

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 18.02.19

Dette dokumentets nettadresse (URL) er:

<https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/cm4all/uproc.php/0/gaatefilm.pdf>

Gåtefilm

(_film, _sjanger) Engelsk: “puzzle film”. Også kalt “mind-game film”. En film der det er “perplexing patterns of story time and causality, trusting that viewers will search for clues by rewatching the movie” (Bordwell og Thompson 2007 s. 85). Seeren strever med å forklare det tilsynelatende uforklarlige i filmen.

Et tidlig eksempel på en gåtefilm er amerikaneren Robert Altmans *Images* (1972). Den kvinnelige hovedpersonen Cathryn lider av en mental forstyrrelse (schizofreni?) som får henne til å se avdøde personer og andre personer som fysisk ikke er til stede. I løpet av handlingen pusler noen av personene et puslespill fra hennes barndom, et puslespill som ingen vet hvordan skal se ut når det er ferdig. Puslespillet antyder noen “sammenhenger” i det gåtefulle som Cathryn opplever, men gir ingen klare svar. (Krimhistorier avsluttes derimot vanligvis med éntydige løsninger.)

“[O]ne overriding common feature of mind-game films is a delight in disorienting or misleading spectators (besides carefully hidden or altogether withheld information, there are the frequent plot twists and trick endings). Another feature is that spectators on the whole do not mind being “played with”: on the contrary, they rise to the challenge. The fact that audiences are set conundrums, or are sprung “traps for mind and eye,” that they are [...] confronted with odd objects or puzzling details that do not “add up” – even though the overall experience “makes sense” – would indicate we are dealing with a phenomenon that spectators recognize as relevant to their own worlds.” (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 15-16) Seeren av gåtefilmer leter etter “subtle shifts in intonation and gesture and facial expression – scrutinizes the action on the screen, looking for clues ...” (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 34).

Kjennetegn ved gåtefilmer:

“1 A protagonist participates in, or is witness to, events whose meaning or consequences escape him: along with him, the film asks: what exactly has happened? There is a suspension of cause and effect, if not an outright reversal of linear progression (*Memento*, *Donnie Darko*, *Lost Highway*).

2 A protagonist seems deluded or mistaken about the difference between reality and his/her imagination, but rather than this inner world becoming a clearly marked “subjective” point of view of a character (as in the European art film), there is no perceptible difference either in the visual register or in terms of verisimilitude, between real and imagined, real and simulated, real and manipulated. [...] films like *The Matrix*, *Dark City* (1998), and *The Truman Show* [...]

3 A protagonist has a friend, mentor, or companion who turns out to be imagined (*Fight Club*, *A Beautiful Mind*, *Donnie Darko*, *Lost Highway*).

4 A protagonist has to ask himself: “who am I and what is my reality?” (the Philip K. Dick adaptations *Blade Runner* [1982], *Total Recall* [1990], *Paycheck* and *Minority Report* [2002]), and even “am I still alive or already dead” (*Angel Heart* [1987], *Jacob’s Ladder* [1990], *The Sixth Sense*, *The Others*).

5 Not only is the hero unable to distinguish between different worlds: he or she is often not even aware that there might be parallel universes, and neither is the audience – until a moment in the film when it turns out that the narrative and plot have been based on a mistaken cognitive or perceptual premise (*Fight Club*, *The Sixth Sense*, *A Beautiful Mind*). The point in the story at which it undergoes such drastic revision, where the ground is pulled from under the audience’s feet, is commented on by one of the fans as follows: “You want that big, juicy, brain-blasting, oh-my-god-everything-has-changed feeling,” to which another blogger replied: “Yes – but the ‘oh-my-god-everything-has-changed’ feeling in *The Sixth Sense* is reinforced by the ‘gotcha’ feeling of replayed scenes from earlier in the movie that you now understand differently. The viewer gets to have it both ways: have the oh-my-god feeling and watch the protagonist experience it too.”

6 A character is persuaded by his – or more often, her – family, friends, or the community that she is deluded about the existence or disappearance, usually of a child – a self-delusion brought upon by trauma, excessive grief, or other emotional disturbance. He/she insists on maintaining this delusion against all odds, and is usually proven right, by uncovering a conspiracy, either of a very sophisticated, diabolical kind, or on the contrary, consisting of a very “scientific,” bureaucratic, or routine “test” or “measure” ordered by the powers that be (*Minority Report*, *The Forgotten* [2004], *The Village* [2004], *Flight Plan* [2005]).” (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 17-18)

“[P]uzzle films embrace nonlinearity, time loops, and fragmented spatio-temporal reality. These films blur the boundaries between different levels of reality, are riddled with gaps, deception, labyrinthine structures, ambiguity, and overt coincidences. They are populated with characters who are schizophrenic, lose their memory, are unreliable narrators, or are dead (but without us – or them – realizing).” (Warren Buckland i Buckland 2009 s. 6) *Fight Clubs* hovedperson har

blitt oppfattet som en person som lider av langt framskreden schizofreni, samtidig som han har et behov for å bevise at han fortsatt eksisterer (Hamus-Vallée 2001 s. 163).

“Gaps and inferences come in many shapes and sizes. There are: temporary and permanent; flaunted and suppressed; diffused and focused gaps. These prompt the spectator to generate curiosity and suspense inferences; inferences with different levels of probability; inferences that are either exclusive or nonexclusive” (Warren Buckland i Buckland 2009 s. 12). “[T]he gaps are designed to wean viewers from their habitual, virtually automatic habits of perception learned from years of watching traditional narrative films. [...] expects viewers to do considerably more interpretative work than traditional narrative films require.” (Marshall Deutelbaum i Buckland 2009 s. 208)

Tilskueren blir lurt av regissørens dramaturgiske virkemidler, og kan ikke si med sikkerhet hva som er sant og usant, ekte og uekte, fornuftig eller sykdom og galskap. Filmsjangeren skaper forvirring og usikkerhet. Seeren lures/manipuleres, men “ikke på det optiske nivået, som f.eks. gjennom bruk av computerteknologi og spesialeffekter, snarere er det en psykologisk-emosjonell manipulasjon gjennom nye formidlingskonvensjoner [som] overskrider de vanlige grensene mellom mainstream, independent, asiatisk og europeisk auteur-kino [...] de blir vanligvis til “kultfilmer” [...] dekonstruktiv fortellemåte [...] oppsplitting av konvensjonelle fortellemønstre [...] Fordi motivene er kjente, fordi handlingsrekkefølge og rytme innen konvensjonell dramaturgi er fast forankret i publikums følelser, kan den postmoderne filmen tillate seg å leke med disse bestanddelene, å løse opp på den vanligvis kausalt oppspente handlingsrekken, å forvirre og rive i stykker.” (Friederike Linge i http://othes.univie.ac.at/9594/1/2010-04-14_0347038.pdf; lesedato 15.01.13)

Fra 1990-tallet av har noen gåtefilmer fått diskusjonsfora på Internett om hvordan filmene kan eller bør tolkes, og nettsteder lagd av seere som vil presentere sine “løsninger”.

“[O]ne can foreground issues of narrative and narratology (by concentrating on the unreliable narrators, the multiple time-lines, unusual point of view structures, unmarked flashbacks, problems in focalization and perspectivism, unexpected causal reversals and narrative loops); one can highlight questions of psychology and psychopathology (characters suffering from amnesia, schizophrenia, paranoia, “second sight” or clairvoyance); philosophers of mind can find conundrums about the relation of body, brain, and consciousness that challenge concepts of “identity,” or ask what it means to be “human” as we share our lives with ever smaller machines and ever more “intelligent” objects. Mathematicians can elucidate game theory, explicitly thematized in *A Beautiful Mind* and implicitly instantiated in David Mamet’s *The Spanish Prisoner* (1997), or they can comment on the role of contingency, chance, stochastic series, and explain the “butterfly” effects of chaos

theory, the “sensitive dependence on initial conditions” thesis, (positive) feedback loops as opposed to linear causality (in films like *The Butterfly Effect* [2004] or *Donnie Darko*). Several films raise matters of *ontology* and parallel worlds, while skepticism and doubt, but also their obverse: belief and trust, are often the *epistemological* issues at stake.” (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 18-19)

I gåtefilmer er et traume “not only something that connects a character to his or her past, but also opens up to a future. It suggests a Foucault-inspired approach: Foucault sought to explain mental pathologies in terms of bodily regimes, discourses, and institutional practices, which go beyond the individual instance, and inscribe pathology “productively” – in terms of the micro-politics of power – into society at large.” (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 31)

Amerikaneren David Lynchs *Lost Highway* (1997) viser en marerittlignende, bisarr verden. Filmen tilhører sjangrene gåtefilm, psykologisk thriller og “noir horror”. Den ukjente Mystery Man i filmen ligner både Mefistofeles og seriemorderen John Wayne Gacy som kledte seg ut som en klovn. Den mest sentrale personen i filmen heter Fred Madison. “[H]ow can Fred’s dreams and visions so accurately predict forthcoming events – unless those events have already happened? This suggests that the narrative of *Lost Highway* is organized like a loop – or better, a Möbius strip – rather than linearly. If this is the case, then scene 18, in Fred’s prison cell, represents the twist in the möbius strip, the twist where the topside is transferred to the underside. Scenes 1 and 49 are the moments where the two edges of the Möbius strip are connected together, with Fred represented outside his house on one side, and inside the house on the other side. Moreover, to travel around the entire length of the Möbius strip, one needs to go around it twice – first on one side (from the intercom message to Fred’s transformation in his cell), then on the other side (from Pete being released from prison to his transformation back into Fred), before we are returned to the moment where the two sides are joined (Fred conveying the intercom message to himself). The metaphor of the Möbius strip appears to accurately represent the structure of *Lost Highway*.” (Warren Buckland i Buckland 2009 s. 56)

Gåtefilmer “enact the very condition their hero suffers from, in the structure of the film itself, as in [Christopher Nolans] *Memento*, where the film, as it were, wipes out its own memory, by being told in short segments that precede each other, rather than follow each other.” (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 20) Filmene visualiserer ofte “the idea of identity crises and personality disorders” som en slags “productive pathologies” (s. 19).

“[T]he most intriguing and innovative feature is this insistence on temporality as a separate dimension of consciousness and identity, the play on nonlinear sequence or inverted causality, on chance and contingency, on synchronicity and simultaneity and their effects on characters, agency, and human relations: we are in worlds that often look just like ours, but where multiple time-lines coexist, where

the narrative engenders its own loops or Möbius strips, where there may well be a beginning, a middle, and an end, but they certainly are not presented in that order, and thus the spectator's own meaning-making activity involves constant retroactive revision, new reality-checks, displacements, and reorganization not only of temporal sequence, but of mental space, and the presumption of a possible switch in cause and effect." (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 21)

"As one can see from the uses that the other protagonists in *Memento* – especially Teddy and Natalie – make of Leonard, in order to further their own ends and objectives, the amnesiac hero is in his pathology programmable like a weapon: he is like a smart bomb, a repeat-action projectile on autopilot. [...] programmable not through ideology and false consciousness, but programmed by a fantasy, or self-programmed through the body (where the body functions as a technology of recording, storage, and replay: the somatic or pathologized body as an advanced "neural" or "biological" medium, in its mental instability and volatility potentially more efficient than the current generation of electronic media, at least for certain tasks." (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 29)

"[T]he disavowal of his [Leonards] guilt-feelings regarding his role in the death of his wife converge with his guilt-feelings regarding one of his clients, the wife of amnesiac Sammy Jankis, with whom Leonard increasingly comes to be identified." (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 29) Filmen prøver å trekke "the audience into the protagonists' world in ways that would be impossible if the narrative distanced itself or contextualized the hero via his or her (medical) condition. In other words, the hypothesis would be that mind-game films imply and implicate spectators in a manner not covered by the classical theories of identification, or even of alignment and engagement, because the "default values" of normal human interaction are no longer "in place," meaning that the film is able to question and suspend both the inner and outer framing of the story." (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 30)

"In *Memento* multiple story lines, either progressive, regressive, recounted, or fragmented, are bound together by elements capable of recalling previous stages of the story, announcing or suggesting possible developments, showing effects whose causes are still unknown, retrospectively affecting several central features of the story, or even obliging the viewers to reconsider the story as a whole. [...] These kinds of "puzzle-films" have in fact the particularity of highlighting the role of the viewers, the mental abilities they have to employ, and the mental operations they have to perform. As a matter of fact, the difficulties we experience are deeply rooted in the skillful way we normally watch ordinary movies. *Memento* is difficult and challenging because we are not able to construct a coherent *fabula* during the screening. It is also attractive because the puzzle demands a solution." (Stefano Ghislotti i Buckland 2009 s. 87-88)

“The second disk in the DVD special edition of *Memento* arranges the film’s scenes in chronological order. To mark the difference existing with the theatrical version, the end credits are shown at the beginning, scrolling down from the top of the screen to the bottom: a clear cue, referring to the fact that the narration of the original edition has been reversed. In the same fashion the opening credit sequence is shown at the end of the film moving backward, from the director’s name to the cast members. The film has not, in fact, been completely reversed: we should say that its structure of events has been linearized, and from this respect the film is similar to other “ordinary” films. Black and white and color scenes do not interpolate: all the scenes are arranged in their temporal succession, and the color scenes, with respect to the original version, are shown in reverse order, following diegetic time.” (Stefano Ghislotti i Buckland 2009 s. 90)

I *Memento* er det to “strings of events, in black and white and in color [...] linked together by the crosscutting editing, but they are not meant to be simultaneous. They have two different time directions: chronological in black and white scenes, reversed in color sequences. The fact that black and white scenes interrupt the color sequences creates an effect of interference: while we have to keep in mind the actions of the color sequence, a black and white scene wipes out our working memory and attracts our focus of attention. As the subsequent color sequence appears, it is difficult to remember the previous one. In other films that adopt a backward narration, such as *Betrayal* (by David Hugh Jones, 1983; based on Harold Pinter’s play) or *Irréversible* (by Gaspar Noé, 2002), this effect is not present, because the sequences are connected to one another, and one can reflect on the causal relationship existing between them. In *Memento* the script is designed to create confusion in the viewer: beyond the crosscutting of two opposite time streams, we can notice that the average length of black and white scenes (except for the last two) is less than a minute, while color sequences (except for the last one) are from one to six minutes long. Such a fragmentation produces 22 black and white scenes and 23 color sequences which are systematically alternated. In addition, in the black and white part we find abrupt interruptions of action, which prevent the possibility of a plain reconstruction, and in the color part continuous actions are cut into two or three parts: it happens with Dodd’s chase, Ferdy’s bar, City Grill, the hooker and the derelict building scenes (two parts), and with Natalie’s home and Dodd’s room (three parts). This partition creates confusion because in order to reorder the color line of actions we have to recollect similar segments which can muddle, overlap, or be exchanged, and which appear as bewildering elements.” (Stefano Ghislotti i Buckland 2009 s. 95)

Mange av scenene i *Memento* “encourage the viewer to make the operation of mental rotation, which consists in putting the events of the two sequences in the right chronological order, to verify the temporal and the causal relationships. [...] [W]e have to arrange the events without the possibility of anticipating actions that have already happened. We can only investigate the causes at the origin of the effects we have witnessed.” (Stefano Ghislotti i Buckland 2009 s. 96)

Leonard lever innen en syklisk tid. Hans skyld er uklar, kanskje drepte han sin egen kone: “The ominous association with Sammy Jankis becomes, in Teddy’s words, a complete identification: Leonard’s wife survived the rape, she was diabetic, Leonard injected too much insulin provoking her death.” (Stefano Ghislotti i Buckland 2009 s. 101-103) Hovedpersonens mulige selvbedrag minner om lignende filmer (f.eks. psykologiske thrillere) som har noen overlappende trekk med gåtefilmer, f.eks. Martin Scorseses *Shutter Island* (2010).

Michael Wedel skriver om den tyske regissøren Tom Tykwers film *Run Lola Run* (1998) at filmens mål er “to fold cause-and-effect patterns into a self-reflexive temporal knot is announced already in these first words spoken during the prologue.” (i Buckland 2009 s. 130)

Strukturen i den sørkoreanske regissøren Hong Sang-soo sin film *The Day a Pig Fell into the Well* (1996) “presents viewers with a narrative whose uncertainties of meaning and motivation mirror the limits of understanding that viewers encounter in everyday reality. By refusing to allow viewers to escape briefly into the highly interconnected alternative to reality presented in a classical narrative like *Crash*, Hong redirects viewers to an alternate cognitive model applicable to their everyday experiences. Rather than an escape from reality, the film offers viewers a method of escape from the perils of jumping to conclusions based upon insufficient evidence. [...] Hong has fashioned the film’s narrative structure and visual style to continually force viewers to struggle to construe the uncertainties of motivation. Unlike *Crash*, in which the motivations and experiences of the film’s characters are reduced to the easily understood consequences of racial discrimination and suspicion, *The Day a Pig Fell into a Well* revels in a complexity created through narrative gaps and nontraditional editing that suggests conversely how difficult it can be to interpret motivation or understand experience. Quite the opposite of traditional, mainstream narrative films, as well as of the films of the Korean New Wave which preceded it, *The Day a Pig Fell into a Well* demands that its viewers engage in an exercise in epistemological realism that asks them to ponder the nature of knowledge, its presuppositions, the extent of its validity, as well as its inevitable uncertainties.” (Marshall Deutelbaum i Buckland 2009 s. 214-215)

Sørkoreaneren Park Chan-wook sin film *Oldboy* (2003) “leaves the spectator simultaneously enlightened and baffled. The secrets of the story are revealed, the masks of the protagonists are thrown off, and, yet, one feels the need to go over the facts once more, to double-check the connections among the characters and verify the premises of a particularly twisted narrative as it is transmitted through the channels of an equally twisted narration. And indeed, it was all intentional; as Park admitted at the news conference following the award presentations at Cannes Film Festival, he made the film with the DVD viewers in mind so that they could watch it several times and discover new elements each time. The young South Korean filmmaker, however, is not alone in the effort to cater for the needs and tastes of the

DVD audience, which is not constrained by the limitations of the single viewing of a film in the theater. Since the late 90s, an increasing number of films have employed complex storytelling techniques that extend the classical rules of filmmaking and test the limits of the narrational capacities of the cinematic medium. Some of them experiment with the treatment of narrative time, using time-loops and repetitions as in *Run Lola Run* (1998); others exhaust the possibilities of the screen by “exploding” the cinematic space as in *Time Code* (2000), while others create characters with impossible identities as in *Mulholland Dr.* (2001) and *Inland Empire* (2006).” (Eleftheria Thanouli i Buckland 2009 s. 218)

“*Oldboy* acquires thus a Möbius strip structure that assigns its protagonists doubly coded roles with shifting qualities and dimensions. [...] Instead of the classical staging in depth, the linear perspective, and the central positioning of the characters in the frame, he opts for overhead shots, slanted angles, fish-eye lens distortions, extreme long shots, and extreme close-ups. [...] a mannerist and self-conscious staging and shooting approach” (Eleftheria Thanouli i Buckland 2009 s. 221-223). “The construction of its characters and the causal chain of events borrowed some of the compositional and generic elements of the classical narrative, such as the role of the male avenger or the motif of the investigation, only to subvert them by entailing them in a Möbius strip structure that allows every person and every event to be doubly coded.” (Eleftheria Thanouli i Buckland 2009 s. 229-230)

Den amerikanske regissøren James Mangolds film *Identity* (2003) er en gåtefilm. “Your identity is the blueprint of your being, the foundation on which morals, ideals and opinions evolve on an internal level. Every behavioral detail is derived from its essence, and when it undergoes any kind of damage or harm, one’s perception of the world around them is greatly altered. [...] James Mangold’s “Identity” is very much a puzzle movie caged by these sentiments (as hinted by the enigmatic title). Indeed, what is the significance of identity for a group of unrelated people who wander into the same motel during a stormy night? What brings them together during a cold stormy night out in the middle of the desert? The great thing about a movie like this is that it only reveals knowledge when it expects its own characters to be on the same page; if they are out of the loop, we are stuck right alongside them. And perhaps that's what identity itself is all about, too: learn things as they come to you rather than have everything implanted in your head ahead of schedule.” (David Keyes i <http://www.cinemaphile.org/reviews/2004/identity.html>; lesedato 05.02.13)

Den belgiske regissøren Jaco Van Dormaels film *Mr. Nobody* (2009) stiller spørsmålet “hva hvis” og leker med fortellerststeder og tidssprang. “Quick, what do string theory, the butterfly effect, 21st-century dystopia, the possibility of quasi-immortality, the unquantifiability of time, the impermanence of memory, death, love, second sight, the heartache of divorce, missions to Mars, and Jared Leto’s baby blues have in common? After seeing “Mr. Nobody” I’m still not sure, though

I am confident that writer-director Jaco van Dormael seems to think they're all part of the same thematic continuum. Almost moving in its gonzo self-assuredness and take-no-prisoners narrative scope – although with the nearly 140-minute running time, that could just be my exhaustion talking – “Mr. Nobody” is as ambitious as it is incoherent, an obvious labor of love that's equal parts science-fiction, romance, and Lynchian mind game. Yet with the film's maddening circular structure and often thudding visual expositions, the experience of watching it isn't quite as enjoyable as a description might augur.” (Michael Koresky i http://www.indiewire.com/article/mr._nobody; lesedato 05.04.13)

På nettstedet Internet movie database ble det i mars 2011 lagt inn en anbefalingsliste over gode gåtefilmer: “Best “Puzzle” Movies by David F [...] Those films that keep you thinking about the plot even after the film has ended. [...]

Memento (2000)

A man, suffering from short-term memory loss, uses notes and tattoos to hunt for the man he thinks killed his wife. (113 mins.) Director: Christopher Nolan [...]

Twelve Monkeys (1995)

In a future world devastated by disease, a convict is sent back in time to gather information about the man-made virus that wiped out most of the human population on the planet. (129 mins.) Director: Terry Gilliam [...]

The Butterfly Effect (2004)

A young man blocks out harmful memories of significant events of his life. As he grows up, he finds a way to remember these lost memories and a supernatural way to alter his life. (113 mins.) Director: Eric Bress, J. Mackye Gruber [...]

Mr. Nobody (2009)

A tale that spans different time zones of the 20th and 21st centuries. (141 mins.) Director: Jaco Van Dormael [...]

The Matrix (1999)

A computer hacker learns from mysterious rebels about the true nature of his reality and his role in the war against its controllers. (136 mins.) Director: The Wachowski Brothers [...]

Source Code (2011)

An action thriller centered on a soldier who wakes up in the body of an unknown man and discovers he's part of a mission to find the bomber of a Chicago commuter train. (93 mins.) Director: Duncan Jones
[...]

Inception (2010)

In a world where technology exists to enter the human mind through dream invasion, a highly skilled thief is given a final chance at redemption which involves executing his toughest job to date: Inception. (148 mins.) Director: Christopher Nolan
[...]

Donnie Darko (2001)

A troubled teenager is plagued by visions of a large bunny rabbit that manipulates him to commit a series of crimes, after narrowly escaping a bizarre accident. (113 mins.) Director: Richard Kelly
[...]

Fight Club (1999)

An insomniac office worker and a devil-may-care soap maker form an underground fight club that transforms into a violent revolution. (139 mins.) Director: David Fincher
[...]

Lost Highway (1997)

After a bizarre encounter at a party, a jazz saxophonist is framed for the murder of his wife and sent to prison, where he inexplicably morphs into a young mechanic and begins leading a new life. (134 mins.) Director: David Lynch
[...]

A Beautiful Mind (2001)

After a brilliant but asocial mathematician accepts secret work in cryptography, his life takes a turn to the nightmarish. (135 mins.) Director: Ron Howard
[...]

The Time Traveler's Wife (2009)

A romantic drama about a Chicago librarian with a gene that causes him to involuntarily time travel, and the complications it creates for his marriage. (107 mins.) Director: Robert Schwentke" (<http://www.imdb.com/list/QyY7EMg9hpQ/>; lesedato 20.11.12)

Inception "is a 'puzzle film' (Thompson, 2010) whose plot twists, holes, and gaps may work as 'a cultural activator, setting into motion [audiences'] decipherment, speculation, and elaboration' (Jenkins, 2006: 95)." (Abigail De Kosnik, Laurent El

Ghaoui m.fl. i <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1354856514560313>;
lesedato 19.01.18)

“In December 2006, Lars von Trier’s *The Boss of It All* was released. The film is a comedy about the head of an IT company hiring a failed actor to play the “boss of it all,” in order to cover up a sell-out. Von Trier announced that there were a number of (“five to seven”) out-of-place objects scattered throughout, called Lookeys: “For the casual observer, [they are] just a glitch or a mistake. For the initiated, [they are] a riddle to be solved. All Lookeys can be decoded by a system that is unique. [...] It’s a basic mind game, played with movies” (in Brown 2006). Von Trier went on to offer a prize to the first spectator to spot all the Lookeys and uncover the rules by which they were generated.” (Thomas Elsaesser i Buckland 2009 s. 13)

“Not content with creating a revolution in filmmaking by spearheading the Dogme 95 movement, Lars Von Trier is now experimenting with how his films are shot and how viewers engage with them. His new film, *The Boss Of It All*, is filmed using a new camera control technique developed by Von Trier called Automavision. The system removes the need for a human camera operator, replacing them with a computer which randomly selects camera shots and movements based around an initial camera position selected by the director. The system removes the usual control the director and cinematographer have over the composition of each shot and, specifically it’s framing. [...] The style deliberately breaks with the traditions of the Hollywood continuity style by forcing the viewer to actively search each shot for the most significant elements. In the Hollywood style these elements, for instance a protagonist, would be centred within the frame and lit in a way which made them highly salient even in busy scenes. In Von Trier’s recent films the protagonist is often cut off by the frame, visually diminished by other less important elements, or moving at odds with the hand-held camera movement. In combination with his often uncomfortable subject matter, this unpredictable framing technique often leads viewers to describe the experience of watching a Von Trier film as “hard work”.” (Tim J. Smith i <http://continuityboy.blogspot.no/2006/12/it-lookey-like-lars-von-trier-is-at-it.html>; lesedato 11.02.13)

“When watching a film composed according to the classic continuity style, all viewers will focus their attention on a small number of objects within a shot. In most shots there will only be one clear centre of attention, usually the face of a principle actor and it will be this that all viewers track within the shot and across cuts. By comparison, viewers watching *Dancer in the Dark* or *Dogville* distribute their attention across more of the screen and show less agreement of what they believe to be the most significant object. When a cut then happens (which they often do at unexpected moments in Von Trier’s films) viewers are not guided to the new centre of attention by the director so they have to actively search the scene. This active engagement with the visual constituents of the film creates a viewing experience that is completely counter to the normal smooth, direct, almost passive viewing experience of a classical continuity film.” (Tim J. Smith i <http://>)

continuityboy.blogspot.no/2006/12/it-lookey-like-lars-von-trier-is-at-it.html; lesedato 11.02.13)

“However, the natural instinct for framing is hard to overcome and it appears that Von Trier realised that his desire for completely un-framed shots would not be possible so long as he or his camera operator were controlling the camera. A hand-held camera is often described as a visual prosthesis: an extension of the camera operator’s eye; seeing what they see. The movement of a hand-held camera may be rough and the framing imperfect but, like the human eye it will always eventually settle on the most important parts of a scene. If Von Trier is to create shots in which viewers are unable to predict what is the most significant part of a scene or how the camera is going to move he needs to take the human camera operator out of the equation. Hence, Automavision. [...] Von Trier recently announced that he has embedded five to seven “Lookeys” in the film [...] Von Trier is offering 30,000 Danish kroner (£2,700) to the first Danish viewer that identifies all the Lookeys. The Lookeys are described as “visual elements that are out of place” (www.lookey.dk) and are intended to turn the film into a “mind game”. By informing his viewers of the presence of these Lookeys Von Trier is again encouraging his viewers to actively engage with his films in a way in conflict with the normal film viewing. Spotting continuity errors, which is how these Lookey’s would be described if they were unintentional, has been an occupation of film viewers throughout the history of film. The pastime has escalated to such a level that there are even books and websites devoted to it. Continuity errors are typically mistakes made during production that are spotted by viewers on repeated viewings of a film. The most common errors are unintentional costume changes across shots or cigarettes and drinks that disappear or refill.” (Tim J. Smith i <http://continuityboy.blogspot.no/2006/12/it-lookey-like-lars-von-trier-is-at-it.html>; lesedato 11.02.13)

Alle artiklene og litteraturlista til hele leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>