

Hermeneutic Phenomenology of Film: A Critical Analysis

Nopita Trihastutie
Widya Kartika University, Indonesia

Abstract

This paper aims to make a critical analysis of the haptic visuality concept. It elucidates the crossing philosophical basis that uses a metaphor to emphasize the way film highlights through its materiality and an encounter between the perceiver and the object represented. In that effort, the analysis takes four paces: first, positioning films in the perspective of media as mediation; second, reviewing the philosophy of film refers to conceptualizing film phenomenology; third, discussing the phenomenology philosophical tenets; fourth, discoursing the crossing basic assumptions of the concept. The results show that a crossing dialogue between Heidegger's film phenomenological framework and Ricoeur's values of hermeneutic to film phenomenology bridges the understanding of a film's conscious and unconscious process. The outcomes of crossing philosophical dialogue answer the question of whether natural science can understand films.

Keywords: hermeneutics, phenomenology, film, critical analysis, haptic visuality

1. Introduction

To begin with, I intend to describe the philosophy contest among scholars regarding film which questions if a film is scientific or not. Wartenberg (2015) notes that film interpretations stimulate theoretical generalizations as well as theorizing the film aspects. The emphasis here is on developing theories of film, as Wartenberg (ibid.) further adds, that the philosophy of film based on the natural sciences has been prominent among cognitive film theorists such as Bordwell and Carroll (1996) and Currie (1995) who emphasize viewers' conscious processing of films. This opposes the traditional film

theories which work on unconscious processes. Some see films in pragmatism like William James and others make use of Wittgenstein's hermeneutic tradition. Both parties have questioned if natural science can understand films. Amid the debate, Laura U. Marks presents a conceptual formulation of the film. In her work entitled "The Skin of Film," Marks (2000) promotes a concept, called "haptic visuality" that signifies vision as something tangible.

In this paper, I intend critically analyze Marks's haptic visuality theory. The theory is based on a metaphor about natural (bodily) experiences. The theory emphasizes the bodily experiences of film in the philosophical basis of phenomenology. The arguments in haptic visuality are built on a phenomenology philosophical basis. In this paper, I argue that the film's bodily experience intersects phenomenology and hermeneutics. Therefore, I elucidate the concept's crossing philosophical basis that signifies a metaphor to emphasize the way film signifies through its materiality, through an encounter between the perceiver and the object represented.

Preceding the elucidation of the film's bodily experience's crossing philosophical basis, it is necessary to present Marks's concept of haptic visuality. "The Skin of Film" emphasizes that films represent experiences through the senses (Marks 2000, vi). Films are the tangible body that viewers can touch (*ibid.*, vii) and also represent other senses like smell and taste (*ibid.*, xvi). These bodily experiences are beyond the transmitter of sign from films to the viewers (*ibid.*, p. xvii), and the presence of the objects presented stimulate memories through embodied knowledge (*ibid.*, 2).

To prove my argument, I take four paces: first, positioning films in the perspective of media as mediation as the ground-breaking of understanding; second, reviewing the philosophy of film refers to conceptualizing film phenomenology; third, discussing the phenomenology philosophical tenets which include knowledge, experience and consciousness, relationship or interaction with the object and making meaning, and expressing the world through language – and how the tenets in film phenomenology; fourth, discoursing the crossing philosophical assumptions of haptic visuality

which emphasizes on prosthetic experience, prosthetic memory and the embodiment of memory through senses. This critical analysis bridges the sharp debate among film scholars about the conscious and unconscious process of a film. Presenting a crossing philosophical dialogue to understand bodily experience will answer the question of whether natural science can understand films.

2. Film: Media and Mediation

In this first part, preceding to scrutinize deeply the concept of haptic visuality, I propose to position films from the perspective of media as mediation. To understand the position of media, for example, film as mediation, I refer to McLuhan's "Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man". "The medium is the message," McLuhan states (1964). It emphasizes that a medium and its characteristics that have an important role are the focus, rather than the content of the medium. McLuhan's proposition of "The medium is the message" lays "message" within two different meanings which signify both content and character of the medium: the content of the medium is a message and the character of the medium is another message.

The concept of film as a medium emphasizes what Schummer (2013, 18) states that film is visual images that are presentational and opaque since the perceptible and sensible contents are presented through senses modalities. Thus, film images are not representations that occur by means of the presented contents (ibid., 19).

Here, the concept of mediation in films refers to the experience of viewing cinematic images as Walton (1984) calls "seeing through." It is perspectival meaning seeing from a given and determinate perspective (Currie 1995). McLuhan emphasizes the correlation of the experience of this "mediated seeing" with the character of the medium rather than on the content because he believes that human's association and action are influenced by the medium (McLuhan 1964, 9). He states that a film is a medium that changes the sequence and lineal connections into creative configuration and structure (ibid., 12).

McLuhan's term "configuration connection" correspond to the media discursive practices which actually constitute

reality in the process of communication (Fairclough 1995). Discourse is seen as the main instrument of production and reproduction of shared social knowledge and practice (Van Dijk 1997). Therefore, when films are seen from a discursive point of view, it is based on the concepts of cognition, society, and discourse to provide orientation, consistency, and organization (Colombo 2004). The concerns are laid on both the textual dimensions of a film which account for the structures of discourse at various levels of description and the contextual dimensions of a film which relate the structural descriptions to various properties of context, such as representations or sociocultural factors (Van Dijk 1988).

Extending the argument for understanding the medium as the message itself, McLuhan proposes that the content of any medium is always another medium (1964, 8). It means that the nature of the channel through which a message is transmitted is more important than the meaning of a message. McLuhan maintains that a message is the change of a pattern that innovation provides human affairs (Federman 2004).

To my concern, the haptic visuality concept work under the media and mediation point of view explained above. It emphasizes the intercultural film as a medium, not the content of the film. Both the characteristics of the film as a medium and its content play an important role to affect the viewers. Both transmit their own message.

The images and objects presented in the films as postulated in haptic visuality meet the presentational and representational characters. The visual images themselves are presentational and the objects presented in the film are representational. Both are mediated in a combination of sensory modalities. This mediated seeing process results in the embodied viewing experience which extends to the physical and social spaces of the viewing environment. Viewers take sensory information from outside the film's world when watching (Marks 2000, 211).

From a discursive point of view, the haptic visuality concept shows that in a complex way, film, then, can follow an object in an attempt to elicit its cultural biography and to read the knowledge it embodies: to engage with the object

discursively. In addition, as material objects themselves, films are uniquely capable of confronting the object in its material as well as its discursive meaning to the viewers (Marks 2000, 97). Whereas in the simplest way, the visual image presentation and the object representation appeal to the viewer's senses are through narrative identification: viewers identify what the characters doing with their activity (ibid., 213).

3. Philosophy of Film: Conceptualizing Film Phenomenology

In the previous part, it has been discussed that film provides a mediated experience. In this part, initially before discussing the philosophical basis of a film, I provide some basic understanding of the correlation between film and philosophy.

According to Botz-Bornstein (2005), philosophy sees a film as a subject and object which can build its own truth and which the world can be seen through it. Here, it means that a film provides a form of thinking about reality through the rules of logic and time. When watching a film, a thinking process occurs thus, a film is considered as an organic intelligence and does not present reality in a metaphorical way. A film has its own mind to present the world as a particular film phenomenology. The abstract existential stance it presents makes a philosophical phenomenon.

As a media that provides the phenomena of experience, a film can be seen in Husserl's philosophical thinking that underlines human experience as the sensible intuition of phenomena. On the basis of this prescription, phenomenology attempts to understand the essence of what is experienced. In the philosophy of film, as this film experience is mediated, it is seen in the phenomenological synthetic approach rather than in the analytical one.

Initially, it is necessary to define the phenomenology of film. Ferencz-Flatz and Hanich (2016, 3) maintain that the phenomenology of the film emphasizes two things: film-as-intentional-object and the viewer-as-experiencing-subject which refers to the film viewer's lived experience when watching moving images and termed as "lived body experience of senses". Merleau-Ponty states that phenomenology reveals the

connection between subject, world, and others; regarding that definition, movies reveal the connection between mind, body, and world (*cf.* Ferencz-Flatz and Hanich 2016, 4).

Following Merleau-Ponty, Vivian Sobchack maintains that film is a philosophical exemplar of intentionality that manifest the correlation of subjective consciousness and its real or imaginary objects (in Ferencz-Flatz and Hanich 2016, 5). Sobchack's film phenomenology focuses on the embodied experience—including the viewer's tactile experience (*ibid.*, 6). The film does phenomenology as it has a form of subjectivity, intentionality, and mind entwined with the film's body to express experience (*ibid.*, 39-40). This experience can be distinguished into different degrees of generality and specificity: the lived body experience of senses, the spatial experience of video images, the temporal experience of documentary films, the collective experience of the cinema auditorium, and the aesthetic experience of film worlds (Ferencz-Flatz and Hanich 2016, 4). Drawing on a strong analogy between human experience and the way film engages with the world is comparable to film as a phenomenology for film manifests particular human experience characteristics.

4. From Philosophical Tenets to Film Phenomenology

In this part, I provide some film philosophical thoughts that position film as a model of philosophy. These thoughts are developed from the basic tenets of Husserl's phenomenology which posit that first, knowledge is something that is realized and found directly in the experience of consciousness; second, a person's relationship or the interaction with an object will determine the meaning of the object for the person concerned; and third, people experience the world and express it through language.

Emphasizing the first tenet of phenomenology in film phenomenology, the understanding of knowledge, experience, and consciousness refers to how the film world is perceived by the viewers as if they were being in the film world. Life in the film world is perceived in awareness through the capture of reality the camera produces (*cf.* Botz-Bornstein 2005). Therefore, viewers experience the human consciousness

through spatial time during the viewing process when the viewers sense the images, as Bergson (1988) states that the image which is more than merely a representation of a thing provides an experience and stimulates thought to form memory aligned with bodily perception. Merleau-Ponty (1992) adds that the meaning of a film image is laid on its ability to fashion a new reality. A film provides a phenomenological experience in which human consciousness is brought to the world in an ordinary way while watching the film images.

This phenomenological experience works to create self and world by emphasizing the interactive character of film viewing. Two bodies which include the body of the viewer and the body of a film involved in the production of the film experience during the film viewing. This cinematic experience refers to “the embodiment experience through senses’ and refers to what is called a “mediated experience” through film. The viewers’ mediated experience through the film is accessible by the scientific method and such experience is projected to the whole domain of human sciences as Gadamer (Skorin-Kapov 2016) argues that truth and method can be approached. The objective observation and analysis of film and film text and meaning as an object can be found within a film text through a particular process that allowed for a connection with the filmmakers’ thoughts that led to the creation of a film text. Instead of a prescribing method of analysis, Gadamer’s philosophical thinking examines the understanding of artwork and experience work.

Gadamer argues that humans possess what so-called “historically-effected consciousness,” which refers to a meaning that they are embedded in and shaped by a particular history and culture; however, this historical consciousness is not against humans’ existence, but it involves their understanding (Palmer 1969, 117). Regarding this concept, viewers’ background knowledge that is rooted in a particular culture shapes the audience and influences their consciousness to make actions driven by their understanding.

Emphasizing the second tenet of phenomenology in film phenomenology, the understanding of relationship or the interaction with the object and making meaning refers to the

relationship or the interaction between viewers and film. The interaction of viewers and film results in understanding the film as the medium which contains images and objects parallel to symbols within a “container” called a “text”; therefore, the film itself can be seen as this “container” and the interpretation of the visual symbols is an effort to construct meanings.

Interpretation is a form of human expression and a result of mediated understanding when humans are placed in a particular historical context. The historical context here concerns particular space and time. The film does not provide a direct experience, but a mediated experience in a particular space and time to viewers. Through this mediated experience, viewers can get an indirect understanding as well. Something mediated results in another mediated thing. The viewers’ mediated understanding of the filmic text does not mean reconstructing the filmmakers’ state of mind, but articulating what is expressed in the film.

Viewers’ mediated experience means to feel a situation or thing personally in which they can always grasp the mediated meaning of unknown thought through it. Their “mediated experience” is converted into meaning because of the appeal of the film text discourse that says more than the filmmaker intends. Viewers’ comprehension of the filmic text produces coexistence among the viewers.

In Heidegger’s concept of humans’ existence or “Dasein,” the viewers have the capacity to make interpretations of their world – the mediated world presented in the filmic text (Horrigan-Kelly et al. 2016, 1). Their interpretation involves their understanding to make the implicit understanding explicit. Further, in Heidegger’s “Dasein,” the intertwined state of interpretation and understanding emphasizes two processes of interpretation: “as structure” and “for structure.” The prior means that the interpretation is something for something else and the latter means that the interpretation is to reveal humans’ prior knowledge about their world (ibid., 3).

The viewers’ capacity to interpret their mediated world demonstrates that interaction with entities is not fewer presuppositions, but guided by the familiarity of their real everyday interaction. The capacity that shows humans’

existence, therefore is said that human existence is presented as having pre-existing knowledge or fore structure of understanding of their world (ibid., 3). This understanding is the result of the manifestations of action and productivity produced by humans to explore the inside meaning (Dilthey 1977).

Viewers' capability to make meaning is something that evolves. This puts forth human's capacity analytics which focuses on both understanding and interpretation. Viewers' capacity to make meaning acknowledges a way of accessing humans' existence that facilitates, said in Heidegger's phrase "show itself in itself and from itself" (ibid., 4).

Viewers may have biases in their interpretation due to the situation that they do not have any sort of preunderstanding. These biases called "prejudices" are said not as something that hinders people's ability to make meanings, but are both integral to the reality of being, and are the basis of human's ability to understand (Palmer 1969, 182).

Making meaning of a film text involves both the film text itself and the viewers within a particular medium of language and makes understanding possible. This kind of making meaning experience marks a dialogue with some characteristics: taking seriously "the truth" claims of the person with whom one is conversing, each participant in the conversation relates to one another insofar as they belong to the common goal of understanding one another, and the interpretation of a given text will change depending on the questions the interpreter asks of the text because the meaning emerges not as an object that lies in the text or in the interpreter, but rather an event that results from the interaction of the two (Gonzalez 2006).

Making meaning of a film text within a particular medium of language can be understood as a dialogue between viewers and filmmakers to achieve an understanding. The making meaning of a film text depends on the critical response from the viewers toward the film text and the interaction of the viewers and the film text results in the meaning.

Emphasizing the third tenet of phenomenology in film phenomenology, the understanding of expressing the world through language in the phenomenology of the film refers to the

film as the medium which contains images and objects parallel to symbols within a container called a text; therefore, the film itself can be seen as this container and the interpretation of the visual symbols is an effort to construct meanings.

Attaching the concept of texts and symbols to films, the elucidation of the philosophy of film begins with discussing how this philosophy is used to understand a text. Humans' efforts to clarify the meanings of their surrounding is related to their existence as Cassirer posits that in the viewpoint of human culture, the explanatory definition of man is an animal *symbolicum* rather than animal rationale (Coelho 2001, 72). Man as an animal *symbolicum* is an ontological curiosity because his existence depends on his consciousness; the existence depends on his consciousness, and his consciousness defines his existence (Przylebski 2017, 133). Humans create a system of symbols to communicate. Their world becomes more modern as well as their symbol system develops through their invention of many communication tools. Humans' inventions are produced by the consciousness of their existing needs and this also marks their existence in the world.

A film is a form of art in which the viewers attempt to understand texts as well as or even better than the authors understand their own works, and understand the authors of texts better than the authors understand themselves (Schleiermacher 1998). A film is considered a text in which viewers are expected to understand what the text is meant by the film. For this reason, viewers must clearly understand the language used in the film that applies at the time and place of the filmmakers producing the film text. The relationship between language and logic lies within the rational method of interpretation to define the truth or fallaciousness of the message (Grondin 1994).

By positioning film in philosophical tenets of phenomenology, I further discuss how the concepts of haptic visuality—the lived body experience of senses like touch or smell and the basic philosophical assumptions.

The word “haptic” relates to the sense of touch, perception, and manipulation of objects using the senses of touch and awareness. When the word “haptic” is attached to

visuality, it refers to metaphorical meaning. The term “haptic visuality” means the way vision itself can be tactile, as though one were touching a film with one’s eyes (Marks 2000, v). In a nutshell, the haptic visuality concept in intercultural cinema suggests that memories stimulate the senses’ awareness of touch, smell, and bodily towards the viewers’ original culture.

The haptic visuality concept is the answer to the question of how filmmakers can use a cinematic visual medium to transmit the physical senses. It refers to a visuality that functions like the sense of touch by stimulating the senses’ memories and engaging the viewers’ physical experience. This is not a form of mental visuality to the things seen but something that has its location in the body (Marks 2000, 132). Haptic visuality does not separate the viewers and the world of a film but recognizes the connection between self and others to bring the filmic images closer to the viewers’ body and their senses (Marks 2000, 151).

It has been explained in the previous parts of the discussion that the very basic understanding of film should be seen in the context of media and mediation and that to conduct the mediation function, the film communicates with the viewers through presenting visual images and representing the objects. Visual image presentation and object representation are the languages of the film and the viewers’ understanding of the meaning of the film language is gained through the process of interpretation. Viewers make the interpretation of a filmic text which is full of filmic language symbols.

To the viewers, they experience what the film content is exposed to through the mediation of the presentation of visual images and the representation of objects in the film text. To understand what kind of experience the viewers gain from the film, I refer to Lansberg (2004) who differentiates between “having a real experience” and “experiencing the real.” “Having a real experience” means being involved with a historical moment and becoming a part of it whereas “experiencing the real” means experiencing the historical moment but not getting involved in it (Lansberg 2004, 33). Since participation in the historical moment is indirect, it is called an “inauthentic experience.” The word “historical” here means “particular time

and space.” The film can be a medium that enables viewers to connect with the “past” they did not experience first-hand. The medium which provides viewers with the collective opportunity of having a relationship with the “history” they did not experience is called the “experiential site” (ibid.). Watching the film is “an act of prosthesis” (ibid., 34). Viewers’ mediated experience is an inauthentic experience where feeling and observing the “history” or the occurrence in a particular time and space through a medium or carrier, therefore, their understanding, as well as the experience, are also termed “mediated” and “prosthetic.”

Regarding the relation of experience to memory, Lansberg (2004, 45) argues that people gain memories through mediated images and narratives presented by modern technologies. This is what so-called “inauthentic memory” or “prosthetic memory” – memory which is resulted from the engagement between viewers and a mass-mediated representation (ibid., 20). This kind of memory viewers takes while watching films. The haptic visuality concept which emphasizes the embodiment of memory through senses, through “filmic mediated experience” and “filmic mediated memory” works under the concept of prosthetic experience and prosthetic memory. Taking a deeper look at tenets in “The Skin of Film,” I will elaborate on how the concept of prosthetic experience and prosthetic memory work.

Focusing on intercultural cinema, Marks states that intercultural cinema operates at the intersections of two or more cultural regimes of knowledge: the issue of where meaningful knowledge is located and the awareness that it is between cultures (Lansberg 2004, 24). This meaningful knowledge and awareness are produced by the mediated experience or so-called prosthetic experience.

Marks uses metaphors to formulate her arguments. Van Wolputte (2004, 257) shows, metaphors that do not belong to cognition are tools to work with experience, functions to suggest, elicit, and provoke, and are rooted in bodily experience, particularly in the sense of touch. Metaphors are the imaginative elaboration around bodily functions, create many possible meanings that are symbolic conventions free, and

produce effect and efficacy that one can attribute to the fact that metaphors address both bodily and social experience (Wolputte 2004, 258).

The metaphor Marks uses to postulate the prosthetic experience is “cinema as archaeology.” She argues that the metaphor is useful to carry a mental diagram that combines elements from different strata: the hard sedimented layer at the bottom and the vulnerable layer at the surface (Marks 2000, 28).

I explain in detail how the metaphor is attached to the film: first, the sediment layers refer to viewers’ knowledge and awareness. The surface layer is knowledge and the deepest layer is awareness. Second, the elements of strata refer to the film elements. These film elements include the actual image, virtual image, cliché, optical image, and recollection image (Marks 2000, 30). Each film element has different nature of revealing the knowledge. The actual image corresponds to the past and present whereas the virtual image is to the preserved past (*ibid.*, 40). Clichés and optical images have the opposite function; the previous hides the object in the image, and the latter, makes the object visible to reveal the knowledge it constitutes (*ibid.*, 46). The recollection image brings what cannot be represented into a dialogue with memory in a particular space and time (*ibid.*, 51). In the process of viewing, all the elements will be working in one vein to construct viewers’ knowledge and awareness.

The process of viewing is a mediated process in which the filmic elements (actual image, virtual image, cliché, optical image, and recollection image) work on building the viewers’ prosthetic experience. Such experience is represented partially through what is uttered and seen (Marks 2000, 30). Through a mediated experience, viewers have two different forms of “experience the real” that confront each other at a given occurrence in a particular space and time. These two different forms refer to differences in what is seen and what is perceived. As the film is an audio-visual medium, it makes these differences possible. The cinematic image corresponds to the notion of the visible which viewers can read about a particular occurrence formation. In Marks’s metaphor of “cinema as

archaeology,” the concept of prosthetic experience emphasizes “experiencing the real” – indirect participation at the moment in a particular space and time through the film elements to build viewers’ knowledge and awareness toward that moment.

In Marks’s metaphor of “cinema as archaeology,” memory is related to the order of knowledge expressed in the intercultural film. The word “order” refers to the level of the memory: private and “official” memory. The “official” refers to the communal memory. It is said that there is a disjunction between these orders of knowledge – memory (Marks 2000, 31). These memories are constructed in the viewers’ prosthetic experience through the recollection of images and objects. The interconnection of memory and the recollection-image occurs when the time-image shifts to the movement-image (*ibid.*, 64).

Through their prosthetic experience, viewers gain prosthetic memory during their viewing process which exposes the image presentation and object representation. Marks uses “fossil” as another metaphor that refers to image presentation and object representation. As Marks says fossils are produced during the contact between viewers with the image presentation and object representation during the viewing process; it corresponds with the photographic process when light reflected by an object makes contact with the witnessing material of film (Marks 2000, 84).

The metaphor of “fossil” describes filmic images as entities that “embody a past.” It is a representation of an entity that is incomparable with the image depiction of the presentation of the entity. In the concept of this “film fossil” the representation images that arise from reality may be presented in a different way from the reality itself; such representation creates memory fragments that surface repeatedly to consciousness but are mysterious in their meaning (*ibid.*). When the prosthetic experience occurs during the process of viewing, a recollection-object breaks down through the engagement with memory, then this memory – a prosthetic one generates sensation in the body. Thus, the embodiment of memory through senses Marks proposed meaning that when the filmic images result in prosthetic memory, this refers to the engagement of prosthetic memory with the senses. As Marks

states, meaning resides in objects, but memory is stored in the body (2000, 121).

In the previous parts, I have explained that haptic visuality is a metaphor that refers to the embodiment of memory through senses and that the archaeological metaphor used in “the Skin of Film” refers to the central tenets of “haptic visuality’: prosthetic experience and prosthetic memory. In this part, I continue my discussion more specifically on this memory which drives the explanation beyond the hermeneutics tradition since both filmic prosthetic experience and prosthetic memory are produced by the relationship between viewers and film. Both film prosthetic experience and prosthetic memory are the products of a relationship between two parties. In this part, I focus my discussion on the relationship as the “producer” rather than on the “product.’

Memory is a process at once cerebral and emotional. Merleau-Ponty (1992) significantly developed the ground for the relationship between perception, body, and memory. The concept posits that the relationship between self and world is mimetic which means that meaning is not solely communicated through signs but experienced in the body. In this embodied perception the perceiver relinquishes power over the perceived occurs. Just like language is an extension of being, a film is an extension of the viewer's embodied existence.

This relationship between viewers and film is a phenomenological model of subjectivity which posits a mutual permeability and mutual creation of self and world through perceptions of the world (Marks 2000, 149). The Film is a phenomenological art, *par excellence*, therefore a phenomenology of the film must describe how the film world is perceived by the viewers as if they were being in the film world. This refers to the meaning that the phenomenology of the film focuses on the relationship between viewers and the film through the conditions and aspects of the film experience. In a nutshell, film phenomenology focuses on describing the perception and understanding of the world and its existence in the world. Sobchack (1992) argues that the phenomenology of film experience emphasizes the interaction between two bodies

– the film body and the viewers' body – during film viewing to produce a film experience.

Marks (2000) argues that the phenomenology of individual experience explains how a viewer experiences images. In the new phenomenology perspective, the embodiment perceives bodies as active objects that work as the courses of meanings (Csordas 1994, 7). Advancing this point, Csordas (*ibid.*, 257) argues that the body should not be considered as an object but as the subject. An exchange between the embodied self of the viewer and the film as the embodied intermediary is a phenomenological encounter in which during the seeing process the presence of the body is recognized, but the unity of the other self is abandoned (*ibid.*, 151). In embodied spectatorship, the senses and the intellect are not separate and how the body encodes power relations somatically can be explained by phenomenology (Sobchack 1992, 152). Haptic visuality resembles existential phenomenology in that recognizes the viewers and the visual object constitute each other (*ibid.*, 93).

Ferencz-Flatz and Hanich (2016, 33) see that the embodiment concept in Marks's haptic visuality convinces that films can evoke other senses than merely those of seeing and hearing to work together. The concept emphasizes both the haptic quality of the filmic experience and the viewer's relationship to the moving image as a continuum. This haptic experience means that viewers do not actually touch the objects displayed on the screen, but the sense of touch is approached asymptotically, with some images evoking a more haptic experience than others.

Ferencz-Flatz and Hanich (2016, 34-35) see that Marks's embodiment concept distinguishes between optical and haptic visuality; when optical visuality is identified with a distant position of the viewers to understand the images, haptic visuality evokes an experience of closeness towards the object seen, as if touching it. The metaphor of "skin" that stress the surface texture of objects is used beyond the literal and biological meaning to comprise the phenomenology connotation. They argue that the significance of phenomenology on film is the strong connection between the viewers' body and the film's

body which also underlines the exchange position of a metaphor to experiencing the visual realm.

5. Philosophical Paradigm: Basic Assumptions of Film Phenomenology and Values of Hermeneutic to Film Phenomenology in Haptic Visuality

From the overall explanation of the definition and the concepts – prosthetic experience, prosthetic memory, and embodiment, I discuss the basic assumptions of film phenomenology and the values of hermeneutic to film phenomenology on which the concept of haptic visuality is built. The concept works on the basic assumptions as proposed by Heidegger's phenomenological framework. Moreover, the concept also emphasizes Paul Ricoeur's values of hermeneutic phenomenology. In this regards, several points of notions can be explained as the following.

First, the film is an object, a medium, and an experience that has embedded in the concept of human existence thus it is a thing that human existence already relates to and finds its meaning naturally (Loht 2017, 5). The film itself has its own being which includes its viewing and the viewer's relationship to it (ibid., 7).

Second, human consciousness is involved in film viewing refers to the intentionality concept. This consciousness always has the object of the mind that has a target meaning or sense. This film's intentionality centers on the character of viewing that involve more existential and predicated consciousness on the understanding of meaning and sense (Loht 2017, 8).

Third, filmic experience during viewing operates the receptive and intentional human mind and the disclosure of the work of the mind work (Loht 2017, 10). This can be seen in Marks's intercultural cinema account of the viewer's disclosedness and disclosure fostered in the process of viewing *History and Memory: For Akiko and Takashige*, by Rea Tajiri, winds back through the images of Japanese Americans in fiction films and government newsreels during and after World War II.

Fourth, phenomena are brought into view through the use of language. Language has the unique ability to let things be seen, to bring them into view by virtue of articulating their

relationship with other things (Loht 2017, 11). As in the film, if a film talks about something, this means that the film can make it present for itself and others, and this is to an extent to which the subject the film talks about was not previously present or known.

Fifth, film that provides a universal way to see the world and to bridge distances between things reflects a modern tendency that regards all orientations in the world as “views” or “pictures” (ibid., 12). The role of visual language stipulates an account that film is inherently descriptive and provisional.

Sixth, describing the things manifested in experience is the emphasis (ibid., 11). Based on Ricoeur’s assumptions, the manifested experience shows a redirected focus embodiment of film perception and film experience towards film language. Attention to the metaphorical and narrative resources residing in film language and its actual effect are presented in Marks’s analysis.

Seventh, underlying the prosthetic experience and prosthetic memory in haptic visuality, further, based on Ricoeur’s assumptions, the manifested experience that concentrates on the indirect or mediated interpretation of expression focuses on the reflective subject in relation to the embodiment experience and tends to accentuate matters of perception in the act of understanding and sense-making. Thus, there is a transition from an experience-expression to an expression-interpretation relation during the indirect encounter with the material world.

Eighth, the embodiment of experience in haptic visuality exercises language in which according to Ricoeur’s assumptions, the close connection between meaning and significance in the interpretation of film language rests on the use of metaphor as a means of expression. The implemented meaning engages inter-subjectively and inter-objectively with the material and natural world. The world of things, nature, and body is enriched and broadened by the dimension of cultural symbols.

Ninth, seen in Ricoeur’s assumptions, the embodiment experience of haptic visuality views the existence that neither divorces from the realities of concrete existence, nor voids of the

clarity of rational insight, but rather embrace the indirect, mediated relation of self-knowledge to human existence.

6. Conclusion

Haptic visuality works on the basic assumptions of film phenomenology as proposed by Heidegger's film phenomenological framework. The concept also emphasizes Paul Ricoeur's values of hermeneutic to film phenomenology. The concept demonstrates that the body has a lived experience of senses and a mimetic relationship to the external world during film viewing. The body parallels memory which is cerebral and emotional. The concept also posits that film is a part of the external world which can also embody a many-sided sensory experience. The embodiment of memory through senses refers to what is called "mediated experience" through the film as the medium. It is the memory embodiment of images and objects contained in the film. Here, these images and objects parallel to symbols within a "container" called a "text," therefore, the film itself can be seen as this "container." Moving further to the central tenets of haptic visuality, prosthetic experience, and prosthetic memory identify the results of the relationship between viewers and film. Hermeneutic to film phenomenology provides a basis to understand this relationship. Hermeneutic to film phenomenology offers a meeting point between the producer (viewers) of the experience and memory, that is how the film world is perceived by the viewers as if they were being in the film world. The crossing philosophical paradigm dialogues the conscious and unconscious process of a film and signifies film from a natural science perspective.

REFERENCES

- Bergson, Henri. 1988. *Matter and Memory*. Translated by Nancy Margaret Paul and W. Scott Palmer. New York: Zone.
- Botz-Bornstein, Thorsten. 2005. *Mapping Film Studies*. Paris: EHESS.

Coelho, Ivo. 2001. *Hermeneutics and Method: The Universal Viewpoint in Bernard Lonergan*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Colombo, Monica. 2004. "Theoretical Perspectives in Media-Communication Research: From Linear to Discursive Models." *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-5.2.592>

Csordas, Thomas. J., ed. 1994. *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Currie, Gregory. 1995. *Image and Mind: Film, Philosophy, and Cognitive Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dilthey, William. 1977. "The Understanding of Other Persons and Their Expressions of Life." In *Descriptive Psychology and Historical Understanding*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Federman, Mark. 2004. *What is the Meaning of the Medium is the Message?* [Online]. Accessed on November 29, 2019. http://individual.utoronto.ca/markfederman/article_mediumist_hemessage.htm

Ferencz-Flatz, Christian and Hanich, Julian. 2016. "What is Film Phenomenology?" *Studia Phaenomenologica* 16: 1-49.

Gonzalez, Francisco. J. 2006. "Dialectic and Dialogue in the Hermeneutics of Paul Ricouer and H.G. Gadamer." *Continental Philosophy Review* 39: 322-323.

Grondin, Jean. 1994. *Introduction to Philosophical Hermeneutics*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Horrigan-Kelly, Marcella, Michelle Millar, and Maura Dowling. 2016. "Understanding the Key Tenets of Heidegger's Philosophy for Interpretive Phenomenological Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Research* 15(1): 1-8.

- Landsberg, Alison. 2004. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*. Columbia University Press.
- Loht, Shawn. 2017. *Phenomenology of Film: A Heideggerian Account of the Film Experience*. Maryland: Lexington Books.
- Marks, Laura. U. 2000. *The Skin of Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodied, and the Senses*. London: Duke University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1992. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. Colin Smith. London: Routledge.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1994. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Palmer, Richard. E. 1969. *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer*. Evanston, IL: North-Western University Press.
- Przylebski, Andrzej. 2017. *Ethics in the Light of Hermeneutical Philosophy: Morality Between (Self-) Reflection and Social Obligations*. Zurich: LIT Verlag GmbH & Co. KG Wien.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst. 1998. *Hermeneutics and Criticism*. Trans. Andrew Brow. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schummer, Jordan C. 2013. "The Nature of Film: Presentation, Representation, and The Imagination." Thesis at San Diego State University.
- Skorin-Kapov, Jadranka. 2016. *The Intertwining of Aesthetics and Ethics: Exceeding of Expectations, Ecstasy, Sublimity*. Lexington Books.
- Sobchack, Vivian. 1992. *The Address of the Eye: Phenomenology and Film Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Van Dijk, Teun. A. 1988. *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum
- _____. 1997. "The Study of Discourse." In *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, edited by Teun A. van Dijk, vol. I, 1-34. London: Sage Publication.

Walton, Kendall. L. 1984. “Transparent Pictures: On the Nature of Photographic Realism.” *Critical Inquiry* 11(2): 246-77.

Wartenberg, Thomas. 2015. “Philosophy of Film.” *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, edited by E.N. Zalta, . Winter. Accessed on November, 29 2019.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2015/entries/film/>

Van Wolputte, Steven. 2004. “Hang on to Yourself: of Bodies, Embodiment, and Selves.” *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 33: 251–69.

Nopita Trihastutie obtained her American Studies Doctoral Program degree at Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia. She teaches media and cultural studies in English Department at Widya Kartika University, Indonesia. Her research on media and culture was funded by the Indonesian Ministry of Higher Education. Her articles have been published in Indonesian-indexed journals.

Address:

Nopita Trihastutie

English Department

Widya Kartika University

Jl. Jl. Sutorejo Prima Utara II No.1, Kalisari, Kec. Mulyorejo, Surabaya, Jawa Timur 60112, Indonesia

E-mail: nophia2002@gmail.com