

NAGLIS KARDELIS

## Cinematographic Dialectic of the Interactions Between Image and Text

### Summary

The author of the article presents an analysis of various aspects of what he calls the cinematographic dialectic of the interactions between image and text in the context of cinematic art. The terms “image” and “text” employed in the analysis are understood (depending on the context) in both direct and speculative/figurative senses. The term “image” stands for the visuality in all its possible manifestations, and the term “text”, accordingly, stands for the textuality in all its possible manifestations. The author draws attention not to the distinction (as such) between image and text (and, for that matter, between visuality in all its possible forms and textuality in all its possible forms), and not to the usually rather banal and self-evident contexts where this distinction is sharply pronounced, but to those “anomalous” (and therefore very interesting) contexts and situations where visuality reveals its textual aspect and, vice versa, textuality shows its visual aspect. In other words, it is argued that we, having in mind the context of cinematic art, might speak of the visual potential inherent in the textual elements of a film and, vice versa, might speak of the textual side of cinematic visuality.

The author also draws attention to the relation (and correlation) between the cinematic interaction of spatial and temporal

elements (also treated in both direct and speculative/figurative senses), on the one hand, and the interaction between visual and textual elements, on the other. It should be stressed that the correlation between spatial and visual elements, as well as the correlation between temporal and textual elements within a film is not absolute: much more interesting are those cinematic situations where spatial elements in a film might be analysed not only in visual but also in textual terms and, vice versa, the temporal elements might be analysed not only in textual but also in visual terms.

In those cases where etymology seems to provide some useful insights into the nature of cinematic phenomena, the philosophical analysis is complemented and conceptually enhanced by the semantical analysis of relevant Latin and Greek terms (such as *textus*, *conceptus*, *eidos*, *historia*, and so on). It is argued that the talk of the demise of textuality in the era of rampant visuality, despite some rational points of such talk which cannot be denied, is rather premature and grossly one-sided, especially having in mind the mighty textual potential of the visuality itself.

Arguing his point, the author presents a few examples from the sphere of Lithuanian cinematography, Greek literary theory and

culture in general, as well as Chinese hieroglyphic writing and calligraphy.

The conclusion is made that, in order to capture the very nature and essence of cinema as an art, the cinematographic practice should consciously employ those contexts and situations where the visual and textual elements merge into a visual-textual whole and where the very distinction between the visual and the

textual, between image and text becomes problematic, loses its sharpness or is not so strictly pronounced. In the author's opinion, the artistic impression conveyed by a piece of cinematic art depends on the artist's ability to fuse visuality and textuality into a cinematic whole which is both static and dynamic, that is, revealing the features of both image and text, synchronic panorama and diachronic sequence.

**Keywords:** Aristotle, Plato, Deleuze, cinema, literature, dialectic, image, text, visuality, textuality, contemporary philosophy, classical Greek culture, Chinese hieroglyphic writing, calligraphy, contemporary Lithuanian cinematography.

Gauta 2015.04.18