

Deja viewing?: videographic experiments in intertextual film studies

Article (Published Version)

Grant, Catherine (2013) *Deja viewing?: videographic experiments in intertextual film studies*. Mediascape : UCLA's Journal of Cinema and Media Studies. ISSN 1558-478X

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/41656/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Déjà-Viewing?

Videographic Experiments in Intertextual Film Studies

By Catherine Grant

The intertext constitutes meaning as the work involved in seeking it.¹

By the combination of two “depictables” is achieved the representation of something that is graphically undepictable [...].

But this is -- montage!

Yes. It is exactly what we do in the cinema [...].²

[T]he film essay enables the filmmaker to make the “invisible” world of thoughts and ideas visible on the screen. Unlike the documentary film that presents facts and information, the essay film produces complex thought—reflections that are not necessarily bound to reality, but can also be contradictory, irrational, and fantastic.³

We [film critics and scholars] can now “write” using the very materials that constitute our object of study: moving images and sounds. But doing this demands re-thinking conventional critical forms. Lots of experimenting must be done [...].⁴

What has always interested me most in film studies is the exploration of what Gérard Genette called “transtextuality,” that is to say, the range of ways in which one film may be brought into relation, whether manifest or hidden, with other films.⁵ Sometimes this interest has alighted on matters of cultural influence and film authorship.⁶ But, often, my work has addressed the *recognition* of cinematic interconnectedness, within the specific fields of transtextuality that Genette called “hypertextuality” and “intertextuality.”⁷ The latter is also the term that Russian writer Mikhail Iampolski used for his complex explorations of sometimes unlikely, or “anomalous,” figurative connections between films in his 1998 book *The Memory of Tiresias*.⁸

Intertextuality” as Iampolski sees it is an especially helpful concept in working through the many conscious and unconscious processes by which “sources” — other texts or films — are used by filmmakers, as well as the intricacies of the chains of associations that come to produce the energy and force of individual films for spectators.⁹ As Helen Grace writes of his work,

[intertextuality] understands the relation between the text and its precursor less in a hierarchical sense and more as an exchange, which adds to both text and source and so it breaks out of the logic of “original versus copy,” which has dominated much of the discussion of this problem [...].¹⁰

As Iampolski himself puts it, “the intertextual field of certain texts can be composed of ‘sources’ that were actually written after them.”

By inserting the “source” of a cinematic figure into a film as its subtext, the intertext can also function as a generative mechanism. This also implies a new approach to cinematic language, one distinct from traditional

semiotic analysis, which normally limits its reading of a figure to the confines of a given film (or group of films).¹¹

Iampolski wasn't writing about literal forms of "insertion," of course, but about a process of intertextually motivated reading.¹² At the time his book was published, experiments with digital forms of textuality, or with academic audiovisual "quotation," were still in their relative infancy. But a decade and a half later, in an age of increasing digital and multimedia scholarship, indeed, of "expanded film studies,"¹³ how better to explore filmic connections and 'insertions' of different kinds than to take Iampolski at his word, and experiment with working them through generatively and *practically*, in this way?



[True likeness: On PEEPING TOM & CODE UNKNOWN](#) from [Catherine Grant](#) on [Vimeo](#).

The above video essay was my first attempt at a scholarly kind of "mash up."¹⁴ I wanted to examine the obvious *and* obscure connections between the two films from which it extracts in ways that were both striking and, hopefully, more *precisely* illuminating with regard to their form *as films* than comparisons performed purely in a non-audiovisual format might be.

The form finally taken by my *True likeness* video, however, was inspired by a written text: Brigitte Peucker's 2010 essay "Games Haneke Plays: Reality and Performance."¹⁵ I had been researching the representation of filmmaking and acting in Michael Haneke's 2000 film *Code Unknown: Incomplete Tales of Several Journeys* (original title: *Code inconnu: Récit incomplet de divers voyages*). Peucker's essay opens by setting out, very powerfully, some thoughts on those topics that coincided with my own and others' starting point on this film:¹⁶

Time and again *Code Unknown* presents us with sequences that promote confusion between the diegetic reality of the film and a performance within it, sequences that promote the spectators' uncertainty about the status of the image. [...]

In moving between illusion and diegetic truth, *Code Unknown* provokes in its spectator an uncertainty that is decidedly disturbing: its ludic dimension crosses over into sadistic tricking. But then the film's compelling images catch us up again - at least until we play the spectator game of assembling its narrative fragments, until we try to decipher the film's governing code. This code too remains unknowable.¹⁷

Peucker argues that this unknowability begins with the little girl's charade at the beginning of Haneke's film. Later in her chapter, though, she introduces her highly original argument that, at least in some of the above concerns, Haneke's film "borrows" from Michael Powell's 1960 film *Peeping Tom*. For her, this is especially the case with regard to *Code Unknown*'s "French New Wave-story." This story, one of a number of the multi-protagonist strands in Haneke's film, features Juliette Binoche as Anne, an actress with a live-in partner, Georges (Thierry Neuvic), a war photojournalist who takes hidden camera shots of metro passengers (in a likely echo of Walker Evans' "Many Are Called" project).¹⁸ Peucker writes,

In Powell's film, the central character's sadomasochistic project is to capture on film the quintessential image of (female) fear, "the true expression" of fear, as you will recall, this is what the psychopath — or director — wants from Anne [in *Code Unknown*].¹⁹

In addition to the above comparison, by pointing out a few other plot similarities between *Code Unknown* and Powell's film and by referring to what she regards as the "detached, cold [and cruel] tone" of them both,²⁰ Peucker compellingly (and at length) argues that "*Peeping Tom* looms large" in Haneke's work as a whole. She adds that Powell's film functions as "more than a gloss on Haneke's films, serving as a possible source both for their mini-narratives of child abuse and for a modernist fascination with self-reflexivity and form."²¹

When I started exploring digitised footage from both films in a video editor, not only was I easily able to find some more audiovisual evidence for Peucker's brilliant observations about what *Peeping Tom* specifically "lends" *Code Unknown*, but I could also see that these observations themselves could be taken quite a lot further. Working through the idea of Peucker's "gloss" (a kind of "invisible note in the margin" of Haneke's films), it struck me that *Peeping Tom* could also be deployed audiovisually, as a *cypher-machine* through which one might perform a "cryptanalysis" of the enigmatic, and *incompletely* told, *Code Unknown*. Given that *Peeping Tom*'s screenplay was itself written by wartime cryptographer Leo Marks, this would, of course, be a classic Hanekian funny game.

It would hopefully be an unnecessary tautology to re-summarise in writing everything that *True Likeness* already presents in sounds and images about the connections it generates between the two films. But, after I made this video I did write up the following observations:²²

- Sequences from *Peeping Tom* can very productively be deployed to begin, end, and even echo in reverse visual form, a number of *Code Unknown*'s famously incomplete sequences. (I reversed the sequence of Mark as a boy mutely coming into say goodbye to his dying or dead mother in the silent-film-within-the-film to show the latter).
- The blocking in the two films [camera and character positioning] is at times uncannily similar, and thus an uncanny effect can be achieved by making *Peeping Tom* irrupt in the later film, and *vice versa*.
- Although I didn't include much of this in the final mash up, which I wanted to keep very short because of the online context of its publication, I felt that *Code Unknown*'s *Peeping Tom* connections also cast a great deal of light on the later film's constant play with muteness and sound through its various portrayals of audio and audiovisual recording equipment. The same can be said of Haneke's film's portrayals of exposed and obscured vision, which echo *Peeping Tom*'s representations of blindness, light and dark. One observation on sound that I wished I'd included, though, is an edit to show the striking similarity in rhythm and sensibility of *Code Unknown*'s concluding drum band with the jazzy percussion music in *Peeping Tom*'s screen test sequence.

The experience of making this mash up ultimately led me to disagree strongly with one element in Peucker's argument: that *Peeping Tom* has a "detached, cold [and cruel] tone" to match its cold and cruel narrative events. Being exposed so much to the remarkable musical score of Powell's film — by *working through it* — as well as to its highly expressive visual design, revealed to me, at least, a deeply *elegiac*, although certainly also self-reflexive film that *does* succeed in mourning the otherwise irreversible effects (in its plot) of parental sins being visited on children. Juxtaposing, or overlaying, some of the expressive sensibility of Powell's film with *Code Unknown*'s cooler, more "documentary," aesthetic may work to supplement our experience of Haneke's film with a hitherto deliberately *incomplete* affect. This would be a provocative audiovisual accompaniment, indeed, for the later film's own stories of often weeping, frightened, bewildered, and inadequately *recognised* child and adult characters.

With their precise juxtapositions of film material, which unfold in real space and time, video essays, or assemblages, like the one above, can introduce us to the "unconscious optics" of particular instances of intertextuality.²³ Clearly, as I noted, one of the elements that *True Likeness*'s sequential montage can show more precisely than other formats is the uncanny resemblance of the blocking in certain sequences of the two films. Indeed, the video montage allows us not just to know this, but also to *experience* it, powerfully, sensually, in part through its affectively charged morphing aesthetic. It is this aspect, I believe, that comprises much of the new knowledge discovered through and articulated in my research. My video doesn't just *illustrate* Brigitte Peucker's argument about *Peeping Tom* and *Code Unknown*, or my additions to it: it expands upon these, and then goes on to present new, phenomenological, as well epistemological, evidence for the connections between these two films.

This potential for new kinds of research discoveries through audiovisual film studies forms has led me to continue with my videographic explorations of intertextuality. But, since *True Likeness*, I have opted to use simultaneous rather than sequential forms of montage. This move wasn't especially thought through in advance; it was born more of a curiosity to see what might be possible in intertextual film studies with picture-in-picture and multiple-screen effects in the non-linear editing programmes I was using. But I had already started to research split-screen forms in contemporary film.²⁴ And in some other work, I had also begun to think through this second form of montage from the point of view of its scholarly and affective potential.²⁵

Below are embedded the four, multiple-screen, comparative film studies videos I have produced to date, together with some notes about their aims. Please watch each video before reading the texts that follow them.



[IMPERSONA](#) from [Catherine Grant](#) on [Vimeo](#).

Partly an experiment in the potential brevity of videographic intertextual comparison, *ImPersona*²⁶ transposes, or “transfuses,” fleeting instances of a similar gesture in two Swedish films: *Persona* (Ingmar Bergman, 1966) and *Låt den rätte komma in* (English: “*Let the Right One In*,” Tomas Alfredson, 2008). It mutes the soundtrack of the first of the two sequences taken from Alfredson’s film, but otherwise uses all the sequences’ original elements in a scaled down form (including timespan and use of full screen) to present not only evidence for, but also an experience of this tiny similarity. The video thus turns on a performance of just one of the intricate chains of associations that have produced the energy and force of Alfredson’s film,²⁷ and also — through the temporal effect of “afterwardsness”²⁸



— of Bergman’s film, also.²⁹

[Garden of Forking Paths? Hitchcock's BLACKMAILS](#) from [Catherine Grant](#) on [Vimeo](#).

Garden of Forking Paths? is a synchronous study of an extant film scene from the silent and sound versions of Alfred Hitchcock’s *Blackmail*.³⁰ In playing the two versions of the sequence together the video affords its viewers an opportunity to scan for all kinds of subtle and unsubtle correspondences as well as differences between the two films. The equal sized screens offer the potential for a comparative form of what Christian Keathley, following Wolfgang Schivelbusch (writing about the advent of train travel), refers to as “panoramic perception,” the capacity to “perceive the discrete, as it rolls past the window indiscriminately,” and “the synthetic philosophy of the glance.”³¹ The video is much more of an assemblage than an essay, but even in the obvious aesthetic choices it makes (using the audio track of the sound version, emphasizing the different lengths of the sequences by blacking out, in due course, the “unnecessary” screen), it seems to have provoked an uncanny effect in its audiences. One commenter described watching it as “spooky.”³² The video certainly enacts and enables the experience of a creeping recognition of *imperfect* doubling, an uncanny disjuncture between its two screens.



[All That Pastiche Allows](#) from [Catherine Grant](#) on [Vimeo](#).

This video is the first in an ongoing series of studies of the aesthetic and affective kinship of some films directed by Douglas Sirk, Todd Haynes and, in future episodes, Rainer Werner Fassbinder.³³ Like *True Likeness*, this video builds on observations made by others (here, director Todd Haynes himself) about the filmic connections being explored, in this case, those of *All That Heaven Allows* (Sirk, 1955) and its “pastiche” *Far From Heaven* (Haynes, 2002) in order to work through Richard Dyer’s understanding of pastiche in relation to affect. With the potential for so many richly patterned elements to become evident through their graphic, live comparison, this video hoped to provide moving evidence both of the intelligence of Haynes’s pastiche, as well as of its precision and the intense care taken in it. With its own stylistic choices, the video also aimed to facilitate a direct experience of the two films’ mutually “enfolding–unfolding”



aesthetics.³⁴

[Uncanny Arrival at a Railway Station](#) from [Catherine Grant](#) on [Vimeo](#).

This video, first published in a study of railways and the cinema, emerged as part of a project to look back at my childhood cinephilia from my present-day film scholarly perspective.³⁵ *The Railway Children* (Lionel Jeffries, 1970) was a film I ardently and repeatedly watched on television as a child, and I have seen and loved it countless times since. I had certainly watched it long before I remember seeing *L'Arrivée d'un train en gare de la Ciotat* (Lumière Bros., 1895). I noticed the resemblance between the two films only when

watching Jeffries' film again recently. But when I explored this, I was struck by the extent of the resonance, and by the uncanniness of the later film's pastiche of the earlier one: Bernard Cribbins' Perks revivifies, down to his moustache, the La Ciotat station porter; an identical luggage trolley lurks in the background; the beshawled woman looks like she stepped off the earlier train, except that she's in Technicolor.

I began to figure, to fantasize, that the uncanniness of *The Railway Children's* penultimate sequence was not only set off by its graphic and musical evocation of the uncertainty of young Bobbie (Jenny Agutter) about quite why she was standing by the rail track, but also by its palpable haunting by the Lumières' originary scene, with its powerful, ghostly, *urtext* of a much more bustling railway platform just after the arrival of cinema. As Thomas Elsaesser writes in his remarkable essay on railway traumas "One Train May Be Hiding Another,"

Neither distant nor near, history has become a kind of perpetual action replay, a ghost-dance of the undead. Like a moving train, it seems to pass ours, possibly in the opposite direction, with human beings facing us through brightly lit carriage windows.³⁶

For me, and possibly some other viewers, too, *The Railway Children's* afterwardsness³⁷ will also always haunt *L'Arrivée d'un train en gare*.



[The Vertigo of Anagnorisis](#) from [Catherine Grant](#) on [Vimeo](#).

My latest comparative film study³⁸ also involves a moment of recognition through a return to another personally charged film, indeed to two personally charged films: *Vertigo*, a favourite Hitchcock film, and *Star Wars Episode V: The Empire Strikes Back* (Irvin Kershner, 1980) which I remember seeing in the cinema with my family three years before I was told that the father who had raised me was not my biological parent. I hadn't really been aware of any specific aesthetic resemblance between the two films. But they were already connected for me: I had written about both of them at *Anagnorisis*, one of my research blogs in which, for probably obvious personal, as well as academic, reasons, I had set out to explore the cultural theme and scene of dramatic moments of recognition or personal discovery, moments that Hitchcock and Kershner's films share.³⁹ I became aware of the deeper similarities and inverted echoes only recently, after seeing thumbnail images from the chosen sequences juxtaposed in my video editor project library. And — yes — the exploration that followed prompted some dizzying moments of recognition. In order to showcase this discovery to best effect, I opted again for equally sized, horizontally arranged, split screens, but I altered or muted most of the audio track from *Vertigo* — until the final sting. More importantly, I also slowed the *Vertigo* sequence — from its original duration of 1:28.5 to 2:35.8 — in order to create the particular synchronous flow that I felt worked best for this, at times very striking, comparison.

Like *True Likeness* and possibly some of the other works above, this last video, then, may raise for some of its viewers the same issues about "authorial manipulation" that are common to debates about highly melodramatic or, even, documentary films. These may cause particular difficulties in the context of scholarly work, especially given the partly personal motivation of at least some of my videos, as I've acknowledged. These questions may not flag up significantly new limitations for these scholarly forms, however. Videographic film studies do seem to work, it seems to me, in exactly same "intersubjective" zone as that of written film analysis and criticism. As Andrew Klevan and Alex Clayton argue of this zone, "we are immersed in the film as the critic sees it, hence brought to share a deeply involved perspective."⁴⁰ Like written essays, video essays also attempt to "stir our recall" of a film moment or sequence — that is, like writing,

they can't just replay these *neutrally* either.⁴¹ In scholarly settings, even the simplest sequence selection and certainly the simplest montage are forms of argument, whether or not further aesthetic effects are introduced. But, unlike written essays, video essays usually do confront us with some kind of replay of actual film sequences; they do thus have to stand or fall on the cogency of their audiovisual evidence. This, of course, can be one of their distinct advantages. As Christian Keathley writes of Matt Zoller Seitz's illuminating use of split screens in his essays on the influences on the films of Wes Anderson,

While describing [...] Truffaut's influence on Anderson might be reasonably convincing if well written, viewing clips from the two films simultaneously makes the critical insight about influence much more persuasive.⁴²

All the videos embedded above frame similar kinds of phenomenological possibility. They each enable their viewers to experience for themselves linear or synchronous moving image and sound juxtapositions in real time. As well as an exposure to audiovisual argumentation (involving selection of evidence, montage and mise en scene, titling, sound editing and other creative effects), they offer an active viewing process, one of live co-research, or participant observation. Unlike written texts, they don't have to remove themselves from film-specific forms of meaning production to have their knowledge effects on us. And we can *feel*, as well as know about, the comparisons these videos enact.

The active aspects of this medium are especially in evidence in the split-screen or "synchronous" studies above. As Donald G. Perrin writes, in a 1969 study of multiple image communication,

In sequential montage the meaning of each new image is determined by the *context* of what has gone before. In its temporal aspects, sequential montage is analogous to verbal language, where several elements in series determine the total meaning. Simultaneous images interact upon each other *at the same time*, and this is of significant value in making comparisons and relationships. [...] The immediacy of this kind of communication allows the viewer to process larger amounts of information in a very short time. [...] For visual comparisons it seems axiomatic that simultaneous images are more effective than sequentially presented images.⁴³

Juxtaposing selected elements of film footage through multiple screens, as I hope to have demonstrated above, opens up a truly *generative* critical frame for transtextually-motivated audio viewing. Such frames encourage the roaming of a "mobile eye,"⁴⁴ an "active eye," "introceptively, subjectively busy,"⁴⁵ in a "critical trawling operation"⁴⁶ of continuous and unfolding comparison. In other words, the videos call for a perceptual/spectatorial posture⁴⁷ that is very much like the one that Christian Keathley characterises as central to a "cinephiliac" mode of watching films.⁴⁸ This posture also resembles, at times, the kind of ocular "grasping" at patterns that Laura Marks posits as central to "haptic visuality."⁴⁹ As Melinda Barlow writes about Marks's work,

[...] when our eyes move across a richly textured surface, occasionally pausing but not really focusing, making us wonder what we are actually seeing, they are functioning like organs of touch.⁵⁰

Such sensuous methodologies seem to me to be eminently suited to the epistemology and hermeneutics of cinematic intertextuality, of *déjà-viewing*. As Adrian Martin has written, these can involve "powerfully psychic and somatic" acts of reminiscence or recognition which involve "forgetting, distortion, and refashioning — in other words, everything that the unconscious brings to the 'creative act' or the creative process of filmmaking," and of film spectatorship, too.⁵¹

NOTES

1. Mikhail Iampolski, *The Memory of Tiresias: Intertextuality and Film* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998) 47.
2. Sergei Eisenstein, "The Cinematographic Principle and the Ideogram [1929]," *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory and The Film Sense* (Clevedon and New York: World Publishing Co., 1964) 30.
3. Hans Richter, "Der Filmessay: eine neue Form des Dokumentarfilms," paraphrased by Nora Alter, "Memory Essays," *Stuff It: The Video Essay in the Digital Age*, ed. Ursula Biemann (Zurich: Edition: Voldemereer, 2003) 13.
4. Christian Keathley, Comment on "Close Up: The Movie/Essay/Dream," *Scanners*, October 17, 2007.
http://blogs.suntimes.com/scanners/2007/10/close_up_the_movie_essay.html. Last accessed May, 7, 2012. I'd like to register here my warm thanks to Chris for his wonderful contributions to our on-going dialogue about video essays, as well as for the inspiration of his own pioneering work in this field.
5. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: Literature in the Second Degree* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1992) 83-84.
6. Catherine Grant, "La función de 'los autores:' la adaptación cinematográfica transnacional de *El lugar sin límites*," *Revista Iberoamericana*, Vol. LXVIII, Núm. 199, Abril-Junio 2002, pp. 253-268). English translation online here: <http://catherinegrant.wordpress.com/authorfunction/>.
7. Genette 5.
8. Catherine Grant, "Recognizing *Billy Budd* in *Beau Travail*: Epistemology and Hermeneutics of an Auteurist 'Free' Adaptation," *Screen* 43:1, Spring

2002, 57-73. See Iampolski.

9. Here, I am paraphrasing from Grace, Helen, "Review of Iampolski's, *The Memory of Tiresias: Intertextuality and Film*," *Screening the Past*, Issue 7, July 1, 1999. Online at: <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/shorts/reviews/rev0799/hgbr7a.htm>. Last accessed May 28.

10. Grace.

11. Iampolski 246.

12. David Bordwell regards this as transtextual motivation: Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film* (London: Routledge, 1985) 29.

13. In his influential book Gene Youngblood discussed various kinds of filmmaking, moving beyond mainstream commercial cinema, which used special effects, computer art, video art, multi-media environments, multiple screens, and holography. See Gene Youngblood, *Expanded Cinema* (New York: P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1970). I argue that, thanks to easily available and user-friendly forms of digital technology, we are now seeing the emergence, and more widespread acceptance, of a variety of "expanded film studies forms." See my essays: Catherine Grant, "Film and Moving Image Studies: Re-Born Digital? Some Participant Observations," *Frames Cinema Journal*, Summer 2012, online at:

<http://framescinemajournal.com/introductioncatherinegrant>; and "Bonus Tracks: The Making of *Touching the Film Object* and *Skipping Rope* (Through Hitchcock's Joins)," *Frames Cinema Journal*, Summer 2012, online at: <http://framescinemajournal.com/bonustracks>.

14. *Unsentimental Education* was my first video essay, preceding *True Likeness*. Made and published in June 2009 for online circulation, it examined some motifs in Claude Chabrol's 1960 film *Les Bonnes femmes*. It worked through the juxtaposition of edited film clips, and still images, with a (largely) pre-written voiceover. Online at: <http://filmanalytical.blogspot.co.uk/2010/06/unsentimental-education-on-claude.html>. Last accessed May 28, 2012. Before my practical experiences of digital film studies began, I had become interested in DVD culture and published an essay on this:

Catherine Grant, "Auteur machines? Auteurism and the DVD." *Film and Television After DVD*, ed. James Bennet and Tom Brown (London and New York: Routledge, 2008) 101-115. My personal interest in digital video essays became more sustained and, indeed, public after I founded my scholarly blog *Film Studies For Free* (<http://filmstudiesforfree.blogspot.com>) in August 2008 in which I survey, curate links to, and assess the possibilities for online and openly accessible film studies. On the multimedia capabilities of digital publishing, see Christian Keathley, "La Cámara-Stylo: Notes on Video Criticism and Cinephilia," *The Language and Style of Film Criticism*, ed. Alex Clayton and Andrew Klevan (London: Routledge, 2011) 180.

15. Brigitte Peucker, "Games Haneke Plays: Reality and Performance," *On Michael Haneke*, ed. Brian Price and John David Rhodes (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2010) 15-33.

16. Perhaps most notably in Girish Shambu, "Auto-Dialogue" on *Code Unknown*," *Girish*, February 13 2006,

<http://girishshambu.blogspot.co.uk/2006/02/code-unknown-auto-dialogue.html> (last accessed May 28, 2012); Thomas Elsaesser, "Michael Haneke's Mind Games" *A Companion to Michael Haneke*, ed. Roy Grundmann (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010); and, in comments on the "insecurity of the boundaries between the 'I' and the 'not I,'" David Sorfa, "Uneasy domesticity in the films of Michael Haneke," *Studies in European Cinema* 3:2, 2006 (see fn 7, pp. 100-1).

17. Peucker 16-17.

18. See Darren Hughes, "Code Unknown (2000)," *Long Pauses*, February 13, 2006. <http://www.longpauses.com/blog/2006/02/code-unknown-2000.html>. Last accessed May 28, 2012.

19. Peucker 21.

20. Peucker 22.

21. Peucker 26.

22. I published these in note form, along with the video, as follows: "True likeness: Peeping Tom and Code inconnu/Code Unknown," *Filmanalytical*, June 26, 2010. <http://filmanalytical.blogspot.co.uk/2010/06/true-likeness-peeping-tom-and-code.html>. Last accessed May 28, 2012.

23. As Marianne Hirsh writes, "[With 'Das optisch Unbewußte' ['The *Optical Unconscious*'] (1931) Walter Benjamin] is concerned with the invisible that is present inside the visible, those bodily movements that are too minute to be discerned by the human eye and too automatic to impinge on human consciousness. [...] The camera reveals these movements [...]" Maryanne Hirsch, *Family Frames: Photography, Narrative and Postmemory* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997) 117; citing Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zohn (New York: Schocken, 1969) 236-237.

24. Apart from my 2008 article on Mike Figgis's split-screen film *Timecode* (Grant "Auteur machines?"), I also made my video "Establishing Split: On REQUIEM FOR A DREAM," *Filmanalytical*, November 2010. <http://filmanalytical.blogspot.co.uk/2010/11/establishing-split-requiem-102-project.html> and also <https://vimeo.com/16397534>. There is also my related scholarly entry on cinematic split screens at *Film Studies For Free*. Online at: <http://filmstudiesforfree.blogspot.com/2010/11/split-screen-studies.html>.

25. I had already seen Cristina Álvarez López's remarkable video essay "Dobles vidas, segundas oportunidades" which uses split screens to compare *The Double Life of Véronique* (*La Double vie de Véronique*, Krzysztof Kieślowski, 1991) and *Inland Empire* (David Lynch, 2006). Cristina Álvarez López, "Dobles vidas, segundas oportunidades," *Transit: Cine y otros desvíos*, August 12, 2011. <http://cinentransit.com/inland-veronica/> I have translated a longer version of her accompanying essay "Double Lives, Second Chances." Cristina Álvarez López, "Double Lives, Second Chances," trans. Catherine Grant, *Frames Cinema Journal*, Issue 1, July 2012, <http://framescinemajournal.com/doublelivessecond>

26. First published in Catherine Grant, "Video Essays and Scholarly Remix: Film Scholarship's Emergent Forms - Audiovisual Film Studies, Pt 2," *Film Studies For Free*, March 20, 2011. <http://filmstudiesforfree.blogspot.co.uk/2012/03/video-essays-and-scholarly-remix-film.html>. This video was presented at a workshop on 'Video Essays: Film Scholarship's Emergent Form' at the 2012 Society for Cinema and Media Studies Conference, on March 22, 2012 in Boston.

27. Once again, I am paraphrasing from Grace.

28. As Paul Sutton writes, "'Afterwardsness' ('Nachträglichkeit') is a concept that developed out of Freud's work on traumatic neuroses and the abandoned seduction theory." Sutton, "Afterwardsness in film," *Journal for Cultural Research* 8:3, 2004, 386. In his excellent discussion of the relevance of this concept for film, Paul Sutton writes: "The idea of a *Nachträglichkeit* spectatorship is to express the very dynamism of the spectatorial experience, to speak of the reconstructive and creative aspect of spectatorship. This process of spectatorship recreates the films it "remembers" and articulates a certain kind of love at first sight (always already at second sight) of the cinema, the expression of a kind of *après-coup* of the *coup de foudre*."
29. *ImPersona* is also a companion piece to my video meditation on audiovisual film studies theory: Catherine Grant, *Touching the Film Object*. <http://filmanalytical.blogspot.co.uk/2011/08/touching-film-object-notes-on-haptic-in.html>. Last accessed May 28, 2012.
30. First published as Catherine Grant, "Garden of forking paths? Hitchcock's *Blackmails* — a real-time comparison," *Film Studies For Free*, March 12, 2012. <http://filmstudiesforfree.blogspot.co.uk/2012/03/garden-of-forking-paths-hitchcocks.html>. Also see Catherine Grant, "On Hitchcock's *Rope* and *Blackmail*. Or, Technician Dreams in Videographic Film Studies," *Filmanalytical*, May 14, 2012. <http://filmanalytical.blogspot.co.uk/2012/05/on-hitchcocks-rope-and-blackmail-or.html>.
31. Christian Keathley, *Cinephilia and History: Or, The Wind in the Trees* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2006) 43; citing Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Railway Journey* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986) 57-8.
32. See Justin Horton's comment on "Garden of forking paths?": <http://filmstudiesforfree.blogspot.com/2012/03/garden-of-forking-paths-hitchcocks.html?showComment=1331902437844#c5504601629398401987>. Last accessed May 28, 2012.
33. First published in Catherine Grant, "All That Film Pastiche Allows: Fifty+ Online Studies," *Film Studies For Free*, April 15, 2012. <http://filmstudiesforfree.blogspot.com/2012/04/all-that-film-pastiche-allows-fifty.html>. Last accessed May 28, 2012.
34. Laura U. Marks, "Information, secrets, and enigmas: an enfolding-unfolding aesthetics for cinema," *Screen* 50:1, 2009, 96-7.
35. Catherine Grant, "On railways and the Movies," *Film Studies For Free*, May 4, 2012. <http://filmstudiesforfree.blogspot.com/2012/05/en-train-de-cinema-railways-and-movies.html>. Last accessed May 28, 2012.
36. Thomas Elsaesser, "'One train may be hiding another': private history, memory and national identity," *Screening the Past*, Issue 6, 1999. <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/reruns/rr0499/terr6b.htm>. Last accessed May 28, 2012.
37. In his study of cinematic afterwardsness, Paul Sutton writes that "the explicit connection between trauma, trains and early cinema can be seen to persist in an aesthetics of trauma or traumatic impact in contemporary mainstream cinema." See Sutton 390.
38. Made specifically in response to *Mediascape's* kind invitation to contribute an essay on my videographic film studies experiments.
39. See Catherine Grant, "Varieties of 'The Reveal'," *Anagnorisis*, May 25, 2008. <http://catherine-grant.blogspot.co.uk/2008/05/varieties-of-reveal.html>. And Catherine Grant, "Necklaces and Attentive Recognition 1: Hitchcock's *Vertigo*," *Anagnorisis*, July 7, 2008. Online at: <http://catherine-grant.blogspot.co.uk/2008/07/necklaces-and-attentive-recognition-1.html>. Both last accessed May 28, 2012.
40. Andrew Klevan and Alex Clayton, "Introduction," *The Language and Style of Film Criticism*, eds. Andrew Klevan and Alex Clayton (London: Routledge, 2011) 9.
41. Klevan and Clayton 9.
42. Christian Keathley, "*La Caméra-Stylo*: Notes on Video Criticism and Cinephilia," *The Language and Style of Film Criticism*, eds. Andrew Klevan and Alex Clayton (London: Routledge, 2011) 180. See Matt Zoller Seitz, "The Substance of Style, Pt. 1: Wes Anderson and his pantheon of heroes (Schulz, Welles, Truffaut)," *Moving Image Source*, March 30, 2009. <http://www.movingimagesource.us/articles/the-substance-of-style-pt-1-20090330>. This was the first in a five-part series of video essays analyzing the key influences on Wes Anderson's style. [Part 2](#) covers Martin Scorsese, Richard Lester, and Mike Nichols. [Part 3](#) covers Hal Ashby. [Part 4](#) covers J.D. Salinger. [Part 5](#) is an annotated version of the prologue to *The Royal Tenenbaums*.
43. Donald G. Perrin, "A Theory of Multiple-Image Communication," *Educational Technology Research and Development* 17: 4, December 1969.
44. Roger Cardinal, "Pausing Over Peripheral Detail," *Framework* 30-31, 1986, 112-130. Cited by Keathley, *Cinephilia and History*, 42.
45. Vivian Sobchack, "The Active Eye: A Phenomenology of Cinematic Vision," *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 12: 3 (1990), 21-36. Cited by Keathley, *Cinephilia and History*, 40.
46. Paul Willemsen, *Looks and Frictions* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994) 238. Cited by Keathley, "The Cinephiliac Moment."
47. Keathley, *Cinephilia and History*, 41.
48. Keathley, *Cinephilia and History*, 6.
49. See my discussion and video essay about Marks's work and hapticity in relation to videographic film studies: Catherine Grant, "Touching the Film Object? Notes on the 'Haptic' in Videographic Film Studies," *Filmanalytical*, August 29, 2011. <http://filmanalytical.blogspot.co.uk/2011/08/touching-film-object-notes-on-haptic-in.html>. Last accessed May 28, 2012.
50. Melinda Barlow, "[Review of] *Touch: Sensuous Theory and Multisensory Media*," *Canadian Journal of Film Studies*, Fall 2003. http://www.filmstudies.ca/journal/pdf/cj-film-studies122_Marks_touch.pdf. Last accessed May 28, 2012.
51. Adrian Martin, "*Film Remakes* (review)," *The Velvet Light Trap* 61, Spring 2008, 60-62.

Author bio:

Catherine Grant is currently Senior Lecturer in Film Studies in the School of Media, Film and Music at



the University of Sussex, UK. Author and editor of film studies videos as well as of numerous written studies of authorship theories, film adaptation, post-dictatorship cinema, and world cinema, she runs the *Film Studies For Free*, *Filmanalytical* and *Audiovisualcy* websites and, in 2012, guest edited the inaugural issue of online cinema journal *Frames* on digital forms of film studies. She is the founding editor of REFRAME (<http://reframe.sussex.ac.uk>), a new digital platform for research in media, film and music, hosted by the School of Media, Film and Music, University of Sussex, and co-editor of REFRAME's peer-reviewed journal *Sequence*.



Déjà-Viewing? Videographic Experiments in Intertextual Film Studies by Catherine Grant is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).