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1.1 Justification

Recent excursions into the rhetorical criticism of nonoratorical forms of public address in the last decade may or may not be significantly correlated with the recommendations of the scholars involved in the National Developmental Project on Rhetoric as reported in The Prospect of Rhetoric. Along with such notables as Lloyd Bitzer and Wayne Booth, the Committee on the Advancement and Refinement of Rhetorical Criticism, chaired by Thomas Sloan, called for the "illumination of contemporary rhetorical transactions (i.e., mass media messages, informal conversations, picketing, sloganeering, chanting, singing, marching, gesturing, ritual, and institutional and cultural symbols)."

A sampling of articles from The Quarterly Journal of Speech indicates that, in the area of mass media, the call has been responded to by critics within our field. In scaling the category of mass media down, there seems to be a clear interest in the rhetorical criticism of film; to date, at least three separate analyses of The Exorcist have appeared. However, is this essay justified by recognition that other studies of film by other rhetorical critics
exist or by knowledge that distinguished critics within our field seek the "illumination" of mass media messages? Saying so does not make it so. I prefer to offer my own brief justification by addressing the larger question: Can art (poetic) be analyzed rhetorically?

In "The Senses of Rhetoric: A Topical System for Critics," Thomas Benson outlines a series of nine topoi or critical uses of "rhetoric" by which rhetorical critics can approach a given nonoratorical form of discourse in order to ask the initial questions needed to unravel a novel/poem/film as text. Of immediate interest is Benson's denial that a critic cannot analyze a poetic text from a rhetorical perspective. While Benson's treatment of the conflict involved, that rhetoric and poetic are distinct and separate forms, is admittedly brief, he does make the point, in the words of Kenneth Burke, that the critic may rightly be "interested in bringing the full resources of Poetics and Rhetorica docens to bear upon the study of a text than in trying to draw a strict line of demarcation between Rhetoric and Poetics." Benson realistically acknowledges that if priority is given to the philosophical/theoretical dichotomy between rhetoric and poetic, critics may never get on to the examination of nonoratorical texts. More importantly, he states his case in favor of rhetorically criticizing poetic texts thus: "If rhetorical criticism can lead to the discovery of forms, processes, and effects that might otherwise go unnoticed, then it has made its case."
Thus, Benson has illuminated a philosophical stance which has import for any rhetorical analysis of artistic forms: the point when rhetorical criticism becomes "rhetorical enlightenment." Put another way, should rhetorical critics restrict themselves to analyzing the most obvious forms of political, social, and commercial rhetoric while never making an attempt to examine the more subtle forms of symbolic-qua-mediated persuasion? I think not; the reason is two-fold.

First, technology continues to expand at an exponential rate, providing society with more and different avenues for information-processing (i.e., home computers under $500, hand-held calculator/computers), communication-processing (i.e., cable-satellite assisted television, light-transmitted telephones, audience-response television, laser communication), and aesthetic processing (i.e., computer graphics, computer-enhanced photography, laser photography and sculpture, computer generated musical composition). Insofar as rhetorical critics are, essentially, communication critics, our responsibility to the field of which we are members is to use as our data all forms, processes, and effects of communication among human beings. The foray into any heretofore unexplored artistic communication by rhetorical critics has as its raison d'être that which Aristotle had for examining rhetoric—discovery and subsequent delineation of "all the available means of persuasion."
Nor are we to resist such an exploration because we might be invading the domain of the critic of art. Certainly we have never felt that criticism of political communication was strictly the domain of the political scientist nor that criticism of the religious sermon was the domain only of the theologian or homiletician. Rather, the criticism generated by rhetorical critics takes a different perspective from that of other critics. The data do not define the discipline so much as the method does.

Certainly we can say that contemporary rhetoric's investigation of the aesthetic is in a relatively early stage. Hence, any conclusions made by rhetorical critics should be labeled as discovery and/or enlightenment. Just as our field has relied on the "discoveries" of Aristotle (as attested by the three volumes of History and Criticism Of American Public Address), so have we utilized the "discoveries" of social movement theorists and fantasy theme/rhetorical vision theorists. This entire essay is an attempt to discover and delineate the rhetorical nature of a relatively new form of artistic endeavor: film.

1.2 Artistic Intent

When I began my research for and thinking about this project, I believed that as a rhetorical critic of film I must do everything possible to discover the filmmaker's intent behind the particular film under study as well as the filmmaker's "cinematic viewpoint"--the creative impetus--
the impulse which goads the filmmaker into producing, creating, and/or making a film. But the question which immediately vexes a critic is how does one gain access to the mind of the filmmaker to define intent, etc? How does a critic discover why a filmmaker creates a particular film or film in general as opposed to other creative endeavors (i.e., writing a book, composing a symphony, designing a building, painting a landscape, sculpting a statue or some abstract recreation of an object-in-the-world)? Even if the filmmaker has answered such a question in a myriad of books or interviews, the critic must then assume that what was said by the artist/filmmaker was the whole story. An example from my own experience illustrates this point.

Until a few years ago, though I had often heard the name, the films of Ingmar Bergman were unknown to me. Suddenly, the opportunity to see such films as The Virgin Spring, The Seventh Seal, and Wild Strawberries presented itself on a local Washington D.C. public television station. The depth of meaning which I perceived in these and other Bergman films led me to start reading as many critical works as were available about these films and their maker. Even though many curious images, symbols, and plot twists were revealed and explained to me, I was still puzzled as to the reason(s) for many of these images and symbols as well as the reason(s) behind the many religious and eschatological themes present within Bergman's films.
Finally, after reading Bergman's introduction to a published edition of four of his screenplays, many questions I had about the themes of his movies were answered indirectly by the comments of the filmmaker himself:

People ask what are my intentions with my films—my aims. It is a difficult and dangerous question, and I usually give an evasive answer: I try to tell the truth about the human condition, the truth as I see it. This answer seems to satisfy everyone, but it is not quite correct. I prefer to describe what I would like my aim to be. ¹⁰

Obviously, this is the problem which the critic can run into—an incomplete or entirely fictitious answer from the artist. Regardless of the reason, the critic simply cannot rely on the filmmaker’s response or explanation. The solution to the problem of discovering the artist's intent or "cinematic viewpoint" is a simple one: ignore it. I do not suggest this because of the difficulty involved in defining this intent; rather, I make such a suggestion because the author's intent is unimportant in perceiving a work of art. In order to explain, let me first return to Bergman's explanation.

Bergman relates how the cathedral of Chartes was rebuilt by thousands of diversified people after it had been struck by lightning and had burned to the ground. The point was that this collection of workers—master builders, artists,
laborers, priests and townspeople—had all remained anonymous. Bergman then announces that, if asked what he would like the general purpose of his films to be, he would reply that he would want to be one of the artists involved in the rebuilding of the cathedral.11

[It is my opinion that art lost its basic creative drive the moment it was separated from worship .... In former days the artist remained unknown and his work was to the glory of God .... The ability to create was a gift. In such a world flourished invulnerable assurances and natural humility .... [Thus] I want to make a dragon's head, an angel, a devil—or perhaps a saint—out of stone. It does not matter which; it is the sense of satisfaction that counts. Regardless of whether I believe or not, whether I am a Christian or not, I would play my part in the collective building of the cathedral.12

The point that I believe Bergman is making is the unimportance of the artist's intent behind the work of art. One certainly does not have to know about the artist or his state of mind at the time of the work's creation to appreciate, understand, or perceive that work. One can still realize some "meaning" (or whatever is communicated) when viewing David's "Oath of the Horatii" without knowing what the artist was trying to convey. One's perceptions of
reality will still be altered to some degree when viewing a painting by a French impressionist or seeing the Cathedral at Notre Dame for the first time without knowing what the artists "meant." Indeed, the concept of the universality of art would probably not exist if every perceiver of art had to know beforehand what the artist intended to "say" with the work. Also, "if the work of art were exclusively, or even predominantly, to be an expression of its originator's personality, what significance would it have for other people, other perceivers?" The important question to be resolved before going any further is whether the critic should take into account the intentions of the artist even if they may be unreliable (assuming these intentions can even be defined). For, the perceiver cannot "assume that the expressive quality [of a work] is always and precisely adequate to what was experienced by the artist in his creative process." Because his discussion on the intentionalist critic is appropriate here, a return to Benson is in order.

The intentionalist critic is interested in symbolic forms deliberately constructed as persuasion, argument, or propaganda. Since these rhetorical efforts occur in forms other than written or oral argument, the critic, according to Benson, must rely either on external evidence of suasive intent, or, internal evidence arising from a close reading of the text. (Apparently, this type of film criticism best fits the documentary film, rather than the fictional
variety because of the more obvious intent, if not to persuade, at least to inform the viewer.)

Without elaborating, Benson states that the intentional-
alist typically desires to understand the shape of the text and its potential effect and that the critic must shift attention "to rhetorical resources and social and psychological contexts to make a reading of the text." We might infer from these comments the intentionalist's reliance on structure, invention (topoi), and audience analysis. Unfortunately, the critic may not always have at his disposal the same inventional sources as the filmmaker (though a comparable knowledge of film theory would make easier the burden placed on the critic). A close viewing of the film may also reveal the filmmaker's conception of the audience; but will that conceived audience be the same which views the film? In this day and age of relatively amorphous audiences whose composition the filmmaker does not generally control (beyond subject matter and M.P.A.A. audience rating), the critic will be hard-pressed to reach specific conclusions about the viewers of a specific film. Thus, we return to the only sure factor in analyzing the film: its own structure (form).

But this is not an analysis to reveal the artist's intent behind the work of art; rather, it is an attempt to reveal the intent of the work of art. "The expressiveness of a work of art is sustained by its own composed elements and not by its relation to the circumstantial emotions or
even the creative goals of the artist.18 As alluded to earlier, we cannot even be certain of what the artist intends in his work. But again, that is not a reason for disregarding artist's intent. There is a more fundamental and philosophical reason—it is irrelevant in our perception of the work.

Even in other cases where we have documents against which we may check the artist's actual project of execution in the effort to discover if he intended to express himself in a certain way... what nonetheless concerns us is not the work's relationship to the artist's experienced intentions but, instead, the intentional psychic state embodied in the work.19

In perceiving the work of art, we should not divert our attention from the work by an unnecessary pursuit of verifiable intentions. It is the work itself which necessarily concerns us as perceivers of the aesthetic.

At this point, a reminder of the basic characteristics of art as outlined by Jan Mukařovský is profitable. A work of art:

(1) is objective.
(2) exists independently of changing emotions.
(3) does not call upon the perceiver for an emotional reaction—rather, to understand it.
(4) is directed to man in his entirety (appeals
to all men).

(5) is created for a multitude.

(6) in itself is organized intentionally.\textsuperscript{20}

The only thing which must be remembered about the intent behind a work of art in terms of the artist is that the work was organized intentionally.

\[\text{It is quite evident that the attitude toward the object is not left to the viewer's whim but that the work itself in its organization directly induces the viewer to focus his attention on itself, or the set of its properties and on the internal organization of this set, and not to look beyond the work for some external aim which it could serve.}\textsuperscript{21}

Therefore, inasmuch as the rhetorical critic is concerned with how the film itself alters the viewer's perceptions of reality, that critic should focus on the film itself and leave all other considerations of the artist's intentions about the film to the sociologists, Freudian and Jungian psychologists, or the auteur critic. The rhetorical critic should dwell upon and analyze the object as it is perceived. As Rosenfield noted more than a decade ago, "the artist's intentions are ancillary to our primary concern, which is artistic intention."\textsuperscript{22}

For those rhetorical theorists and critics who would argue that the artist cannot be cast aside and forgotten, two more points should be made. First, I think it obvious
that film is a form of art with rhetorical properties (properties with ability to alter our "knowledge-of-the-world") and should be approached as such. It is not a form of rhetoric which happens to have aesthetic properties. Second, the goal of this thesis is to discover and delineate those rhetorical properties and not to devise a method by which a critic can pass judgment about the effectiveness of the artist's presentation of some rhetorical cum psychological/historical/sociological theme. A work of art should not be utilized as an historical or sociological document without preliminary interpretation of its documentary (informational) value.  

As will be seen shortly, earlier studies engaged in rhetorically criticizing film are exercises in discovery and judging the theme. I propose to analyze rhetorical structure--how the film leads the viewer to apprehend the "meaning" of the film. Here, it should be noted that I take the same view of "meaning" as Mukarovsky.  

The understanding that the artistic sign establishes among people . . . [concerns] a certain attitude toward things, a certain attitude on the part of man toward the entire reality that surrounds him . . . . The work does not, however, communicate this attitude--hence the intrinsic artistic "content" of the work is all inexpressible in words--but evokes it directly in the perceiver. We call this
attitude the "meaning" of the work only because it is rendered in the work objectively by its organization.

The quest in this essay is to discover and delineate all the available means by which a film can and does evoke the "meaning" in the perceiver. Only afterwards can the discipline of rhetoric begin to judge the efficacy of that evocation.

Beginning with essays which analyze specific films and continuing with essays which approach general theoretical aspects of writing film criticism, I shall review suggested critical methods for the rhetorical analysis of film. This review focuses on those conceptions used to account for elements of the plastic material itself (i.e., the images projected on the screen comprised of shots, scenes, and sequences which are in turn structured by cuts and transitions) and are therefore indigenous to the nature and substance of film rather than those elements which also occur in other artistic forms (i.e., plot, characterization, and theme). It should be noted that the majority of critical essays (on specific films) in the following review do not focus on the plastic material and are mainly attempts at sociological/psychological criticism rather than a rhetorical analysis of strictly filmic elements.
1.3 Review of Literature

In a pair of essays by Rushing and Frentz which appeared in *Western Speech*—"The Rhetoric of 'Rocky': A Social Value Model of Criticism," and "The Rhetoric of 'Rocky': Part Two"—the authors (1) outline a social-value model of rhetorical criticism and (2) utilize this model to examine the political context surrounding the film by demonstrating the pattern of value change present within it.\(^{25}\) The authors assert that their model, if explicitly formulated and functionally clear, "should operate heuristically to reveal the nature of the political context that impinges on a film . . . and the specific exigence to which it is a response."\(^{26}\) Without further study, a critic might assume that this particular model would be helpful in the analysis of any given film if that critic desires to examine political constraints upon and potential social change exhibited by the film under analysis. The model posited may indeed be applicable to all films but be providing only one or two specific answers. Nor is this method limited to the analysis of film. There is no attempt to analyze the plastic material itself (beyond the use of analyzing specific scenes). Rather, Rushing and Frentz offer a method which could be applied without any knowledge of film theory and which may even be adjusted slightly to investigate novels or plays. This does not mean their method is inappropriate; I would assert, however, that a critical methodology of the film should include, if not be limited to, those elements of the
medium which are unique to that medium. Only then, if at all, can we begin to see how the medium is effective in potentially changing the attitudes and perceptions of an audience.

Similarly, Rushing and Frentz have recently devised a model for their analysis of The Deer Hunter. For this film, the authors posit a psychological/ritual model which relies on Jungian psychology and Mircea Eliade's perspective on ritual. In their own words, the authors' entire analysis of the film consists of an exploration of: (1) the psyches of the three major characters, (2) the initiation rituals in terms of their mythic potential and how the characters experienced them, and (3) the changes in the characters' psyches as a result of war. Primarily, this analysis relies on dialogue among the characters in addition to elements of plot and limited description of certain scenes. The authors conclude that The Deer Hunter projects war as a universal initiation ritual and, yet, they admit that the rhetorical stance presented within the film has various interpretations (none of which can be ruled out on the basis of their model).

It is not undeniably clear whether the film is rabidly anti-war, whether it merely portrays what war does to people under both sacred and profane experiences and proclaims nothing, or whether it implicitly advocates personal and societal transcendence through killing.
Again, I do not suggest that the model presented by Rushing and Frentz is incorrect nor inappropriate. As an exercise in psychological/mythical criticism, their essay can provide insights for those readers who have (and even those who have not) seen The Deer Hunter. However, their essay does not address its analysis to those particular elements of the film which specifically define film as a separate artistic medium. Instead, Rushing and Frentz seem to present a form of criticism more analogous to literary criticism than to rhetorical criticism. Theirs is an interpretation of the film's theme/meaning rather than an analysis of how the filmic elements of shot, scene, sequence, cut, etc. persuade the viewer to consider and/or adopt that particular theme/meaning.

That which is lacking in the critical essays cited above receives cursory examination in the following three essays (all of which base their analyses on the level of the image). In "The Exorcist: Images of Good and Evil," Schuetz examines the film from an organistic perspective by utilizing the contrary symbols of yin and yang as a paradigm. Her analysis "does not adopt the typical rhetorical, film, or dramatic perspectives." Rather, the author uses a paradigm derived from the I Ching in order to explain how viewers may interpret the film differently.

Of course, any one perceiver will probably differentiate with some images, identify with others, transcend others, and synthesize still
others, being influenced or affected to the extent that the images are relevant to his own frame of reference. 35

By focusing on unresolved images of good and evil elicited from the setting, character development, and the climactic action, 36 Schuetz concludes that the film influences viewers in various ways because these "opposing images permit the viewer an open-ended interpretation of the film . . . ." 37

While admitting that each viewer's interpretation of the film is linked to a person's frame of reference 38 (a range of personal experience brought by a multitude of viewers to the film), the author does not address the question of an audience's single and crucial shared frame of reference: The common manner in which we, as film viewers, apprehend the flow of shot-shot/scene-scene in order to understand the narrative structure of the film as a whole.

For example, the author discusses the opening scene in which a Jesuit archeologist "is taking part in the excavation of an ancient ruin. The focus of the scene is [the] discovery within a single site of two symbols--one a sculptured head of a demon and the other a St. Benedict Medal used in Catholic exorcism." 39 By linking this scene with the symbols of yin and yang, Schuetz begins the development of her thesis. However, there is no preceding explication of exactly how these objects are presented within the film. Are they presented sequentially in close-up? Are they
viewed together in close-up or in some type of shot which contains part or all of the entire ruin? How is it obvious to the critic and/or the viewer that these objects are important to the story line? Put another way, how are these objects presented in order to ensure that the viewer will realize their significance/meaning as opposing symbols of yin and yang, good and evil, light and dark, etc.?

Essentially, the Schuetz essay is an analysis of a particular film utilizing two complementary symbols from Chinese philosophy as a paradigm to evaluate that same film. The author's conclusion that "several kinds of responses are possible—viewers who are unwilling to suspend disbelief, those who dichotomize and have to find a winner, and those who transact with the yin and yang as a unity"—overlooks those viewers who suspend belief for the duration of the film and view the action on the screen as a typical example of two forces or entities in conflict: The very essence of drama. However, there is an avenue to be explored which is more important than any given response to the film: How does a particular film in its presentation create or invite the suspension of disbelief? In other words, how is the viewer led (persuaded) to suspend disbelief? Just as a persuasive argument has a particular structure which leads the audience (hopefully) to accept the claim, should not the film have a particular structure of shots and scenes which allows the viewer to suspend disbelief temporarily and accept the view of reality which the film presents? This,
I believe, must be the starting point for the rhetorical criticism of any film. Without an appropriate acceptance of the drama being played out in the film, how can the viewer begin to accept any of the possible interpretation(s) of the film or the film's rhetorical message (unless already predisposed to accept)?

A recent approach beginning to move in the direction of analyzing the structure of a film is Martin Medhurst's "Image and Ambiguity: A Rhetorical Approach to The Exorcist." Medhurst attempts to answer two questions about the film dealing with (1) potential meanings and (2) variation in perceived meaning. The author asserts that an analysis of how viewers attribute meaning to filmic images should examine the images themselves in light of their potential rhetorical impact. Basing his analysis on Burke's concept of associational clusters, the author traces three primary visual images (supported by aural and verbal image) and argues for a quasi-religious interpretation of the film. By focusing his analysis on three recurring image cues, Medhurst appears to have taken a step toward a structural/semiotic approach in concluding that certain images, by way of presentation and ordering, recur throughout the film and provide the viewer/critic with interpretive clues to the meaning of the film. Medhurst's analysis emphasizes the basic struggle between good and evil and that human beings must consciously will the good and act on that choice.
Though Medhurst charts a typology of associational clusters (objects = objects = good or evil) through six episodes of the film, he asserts that his analysis is "informed by both auteur theory and structuralism though it is synonymous with neither . . . . [nor does this essay] purport to follow any particular theory of structuralism or semiotics . . . .". Rather, the author seems to have constructed a pseudo-structural/semiotic analysis by selecting six scenes from the film which contain certain signs interpreted as indicating the abstract concepts of good and evil and/or central characters of the drama. Thus, the reader is subjected to an analysis which has selected no more than three objects which occur in a total of six episodes (as defined by the author) and which asserts that the film's "basic contention is that mankind has a choice to make . . . between the forces of good and the legions of evil."  

Granted, a full-blown analysis of all images and scenes may not be possible in the average space of a journal article. However, the author himself suggests strongly that the critic, in order to discover the central statement offered by the filmmaker, conduct a "structural analysis of the images presented." This statement is given added emphasis in light of Medhurst's own quoting from Benson:

An analysis of the tokens, the icons in their rhetorical dimension, must proceed by a close analysis of the images themselves, their
immediate context in a sequence of images that constitutes the film as a whole . . .

Taken in concert, the statements by both Medhurst and Benson do not suggest a selective approach but rather a complete analysis of all images which comprise the totality of the film. There is no way of knowing whether Medhurst conducted a complete analysis of the images preliminary to writing his essay. However, Medhurst's own comments suggest that his was a selective approach. In reference to his method, Medhurst uses phrases such as "By applying this equational scheme to key images in The Exorcist," "it is possible to chart some of the equational structures," and "By examining three primary visual cues." In addition, Medhurst admits to choosing the three particular images "because they reappear in one form or another throughout the film." Here, several questions must be raised. First, who decided that the images chosen are "key" or "primary" images? Second, had Medhurst arrived at the central value assertion of the film and then sought the equational structures to support such an assertion? And last, are there other images which support (or negate?) the conclusions to which Medhurst arrives? The first two questions are meant to speak for themselves. The third question is resolved in the following discussion which illustrates the problem of selective analysis.

Medhurst derives his first "equation" from the opening scene wherein Fr. Merrin is surrounded by the wind at the
archeological dig. Having recognized that the blowing wind is associated with evil, Medhurst does not seem to find any significance in his own description of the scene:

As Merrin faces the statue of an ancient god the wind begins to blow. Immediately, he turns to the left while the director cuts to a two-shot of fighting dogs. The wind continues to swirl around the contorted figures of the dogs while Merrin turns to the right. Immediately, the director cuts to the lonely figure of an Arab keeping watch over the ruins. The wind swirls about him. Finally, Merrin returns his gaze to the statue . . . . As Merrin beholds the statue, the wind increases in intensity until the ancient god is obscured by the blowing dust.52

Using Medhurst's own methodology we can further infer the impending confrontation between Merrin and the (demon) wind because the wind begins to blow when Merrin faces the statue and eventually becomes so strong as to envelop the statue and its immediate surroundings. This scene, when taken in its totality, presages the defeat of Merrin later in the film.

Certainly, these "associational clusters" (wind = evil, Merrin = good, wind envelops Merrin = defeat of good by evil) are no less credible than those which Medhurst discusses; equally as certain is that they too enhance our understanding of the first of Medhurst's two basic questions:
"What are the potential meanings one might attach to the film?" If such clusters support some of Medhurst's conclusions, why are they not mentioned?

For another example of selective analysis I move ahead to the movie's climax where Fr. Karras falls to his death from a bedroom window in (presumably) an act of faith to destroy the demon which he has invited to leave the body of the possessed Regan into his own. First, Medhurst has likened Karras to good because he wears a St. Christopher's Medal. But why this medal and not another, more recognizable, religious artifact, such as a crucifix, if the director's intent is to replace the symbol of the priestly collar to indicate Karras is good? Medhurst does not seem to recognize the importance of the fact that St. Christopher was a martyr. Thus, not only does Karras equal good, but Karras equals martyr. Further, in an earlier dream sequence (description of which is relegated to a content note by Medhurst), the audience has seen the medal crash to a sidewalk. Clearly, the association to be made is that Karras will also, somehow, crash to a sidewalk. (If the medal equals good and Karras equals good because he wears the medal, it also follows that the medal equals Karras.)

With selective analysis, there is always a danger that the critic will ignore or oversimplify the potential meanings within the structure of a film.

A second problem in the Medhurst essay, when viewed in conjunction with the Schuetz essay mentioned above, is the
question of variable interpretations placed on the film by viewers. Schuetz asserts that these different interpretations follow from the viewers' unique frames of reference (see above p. 17). Medhurst asserts that these interpretations derive from the ambiguous structure of the film: "the varying interpretations of Friedkin's film can be accounted for in large part by taking note of his use of ambiguity."56 I am not suggesting that either one of the authors is wrong in his or her conclusion of various viewer interpretations. After all, the conclusions of both authors are based upon their analysis of selected images. Are there other images within The Exorcist which contradict their findings? How can we (as readers of both essays) tell unless we are presented with the totality of data (images)? If we do not allow the empiricist to ignore data which may negate the findings he expects, how can we expect any less from a critic of film (or any other form of public address)?

The denigration of these authors' conclusions is not my intention so much as pointing out the fallacy of selective criticism in regard to a form of public address which must be viewed as a work of art in its totality. Another essay which parallels Medhurst's is "Joe: An Essay in the Rhetorical Criticism of Film" by Thomas Benson. Like Medhurst, Benson seeks to explain the audience's interaction with the work.57 Also like Medhurst, Benson analyzes the images presented in Joe by utilizing a methodology which is "influenced by, but makes no claim to represent, orthodox
semiology or structuralism."

The apparent influence of semiology and structuralism is much stronger than the reader might believe after having read the entire essay which emphasizes plot twists, analysis of the central (title) character, and the film's lack of authenticity. For Benson, a rhetorical artifact is a sign which "bears meaning of an intentional sort, best characterized by discursive structure, but also present in non-discursive forms which exhibit the marks of discourse, that is, which reveal meaning units in a syntax which tends towards a propositional synthesis." Even though Benson is not "seeking a definitive position on 'film language,'" he is asserting that the film is made up of signs which are structurally oriented to manifest at least three types of rhetoric: (1) a formal rhetoric, operating as a series of implicit propositions about structures, governing the shape of the work as if unfolds, (2) an internal rhetoric creating the context of values and relevant knowledge which allow the work to be apprehended, or (3) an external rhetoric as a mode of arguing about how we should evaluate, understand, or act in the world. As will be shown in more detail later, all three of these types should be the concern of the critic using a sign-theory based methodology to analyze film. For, all three are essentially derived from the signs themselves and the structure of those signs within the given work of art.

Benson recognizes the import of analyzing the signs which comprise the film as a whole by focusing on those
signs (he terms them "images") and their contextual relationship with other signs.

In summary, I take the rhetoric of filmic images to encompass the messages which emerge from the interpretation of visual images and their context, context being understood to arise from such fundamentals as repetition, juxtaposition, duration, in short, any situation in which it is possible to speak of the dialectical relationships within a film and between a film and its audience.  

An analysis of any given filmic sign requires the discovery of the meaning of that sign as defined by its content and relationship with other filmic signs.

In conclusion, two important points need to be made about the strategy which Benson has proposed for investigating the rhetorical dimension(s) of film. First, perhaps unknowingly, Benson's method has focused on two of the three major areas of semiotics as outlined by Charles Morris: syntactics and pragmatics. Syntactics is the study of the relation of signs to one another while pragmatics is the study of the relation of signs to interpreters (perceivers/film viewers). However, Benson has neglected to refer explicitly to the analysis of signs and their relation to the objects which they designate: the domain of semantics. And yet, if the rhetoric of a film is revealed by "an analysis of the iconography of these tokens [images]," then the investigation of the semantic level is necessary.
for any thorough analysis of a film. For Benson's use of iconography suggests a reference to iconic signs: signs which have properties of the objects which they denote. Therefore, any rhetorical criticism of film which utilizes some semblance of a semiotic analysis should operate within the three areas of semantics, syntactics, and pragmatics.

Second, Benson's comment that the study of the contextual relations provides clues to how the audience is likely to apprehend the imagery would seem to indicate that a total analysis of the signs does not have to presume that a viewer is aware of or attends to all of the imagery and its meaning(s). I would assert (I believe Benson would also) that a complete analysis of the film's sign system can indicate how the viewer may apprehend significant (to the viewer) portions of that imagery. (If we are to accept the conclusions of Schuetz, viewers' differing perceptions of a film can be attributed to differing frames of reference.) According to Mukarovsky,

The originator determines the organization of the work, whereas the perceiver confronts a finished work, and he can interpret it in various ways. This conceptual process on the perceiver's part occurs only in a fleeting moment, whereas the work itself endures. Still, the possibility exists that viewers will (can) perceive the film or portions of the film in the same manner and attribute the same meanings as do other viewers.
In part, this question of viewer apprehension is raised in Ted Perry's "A Contextual Study of M. Antonioni's Film L'ECLISSE."

In order to illustrate how meaning is created intra-referentially (meaning created through context) in the film, Perry offers an example of a shot from the film in which two characters, viewed from high angle, are seen crossing a street at a pedestrian crossing marked with the conventional European black and white horizontal bars.

After offering an explanation of the meaning created in the shot, the author states:

If the viewer has integrated the film fully up to this point, he will see the couple's crossing of the street within a specific range of feelings and attitudes developed earlier in the film, but which otherwise he might not associate with stripes on a street.

Thus, whether the viewer perceives the intra-referential meaning or not does not seem to be of concern to Perry: the "intra-referential context determines the meaning of the poem rather than the referential meaning which the reader brings to it." According to Perry, there is an "incessant conflict between the value context's struggle to make new meaning and the fact context's capacity to produce predetermined responses." (Fact context consists of those parts of the physical world signified by the motion picture images; value context consists of the attitudes, impressions, and values through which the film fixes the fact context so
that the latter will be perceived in a specific way.\textsuperscript{74} For Perry, the final question is about the "film's innerstructure of interconnected motifs" and not the correspondence between sign and phenomenon nor truth or falsity\textsuperscript{75} nor, implicitly, the completeness of the viewer's integration/perception of the film's value context.

This somewhat lengthy discussion is not to suggest that viewer's perceptions are of no importance. However, what must be stated is that an analysis of any aesthetic object need not make claims about whether or not the work is apprehended \textit{in toto} by the average viewer. Naturally, preoccupation with a question such as that would imply some judgment about the effectiveness of the filmmaker's technique or overall plan for the subject matter of the film. Truly, the critic is a viewer; hopefully, the critic will be making an involved and repeated study of the film or work under consideration. The critic's concern, at this stage, should be with the work itself and not with providing a detailed analysis of, say, how many numbers of viewers understood the psychological/sociological import of the theme or concluding that a particular film is "not very effective because, after all, nobody has understood the real meaning as I have." If we are to be able to discover and delineate the means by which a film is apprehended, we must begin with the artist's completed work. The object of the criticism of art is the work itself.
Criticism is judgment. The material out of which judgment grows is the work, the object... judgment has to evoke a clearer consciousness of constituent parts and to discover how consistently these parts are related to form a whole.

This statement by John Dewey, in *Art as Experience*, implicitly stands as a guideline for that critic who utilizes semiotics and its three levels to analyze a work of art. By analyzing each part of the work (e.g., each shot of a film) and its relation to other parts to form an integral whole, the critic can provide new insights through the "explication of the content of an object as to substance and form, rather than just acquittal or condemnation on the basis of merits and demerits." However, besides analyzing the parts of the whole, there is also an inherent need to investigate structure. Close attention to structure is required in order to discover how the various parts relate to form a whole.

According to Dewey, judgment is comprised of analysis and synthesis where analysis discloses "details and particulars as belonging to total situation, a universe of discourse," and synthesis distinguishes "particulars and parts with respect to their weight and function in formation of an integral experience." Apparently, Dewey would agree that an analysis of how the various parts (shots) of a film relate to each other and combine to form the work of art is...
the unification function of judgment (synthesis). In addition, discrimination (analysis) might best be served by semiotic analysis--viewing each constituent part of a film as a sign which designates some "object" (I say might because, at this stage, nothing about semiotics has been established as absolute in its efficacy as a methodological tool for a rhetorical/aesthetic criticism of film). Discrimination of parts is the starting point for criticizing art.

We must understand the structure of art before we can evaluate art. To say that a work is "good" or "beautiful" or "inferior" is only the beginning of evaluation. If the judgment is to have any claims upon the opinions of others, we must be prepared to support it with reasons. These characteristically take the form of pointing to the elements which make up the work . . . . Study of the structure of art enables us to single out these elements and estimate their importance. 80

The critic must begin with the work itself. Obviously, I have suggested all along that a semiotic analysis of the film can provide what is necessary for the critic to construct a complete analysis at that starting point. More obviously, this assertion is one of the primary questions to be addressed in this essay. Of interest, consequently, are two recent articles which must be mentioned because of their specific attention to structure.
The first of these two articles, "The City: The Rhetoric of Rhythm," by Medhurst and Benson, analyzes a documentary film to show how rhythm relates to the formation of filmic meanings. The authors argue that the filmmakers of The City construct their formal appeals through extensive use of metric and rhythmic montage. Medhurst and Benson utilize the concepts of metric and rhythmic montage as delineated by Sergei Eisenstein. Based on their analysis of the film's five segments, the authors conclude that (1) rhythmic forms appeal to and reveal the innate psychological processes of human beings and (2) the filmmakers realized the aesthetic and rhetorical value of rhythm.

As opposed to those articles discussed above, this essay on The City serves as an example of criticism which takes into account all of the shots and how they are structured within a particular film. However, in no way is this article to be seen (nor did the authors intend it to be) as a semiotic analysis of film. While the method is structural in nature, Medhurst and Benson analyze only one part of how the meaning of a film is constructed (apprehended) by a viewer. In addition to the rhythm of cutting, the authors assert that cinematic knowledge also relies on shot content, structural relationships of shots to one another and context. While these elements of the film are not the focus of Medhurst and Benson, the authors confirm the importance such filmic elements hold for criticism which seeks to understand how a film viewer apprehends filmic
content and meaning.

The second article of note which looks at structure is an analysis of three episodes of the CBS series *Lou Grant*. In "The Grande Syntagmatique: A Methodology for Analysis of the Montage Structure of Television Narratives," Michael J. Porter adapts a methodology for studying narrative in film first developed by Christian Metz. While this method has its roots in the semiotics of Saussure, it is not an approach which specifically speaks to the problem of how a viewer arrives at an understanding of a film's content. Rather, Metz's (hence, Porter's) method is essentially an analysis of narrative structure and not of how the individual shots of a film combine in such a way that the viewer is led to conclusions about the film's content. For Porter, the utility of this methodology is its ability to determine if episodes within a television series share a common montage structure. In addition, Porter believes that this method can be used in the description of television program genres and stylistic elements of a given series as a variable in determining a program's success or failure in the ratings. While these are significant questions for critics of both film and television, there is still a need for the discovery of how viewers come to share common meanings from the images presented on the screen.

Heretofore, this review of literature has focused on specific criticisms of specific films. There are, in addition, three essays which address the criticism of film
from a general theoretical perspective. The first of these is "The Rhetoric of Film: Toward A Critical Methodology" by Jerry Hendrix and James A. Wood.90

This essay posits the use of several rhetorical formulas (e.g., five canons of classical rhetoric, dramatistic pentad, and Berlo's model of communication) in order to reveal the suasive dimensions of a particular film. Unfortunately, this essay seems to suggest a method no different from the "figure study" type so prevalent within the three volumes of The History and Criticism of American Public Address—reducing criticism to an exercise in fitting filmic elements into the categories of a particular rhetorical schema. At best, such an analysis would reveal a catalog of how a filmmaker used ethos, logos, pathos, et cetera.

For example, the authors state: "For our classical framework we shall use the five skills which should be evident in any persuasive message: memory, invention, arrangement, style, and delivery."91 At this point, the authors have already presupposed that either: (1) the filmmaker had a clear intent to persuade or (2) only those films which are overtly persuasive in intent can be analyzed by such a system. Rather, the type of method needed is one which can be used for all films whether they are intended to have a persuasive effect or not.

In another example, the authors state that "camera distance, relative symmetry in pictorial composition, and editing rate and rhythm all contribute to the distinction
between a nervous, forceful style and a stately style." One wonders just how a critic is to translate plain, middle, or grand types of style into cinematic presentation in order to categorize the style of a particular film. The authors do not offer such a formula (nor even hint at one). When considering delivery, the authors believe that a distinction between a "conversational tone and a hortatory tone of delivery . . . seems applicable to the tone established in the viewing situation by introduction and discussion accompanying presentation of the film." How many filmmakers verbally introduce or provide running commentary to their film to every (or any) viewing of that same film? No matter what tone is asserted as being in the work, that tone must be derived from the work itself and not some ancillary explanation of the film's meaning and/or intent by either the filmmaker or "expert" spectators.

More importantly, this essay does not address the question of how the filmmakers show us "their representations and interpretations of social reality." Not only do the authors presuppose that the critic can discover clearly delineated rhetorical schema in a film, but they also implicitly neglect the need to investigate how each shot of a film creates a meaning or points toward some object as an integral part of the filmmaker's representation or interpretation of reality.

Clearly, the formats mentioned by Hendrix and Wood are not incorrect (though some may need theoretical renovation)
for the purposes each type may achieve. However, as academicians, rhetorical critics of film must not assume that only established rhetorical formulas will elicit the kind of answers they are seeking in a particular analysis. Nor can critics assume that only particular methodologies will be appropriate for particular types of film. The question which must be asked is: "Is there a single method which can be employed for the analysis of all films?" Thomas Benson addresses the question by delineating a topical system in an effort to indicate the difficulties involved in any number of various rhetorical methodologies.

The first of Benson's critical types of interest to the analyst of film is the social critic who takes in works designed to persuade and all others which reflect and influence social and political norms, regardless of their intent.95 Because this critic seeks the values the work asks the audience to share,96 this stance is one which would most aid the film critic bent on examining the film-as-story by analyzing plot, theme, and/or characterization. Thus, the critic can reveal those values which are enacted within the drama and whether those values exhibited are "rewarded" or "punished." However, this type of criticism would not be an examination of the plastic material and thus is not a stance which would enjoin the critic to utilize film theory per se unless the plastic itself, exhibiting its own possibilities as plastic, supported/attacked certain social ideals.
The second type of critic which fits the rhetorical analysis of film is one who "looks for rhetorical patterns and forms as elements in the structure of words not necessarily rhetorical in intention." Benson's own analysis of this type provides impetus for any theoretical exploration into formal rhetorical systems utilized in film composition. Because the critic cannot assume any filmmaker ever drew upon, say, classical systems of rhetoric as his major compositional schema, "a film critic's alternative is to find an analogous formal system in film theory—the rhetorical equivalent of Spottiswoode's Grammar of Film or Metz' Language of Film." This type seems best suited for the critic of film specifically if such a rhetorical system can be devised—a point which will be discussed in this chapter.

Benson warns that these types are not necessarily mutually exclusive, nor is it to be assumed the nine types mentioned are the only ones. Rather, he has found these nine the most helpful to his own student-critics. But, more importantly, Benson suggests that a current task for critical theory is "to trace the possibilities for cross-fertilization among rhetorical critics and critics of literature, film, television, and other nonoratorical forms: the domain of the semiologist." Perhaps, then, Benson has found the most worthwhile rhetorical equivalent alluded to in his discussion of the third type mentioned above—a semiotic approach to the criticism of film. Whether this is a viable solution remains to be seen; certainly, it merits further
explication by critics in search of an adequate methodology for the rhetorical analysis of film.

The previous discussion concerning various approaches toward the rhetorical criticism of film has included a number of assertions about current critical methodologies. Foremost in my mind is that the essays discussed convey that current exercises in the rhetorical criticism of film are focusing primarily on the rhetorical message. Thus, these methods seek to discover the rhetorical equivalent of a basic form of literary criticism: What does this mean? Instead, I believe that attention should be paid, at least equally, to discovering how a film operates rhetorically. How does a viewer apprehend certain images especially in relation to other images within a given film? How does a viewer perceive one shot juxtaposed to another, and how can the filmmaker manipulate the viewer's perceptions by his choice of how those two shots are related to one another (i.e., cut, fade, dissolve, etc.)? Just as Aristotle delineated the various means of persuasion, the same must be done by critics of film.

The next question to arise is the relationship of semiotics to film. What does one have to do with the other? Perhaps the easiest way to approach this question is to consider the individual shot of film as an iconic sign—a sign which manifests properties of the object being signified but which is obviously not that object. Even though Umberto Eco takes Morris to task on the very notion of an iconic
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sign, I believe that for my purposes here, the notion that a shot is some kind of sign is enough to warrant the investigation of semiotics as a possible critical tool. For, "the work of art is conceived as a sign which is, in all but the simplest limit case, itself a structure of signs." Certainly, it can be admitted that film is a work of art and that film manifests a structure of shots. Therefore, semiotics appears to be a significant and useful tool for looking at film.

Finally, while the reader may be asking where and how rhetoric comes into the picture, the point to be kept in mind is that made by Benson—that film is made up of signs which are structurally oriented to manifest at least three types of rhetoric. Further, Eco contends that rhetoric and semiotics have much in common:

From Aristotle to Quintilian, through the Medieval and Renaissance theoreticians up to Perelman, rhetoric appears as a second chapter in the general study of semiotics (following linguistics) elaborated centuries ago, and now providing tools for a discipline which encompasses it. Therefore a bibliography of the semiotic aspects of rhetoric seems identical with a bibliography of rhetoric.

Perhaps it is time to re-evaluate the methods we use to study film by embracing the theory of signs and, thereby, creating an atmosphere which requires critics to investigate
how a film means before examining what a film means—a task which seems increasingly difficult in view of the variety of perceptions which viewers can bring to film. However, semiotic analysis has generally been reserved for the enhancement of literary criticism. Only recently has semiotics been adapted to study film and/or television-narratives based on iconic signs rather than linguistic signs. One recent article outlines various problems in the use of linguistic models to analyze cinema.

Farrel Corcoran's "Towards a Semiotic of Screen Media" elucidates the difficulties in using linguistic models as a governing metaphor for the study of cinematic communication (both film and television). All of the problems with such models are related, as Corcoran sees it, to the "historical precedent for speaking of film as a metaphorical language." Basically the problems are (1) semiotics being tied to the competence paradigm—formal, rule-governed structures, (2) uncovering filmic structure through the use of classical structuralist methods—Saussurean "taxonomic" linguistics, (3) testing for grammaticality, and (4) identifying the minimal unit. Regardless of these problems, the author is clear in suggesting the benefits of semiotic research if researchers and critics begin to examine how information is structured and how that structure enables viewers to share common meanings.

While there are formidable obstacles in traditional semiotic methods, the rhetorical-semiotic approach to be
proposed in this thesis can solve many of the difficulties which are Corcoran's concern. As will be seen later, the behavioral approach of Charles Morris provides a language of semiotics which enables the critic to (1) classify types of signs used (both iconic and conventional) and (2) arrive at an understanding of how filmic signs are structured in such a way which allows viewers to understand what a film "means" in every sense of the word (i.e., following the narrative content, recognizing upheld and/or denigrated values, and understanding prescribed inferences and/or persuasive appeals).
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CHAPTER TWO

A RHETORICAL-SEMIOTIC BASIS FOR FILM CRITICISM

2.1 Semiotics and Rhetoric

Throughout the previous section, I advocated the use of a semiotic-based methodology for rhetorically criticizing film. Some of the examined essays dwelt on the theme or message of the film; others went as far as analyzing specific images or related shots/sequences in a particular film. Most of the essays did not appear to go beyond a selective analysis; they do not analyze each and every element comprising the total film. Thus, I suggest a need for developing a methodology which utilizes semiotics by which film can be approached from a rhetorical perspective. What is semiotics and what is its relationship to rhetoric? To answer the first question, a brief look at the beginnings of this relatively recent field of study is in order.

Between the years 1906 and 1911, Ferdinand de Saussure taught three courses in general linguistics at the University of Geneva.¹ During the course of these lectures, Saussure stated:

A science that studies the life of signs within society is conceivable . . . . I shall call it semiology (from Greek semeion 'sign'). Semiology
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would show what constitutes signs, what laws govern them.²

At about the same time (actually just before the turn of the century), C.S. Peirce, an American philosopher, wrote about semiotic—the doctrine of signs.³ Since that time this science (as both men believed it to be) has grown to encompass and/or influence varied fields of study—everything from animal communication (zoosemiotics) to the analysis of nonverbal communication (kinesics and proxemics), aesthetic theory, and rhetoric.⁴ Indeed, along with others, Terence Hawkes, Senior Lecturer in English at University College, Cardiff, believes that its boundaries are coterminous with structuralism: "The interests of the two spheres are not fundamentally separate and, in the long run, both ought properly to be included within the province of a third, embracing discipline called, simply, communication."⁵ In 1938, Charles Morris, in a monograph for the International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, wrote:

Human civilization is dependent upon signs and systems of signs, and the human mind is inseparable from the functioning of signs . . . . Semiotic has a double relation to the sciences: it is both a science among the sciences and an instrument of the sciences. The significance of semiotic as a science lies in the fact that it is a step in the unification of science,
since it supplies the foundations for any special science of signs, such as linguistics, logic, mathematics, rhetoric, and (to some extent at least) aesthetics.\textsuperscript{6}

Clearly, semiotics has established a place for itself and can be of use to those who study rhetoric and/or any other area of communication. What better place to start, for the rhetorical criticism of film, than with a discipline which can cross so many modes of communicating? No one can argue that film is not a member of a larger set of mass communicating media or that these media are within an even larger set of ways to communicate. As such, film must exhibit some of the same characteristics of language as English exhibits some of the same characteristics as German or French. I am not arguing, here, that film is a language—obviously, no one can yet speak in "Film" as they might in English or Latin. Yet, there are devices in film which are conventionally agreed upon to mean something (usually, but not always the same thing) to the viewer(s). Saussure defined language as "a social product of the faculty of speech and a collection of necessary conventions that have been adopted by a social body to permit individuals to exercise that faculty."\textsuperscript{7}

In considering the second half of that definition, film is surely a collection of conventions which allow filmmakers-viewers as a social body to communicate. As to the first qualification, in a large sense, I would hazard a guess that
film is also a social product of the faculty of speech because of its basic connection to the spoken word. For example, many of the conventions used in film today are devices which have replaced the titles used in silent film to indicate passage of time, change of location, et cetera. In some limited way, these film techniques are products of the spoken/written word. Additionally there are other characteristics of language as outlined by Saussure which can be likened to film.

(1) Language is outside the individual who can never create nor modify it by himself; it exists only by virtue of a sort of contract signed by the members of a community.

(2) The individual must always serve an apprenticeship in order to learn the functioning of language.

(3) Language is a system of signs in which the only essential thing is the union of meanings and sound-images.

(4) Language is concrete and tangible. It is possible to reduce linguistic signs to conventional written symbols.

When considering film, it is possible to find these same characteristics. We have already seen how film has conventional elements, and it is obvious that there is some agreement about those conventions among the members of the "film" community. Secondly, some necessary learning must
occur before one understands the conventions of film. (Witness the analogous situation where research indicates children often can not distinguish the T.V. program from the commercial.) Many people do not understand or label as such films which, like Last Year at Marienbad or La Jetée, break normal filmic conventions. Third, film is also a system of signs, both aural and visual, which carry a certain level of meaning individually and collectively. Last, it is certainly possible to reduce the film into written symbols. Though not with the richness (measured in discrete pieces of information) of the film itself, the screenplay gives an adequate account of a film. All of the above is merely to suggest the similarity that film has with language. Obviously, our concern is with the connection which film has with semiotics. If there is agreement that film is comprised of signs and that this separate system of signs (for the signs of film are not the same as the signs for a given language) expresses ideas or transmits meaning, then it must also be agreed that semiotics, as the science that studies signs, has bearing on the study of film.

To return to the second question, the relationship between semiotics and rhetoric, first requires a definition of rhetoric. Without taking the stance of a Lewis Carroll character by defining rhetoric however I want, I would rather not adhere to any specific classical definition such as Aristotle's or Cicero's. Instead, I take for my definition certain traits and elements from various
rhetorical theorists. The first and foremost is Burke's notion that wherever there is persuasion, there is rhetoric and wherever there is meaning, there is persuasion. Assuredly, I do not subscribe to the idea that, say, all signs are rhetorical because they have meaning. Just because I see the leaves of a tree rustling (a sign which signifies wind) does not mean I believe such a sign is rhetorical. However, as long as human action is concerned in the production of signs (which have "meaning"), I must admit that rhetoric is involved.

Secondly, another salient feature of rhetoric is also affirmed by Burke. "Persuasion involves choice, will; it is directed to man only insofar as he is free." Anything which is forced upon us, which does not allow us to choose, to decide its accuracy, relevancy or place in our own world, is not rhetoric. In art, there is nothing which denies the free choice of the perceiver. Certainly, the viewer of a film does not have to accept the filmmaker's "message," "view of reality" or "attitudes."

Lastly, rhetoric is a way of communicating with others. It is reasoned human interaction imbued with probability and alive with the extra-logical. Rhetoric "represents one of the more complex manifestations of sign production, involving the choice of given probable premises, the disposition of rhetorical syllogisms (or other forms of many-valued logic) and the necessary 'clothing' of expressions with rhetorical figures." To equate rhetoric only with
overt persuasion of a mass audience in a public speaking situation is as dangerous and foolish as saying everything which exists in the world (and which has some "meaning") is rhetorical. I believe in a middle-ground—a rhetoric somewhere between these two points. Above all, we must believe that art is a means of communication and that "it must have a definite hortatory function, an element of suasion or inducement of the educational variety; it must be partially forensic."¹³

I do not pretend that my definition of rhetoric is original nor unique. Perhaps I have provided a definition so broad to allow for theoretical maneuvering in the rough seas of scholarship; I think not. Rather, I believe that rhetoric simply does exist wherever there is an attempt by human beings to influence the actions, behavior, attitudes, thought processes, et cetera of other human beings. The key word, here, is influence. By influence I do not necessarily mean change although that is always a possibility. Nor do I mean manipulate, which has a rather negative ring when dealing with an act involving free will. Instead, I tend to see influence in the sense of effect even if the effect is as basic as indicating that a sentence is to be read as a question because it ends with a question mark.

2.2 Rhetorical Semiotic or Semiotic Rhetoric?

Whether we choose to subsume rhetoric under semiotic or vice-versa is perhaps a matter of perspective. Certain
evidence has already been presented to suggest that rhetoric is a discipline within the larger field of semiotics. Even though I am myself a rhetorician, I believe there would be folly in thinking that rhetoric, and not semiotic, is the all-encompassing field. As the "science of signs"—verbal or non-verbal, human or non-human, artistic or non-artistic—semiotic covers the very essence of rhetoric: human sign behavior. Still, the questions remain—exactly, how is rhetoric concerned with semiotic, and how can semiotics assist the rhetorical criticism of film? The answers to such questions, I believe, can be found in the behavioral approach to semiotics by Charles Morris.

According to Morris, four basic factors are involved in the process of semiosis. They are:

1. the **sign vehicle**—that which acts as a sign
2. **signification**—that which the sign refers to
3. the **interpreter**—the agent which takes account of (perceives) the sign
4. the **interpretant**—that effect on some interpreter in virtue of which the thing in question is a sign to that interpreter.14

In an elemental sense, there is already a basis for the close relationship between rhetoric and semiotic. The interpretant factor of the process of semiosis prescribes an effect on the interpreter brought about by the presence and subsequent taking-account-of the sign. Once we eliminate
all of the signs which exist either naturally or are produced by non-human agents, we are left with signs which are produced by human beings themselves. If we further eliminate those signs produced by humankind which are not designated to bring about some effect from interpreters of those signs, we are left with those signs which are designed by human agents to produce some response/effect in other human agents (having also excluded those signs directed at non-human agents). Obviously, these signs—produced by persons to arouse some effect in other persons—carry a rhetorical impact. Thus, it is the interpretant element of the semiotic process—the influence of behavior in human beings by human beings—which is most basically and fundamentally aligned with the rhetorical process.

This essay seeks to develop a method by which the various rhetorical signs which make up a film can be analyzed and delineated as to their place in the film and as regards their categorization in the three levels of semiotics: syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics. Further, as I have suggested before, by basing the rhetorical criticism of film on the basic level of the sign, rhetorical critics can begin to discover, catalog, and define the very bases by which viewers of the film are led to apprehend the film in a certain manner. Rather than beginning with analyses of theme, plot, and characterization in much the same way as literary critics attack poetry, fiction, and drama,
rhetorical critics should begin foraging into the analysis of filmic art at the most elemental level of that art: the shot as a sign. Just as importantly, instead of focusing on psychological, sociological, political, et cetera models, the critic should utilize film theory or praxis in order to derive a proper rhetorical-semiotic model of film.

Before proceeding beyond the basic definition of the process of semiosis, I should note that the general theory of semiotics as outlined by Morris does not adhere to any specific theory of how an interpreter uses the sign to take account of some object (signification).

[I]t is not necessary to deny "private experiences" of the process of semiosis or of other processes, but it is necessary from the standpoint of behaviorists to deny that such experiences are of central importance or that the fact of their existence makes the objective study of semiosis (and hence of sign, designatum [signification], and interpretant) impossible or even incomplete.¹⁵

Whether this question can be dealt with in the same manner in this study is problematic. Not debatable is the fact that human beings perceive and respond to signs everyday. Furthermore, the filmic signs which I intend to utilize within this study are not derived from some arbitrary caprice but from the conventions of film theory—the same conventions which filmmakers, by and large, use all over the world.
2.3 A Rhetorical-Semiotic Method for the Criticism of Film

2.3.1 Semantics, Pragmatics, and Syntactics

That there are three levels of semiotics has already been established. They are semantics, pragmatics, and syntactics. Semantics is the study of the relation of signs to the objects to which the signs apply; pragmatics is the study of the relation of signs to interpreters; and, syntactics is the study of the relation of signs to other signs. At first glance, it seems probable that a rhetorical analysis would be confined to the level of pragmatics for, certainly, rhetoric is most basically concerned with the relationship between signs and their interpreters. However, the syntactic and semantic levels must also be considered in order to facilitate the understanding of the pragmatic dimension. Each level contains a specific dual relation within the triadic relation of semiotic elements (sign, object and interpreter). Applied to film, the critic must establish and analyze all three levels in order to make a complete analysis of the film's rhetorical dimension. For example, to examine fully and understand any given filmic sign and its rhetorical impact requires knowledge of the sign's signification, its place in the structure of the film (reciprocal relationship with other signs) as well as the effect (interpretant) on the perceiver. And even though "meaning" is a word upon which Morris does not dwell, for him, the "meaning" of a sign is both its signification and interpretant. Thus, it is clear that
all three levels inherent in the process of semiosis are of necessary importance for the rhetorical critic. Still, we are rather far from establishing a method for rhetorical analysis. Just how can the three levels be utilized to examine specific filmic signs? The answer lies within Morris' classification of dimensions of signification and sign usage.

2.3.2 Dimensions of Signification and Sign Usage

According to Morris, there are three primary dimensions of signification: (1) designative, (2) appraisive, and (3) prescriptive where

A sign is **designative** insofar as it signifies observable properties of the environment or of the actor, it is **appraisive** insofar as it signifies the consummatory properties of some object or situation, and it is **prescriptive** insofar as it signifies how the object or situation is to be reacted to so as to satisfy the governing impulse. In these terms, usually 'black' is primarily designative, 'good' is primarily appraisive, and 'ought' is primarily prescriptive.

Included within the designative dimension are those signs which serve an identification function in regard to space and time; Morris calls them identifiors. Identifiors, as signifying locations in space and time, direct attention
(and behavior) toward a specific region of the environment.\textsuperscript{20} Morris' reason for including identifiers within the designative dimension is unclear at best. Apparently, he is reluctant to establish too many categories of signs in order to remain as close as possible to the tridimensional system of semiotic levels. Obviously, one can make a strong case for developing an identificative dimension of signifying since the function of identifiers is essentially different from designators.

In the case of identifiers the interpreter is disposed to direct his responses to a certain spatial-temporal region; in the case of designators the interpreter is disposed toward response-sequences which would be terminated by an object with certain characteristics . . . .\textsuperscript{21} However, identifiers do function in directing behavior to a characteristic (like designators): the location of an object. In a loose sense, location is an identifiable characteristic. Thus, there is no apparent reason for establishing a separate and discrete dimension of identification. Most important is the distinction between identifiers and other designators. Whether the distinction is so strong as to require the addition of another dimension of signifying is unnecessarily problematic; both are clearly informative in usage.

In his earlier \textit{Signs, Language, and Behavior}, Morris included a fourth, equally important, dimension (formative)
to account for those signs which help to organize the interpretants of other signs (i.e., "or," "not," suffixes, grammatical structure, and punctuation devices). In his later *Signification and Significance*, Morris decided to relegate the formative dimension to a secondary place while maintaining that it is still an important category which must be taken into account. Whether the formative dimension remains on the same level as the other dimensions is of no importance to this study. The existence of such signs which have an organizational/structural function related to other signs maintains their importance for the purpose of this essay.

Such a stance is further indicated by the classification of sign usages.

In *Signs, Language, and Behavior* four main uses of signs were discussed. They were then called the informative, valuative, incitive, and systemic uses of signs. Signs may be used to inform someone of the properties of objects or situations, or to induce in someone preferential behavior toward some objects or situations, or to incite a specific course of action, or to organize the dispositions to behavior produced by other signs. That Morris considers these four sign usages as equally important is clear when he states: "designative signs are used informatively; appraisive signs are used valuatively,
prescriptive signs are used incitively, and formative signs are used systemically.\textsuperscript{25} Furthermore, Morris never provides a concrete reason for eliminating the formative dimension other than saying it is "worthwhile to explore the possibility of maintaining a tridimensional analysis."\textsuperscript{26} In order to maintain a balance between the dimensions of signification and types of sign usage, for the purposes of this essay I will adhere to Morris' original classification which includes the formative dimension (since it does not alter the fact that formative signs exist and play a role in the process of semiosis) as a fourth dimension of signification. While it is obvious that the dimensions of signification are directly related to the types of sign usage, there is also a relationship between the three levels of syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics and the above mentioned categories.

First, the level of semantics (relationship between sign and signification/object), most closely deals with the designative dimension and informative type of sign usage. "In the informative use of signs the producer of a sign seeks to cause the interpreter to act as if some present, past, or future situation had such and such characteristics."\textsuperscript{27} Because the designative dimension provides information by signifying the observable properties of an object or situation, any analysis of the signs which are used informatively may be said to involve semantics.

Second, since the syntactic level involves the relationship between and among signs, syntactics aligns
with the formative dimension and the systemic use of signs. "The systemic use of signs is the use of signs to systematize (organize) behavior which other signs tend to provoke . . . . the aim is simply to organize sign-produced behavior, that is, to organize the interpretants of other signs." Further, if a sign influences in a uniform way the total signification of the particular sign combinations in which it appears, the operative dimension of signification is formative. Thus, an analysis of systemic signs involves primarily the syntactic level.

Last, the pragmatic level, since it involves the relationship between the sign and the interpreter, concerns (1) most obviously the prescriptive dimension and incitive usage and (2) less obviously the appraisive dimension and valuative usage. The prescriptive dimension is characterized by "what to do?" and "ought." "In the incitive use of signs the aim is to direct behavior into definite channels . . . ." Because we are dealing with the sign and interpreter within the pragmatic level, an analysis of the prescriptive dimension and incitive signs is included with that level. Such a comparison also allows for the inclusion of the appraisive dimension and valuative usage within the scope of the pragmatic level. The valuative usage is the use of signs to cause preferential behavior to certain objects, needs, preferences, responses or signs. Because the appraisive dimension is characterized by "what to prefer," we can include the appraisive
dimension and valuative usage within the scope of the pragmatic level since there is a direct attempt to influence the preferential behavior of the interpreter by way of conferring preferential status on an object or situation. The foregoing formulation leaves a schematic which aligns the levels of semiotics with the various dimensions of signification and types of sign usage represented in Table 1.

Inherent with the establishment of various categories is the tendency to view such categories as singular and discrete (in much the same manner as contemporary theorists superficially view the elements of Burke's dramatistic pentad). This is not the case with these categories. Morris states clearly that signs in any of the modes of signifying may be used informatively, valuatively or incitively. In point of fact, appraisors frequently involve designators, and prescriptors often rest on designators and appraisors.

For signs may not be valuatively adequate unless they or other signs convincingly communicate the where and what of that to which it is desired to cause preferential behavior . . . . the effectiveness of signs is often dependent upon the denotation . . . of certain designators . . . . [comparatively] the persuasiveness of a prescriptor often depends upon the ability to convince the interpreter one is trying to influence that certain designators are reliable
Table 1: Comparison of the Levels of Semiotics with Dimensions of Signification and Types of Sign Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>SIGN USAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>Designative</td>
<td>Informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>Appraisive</td>
<td>Valuative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>Incitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Systemic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and that certain appraisors coincide with the preferential status which he himself accords to what is designated.33

Of course, these statements are not so unusual when one takes into account that information can have a persuasive and/or an axiological effect and that an ostensibly persuasive message can have an informative effect. More important than the fact that these various categories can intermingle is the idea that designators must be effective in the production of adequate prescriptors and appraisors. On this basis rests the method for rhetorically analyzing film.

There are two important implications for rhetorically analyzing film in regard to the concepts discussed above. First, how many of the signs within a film are designative and what is their role in the construction of appraisals or prescriptions? Second, upon what criteria are designators judged to be effective (Morris' term is "adequate") in the production of adequate appraisors or prescriptors (again, judged how?). In order to answer both questions, it is necessary to investigate the nature of filmic signs specifically. Since Morris does not discuss them, we must look elsewhere.

2.4 The Signs of Film: Designative and Formative

In *Semiotics of Cinema*, Jurij Lotman divides signs into two groups: conventional and pictorial; pictorial signs are iconic signs.34 While the connection between
expression and content is not internally motivated in the conventional sign, iconic signs presuppose a meaning which has "one unique, naturally inherent expression." Thus, iconic signs seem to be more easily comprehensible than discursive ones. Furthermore, (for the discussion of filmic signs) Lotman makes a second crucial distinction. Because conventional signs can easily acquire a syntax, they are capable of telling; iconic signs are restricted to the function of naming. Since iconic signs are inherently depictive in nature, the iconic signs of film—shots—serve a designative function. For Lotman, the shot is the basic carrier of meaning; "the semantic relationship—the relation of the sign to the phenomenon which it designates—is most emphasized at this level."

Secondly, since iconic signs are capable only of naming, other signs of a conventional nature must also be present. In order for the construction of a narrative text from iconic signs, these signs must be combined with conventional signs.

It is instructive that in Egyptian hieroglyphic writing, which may be viewed as an attempt to creative a narrative text on an iconic basis [like film], there quickly arose a system of determinitives: formal signs of a conventional type for the transmission of grammatical meanings. Thus, iconic (designative) signs combine with conventional
formative) signs in the construction of more complex units of meaning. A sequence of two shots is a merger into a complex semantic unit of a higher level.40

Essentially, two levels of meaning are determined by the structure of film language. The first is the sheer semantic relationship between the shot and the objects (content) represented in the shot. The second type involves the combination of shots (montage) as well as depth levels, lighting, change of speed, et cetera, to impart additional meanings—symbolic, metaphorical, metonymical, et cetera.41 Hence, I will argue that each shot (to return to Morris' terminology) serves a designative function whereas each transitional device (i.e., cut, fade, dissolve, wipe) between shots serves a formative function. Furthermore, the appraisive and prescriptive dimensions of signification are constructed upon the combination of designative signs (shots) and formative signs (transitions).

While Morris believed that there was nothing to prevent a given sign from exhibiting any or all of the dimensions simultaneously, the point should be made that the occurrence of appraisives or prescriptives in film is based solely on combinations of shots. For example, one may argue that the appearance of a character in a black hat (typical of Hollywood westerns of the 'thirties and 'forties) would be an instance of a single shot exhibiting an appraisive function (because the black hat equals evil, the character
is evil). However, such a valuation is inherently based on a convention adopted in the genre and, implicitly, during the course of the first film which ever depicted an antagonist wearing a black hat (not to mention any associations drawn from other cultural elements). No doubt, early uses of this convention were perceived and associated from the opposite angle. Thus, because the antagonists of the genre always wore a black hat, the black hat eventually became a sign for the antagonist. In contemporary society this convention has essentially disappeared—even "Little Joe" Cartwright of Bonanza wore a black hat. Insofar as the filmic shot is inherently an informational/designative sign, an individual shot is unable to impart anything more than nominative information. It is in the repeated use, say, of a low angle shot each time Kane appears in Citizen Kane, that such a device becomes significant (the low-angle shot signifies the dominance of Kane in this example).

As an example of the power of connected shots (montage) to create an appraisive or prescriptive statement, the Russian film director, Kuleshov, performed an experiment using the talents of the Russian actor Mozhukhin. Kuleshov edited the same close-up (head and shoulders) of a smiling Mozhukhin with various shots of objects and people. In one instance the shot of Mozhukhin was preceded by a shot of a bowl of soup. Viewers of this scene reported that the actor was exhibiting hunger. In another instance, the shot
was preceded by the image of a beautiful young woman. Viewers of that scene reported that Mozhukhin was exhibiting desire. In a third sequence, when the shot was preceded by that of a dead child, the audience saw pity in the face of Mozhukhin. Clearly, the implication is that the use of purely designative signs connected by formative signs (cuts, et cetera) can lead the viewer to read the montage of two (or more) shots as something specific. Indeed, montage enhances the possibility that the viewers will read such signs in only one way. One of the criticisms leveled against montage by André Bazin is its inability to allow for various interpretations.

In analyzing reality, montage presupposes of its very nature the unity of meaning of the dramatic event . . . . In short, montage by its very nature rules out ambiguity of expression. Kuleshov's experiment proves this per absurdum in giving on each occasion a precise meaning to the expression on the face . . . .

Whether anyone disdains the use of montage in favor of cinematic realism or vice-versa does not alter the fact that montage is the combination of two or more shots linked together by some sort of transitional device which lends added significance (or "meaning") of a deliberate nature (someone edited those shots together in that way; whether a specific meaning was intended or not would be difficult
to deduce with certainty and is irrelevant). Sergei Eisenstein loosely defines montage as: "combining shots that are depictive, single in meaning, neutral in content—into intellectual contexts and series." Clearly, ambiguity of expression is not non-rhetorical, but neither is explicit expression.

In order to illustrate further the role which designative filmic signs play in conjunction with formative filmic signs to comprise a prescriptive or appraisive sign, I will cite an example from the recent film Being There, which starred the late Peter Sellers. In an early sequence from the film, the first shot is of a door inside the house in which Chance, the gardener (Sellers), has lived most of his life. In the shot, we see Chance enter a hallway through one door, turn left, and exit through another door. In the next shot, Chance is seen, from above, walking on the landing between two flights of stairs and ascending the stairs. After another jump cut (replacement of one shot with another later shot; time compressed), we see Chance ascending still more stairs after entering our line of sight through another door. Jump cut again. The last shot is of Chance lifting the sheet from the face of the old man for whom Chance had worked most of his life. As viewers, we are knowledgeable enough to realize that the four brief shots signify a much longer and more detailed action. The use of the jump cut serves a meta-filmic function; it is a
picture without dimension or pictorial trajectory which seems to say "later" as it connects all four shots into a single sequence with a beginning, middle, and end. This sequence could be summed up as: "Chance's journey upstairs to see if the old man is really dead." The audience is prescriptively led to view these shots as an evolving, continuing action in time and not as four unrelated shots.

In another example from the same film, Chance is talking with two lawyers in the garage of the house. Just before the shot ends in a jump cut to the next shot of the same three people talking in Chance's room, we hear the sound of a television game show. Thus, we have a sound shot which presages the next shot in the bedroom where the television is on while the three characters are conversing. Not only does the sound shot device serve to connect the two events (shots), but, more significantly, the viewer is led to understand the importance which television has in Chance's life (especially so when compared with the entire film as a whole). In other words, a rhetorical statement is being made about the pervasiveness of television in the existence of Chance as well, perhaps, as in the lives of all of us. In this instance, the viewer is appraisively led to confer preferential status on an object: television; these connected shots can be said to comprise a single appraisive sign.
The recent Academy Award-winning *Chariots of Fire* opens with various shots of a memorial service in progress at an English church in 1978 (one of the shots contains a title designating both place and date). As one of the speakers eulogizes the death of a former Olympic gold medal winner (and as he remembers when all these friends first met), the scene dissolves to a group of athletes running along a beach. Based on the information provided through the dialogue and that the last shot during the memorial service is a close-up of one of the central characters, the dissolve is easily understood as a flash-back in time. The first of the runners shown in close-up is a much younger version of the elderly man seen in close-up during the last shot of the memorial service. Secondly, the attire worn by the runners is recognizable as clothing worn early in the twentieth century. The dissolve is easily apprehended by the viewer as a prescriptively signified backward movement in time. The film utilizes a conventional sign—dissolve—to link two designative shots separated by at least half a century.

In *The Greatest Show on Earth*, another conventional device is used continuously to link designative shots of different locales. In the film's climax, a horizontal wipe is used to indicate simultaneous action. In one series of shots, the viewer sees two men as they place flares on the railroad track to stop a train which carries a circus
pay wagon. At this point a horizontal wipe moves across the screen from right-to-left to reveal a second train speeding along. Dialogue in the first portion of this scene reveals this train as the "second section" of the circus with pullman cars that serve as the performers' quarters. After a number of shots which reveal action aboard this second train, another horizontal wipe is used to show the thieves breaking into the circus pay wagon aboard the "first section." Thus, the conventional use of the wipe serves as a device which links these two separate locales and the accompanying action and which signifies "meanwhile." (This particular device was prominent in the movie serials of the 'forties and 'fifties but it has fallen into general disuse in contemporary cinema). The viewer concludes, based on the prescriptive sign complex created by designative shots combined with the formative wipes, that these separate events are occurring simultaneously.

As indicated in these few examples, film is essentially a mix of the iconic and conventional. Each shot of a film can provide information only in its own right. However, when these shots are combined with each other through the use of conventional signs or transitional devices, they have the power to make both valuative and prescriptive statements (though it is not always necessary that they do so). Table 2 indicates the correlation between dimensions of semiotic, sign usages, and the general elements of film.
Table 2: Correlation of Dimensions of Signification and Types of Sign Usages with Basic Filmic Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Sign Usages</th>
<th>Filmic Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATIVE</td>
<td>INFORMATIVE</td>
<td>SHOT as factual statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>observable properties</td>
<td>what has been, is, or will be</td>
<td>e.g., long shot, pan shot, close-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;black&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMATIVE</td>
<td>SYSTEMIC</td>
<td>TRANSITIONAL DEVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metalinguistic properties</td>
<td>further influence behavior called out by other signs</td>
<td>e.g., simple cut, jump cut, dissolve, fade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRAISIVE</td>
<td>VALUATIVE</td>
<td>SHOT SEQUENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consummatory properties</td>
<td>confer preferential status on something</td>
<td>montage, close-ups of object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;good&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESCRIPTIVE</td>
<td>INCITIVE</td>
<td>SHOT SEQUENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manipulatory properties</td>
<td>incite a particular response to objects or signs</td>
<td>montage, metaphorical dissolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;ought&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The preceding discussion leads indirectly to the second question noted earlier: Upon what criteria are designators, hence appraisors or prescriptors, to be judged effective or adequate? Again, since this essay deals specifically with the filmic sign, Morris provides only a partial answer to the problem. For Morris, "to say that a sign is adequate [effective] is to say that its use reaches a goal in a particular occasion or that in general it facilitates the attainment of a certain goal." The implication in this statement is that an adequate sign is one which achieves the purpose intended by its producer. However, in terms of art in general and of film in particular, this is a problematic evaluation for a critic. As discussed earlier, the discovery of the artist's intent is irrelevant and would be next to impossible to judge. That is, the critic would be hard pressed to analyze each and every filmic sign for its respective purpose.

Fortunately, Morris resolves this dilemma in his definition of communication. "For our purposes, 'communication' will be limited to the use of signs to establish a commonage of signification . . . ." Thus, since film is inherently a communicative system, the adequacy of filmic signs may be said to rely on such signs producing common signification in those who perceive filmic signs. And even though "commonage of signification" may be extremely difficult to measure when considering the vast numbers of
viewers for a given film, there is a certain high probability that each designative sign within a film will "mean" basically the same thing for each viewer. A shot of a speeding car traveling down a country road can reasonably be expected to be perceived with the same degree of signification by virtually all viewers. Hence, it is unnecessary to account for the artist/filmmaker's intent in producing the sign. Rather, there is reasonable assurance that a sign is adequate if it establishes a commonage of signification in the numerous interpreters of that sign. This assurance is based on the nature of (1) designative signs and (2) the objective nature of cinematic representation.

First, a designative sign is adequate (informatively) when its production causes its interpreter to act as if something has certain characteristics. On a more specific level of abstraction, a shot in a film is designatively effective if the viewer perceives the object(s) within the shot to have the characteristics depicted. Already established is the designative function of the iconic/filmic sign because such pictorial signs can only name (therefore they can only provide information). Furthermore, the strength of the cinema is its "objective" photographic nature. André Bazin asserts:

The objective nature of photography confers on it [photography] a quality of credibility absent from all other picture-making [iconic signs].
In spite of any objections our critical spirit may offer, we are forced to accept as real the existence of the object reproduced, actually re-presented . . . in time and space. 47

Because of the common method of mechanical reproduction between photography and cinema, film can be said to induce the same air of credibility which photography produces. For Christian Metz, a direct feeling of credibility operates on viewers in films of the unusual as well as in those which are "realistic." 48

The subjects of films can be divided into the "realistic" and the "nonrealistic," if one wishes, but the filmic vehicle's power to make real, to realize, is common to both genres . . . 49

In addition, film has an extra measure of credibility beyond that of photography. Because movement/motion can be depicted in film, it imports a corporality to objects, giving them an autonomy their still representations (photography) can not have. 50 When such statements are considered in conjunction with the notion of a viewer's willing suspension of disbelief, there is a reasonable certainty that the shots of a film can be considered (relatively) effective because of the power which film has in conferring credibility on the object(s) and action(s) which comprise the filmic content.
Now, while the above discussion may seem somewhat tautological (shots of a film are designatively adequate because they are filmic shots), it must be remembered that a designative sign need only cause its interpreter to perceive that something has certain characteristics. Because the shots of film are inherently iconic signs, the very definition of an iconic sign as a sign which exhibits the properties of the object it denotes adds further emphasis to the designative effectiveness of these shots. This is not to say that every filmic shot ever seen is designatively effective. As the level of cinematographic sophistication rises, it becomes increasingly difficult to believe in the grade B movies which used painted backdrops in a studio instead of filming on location. Certainly, the generation of youngsters growing up on Star Wars, The Empire Strikes Back, Superman, and perhaps, even 2001: A Space Odyssey would be hard pressed to find an equivalent level of believability in science-fiction films of the 'fifties in which the space ships hurtling through the universe often looked like cardboard tubes with fins attached (sometimes a viewer might see the wires from which the ship hangs). And yet, even today's film audiences no doubt appreciate such unsophisticated movies for what they are: representations of a past era and outdated levels of cinematic technology.
There is a certain reliability in asserting that filmic shots are designatively adequate because of their iconic properties and mechanical objectivity. When they are not, there is reasonable assurance that the critic/viewer will be able to make an informed judgment that they are ineffective. But, how does one judge the effectiveness of prescriptive and appraisive signs which are constructed upon designators and formators?

Morris readily admits that designators are not, in general, as adequate for valuative and incitive purposes as are appraisors and prescriptors. However, since the cinema must rely on the designative sign, the use of appraisors and prescriptors for their respective purposes is problematic. Yet, in principle, the valuative and incitive uses of signs can be performed by designative signs. According to Morris,

Instead of using appraisors one would simply designate the characteristics of objects and their relation to needs; instead of using prescriptors one would simply designate the way in which certain modes of action upon certain objects satisfy or thwart various needs. It is in fact possible to go very far in this direction, leaving it to each interpreter to determine on the basis of such information what he will prefer and how he will act.
Thus, the adequacy of any appraisive or prescriptive signs relies on the adequacy of the designative signs. Furthermore, such adequacy (of appraisives and prescriptives) also relies on and is enhanced by the formators which combine/organize the designators. Formators serve as a way of increasing the adequacy of other signs. As noted earlier, the conventional signs (transitions between shots), which serve as formators, combine with shots to construct complex semantic units of a higher level. Therefore, the judgment of adequacy in regard to the valuative and incitive use of signs is determined by the adequacy of both designators and formators. The adequacy of a formator is based on (1) the adequacy of the designative signs which frame it and (2) the strength of its conventional status.

For an example of the first, imagine a shot of a table set for dinner. In this shot several characters are seated around it waiting for the meal to begin when someone remarks on how beautifully the table is set—especially with its floral centerpiece. As if to emphasize this remark, there is an immediate cut to another shot of the table from a different angle. Immediately after the cut, the hostess remarks that she made the centerpiece herself. Thus the dialogue emphasizes the fact that there is no temporal discontinuity. In this second shot, everything and everyone is in the proper place—except for the centerpiece which is now missing. Because of the spatial discontinuity (the
missing centerpiece) between the two designative shots, which should match due to the apparent continuity of dialogue, the cut itself becomes suspect. Certainly there are numerous examples of bad cutting which are easily recognizable by viewers. Insofar as any two shots which are combined logically to follow one another or which maintain spatial continuity, the transition which joins those two shots is judged as adequate in comparison. (Every film production crew has at least one person whose only job is to make sure continuity is maintained.)

Secondly, the very nature of formators used in film is conventional. This implies a certain accepted (by a majority of viewers) level of meaning and understanding. Granted, there have probably been instances of transitional devices in film which were used for the first time. Certainly it is the nature of any art to invent and violate conventions. In cinema, however, repeated use of a new convention in one specific film is bound to give that convention an understandable meaning to some degree. As long as consistency is maintained, sheer repetition becomes meaningful. 54

Finally, the ultimate test of whether any appraisive or prescriptive sign is adequate may rest in its ability to produce a commonage of signification among its interpreters. Obviously, if the designative signs are not effective, the other signs are also subject to a judgment of inadequacy.
"Inadequacy in one respect leads to inadequacy in any other respect." Just as importantly, the various kinds of sign adequacy are interrelated and interdependent; each lends its support to the others. Inevitably, judgment of adequacy must rest on the critic/viewer and an informed evaluation based on detailed scrutiny of each shot in the film: what must be the starting point for a semiotic analysis of film.

The strength of cinema's effect lies in the variety of constructed, complexly organized and maximally concentrated information... the totality of various intellectual and emotional structures transmitted to an audience and having a complex effect on that audience....

Studying the mechanics of this effect is the basic task of a semiotic approach to film. Such an approach requires an analysis which is complete; each shot must be analyzed alone and in conjunction with the transition which joins it with another shot. Furthermore, "observations about some 'artistic device' or other [i.e., psychological/sociological/historical models of explanation] which do not pursue such an ultimate goal [how information is transmitted] are, to a considerable extent, a waste of time."
2.5 Considerations on the Validity of a Rhetorical Semiotic of Film

Of Morris' "Foundations of the Theory of Signs," Eliseo Vivas in the Kenyon Review writes: "it must be reckoned as one of the most distinguished contributions that have been made to the recent literature on meaning." Specifically, Vivas believed that the value of Morris' analysis is that it "clarifies the assertion that we know the meaning of a term when we know the conditions under which we are permitted to apply it." Vivas recognizes that the strength of semiotics lies in the tradic relation of syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics. Philip Blair Rice suggests that when Morris' three-dimensional scheme has been developed further, "it not only will enable the pragmatists and positivists to correct each other, but, it may be hoped, will reveal the inadequacy of certain assumptions which these schools have in common."

In a recent study of meaning, Hardy of Johns Hopkins University says of Morris' approach: "[it] is inspired by the philosophy of pragmatism and directed by findings of linguistic studies. I find both these aspects of semiotic congenial." In the semiotic of Morris, Hardy sees "the possibility of a critical metalanguage for the analysis of sign situations." For Hardy, the strength of the theory is its eclectical nature.

The close relation of the theory of semiotic to the structure of the ancient Trivium is evidence
that it is based upon the culture and learning of western civilization. The humanist finds himself on familiar ground throughout Morris's exposition . . . . In general, the theory of semiotic synthesizes the methodological lore of two and a half millenia. It systematizes an empirical theory of speculation in a fashion commensurate with the ideas, the language and the experience of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{65}

This synthesis allows for an alliance of rhetoric and semiotic. Morris outlines the history of semiotics in \textit{Signs, Language and Behavior}; it is a history replete with theorists who have shaped our conceptions of rhetoric: Plato, the Sophists, Aristotle, Augustine, Bacon, Locke, Hume, Ogden and Richards.\textsuperscript{66} Of Aristotle, Morris recognizes his attention "to many phases of semiosis: in the \textit{Organon}, to the semantics and syntactics of the language of science; in the \textit{Poetics}, to the various aspects of esthetic discourse; in the \textit{Rhetoric}, to some problems of pragmatics."\textsuperscript{67} Clearly, there is a long established relationship between rhetoric and semiotics. And while the area of pragmatics would seem, again, the most applicable portion (or semiotics) for a rhetorical criticism of film, a completely descriptive semiotics requires that the critic include the areas of syntactics and semantics in his investigation of whatever form of communication under analysis.
As with any new or revised theory propounded by scientists, philosophers, et cetera, Morris has had his detractors. While speaking of Charles Peirce and his conception of semiotics, Peter Wollen states that Morris "travestied his [Peirce's] position by coupling it with a virulent form of Behaviorism." Unfortunately, Wollen's position is based only on severe criticisms of Behaviorism by Noam Chomsky and E.H. Gombrich. He offers no other evidence besides this form of guilt by association. William Alston takes Morris to task concerning the concept of the disposition to respond called out by signs. For Alston, the danger of Morris' approach is like that of all behavioral theories of meaning—they are based on an insight that "perverts through oversimplification." Like Wollen, Alston seems to disregard Morris for the very reason that his theory is rooted in Behaviorism.

However, Alston provides, at least, a brief argument to defend his criticism of Morris. Alston bases his argument on what he calls Morris' "assumption that every meaningful expression is a 'sign' of something." Alston seems to think that "disposition to respond" (for Morris) means an immediate, overt response from the receiver of the sign. He uses the following example in his argument.

In fact, it is only in one sort of case that an utterance like "Your son is ill" will produce a disposition to go to where one
believes one's son to be if one has a great deal of concern for one's son. This kind of case is one in which the hearer believes that the speaker is providing correct information and the hearer has not previously acquired that information.73

There is no indication by Morris that all signs produce a disposition to respond immediately and/or overtly. Quite to the contrary, Morris' category of sign dimensions recognizes that informative signs and sign-complexes (such as "Your son is ill.") need only designate certain characteristics about a given object. It is not necessary for an informative sign to bring about an overt action from the receiver (i.e., going to the side of the son who is ill) as Alston suggests. Rather, such a sign-complex may only produce, in the father, a mental expectation of the condition of the son. Unfortunately, Alston assumes that Morris is saying all signs elicit an overt response from the interpreter; clearly, Morris does not indicate such a precondition for a sign to be a sign.74 Thus, Alston seems to be guilty of the same oversimplification of which he accuses Morris and other behavioral theories of meaning.

While the above critique of William Alston's argument against Morris' semiotic perspective may seem to be a digression, it is important to realize that such a distinction about the nature of the interpretant is central to this essay. The signs of cinema are essentially aesthetic
signs. As such, the apprehension of the signs involves a process of aesthetic perception. Morris' description of this process is basic to the very notion of a rhetorical approach to film as defined in this essay. In perceiving a work of art,

there is a connected tissue of references in which one aspect of the work sets up demands and expectations which are met, or partially met, by other aspects, these other aspects in turn functioning in a similar manner—and in this process the character of the whole is built up in terms of the character of the parts . . . . A complex sign structure is operative in such esthetic perception, and the interpreter (including the creator) performs a complex perceptual activity, passing from part to part of the art object, responding to certain parts as signs of others, and building up a total response (and so total object of perception) in terms of the partial responses.75

That filmic signs may produce overt responses on occasion (i.e., laughter, tears, screams, or verbal responses) is certain. Still, the essence of aesthetic perception and the interpretants resulting from said perception is primarily cerebral (or cognitive). The question which this essay seeks to answer concerns how the film viewer is able
to "read the tissues of references" which comprise a film.

The most recent essay on the subject of semiotic methodologies for cinematic analysis is Farrel Corcoran's "Towards a Semiotic of Screen Media." In this essay, Corcoran enumerates various problems in using classical semiotic analysis in the study of film and television. According to Corcoran, the majority of semiotic methods are closely tied to the structuralist approach based on Saussurean semiotics and exemplified in the writings of Levi-Strauss. One of the primary problems, as previously noted, is that these methods are rooted in the competence paradigm (which implies that cinematic communication has formal, rule-governed structures of which communicants have special, implicit knowledge) and hence, film is equated with language. This comparison leads to the difficulties outlined by the author such as: (1) tests of grammaticality, and (2) identification of the minimal unit of analysis. However, while film may have some features which compare with language (see above, pp. 52-53) in some respects film is totally unlike language.

First, language is based on the conventional use of arbitrary signs; film uses an equal mixture of conventional and iconic signs. Even though the combining of shots and transitions in film implies that it has a structure, it does not appear to be a structure which has the formal complexity of language. According to Morris,
Sets of signs tend to become systems of signs; this is as true in the case of perceptual signs, gestures, musical tones, and painting as it is in the case of speech and writing. In some cases the systematization is relatively loose and variable and may include subsystems of various degrees of organization and interconnectedness.

The assembly rules of film appear to be more like those of poetic discourse (which gains its power in its departure from the grammar of speech in its common forms). Furthermore, film is governed by the rules of narrative structure as well as those of aesthetics (e.g., revolution in "schools" of art usually results from the violation of aesthetic norms). Such are the reasons for Corcoran's statement that "it is difficult to think of working out a system of rules which would recognize a well-formed [grammatical] string and assign it a structure" (precisely what a majority of semiotic analyses has been attempting to do with film). A practical test of grammaticality is what will be acceptable in a given community of language-users. The structures of film (like those of poetry) are less defined than those of speech in that their rules can be violated. Such violation in film (departure from the norm) may, for the most part, be acceptable to the community of film-viewers because of its aesthetic nature.
A second major problem is that of isolating film's minimal unit of analysis. Classical semiotic analyses, because of their adherence to the strict linguistic model, have sought to identify features of film with those of linguistics: morphemes, words, and sentences. Rather than searching for corresponding segmental units in film, Corcoran suggests looking for suprasegmental features which may be found in such elements as camera movements and angles, editing style, and use of deep focus. Indeed, film theory has provided such units by distinguishing among range of shots, camera angles, types of transitions and types of camera movement. And yet, while the critic makes such determinations, the basic unit of analysis must remain the shot and the transition—the iconic sign and the conventional sign. Essentially, these are the only practically recognizable units of analysis.

Finally, Corcoran asserts that semiotics should concentrate attention on how film viewers come to share common meanings from film images. Film is a coded system which mediates information to viewers who must extract and process it; "awareness of the functioning of this system has been suppressed by the almost exclusive concentration of media studies on the psychological and sociological effects of messages." In this essay, I have argued that rhetorical critics of film should divert attention from historical/psychological/sociological models to examining how viewers
apprehend meanings in film. The semiotic approach of Charles Morris, combined with generally accepted prescriptions of film theory, allows for an analysis of how the signs of film lead to such apprehending.

The methodology outlined in this chapter is not one which is based on the classical Saussurean approach and, hence, may not involve many of the difficulties discussed by Corcoran (this is not to say that this method is problem-free). Morris has provided a vocabulary for researchers to use in analyzing a variety of types of discourse. Its strength lies in its ability to (1) account for the function of signs and (2) deal with both vocal and non-vocal signs. Because this method is based on the nature of film as a blend of the iconic and conventional, it is particularly adaptable to looking at and analyzing films which may exhibit idiosyncratic structures (something which classical semiotic approaches are unable to do because of the intuition that the units of analysis are logically prior to the grammar\(^87\)). Morris' semiotic seems to parallel Chomsky's generative grammar in constructing a finite set of rules, based on the functioning of signs in a context, to account for the infinite number of filmic "utterances."

Lastly, Morris' emphasis on the tripartite typology of analysis: syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic, allows the critic of film to recognize that non-vocal signs can be used for all purposes.
If [film] may become at times predominantly "esthetic," it may also serve to inform its participants and onlookers, or to determine their valuations, or to incite in them specific courses of action.88

Rather than focusing strictly on syntactical features of film, Morris' semiotics considers the additional areas of semantics and pragmatics—what the signs signify as well as the responses they produce.

In keeping with the above assertions, the following chapter will be devoted to a shot-by-shot analysis of Stanley Kubrick's *2001: A Space Odyssey*. The examination will include an analysis of both the iconic and conventional signs which comprise the film. As such, the four dimensions of semiotic (designative, formative, appraisive, and prescriptive) will be utilized with an eye toward assessing the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels of meaning by specific focus on the significations and interpretants of the filmic signs.
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CHAPTER THREE
CASE STUDY ANALYSIS

3.1 Justification of 2001: A Space Odyssey as Case Study

Any study such as has been undertaken in this essay requires an application of the method to a specific occurrence. Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey has been chosen as a case study for several reasons. First, this film lends itself to the type of analysis I have outlined because it is a film in which the image is all important. It runs for one hundred and thirty-three minutes and yet contains only forty minutes of dialogue; there is no dialogue at all for the first twenty-two minutes of the film. Kubrick manages to convey a story without telling a story through extensive dialogue and/or explanation. "By demoting the story element, Kubrick restores tremendous power and importance to the image--and it is through images that the viewers have to make connections."¹ Because the meaning of the film (or the story) is not explicit in the verbal/narrative portion of the film, the viewer of 2001 is forced to apprehend and attend to the pictorial portion more closely in order to follow the events depicted.

For finding the meaning is not a matter of verbalizing, but of feeling it in the images drawn
from past and future time, in the involvement with the experience of space, and in apprehending what is happening rather than being fed cut-and-dried information.\(^2\)

Upon viewing the film for the first time, I realized that any understanding of the events portrayed would require much more attention than I had ever given to any other film. On the other hand, there was still a sense that I had fully experienced some new kind of cinema. Initial criticism of the film after it opened was mixed because critics were responding to the film based on normative notions of cinema.\(^3\) However, when the film began to reach the general public "for whom the message was not something that used the envelope of the medium to travel in, but actually \(\text{was}\) the medium, they received it with an extraordinary sense of involvement."\(^4\) In short, \(2001\) is a film which embodies the essence of cinema—interconnected shots which convey significance based on those connections.

Second, \(2001\) was a landmark in cinema because it did not follow the tradition of cinematic epics. Audiences saw a new use of film. The movie "forced its viewers to jettison the outmoded notion of a story told largely in words, with interlocking subplots, a well-defined climax and the same characters continuing all the way through."\(^5\) Further, Kubrick utilized newly developed, sophisticated, cinematic techniques to depict travel in deep space as well as the
prehistoric savannah where man-as-tool-user was "born."
(Indeed, many of these techniques of intricate matting and complex front-screen projection have led to the success of Star Wars, The Empire Strikes Back, and a host of space-travel films.)

Last, because of the film's emphasis on images, 2001 compares more closely to a conception of art than most Hollywood film fare (though this film was made in Britain). Such art requires the audience to experience the film to the fullest. The images and their manner of presentation compelled them [the audience] to come to terms with the sight and sound and feel of the whole film. One was asked to experience it, like a piece of sculpture, before one tried to understand it. As in sculpture, the meaning comes from the way that the medium has been worked. As in sculpture, the form can be spellbinding to eye and mind even where the function is not apparent or nonexistent.6

Clearly, Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey is an exceptional artistic endeavor. Kubrick's reliance on the images of the film, rather than on extensive dialogue, to tell a story of past and future gives the viewer an opportunity to experience a film without being led by the hand every step of the way.
3.2 Analysis: Introductory Remarks

In order to facilitate the analysis, *2001: A Space Odyssey* was coded by shot and transition primarily according to the various elements of film as outlined by Bernard Dick in *The Anatomy of Film*. First, each shot (designator) was coded in regard to angle of the shot (up, down, horizontal), range of the shot (close-up, extreme close-up, medium shot or long shot), the presence of a pan (left or right horizontal movement of camera), tilt (up or down vertical movement) or tracking (toward or away), and shot content. Second each transition (formatter) between shots was then coded according to type of cut (simple, jump, parallel, or contrast), fade, or dissolve (simple, metaphorical, or form) used. Basically, the film contains 609 shots and 609 transitions. Table 3 presents a complete review of the coding data.

After the film was coded, it was divided into individual scenes based on subject matter/plot, time contrast, dialogue and/or background music (See Appendix A.). This division, while I believe it to be sound, is not necessarily to be considered definitive. Indeed, the original screenplay may be divided quite differently. The purpose of the division into scenes was to make the task of analysis easier.

Finally, the dialogue was transcribed and matched with the appropriate shots in which it occurs (See Appendix B.).
Table 3: Incidence of Filmic Variables within Shots and Types of Transitions in *2001: A Space Odyssey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHOTS</th>
<th>Angle of Shot</th>
<th>Tilts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of Shot</strong></td>
<td>Up - 42 shots</td>
<td>Up - 15 shots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long - 174 shots</td>
<td>Down - 50 shots</td>
<td>Down - 25 shots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - 197 shots</td>
<td>Horizontal - 517 shots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-up - 161 shots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Close-up - 77 shots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left - 38 shots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right - 44 shots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Tilts**        |                          |               |
| Up - 15 shots    |                          |               |
| Down - 25 shots  |                          |               |

| **Tracking**     |                          |               |
| In - 59 shots    |                          |               |
| Out - 12 shots   |                          |               |
| Up - 1 shot      |                          |               |
| Right - 3 shots  |                          |               |

| TRANSITIONS      |                          |               |
| Simple Cut - 426 | Fade Out - 8             |               |
| Jump Cut - 86    | Fade In - 6              |               |
| Parallel Cut - 78| Dissolve - 1             |               |
| Contrast Cut - 10|                          |               |
Also, the background music was matched to accompanying shot(s) and/or entire scenes. It should be noted that Kubrick deleted a musical score written for the first half of the film (by Alex North) just before its New York premiere. He chose, instead, to use three works by György Ligeti and one composition each from Richard Strauss, Johann Strauss, and Khatchaturian. However, the analysis which follows was constructed from the coding data in an attempt to exclude the expressive influence of the music from the shot-by-shot analysis. Hence, the analysis of those scenes containing background music was undertaken without reliance on the aural portion of the film to color any perceptions about the appraisive or prescriptive levels of meaning. The reason for this will be discussed later in Chapter Four.

In a large sense, 2001 is four shorter films combined to form an epic story which spans man's earliest beginnings to his possible future. Though not with the same overall satisfaction, each of these four sequences could be viewed separately. Each sequence exhibits a definite beginning, middle, and end with traditional plot exposition, including climax and dénouement.

The first sequence, entitled "The Dawn of Man," presents the acquisition of tool-using behavior by early man (in fact, these hominids resemble apes more closely than they resemble modern man). The second sequence
(untitled) concerns the discovery, by American scientists, of a black monolith buried under the surface of the moon near the crater of Tycho. The third sequence, entitled "Jupiter Mission," takes place eighteen months after the previous sequence. The massive spaceship "Discovery" has been sent on a secret mission to Jupiter; only the ship's sophisticated computer, HAL, knows the purpose of the mission. Intentionally, HAL causes the death of four of the five crew members; eventually, the remaining member of the crew is forced, for his own survival, to disconnect the higher logic functions of HAL. Only at the end of this sequence, after Bowman has disconnected HAL, does he learn the purpose of the mission. The final sequence concerns Bowman's subsequent journey into an unknown world and his transformation into a new stage of life. The preceding overview is presented only as a brief synopsis of the film. Any reader unfamiliar with the film is encouraged to skim the scene-by-scene synopsis (Appendix A) before reading the analysis which follows.

3.2.1 Analysis of Sequence 1: "The Dawn of Man"

Scene 1 (Shot #1)

This scene is a single shot which lasts for approximately one minute and twenty-four seconds and includes the title and credits. Within the frame of the camera is the moon (at the beginning of the shot). The camera then tilts upward and tracks forward over the moon to reveal the
earth behind it. This shot serves as an identifier in locating a specific spatial region: Earth. The background music accompanying this shot is from Richard Strauss' *Also Sprach Zarathustra*; this particular section is entitled "Sunrise." Not only does the music provide a mood to the opening shot with which it is matched (the music reaches crescendo as the earth is completely revealed), but "Sunrise" presages the next scene. The transition to shot #2 is a simple fade to black with a fade-in to the next scene. This type of sign (formator) usually serves the purpose of indicating a distinct change in time (and perhaps location) in much the same manner as a new chapter in a novel.

Scene 2 (Shots #2-24)

The scene opens with a fade-in to reveal a barren landscape with mountains in the background bathed in a red glow. A superimposed title: "The Dawn of Man" appears in the lower half of the screen. The next five shots are basically the same type of long range shots depicting some barren landscape. Some shots reveal mountains, with the sun's red glow behind them; one shot clearly shows the sun above a flat horizon. Each transition between these shots was coded as a parallel cut because of the change in location. Essentially, there is no significant change in time indicated because each shot shows the sun rising or just barely above the horizon. All of these shots exhibit the identificative function of designative signs. Along
with the title in shot #2, they serve to identify the locale and time of the action which follows. The locale is the barren savannah devoid of any objects associated with a technologically advanced human race. Since these six shots exhibit the same basic content (sunrise over the savannah) there is added significance in the fact that there are six shots and not simply one or two. The basic information would not be altered if only one shot was used—the viewer would still witness the dawn. Rather, the repetition of this content in six shots stresses the barren and desolate nature of this locale. Thus, these six shots (instead of one) are appraisive. They emphasize that this world is comfortless.

The film jump cuts to shot #8 to reveal a landscape without any long shadows—brightly lit in the light of mid-day. The abrupt change in lighting from shot #7 to #8 is a clue that the viewer is to regard the transition as signifying the compression of time. The jump cut framed by two shots which drastically differ in lighting serves as a prescriptive sign—the viewer is to "read" this change as "later" in the day. The following five takes contain various rock formations, sparse vegetation, and the bleached bones and skull of some horned animal. Though these are long range shots, they are less so than those in #2-7. The film is focusing on a more specific locale. However, the desolation stressed in the first six shots of
this scene is further enhanced by this second set of six shots (#8-13). These shots are combined by simple cuts (because the lighting does not change and the shots are different viewpoints on a specific locale). As if to offer proof of the previously depicted barren nature of the landscape, these six shots signify that not only does the landscape look desolate, but on closer inspection it is desolate. Thus, this second set of six shots serves a prescriptive function to insure that the viewer will apprehend and understand this environment as one which is sparsely vegetated and somewhat hostile. The bleached bones in shot #12 are in the foreground of the shot and are emphasized because they appear in close-up. This shot is reminiscent of many westerns which always seemed to have a desert scene and inevitably showed the stripped and dried bones of cattle half buried in the sand. Thus, this shot may serve an appraisive function in its association with other films or images with which viewers may be familiar. At this point, it is appropriate to reassert that a given sign or sign complex can exhibit two or more of the dimensions of signification. Morris believes that in such cases one particular dimension will be stronger than the other(s). (See, also, above, pp. 66-68.) Thus, it is not unusual that this particular set of shots can both prescribe and appraise.

The next eleven shots (#14-24) depict another specific aspect of the savannah: life among the hominids. These
shots show ape-like creatures foraging for food in the dirt and their competition with a pig-like species of animal (the tapir) which grazes on plant life. Individually, these shots serve a designative function: they illustrate what life is like for these animals. Combined with simple cuts, these shots serve an appraisive function. The cuts organize these shots into a distinct whole; they depict a single group of hominids. Again, the repetition of images (in eleven shots) emphasizes the fight for survival. There is little food and water; hominids must compete with other animals for food and water, and they are at the mercy of predators (shot #24 shows one of the apes being attacked by a leopard). On one level then, this series of shots contrasts the appearance of absolute lifelessness of the earlier shots; yet it also evaluates the life of the hominids as difficult and competitive. Furthermore, because the viewer has witnessed this scene progress from general to specific (i.e., shots of landscape--more detailed shots of landscape--action shots showing a specific hominid group), this group of apes signifies the cultural level of "civilization" because of its synecdochical nature.

This scene ends with a fade to black, another instance of a conventional cinematic technique (a formative sign) to end a scene and suggest a change in space, time, or both. By viewing this transition (fade-out, fade-in) in conjunction with shot #24 (which ends scene 2) and shot #25 (which
opens scene 3), these three signs produce an adequate pre-
scriptive sign which orients the film viewer in terms of
the narrative. The viewer is led to infer a significant
shift forward in time—either one or more days later. The
formator (fade) is adequate/effective because the two des-
ignative signs which precede and follow respectively are
different in both location and lighting (which indicates a
difference in time of day). Insofar as the two shots are
different in kind (content), the transition is effective.
On the other hand, if shot #25 revealed the same content as
#24 (the leopard attacking an ape in the same locale) the
transitional fade would seem confusing, unnecessary, or
both; essentially, it would be inadequate and thus throw
doubt on the entire set of three shots.

It should be noted that the prescriptive dimension is
in evidence whenever the viewer is led to a conclusion,
inferrance, deduction, or premise. All of these are pre-
scribed by the manner in which shots are ordered and/or
presented within the film. While each shot is essentially
designative, the combination of two or more shots and
formative transitions can lead the viewer to conclude, infer,
et cetera.

While such statements may seem to be stretching Morris' 
definition of the prescriptive dimension, it should be
recalled that film is a construction of designative and
formative levels. Therefore, any prescriptive (or
appraisive) signs must rely on the designation of an object's characteristics or actions upon objects in relation to the interpreter's needs. The most basic need of the film viewer is to understand the film. In Signification and Significance, Morris defines a prescriptive sign as one which "signifies how the object or situation is to be reacted to so as to satisfy the governing impulse." In the case of film, the governing impulse or need is understanding the film being viewed. Thus, it is not so unusual to assert that the prescriptive dimension is utilized in film to assist the viewer's "reading of the text."

Scene 3 (Shots #25-40)

Scene three opens with a long shot of the apes' water-hole around which they are all gathered. Because of the contiguous relationship established by the transition from shot #24, this group of apes is perceived as the same group of apes in the last shots of scene two. Though the immediate locale and time have changed, these apes at the waterhole are the same. The transition between shots #24 and #25 signifies "later in the life of these apes." The next five shots are all of medium-length, joined by simple cuts, showing the apes performing various insignificant actions at the water's edge: drinking water, searching for food, and grooming each other. By virtue of the detail in these medium-length shots, as opposed to the longer range shots used in scene two, this group is given further
significance. This particular group can be viewed as the central "characters" of the film (so far) because of the attention which has been devoted to them (17 of 30 shots) and the "focusing-in" achieved by the switch to medium length shot range. These six shots, joined by simple cuts on the basis of continuity in space and action, function appraisively by conferring narrative importance on this group of apes; the plot is beginning to revolve around this group.

Following a simple cut, a long shot (#31) of the waterhole, from an elevated angle, depicts another group of apes moving slowly over a rise situated in the foreground (the waterhole is in the background). Shot #32 (medium length) shows the leader of the group at the waterhole as it realizes the presence of the other group. The following eight shots, all joined by simple cuts, depict an ensuing confrontation between the two groups; the first group is eventually chased away. These takes alternate from each group's perspective (defenders-attackers-defenders . . .) while also alternating between long and medium range--the long shots are noticeably in deep focus\textsuperscript{13} (high resolution in both foreground and background). The deep focus shots show the attacking group in the background while members of the defenders move back and forth directly in front of the camera (extreme foreground). The juxtaposition of alternating perspectives and use of deep focus perceptually
enhances the viewer's participation in this conflict. In a sense, the viewer is prescriptively led to identify with the apes. And yet, such identification may also be categorized as appraisive signification because of the increased preferential status conferred upon those characters or objects with which the viewer is identified. While both modes of signifying may be present in cases of identification, since the viewer is initially led to identify with an object or objects, it can be said that the prescriptive dimension overrides the appraisive dimension. However, those shots from the perspective of the defending group are markedly different from the others. When the camera shows the defenders in the background, the range of the shot is long enough to be well behind the attacking group. Conversely, the shots with the attackers in the background place the viewer in the midst of the defending group (because of the proximity of the apes moving back and forth in front of the camera). As a result, not only is the viewer a participant-observer in this confrontation, but the changes in focal length and perspective are used valuatively to lead the viewer to side with (hence, confer preferential status upon) the group which had originally occupied the waterhole—the group which remains central to the film's narrative.
Scene 4 (Shots #41-52)

This scene begins with a long range shot of the landscape in dim light. Instead of a fade, the transition between scenes is a jump cut (indicated by the abrupt shift in locale and lighting). Because the previous shot (#40) was in bright sunlight, the shift to dim light logically indicates (based on linear movement of time) that this scene takes place later the same day—dusk. While a fade may indicate any amount of time compression (i.e., a day, a week, et cetera), jump cuts are usually reserved for shorter durations. After a simple cut, shot #42 shows a rock formation in long shot (though the range is closer than in #41). Shot #43 is a medium shot of a growling leopard lying next to its kill—a downed zebra. Preceded by another simple cut, shot #44 shows a shallow cave among the rock formations. The transition to shot #44 was coded as a simple cut because of the continuity of lighting and, even though the locale is different, the growling of the leopard can still be heard. Shot #45 depicts the same cave from a different angle and perspective. The next six shots (#46-51) all reveal, in medium length, the group of apes huddled together within the cave and just outside of it. Most of the apes are wide awake and seem to be keeping vigil for the same leopard shown earlier. First, this series of shots detailing the apes in their shelter was preceded by the shot of the leopard. Second, the sound of the leopard's growling
can be heard, as if in the distance, by the viewer and by the apes—one shot shows the apes reacting to the growl. Thus, based on a relationship of contiguity (the shot of the leopard and its growl heard during later shots), this scene serves a prescriptive function; it leads the viewer to apprehend the dangers which this group of apes must face each night. Inherently, these shots are used valuatively to emphasize the hostile environment—a negative status.

This is another example of how a given sign or sign complex can exhibit two or more modes of signifying. Also, each shot in this scene has become progressively darker. This gradual change in lighting stresses the idea that this is nightfall. The last shot (#52) is a long shot of the horizon with only a faint glow of the setting sun.

Scene 5 (Shots #53-57)

This scene begins, after a fade, with a medium shot from above showing several apes asleep in bright sunlight. One of the apes, Moonwatcher, awakens and is immediately aware of something out of the ordinary. The next shot (#54) reveals (designates) a black rectangular monolith standing on end in the midst of the apes' dwelling. After a simple cut, shot #55 (medium) shows the apes beginning to surround the monolith as they continue to scream and gesture in animated fashion. Eventually, Moonwatcher touches the monolith—furtively at first and then with increasing boldness until he is actually stroking the smooth surface.
A second medium shot (#56) shows the other apes, gaining courage from Moonwatcher's action, touching and rubbing the monolith. The final shot of this scene, after another simple cut, looks straight up the side of the monolith at the moon, directly overhead, partially eclipsing the sun.

This scene appraisively emphasizes that the appearance of the monolith is an extraordinary occurrence for the apes and has great significance in the film's narrative structure. First, the duration of these shots is longer than the majority of shots in this sequence. While the average duration of each shot in sequence one is 9.34 seconds, the average duration of these five shots is 33.2 seconds. Secondly, the apes are obviously surprised (as are the viewers) to find such a distinctly different object suddenly intruding into their environment. The contrast is pointedly obvious. The monolith is made of a black material; the rocks and ground in the apes' locale is distinctly light brown/light red. The monolith has sharp angular (90°) corners and smooth sides; the apes' environment is comprised of eroded, rounded boulders and rocks. (For the viewer, this is clearly an other-worldly object which has been fashioned by a reasonably intelligent society--someone other than the apes.) Third, the background music, György Ligeti's Requiem for Soprano, Mezzo-Soprano, Two Mixed Choirs and Orchestra lends significance because of its non-verbal vocals. Rather, the voices in the music produce mostly
sustained tones of various degrees and notes on the musical scale; it can be described only as stylized wailing. Last, the final shot, oriented straight up the monolith toward the moon and sun, is unusual because of its acute angle. Like extreme close-ups in cinema, extreme or distorted camera angles take on added significance; sometimes they serve as metaphors. In this instance, the sudden shift of attention (from the horizontal) to the vertical up the length of the monolith at the moon and sun overhead prescriptively suggests a connection between the monolith and the heavens (universe) above. While the final shot carries most of the prescriptive signification, its extra-semantic meaning beyond the designative level of conveyed information vis-à-vis shot content, is prescribed only because of the shift in camera angle from the previous shot.

Scene 6 (Shots #58-81)

As before, this scene also opens with a long shot of the barren landscape (after a jump cut) followed by several closer shots of rock formations and the waterhole. These four shots (#58-61) serve as identifiers in placing the ensuing action in a locale recognizable for the viewer. Yet, they also imply that this group of apes again has temporary control of the waterhole. Hence, the viewer prescriptively infers an ebb and flow of territorial acquisition between at least two groups of hominids—there could also be other groups involved. This series of shots is followed
by a medium shot of Moonwatcher walking over and looking at a pile of bones lying on the ground near the waterhole. Since the shot range has moved progressively closer in each of the five shots at the beginning of this scene (becoming progressively more specific in detail) until the medium length of shot #62, the impression is that they are all linked by way of contiguity and association. Thus, though the viewer does not see the waterhole in shot #62, the viewer assumes that Moonwatcher is in the vicinity of the waterhole.

Following this shot of Moonwatcher beginning to contemplate the bones strewn around him, there is a contrast cut to a reprise of shot #57—straight up the monolith to the moon and sun beyond. After a second contrast cut, shot #64 depicts Moonwatcher picking up one of the bones and hitting other bones with it. At this point, the music which opens the film, Also Sprach Zarathustra, begins again. The following sixteen shots, all in slow motion, show the ape's arm swinging the bone, the bone smashing into other bones, the ape's face, and shots (#67 and #80) of a tapir falling suddenly to the ground. Shot #64 and #65 are followed by simple cuts (coded as such because there is no change in "real" time). Shot #67 (falling tapir) is preceded and followed by contrast cuts. Shots #68-79 are all joined by minute, but discernible, jump cuts in time. Shot #80 (falling tapir) is also framed by two contrast cuts. These
notable features serve to produce prescriptive and appraisive signs.

First, because of its placement between the first shot of Moonwatcher noticing the pile of bones and the second of Moonwatcher picking up a bone to knock it against other bones, shot #63 (monolith) serves prescriptively. The viewer is led to conclude that the monolith has precipitated Moonwatcher's subsequent action because of its intrusion into the scene. Nor is it simply any shot of the monolith; it is the most unusual shot taken from scene five: the vertical angle looking up the face of the monolith.

Second, the use of slow-motion in shots #65-81 lends significance to this scene because of the extraordinary nature of slow-motion photography—objects in the real world do not move like objects filmed in slow-motion. More importantly, though the use of slow-motion draws out action (slowing "real" time), these shots are edited with jump cuts which accelerate time because they leave out discernible portions of reality. This series of shots (#65-81) serve appraisively through the excessive and paradoxical distortion of time. While "real" time is slowed, narrative time is accelerated. The viewer perceives this action as a meaningful change in the evolution of humankind: acquisition of tool-using behavior as technological and intellectual progress. Furthermore, added emphasis is provided by the distinct contrast between the duration of these shots
and those of scene five. As mentioned above, the average duration of the five shots which comprise the previous scene is 33.2 seconds. The average duration of the seventeen slow-motion shots in this scene is 2.23 seconds—a marked difference (even in comparison to the sequence average: 9.34 seconds). Because of the distinctly different and unusual nature of these shots, there is a transfer of this appraisive "uniqueness" to the objects and action contained in these shots.

Third, all of the shots in slow-motion (#65-81), except for shot #81 are close-ups. The use of close-up shots gives further emphasis to the action because they specifically focus on certain actions and/or objects. The viewer has less to which he or she must attend because of the increased level of specificity. Close-up shots contrast with the non-discrete and life-like perception inherent in longer-range shots. Human vision can focus on objects, but not with the same level of discretion and specificity of the cinematic close-up. In normal perception, the area surrounding the object in focus is peripherally present. The presence of the cinematic frame enclosing the object in close-up rids the viewer of peripheral vision (in terms of the film's content). Shots #71-79 repeatedly depict the moments of impact as Moonwatcher's club alternately crushes skulls and rib bones. These close-ups provide counterpoint to the two slow-motion shots of the downed tapir.
Because of the cross-cutting of Moonwatcher's actions with the two shots of the felled tapir, the viewer infers (prescriptive mode) a future where the bone-as-club will become a hunting implement. Thus, the viewer recognizes (1) that this ape has advanced technologically and (2) that the advancement was initiated by the monolith which appeared in the previous scene. The final shot (#81) shows Moonwatcher, teeth bared and mouth agape, as he flings the bone away and raises his arms in seeming triumph. Additional significance is provided by the reprise of Also Sprach Zarathustra—the same music which opened the film in scene one. The music begins in shot #64 and matches many of the shots with its minor climaxes until the final crescendo which occurs in the second shot (#80) of the felled tapir.

Scene 7 (Shots #82-89)

This scene, which contains only eight shots, advances the premise of the previous scene. There are various shots of apes, alone and in groups, eating the fresh, raw meat which, heretofore, they had been unable to enjoy in quantity (if at all). Based on the narrative structure of the film (this scene follows the scene of Moonwatcher's behavioral advancement; they are joined with a jump cut), the viewer can reasonably infer that this group of apes is the one led by Moonwatcher. The scene ends speculatively with a shot of a small young ape beginning to play with one of the bone/clubs by picking it up and hitting the ground: this young
ape is exhibiting learning behavior. Though relatively short, this scene prescriptively leads the viewer to recognize/conclude that man has progressed from Moonwatcher's flash of insight to (1) using tools to enhance chances of survival and (2) passing on this knowledge to future generations. In a larger sense, the shots operate in a classically rhetorical fashion; they offer proof in support of the inference presented in scene six. Any doubts the viewer may have in understanding the significance of the previous scene should be quelled by the evidence presented in this scene.

Scene 8 (Shots #90-105)

In the last scene of the first sequence, the viewer is shown the culmination of the action precipitated by the black monolith. The scene begins with a long shot (#90) of Moonwatcher carrying his bone/club and leading (as shown in successive shots and simple cuts) the group back to the waterhole. The following shots are reminiscent of an earlier scene; Moonwatcher's group confronts the other group of apes over water rights. Contrary to scene three, the confrontation is shown from only one vantage point—the perspective of those apes which occupy the waterhole. (Moonwatcher's group advanced forward over a rise toward the camera.) Alternating between medium and long shots and using simple cuts, these shots show the advance until Moonwatcher strikes the leader of the other group—at first
timidly and then with increasing force and energy. Other apes with clubs descend upon the fallen leader and then successfully chase off the other apes. As in scene three (first confrontation), the alternation of medium and long shots seems to produce a participant-observer relationship. The viewer is consistently thrown in and out of the scene's central action: Moonwatcher's attack on the other leader. As before, the viewer is situated with the defending group--apes run back and forth in the extreme foreground of the shots, their backs to the viewer. Again, the alternating range prescriptively identifies the viewer with these apes. In fact, the viewer's relationship with these apes is more pointed by virtue of the cinema's inherent connection to the present tense.16

The final two shots (§104-105) are slow-motion close-ups. Shot §104 shows Moonwatcher throwing his club into the air. This shot closely resembles §81 which depicted his jubilation in mastering the new tool. Shot §105 is an extreme close-up of the bone twirling in mid-air. It focuses attention on the bone because it is not only in slow-motion close-up but also because the shot actually follows the bone as it rises, reaches its apex, and begins to fall to earth. At this moment, there is an associative jump cut to a sophisticated and elongated (like the bone) space vehicle (the first shot of Sequence Two). The instantaneous nature of this cut between these two distinctly
different shots prescriptively leads the viewer to infer a metaphorical relationship. First, the bone is metaphorically compared to the space vehicle—both are technological tools; the bone is the forerunner of the space vehicle. Second, this associative jump cut compresses into an instant, hence, stands for, the entire cultural/technological history of man. The viewer is propelled through thousands of years—from past to future—in a single moment.

There is little significant use of complex cinematic techniques within the first sequence except for the scene which uses slow-motion and rapid montage (cutting) to show the ape's acquisition of tool-using behavior. Most shots are either long or medium range with a horizontal angle. Most of the transitions are either simple (instantaneous) cuts or easily recognizable jump cuts. The use of the fade is neither unusual nor difficult to apprehend. Such simplicity of technique aids the viewer's apprehension of the narrative (including all four dimensions of signs) in lieu of the nonexistent dialogue; dialogue usually provides the viewer with clues to understanding the narrative (i.e., plot, scene shifts, et cetera).

3.2.2 Analysis of Sequence 2: "TMA-1”

Scene 1 (Shots #106-125)

As described above, this scene opens with a shot of a space vehicle against the void of space after the
associative jump cut from the close-up of Moonwatcher's bone/tool/weapon. Six different and sophisticated space vehicles all in orbit around the earth are shown in six successive long shots. The intervening transitions (formators) were coded as parallel cuts because of the changes in location (determined by the content of the designative shots) without noticeable changes in time. The first six shots serve as identifiers of space-time (earth's orbit--future) and also emphasize that this is an advanced society. This appraisive sign is constructed on these factors: (1) parallel cutting, (2) number of space vehicles, and (3) camera movement.

First, the parallel cutting stresses that the depicted action is taking place at the same time. That all of these space vehicles are in orbit at the same moment suggests the technological advancement. Second, the sheer number of vehicles (six) also emphasizes the level of technology. Even though these ships are different, the repetition of these objects takes on significance at a higher level of abstraction (they are perceived as examples of advancement because there are no comparable space vehicles in the contemporary world of the viewer). Furthermore, the sixfold repetition removes the unique aspect of these ships; they are not unusual in this world. Third, there are both left and right pans of the camera in several of these shots. These pans designatively mimic the horizontal scanning of
the viewer's everyday existence; they provide much more information than stationary shots because they cover more area. These six shots function appraisively in signifying the sophisticated level this society has achieved. Not only do these space vehicles seem to be everywhere; they are commonplace in this fragment of time. The last vehicle shown in the series is a space transport as indicated by the recognizable logo for PanAm.

Following the shot of the transport, there is a simple cut to the interior of the transport (shot #112). The viewer is prescriptively led to this conclusion because (1) the interior shot looks just like the interior of a contemporary airliner, (2) the interior shot is immediately preceded by the transport shot and (3) there is an instantaneous cut joining the two shots. During this shot looking down the aisle of the transport, the camera shifts focus to the foreground to reveal a fountain pen floating in the air to the left of a lone passenger sitting in one of the seats. In the following five shots, all joined by simple cuts, the rigors and reality of space travel are depicted by the focus on a specific and seemingly insignificant event.

The viewer sees the passenger (Dr. Heywood Floyd) strapped in his seat and asleep with his arms floating lazily in the air in a medium shot (#113). Shot #114 is a repeat of #112; the camera shifts focus back to the end of
the aisle as a flight attendant enters the cabin. Shot #115 is a close-up of the attendant's feet from floor level—the camera tracks right to keep the feet in frame. On the side of the shoes is the label: Grip Shoes. Shot #116 shows the attendant walking deliberately, fighting zero-gravity, while holding on to the tops of the empty seats as she comes down the aisle toward the camera. She eventually arrives adjacent to Dr. Floyd, grabs the pen (now back in focus) and in #117, places the pen in Dr. Floyd's pocket.

The six shots are unified by locale: the interior of the space vehicle (#118 shifts to an exterior shot of a space station). All are further unified by content. In each there is a clue to the zero-gravity environment (i.e., pen, Grip Shoes, Floyd's floating arms). Through this unification, these shots appraisively enhance the "reality" of space travel. Specifically, the floating pen is visible in three of the six shots. This attention to detail, seen in connection with the attendant's difficulty in traversing the length of the cabin and Floyd's floating arms, emphasizes the no gravity quality; the viewer perceives and responds to this portion of the narrative as if it were "real" (in part, because of the designative adequacy of each individual shot—there is no visible support for the pen or arms).

Also, by virtue of the attention given to the pen seen in quasi-close-ups (because of the camera's shift, bringing
the foreground into focus), these three shots prescriptively imply a metaphorical relationship to the viewer. The pen resembles the bon's slow-motion tumbling action (shot #105) in Sequence One's final shot. Just as the space vehicles are extensions of the bone/tool, so is the pen. Such a comparison is pointedly made by the commonality of absolute form (elongated) and attention to the pen.

And yet, there is still an obvious familiarity (for the viewer) in this series of shots. The interior looks like any other airliner; it is a transport operated by a familiar corporation--PanAm. And though the action takes place in earth's orbit (an awe-inspiring location as indicated by current attention to the Space Shuttle), Floyd sleeps through it all. The significant action revolves around an almost-lost fountain pen. In this sense, this series serves a second appraisive function. The viewer is led to perceive that, eventually, space travel will become familiar and mundane.

From #118-125, the narrative returns to the void to depict the transport's landing inside the hub of a space station so large that the hanger dwarfs the transport itself. Shot #122 designatively reveals this immensity by tracking back and panning right to follow the incoming transport; though the reverse tracking takes in more area, the camera must scan right to show the entire width of the hanger. On the sides of the hanger area, there are large viewing
windows in which the minute form of a technician can be seen observing the transport's approach.

This series of shots has two effects. First, it places Dr. Floyd on the space station because the viewer knows (from previous shots) that he is aboard the transport. All of the shots have followed the transport's approach. The final take (#125) shows the transport closing in on the docking area as the camera tracks forward at the same rate (approximately) of the transport's approach. Second, a distinct contrast is set up between #122 and the other shots of this series. While #122 emphasizes the immensity of the space station, the other shots emphasize the vastness of space. In each of the others, the space station is completely represented along with the approaching transport. Appraisively, the viewer apprehends that these objects are miniscule in comparison to the universe.

Accompanying this entire scene is Johann Strauss' Blue Danube Waltz. The slow tempo (allegro moderato) of the music compares with the gentle lyricality of the space vehicle's movement, the fountain pen slowly tumbling in mid-air, and Floyd's arms, free of gravity, floating lazily above the seat's armrests. The waltz reaches crescendo in the last shot (#125). Though this scene is not filmed in slow-motion, the music coupled with the slow sensation of movement in a zero-gravity environment provides a slow-motion quality to the scene.
Scene 2  (Shots #126-151)

This scene begins with a close-up (#126) of a door opening to reveal a single flight attendant and Dr. Floyd seated on a semi-circular bench. Because of the closeness of the shot, the right edge of this door serves as a formator: a horizontal wipe from right to left. This is also reinforced by the dying presence of the music's last note. Thus, the object (door) serves formatively to connect previous events with shot #126. The viewer knows that Floyd is now aboard the space station because of the contiguous relationship of shot #125 (transport approaching station) with #126 and because of the brief musical carry-over. As the camera begins to follow Dr. Floyd from this room into an adjacent reception area, the first words of dialogue are spoken by the attendant (22 minutes into the film; see Appendix B). The camera pans left to follow Floyd into the reception area where he is greeted by a receptionist. The next three shots are joined with simple cuts as Floyd greets Mr. Miller from Station Security and both proceed to a small passageway containing a video screen. There is a parallel cut to a close-up of the receptionist's hand activating the screen followed by a parallel cut to the screen as Floyd begins the Voice Print Identification procedure (shot #131). The manner in which Floyd delivers (vocally) the required responses reinforces the matter-of-fact attitude he has toward space travel. It is
obvious to the viewer that Floyd is a veteran of space travel; he has gone through these procedures before. Furthermore, Miller's prompt appearance and deferential attitude toward Floyd (as indicated via the dialogue in these shots) serve appraisively to suggest Dr. Floyd'd important status. Not only does Miller apologize for being a few seconds late, but as head of station security Miller's appearance (instead of someone else) confers importance on Floyd's rank in the hierarchy.

After a jump cut, the viewer sees a deep-focus long shot (#132) of the continually sloping corridor of the space station wheel. Floyd and Miller appear in the background and advance toward the camera, continuing to chat about various details—including the information that this is a layover stop for Floyd. The deep-focus of this shot designatively emphasizes the size of the space station based on (1) the time both men take to traverse the corridor and (2) the angle of slope to the flor. This portion of the wheel, as a part of the whole, operates as a synecdoche; the viewer can mentally extend this part of the wheel into a circle. The camera pans right to follow both men until Floyd stops in front of a Bell Telephone booth while telling Miller he has a few calls to make. Shot #133, following a jump cut, shows Floyd sitting in the booth, placing a credit card into the Bell Picturephone to initiate a call. The following eight takes concern Floyd's conversation with his
young daughter about her birthday and are presented in close-up, alternating between side-views of Floyd and the phone's T.V. screen and edited together with simple cuts. These shots appraisively accentuate the aspect of familiarity. In addition, since the Earth can be seen through a window next-to Floyd in all of the side-view shots, the familiarity is inherently connected with life on Earth. The space station is an extension of the Earth; on the space station, life is virtually the same. Corporate logos are present; people use credit cards and make calls home, and Ma Bell still charges for calls (as seen in #141: a close-up of the phone screen showing the amount charged).

After a jump cut—we never see Floyd make any other calls—there is a medium shot of several people sitting in a lounge; their conversation in a slavic tongue reveals that they are not English or American. Floyd joins them and, in the next nine shots (#143-151), they discuss generalities at first and then specifics about a quarantine placed on an American base at Clavius on the moon. Instead of a more standard editing style using intercut close-ups of each speaker as he or she speaks, a fewer number of shots are used with various right and left pans. While these pans technically serve as formators to connect the speakers (the camera's intermittent motion shows filmically what a cut implies), they (1) provide increased designative information and (2) prescriptively identify the viewer with
these characters. The medium shots with pans, opposed to close-ups with simple cuts, provide more detail about the surroundings (hence, more designative). Second, this technique draws the viewers into the conversation by simulating the perspective of a participant in the conversation (more accurately, someone present in this gathering)—moving their heads back and forth as attention shifts with the normal flow of conversation. All of these shots (average length is 40 seconds) are medium range except for #149 as Dr. Smyslov lowers his voice to ask about the truth of the rumor concerning the epidemic. This close-up further highlights the viewer's participation; it is as if the viewer-participant leans forward to focus attention because Smyslov lowers his voice.

Scene 3 (Shots #152-176)

To the strains of the Blue Danube Waltz in reprise, scene three opens with a long shot of a spherically shaped shuttle vehicle after a fade-out-fade-in transition. This formative sign (fade) signifies that a longer time segment has passed between the events of #151 and #152. Shot #152 serves as an identifier to locate the action of the next series of shots beginning with #153 after a simple cut: aboard the shuttle. This shot shows a flight attendant carrying trays, one of which she hands to another attendant. After a simple cut, #154 is a close-up of the tray with its various compartments of liquid foodstuffs. Each compartment
has a picture label indicating the contents (presumably for an international set of travelers) and its own straw. Following a parallel cut, #155 shows the shuttle continuing its journey. Following another parallel cut, shot #156 depicts the flight attendant in the galley obtaining another tray and then, upon entering a circular passageway, walking slowly up the rounded surface (until she is upside down) and exiting through a door. After a simple cut, shot #157 reinforces the disorienting action of #156. A door opens and the upside-down flight attendant walks through. At this point the camera rolls 180 degrees until the attendant is once again right-side up (in the viewer's perspective). By joining these two shots with a formative simple cut, an appraising sign is established. By disorienting the viewer's perspective in two shots, the combination of designators (shots) with a formator stresses the "reality" of space travel—up and down do not exist in an environment free of gravity (except in relation to the occupants of that environment).

Later shots in this scene re-emphasize the routine and familiar nature of space travel in this era. Viewers witness the shuttle pilot's obligatory visit with the passengers (shot #160) as well as Floyd's encounter (shot #161) with the shuttle's lavatory and its seven separate and detailed steps for operating the toilet. In this last instance, Floyd seems to take it all in stride. Throughout
this series (shots #152-165), occasional shots of the shuttle during its journey and subsequent approach to the moon are formatively linked (parallel cuts are used) with the interior shots of the shuttle. This intercutting functions appraisively in suggesting that space travel is like travel on a transcontinental or transatlantic airliner—long and uneventful.

Scene three ends with shots (#166-176) of the shuttle's approach to the landing area, the pilot's view of the lunar surface, the instrumentation panel inside the cockpit, and shots from the lunar surface. Shot #170 depicts the approach as it is viewed by several workers in space suits. Shot #176 reveals the cavernous underground bay as the shuttle is slowly lowered into it on the landing pad. Again, the music (Blue Danube Waltz) rises to crescendo in the final shot of this scene (as in scene one). These shots designatively provide as much detail as possible about the action and the technological advancement of the base at Clavius. While the essential narrative could be upheld by one or two shots of the landing, this series of eleven takes emphasizes the action because of the variety of perspectives—from the cockpit, the landing area, the lunar surface, and from the mountain ridge surrounding the base. Thus, a higher level of information is being designated because of the number of shots and perspectives. Essentially, these designators, combined with formative simple cuts,
appraisively emphasize the sophisticated level of technology which, in turn, appraisively stresses the "reality" of the filmic "present."

Scene 4 (Shots #177-188)

This scene, entirely devoted to a briefing, opens with a deep-focus long shot of a conference room with a speaker's lectern at the other end of the room. Tables and chairs are arranged in a block-U shape, and Floyd is seated, back to the camera, in the foreground. The shot opens with subdued conversations as the final note of the Blue Danube Waltz dies out. After a photographer is finished with taking pictures of Dr. Floyd, he is introduced by Dr. Halvorsen and Floyd leaves his seat to walk to the lectern. The use of deep focus and the unusual duration (1 minute, 44 seconds) of this shot, compared to an average of 16.32 seconds in Sequence Two, designatively provides the viewer with more information and time to assimilate the information. The viewer's attention is not focused on background or foreground or any specific objects.18

During Floyd's extensive monologue (See Appendix B.), a series of twelve separate shots is joined with simple cuts. The monologue also acts formatively to indicate instantaneous cutting because of its even flow. Three of these shots are close-ups of Floyd. The rest of the shots are taken from various spots along the right side of the room. Floyd is somewhere in each (usually right side of
frame) except for the close-ups and a shot (#185), from the lectern area, of another person asking a question. These shots serve designatively to provide information about the room and its occupants while maintaining attention on Floyd. Along with Floyd's comments, these shots combined with the formative simple cuts appraisively reinforce Floyd's status in the hierarchy. The viewer now knows for certain that he is privy to information few others know anything about.19

Also, two of Floyd's close-ups (#178 and #187) occur as he is stressing the use of and need for security procedures. By using close-ups at this point in the monologue, the viewer's attention is not visually diverted as it might be with longer-range shots of the conference room. Instead, the focus of attention is on the content of Floyd's remarks about security measures.

The last shot (#188) is a repeat of the opening shot—the entire room from behind Floyd's chair. Because this shot is from the same locale as the opening shot, both provide a unification of the entire scene; it ends where it began. This realization corresponds to the information (or lack of it) gathered from the briefing. Though the viewer is aware of the seriousness of the discovery at the crater Tycho (vis-à-vis the emphasis on security measures) nothing specific is said about what was discovered. And yet, there has been a clue in the film about the discovery. Two of the shots in Sequence One as angled straight up the monolith
to the moon (and sun beyond) imply a connection between the monolith and the moon. Because of the linear pattern of the narrative, the monolith shots are inherently connected (by the intervening shots and transitions) to this scene's discussion of a significant scientific/historical find. However, the scene, in itself, does not actually explain the mystery; hence, it ends at the beginning.

Scene 5 (Shots #189-212)

This scene opens (following a jump cut) with a series of eight shots (#189-196) depicting a moon vehicle flying over the lunar surface. All are "exterior" long shots of the vehicle's flight except #192, which is a close-up of a display panel and video screen. György Ligeti's Lux Aeterna serves as background music. In addition, the vehicle's movement (in terms of camera placement) varies with each shot (i.e., toward camera and overhead, away from camera, following camera from below and behind, right to left and left to right—perpendicular to camera). These shots prescriptively imply that the journey lasts longer than the viewer's "real" time—narrative duration is longer than viewing time—because of (1) the variety of perspective, and (2) use of jump cuts which join these shots. The variety of shot perspectives and long range of these shots designatively inform the viewer that each take is in a different locale. This information allows for the transitions to be perceived as jump cuts. Since jump cuts compress
time (and action), the viewer understands that this portion of the journey actually takes longer (and covers more distance) than its "real" time duration.

Furthermore, the number of shots (eight) involved in this segment appraisively stresses the length of the journey. The narrative would not significantly change if only one or two shots of the vehicle were used. The fact that eight shots are used to designate the journey emphasizes that this journey is lengthy and covers a vast distance. Again, this is an example of how a given sign complex, based on the combination of designative shots and formative transitions, can exhibit two separate modes of signification.

Following a parallel cut, shot #197 shows the cockpit of the vehicle. Because of the obvious change in location (exterior to interior) and the juxtaposition of #196 and #197, the viewer can conclude that this cockpit belongs to the vehicle flying in #189-196. Shots #197-204 concern a discussion among Floyd, Halvorsen, and Michaels about the mystery. During this segment, we learn more about how the discovery was made but now about what was found. The dialogue augments the fact that the transitions which join these shots together into a whole are simple cuts. More importantly, the dialogue designatively functions to reveal information about how the discovery was made. The only significant clue concerning what was found comes out in the comments of Dr. Halvorsen—"It seems to have been
deliberately buried" (shot #202) and "the only thing we're sure of is that it was buried four million years ago" (shot #204). Shot #203 highlights these comments when Floyd remarks "Deliberately buried?" Thus, these three shots, because of their linear/narrative link to the events of Sequence One, prescriptively lead the viewer to deduce some connection between the discovery and the monolith in Sequence One. The length of time involved—four million years in the past—reinforces the tie to "The Dawn of Man" sequence.

Shots #205-212 show more of the journey and the vehicle's subsequent approach and landing at Tycho. This series of eight shots intensifies those of the first series (#189-196). The same background music, Lux Aeterna, occurs in #205-212 (as in #189-196). The first three (#205-207) show the vehicle moving right to left, left to right, and right to left, respectively, across the screen. Shot #208 is a long shot (as are the preceding three) of the moon vehicle; the camera pans right to follow the vehicle until the landing pad is revealed in the lower right corner of the frame. Since the four shots are joined with parallel cuts, they appraisively emphasize the lengthy duration of this flight across the lunar surface; this is especially so in light of their contextual relationship to shots #189-196 and the segment inside the vehicle's cabin when the three characters take time to have lunch (based on an assumption that they could have eaten either before or after the flight
if it were relatively short).

Shots #209-211 are close-ups of an instrumentation panel, the cockpit, and a video screen respectively. These shots seem to emphasize the intricacy and sophistication of the vehicle's landing procedures. The graphic displays on the video screen appraisively suggest (the screen can be seen somewhere in each of these three shots which are joined with simple cuts) that landing the shuttle is a delicate procedure even with the advanced technological level of this era. The last shot of the scene (#212) shows the vehicle's landing, in the distance, through a window at the landing facility. This final shot sets up the events of the next scene because it designatively informs the viewer that Floyd and the others have arrived at the Tycho crater: the scene of the mysterious find.

Scene 6 (Shots #213-229)

Shot #213 is a high-angle long shot looking down into an excavated pit in which a monolith (resembling the monolith from Sequence One) has been uncovered and is now surrounded by bright floodlights. Looking down into the pit is a group of six men in space suits. Because of the abrupt change in location and this shot's juxtaposition with scene five (Floyd's journey), the transition between #212 and #213 was coded as a jump cut. Next is a long shot (#214) looking up at the group as if from the edge of the pit. The following shot (#215) reverses the previous take--from a high
angle—as the men start down a ramp into the excavation. Shot #216 utilizes long range and deep focus as the camera moves down the ramp amid the group (two men are walking ahead—extreme foreground—and the monolith can be seen in the background—extreme right of frame). The use of deep focus (with its higher level of designation and approximation of binocular vision) coupled with gentle up-and-down and forward camera movement (functioning formatively) draw the viewer into a participatory relationship. (Indeed, this shot closely resembles the camera-as-first-person technique in Robert Montgomery's *The Lady in the Lake*.) Thus, as with the right and left pans used during Floyd's conversation with Soviet scientists in scene two, this shot illustrates how camera movement and focal length can function formatively with the designative information provided to prescriptively identify the viewer with the characters in the narrative.

The next two shots show the group's approach to and arrival at the floor of the excavation. Shot #219 depicts one of the men circling around the monolith as the camera pans left to follow him. Shots #220-221 show the same man and then the others as they gather around the monolith to gaze at it as the apes had done in Sequence One. Shots #222-224 are three separate close-ups of Floyd as he touches the monolith (#223 is an extreme close-up of his hand as it makes contact). This is also reminiscent of man's first encounter with the monolith, especially in view of Floyd's
implied status as the group's leader. In this sense Floyd is like Moonwatcher. Because of the repetition of action (leader touching monolith), this monolith is associatively linked to the monolith in the first sequence. Further evidence is provided by the use of close-ups; they designatively confirm that Floyd is the one touching the monolith.

Shots #225-227 show the men as they are urged by the photographer to gather in front of the monolith for picture-taking purposes. In shot #227, just as the photographer is beginning to line up his camera, a high-pitched signal is heard. Shot #228 tracks forward towards the group of men as they begin to react in pain at the signal. Shot #229 repeats an already familiar perspective—a high-angle shot straight up the monolith at the Earth above and the partially eclipsed sun behind it. The obvious repetition of perspective (shot angled straight up the monolith) corroborates the monolith's connection to the monolith in Sequence One. The reprise of Ligeti's Requiem (heard during the ape's encounter with the monolith) further verifies the connection first established by shots #222-224 (Floyd touching monolith).

Furthermore, because of this shot's linear connection to the events of Sequence One (via the narrative structure) the high angle perspective functions appraisively. The viewer is aware of the power of the first monolith because of its prescriptively signified influence on Moonwatcher's
behavior. The angled shot of the second monolith recalls the power of the original monolith. Thus, the camera angle alone appraisively signifies a dominant status of previous shots which implied the monolith's effect on the apes. Even though these two shots of the monolith are separated by 166 intervening shots and transitions, the pragmatic level of meaning (viewer/interpreter response) associated with the first monolith (scene 6, shot #63) is called up by the repetition of the image.

Essentially, Sequence Two serves the purpose of establishing a reality of space travel and living/working in space. Most of the sequence does little to advance the plot. Much of the dialogue is innocuous and trivial; only Floyd's remarks during the briefing and the conversation aboard the moon shuttle give the viewer any indication about what is happening. Only fourteen minutes is devoted to dialogue in a thirty-four minute sequence. However, Sequence Two serves a more important purpose: connecting the first two sequences. The connection, via the monolith, provides a justification for the extreme jump forward in time—from the distant past to the near future.

3.2.3 Analysis of Sequence 3: "Jupiter Mission"
Scene 1 (Shots #230-294)

This sequence begins after a jump cut (from the last shot of Sequence Two) with a long shot of the space void.
This shot utilizes one of the techniques of the silent movies by providing a title: "Jupiter Mission—18 Months Later." The title avoids confusion by providing information which designates the passage of a specific amount of time as well as indicating a relatively specific locale (Jupiter Mission) by naming the ensuing action. The title serves as an identifier (designative dimension). As the title fades away, an elongated spaceship enters the frame on the left and traverses the screen from foreground to background. After a simple cut, #231 shows the ship entering from the left and traversing from background to foreground, and exiting at the right of the frame again. Shot #232 shows the ship moving laterally across the screen from left to right. Thus, these three shots joined with the simple cuts function designatively to identify a location in space-time and to depict the size of the spaceship. Furthermore, by stressing the absolute form of the ship in three successive shots (after all, #230 effectively identifies the space-time location and the basic features of the ship), the viewer is prescriptively led to infer a metaphorical relationship. The ship is elongated with a spherical head at the front while the rocket engines (rear) are also larger than the ship's central section. Visually, the ship's form resembles the bone used by Moonwatcher in the first sequence (the spherical front of the ship compares with the rounded joint at the end of the bone). Just as the vehicles
shown early in the second sequence are likened to the bone-as-tool, so is this space ship metaphorically compared by the three-shot emphasis on its form.

Shot #233, after a parallel cut, takes the viewer inside this ship with a long shot of the astronaut's living quarters. The viewer infers that this interior is of the ship in shots #230-232 because of the contiguity provided by the abrupt parallel cut (formator). Shots #233-236 show Astronaut Frank Poole as he jogs around the inside of the spherical cabin and living quarter. Shot #233 shows the central aisle of the sphere and the vertically oriented hub. The camera pans left and right alternately as it follows Poole jogging, appearing to run horizontally. Shot #234 is of medium range with the camera following (tracking forward) Poole, now oriented vertically. The next two shots are close-ups angled up from ground level—first tracking backward as Poole seems to be running behind the camera and then tracking forward as the camera follows his progress. This series of shots points to the fact that an artificial gravity is present and that the direction "up" is always towards the center of the sphere. Shot #233, with its violation of earth-bound perspective, combined with the three other shots from different angles and moving camera, imply that the artificial gravity is provided by the slow rotation of the cabin.
Shot #237 is an extreme close-up of a domed instrumentation light and the reflection of Frank entering the vicinity of this light (the light will later be identified as the "eye" of the HAL 9000 computer). The next shot (#238) shows another astronaut (Dave Bowman) as he exits from the hub, moves down a ladder, and joins Frank, who is now sitting at a table eating. Because Frank is now attired differently (not in his jogging clothes) the transition between shots #236 and #237 was coded as a jump cut. As Dave joins Frank, the background music—Khatchaturian's Gayne's Adagio—which began during the first shot (#230) fades away. The following shots (#238-262) vary between medium and close-up range as viewers see the astronauts eating and watching a television transmission from Earth of a BBC interview with the astronauts.

The dialogue present during the interview program designatively provides viewers necessary information about who these astronauts are, the three hibernating crew members, the computer HAL, the mission, and that the spaceship "Discovery" is now eighty million miles from Earth. In addition, the interview raises the question of whether HAL is capable of emotional responses. HAL speaks for itself when expressing its infallibility. The entire interview is seen in the same screens which Frank and Dave are watching (one of them is always present in these shots). Thus, these shots utilize two levels of designation: those of
the interview which are edited together like any other television interview and those of the film itself—varied perspectives of the astronauts eating their meal while watching themselves on the interview. This dual level of designation (besides the extra information it conveys—shots of the interview within shots of the film) appraisively stresses the astronaut's solitude. They are eighty million miles from Earth; three of the crew members are in hibernation; their only companion is a computer. Even the background music is silent during the interview segment (emphasized when it is heard again during shots #263-274).

However, the shots of the interview segment reinforce the scene's earlier shots of Frank's jog around the cabin. Most of the shots place Frank and Dave in a diagonal orientation to the screen. Thus, the high and low angles, medium range to extreme close-ups and diagonal framing of the main characters enhances the viewer's perception of the filmic "present" as real. Hence, the designative adequacy of these shots produces an appraisively signified reliability and believability. The sheer number of effectively presented designators combined with the formative transitions lead the viewer to confer a sense of reality upon the action. Even the interview segment lends a documentary (non-fictional) quality to this scene.

Shots #263-274 are devoted to showing more of Frank and Dave's life aboard "Discovery" as the strains of Gayne's
Adagio are heard again. Shot #263 is another long shot of "Discovery" moving left to right and away from the camera. After a parallel cut, #264 shows Frank relaxing on a couch while watching a televised birthday message from his parents. Because of its intervening juxtaposition between two shots (#262 and #264) of the ship's interior, the long shot of "Discovery" takes on a formative value (the viewer does not need the exterior shot to understand that the "Discovery" is still moving toward its destination). Thus, this shot seems formatively to signify a passage in time, especially since Frank is now in a different locale (shot #264). As Frank continues to attend impassively to the birthday message from home, there is a parallel cut to two shots (#266-267) of Dave sleeping. After another parallel cut, #268-270 returns to Frank as his parent's transmission ends. By intercutting the shots of Dave asleep, this series of shots seems to highlight appraisively a feeling of solitude. There are moments during the journey when Frank (or Dave) is totally alone. It is also implied that at least one crew member must be awake at any given moment. That the shots of Dave occur in the midst of the shots of the birthday message allows the viewer to apprehend the simultaneity of these two separate events (hence, the use of parallel cuts). The appraisively signified feeling of solitude is reinforced by the fact that neither Frank nor Dave has spoken to one another in the entire scene; each has conversed
only with HAL.

Shot #271 is a close-up revealing Frank playing a game of chess with HAL. The transition before this shot is obviously another jump cut because Frank is fully clothed in a jump suit as opposed to the t-shirt and shorts he was wearing in shot #270. Shot #272 is a close-up of a hand sketching one of the hibernation pods; #273 (medium range) reveals Dave as the artist. The music fades out as Dave finishes his sketch and the camera (#274) tracks backwards to follow him as he walks to another part of the cabin and stops at a control panel as HAL addresses him. The rest of scene one is devoted to a conversation between HAL and Dave. Shot #275 is an extreme close-up of HAL's eye. (This light has been established as a sign for HAL, much like a close-up of a human face, by continually showing this light each time HAL spoke during the interview segment.)

Shot #276 is a medium length shot looking out from HAL's eye as Dave begins to show HAL his sketches. This assumption is produced by (1) the "fish-eye" lens effect used which corresponds to the dome shape of HAL's eye-camera and (2) the immediate juxtaposition of shot #275 with shot #276. Furthermore, during #276, HAL's voice is heard asking Dave to hold the sketch a bit closer, whereupon Dave moves the sketch-pad closer to the foreground—the viewer's perspective is clearly HAL's perspective. This shot also informs the viewer that HAL's vision is comparable to human
vision—HAL recognizes that the sketch is of the hibernating crew member Dr. Hunter.

During their conversation, #275-285 utilize four separate perspectives: close-ups of HAL (light as "eye"), shots looking out through HAL's eye, a medium shot of Dave seated at the panel, and close-ups of Dave. The style of editing (the transitions are simple cuts) resembles most films which depict conversations between or among people—close-ups of the individuals with occasional shots of all participants from a distance (it would be familiar to the average film viewer). However, this style of editing also anthropomorphizes HAL by treating the computer just as if it were a real person in conversation with Dave. In fact, #287-293 enhance this appraisive sign by alternating solely between close-ups of Dave and HAL's eye. Finally, the viewer also becomes aware of HAL's omniscient level of perception when he predicts that one of the ship's components is about to fail. Not only can HAL see what is happening on board "Discovery," but it is intimately aware of intricate and minute changes in ship functions.

Scene 2 (Shots #295-328)

Following a jump cut, shot #295 shows both men working at different panels while recording data. Shot #296 shows both astronauts walking through the hub of the revolving cabin. They feel their way carefully through this padded chamber because there is no gravitational force at the
center of the cabin. The third shot is a close-up of a video screen as Mission Control gives them the go-ahead to replace the unit before its predicted failure. The abrupt changes in locale allow the transitions which join these shots to be coded as jump cuts. Thus, the three shots compress the action. The viewer is aware from Dave's comments at the end of scene one that he is going "to go over this with Frank" and then "get on to Mission Control." Shots #295-297 compress all of the action by showing both as they monitor data in one part of the ship (the viewer knows this shot does not take place in the cabin because Frank is oriented vertically while Dave is standing horizontally--no artificial gravity), part of their walk back into the cabin, and receiving a reply from Mission Control (implying that a message was sent by the astronauts at some point since the end of scene one). In this case, the combination of these three shots with jump cuts implies events which were not depicted.¹⁹

The rest of scene two is devoted to Dave Bowman's EVA in order to replace the unit HAL has predicted to fail. The first shot (#298) shows Dave, already suited up, entering the pod bay. At the same time, the only sound which can be heard is that of Dave's breathing; it has a muffled quality which suggests that this is all Dave hears. Successive shots show C-pod as it leaves "Discovery" (Dave is inside the spherically shaped, one-man craft), the pod
moving down the length of "Discovery," and Dave exiting the pod to float to the location of the faulty unit. Intercut (using parallel cuts which conventionally mean simultaneous action) with these exterior designative shots are occasional interior (inside "Discovery") shots showing Frank monitoring Dave's progress and HAL's eye. The combination of HAL's eye as designative shot with the designation of Frank's monitoring action prescriptively implies that HAL also is aware of Dave's progress. In two instances, (shot #301-302 and #325-326) the shots of HAL (#301 and #325) immediately precede the shots of Frank (#302 and #326). Because the shots of HAL occur first, in these parallel cuts to "Discovery's" interior, that element of precedence adds strength to the prescriptive implication.

The fact that Dave's breathing is the only sound heard during all of the shots devoted to his EVA appraisively stresses his solitude. First, the sheer number of shots (twenty-five) with the accompanying sound magnifies the designative information (that this is the sound of Dave's breathing). Second, the parallel shots of Frank and HAL do not contain the sound of the breathing; it is noticeably absent. Third, while the viewer's perspective of the EVA is primarily distant (most of these shots are long or medium range), the viewer hears this amplified sound just as Dave is hearing it.
Furthermore, there is a second appraisive sign resulting from the designative shots, formative transitions, and the appraisively signified solitude. The shots of Frank designatively inform the audience that he is ready to rush to Dave's aid because he has a space suit on instead of usual flight suit attire. Shot #303 is a long shot of "Discovery," which pans right to follow numerous meteors which closely drift past the ship. The attention given to the meteors as well as the knowledge that Frank is suitably clothed for EVA, coupled with the appraisive emphasis on Dave's solitude, appraisively stresses the risk involved in a seemingly routine EVA to replace the faulty AE-35 unit. Clearly, there are dangers involved. Extra emphasis is added by the duration of this segment: six minutes and thirty-five seconds (average shot duration = 12.74 seconds); its duration heightens the tension.

Scene 3 (Shots #329-368)

This scene begins with two close-ups of different video screens with graphic displays of electronic circuitry. Having followed shot #328 (after a jump cut) with Dave still working on the faulty unit during EVA, the shot does not make readily apparent what has taken place or how much time has elapsed. Shot #331 is an extreme close-up of HAL's eye, which is followed by a shot looking out HAL's eye (#332) at Dave and Frank checking the suspect AE-35 unit. These two shots serve a dual purpose. First, by using a
shot of HAL's eye to precede one (with fish-eye lens effect) revealing both astronauts, the two takes are confirmation that the appearance of the distorted fish-eye effect is a sign for HAL's visual viewpoint. Also reaffirmed is the viewer's impression of HAL's omnipresence regarding onboard activities.

Second, shot #332 serves as an identifier in telling the viewer where the action is taking place and that both astronauts are in the process of determining the validity of HAL's fault prediction. The intervening close-ups (#329-331), because of their tight focus on specific objects (displays and HAL), are sufficiently vague not to add to the narrative action until they are followed by shot #332. The occurrence of this shot, even though it appears three shots after the final shot of scene two (#328), implies that a jump cut (formator) served as the transition between shot #328 and #329. Dave's return to the confines of "Discovery" is implied in the jump cut because of its linear connection (via three interior close-ups) to shot #332.

The following nine shots (#333-341), edited with simple cuts, alternate among close-ups of Dave, Frank, and HAL's eye along with a repeat of #332 looking out from HAL's eye, and a shot of both astronauts from across the room. During the short conversation which occurs during this series, the close-ups of HAL as it speaks further emphasize the anthropomorphization of HAL. Though a machine, HAL is given the
same status as Dave and Frank by focusing attention, when it is communicating, on its sole outwardly recognizable feature: the domed light which also serves as a camera for HAL. That this light has become a "sign" for HAL is highlighted by its red luminescence and a yellow dot of light in the center—an acute resemblance to a human eye. The content of HAL's remarks reveals its own attitude toward this status. The computer's use of the plural "we" suggests that HAL considers "himself" as one of the crew. The conversation also designatively reveals that Dave and Frank cannot find anything wrong with the AE-35 unit; this information intimates at succeeding action.

In shots #342-344, preceded by a jump cut, a second transmission from Earth suggests the possibility that HAL is in error as well as the information that one of the crew will be going EVA to replace the faulty unit in order to check the fault prediction. Mission Control is incredulous about the possibility that HAL is in error. The next segment of designative shots (#345-353) varies among close-ups of Dave, Frank, and HAL with some medium shots of Dave and Frank sitting at the control panel as they discuss the possibility of error. HAL is adamant in ascribing any problems to human error: "Well, I don't think there is any question about it. It can only be attributable to human error. This sort of thing has cropped up before [pause] and it has always been due to human error." In the same
discussion, HAL reaffirms his reliability. "The nine thousand series has a perfect operational record." And, in its last statement, HAL maintains "his innocence" in a curiously human way: "Quite honestly, I wouldn't worry myself about that." In this series, the designative dimension of the dialogue coupled with the nature of HAL's responses and the use of standard dialogic editing (shots alternate among the communicants) appraisively accentuates HAL's human-like quality and treatment. HAL seems defensive about its position—a decidedly human trait. (As a part of the soundtrack, dialogue is a plastic element of film; it also imparts information to the viewer.)

In #353, Dave abruptly closes the matter and mentions to Frank that there is a problem with the transmitter in C-Pod; he asks Frank to take a look at it with him. Shot #354 closes this segment by showing, reflected in a close-up of HAL's eye, both men as they stand and walk off. Since the large majority of these close-ups have not shown a mirror-like reflection, its use takes on added significance. (The only other occurrence took place in shot #237—before this light was established as a sign for HAL.) The significance arises in the marked difference it has in relation to the non-reflecting close-ups of HAL. Shot #354 appraisively lends a quality of foreboding to this scene; its use is clearly ominous when viewed in context.
In shots #355-362 the viewer sees both astronauts enter the pod bay, wait for HAL to rotate the pod and open its door, and climb into the pod. Shot #362 shows the pod rotating back to its original position (on Dave's order) until the pod window is facing the control panel with HAL's eye situated on it. Shot #359 is an extreme close-up of the eye; its occurrence, in the midst of the other longer range shots advancing the narrative action designatively reminds the audience of HAL's omnipresence.

Shot #363 is a close-up of Dave's hand as he flips off a row of toggle switches. Shot #364 shows Dave and Frank, in side view, facing one another inside the pod. Dave is in the right third of the frame, Frank is in the left third of the frame, and the window of the pod is in the center. HAL's eye is visible, in the background, through the window in the center of the shot. This shot lasts one minute and fifty-seven seconds. Toward the end, Dave and Frank discuss the possibility of disconnecting HAL. As if to emphasize Dave's suggestion that disconnection would "be a bit tricky," there is a simple cut to a close-up of HAL's eye through the pod window (#365). Shot #366, after a simple cut, is a repeat of #364. After Dave's comment, "Well, I'm not so sure what he'd think about it," shot #367 (after a simple cut) is an extreme close-up of HAL's eye. Shot #368 is a close-up of Frank's mouth, moving as he speaks, but without any sound. The camera then pans left to Dave's silent,
though moving, mouth.

Because of its extended duration, shot #364 clearly establishes the placement of Frank and Dave—left and right of the frame respectively. Also, HAL is obviously aware of their conversation even though unable to hear, (as designated by Dave's comment at the beginning of this shot). Shot #368, on the other hand, reverses the perspective—Frank is now on the right while Dave is on the left. Together with the lack of sound, this shot prescriptively leads the viewer to infer that HAL is closely watching their actions. The juxtaposition of #367, a close-up of HAL's eye, in preceding this shot augments the inference. Furthermore, the specific focus on the close-up of Frank's mouth, then panning left to Dave's mouth, back to Frank, and then back to Dave leads the viewer to conclude that HAL is sophisticated enough to read lips.

Scene 4 (Shots #369-492)

Scene four begins with an identifier (designative dimension)—a long shot of "Discovery" as the viewer again hears only the sound of breathing—following a fade-out-fade-in transition from scene three. Shot #370 is a long shot of a pod, already outside the pod bay, rising from behind the control room monitoring the pod; Frank has gone EVA this time. The next six shots vary among shots of Frank, Dave, HAL's eye on an instrumentation panel, and finally Frank floating away from the pod (#377). In shot #377, the pod
begins to rotate as Frank floats away from it. Shot #378 shows the pod as it stops rotating. In concert with shot #376, a close-up of HAL's eye on the panel, these three shots prescriptively lead the viewer to infer that HAL has taken control of the pod (Frank is no longer inside and shots #371 and #375 established Dave's monitoring position). Furthermore, the change in perspective from #377-378 combined with an instantaneous cut (simple) tells the viewer that the pod, when it stops rotating in #378, is now facing Frank. As it stops rotation, the mechanical arm of the pod begins to move and the manipulators in the arms begin to open and close. The pod also begins to move directly towards the camera and, presumably, Frank.

Shot #379 is a closer shot of the pod (following a simple cut) -- focusing on a red light which resembles HAL's eye. Shots #380-382 are three successively closer shots of this light, lasting less than two seconds. Shot #383 is a close-up of HAL's eye. Coupled with the information that Frank's amplified breathing ceases in shot #380, these five shots prescriptively imply that HAL has utilized the pod to attack Frank. The use of brief, but obvious, jump cuts in time (formators) to join shots #379-382 compresses the actual duration of the event and accelerates it. (This compares with the first use of a tool as weapon -- Moonwatcher's destruction of animal bones in Sequence One.)
In the next three shots (0384-386), HAL's murderous deed is confirmed. After a parallel cut, shot 0384 shows Dave sitting at his station in his EVA suit. Shot 0385 depicts a television monitor; the viewer sees what Dave sees (as indicated by the immediate juxtaposition of 0384 and 0385, joined with a simple cut)—Frank's body hurtling away from the "Discovery." Shot 0386 is a medium shot of Frank as he struggles with his severed oxygen hose. In the next six shots (0387-392), Dave rushes to the pod bay and boards another pod to effect a rescue. Shot 0391 reveals Frank floating toward the camera with "Discovery" in the distance; the stilled body designatively signifies that Frank is dead. The following thirty-two shots (0393-424) depict the pod's exit from "Discovery" and Dave's pursuit of Frank's body. There are occasional parallel cuts to Frank's lifeless body tumbling through the void. The last shot (0424) is a close-up of Dave as the pod's mechanical arms grasp Frank.

Shots 0425-441 concern action aboard the "Discovery" during Dave's absence. Preceded by a parallel cut, shot 0425 is a close-up of HAL's eye followed by a shot of the pilot's seats from HAL's viewpoint (designated by the "fish-eye" effect). After a simple cut, shot 0427 reveals the hibernation chambers containing the other three members of the crew. This is immediately followed by a close-up of a control panel for the chambers and then a close-up (0429) of one crew member's vital signs. Shot 0430 is another
close-up of a screen which reads: Computer Malfunction (with the accompanying sound of a warning signal). The next eleven takes vary among shots of the chamber, screen, vital signs display, and HAL's eye. In shot #437 the screen reads: Computer Malfunction—Life Functions Critical; shot #439 reads: Life Functions Terminated. Shot #438 shows the vital signs; one by one, each oscillographic display goes straight line as each life function ceases. A shot of the three hibernation chambers (#440) precedes another close-up of HAL's eye (#441).

First, the abrupt cut from the close-up of Dave to the close-up of HAL's eye signifies simultaneity. Since the following sixteen shots occur on board "Discovery," the viewer perceives these events as happening while Dave is retrieving Frank's body. Second, shots #427-440 designatively advance the narrative by depicting the demise of the three hibernating crew members. Third, using a close-up of HAL followed by a shot of the pilot's control panel (located in the same cabin where the hibernation pods are) to begin this series of shots prescriptively leads the viewer to conclude that HAL has precipitated the computer malfunction which leads to the deaths. This inference is emphasized by the last shot of this series—another close-up of HAL (#441) in conjunction with the fact that HAL controls all of the ship's functions.
Shot #442, preceded by a parallel cut, shifts the scene back to the pod bay by showing the bay's control panel just as the viewer hears Dave's voice requesting HAL to open the pod bay door. Because Dave's last designated location (shot #424) was at a distance far from the "Discovery," this shot also allows the viewer to understand that while HAL was effecting the other crew members' deaths, Dave was making his return. In the following five shots (#443-447), Dave repeatedly attempts to make contact with HAL. These shots vary to show Dave, the pod arms holding Frank's lifeless body, an instrument panel and window with the pod outside (in the background), and a long shot of the pod alongside "Discovery." In shot #447 HAL finally responds: "Affirmative, Dave. I read you." The next thirteen shots alternate between close-ups of Dave and HAL's eye (except for one medium shot of the panel with HAL's eye on it) during their ensuing conversation. After telling Dave that he is not going to let him re-enter, HAL reveals that he was aware of the plan to disconnect him because he could read their lips. Shot #460 is a close-up of Dave as he calls HAL's name repeatedly—without any response. However, the dialogue has indicated that Dave is going to attempt re-entry through the emergency air lock but that he is without his helmet, which he had left behind in his haste to rescue Frank.
The following twenty six shots (#461-486) depict Dave's preparations to enter "Discovery." A variety of perspectives shows the pod move to the emergency hatch, the pod arms releasing Frank's body and then opening the hatch, and the pod rotating until its door is backed up to the emergency hatch, intercut with close-ups of Dave. In shot #480, the camera is inside the emergency hatch looking out; the pod door is seen in close-up with its label: Caution--Explosive Bolts. After a close-up of Dave, shot #482 shows Dave's hand as he arms the explosive bolts on the pod door. After several shots (#483-486) of Dave preparing to exit by bracing himself in front of the door and holding his breath, shot #487 shows the pod from inside the padded chamber which comprises the entire emergency hatch. Suddenly the door explodes; #488 is a reverse shot of the chamber as Dave comes flying by and hits the wall opposite the hatch. After another cut, a reverse shot again shows Dave flying by, back toward the open hatch and then grabbing a lever to close the door and flood the chamber with oxygen. The only sound is the rush of air as it enters the emergency entrance. The final shot of scene four is a close-up of HAL's eye, which slowly dissolves to a close-up of Dave with his helmet on (#493)—the first shot of scene five. This series, combined with simple cuts as formators, designatively advances the storyline in depicting Dave's improvised re-entry into "Discovery." The use of the reverse shots (#487-489)
utilizes fast-motion photography (only slightly sped up) to compress the duration of the re-entry. This effect seems to enhance the believability of the action by emphasizing the speed with which Dave's entry occurs (he is holding his breath throughout).

Scene 5 (Shots #493-523)

After the dissolve from HAL's eye (#492), the first shot of scene five is a close-up of Dave, with helmet on, as the camera tracks backward to follow Dave's progress through the length of the emergency hatch. In shots #494-502, the camera follows Dave through the emergency hatch door, into and through the pod bay, watches his progress as he climbs a ladder (in a vertical angle shot), and reveals Dave as he opens the logic center/memory banks' door and then enters. Shot #502 is a close-up of HAL's eye with the reflection of Dave moving toward it.

The dissolve from HAL to a shot depicting Dave's movements through the emergency hatch prescriptively implies, to the viewer, the passage of time (in the same manner as a jump cut) because Dave has a helmet on now. HAL seems to know that Dave is going to disconnect him. This is augmented by HAL's monologue beginning in #494: "Just what do you think you're doing, Dave? I really think I'm entitled to an answer to that question." Throughout #497-503, HAL attempts to bargain by giving assurances that he is back to normal. Shot #503 is another reflection of Dave
in HAL's eye.

His efforts to no avail, HAL begins pleading as Dave begins disconnecting the row of memory banks which slowly slide out one after the other (shots #506-508). The following series of designative shots (#509-515), combined with simple cuts (highlighted by the continuous nature of HAL's monologue), as formators, show Dave and the memory banks from above Dave's head, from the side, from below, and over Dave's shoulder. In all of these shots, Dave continues to float in zero-gravity; the variety of perspectives eliminates any sense of up or down.

In shots #516 and #518, Dave is reflected in HAL's eye as HAL's voice becomes slower and lower in tone. The content of his speech designatively reveals that HAL has regressed to the beginning of his speech instruction as he begins to sing a song he was taught. During #519, a close-up of Dave, HAL's voice (in voice-over) fades out. Due to the sequence of events, the content of HAL's speech, and the ensuing silence, the viewer is prescriptively led to conclude that HAL's higher functions have been disconnected.

After a brief moment of silence, another voice is heard by Dave—the voice of Dr. Heywood Floyd as he begins to explain the mission in an automatic recording. The last four shots alternate between this prerecorded message on screen and close-ups of Dave as he learns of the monolith and the purpose of the mission. With the last shot (#523),
of Dave and of this sequence, the audience learns that the monolith had emitted a single radio signal aimed at Jupiter. (This is the same signal heard by the men in the excavated pit at the end of Sequence Two.) Along with Dave, the audience learns for the first time the purpose of this mission. The last spoken words in the film are those of Dr. Floyd.

Except for a single, very powerful, radio emission aimed at Jupiter, the four-million-year-old black monolith has remained completely inert, its origin and purpose still a total mystery.

Sequence Three focuses on implications of advanced computer intelligence. Except for the last series of shots when Floyd reveals the mission's objective, the sequence adds little to the plot developing from the previous sequences. Almost every action in Sequence Three coheres to foretell and/or establish the confrontation between HAL and the astronauts. Accordingly, numerous clues lead to this end. HAL is treated as being human-like by the astronauts in the way they relate to him. Both Dave and Frank refer to him with the pronoun "he"—never "it." Dave admits to the interviewer that HAL acts as if he has real emotions—ostensibly, because he was programmed that way; they both seem to reinforce the notion when they question his reliability and attempt to deceive him by hiding in the pod. Toward the end of scene four, Dave reacts angrily
to HAL as if with a child. Even HAL seems to show real emotion when he begins to use emotional appeals to persuade Dave not to disconnect him—in the end he is reduced to child-like statements and song-singing. In addition, the close-ups of HAL when he is communicating with the others reinforce the appraisive anthropomorphization of HAL. He is treated cinematically as any other character in a dialogue by the close-ups. The depicted events appraise HAL's human-like qualities and frailties—emotion, deceit, revenge, and murder.

In the first two parts of the film, the monolith has been a visually unifying image. However, the monolith itself does not appear during this third sequence. There are, though, two separate references to the monolith. First, the prerecorded message by Dr. Floyd at the end ties this mission to the monolith's mysterious appearance in part two, and implicitly, to its appearance in the "Dawn of Man" sequence. Yet there is no explicit visual reference to the monolith. There is, however, an implicit, metaphorical visual reference to the monolith. The row of memory banks which float out of their slots as Dave disconnects HAL are miniature replicas of the monolith. Though they are made of a colorless, translucent material, they are easily recognized as rectangular shapes in proportion to the dimensions of the monolith. The sheer number of designated shots containing the memory banks combined with
formative simple cuts emphasizes their analogous shape. Hence, the memory banks become a metaphor for the superior intelligence represented by the monolith. There is a possibility that the advanced intelligence from another world may be a society of machines—a theme not unknown in science fiction.

3.2.4 Analysis of Sequence 4: "Jupiter and Beyond the Infinite"

Scene 1 (Shots #524-575)

After fading out from a close-up of Dave Bowman (#523), the film cuts (as opposed to a fade-in) immediately to a long shot of the space void (#524). The accompanying title: "Jupiter and Beyond the Infinite," designatively informs the viewer that "Discovery" has reached its destination. The camera then tilts down to reveal the planet Jupiter, various Jovian moons, and "Discovery" in the distance. The background music, Ligety's Atmospheres, begins—its title an indication of the musical tone and content. Shot #525 tilts up to show a monolith (which resembles the other monoliths), oriented horizontally, tumbling in space. The next five shots (#526-530) are various perspectives of the monolith orbiting Jupiter along with, and alongside at times, "Discovery." These shots inform the viewer that Dave has made contact. The next shot (#531) shows an EVA pod moving toward the camera. Shot #532 is a long shot displaying the northernmost section of Jupiter, a moon directly above it, and the monolith in the uppermost third of the screen. The
camera tracks forward while tilting up to reveal other moons in a vertical-alignment. As the camera continues to track forward, two vertical walls of light (left and right sides of the frame) begin moving toward and past the camera. The walls of light, containing all the colors of the spectrum, begin moving rapidly past. The prescribed impression, based on the illusion of forward camera movement, is that the space pod is traveling at a great rate of speed. In these shots (and in those that follow), the forward movement of the camera implies the space pod's forward movement. The viewer is prescriptively led to conclude that the pod is traveling forward at high speed. Placing the axis of screen action perpendicular to the screen surface gives the impression of depth—dimensionally augmenting the two-dimensionality of the screen. 23

The next shot is a close-up of Dave's helmeted face—he begins to shake and vibrate until his face is a blur. The conclusion is prescribed that Dave is inside the space pod as it hurtles into the "Infinite" (vis-à-vis the opening title) based on previous shots of the pod's forward movement and the extreme vibration which Dave is experiencing. The following nine shots (0534-542) alternate between long shots of the walls of light (they become horizontal in 0540) and extreme close-ups of Dave, his face frozen in fear and agony (eyes wide, mouth open). Shot 0543 is an extreme close-up of a blinking eye. Based on continuity and editing,
the viewer can infer that this is Dave's eye (since all of
the action is either depicted looking out from within the
pod or inside the pod focused on Dave). However, the colors
of this eye are abnormal--a blue pupil and orange-yellow
cornea with a polarized light quality. The alternation
between the extreme close-ups of Dave and the pod's journey
designatively confirm that Bowman is experiencing this
unique trip through space. In a sense, the continuing al-
ternation in shot content augments the prescribed conclusion
referred to above: that Dave is inside the pod as it moves
through space. Hence, there is confirmation, based on
designative information, of the viewer's initial conclusion.

The designative illusion (again, once prescriptively
established, a particular sign becomes primarily designa-
tive) of rapid forward motion continues as 0544 depicts
what appears to be a cluster of stars looming in the
distance. The following twelve shots reveal various gaseous
swirls of light against a background of starless void with
occasional intercut shots of a blinking eye with different
combinations of color. Shot 0552 depicts what appears to
be a fetus in an early stage of development. Forward move-
ment continues as shot 0557 reveals a curved surface (like
the horizon of a planet) in the lower third of the frame.
Above this horizon are five oscillating objects, each in
the shape of a diamond, which appear to stay at an equal
distance ahead of the camera. After another shot of an eye,
shot #559 has a landscape-like surface in the top of the frame—as if the camera were now upside-down.

After another extreme close-up of Dave's pupil (blue and purple), the camera in shot #561 moves faster and closer to a Grand Canyon-like landscape (but colored quite differently). The last fourteen shots of this scene vary with the type of strangely-colored landscape traversed. The forms of these landscapes are familiar—mountains, valleys, plains, water, tundra—but the colors are bright blues, yellows, reds, and greens which are never comparable to colors associated with comparable landscape on earth. The final shot shows a blinking eye (#575); the colors of the eye change with each blink of the eyelid until the pupil is dark (black) with a pale yellow cornea.

For the most part, this scene's fifty-two shots (lasting fourteen and one-half minutes) designatively depict a journey covering a great distance over a relatively short period of time. Perhaps the pod has even come close to attaining the speed of light as suggested by the shots showing celestial phenomena—one after another. There are two possible conclusions about the ultimate destination. First, the form of earth-like landscapes could be those of a parallel world. Second, these landscapes could be those of the Earth in a separate space-time location. At this point, either conclusion is possible because of the narrative's ambiguous nature. Furthermore, the intercut shots
of Dave's pupil (color changes with each successive shot) imply that Dave is experiencing a metamorphosis. Since the colors of the eye continually change, the shots prescriptively indicate to the viewer that Dave is undergoing an unspecified transformation because the eye has been cinematically equated to Dave by virtue of the scene's editing. Indeed, shots #556, #558, and #560 highlight this change because they occur between the celestial phenomena shots and the landscape shots (#557 and #559 appear to provide a transition between the larger phenomena and the landscape by depicting a planet-like horizon; see above). The final shot of the scene (#575) stresses Bowman's metamorphosis as the pupil's colors change each time the eye blinks.

Scene 2 (Shots #576-609)

This scene opens with a medium length shot (after a contrast cut) looking out the window of the pod. The pod is situated in a room with a lighted floor and Louis-the-Sixteenth decor. After a cut to a close-up of Dave, his head still shaking, there are three separate medium shots of the pod, situated in the room, from three perspectives. These shots designatively emphasize the pod's placement in the corner of this room which has a bed, several tables, and sitting-room chairs. Shot #581, which follows these three shots, is a repeat of #577—a close-up of Dave still shaking. (Because of the unusual nature of this scene, a full description of the narrative will be provided before the
semiotic analysis.)

Shot #582 looks out the pod window again. Standing next to a door at the opposite end of the room is someone in a space suit identical to the one Dave wears. The next shot is a closer shot of this man. The face inside the helmet resembles Dave. Shot #584 is a close-up of the face inside the helmet. The face is Dave's but a recognizably older Dave (called for convenience Dave\textsuperscript{2}). Shot #585 is a reverse shot over the shoulder of Dave\textsuperscript{2} toward the corner where the pod was situated; however, the pod is no longer there. Dave\textsubscript{2} walks toward the center of the room. After a jump cut, shot #586 shows Dave\textsubscript{2} walking toward the camera (still situated at the doorway). After a simple cut, shot #587 reveals what is beyond the doorway--the camera pans right (simulating the movement of Dave\textsubscript{2}'s gaze) to show a sink and bathtub in the same style of decor as the adjacent room. Shot #588 is a close-up of Dave\textsubscript{2} from the left as he walks forward (right to left in the frame). The next shot (#589) shows Dave\textsubscript{2} walking through the door into what is obviously a bathroom. In shot #590, Dave\textsubscript{2} is reflected in a picture-sized mirror. As he stares at himself, he suddenly hears a noise from the room he has just left. Shot #591 takes his perspective as the camera pans right and then tracks forward back to the open door. Shot #592 is a close-up of Dave\textsubscript{2} (face-on) as the camera tracks backward to stay ahead of him. For the second time, the
camera (in shot #593) takes his perspective as it reaches the doorway and looks beyond it into the larger room. This same shot reveals a man seated at a small table (in the corner where the pod had been) with his back to the camera. After a brief close-up of Dave₂, shot #595 cuts back to the seated man, who is eating a meal. At this point, the man turns in his chair and glances in the direction of the camera (and Dave₂). He is an even older version of Dave. After turning back to his meal, this man, Dave₃, pushes his chair back, stands up, and walks toward the camera. When he reaches the doorway, he glances around and then shakes his head as if he were sure someone or something had been there.

Following a simple cut, shot #596 looks down from ceiling level and the other side of the room as Dave₃, clad in a dark dressing gown, walks back to the table to resume his meal. Shot #597 is a closer shot (from the same angle and vantage point) as #596. As he reaches for something on the table, Dave₃ knocks his crystal water glass off the table. Shot #598 is an extreme close-up of the glass shattering on the floor; shot #599 shows Dave₃ (from table level) as he pushes his chair back and looks down at the broken goblet. At this point, Dave₃ is distracted and turns to his right to look in the direction of the large bed.

Shot #600 is a long shot of the bed—the head of Dave₃ can be seen in right foreground of the frame—as if over
his shoulder. On the bed is a withered old man lying on his back—only his face and arms are visible. Shot #601 is a medium, bed-level shot from the side to reveal a bald, wrinkled version of Dave. Dave, feebly raises his right arm to point (screen right) at something out of frame.

Shot #602 is taken from above the head of the bed, looking down, to show a monolith, like the others, just beyond the foot of the bed. Shot #603 shows the bed and monolith from the corner of the room where the table (and pod) had previously been. Shot #604 shows the monolith again from the perspective of the dying Dave. Shot #605 looks down on the bed from the vantage point of the top of the monolith. The old man is no longer there—instead, a round globe of flowing, yet diffused, light lies in the place of Dave. Inside this sphere is an unrecognizable shape. At this time, Strauss' Also Sprach Zarathustra begins in its second reprise.

Shot #606 is a bed-level shot from the side which reveals an unborn child on the bed with its eyes open and looking upward. The next shot (#607) is from the child's perspective looking at the monolith. The camera zooms forward until the blackness of the monolith fills the screen. From the blackness, the film cuts to a shot of the Earth's moon. As the camera tilts down, part of the Earth appears in the right-bottom quadrant of the frame. The camera then pans slightly left and a faint glow appears in the left side
of the screen. After a simple cut, shot #609 shows the same unborn child (from shot #606), inside its amniotic sac, floating in space above the earth. The music comes to crescendo and the film fades to black for the film credits. (The semiotic analysis of this scene now follows.)

Though there is only one instance where the viewers can see two versions of Bowman in the same shot (#600), the linear sequencing of shots allows for the possibility that the original Dave was present in the same moment of time as Dave₂, and Dave₂ was present during the appearance of Dave₃. In shot #582 the perspective was objective—Dave, in the pod, could see Dave₂ standing across the room. In shot #593, Dave₂ could see Dave₃ seated at the table (this is affirmed by shot #594—a close-up of Dave₂). Because of the simple cuts (formators) used to join with these designative shots, these signs prescriptively imply to the viewer that somehow, probably due to Dave's unique journey, the successive-simultaneous versions of Dave exist as pairs in specific moments of time. Without the contiguity of these shots (in terms of camera perspective and locale) the viewer might perceive the intervening cuts as jumps or speed-ups in time—such a situation might seem less confusing, but the meaning would be quite different. The use of the simple cut specifically implies that time is dis-oriented at this location. Time, as the viewer knows it, is violated.
Second, from the juxtaposition of #600-602 (all showing the oldest version of Bowman) with #604-605 (the star-child), the prescribed conclusion is that Bowman has somehow become the star-child. These shots are linked by #603—angled up from the head of the bed at the monolith as if from Dave's perspective. While the "object" on the bed in shot #604 is unrecognizable except for its spherical shape and luminescent glow, shot #605 designates, by virtue of the close-up of the star-child, the characteristics of the object. Indeed, shot #604 serves as a transition to the final stage; it is as if the transformation were actually taking place in front of the viewer.

Last, the appearance of the star-child and its subsequent placement floating above the earth is effected by the monolith. Guided by the monolith, the tool of an other-world society, mankind (Dave's last name—Bowman—can hardly be a coincidence) has returned to its birthplace, profoundly changed, after an odyssey into the infinite. Since #606 takes the perspective of the star-child (angled up from head of bed at monolith) as the camera moves toward the monolith until it fills the screen, the viewer is prescriptively led to infer that the monolith is the instrument of travel. (Here again, the camera movement serves a formative function.) How far and how long it takes is not clear; the viewer knows only that the star-child ends up in space—above the Earth. Presumably, another odyssey has begun.
3.3 Analysis: Conclusions

The single object which links the four sequences of *2001: A Space Odyssey* is the monolith. Its appearance in the first two sequences of the film are visually connected by comparable shots straight up its vertical length. Visually, the monolith does not appear in the third sequence; however, Dr. Floyd's prerecorded message openly refers to it. In the same scene, this inert representation of a highly intelligent, extra-terrestrial society is implicitly present in the shape of the logic banks which comprise the higher intellectual functions of HAL. Dr. Floyd's message also connects Sequence Three with the events of the previous two parts of the film. Finally, the first shot of Sequence Four reveals the monolith—this shot occurs immediately after Floyd's recorded remarks that the monolith's origin and purpose are "still a total mystery." Obviously, the monolith is the single object which occurs in all four parts of the film.

The monolith is more than a representation of the advanced culture, however. The monolith, too, is a tool—a tool with the same elongated shape as Moonwatcher's bone and the space vehicles which orbit the earth. The monolith-tool influences (begats) tool-using behavior in Moonwatcher. Not only does it influence man, but it follows mankind in the advance to Jupiter and beyond. The monolith effects a change in Moonwatcher; it also profoundly changes Dave
Bowman, as evidenced in the final scene.

That Sequence One and Sequence Four are intimately connected seems clear from equivalent elements. Both sequences occur without any dialogue; both contain the *Zarathustra* theme music. In both parts, the monolith changes the central character. Implicitly, Moonwatcher's advancement heralds the development of mankind. (Indeed, Moonwatcher's adaptation of the tool to its use as a weapon has its parallels with recent history.) Equally, Bowman's transformation foretells another change in man.

But what of Bowman's explicit role (as opposed to the idea that he is a metaphor for humankind)? Bowman has returned to the earth in another form and, presumably, in another time (there are no space vehicles or satellites orbiting the earth). As mentioned above, the landscapes which Bowman traverses are similar to those found on earth. Like the barren savannah of Sequence One, these landscapes are also devoid of man-made structures or any other sign of man's dominion. Secondly, the deep, rich shades of red in these landscapes echo those of the opening shots (#2-7). In addition, the pale green and yellows of other landscape shots (#569, #572-573) in Sequence Four are reminiscent of the shades of color used in shots #11 and #12. One cannot avoid feeling that Bowman has returned to the "Dawn of Man" to set in motion the events, depicted through the film, in a curious circular time-warp.
Stanley Kubrick's *2001: A Space Odyssey* is an exceptionally visual film. This is what ultimately made the film unique—the gradual perception of the perfect cinematic concept for the film as a nonverbal visual experience, one that would resist neat categorizing by dialogue or narration and, instead, penetrate an audience's consciousness at a deeper and more stimulating level.  

There is nothing unusual, for the most part, about the film's editing and camera placement. Seventy percent of the transitions (formators) are simple cuts. Eighty-five percent of the shots (designators) utilize a horizontal camera angle while there is a fairly equal mix of long, medium, and close-up range shots.

Essentially, the sequential ordering of the designative shots (iconic signs) connected by and combined with formative transitions (conventionalized shot-change signs) carries the narrative content of the film. Beyond the informational/designative level of meaning provided by the individual shots, there are significant features or shot clusters which prescriptively or appraisively augment the designative function.

First, the film utilizes repetition of basic shot content to emphasize certain physical characteristics of the designated environment. The opening shots of scene
two in the first sequence exemplify this technique. The first twelve shots of this scene continually depict the savannah's desolation. The sheer repetition of this shot content lends added appraisive significance to the designative level of meaning. In Sequence Two, while Floyd is traveling between Clavius and Tycho, two series of eight shots each show the moon shuttle traversing the lunar surface. Again, that the action depicted within these shots is accomplished in sixteen shots rather than two or four emphasizes the duration of the journey.

A second use of repetition involves that of specific images. The most obvious example occurs in the first two sequences: the vertical shots pointed up the monolith's length to the moon and sun (in Sequence One) and the Earth and Sun (in Sequence Two). Not only is the extreme camera angle an indication of the monolith's significant effect on mankind (in both sequences), but the repetition of the same image connects the two sequences—providing narrative unity. In the third sequence, HAL's eye is continually shown in extreme close-up. Because these shots occur in the midst of others which show action taking place in various locations aboard "Discovery," the repetition emphasizes the computer's omniscience and omnipresence.

Another specific feature is those shots which are a marked departure from the average shot duration. By either increasing or decreasing the shot length, extra significance
is given to such shots. For example, the shot series which
depicts Moonwatcher's acquisition of tool behavior is empha-
sized in the rapid rhythm created by continual jump cutting
and brief shots. Conversely, in Sequence Three, the ex-
tended length of the shot devoted to the astronaut's con-
versation inside C-Pod, coupled with the following shots
of AHL, lead to the conclusion that HAL is aware of the
conversation's implications. This shot, which lasts one
minute and fifty-seven seconds, acts as a pointer; it
specifically highlights this particular segment of the
film.

A third technique is utilized during the third sequence
in those segments when the editing style anthropomorphizes
HAL. by intercutting the shot of HAL's eye when he is
speaking to either Frank or Dave, HAL is given equal status
as a conversational participant. The film treats HAL just
as it might any human being engaging in a conversation--
the close-up of HAL's eye is cinematically comparable to a
close-up of a character's face while that character is
speaking.

The features noted above are examples of how shots
are manipulated in order to lend added emphasis to specific
designative shots and shot segments. In addition, the use
of extreme close-ups, shifts in the camera's focal length
(within shots), slow or fast motion, camera movement along
all three axes, and changes in camera angle all aid in
prescriptively or appraisively augmenting the designative level of meaning. Perceivable differences call attention to these moments within the film. These emphasized shot clusters are apprehended by the viewer as having a higher semantic level of meaning (beyond the purely designated information).

While the basic narrative content of the film is discernible, the larger "meaning" of 2001 remains an enigma. A variety of interpretations for the film's ending are possible because of the aesthetic ambiguity attached to the film's final few shots. The suppression of the spoken word combined with attention to visual images and detail "requires an act of continuous inference on the part of viewers to fill in the field of attention by making their own imaginative connections." Such inferences are derived from the inherent connection of the designative iconic sign (shot) with the formative conventional sign (transition). Not only do these basic film elements coalesce into a narrative, but they also blend together in producing various prescriptive and appraisive responses to portions of the narrative.

As mentioned earlier, the viewer has a felt need to understand the dramatic events depicted within the film. The viewer has only the film (hence, designative and formative signs) to rely on in his or her effort to read and understand the "tissue of references" which comprise the
film. All of the prescriptive and appraisive responses to the film are based on that need of understanding—the viewer's desire to know what the film is saying.
CHAPTER THREE

FOOTNOTES


2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 241.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., p. 242.

6 Ibid.


9 While a simple cut indicates an instantaneous change in perspective within the same locale, a parallel cut indicates simultaneous action in a different locale; a contrast cut signifies a switch to a different and unrelated location. A jump cut indicates a forward jump in time.
To some degree, this shot may "call up" an appraisive response in the viewer who is familiar with the American Western genre. Yet, this single image is still loosely associated with previous filmic images even though they occur outside of this particular film. See Christian Metz, *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*, Michael Taylor, trans. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974), pp. 99-102, for his discussion of paradigmatic and syntagmatic categories.


Ibid., p. 4.

The use of deep focus most closely approximates binocular vision because of the high resolution of the objects in both foreground and background.

Though never referred to by this name in the sequence itself, the name is used in the film's credits.


Ibid., p. 10. Lotman asserts that the viewer is both witness to and participant in the narrative.

Though this sequence is untitled, I have taken this title from Arthur C. Clark's novel *2001: A Space Odyssey* which was based on the screenplay. TMA-1 refers to Tycho Mangetic Anomaly-1.

19 Even the top Soviet scientists do not know anything about the mystery; see Appendix B.

20 Though not explicitly discussed until now, the example describes the ability which the combination of designative and the formative jump cuts has in functioning prescriptively—implying the occurrence of events not shown. Such is the case whenever jump cutting is evident.

21 According to Lotman, "eyes photographed in close-up have become a metaphor for conscience, morally evaluating some idea," p. 83.

22 In a larger sense, the intervening shots and transitions between each close-up of HAL serve to formally link all of these shots together.

23 Lotman, p. 81.

24 The faster an object travels, the more space shrinks and time shows down. The shots of Dave's frozen visage imply that time has slowed tremendously. See Nigel Calder, Einstein's Universe. (New York: Viking Press, 1979), pp. 96-98 for a layman's discussion of Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity.

26 According to Lotman, "language becomes noticeable when a speaker uses it in an unusual, individual manner: strikingly, figuratively, artistically . . . a participant in an act of artistic communication obtains information, not only from the language in which art converses with him," p. 49.

27 Walker, p. 267.
CHAPTER FOUR
CONCLUSION

4.1 Overview

This study has been predicated on the argument that rhetorical critics of film should devote attention to (1) discovering the basic rhetorical-semiotic properties of film by (2) relying on film theory (rather than on sociological, psychological, historical, et cetera explanatory models) and (3) analyzing those specific elements indigenous to the cinematic art form. In keeping with that basic assertion, a method has been outlined, devised from the semiotic theory of Charles Morris, with an eye toward suggesting how filmic form relates to viewer understanding. Hopefully, this method will enable a critic to: (1) classify iconic and conventional filmic signs as to mode of signifying (i.e., designative, formative, appraisive and/or prescriptive) and (2) understand how filmic signs are ordered/structured in a manner which allows the viewer to recognize what the film says and "means." Therefore, this dissertation is not only in line with the recommendations of the National Developmental Project on Rhetoric and its Committee on the Advancement and Refinement of Rhetorical
Criticism (see above, p. 1), but it also responds to Roderick Hart's six-year-old call for a return to the synthetic-critical posture.\(^1\) For Hart, the "descriptive, theory-conscious" approach would allow "rhetorical critics to describe suasory messages extensively enough so that intelligent hypotheses would emerge, eventually lend themselves to experimental verification or rejection, and, later, to theoretical enlargement."\(^2\)

Furthermore, the analytical model proposed in this essay is aligned with Thomas Farrell's conception of a model as an abstract representation of an object, event, or process.\(^3\) Insofar as the primary function of a model should be explanation,\(^4\) this thesis has sought to draw some connection or analogy between the way an artifact of rhetorical communication functions structurally or operationally and the way some related specifiable process operates.\(^5\)

More specifically, an attempt has been made to link the structural composition of film to Morris' typology of signifying modes in order to elucidate the process by which viewers apprehend basic filmic content. In turn, a shot-by-shot analysis of Stanley Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey has been undertaken to illustrate the method's application to specific instances. In light of the preceding overview, it seems appropriate (1) to discuss some conclusions about film-as-rhetoric drawn from the case study analysis, (2) to
assess the success of the method, and (3) to propose a program of further research.

4.2 Film-as-Rhetoric

As a complex mixture of iconic and conventional signs intentionally constructed for an audience to view, film is a communicative experience which can be rhetorically analyzed. Put another way, rhetoric is, in part, an aid to studying communicative understanding and, as such, is applicable to film. While a film may be primarily produced to maximize viewer turn-out, we also may surmise that all films inherently communicate something to their viewers. But, whether a film has a "message" of any sort is not as important as the notion that, hopefully, the film will be understood by the audiences which see it.

Essentially, each film viewer brings to the cinematic experience the need or desire to understand the film just as he or she needs to make sense of the daily-lived world. With that in mind, any particular film must be geared toward guiding the viewer to understanding the film's content. No doubt as there are films which, in the attempt to appeal to the largest audience possible, are so simplistic as to be trite and banal, there also are films which fail at the box-office because viewers can not make sense of the experience. The success or failure of a film often, then, comes down to its understandability.
There are two significant points to be made about Morris' semiotic theory which have a bearing on audience understanding. First, because of the film's necessary reliance on the designative and formative dimensions to "tell" the narrative, prescriptive and appraisive dimensions of meaning must be based on the informative and systemic types of sign usage. While Morris does allow for the ability of designative signs to be used prescriptively or appraisively, such situations must rely on the interpreter's needs (see above, pp. 82, 113-114, and 187-188). Though he never explicitly defines what he means by "needs," one might assume that Morris is referring to those biological, psychological, and sociological needs akin to Maslow's hierarchy. But what need(s) does the film viewer bring to the film experience? Besides the need to be entertained or the need to alleviate boredom or the need to see one's favorite movie star or filmmaker's latest creation, there would seem to be only one need which each viewer brings to the situation: the need to understand what they are about to witness. While it is highly possible that Morris never envisioned such a re-formulation, neither does it seem contradictory to his approach.

Second, in a larger sense, the film as a whole constantly requires responses from the viewer. Designatively, the iconic signs (shots) of the film "ask" the viewer to respond to the objects or situations depicted as if they
had such and such characteristics. Formatively, the film's transitions rely on the viewer's knowledge of filmic conventions. Prescriptively the film requires the viewer to make inferential leaps, conclusions, assumptions, et cetera about events and situations (depicted or not depicted) in order to fully comprehend the narrative. Appraisively, the film requires the viewer to make valuative judgments or associations about objects or situations which are inherent in the narrative. At all of these levels, there is a basic requirement. In order to understand the film, the viewer must participate—sensually, cognitively, and emotionally. From the opposite viewpoint, the film must, in essence, incite the viewer to participate—to respond to the film.

As can be seen from the analysis in Chapter Three, the narrative of 2001: A Space Odyssey is carried, primarily, via the visual aspect. Less than half of the film's running time (forty minutes out of one hundred and thirty-three) contains dialogue; little of the dialogue adds significantly to the visually depicted portion of the storyline. Surprisingly, the film does not exhibit many complex cinematic techniques (not to be confused with special effects for which this film is well-known). A majority of the shots utilize long to medium range with horizontal camera angles; most of the transitions are simple, instantaneous cuts.

The initial critical response to Kubrick's 2001, as noted earlier (see p. 103), was reserved if not far from
complimentary. The most likely reason was because the film was so different from the average film fare of its time. The film was (and still is) different because the narrative relies so heavily on what makes film film—a pictorially represented narrative which uses iconic signs (shots) connected by and with conventional signs (transitions). While the iconic signs manifest the function of naming, the conventional signs manifest the function of telling by providing a "grammatical" structure. Furthermore, 2001 does not rely on dialogue and/or narration (features which are not unique to film) to guide the viewer's apprehension of the narrative. As such, Kubrick's film requires greater and more involved participation from the viewer than the average film.

However, this is not to say that 2001 is the only true film. The power behind all films is that the narrative is in the film-as-organized rather than in a story told. In all films, to some degree, the narrative connections are derived from the images which are presented and organized. The character of the film is constructed upon the character of the filmic elements. Audience understanding aside, the case study provides other insights into the nature of film-as-rhetoric.

In Signs, Language and Behavior, Morris stated that while film (or ritual or drama) may be primarily aesthetic, it may also serve to inform its participants, determine
their valuations, or incite in them specific courses of action. While such a statement does not necessarily set up an either-or situation, it should be noted that the case study analysis of 2001 seems to contrast with Morris' formulation. In that film is an "aesthetic narrative," it must exhibit all three of the dimensions in order to be fully understood. The point is not that a film may designate, appraise, or prescribe but that the film in question (and all films) necessarily exhibit all three dimensions.

Furthermore, a reading of Morris, because of the majority of the examples he uses, would seem to indicate that one might find singular, discrete, prescriptive or appraisive signs in film comparable to "ought" or "good" in language. The analysis of 2001 (albeit, governed by the restrictions imposed from the nature of filmic signs in general) reveals, however, that the prescriptive and appraisive dimensions of signification derive only from the connection of designative and formative filmic signs. Moreover, the prescriptive and appraisive dimensions contained within 2001 seem only to augment the designated narrative. In other words, they do not seem to be an end in themselves. As such, the nature of film better fits into Morris' conception of relying on designators and thus allowing the interpreter (film viewer) to decide what will be preferred and how he or she will act in relation to his or her particular need to make sense of the film. Indeed,
such a conception allows for different viewers to have different interpretations of a particular film.

Finally, the rhetorical-semiotic analysis of *2001* provides support for Thomas Benson's assertion that film can manifest three types of rhetoric (see above, p. 25). First, there is a formal rhetoric which operates as a series of propositions about structures and which governs the shape of the work as it unfolds. This type corresponds to the combination of designative and formative signs which comprise the film. The series of propositions is, itself, the second type of rhetoric—an internal rhetoric which creates the context of values and relevant knowledge which allow the work to be apprehended. In the case of *2001*, the context of values and relevant knowledge corresponds to the appraisive and prescriptive dimensions respectively. The third of Benson's types is an external rhetoric as a mode of arguing about how we should evaluate, understand, or act in the world. Though this type does not fully arise in the analysis of *2001* (nor was it intended to), it would be a disservice to assert that such pronouncements do not exist in the film. At the very least, it is obvious from the analysis that *2001* provides (1) a unique interpretation for the cause behind man's acquisition of tool-using behavior, (2) implications about the effects of developing computer intelligence which is comparable to the functioning of the human brain, and (3) a vision of humankind's intellectual-spiritual future.
In retrospect, then, one might argue that all of the sign dimensions could be subsumed beneath the rubric of the rhetorical because the dimensions inevitably coalesce to manifest the three types of rhetoric discussed above. In addition, the idea that film requires the viewer to make innumerable responses, based on initial apprehension (taking account) of its signs, lends credence to such a re-evaluation. In one sense, all films are inherently rhetorical because they require the viewer to regard and respond to the signs which comprise the film in order for the viewer to make sense of the whole. Furthermore, the realization that a film, in order to be understood, requires the viewer to participate on all three semiotic levels (semantically, syntactically, and pragmatically) is more important to the critic than any perspective or categorical labels he or she may bring to the analysis.

4.3 Assessment of the Rhetorical-Semiotic Method

Essentially, this method requires an analysis of a film's plastic elements. Each shot and transition must be coded; admittedly, this procedure is exhaustive and time-consuming (initial coding of 2001 took approximately twenty hours). However, this process is necessary in order to account for the film as film and not something else (i.e., those elements which characterize film—rather than other forms of narrative/ fictive/dramatic discourse such as theme, plot, or characterization). Each shot has its own
orientation. In other words, each shot characteristic which may influence the signification and interpretant of the shot-as-designative sign must be noted. Thus, besides the basic content/object(s) framed within each shot, camera range, angle, and movement as well as notable changes in speed, duration, and focal length must be accounted for in the analysis. By notable changes in speed, duration, and focal length, I mean those instances where the features departed from the average. Instances of slow-motion photography were obvious. Likewise, when a shot contained a shift in focal length (i.e., an out-of-focus object was brought into focus) or deep focus was utilized, such features were easily recognized. While each shot was not individually timed, those shots which were inordinately shorter or longer than the average (running time divided by number of shots) were noted.

Second, each transition between shots was coded as to type and sub-type. Except in the case of fades or dissolves, because of their recognizable pictorial and temporal dimension, the coding of cuts as to sub-type required that the preceding and following shots in each case be re-examined. Initially, there were some cases where it was difficult to distinguish between a jump cut and a contrast or parallel cut. In these instances, an entire series of shots often was relied upon to assist in making the distinction. Such occurrences suggest that the various sub-types of cuts
require definitional tightening. Yet, such difficulties were resolved, if not in re-examining the shots surrounding the transition, by examining the soundtrack—the third basic element of the film's plastic material.

The first task was to note the appearance of any background music with its corresponding sets of shots. (The title and composer of each particular musical composition was gleaned from the original soundtrack album.) Next, the dialogue was transcribed and then matched with the shots in which it occurred. While every element of the soundtrack was not accounted for, dominant sounds (e.g., Frank and Dave's breathing during their EVA's, the monolith's radio signal in Sequence Two, various hominid vocalizations in Sequence One) were noted, when necessary, to explicate designative, prescriptive, or appraisive significations. While such a loose adherence to the soundtrack may seem deficient, it should be noted that most of the background sounds, besides dialogue and those examples mentioned above, are strictly relegated to upholding the designative level of each shot. The sounds of footsteps, doors, machines, et cetera are not apt to add any significant meaning to the shot(s) in which they occur except when they depart from the norm (as in the amplified breathing heard during the astronauts' EVAs).

As with any other critical model, especially one which seeks to explain plausibly some level of interpretation by
audiences experiencing the "discourse," this model is a simplification of that overall communicative experience. While I would argue that little of the plastic has been missed in the case analysis of 2001, there are elements pertaining to the viewer's actual encounter with the film which have not been accounted for by this model.

First, this method does not include any analysis of audience expectations or foreknowledge. The model presupposes a first-time viewer who does not have any (or relevant) knowledge about the film beforehand. Hence, would the interpretants of the signs which comprise the film be significantly altered if, say, the viewer has read reviews, knows and/or appreciates the other works by the filmmaker, or has seen the film before (either one or more times)? Furthermore, this model does not account for the myriad of other films and filmic images the viewer has seen or of which he or she might be reminded when viewing the particular film in question. As an example, I refer to the current success of Steven Spielberg's E.T.: The Extra-Terrestrial. Within this film are several obvious as well as subtle references to and reminders of previous films (Spielberg's own Jaws and Close Encounters of the Third Kind, George Lucas' The Empire Strikes Back, as well as Kubrick's 2001: A Space Odyssey). While it is problematic to assume that the average viewer would even recognize such instances, the larger question which remains unanswered is what effect such
recognition might have on the interpretant of the cinematic sign in question. One might hypothesize that such occurrences would alter the designative, appraisive, and prescriptive dimensions within the film. There is a likelihood that viewers would transfer whatever informational, evaluative, or incitive response they had upon seeing the original film(s) to the shots in which the visual reminder occurs.11 (In a larger sense, such a transference is heavily relied upon whenever a studio releases a sequel to a previous box-office success.12

Second, there are two problems concerning audience perceptions which have a more direct influence on the rhetorical-semiotic method itself. First is that of the viewer's sophistication in understanding the signification of a film's conventional signs (formators). While the method presupposes that the conventions of simple and jump cuts, fades, and dissolves and their possible meanings are learned, the model can not account for each viewer's specific level of understanding.13 Hence, the standard used will probably be that of the critic's own level of sophistication. Furthermore, since in my formulation the creation of prescriptive and appraisive signs relies on the combination of designators and formators, the critic's analysis may not accurately reflect the average viewer's "reading" of the film. Obviously, this is a problem to be addressed in future research (see below). Further, insofar as the
critic must first undertake a shot-by-shot coding of the film under analysis, how is that to be compared with the viewer who sees the film once and does not have an opportunity to review the film nor concentrate on any particular portions which may be confusing or difficult to grasp? Again, the critic's apprehension may not parallel that of the average viewer. In both of the above-mentioned problems, an accurate analysis must rely on the critic's judgment of what is a reasonable and probable reflection of the general viewer's experience. Although this is not a problem unknown to the traditional rhetorical critic studying the effects of a particular speech or communication event, subsequent research should address these questions in order to strengthen the analytical approach.

One related problem which is more difficult to resolve concerns the levels of meaning within a film. Connotatively, within a scene or even a specific shot, any viewer may attend and respond differently (from the critic) to the details of what is iconically or conventionally represented. (One specific example would be the time span any given viewer might associate with a jump cut.) At best, the critic can make a reasonable and probable judgment about the film's denotative level of meaning.

Third, the possibility exists that the average viewer will experience a more vivid rendering of the film than that of the critic. Obviously, the film is usually intended
for projection on a large screen. Since the critic will find it more advantageous to utilize video playback capabilities (as were used in the case study of 2001), the analysis may actually be more conservative in accounting for the richness of designative information. Consequently, the critic may not experience the vividness of detail which the viewer perceives. Accordingly, the critic's "reading" of the appraisive and prescriptive levels of meaning may be affected. The proliferation of feature-length films now available on videotape has both positive and negative implications for the future of rhetorical-film criticism. While virtually every major film of interest, eventually, will be available to critics, some caution must be exercised when assuming the film appears on tape as it was originally shown in the theatres. According to the August, 1982, issue of Video Review, some tapes are copies of edited-for television versions. In any case, distributors can usually confirm whether a tape has been edited.

Along the same line is the difficulty the critic utilizing this approach would have in accounting for the expressiveness of a film seen on a large screen. Kubrick's 2001 was originally intended to be seen in Cinerama. Obviously, most theatres do not have the three-screen capability to show such a film. Other films which can be shown in 70 mm (which also requires a larger screen than average) are seen by audiences on smaller screens which are
appropriate for 35 mm projection. This approach analyzes what takes place, as it were, within the frame. Hence, it can not deal with levels of expressiveness related to screen/frame sizes.

Nor can the rhetorical-semiotic approach account for the expressiveness or emotive quality aroused by the film's musical score. In order to control for the musical expressiveness, the critic should undertake the analysis with the sound off. While the case study of 2001 was constructed from a written, coded description of the film in order to prevent (as much as possible) the music's expressiveness from creeping into the analysis, there would be difficulty in asserting that such expressiveness was totally divorced from the analysis. Any critic who undertakes a shot-by-shot analysis of a film is bound to become familiar with the music which accompanies the soundtrack. As yet, Morris' formulation (as used here) can not deal with musical signs.

In sum, I would first argue that the method outlined in this thesis allows a critic to approach the film on its own grounds. By relying on accepted theories and definitions of film and its elemental features, the method can focus on and examine the unique combination of iconic and conventional signs which characterize film as an art form. Furthermore, it is not necessary for the critic to transplant explanatory models from various other social science disciplines in order to explicate the film. Nor does it
require consultation with other artistic forms (i.e., novels or plays) which are quasi-duplications of the film-narrative.

In addition, the alliance of film theory with Morris' semiotics provides a language by which critics can analyze film without ignoring (indeed, are required to take account of) the essential filmic elements of shot and transition. Film is a complex mixture of signs—iconic, conventional, musical, and linguistic. As such, any analysis of film should initially focus on all of the plastic elements which comprise that mixture. The rhetorical-semiotic method provides critics with the tools necessary for discovering and examining how filmic signs "mean."

4.4 Outline of Program for Future Research

This thesis and its proposed method has raised additional questions. Obviously, as a theory of explanation, the rhetorical-semiotic approach primarily concerns "what" and "how" questions. As a model which purports to explain how viewers apprehend filmic narrative, the first step in a research program would be the refinement of the approach itself as a methodological tool. Roderick Hart puts it succinctly:

Because theory necessarily builds upon some convergence or replication of insight, it would behoove some of us [rhetorical critics] to refine our analytical tools so that others in
the field can share in the "how" as well as in the "what" of our researches. Initially, such refinement will come from the use of the approach to analyze other films with an eye toward (1) comparing the findings of the case study with analyses of other films and (2) more fully explicating the application of the approach. Only then can others begin to utilize this approach to analyze the films which interest them.

At such a point, numerous and, I believe, significant questions come to mind which could be investigated by other rhetorical critics as well as mass-media researchers.

1) Are there significant differences in sign usage between films which are a box-office success and those which are not?

2) Are there significant differences in sign usage between films which (like 2001) have limited dialogue and those in which a majority of the shots contain dialogue?

3) Do films which are constructed from a complete storyboard differ significantly in sign usage from those which are not? If so (as in the case of Raiders of the Lost Ark), might that be an indicator of success?

4) Because of their inherent connection, are filmed television narrative shows, movies, or series significantly different in sign
usage from feature-length films originally intended for theatres?

(5) Are representative foreign films significantly different from those "made" in Hollywood?

(6) Is there a significant correlation of sign usage among the films of a single filmmaker? If not, how does that affect the conception of "auteur theory?"

(7) Are there significant differences of sign usage among various generic types of films? If not, how does that affect the conception of film genres?

Concerning the analysis of *2001: A Space Odyssey* in Chapter Three, two specific observations lead to other related research questions. First, it appears that the majority of prescriptive signs concern the advancement of the narrative. For example, the viewer is led to read specific transitions as forward jumps in time or as signifying events which are not pictorially (iconically) depicted. In turn, the appraisive dimension seems more in line with suggesting larger rhetorical pronouncements. The valuative use of signs to imply the benefits of technology as well as disadvantages associated with ultimate levels of computer intelligence (HAL) comes closer to presenting a rhetorical theme than the other dimensions of designative, formative, or prescriptive signs. The implication suggests the need for
an axiological investigation of aesthetic sign phenomena. 17

Second, it would seem that repetition of technique is more meaningful when used sparingly. A case in point is the slow-motion photography used to enhance the meaning of Moonwatcher's acquisition of tool-using behavior. Since the slow-motion effect is not used anywhere else in the film, the appraisive significance associated with its appearance is magnified. Conversely, in 2001 repetition of a specific image (i.e., the high-angle shot up the monolith) gives the object(s) within the shot added emphasis—beyond that of the high-angle shot itself. 18 As audiences become more sophisticated and more attuned to special effects, further research may indicate whether and what forms of repetition are more effective than others.

Whether these questions are ever answered depends upon the acceptance of the rhetorical-semiotic approach by other critics of film. Admittedly, the method, as it now stands, is an exhausting one which requires complete attention to all of a film's plastic elements. As such, it would not be surprising if others were to shy away from adopting this critical tool. That it may be used, refined, and re-used seems adequate compensation. Nor need it be necessary that other critics find exactly the same results. While it may be neither possible nor desirable . . . for critical techniques to be objectified, for critics to be interchangeable for purposes of replication. . .
[a] critic's public should, in principle, be able to verify for itself that the critical object can be apprehended as the critic proposes without offending reason . . . 19

In keeping with Edwin Black's dictum, I would be suspicious of the model if others were to find exactly what has been found here. Ultimately, a method's success is determined by one's peers who utilize it. Yet, it also seems significant to treat as success the questions raised as well as the questions answered.

2 Ibid., p. 77.


4 Ibid., p. 314.

5 Ibid., p. 302.


8 Ibid.

9 Ibid.

10 Farrell, p. 314.

11 In E.T., many viewers react vocally (and with delight) when, during a scene depicting Halloween in a suburban neighborhood, a child appears wearing a Yoda mask (Yoda is a character from Lucas' The Empire Strikes Back).

After showing *2001* to several undergraduate students in a seminar on film criticism, many reported their confusion in understanding some of the connections this author had thought were obvious.

"Experts Answer Your Questions," Editorial Response, Video Review, August, 1982, p. 13. Based on the running time of the *2001* videotape used for the case study analysis, there is reasonable assurance that this version parallels that of the first-run theatrical release.

Hart, p. 73.

George Lucas and Steven Spielberg have used this technique in *Star Wars*, *The Empire Strikes Back*, and *Raiders of the Lost Ark*. Each shot of these films was drawn on paper before filming began. In part, such a procedure was used as a guard against going over budget; it also suggests that these films are constructed and edited more carefully.


Steven Spielberg uses several shots of a flower pot to signify the life-death-rebirth of E.T. in the film of the same name. In essence, the dying or blooming flowers become a sign for E.T.'s health.

APPENDIX A

Scene Synopsis of 2001: A Space Odyssey

Sequence 1

Scene 1

Single shot of moon with earth in distance--Title and credits of film.

Scene 2

Life on the savannah--images of hominids foraging for food and water. One hominid is attacked by a leopard.

Scene 3

Confrontation between two separate groups over a waterhole. Moonwatcher's tribe is chased away by the other group.

Scene 4

Moonwatcher's tribe huddled in a cave and under an outcropping of rock apparently apprehensive about the dangers associated with nightfall.

Scene 5

Moonwatcher's tribe finds a black monolith in its midst. Eventually, members of tribe follow Moonwatcher's lead and touch the monolith.

Scene 6

Moonwatcher realizes the potential to use animal bones as a tool.

Scene 7

Hominids enjoy the fruits of their newly discovered technology--eating fresh meat from kills aided by bones used as clubs.
Scene 8

Moonwatcher's tribe takes back the waterhole they had previously lost—Moonwatcher realizes the potential of the tool as weapon.

Sequence 2

Scene 1

Dr. Floyd's journey to and arrival at the space station in orbit around the earth.

Scene 2

Dr. Floyd on board the space station—his meeting with head of security, telephone call to daughter, and conversation with Soviet scientists.

Scene 3

Dr. Floyd's journey to moon from space station.

Scene 4

Scientific briefing about the mysterious discovery at Tycho crater.

Scene 5

Trip to Tycho and discussion about the American "find" there.

Scene 6

Second appearance of the monolith in the film. Dr. Floyd's party is subjected to a high pitched signal emanating from the monolith.

Sequence 3

Scene 1

Life on board the "Discovery" during its voyage to Jupiter. The on-board computer predicts a fault in a major communication component.

Scene 2

Dave Bowman's EVA to replace faulty unit.
Scene 3
Dave Bowman and Frank Poole discover nothing wrong with unit. Mission Control suggests the HAL 9000 computer is malfunctioning. Dave and Frank discuss possible disconnection.

Scene 4
Frank Poole goes EVA to replace the faulty unit to check the fault prediction by HAL. HAL attacks and kills Frank via the space pod. While Dave is attempting rescue, HAL kills three hibernating crew members. When Dave returns, he must enter "Discovery" through the emergency hatch.

Scene 5
Dave Bowman disconnects HAL—he learns of the purpose of the mission—the purpose involves the monolith from Sequence Two.

Sequence 4
Scene 1
Bowman follows the monolith in a journey into the infinite.

Scene 2
Bowman finds himself in small room resembling a hotel room. He appears older in three successive stages until he is a withered old man lying on a bed. The monolith appears in the room and transforms Bowman into an unborn child. The film ends with the star-child (Bowman) floating above the earth.
APPENDIX B
Dialogue Transcript of 2001: A Space Odyssey

The following is a transcript of the dialogue of 2001: A Space Odyssey. The numbers in parentheses indicate the beginning of specific camera shots within the film.

Sequence 2

Scene 2

Stewardess: (126) Here you are, sir. Main level, please.
Floyd: Thank you. Right. See you on the way back.
Stewardess: Goodbye.
Floyd: Bye. Hi.
Receptionist: Good morning sir.
Floyd: Good morning.
Receptionist: We haven't seen you up here for a long time.
Floyd: Well, very nice to see you again.
Receptionist: (127) Did you have a pleasant flight, sir?
Floyd: (128) Yes, very nice thanks. I think Mr. Miller of, uh, Station Security's supposed to be meeting me.
Receptionist: Oh, well, may I call him for you sir?
Floyd: Would you please?
Miller: (129) Hello, Doctor.
Floyd: Hello, Miller. How are you?
Miller: Sorry I'm late.

Floyd: That's quite all right. Gee you're looking great.

Miller: Thank you, it's nice to have you back. Did you have a good flight?

Floyd: Oh, very nice indeed.

Miller: Good. Well, shall we go through?

Floyd: O.K.

Receptionist: Would you please use number seventeen?

Miller: Thank you Miss Turner.

Floyd: Thank you. Bye.

I.D. Screen: (131) Welcome to Voice Print Identification. When you see the red light go on, would you please state, in the following order: your destination, your nationality, and your full name, surname first, Christian name and initial.

Floyd: Moon, American, Floyd, Heywood R.

I.D. Screen: Thank you. You are cleared through Voice Print Identification.

Floyd: Thank you.

Floyd: (132) We got time for a drink?

Miller: Oh, I think we can manage that.

Floyd: How long have I got?

Miller: Your flight leaves in an hour and ten minutes. As a matter of fact, I've reserved a table for you in the flight room.

Floyd: Oh, fine, thanks.

Miller: It's, uh, been about seven or eight months since you were here last wasn't it?
Floyd: Let's see, last June? Yeah about eight months.

Miller: Um, I suppose you saw the work on the new section when you came in?

Floyd: Hey, coming along great.

Miller: Yeah, it's fine.

Floyd: Oh, wait a minute.

Miller: Hm?

Floyd: I gotta make a couple of phone calls, you go on ahead to the restaurant and I'll meet you there.

Miller: Right.

Child: (133) Yes.

Floyd: Hello.

Child: (134) Hello.

Floyd: How're you squirt?

Child: All right.

Floyd: Whatta ya doin?

Child: Playing.

Floyd: Where's Mummy?

Child: Gone to shopping.

Floyd: Well, who's takin care of ya?

Child: Rachel.

Floyd: May I speak to Rachel, please?

Child: Gone to the bathroom. (135) Are you coming to my party tomorrow?

Floyd: (136) I'm sorry sweetheart, but I can't.

Child: Why not?
Floyd: Well, you know, Daddy's traveling. (137) Very sorry about it but I just can't.

Child: Oh!

Floyd: I'm going to send you a very nice present though.

Child: All right.

Floyd: Anything special that you want?

Child: Yes.

Floyd: What?

Child: A telephone.

Floyd: (138) We've got lots of telephones already. Can't you think of anything else that you want for your birthday? Something very special?

Child: Yes.

Floyd: What?

Child: (139) A Bush baby.

Floyd: (140) A Bush baby? Well, we'll have to see about that. Listen sweetheart, I want you to tell Mummy something for me, will you remember?

Child: Yes.

Floyd: Well, tell Mummy that I telephoned, O.K.?

Child: Yes.

Floyd: And I'll try to telephone her again tomorrow. Now will you tell her that?

Child: Yes.

Floyd: O.K. sweetheart. Now have a nice birthday tomorrow.

Child: All right.
Floyd: And have a nice birthday party tomorrow too, (141) huh?
Child: All right.
Floyd: O.K., now take care and be a good girl, won't you.
Child: All right, bye bye.
Floyd: Bye bye. Happy Birthday!

(142) [Subdued conversation]
Floyd: (143) Elena! How nice to see you again.
Elena: Heywood, what a wonderful surprise to meet you here.
Floyd: Ah, you're looking wonderful.
Elena: Thank you, you're looking well too. This is my good friend, Dr. Heywood Floyd. I'd like you to meet Dr. Kalinen.
Floyd: Hi, how do you do?
Elena: Dr. Festniva.
Floyd: How do you do?
Festniva: How do you do?
Elena: And this is Dr. Andrei Smyslov.
Floyd: Ah, how do you do? I've heard a lot about you.
Smyslov: Won't you sit down?
Floyd: (144) Well, uh . . .
Smyslov: No, no, please.
Floyd: Oh, thank you.
Smyslov: Would, uh, would you like a drink Doctor?
Floyd: Oh, no thank you. As a matter of fact I haven't had breakfast yet. Someone's meeting me in the restaurant. No, if you don't mind I'll just sit with you a few minutes and then I must be off.

Smyslov: Are you quite sure?

Floyd: Quite sure, thank you. (145) Well, how's Gregor?

Elena: Oh, he's fine. He's been doing some underwater research in the Baltics, so uh I'm afraid we don't get a chance to see very much of each other these days.

Floyd: Well, when you do see him, be sure to give him my regards.

Elena: Yes, of course.

Floyd: Well, where are you all off to? Up or down?

Elena: Oh, we're going home. We've uh just spent three months calibrating the new antenna at Telenka. What about you?

Floyd: I'm just on my way up to Clavius.

Smyslov: Oh, are you?

Floyd: Um, hum.

Smyslov: Well, Dr. Floyd, I hope you don't think I'm being too inquisitive but perhaps you can clear up the great big mystery about what has been going on up there.

Floyd: 'Fraid I don't know what you mean.

Smyslov: (146) Well, it's just that for the past two weeks, some extremely odd things have been happening at Clavius.

Floyd: Oh, really?

Smyslov: Yes. Well, for one thing, whenever you phone the base all you can get is a recording which repeats that the phone lines are temporarily out of order.
Well, they're probably having some trouble with their equipment or something like that.

Yes, yes that's what we thought was the explanation at first but it's been going on now for the past ten days.

You mean you haven't been able to contact anyone for the past ten days?

That's right.

Oh, I see.

(147) There's another thing, Heywood. Two days ago, one of our rocket buses was denied permission for an emergency landing at Clavius.

That does sound odd.

Yes, yes. I'm afraid there's going to be a row about it. Denying the men permission to land is a direct violation of the IAS Convention.

Yes, of course, of course. Did the crew get back all right?

Yes, fortunately they did.

Oh, I'm glad about that.

Dr. Floyd, at the risk of pressing you on a point you seem reticent to discuss, may I ask you a straightforward question?

Well certainly.

(149) Quite frankly, we have had some very reliable intelligence reports that a serious epidemic has broken out at Clavius. Something apparently of an unknown origin. Is this in fact what has happened?

(150) Well, sorry Dr. Smyslov but uh, I'm really not at liberty to discuss this.
Smyslov: I understand. But this epidemic could quite easily spread to our base. Uh, we should be given all the facts, Dr. Floyd.

Floyd: I . . . I know. As I said, I'm not at liberty to discuss it.

Elena: Now, are you sure you won't change your mind about that drink?

Floyd: No, I'm positive. I really must be going.

Elena: Well I hope that you and your wife can come to the IAC Conference in June.

Floyd: Well, we're going to try. I hope we can make it.

Elena: If you do, you remember to bring that darling little daughter with you.

Floyd: Well, that'll all depend on the school vacations and all that sort of thing. But if we can, we will. Don't forget, you've got a standing invitation if you ever get to the States.

Elena: No, of course not. Gregor and I will look forward to seeing you.

Floyd: (151) Well, goodbye Elena. It's been a pleasure meeting you all. Dr. Smyslov?

Smyslov: Whatever the reasons for your visit to Clavius Dr. Floyd, the very best of luck to you.

Floyd: Thank you. Ladies.

[More Russian conversation as Floyd walks off]

Scene 4

Photographer: (177) Excuse me Dr. Halvorsen, I'm through now. Thank you very much gentlemen.
Halvorsen: You're welcome. Well, I know you will all want to join me in welcoming our distinguished friend and colleague from the National Council of Astronautics, Dr. Heywood Floyd. Now, Dr. Floyd has come up specially to Clavius to be with us today. And before the briefing, I know that he would like to have a few words with you. Dr. Floyd?

[Applause]

Floyd: Well, thank you Dr. Halvorsen. Hi everybody. Nice to be back with you. Well (pause) first of all, I bring a personal message from Dr. Howell who (pause) has asked me to convey his deepest appreciation to all of you for the many sacrifices you've had to make. And, of course, his congratulations on your discovery (pause) which may well prove to be among the most significant in the history of science. (178) Now, uh (pause) I know there have been some conflicting views held by some of you (pause) regarding the need for complete security in this matter. More specifically, your opposition to the cover story (pause) created to give the impression there's an epidemic at the base. (179) Hey, I understand that uh beyond it being a matter of principle (pause) many of you are troubled by the concern and anxiety this story of an epidemic might cause to your relatives and friends on earth. Well, I uh (pause) (180) completely sympathize with your negative views. I found this cover story personally embarrassing myself. However, I accept the need for absolute secrecy in this (pause) and I hope you will too. Now I'm (181) sure you're all aware of the extremely grave potential for cultural shock and social disorientation contained in this present situation (pause) if the facts were prematurely and suddenly made public without adequate preparation and conditioning. Anyway, (182) this is the view of the council. The purpose of my visit here is to gather additional facts
Floyd (cont'd.): and opinions on the situation (pause) and to prepare a report to the council (pause) recommending when and how the news should eventually be announced. (183) Now if any of you would like to give me your views and opinions, in private if you like, I'd only be too happy to include them in my report. (184) Well, I think that's about it. Any questions?

Bill: (185) Dr. Floyd (pause) have you any idea how much longer this cover story will have to be maintained?

Floyd: (186) Ha, ha, [chuckles] I don't know Bill, I (pause) I suppose it'll be maintained as long as deemed necessary by the council. And of course there must be adequate time for a full study to be made of the situation before any thought can be given to making the public announcement. Oh, yes uh (pause) (187) as some of you already know, the council has requested that formal security oaths be obtained in writing from everyone who has any knowledge of this event. Well (pause) were there any more questions?

Halvorsen: (188) Well, I'm sure we'll all want to cooperate with Dr. Floyd as fully as possible (pause) and as there seems to be no more questions, I think we ought to get on with the briefing. Thank you Dr. Floyd.

Floyd: Thank you.

[Applause]

Scene 5
Michaelis: (198) Well, anybody hungry?
Floyd: Yeah, what've we got?
Michaelis: You name it.
Floyd: What's that, chicken?
Michaels: Something like that. It tastes the same anyway.
Halvorsen: Got any ham?
Michaels: Ham, ham, ham, ham, there.
Halvorsen: Oh, yeah, good.
Floyd: Ah, looks pretty good.
Michaels: They're getting better at it all the time.
Halvorsen: You know, that was an excellent speech you gave us, Heywood.
Michaels: It certainly was.
Halvorsen: I'm sure it beefed up morale a helluva lot.
Floyd: (199) Thanks Ralph. Oh, by the way, I wanted to say to both of you I think you've done a wonderful job. I appreciate the way you've handled this thing.
Halvorsen: (200) Well, the way we look at it, it's our job to do this thing the way you want it done (pause) we're only too happy to be able to oblige.
Michaels: Have you seen these yet?
Floyd: What are they? [at the same time]
Halvorsen: Have a look at that.
Michaels: Here's what started the whole thing.
Floyd: Oh yeah.
Halvorsen: (201) When we first found it, we thought it might be an outcrop of magnetic rock. But all the geological evidence was against it. And not even a big nickel-iron meteorite could produce a field as intense as this. So, we decided to have a look.
Michaels: We thought it might be the upper part of some buried structure, so we excavated out on all sides, but unfortunately we didn't find anything else.

Halvorsen: (202) And what's more, the um, evidence seems pretty conclusive that (pause) it hasn't been covered up by natural erosion or other forces, it (pause) seems to have been deliberately buried.

Floyd: (203) Deliberately buried. [chuckles]

Michaels: (204) Well, how 'bout a little coffee?

Floyd: Oh, great. [at the same time]

Halvorsen: Good idea.

Floyd: I don't suppose you have any idea what the damn thing is, huh?

Halvorsen: [Chuckles] Wish to hell we did. No, the only thing we're sure of is that it was buried four million years ago.

Floyd: Well, I must say (pause) you guys have certainly come up with something. [chuckles]

Michaels: Watch this now, it's hot.

Sequence 3

Scene 1

Announcer: (241) Good evening. Three weeks ago the American space craft Discovery One left on its half billion mile voyage to Jupiter. (242) This marks the first manned attempt to reach this distant planet. Earlier this afternoon, "The World Tonight" recorded an interview with the crew of Discovery at a distance of eighty million miles from Earth. It took (243) seven minutes for our words to reach the giant space craft, but this time delay has been edited from this recording. (244) Our
The crew of Discovery One consists of five men and one of the latest generation of the HAL 9000 computers. (245) Three of the five men were put aboard asleep, or to be more precise, in a state of hibernation. They were Dr. Charles Hunter, Dr. Jack Kimball and Dr. Victor Kaminski. (246) We spoke with Mission Commander Dr. David Bowman and his deputy Dr. Frank Poole. Well, good afternoon gentlemen. How's everything going?

Marvelous.

Have no (pause) we have no complaints.

Well, I'm very glad to hear that and I'm sure that the entire world would join me in wishing you a safe and successful voyage.

Thanks very much.

Thank you.

(247) Although hibernation has been used on previous space efforts, this is the first time men have been put into hibernation before departure. (248) Why was this done?

Well this was done in order to achieve the maximum concentration of our life support capability (pause) (249) basically food and air. Now the three hibernating crew members represent the survey team. (250) And their efforts won't be utilized until we're approaching Jupiter.

(251) Dr. Poole? What's it like while you're in hibernation?

Well it's exactly like being asleep. You have absolutely no sense of time (pause) only difference is that you don't (252) dream.
As I understand it, you only breathe once a minute. Is this true?

Well that's right. (253) And the heart beats three times a minute, body temperature's usually down to about, uh, three degrees centigrade.

(254) The sixth member of the Discovery crew was not concerned about the problems of his hibernation (pause) for he was the latest result in machine intelligence (pause) (255) the HAL 9000 computer which can reproduce, though some experts still prefer to use the word mimic, most of the activities of the human brain and with incalculably greater speed and reliability. We next spoke with the HAL 9000 computer whom we learned one addresses as HAL. Good afternoon HAL. How's everything going?

(256) Good afternoon Mr. Hamor. Everything is going extremely well.

HAL, you have an enormous responsibility on this mission (pause) in many ways perhaps the greatest responsibility of any single mission element. You're the brain and central nervous system of the ship and your responsibilities include watching over the men in hibernation. Does this ever cause you any lack of confidence?

(257) Let me put it this way Mr. Hamor. The 9000 series is the most reliable computer ever made. No 9000 computer has ever made a mistake or distorted information. (258) We are all, by any practical definition of the words, foolproof and incapable of error.

HAL, despite your enormous intellect, are you ever frustrated by your dependence on people to carry out actions?

Not in the slightest bit. I enjoy working with people. I have a stimulating relationship with Dr. Poole and
HAL (cont'd.): Dr. Bowman. My mission responsibilities range over the entire operation of the ship, (260) so I am constantly occupied. I am putting myself to the fullest possible use which is all I think that any conscious entity can ever hope to do.

Reporter: (261) Dr. Poole? What's it like living for the better part of a year in such close proximity with HAL?

Frank: Well, it's pretty close to what you said about him earlier. He is just like a sixth member of the crew (pause) very quickly get adjusted to the idea that he talks (pause) you think of him, uh really as just another person.

Reporter: In talking to the computer, one gets the sense that he is capable of emotional responses. For example, when I asked him about his abilities, (262) I sensed a certain pride in his answer about his accuracy and perfection. Do you believe that HAL has genuine emotions?

Frank: Well, he acts like he has genuine emotions. Um, of course he's programmed that way to make it easier for us to talk to him. But as to whether or not he has real feelings is something I don't think anyone can truthfully answer.

HAL: (264) Excuse me Frank.

Frank: What is it, HAL?

HAL: We've got the transmission from your parents coming in.

Frank: Well fine. Put it on here please. Take me in a bit.

HAL: Certainly.

Dad: Hello, Frank.

Mom: Happy Birthday darling.
Dad: Happy Birthday. Many happy returns of the day.

Frank: A bit higher, HAL.

Mom: Glad you and Dave are both well.

Dad: Now mother and I are both feeling wonderful too! Ray and Sally was going to be here too but at the last minute Ray's back went bad on him again.

Mom: How do you like your cake dear?

Dad: Looks great doesn't it? Sorry you can't join us. Oh, I ran into Bob the other day (pause) he said to be sure and wish you Happy Birthday.

Mom: All my students made me promise to send their best wishes too. You know they talk about you all the time in the classroom, Frank. You're a big celebrity in the second grade. You know, we were on television last evening.

Dad: Oh yes, yes. Your mother and I and Dave's parents were interviewed about what we thought about our illustrious sons. You can imagine what we told them. I think it's being broadcast next Thursday, perhaps you'll be able to listen in.

Mom: Oh, we were thrilled about Elaine and Bill, dear. I'll be glad to get the present for you, but please tell me how much I can spend.

Dad: Ooh yes, Frank. About your AGF-19 payments, I think I've straightened it out for you. I talked to the accounting office in Houston yesterday and they said that you should be receiving your higher raise in pay by next month. Well Frank I can't think of anything else to say.

Mom: Oh, give my love to Dave.
Dad: Oh, yes, be sure and give him my best regards. We wish you the very happiest of birthdays.

Mom: We love ya.

Dad: All the best, son.

Both: [Singing "Happy Birthday."]

Dad: See you next Wednesday.

HAL: Happy Birthday, Frank.

Frank: Thank you HAL, a bit flatter please.

Frank: (271) [clears throat] Anyway, Queen takes pawn.

HAL: Bishop takes Knight's pawn.

Frank: Lovely move. Uhhh (pause) Rook to King one.

HAL: I'm sorry Frank. I think you missed it. Queen to Bishop's three, Bishop takes Queen, Knight takes Bishop. Mate.

Frank: Hmmm. Yeah, it looks like you're right. I resign.

HAL: Thank you for a very enjoyable game.

Frank: Yeah, thank you.

HAL: (274) Good evening Dave.

Dave: How ya doin', HAL?

HAL: Everything's running smoothly, and you?

Dave: Oh, not too bad.

HAL: (275) Have you been doing some more work?

Dave: A few sketches.

HAL: May I see them?
Dave: (276) Sure.

HAL: That's a very nice rendering Dave (pause) I think you've improved a great deal. (pause) Can you hold it a bit closer?

Dave: Sure.

HAL: That's Dr. Hunter isn't it?

Dave: Um hum.

HAL: By the way (pause) you mind if I ask you a personal question?

Dave: No, not at all.

HAL: Well, forgive me for being so inquisitive (277) (pause) but during the past few weeks I've wondered if you might be having some second (278) thoughts about the mission.

Dave: How do ya mean?

HAL: (279) Well, it's rather difficult to define. (pause) Perhaps I'm just projecting my own concern about it. I know I've never completely (280) freed myself from the suspicion that there are some extremely odd things about this mission. I'm sure you'll agree there's some (281) truth in what I say.

Dave: Well, I don't know; that's a rather difficult question to answer.

HAL: (282) You don't mind talking about it, do you Dave?

Dave: (283) No, not at all.

HAL: Well, certainly no one could have been unaware of the very (284) strange stories floating around before we left. Rumors about something being (285) dug up on the moon. I never gave these stories much credence. And particularly in view of some of the other things that have happened, I find them difficult to put out of my mind. (286) For instance, the way all our preparations were kept
HAL (cont'd.): under such tight security. And the melodramatic touch of putting Drs. Hunter, Kimball, and Kaminski on board already in hibernation after four months of separate training on their own.

Dave: You're working up your crew psychology report?

HAL: (288) Of course I am. Sorry about this. I know it's a bit silly. Just a moment (pause) just a moment. (289) I've just picked up a fault in the AE-35 unit. (290) It's going to go 100% failure within 72 hours.

Dave: (291) Is it still within operational limits right now?

HAL: Yes (pause) (292) and it will stay that way until it fails.

Dave: (293) Would you say we have a reliable 72 hours to failure?

HAL: Yes (pause) that's a completely reliable figure.

Dave: Well I suppose we'll have to bring it in, but first I'd like to go over this with Frank (294) and get on to Mission Control. Let me have the hard copy on it please.

Scene 2

Mission Control: (287) X-Ray Delta One, this is Mission Control. Roger, you're 2013. Sorry fellas you're having a bit of trouble. We are reviewing telemetric information in our mission simulator and will advise. Roger your plan to go EVA and replace Alpha Echo 35 unit prior to failure.

Dave: (299) Prepare B-Pod for EVA, HAL. (pause) (300) Open the pod door, HAL.
Scene 3

Dave: (337) Well HAL, I'm damned if I can find anything wrong with it.

HAL: Yes (pause) (338) it's puzzling isn't it? I don't think I've ever seen anything quite like this (339) before. I would recommend that we put the unit (340) back in operation and let it fail. It should then be a simple matter to track down the cause. (341) We can certainly afford to be out of communication for that short time it will take to replace it.

Mission Control: (342) X-Ray Delta One this is Mission Control. Roger your one-niner-three-zero. We concur with your plan to replace number one unit to check fault prediction. We should advise you however, that our preliminary findings indicate that your on-board niner-triple-zero computer is in error predicting the fault. (343) I say again, in error predicting the fault. I know this sounds rather incredible but this conclusion is based on results from our twin niner-triple-zero computer. We are skeptical ourselves and we are running cross-checking routines to determine reliability of this conclusion. Sorry about this little snag fellas but we'll get this info to you as soon as we work it out. X-Ray Delta One, this is Mission Control. (344) Two-zero-four-niner transmission concluded.

HAL: I hope the two of you (345) are not concerned about this.

Dave: No, I'm not HAL.

HAL: Are you quite sure?

Dave: Yeah, I'd like to ask you a question though.
HAL: Of course.

Dave: How would you account for the discrepancies between you and the twin nine-thousand?

HAL: Well, I don't think there is any question about it. It can only be attributable to human error. This sort of thing has cropped up before and it has always been due to human error.

Frank: Listen, HAL, there's never been any instance at all of a computer error occurring in the nine-thousand series has there?

HAL: None whatsoever Frank. The nine thousand series has a perfect operational record.

Frank: Well, of course, I know all the wonderful achievements of the nine-thousand series but, uh, are you certain there's never been any case of even the most insignificant computer error?

HAL: None whatsoever, Frank. Quite honestly, I wouldn't worry myself about that.

Dave: Well, I'm sure you're right HAL, um, fine. Thanks very much. Oh, Frank, I'm having a bit of trouble with my transmitter in C-Pod. I wonder if you'd come down and take a look at it with me.

Frank: Yeah.

Dave: See ya later, HAL.

Dave: (355) Rotate C-Pod please, HAL.

Frank: (356) What sort of trouble you havin' Dave?

Dave: I've been getting some interference on D channel.
Frank: Hmm. We'll have a look at it.

Dave: (357) Open the door, HAL. (pause) (361) Rotate pod please Hal. (pause) (362) Stop pod rotation please HAL. [(363) occurs here] (364) Rotate the pod please HAL. Rotate the pod please HAL. (pause) I don't think he can hear.

Frank: Rotate the pod please HAL. [louder] Yeah, we're O.K. Well, what do ya think?

Dave: I'm not sure, what do you think?

Frank: I've got a bad feeling about him.

Dave: You do?

Frank: Yeah, definitely. Don't you?

Dave: I dunno. I think so. You know, of course, he's right about the nine-thousand series having a perfect operational record. They do.

Frank: Unfortunately that sounds a little like famous last words.

Dave: Yeah. Still, it was his idea to carry out the failure mode analysis, wasn't it?

Frank: Hmm.

Dave: It could certainly indicate his integrity and self-confidence. If he were wrong, it would be the surest way to prove it.

Frank: It would be if he knew he was wrong.

Dave: Hmm.

Frank: Look Dave, I can't put my finger on it but I sense something strange about him.

Dave: But still I can't think of a good reason not to put back the number one unit and carry on with the failure mode analysis.
Frank: No, no I agree with that.
Dave: Well, let's get on with it.
Frank: Okay, but look Dave. Let's say we put the unit back and it doesn't fail. That would pretty well wrap it up as far as HAL's concerned, wouldn't it?
Dave: Well, we'd be in very serious trouble.
Frank: We would, wouldn't we?
Dave: Um hum.
Frank: What the hell could we do?
Dave: Well, we wouldn't have too many alternatives.
Frank: I don't think we'd have any alternative. There isn't a single aspect of ship operations that's not under his control. If he were proven to be malfunctioning, I wouldn't see how we'd have any choice but disconnection.
Dave: I'm afraid I agree with you.
Frank: There'd be nothing else to do.
Dave: Be a bit tricky.
Frank: (365) Yeah.
Dave: We'd have to cut his higher brain functions. (pause)
Frank: Yeah.
Dave: Without disturbing the purely automatic and regulatory systems. And we'd have to work out the transfer procedure of continuing the mission under ground based computer control.
Frank: (366) Yeah. Well that's far safer than allowing HAL to continue running things.
Dave: You know, another thing just occurred to me.

Frank: What?

Dave: Well as far as I know, no nine thousand computer has ever been disconnected.

Frank: No nine thousand computer has ever fouled up before.

Dave: That's not what I mean.

Frank: Hmm?

Dave: Well, I'm not so sure what he'd think about it (pause) (36?).

Scene 4

Dave: (389) C-Pod for EVA, HAL. Have you made radio contact with him (390) yet?

HAL: The radio is still dead.

Dave: Do you have a positive track on him?

HAL: Yes, I have a good track.

Dave: Do you know what happened?

HAL: I'm sorry Dave, I don't have enough information.

Dave: Open the Pod door HAL.

Dave: (442) Open the Pod Bay doors, please, HAL (pause). (443) Open the Pod Bay doors please HAL (pause). (444) Hello, HAL, do you read me? (pause) Hello, HAL do you read me? (pause) Do you read me HAL? (445) Do you read me HAL? (pause) (446) Hello HAL, do you read me? (447) Hello, HAL, do you read me? Do you read me HAL?

HAL: Affirmative, Dave. I read you.

Dave: (448) Open the Pod Bay doors HAL.
HAL: (449) I'm sorry Dave, I'm afraid I can't do that.

Dave: (450) What's the problem?

HAL: I think you know what the problem is just as well as I do.

Dave: What are you talking about HAL?

HAL: (451) This mission is too important for me to allow you to jeopardize it.

Dave: (452) I don't know what you're talking about HAL!

HAL: (453) I know that you and Frank were planning to disconnect me. And I'm afraid that's something I cannot allow to happen.

Dave: (454) Where the hell did ya get that idea HAL?

HAL: (455) Dave, although you took very thorough precautions, in the pod, against my hearing you, I could see your lips move.

Dave: (456) All right HAL. I'll go in through the emergency airlock.

HAL: (457) Without your space helmet Dave, you're going to find that rather difficult.

Dave: (458) HAL, I won't argue with you anymore. Open the door!

HAL: (459) Dave, this conversation can serve no purpose anymore. Goodbye.

Dave: (460) HAL? (pause) HAL. (pause) HAL! (pause) HAL! (pause)

Scene 5

HAL: (494) Just what do you think you're doing Dave? (pause) (495) Dave
HAL (cont'd.): (pause) I really think I'm entitled to an answer to that question (pause). (497) I know everything hasn't been quite right with me (pause) but I can assure you now (pause) very confidently (pause) that it's going to be all right again (pause). I feel much better now (pause). (498) I really do (pause). (499) Look Dave (pause) (500) I can see you're really upset about this (pause) I honestly think you ought to sit down calmly (pause), take a stress pill and think things over (pause). I know I've made some very poor decisions recently (pause) (501) but I can give you my complete assurance that my work will be back to (502) normal (pause). (503) I've still got the greatest enthusiasm and confidence in the mission (pause) and I want to help you. (pause) (504) Dave (pause) stop. (pause) (505) Stop will you? (pause) (506) Stop Dave. (pause) Will you stop Dave? (pause) Stop Dave. (pause) (507) I'm afraid. (pause) I'm afraid Dave. (pause) (508) Dave (pause) my mind is going. (pause) I can feel it. (pause) I can feel it. (pause) My mind is going. (pause) There is no question about it. (pause) (509) I can feel (510) it. (pause) I can feel it. (pause) I can feel it. (pause) (511) I'm (pause) afraid. (pause) [slower] Good (pause) afternoon (pause) (513) gentlemen. (pause) [slower still] I am a HAL nine thousand computer (pause) I became operational at the HAL plant in (514) Urbana, Illinois on the 12th of January 1992. My instructor was Mr. Langley (pause) and he taught me to sing a song. (pause) If you'd like to hear it I can sing it for you. (pause)

Dave: (515) Yes, I'd like to hear it HAL. Sing it for me.
HAL: [Voice slower and progressively lower in tone] It's called Daisy. (pause) Daisy, (pause) Daisy (pause) (516) give me your answer, do. (pause) I'm (517) half crazy (518) over the love for you. (pause) It won't be a (519) stylish marriage. (pause) I can't afford a carriage (pause) but you look sweet upon the seat of a bicycle built for two. (pause)

Floyd (on screen): Good day gentlemen. This is a pre­recorded briefing made prior to your departure (pause) (520) and which for security reasons of the highest importance (521) has been known on board during the mission only by your HAL 9000 computer. (522) Now that you are in Jupiter space, and the entire crew is revived, it can be told to you. Eighteen months (523) ago, the first evidence of intelligent life, off the earth, was discovered. It was buried forty feet beneath the lunar surface (pause) near the crater Tycho. Except for a single, very powerful, radio emission aimed at Jupiter, the four­million-year-old black monolith has remained completely inert, its origin and purpose still a total mystery.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


