder shot A shot commonly used in dialogue scenes in which the speaker is seen from the perspective of a person standing just behind and a little to one side of the listener, so that parts of

the head and shoulder of the listener are in the frame, as well as the head of the speaker.

P

pace The rhythm of a film.

pan A movement of the camera from left to right or right to left along a horizontal plane. Unlike the tracking shot in which the camera moves with the subject, the pan is shot from a stationary point.

paradigm In semiology, a unit of potential, as opposed to actual, relationship. The paradigm describes "what elements or statements go with what"; the syntagma, "what follow what".

parallel action A device of narrative in which two scenes are observed in parallel by cross-cutting. Also called parallel montage.

persistence of vision The physiological phenomenon that makes cinema and television possible. An image is retained on the retina of the eye for a short period after it is seen so that, if another image takes its place soon enough, the illusion of motion can be created.

photography Literally "light-writing". Any system of recording images, especially those which use chemical technology. Although cinematography is a more precise term for motion picture photography, the more general term, photography, is often used synonymously: one speaks of photographing a motion picture rather than "cinematographing" it.

poetic film Non-narrative film, often experimental. Jonas Mekas's phrase to distinguish New American Cinema from the general run of commercial, narrative fiction film.

point-of-view shot (POV) A shot made from a camera position close to the line of sight of a performer who is to be watching the action shown in the POV.

process shot A shot made of action in front of a rear projection screen having on it a still or moving image for the background.

prop Any physical item used in a play or film: chairs, tables, eyeglasses, books, pens, programs.

pull-back shot A tracking shot or zoom that moves back from the subject to reveal the context of the scene.

R

reaction shot Any shot, usually a cutaway, in which an actor reacts to action that has just occurred.

realism The use of scripts, staging, costuming, and camera coverage that renders action as if it were real, not fantasy. Attending to the conventions of realism, that is, the promotion of ordinary human figures in lifelike situations concerned with everyday problems maintaining a high degree of plausibility.

reverse motion, reverse action Action that goes backward on the screen, achieved by shooting with the camera upside down, then turning the processed film end-over-end, or by shooting with the camera rightside up and action reversed, or by reverse printing in an optical printer.

S

saccade The flick movement of the eye from one position to another that occurs not only when reading words but also when reading images and real scenes.

scene A dramatic unit composed of a single shot or several. A scene usually takes place in a continuous time period, in the same setting, and involves the same characters.

screen 1) The surface on which a film or television image is projected. 2) A method of printing in which ink is forced through a fabric screen to make the desired impression, the blank areas having been covered with an opaque material to prevent the ink from coming through. 3) A glass plate etched with crossed lines used to make halftone patterns. 4) (verb) To project a film for a limited audience.

screenplay The script of a film or television show, usually but not necessarily including rough descriptions of camera movements as well as dialogue.

semiology, semiotics Theory of criticism pioneered by Roland Barthes in literature and Christian Metz, Umberto Eco and Peter Wollen in film. It uses the theories of modern linguistics, especially Ferdinand de Saussure's concept of signification, as a model for the description of the operation of various cultural languages, such as film, television, kinesics (body language), and written and spoken languages.

separation Fragmentation of a scene into single images in alternation - A, B, A, B, A, B, etc.

sequence A dramatic unit composed of several scenes, all linked together by their emotional and narrative momentum. A sequence can span time and space as long as its dramatic elements and structure are unified.

shot 1) A single run of the camera. 2) A piece of film resulting from such a run. Systematically joined together in the process of editing, shots are synthesized into sequences, and the sequences in turn are joined to form the film as a whole.

shot analysis A careful and thorough recording of separate shots that constitute an entire film or specific sequences. The analysis describes the visual images, camera movement, duration, sound and transitions from shot to shot. Sometimes such an analysis is drawn as if it were a storyboard.

sign 1) In semiology the basic unit of signification composed of the signifier (which carries the meaning) and the signified (which is the concept or thing signified. 2) Rudolf Arnheim's term for an image serving merely as a sign to the extent to which it stands for a particular content without reflecting its characteristics visually.

slow motion Action that takes place on the screen at a rate less rapid than the rate of the real action which took place before the camera. This occurs when the camera is operated at a frame repetition rate greater than standard, but the projection frame repetition rate is maintained at standard or below.

soft focus An effect in which sharpness of image is reduced by the use of an optical device, usually a soft-focus lens, diffusion disk, or open-weave cloth over lens.

split screen The division of the film frame into two or more separate non-overlapping images, done either in the camera or in an optical printer.

structuralism The study of how human institutions and art forms are structured on basic notions of conflict and opposition (for example, light and dark, good and evil) and how those structures are repetitive and archetypal.

subjective camera A situation in which the audience involvement with a scene is intensified through identification with the camera point-of-view. In some dramatic films, the camera has taken the place of an actor, with other actors looking directly at the lens.

surrealism 1) A movement in painting and film during the 1920s best represented in film by the work of Luis Bunuel and Salvador Dali. 2) A film style reminiscent of that movement, either fantastic or psychologically distortive.

symbol 1) A sign (Peirce) that demands neither resemblance to its object nor any existential bond with it, but operates by pure convention. 2) More generally,

something that represents something else by resemblance, association or convention.

synecdoche In rhetoric, a common figure of speech in which a part signifies the whole (or the whole a part), hence a "motor" is understood to be an "automobile". Generally a metaphorical device basic to cinematographic language.

syntagma A unit of actual rather than potential relationship. Syntagmatic relationships exist between the present elements of a shot or a statement in film. The syntagma describes what follows what, rather than what goes with what.

T

take A shot. Also a term used to indicate the number of times a given shot has been made.

theme The story subject matter from which the general value or idea forming the intellectual background for a film is evolved.

tone The mood or atmosphere of a film (for example, ironic, comic, nostalgic, romantic) created as the sum of the film's cinematic techniques.

tracking shot A shot made while the camera and its entire support are moving.

tragedy A work of literature or drama that focuses on the downfall of an admirable character whose defeat (physical or moral) usually is brought about through a flaw in an otherwise noble nature.

two-shot A shot of two people. Likewise, three-shot.

typage Eisenstein's theory of casting, which eschews professional actors in favor of "types" or representative characters.

U

underground cinema A term often used synonymously with independent film, avant-garde film and experimental film.

universal time Time created through imagery (often edited in a montage sequence) that abstracts its subject matter from a specific temporal or spatial context. The actions perceived could occur, therefore, anywhere and at any time, and the experiences on the screen are universalized.

V

verism General realism in art, literature and film.

viewpoint The apparent distance and angle from which the camera views and records the subject. Not to be confused with point-of-view shots or subjective camera shots.

voice-over 1) A sound and picture relationship in which a narrator's voice accompanies picture action. 2) Any off-screen voice. 3) A narration job.

W

wide-angle lens A short lens able to capture a broad field of action.

wipe An optical effect in which an image appears to "wipe off" the preceding image.

Z

zoom A lens with effective focal lenght continuously variable within a limited range. Changing the focal lenght of such a lens as a shot progresses simulates the effect of movement of the camera toward or away from the subject.

APPENDIX II

A videotape including the following film extracts:

1) Fritz Lang: M (1931)

2) Luis Buñuel & Salvador Dali: Un Chien Andalou (1928) -extract

3) Luis Buñuel: Le Phantome de la Liberté (1975) -extract

4) Maya Deren: Meshes of the Afternoon (1943)

5) Busby Berkeley: 42nd Street (1933) -extracts

6) Busby Berkeley:Dames (1934) -extracts

7) Busby Berkeley: Gold Diggers of 1935 (1935) -extract