

Ethos and the sensitive

■ LUIZ ARMANDO BAGOLIN*

MAGALI DOS REIS*

TARKOVSKI, Andrei (2010).

Esculpir o Tempo.

Tradução de Jefferson Luiz Camargo
São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 3. ed., 306 p.

ABSTRACT

The book of Tarkovski, *Sculpting in Time* shows a free reflection on the cinema, the position of the artist and the metaphysical values in contemporary society.

Keywords: *ethos, sensitive, time, aesthetics*

The third edition of the book of Tarkovsky, *Sculpting Time* to Portuguese replays the comments on their production, not directed to criticism, but as a diary, himself. Averse to theories that circulated in the second half of the twentieth century on film or an aesthetic which might be applicable, Tarkovsky sought to reflect, especially during the intervals of his films on the nature of cinema as something concerning the poetry in general, that in turn, operates between the cultivation of sensitive aisthesis, and building an ethos susceptible to the affects.

* Doctor of Philosophy from the Faculty of Philosophy and Humanities at the University of São Paulo-USP, where he earned a degree in art education, major in fine arts at the School of Communications and Arts. It is a teacher and researcher at the Institute of Brazilian Studies at the University of Sao Paulo, IEB / USP. E-mail: lbagolin@usp.br

** PhD in Education, Society and Culture, State University of Campinas, Master of Applied Social Sciences and Education degree in Education from the same university. He is currently Adjunct Professor of the Post-graduate studies in Education at the Catholic University of Minas Gerais. E-mail: magali_reis@pucminas.br

The third edition of the book of Tarkovsky, *Sculpting Time* to Portuguese replays the comments on their production, not directed to criticism, but as a diary, himself. Averse to theories that circulated in the second half of the twentieth century on film or an aesthetic which might be applicable, Tarkovsky sought to reflect, especially during the intervals of his films on the nature of cinema as something concerning the poetry in general, that in turn, operates between the cultivation of sensitive aisthesis, and building an ethos susceptible to the affects.

During these interludes, which sought to establish the universal in his films is apparently borne out by the reflection, because, being thought of as essential and filmed some clichés - such as childhood, motherhood, destiny, dreams, loneliness - others, also shared by the reception, attended the debate between filmmaker and audience. Not trying to condition it to their own expectations and desires, nor subordinate to advance the axiological rules related to their prior achievement, the author adds the receptivity of the effect of transactions between image and affect, since the search for knowledge is from uterine immersion. Therefore, the tale of Bogomolov from which Tarkovsky film *Ivan's Childhood* is not followed closely as the narrative realism, but the possibility of inventing characters, the most interesting being “outwardly static but inwardly from an energy overwhelming passion” (p. 14). The film really should stay away from the literature, excusing himself to transcribe it, or his style, to open to the “poetic joints, the logic of poetry” (p. 16). This opening, without affecting the sovereignty of the film, made from symbolic associations between frames, allows the public to rebuild their way to share what he saw and heard, proposing to them a specific meaning, therefore maintaining its sovereignty also his point of view about the reception. Tarkovsky defends poetry not as a genre, but as the organization of human existence which poetically, shall be added as “a specific form of relationship with reality” (p. 18). This is not reduced to mere illusion of feeling seized by the outward senses, but is hidden under a surface which covers the true objectivity.

Investing his speech in some ontology, Tarkovsky rejects the Convention on the concept of *mise-en-scene*, the traditional meeting of actors and scenery conveniently express an idea, highlighting, in his place, generated by the associative strategy, which uses in his films, able, so only this, to produce a congruence between composition and event. “What makes the scene so

irresistible,” Tarkovsky said, “is the refusal to overload the scene with obvious ideas” (p. 25). The composition of the ethos of the artist as a device that seeks to increase the means that are acceptable for the sake of objectivity and sincerity of the work produced, procedures or personal choices for the expression of a story that will have its value assured in that was born of a real need for the director and, although quite emotional, marked by the collaboration comes to “raising the value of life” (p. 27).

As a first viewer of his films, Tarkovsky assumed that if a scenario is able to raise him “accurate memories and poetic associations” (p. 28), although they are entirely subjective, indeed, for this reason, the more you can have on public a related emotion. The method consists of memory “an artistic reworking of the past” (p. 29), provided that subject to that ethos, and the dream also figured from the rupture or discontinuity of the edited sequence. In Ivan's Childhood, for example, the solution for the representation of dreams has been to use one of them, the third dream, the negative image.

Not interrupted by lightning, the Trinity of Andrei Rublev is about the soul of an artist is not corrupted by the degeneration and evil around him. As an allegory of the tripartite spiritual unity that encapsulate the ethos of the artist, Tarkovsky, the painter of icons within the fifteenth century Russia to present itself as a principle or example is not protected by a historical reconstruction that would stiffen it into a genre . Because the film should seek “spiritual complicity” (p. 37), sharing around the value of the remaining symbols dear to religion as a feeling of belonging.

Not following any practical purpose, contrary to what occurs with science, art is experienced as “an acceptance of aesthetic beauty, or even on an emotional level supraemocional” (p. 43). From the viewpoint of the artist, art is giving, sacrifice, revelation, according to the author proposes that the figure of the movie director in the homology of the poet: both are not content to describe the world, but rather to create, participate in its creation. A threshold between aesthetics and theology, Tarkovsky's speech about art enhances the paradox as a strategy pursued in the movies themselves, since corroborated by the audience to participate in his experience also subjectively, through discovery or disclosure of your own affections. When stir the senses, the work of art converts the time, “a condition of existence of

our self” (p. 64) as a matter to plow up the memory to him, time, amalgamated, and to form an inseparable unity that does not is fully understandable, as is fully intelligible unit exposed by the author as “spiritual concept” (p. 64).

The time it leaves traces that prove to be the traces of lived experience for the soul able to connect past, present and future, as mutually dependent events captures the dichotomy of cause and effect. As the purpose of his affections, the inner self is developed at a time, developing paradoxically at all, which confirms, for the author, his theory of associations. For Tarkovsky, “the film is able to operate with any fact which extends in time, life can take almost anything you want [...] absolutely everything” (p. 75) Associate as an action that permeates the whole, the manifestation time as the form of a real event, the observation in a pure state to the desired film is similar to haiku. Short triplets, imbued with images of life observed directly, indirectly associated to other images, not present in the poem, but accessed through it. But just as in haiku, it's almost unavoidable to use a kigo, film, according to the author, can not help himself from “the natural and real ways of life perceived by the senses of sight and hearing” (p. 82), which gives the status of a naturalist. The movies is not enough just to reflect the reality as perceived by ordinary perception: we must transcend it. “His role”, says Tarkovsky, “is to make the vision reality spiritual influence, as did Dostoevsky, the first to express in a spirited manner of evil age” (p. 114). Taking a stand against the imposture of the avant-garde, Tarkovsky sings through the corners of his father, the poet Arsenic, praise the mystery that we all face when we kneel in front of a mirror, *The Mirror* and other films, when, for example, if used the painting of Leonardo Da Vinci. As the author suggests: “The paradox is that what is unique about an artistic image becomes mysteriously typical, because, strange as it sounds, the typical is in direct correlation with what is individual, idiosyncratic, unlike anything more” (p. 131). As the film without the naturalist naturalism, it is also advisable to avoid a color photograph, or at least try to soften the effect, seductive on the public. It is the director of the collecting segments that have passed before the camera that which, in turn, is consistent with “their personal artistic goals, creating the internal logic of action” (p. 220). The claim here is clearly the sovereignty of the director of his criteria of authorship on the first edition of which was captured and interpreted. Thinking about the film as a mosaic which we must build carefully, being previously cut parts or

fragments, tesserae, the issue is not seen as a mechanical science, but as a creation inspired by the filmmaker's soul. Tesserária, the art director is like the composition of a large mosaic, which is to be seen fully formed only after all and it was a step backwards, making the vision that makes the set momentarily forget the discontinuity of small parts that builds it. Accused in the Soviet Union, often not realistic, by distancing themselves from reality - not the supposed widespread as everyday life in which even the most distant part dreamer, but the supposed reality peddled by party - Tarkovsky says his desire to plunge into the emotional subjectivity which seeks to thrill the souls of others. Make it receptive to beauty, sensitive, he believes, is at the same time make it receptive to the good. Considering that the film is a special place, a second reality as proposed by the author, the director's function is that of spiritual guide, depending on the construction of an ethos conducive to good, which embodies the Stalker conveniently, since its strength comes from their faith and desire to serve others. Counterpart, so the discourse in Tarkovsky, *Stalker* is a film that testifies to the operation of this ethos multiplied everywhere, not contained by anything, as the "Zone" (p. 238), whose borders are impossible to be defined. At its core, the room is the place to hold the innermost desire, do not confess, who enter it. The words mean nothing in the *Zone*, which has only within the soul. "In *Stalker*", Tarkovsky said,

I do kind of a full statement: that is, that just the love for humanity - miraculously - to prove that it is grossly false assumption that there is no hope for the world [...] The Zone does not stand for anything, anything more than anything else in my films: the zone is a zone, it is life, and along it, a man can be destroyed or can be saved. If he is saved or not is something that depends on your own self-respect and their ability to distinguish between what really matters and what is purely ephemeral. (p. 239)

Tarkovsky still preaching, as Aristotle in the *Poetics*, that the work of art may or may not produce a catharsis as cure the ills of the soul, but in itself represents no truth. It's the little daily actions, however minimal, which can lead to great miracles, such as watering a plant sterile and his son Alexander in *The Sacrifice*, by repeating the story of a monk. There is a clear message, philosophical and theological, in that statement about the necessity of love for humanity, as a reproach on the "absurdity of someone who feels unworthy and therefore sinful, everything that is not a necessity life" (p. 272). Alexander's sacrifice is the representation of the jump of a man of reason in the darkness of faith by love for his son in front of an impending

nuclear apocalypse, against all rules of behavior or rules of what to say and do in society. “Sacrifice is, among other things, a repudiation of commercial cinema” (p. 274), Tarkovsky says. It is also an invitation to experience and sensitivity, filtered through an ethical-aesthetic that passes by Horkheimer and Adorno, and then make the criticism of the film industry to a speech about the spirit of the artist and the meaning of the work of art. But is it still possible the assertion of self of the artist in a world like ours, completely not historicized?

Article received on 23th December 2010 and approved on 16th September 2011.