

Bibliotekarstudentens nettleksikon om litteratur og medier

Av Helge Ridderstrøm (førsteamanuensis ved OsloMet – storbyuniversitetet)

Sist oppdatert 20.07.24

Om leksikonet: https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/om_leksikonet.pdf

Samtidighetsforståelse

Vår stadig endrete/reviderte forståelse av hva som skjer i en fortelling/historie, hva boka eller filmen dreier seg om, hvordan personene egentlig er osv. Ofte kreves det senere omtolkning på grunnlag av nye opplysninger og opplevelser av verket.

Den danske litteraturforskeren Steffen Hejlskov Larsen etablerte begrepet “forløbslæsning” om et “kontinuert oplevelsesforløb hos læseren” (https://issuu.com/danskclf/docs/dansk_noter_4_web; lesedato 22.01.20). Hejlskov Larsen brukte begrepet bl.a. i artikkelen “Betrægtninger over en sprogæstetisk læsemodel” (1968).

Samtidighetsforståelsen bidrar til opplevelsen av spenning i en bok, en film eller andre kunstverk. Alle mennesker har en tendens til hele tiden å ønske å se sammenhenger, søke løsninger og forklaringer. En slik søken blir en prosess med ulike faser i løpet av den tiden det tar å lese en bok, se en film eller lignende. Verk som overrasker oss på en konsistent, logisk eller estetisk tilfredsstillende måte (slik at vi får en positiv aha-opplevelse) og som blir “dypere” etter hvert, oppleves av mange som kvalitativt gode. I en god historie er det nesten til enhver tid usikkerhet og spenning. Ofte driver forfatteren eller regissøren et tilbakeholdelsesspill, der viktig informasjon holdes tilbake for å øke spenningen og forventningen.

Leseren, seeren eller spilleren opplever kontinuerlige (mindre eller større) overraskelser og må dermed revidere sine antakelser. I løpet av den tiden det tar å oppleve verket, skjer det en prosess med stadig modifiserte forventninger.

“In classical narratives, events occur in distributions: they are linked to each other as cause to effect, effects in turn causing other effects, until the final effect. And even if two events seem not obviously interrelated, we infer that they may be, on some larger principle that we will discover later.” (Chatman 1988 s. 46)

Leseren opplever “the arousals, expectations, doubts, suspense, reversals, revaluations, disappointments, embarrassments, fulfillments, and even the incoherences animated by reading.” (Peter Brooks i Furst 1992 s. 268) Og leseren kan “expect the unexpected, always conceptualizing an ending in advance” (Blackford 2004 s. 78).

Det er ofte tilfelle at en “narration continues to expand and contract our knowledge for the sake of suspense and surprise” (Bordwell og Thompson 2007 s. 390). En “moment-by-moment manipulation of our knowledge yields a constantly shifting play between the probable and the unexpected, between suspense and surprise” (Bordwell og Thompson 2007 s. 392). Den sveitsiske psykologen Jean Piaget skilte mellom “reproduktive bilder” som henter inn i minnet det vi allerede har sett, og “antisiperende bilder” der vi forestiller oss det som ennå ikke har inntruffet (gjengitt fra Sandbothe og Zimmerli 1994 s. 54).

“[R]eading can be seen as a continuous process of forming hypotheses, reinforcing them, developing them, modifying them, and sometimes replacing them by others or dropping them altogether.” (Rimmon-Kenan 1985 s. 121) “As we read on we shed assumptions, revise beliefs, make more and more complex inferences and anticipations; each sentence opens up a horizon which is confirmed, challenged or undermined by the next. We read backwards and forwards simultaneously; predicting and recollecting, perhaps aware of other possible realizations of the text which our reading has negated. Moreover, all of this complicated activity is carried out on many levels at once, for the text has ‘backgrounds’ and ‘foregrounds’, different narrative viewpoints, alternative layers of meaning between which we are constantly moving.” (Eagleton 2008 s. 67)

Det i en historie som allerede er fortalt, blir viktige holdepunkter for hva vi forstår på ethvert tidspunkt senere i historien og for hvilke hypoteser vi danner oss om sammenhenger i handlingen. Ting som har skjedd tidligere, kan være forvarsler om ting som skal skje senere (frampek). Det hender at forståelsen “backfires”. I den kinesiske regissøren Wong Kar-wai sin film *In the Mood for Love* (2000) “Revelation of the spouses’ affair invites the spectator to retroactively sift through prior action. Now we are asked to reappraise earlier scenes whose proper context the narration has suppressed. [...] narrational gambits such as this cue us to reevaluate preceding action in the film.” (Buckland 2009 s. 175-176)

“The moment-to-moment interpretations varied substantially, in a way that would probably never be captured by any summary of the story that the students might give subsequently. Ambiguities were activated or not; initial decisions were sometimes rethought and sometimes taken for granted.” (Mackey 2006 s. 162)

Vi ønsker å forstå det vi allerede har lest fordi vi vet at det blir viktig for forståelsen av resten av teksten. Den amerikanske litteraturforskeren Peter Brooks bruker i boka *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (1984) uttrykket “the anticipation of retrospection” om forventningen om at vi senere skal oppleve et klargjørende tilbakeblikk. Brooks skriver: “If the past is to be read as present, it is a curious present that we know to be past in relation to a future we know to be already in place, already in wait for us to reach it. Perhaps we would do best to speak of the anticipation of retrospection as our chief tool in making sense of narrative, the master trope of its strange logic”. “[T]he force that drives a reader

through a narrative work – the thing that keeps us turning pages – is that the end of the narrative work already exists – the future is fixed – so we (readers) look forward to looking backward. While reading page 20 of a novel, we know that when we get to page 368 page 368 will throw meaningful light back onto page 20, so we continue. While reading line 2 of a poem, we know line 16 will further illuminate line 2. Or as Brooks puts it: "... everything is transformed by the structuring presence of the end to come." " (http://www.howlarium.com/looking-forward-to-looking-backward; lesedato 14.06.21)

Vi leter etter sammenhenger og mønstre. Store og små skift i samtidighetsforståelsen kan få leseren (eller seeren, spilleren) til å reflektere over alt hun/han har tatt for gitt, men som plutselig kan vise seg ikke å stemme. Forventninger om hva som skal skje inntrer i større eller mindre grad, og hendelser får en tilbakevirkende kraft på vår forståelse av det som har skjedd tidligere i fortellingen.

"We look forward, we look back, we decide, we change our decisions, we form expectations, we are shocked by their nonfulfillment, we question, we muse, we accept, we reject; this is the dynamic process of recreation." (Wolfgang Iser sitert fra http://www.participations.org/; lesedato 30.04.15) "[E]ach intentional sentence correlative [link to be made between one sentence and another] opens up a partial horizon, which is modified, if not completely changed, by succeeding sentences. While these expectations arouse interest in what is to come, the subsequent modification of them will also have a retrospective effect on what has already been read" (Iser sitert fra Duncan 2013 s. 11).

Den franske kultursosiologen Jean-Pierre Esquenazi hevder at Alfred Hitchcocks film *Vertigo* (1958) skifter sjanger 11 ganger i løpet av handlingen. Dette tvinger seeren stadig til å spørre seg selv om hun skjønner hva regissøren ønsker å oppnå med filmen. Interessen ved filmen er primært den tolkningsmessige "svimmelheten" som seeren opplever, ikke hovedpersonens svimmelhet (gjengitt fra Ethis 2013 s. 72).

Sjangerkonvensjoner er styrende. Hvis vi i en westernfilm ser en diligence sett fra en fjelltopp, forventer vi at vogna blir betraktet av indianere og at et indianerangrep er nært forestående (Aumont, Bergala et al. 2004 s. 83).

Samtidighetsforståelsen følges av følelser: "To have an expectation about "what happens next" is to invest some emotion in the situation" (Bordwell og Thompson 2007 s. 60).

"Tracing out a plan or following an investigation can yield suspense (Will the criminal succeed? How?), while unexpected twists trigger surprise, forcing us to reconsider the odds of the criminal's success. [...] The thriller's emphasis on suspense and surprise encourages filmmakers to mislead the audience, and this can lead to experiments with narrative form." (Bordwell og Thompson 2007 s. 323-

324) “The viewer must keep both possibilities in play while she waits for unambiguous cues to clarify the proper state of events.” (Buckland 2009 s. 177)

Leseren og seeren må leve med usikkerhet, og dette skaper spenning. “[T]he text’s very existence depends on maintaining the phase of the ‘not yet fully known or intelligible’ for as long as possible.” (Rimmon-Kenan 1985 s. 125)

Usikkerhet skapes på mange måter. I den franske regissøren Michel Gondrys *The Science of Sleep* (2006) er vi noen ganger i tvil om hva hovedpersonen Stéphane drømmer og hva han faktisk opplever. Noen scener foregår entydig i virkeligheten og andre entydig i hans drømmeverden, mens noen scener har en uklar mellomstatus. I andre filmer kan vi føle oss sikre på noe, men ta feil. I svensken Stephan Apelgrens film *Wallander: Cellisten* (2008) blir en kvinnelig russisk cellist nesten drept av en bombe som blir plassert under bilen hennes av russisk mafia. Senere i filmen ser vi noen plassere en gjenstand under etterforsker Wallanders bil, og seeren venter at den skal eksplodere når som helst. Det viser seg å være sporingsutstyr som er festet under Wallanders bil, slik at skurkene kan følge med hvor han beveger seg.

En regissør kan gi seerne informasjon som bevisst leder seeren til å trekke feil slutninger. Regissøren kan f.eks. bruke en skjult sceneendring (seeren legger ikke merke til skiftet fra ett sted til et annet), skjult ellipse, skjult tilbakeblikk eller skjult parallellmontasje (Fuxjäger 2007 s. 45).

I filmen *Final Destination 2* (2003; regissert av David R. Ellis) ledes seeren mange ganger til å ta feil av hvordan en av personene kommer til å miste livet. En feilaktig oppfatning kan også holdes ved like gjennom et helt verk, som i Steven Spielbergs film *Saving Private Ryan* (1998). De fleste seere vil anta at den gamle mannen vi ser i begynnelsen av filmen, er John H. Miller, mens den gamle mannen på slutten viser seg å være James Francis Ryan. Det er først når Miller blir drept mot slutten av filmen, at seeren må endre oppfatning, og den nye oppfatningen blir bekreftet helt på slutten av filmen.

De fleste opplever en filmhandling som “en forløpende samtid”, ikke som avsluttet fortid (Krohn og Strank 2012 s. 28). Dette skaper gode muligheter for identifikasjon.

Handlingen kan brått ta en uventet retning. I filmmanus kalles det på engelsk “plot points” når handlingen vris i en ny retning. Franskmannen Philippe Claudels film *Jeg har elsket deg så lenge* (2008) inneholder øyeblikk der “vi er nødt til å stable fullstendig om på førsteinntrykket” (*Morgenbladet* 24.–30. juli 2009 s. 28). Om den samme filmen skrev *Dagbladet*: Regissøren Claudel har “et selvskevrent manus som overrasker, der vi som tilskuer stadig skifter mening og der han til slutt tvinger oss til å ta et standpunkt og et oppgjør med oss selv” (23. juli 2009 s. 47). Eksempler på andre filmer som har store, overraskende vendinger i plottet er

Aisling Walshs *Fingersmith* (2005) og Steven Soderberghs *The Informant* (2009). Walshs film er basert på romanen *Fingersmith* (2002) av den britiske forfatteren Sarah Waters. Romanen har to jeg-fortellere, den unge kvinnen Sue i første del, og den unge kvinnen Maud i andre del. Sue er med i en forrædersk plan om å lure pengearven fra Maud, og verken hun eller leseren aner at det er Sue som er i ferd med å bli lurt. Leseren får en stor overraskelse helt på slutten av del 1 av romanen. I del 2, der Maud forteller fra sitt perspektiv, oppdager leseren trekk ved Maud som ikke kom fram i del 1.

I James Camerons film *The Terminator* (1984, også kjent som *Terminator 1*) opptrer skuespilleren Arnold Schwarzenegger i rollen som en ond robot, og de fleste seere vil forvente at Schwarzenegger er ond også når han dukker opp i Camerons *Terminator 2: Judgment Day* (1991). Seerne blir overrasket når han i film 2 viser seg å være på det godes side, i kamp mot de onde robotene som han selv tilhørte i film 1.

I noen filmer blir seerne “lurt” gjennom nesten hele filmen, f.eks. hvis vi ser personer og handlinger som egentlig bare finnes i hovedpersonens minner eller fantasi. At disse personene ikke reelt og fysisk eksisterer (lenger), oppdager seerne vanligvis mot slutten av filmen, f.eks. i Uwe Bolls *Blackwoods* (2002) og Pål Slettaunes *Babycall* (2011).

“Like some of the other books that I read, that I think are going to be pretty interesting, I always cut myself short, I read the back first and then it’s like, “No! Now I know what’s going to happen. I’ve just ruined the whole book.” ” (ei 14 år gammel jente sitert fra Blackford 2004 s. 77)

I en analyse av et dataspill kan det fokuseres på “the dynamics of fulfilled, frustrated, delayed, and diverted expectations” (Wolf og Perron 2003 s. 211). Dette innebærer å vektlegge spillerens samtidighetsforståelse.

Den amerikanske litteraturforskeren Stanley Fish presenterer i artikkelen “Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics” (1970) “a method, rather simple in concept, but complex (or at least complicated) in execution. The concept is simply the rigorous and disinterested asking of the question, what does this word, phrase, sentence, paragraph, chapter, novel, play, poem, do?; and the execution involves *an analysis of the developing responses of the reader in relation to the words as they succeed one another in time*. Every word in this statement bears a special emphasis. The analysis must be of the developing responses to distinguish it from the atomism of much stylistic criticism. A reader’s response to the fifth word in a line or sentence is to a large extent the product of his responses to words one, two, three, and four. And by response, I intend more than the range of feelings (what Wimsatt and Beardsley call “the purely affective reports”). The category of response includes any and all of the activities provoked by a string of words: the projection of syntactical and/or lexical probabilities; their subsequent occurrence or

non-occurrence; attitudes toward persons, or things, or ideas referred to; the reversal or questioning of those attitudes; and much more. Obviously, this imposes a great burden on the analyst who in his observations on any one moment in the reading experience must take into account all that has happened (in the reader's mind) at previous moments, each of which was in its turn subject to the accumulating pressures of its predecessors. (He must also take into account influences and pressures predating the actual reading experience – questions of genre, history, etc. [...] All of this is included in the phrase “in time.” The basis of the method is a consideration of the *temporal* flow of the reading experience, and it is assumed that the reader responds in terms of that flow and not to the whole utterance. That is, in an utterance of any length, there is a point at which the reader has taken in only the first word, and then the second, and then the third, and so on, and the report of what happens to the reader is always a report of what has happened to that point. (The report includes the reader's set toward future experiences, but not those experiences.)” (Fish i “Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics”; <http://www.philol.msu.ru/~discours/images/stories/article2.pdf>; lesedato 22.01.20)

“Essentially what the method does is slow down the reading experience so that “events” one does not notice in normal time, but which do occur, are brought before our analytical attentions. It is as if a slow-motion camera with an automatic stop action effect were recording our linguistic experiences and presenting them to us for viewing. Of course the value of such a procedure is predicated on the idea of *meaning as an event*, something that is happening between the words and in the reader's mind, something not visible to the naked eye, but which can be made visible (or at least palpable) by the regular introduction of a “searching” question (what does this do?). [...] there is no fixed relationship between formal features and response [...] It is, in essence, a language sensitizing device [...] more is going on in language than we consciously know [...] In a peculiar and unsettling (to theorists) way, it is a method which processes its own user, who is also its only instrument.” (Stanley Fish i “Literature in the Reader: Affective Stylistics”; <http://www.philol.msu.ru/~discours/images/stories/article2.pdf>; lesedato 22.01.20)

Den engelske dikteren John Milton skrev eposet *Paradise Lost* (1667; på norsk 1993) basert på Bibelens fortellinger om Satans opprør mot Gud, skapelsen av jorden, Adam og Evas syndfall og utdrivelsen av Paradiset. I boka *Surprised by sin: The reader in Paradise Lost* (1967 og 1997) hevder Stanley Fish at eposet handler om lesernes egen syndfullhet, og at synden viser seg hver gang leseren f.eks. får sympati for en ond person eller handling i teksten. Milton vil overraske leseren ved å la hun/han oppdage egen hovmodighet og andre svakheter gjennom teksten. Leseren skal komme i “tolkningskriser” (“interpretive crises”; Fish 1997 s. xiv i forordet). Krisene oppstår gjennom at leseren gjøres ansvarlig for sine valg av tolknninger i et farefullt felt som gjelder sjelens frelse eller fortapelse. “[T]he reader is presented with a series of ‘interpretative choices.’ ” (Fish 1997 s. 346), og må ta ansvar for disse. Hvert øyeblikk kan teksten by på nye perspektiver, som leseren

med fare for sin sjel ikke kan neglisjere. “Do you know what to make of this *now*?” (Fish 1997 s. 347)

Meningen i *Paradise Lost* ligger ifølge Fish primært i hvordan teksten fører leseren gjennom en tolknings- og selvinnsiktsprosess. “[I]f the meaning of the poem is to be located in the reader’s experience of it, the form of the poem is the form of that experience [...] The stages of this experience mark advances in the reader’s understanding, in the refining of his vision” (Fish 1997 s. 341). Prosessen er ikke jevn og likefram. “The reader’s capacity to see him [Satan i eposet] clearly changes, although that change is gradual and fitful, uneven [...] [og frambrakt i] the reader’s laboring mind” (Fish 1997 s. 345).

“[T]he physical form of *Paradise Lost* has only an oblique relationship to its true form, which I identified with the form of the reader’s experience. That experience, however, does not lend itself to the kind of description one usually associates with the word ‘formal’; here are no readily discernible beginning, middle, and end, no clearly marked transitions, no moments of crisis at which issues are preeminently resolved; instead, the form, if it can be called that, follows the convolutions of the reader’s education, now describing in advance, now backsliding, at one moment pointing upward, at another, downward, at a third, in both directions at once. Still, there is a pattern into which the experiences of all successful readers fall (although there are as many variations within it as there are readers) and we are now in a position to trace out that pattern: [...] During the poem, the reader is being forced by the verse to sharpen his moral and spiritual perceptions to the point where they are answerable to those essences of which he has hitherto had only an imperfect and partial knowledge. This refining process is desultory and wandering, concerned randomly with the entire range of moral abstractions.” (Fish 1997 s. 352-353)

“[W]e can turn to the textual theory of Wolfgang Iser and to Stanley Fish’s “Affective Stylistics” period [...] Both writers insisted on the importance of studying a text as it happens, from sentence to sentence, page to page. Fish argued that we as analysts too often interpret the text as a whole, hence forgetting how it developed and took form in the act of reading. He wrote of literature as “kinetic,” in that it moves, and “does not lend itself to a static interpretation because it refuses to stay still and doesn’t let you stay still either.” He further reasoned that readers respond not only to a finished utterance, but rather to the “temporal flow” of a text: “That is, in an utterance of any length, there is a point at which the reader has taken in only the first word, and then the second, and then the third, and so on, and the report of what happens to the reader is always a report of what has happened *to that point*” (emphasis added). Iser too was interested in how sequent sentences act upon one another, and in how texts leave “gaps” between sentences and ideas that readers must fill in, producing an ebb and flow (a beating heart?) of anticipation, retrospection, and accumulation, an “experience [that] comes about through a process of continual modification.” “Every moment of reading,” he notes, “is a dialectic of protension and retention, conveying a future horizon yet to be occupied,

along with a past (and continually fading) horizon already filled; the wandering viewpoint carves its passage through both at the same time and leaves them to merge together in its wake.” [...] we constantly interpret as we go along.” (Gray 2010 s. 41-42)

I Warren Bucklands artikkelen “Making sense of *Lost Highway*” (i boka *Puzzle films: Complex storytelling in contemporary cinema*, 2009, redigert av Buckland) analyseres David Lynchs film fra 1997 scene for scene. Buckland viser hvordan seeren kastes inn i et sett av gåter, og hvordan seeren stadig må gjette, komme med antakelser, lage hypoteser om sammenhengene i plottet og hva som kommer til å skje i neste scene. I analysen gjennomgår Buckland hver eneste scene i filmen i filmens egen rekkefølge, og forklarer hva en seer (som ikke har sett filmen tidligere) må anta ut fra den gåtefulle og unnvikende informasjonen som blir gitt. “[T]he spectator generates hypotheses in response to the gaps the narration has constructed, and is anticipating events in future scenes”, skriver Buckland. To andre utdrag fra artikkelen (her tatt fra en online-versjon):

“The hypotheses we generate about this spatial gap are a suspense, non-exclusive hypotheses operating at the film’s macro level – suspense because we assume the gap will be resolved in the future (so we anticipate the filling in of this gap at a later time in the film’s unfolding); it is non-exclusive because it could have been anyone (we cannot generate an hypothesis suspecting a particular person); and it operates on the macro level because it spans the entire film. The scale of probability-improbability usually refers to the hypotheses we generate. But in this case, the way the narration fills in this gap at the end of the film is highly improbable. Although our hypotheses were non-exclusive, it is highly unlikely that any spectator would generate the hypothesis that Fred is also outside the house pressing his own doorbell!” (http://www.artlurker.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Buckland-Warren-Puzzle-Films-Complex-Storytelling-Contemporary-Cinema-2-Making-Sense-of-Lost-Highway_Warren-Bucklan.pdf; lesedato 16.11.12)

“The lack of information on Dick Laurent’s identity is a temporary, flaunted, focused gap that leads the spectator to generate an exclusive, curiosity hypothesis that operates on the macro level (for his identity is not immediately resolved). In a more conventional film (one that follows the conventions of the canonical story format), the spectator’s narrative schema would condition her to expect the next scene to contain exposition explaining who Dick Laurent is. The screeching tires and the police siren are not coded as prominent cues, and many spectators may not perceive them as cues, but as part of the film’s “reality effect” – that is, background noise that one may expect to hear, rather than a significant narrative event. In summary, the opening scene enables the narrative schema to gain a foothold in the film, since the spectator generates hypotheses in response to the gaps the narration has constructed, and is anticipating events in future scenes. The first scene ends on an establishing shot, a very long shot of the front of Fred’s house in the early

morning light. After a fade, the second scene begins by repeating this exterior establishing shot, except this time it is night. Inside the house, we see Fred packing a saxophone into its case, and talking to Renee (Patricia Arquette), who wants to stay home and read rather than go to the club with him. This seemingly simple scene nonetheless keeps the spectator busy. It appears to follow the canonical story format by continuing to introduce the setting and characters, and by explaining a state of affairs. On the basis of the two exterior establishing shots (shown back to back), we generate the hypothesis that the film has now progressed from morning to evening of the same day. In other words, using our narrative schema, we establish a linear temporal relation between the two scenes. Secondly, information about Fred is conveyed indirectly: we assume he is a musician, and we find out from his talk with Renee that the two of them are married” (http://www.artlurker.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Buckland-Warren-Puzzle-Films-Complex-Storytelling-Contemporary-Cinema-2-Making-Sense-of-Lost-Highway_Warren-Bucklan.pdf; lesedato 16.11.12)

“When [M. N. Shyamalans film] *The Sixth Sense* was released in 1999, many moviegoers were so intrigued by the surprise twist at the end that they returned to see the film again and trace how their expectations has been manipulated.” (Bordwell og Thompson 2007 s. 75).

Hva samtidighetsforståelse er kan belyses ved et lingvistisk eksempel. Såkalte “garden path sentences” er setninger der leseren blir “ført på avveie” eller “møter veggen”. Det er setninger som tolkes feilaktig fordi leseren har dannet seg en feilaktig hypotese om det som leses (Gross 1994 s. 18-19). Til slutt kommer leseren til et punkt der hypotesen må forkastes. Setningene som har vært “hagesti-setninger” må da leses på nytt, med en ny hypotese. Hagesti-setninger gjør oss eksplisitt oppmerksomme på teksters mulige tolkningsmangfold. Eksempler: “The cotton clothing is made of grows in Mississippi.” og “The sour drink from the ocean.”

Litteraturliste (for hele leksikonet): <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no/gallery/litteraturliste.pdf>

Alle artiklene i leksikonet er tilgjengelig på <https://www.litteraturogmedieleksikon.no>