

„Kwartalnik Filmowy” no. 129 (2025)  
ISSN: 0452-9502 (Print) ISSN: 2719-2725 (Online)  
<https://doi.org/10.36744/kf.3997>  
© Author; Creative Commons BY 4.0 License

**Višnja Pentić**

Academy of Dramatic Art University of Zagreb  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9108-0429>

# From Narration to Monstration: Representing Trauma in Ivan Martinac's *House on the Sand*

## Keywords:

parametric narration;  
trauma  
representation;  
monstration;  
minimalism;  
slow cinema;  
camera gaze

## Abstract

Ivan Martinac's only feature film *House on the Sand* (*Kuća na pijesku*, 1985) is an avant-garde exploration of trauma within Yugoslav cinema, distinguished by its minimalist narrative and experimental techniques. Through parametric narration, the work deviates from traditional storytelling, embracing stylistic coherence over plot-driven narratives, akin to the approaches of directors like Robert Bresson and Michelangelo Antonioni. The narrative employs innovative cinematic techniques such as fixed camera positions, zooms, and pans. These elements emphasize the film's internal coherence and detach the camera's perspective from the characters, fostering an autonomous, meditative gaze. This approach aligns with André Gaudreault's concept of monstration, wherein the camera itself actively constructs meaning through framing and movement, rather than merely documenting the plot. The camera serves as an omniscient yet alienated observer, reflecting Martinac's broader philosophical engagement with the cinematic medium and its possibilities. This formal innovation situates the film as a unique artifact in both Croatian cinema and global filmmaking.

On the margins of Yugoslavia's cinema, *House on the Sand* (*Kuća na pijesku*, 1985) by Ivan Martinac emerged. At that historical moment, this feature-length film seemed like an exception in the context of not only Croatian and Yugoslav but also European and world cinema. *House on the Sand* remains an exception to this day, as no Croatian film can compare to it when it comes to the formally innovative representation of trauma, namely, the protagonist's suicide and its consequences for his closest friend who survives him. I will explore the strategies and cinematic means used by Martinac to narrate this traumatic experience and represent the two characters' unaddressed trauma.

Director, poet, and architect Ivan Martinac authored 58 films and seven poetry collections. He made his first, lost film *Destiny* (*Sudbina*) in 1959 in Belgrade's Kino-klub, where he edited the entire work independently using only leftover footage from other club films. Since *Destiny* was a kind of a ready-made film, it did not rely on content. Reflecting later on his debut, Martinac concluded that *form is more important than content in every film*,<sup>1</sup> a belief that became his artistic credo, not only in his experimental work but also in his narrative films.

Martinac published his first poetry collection, *Elipse* (*Ellipses*), in 1962 in Novi Sad, and his last, *Ullazak u Jeruzalem* (*The Entry Into Jerusalem*), in 1992 in his hometown of Split, where that same year he made his last film, *The City in Grey* (*Grad u sivom*). He also published the collage drama *Čuvari kriptе prema Beckettu* (*Crypt Keepers, After Beckett*) in 1998 and compiled three monographs on his film work. Moreover, he is the author of *Filmska teka* (*Film Notebook*, 1977), which includes filmographies of global and Yugoslav directors, the photobook *Stradanje Ivane Orleanske* (*The Passion of Joan of Arc*, 1980), a reconstruction of Carl Theodor Dreyer's film of the same name using the photogram technique, and the conceptual book *Obračun za studeni* (*Calculation for November*, 1991), which consists of documents from his father Jakov's legacy. Furthermore, Martinac authored the performance *Nije vrijeme za plodove* (*It's Not Time for Fruit*), which took place in Split on October 23, 1989. Together with six other performers, he carried a dry cherry tree through the historical city center. The tree's shape resembled a cross, thematizing the motif of resurrection present in Martinac's poetry, paintings, and *House on the Sand*.

The narrative premise of *House on the Sand* can be summarized as follows: Upon returning from a trip to his hometown of Split, archaeologist Josip Križanić (played by Dušan Janićijević) commits suicide. Subsequently, his friend Jakov Kostelac (played by Branko Đurić) arrives at Josip's apartment and listens to a farewell message on an audio cassette. The director himself described the plot of the film in his extensive notes on *House on the Sand*, published in 1986 in the catalogue of the Belgrade Alternative Film Video festival:

*If someone wanted to recount "House on the Sand," they might say something like this: In the first sequence ("Return Home"), Dr Josip Križanić returns from Ampurias, an ancient site near Barcelona. At the airport, his friend, investigative judge Jakov Kostelac, picks him up and takes him home.*

*In the second sequence ("Autumn, Winter"), Josip spends months in Split, aside from a short trip to Zagreb, which remains ambiguous as to whether it was experienced or merely dreamt.*

In the third sequence ("Where the Evening Comes From"), Josip, for reasons unknown, ends his life with a revolver shot.

In the fourth sequence ("Rain or Everything That Happens to One Happens to All"), Jakov enters Josip's apartment, finds the cassette with Josip's story almost by chance, listens to it, and in some way identifies with him.

This would be a brief synopsis, but such a recounting offers little for understanding this film.<sup>2</sup>

In the poetry collection *Ulazak u Jeruzalem*, Martinac published a poem voiced by the main character of *House on the Sand*, Dr Josip Križanić. In the poem "Neposlano pismo Josipa Križanića Sofiji Espartero y Galan" ("Unsent Letter from Josip Križanić to Sofia Espartero y Galan"), dated September 13, 1985, Josip speaks in the first person to a young woman he met in Barcelona, asking for her forgiveness. The poem "Podaci o Josipu Križaniću što ih je prikupio Jakov Kostelac" ("Data on Josip Križanić Collected by Jakov Kostelac") lists precise dates of significant events in Josip Križanić's fictional biography, along with details such as the title of his dissertation, the names of his publishers, and the locations worldwide where he worked as an archaeologist. The poem ends with the lines: *April 27, 1985, on his 50<sup>th</sup> birthday, he shoots himself in the right temple, in front of a reproduction of Rembrandt's painting "The Jewish Bride" (1663). He is buried in the family tomb in Split.*<sup>3</sup> The collection also contains four more poems directly linked to *House on the Sand*: "Izjava Daniela Brauna" ("Statement by Daniel Braun"), voiced by a doctor who knew Josip Križanić, "Iz bilježnice Josipa Križanića, bez nadnevka" ("From the Notebook of Josip Križanić, Undated"), which consists of quotations in Latin and Croatian from the Gospel of Matthew 7:27, "Clodia Fausta," in which the voice compares himself to Jakov and Josip from *House on the Sand*, and "Magnetofonski zapis Josipa Križanića" ("The Audiotape of Josip Križanić"), which constitutes the text used in the film itself as Josip's final message recorded on a cassette tape that Jakov Kostelac listens to in the apartment after Josip's suicide.

Moreover, *House on the Sand* serves as one of the rare Croatian films which the director equipped with extensive authorial notes, which were partially published in the catalogue of the Belgrade Alternative Film Video festival in 1986. In these notes, the director explains the film's vision and his artistic worldview across 32 pages of text, with visual supplements and floor plans of the house where the film was shot, marking the cameras' positions. Martinac also designed and made 11 copies of a plastic badge for the film, consisting of a white square and a red triangle to form the shape of a house.

Apart from *House on the Sand*, the main character of a sensitive man as a central and unifying consciousness also appears in the classical Croatian modernist films of Vatroslav Mimica – *Prometheus from the Island of Viševica* (*Prometej s otoka Viševice*, 1964) and *Monday or Tuesday* (*Ponedjeljka ili utorak*, 1966) – as well as in the late modernist film *The Stone Gate* (*Kamenita vrata*, 1992) by Ante Babaja. However, neither of these two directors went as far as Martinac did in using what Noël Burch, in his *Theory of Film Practice* (1969), called the visible structuring of a narrative film which, *through the alternation of rhythm, repetitions, backward movement, gradual elimination, circling, and systematic changes, can be adapted to a strictly semi-musical organization.*<sup>4</sup> *House on the Sand* strives for a kind of musical compo-

sition of the expositional elements, which form a structure whose logic primarily draws on formal, not content-based relationships between the parts of the whole. In this sense, its composition is serial and deeply structured, but not structural, as Martinac's short experimental films are in the sense defined by P. Adams Sitney.<sup>5</sup> One could argue that Martinac's dedication to serial thinking about the feature film form comes from his lifelong work in the field of experimental film; together with Lordan Zafranović, he is the only Croatian experimental filmmaker of that generation who directed a professional feature film.

In his overview of modernist types of exposition, Hungarian film historian András Bálint Kovács emphasizes that *serial composition is not primarily a narrative procedure*,<sup>6</sup> a view with which David Bordwell disagrees. Inspired by Burch's *Theory of Film Practice*, Bordwell characterizes seriality as a distinct type of narration, which he calls parametric. In his book *Narration in the Fiction Film*, he contrasts classical narration with four other types of narration. In this context, he defines types of narration, or, as he calls them, modes of narration, as *a distinct and coherent set of conventions of syuzhet construction and film style*.<sup>7</sup> Along with the classical mode, or classical narration, Bordwell identifies the narrative modes of art-cinema narration, historical-materialist narration, parametric narration, and palimpsestic narration. In the classical mode, the film's expressive means become subordinated to the construction of the plot, and the style strives for what is called invisibility or what Noël Burch refers to as the *zero point of cinematic style*,<sup>8</sup> referencing Roland Barthes's term *writing degree zero* from his book of the same name.<sup>9</sup> In art-cinema narration and historical-materialist narration, the style proves more pronounced, but still in the service of the plot. However, Bordwell's parametric narration represents the only *stylistic system that creates patterns distinct from those of the syuzhet system*.<sup>10</sup> Comparing parametric narration with serial music and the French New Novel, he concludes that we can talk about *a hidden internal formula that supervises surface variations and that style can be based on internal coherence rather than representational function*.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, since it still constitutes a form of narrative exposition, we mostly cannot speak of the consistent dominance of style over content. Instead, as Bordwell cites Burch here, a dialectical rhythm is established, which sometimes unites and sometimes separates what we call form and content.<sup>12</sup>

Explaining how he named this type of narration, Bordwell reveals that he derived it from Burch's book, mentioning that he could have called it *style-focused*, *dialectical*, *permutational*, or even *poetic*.<sup>13</sup> As two prime examples of parametric narration, he cites *Last Year at Marienbad* by Alain Resnais (*L'Année dernière à Marienbad*, 1961) and *Mediterranean* by Jean-Daniel Pollet (*Méditerranée*, 1963), about which Burch also writes extensively. Bordwell names directors who systematically use parametric narration in the mature period of their careers, for example Robert Bresson and Yasujiro Ozu. Additionally, he analyzes Bresson's feature film *Pickpocket* (1959) in detail.

*House on the Sand* employs the practices that Bordwell connects with parametric narration. In the broadest sense, we can link these practices to the type of narration that Croatian film theorist Hrvoje Turković<sup>14</sup> calls *poetic*,<sup>15</sup> distinguishing it from *narrative*, *descriptive*, and *argumentative* ones.<sup>16</sup> Bordwell argues that

directors who consistently use parametric narration – such as Ozu, Bresson, and Dreyer – are often said to make mystical films. This stems from the fact that recognizing the internal norm, or order, calls for a search for meaning. However, he resists the idea that formal techniques themselves should be read as a result of religious, mystical, or similar motivations. Thus, Bordwell implicitly debates the thesis of Paul Schrader's *Transcendental Style in Film: Ozu, Bresson, Dreyer* (1972), which links them through a religious key, concluding that the transcendental style of these authors brings us closer to an invisible image where the parallel lines of religion and art intersect.<sup>17</sup> Susan Sontag presents a similar view in her essay "The Spiritual Style of Robert Bresson,"<sup>18</sup> which Schrader quotes extensively. Bordwell does agree with Sontag in one regard – both oppose the concept of interpretation in the classical sense of interpreting the offered meanings. Bordwell asserts that parametric narration points to the limitations of art-cinema narration and allows us to appreciate the richness of texture that resists interpretation.<sup>19</sup>

Besides the question of potential affiliation with transcendental style, one can also consider the issue of modernism when attempting to categorize parametric narration. In his book *Screening Modernism: European Art Cinema, 1950-1980*, András Bálint Kovács observes that except for the classical narrative one, all of Bordwell's modes are modernist,<sup>20</sup> criticizing him for avoiding the term *modern*.<sup>21</sup> However, Bordwell anticipated this criticism, concluding the chapters on parametric narration with a section titled "The Problem of Modernism." In this section, he emphasizes that he knows that several of the proposed narrative modes can be characterized as modernist. He also concludes that the use of parametric narration fundamentally alters our perception of the film, thereby epitomizing the historical nature of all viewing habits.<sup>22</sup> Bordwell aimed to place parametric narration beyond modernism – as an approach that transcends this historical-stylistic tendency.

David Bordwell distinguishes two strategies through which style comes to the forefront due to the internal coherence of the whole. This coherence results from establishing a noticeable and often unique internal stylistic norm. He calls the first strategy *ascetic*, or *sparse*, explaining that in this case, a limited number of selected techniques establish a strong internal norm that *processes* events within the plot according to a recognizable *preset* style.<sup>23</sup> In practice, this means that the framing parameters achieve independence from the content, which stands in stark contrast to the approach used in classical narration. The second strategy, which he calls *replete*, establishes an internal norm that creates an inventory of paradigmatic options for treating events within the plot.<sup>24</sup> In practice, this means that the same content will be treated in multiple different ways when considering the framing parameters. As an example, he uses Godard's *Alphaville* (1962). He also mentions the possibility of using both strategies within the same work, as seen in Carl Theodor Dreyer's films, such as *The Word* (*Ordet*, 1955) and *Gertrud* (1964).

Here, I will focus on the characteristics of parametric narration that uses the ascetic strategy to establish a recognizable internal norm, as these are the techniques employed in *House on the Sand*.

1. The use of a small number of highly noticeable formal techniques that repeat throughout the film.<sup>25</sup>



*House on the Sand* employs the most radical formal technique in the depiction of the two-story apartment where Josip Križanić lives, and in which 80 percent of the action, or around 60 minutes of the film, takes place according to Martinac himself.<sup>26</sup> Specifically, Martinac films all scenes in the apartment from only two camera positions – one on the ground floor, and the other, aligned with the first, on the upper floor. Zooming and panning structure the space, and the scene usually begins even before Josip enters it and continues after he exits.

This is a well-known technique that Burch extensively discusses in his essay “*Nana, or the Two Kinds of Space*,”<sup>27</sup> calling it the structural use of off-space.<sup>28</sup> In *House on the Sand*, the camera becomes someone who greets Josip and sees him off, the only witness to his solitary existence, which it structures and narrativizes through movement, giving this existence meaning beyond the plot itself. It is his invisible housemate, living its own life in the sense that it has emancipated itself from Josip, possessing its own will independent of his, as its position remains fixed regardless of the plot elements it faces.

Perhaps this principle of the emancipated camera gaze manifests the strongest in the scene described by Croatian film theorist Tanja Vrvilo in her analysis of the film: *Particularly anxiety-inducing is the scene in which Josip, going to bed, suddenly gets up and closes the door “in front of the eyes.” The camera then zooms in on the door and stares at the yellow light of Josip’s lamp piercing through the opaque glass. And Martinac cuts inside, to a close-up of Josip’s motionless face on the pillow, until Josip raises his hand and turns off the light (to the gaze).*<sup>29</sup>

2. Accumulation of stylistic patterns without a predictable climax, along with the use of subtle variations in their execution.<sup>30</sup>

As an example of the accumulation of stylistic patterns, I will use the three driving sequences, all filmed so that the frame captures the back of the driver’s head and the rear-view mirror. These sequences appear at the film’s beginning, middle, and end; they stand out for their unusual length, simulating real-time progression. Their significance lies primarily in the pure duration within the movement – of the car, and, consequently, the camera – which constitutes the essence of cinematic art. Filming in a car from behind the driver’s head serves as a common technique in modernist cinema.<sup>31</sup> In turn, long car rides during which nothing particular happens, or where the entire film unfolds, have become a hallmark of some of the most important contemporary directors, whose films critics describe as “slow cinema,” for instance Abbas Kiarostami, Nuri Bilge Ceylan, and Apichatpong Weerasethakul.<sup>32</sup>

After Jakov Kostelac meets Josip Križanić at the airport at the beginning of the film, the two of them get into a car, with Jakov driving and Josip sitting in the back seat, which, in real life, seems somewhat unusual for two friends driving together. The first driving sequence begins in the third minute of the film and lasts almost four minutes. It consists of two types of shots that could be understood as Josip’s subjective perspective: one set shows his viewpoint as he looks at Jakov’s back (shots 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16), and the other – through the car’s right window – at the moving landscape (shots 11, 13, 15). We see an undeveloped suburban area, followed by glimpses of buildings, skyscrapers, and a shipyard. The second driving sequence begins about twenty minutes later and lasts almost three minutes,

again consisting of shots of Josip from behind (shots 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55) and his subjective viewpoint, which this time is frontal, since he is driving (shots 49 and 53, with a traffic light in the foreground). This differs significantly from the first sequence, as the take begins before Josip gets into the car, while in the first case, the camera “enters” with the characters. Finally, there is the last, most important driving sequence of three minutes, which takes place at the very end of the film when Jakov assumes Josip’s identity after his suicide. Once again, the camera waits for the driver to enter the frame, filming only the rear-view mirror in which we first see Jakov approaching the car and then entering and sitting down (shot 187).

The sequence consists of a series of close-up shots of the rear-view mirror, filmed from the same position (shots 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 194), but zoomed in so that it first appears near the edge of the frame and then gradually moves to the center. The shot only widens for a very brief moment – showing Jakov from behind, with the entire windshield also in view, from the same rear seat position as before – accompanied by the sudden sound of a horn (shot 193). Afterwards, the car enters a tunnel, and around the rear-view mirror, in which we see Jakov’s face again, the urban views of Split disappear. Scattered patches of red light replace them, with disturbing background music in the sound design (shot 194). When the car exits the tunnel, an explosion of white light floods the image, marking the end of the film (shot 195). Croatian film historian and theorist Tomislav Šakić writes that this sequence somewhat paraphrases the journey through the star gates in Stanley Kubrick’s *2001: A Space Odyssey* (1968),<sup>33</sup> while film critic Jurica Pavičić describes it as a *religious, spiritual fade out*.<sup>34</sup>

### 3. Abnormal ellipticity of the narrative.<sup>35</sup>

Bordwell identifies signs of abnormal ellipticity, including the separation of cause and effect, the omission of key scenes, the interruption of scenes before the climax, and the absence of temporal markers of scene duration.<sup>36</sup> *House on the Sand* employs abnormal ellipticity in the most important scene of the film: Josip’s suicide. While the film depicts the room where the suicide takes place, it does not reveal the part of the room where Josip is at the moment of the suicide. The entire scene consists of a single shot that lasts just under two minutes (shot 174). It begins with a wide shot of the upper floor of the house, showing part of the space bordered by a wall on which a reproduction of Rembrandt’s painting *The Jewish Bride* (*Het Joodse bruidje*, 1665-1669) hangs between the window and the balcony door. The shot is initially static, with Josip standing on the balcony; he soon enters the room, heading straight toward the camera, then moves past it, and exits. After we can no longer see him, we hear the sound of the light being turned off, and the room falls into partial darkness. The shot then zooms in slowly on Rembrandt’s painting until it enters the image, where it stops, followed by the sound of a gunshot from off-screen. Cut.

The interesting dynamic of this scene lies in the choreographed relationship between Josip’s movements and those of the camera. When Josip moves, the camera stands still; when he turns off the light, the camera comes to life and begins to zoom – as if it takes on his inner view before and in the moment of death. The object of his thoughts, what occupies his mind in that decisive moment of his existence, is what we can see in Rembrandt’s painting: the happiness



resulting from human contact, and Josip's inability to attain it. This entire scene can best be described as a form of first-person film narration. American film scholar Bruce Kawin calls it the mindscreens, which presents the film's visual field as a product of consciousness.<sup>37</sup>

The treatment of speech in the film provides another example of extreme ellipticity. When Jakov visits Josip's apartment after his death, he finds an audiotape and listens to the deceased's voice, which seems like an audio diary/confession. Josip becomes briefly resurrected as a disembodied voice seeking a body, a process that French musicologist and film theorist Michel Chion calls the acousmatic voice.<sup>38</sup> Through the consistent use of two techniques, *House on the Sand* presents most of the dialogue as monologue, in which the characters seem to speak to themselves. The first technique includes the persistent use of telephone conversations in which the other person on the line is never heard, and the person speaking faces away from the camera. The second technique consists in hiding the speaker altogether so that they are not visible in the frame – as in the first driving sequence, where Josip speaks to Jakov but is never shown – or making the person visible without showing their mouth, instead filming them from behind – like Jakov in the first driving sequence.

Martinac systematically separates the body from the voice, intensifying the character's inherent state of inner isolation and deepening their separation from the world at all levels. The denied meeting of gazes further emphasizes this isolation: no scene in the film is directed so that the protagonists' gazes meet, except where Josip is traveling to Zagreb on a tram with his daughter Katarina. Temporal markers of the scenes are entirely absent, so we do not know what time span the film covers. The inserted intertitles like "Autumn, Winter" do not help clarify this. The film does not suggest whether the scenes unfolded in the order in which we view them, either. We can observe a tendency toward a cyclical structure, as the film begins and ends with the abovementioned car-driving sequences.

#### 4. Abnormal repetitiveness of the narrative.<sup>39</sup>

Bordwell writes that with the use of abnormal repetitiveness, the plot often offers too little information, creating a sense that seemingly nothing happens. This leads to the complete equalization of so-called significant or important scenes with those that depict banal actions.<sup>40</sup> In *House on the Sand*, repetitiveness is present both at the level of recurring scenes, such as Josip's meals at the table, car rides, or walks through the courtyard of the Archaeological Museum in Split, and at the level of camera positions, motifs within the frame, and the compositions used to depict them. Therefore, the treatment of certain motifs within the frame's composition enables the creation of visual schemes that use seriality and dominate the elements of the narrative. This proves most evident in the dream sequences, in which Josip typically walks through highly aestheticized spaces where several leitmotifs appear: bricked-up windows, colonnades, stone pillars, stairs, and the ancient stone relief of the Stele of Gaius Utius,<sup>41</sup> with experimental music by Croatian composer Mirko Krstičević in the background.

These shots typically feature artistically structured compositions that create clashes between vertical and horizontal duplications, such as columns and stairs. Tomislav Šakić argues that *the entire structure of the film rests on the proper*

*alternation of Josip's days with his nights, or dreams, which are shaped by compositions that we can call serial.*<sup>42</sup> This internal world of the protagonist, realized as a tangle of ancient motifs from Diocletian's Palace and the courtyard of the Split Archaeological Museum, contrasts with daily life's banal, grim leitmotifs, embodied in the repeated shots of Josip's modest solitary meals at the dining table and scenes showing his communication with others through brief phone calls. Jurica Pavičić also interprets this dichotomy produced by the film's two basic layers in the manner of Michelangelo Antonioni. He concludes that in Martinac's film, art and dialogue with cultural history offer a corridor to transcendence, while daily life proves grey and hopeless.<sup>43</sup>

It seems that some events in the film propel the plot forward. This includes the visit to Josip's daughter Katarina in Zagreb and the so-called last supper – dinner with friends in Jakov Kostelac's apartment before Josip's fateful return home. Martinac presents both events as spaces between dream and reality, as they blend techniques previously used to depict Josip's days and nights, making it impossible to determine whether these events belong to the realm of reality or imagination and fantasies. As the film progresses, the protagonist's inner world and the so-called objective reality increasingly overlap. Josip's consciousness seemingly takes control over the depicted events, which suggests pure subjectivity. Thus, *House on the Sand* becomes a film in which what truly happens is the consciousness itself, and its fluctuations shape the narrative.

### The camera as a monstrator

A crucial aspect of *House on the Sand*'s exhibition practices involves the repeated use of fixed camera positions related to specific motifs, with variations in panoramas and zooms, all executed flawlessly by cinematographer Andrija Pivčević. Since Robert Bresson did not use panning and zooming in the way Martinac employs them, Bordwell skips this aspect in his description of parametric narration, but Burch analyzes it in detail. Considering Antonioni's first feature *Chronicle of a Love* (*Cronaca di un amore*, 1950), Burch concludes that the significant authorial decision in this film *consists in stripping the image of any narrative function by returning independence to the camera.*<sup>44</sup> However, the image itself – or each individual shot – always narrates through its parameters in the sense of structuring the depicted scene. The most crucial parameters include the frame's cut and the camera movements that change the frame. Therefore, narration does not happen only at the level of the relationship between shots but also within individual shots. The instance that narrates, in a literal sense, is the camera itself.

I will use the word "camera" here in accordance with Bazin's concept, where it simultaneously refers to both the pre-filmic element, or the apparatus that records, and the instance that produces the point of view.<sup>45</sup> In *House on the Sand*, the camera creates an emancipated point of view because it does not belong to any character within the scene.

Building on Burch's analysis of the use of off-frame space in Jean Renoir's films and his claim that in Antonioni *spoken words are no longer actions, but a narrative device that describes actions that have already occurred or those that might yet*

occur,<sup>46</sup> American film theorist Gilberto Perez distinguishes between two types of cameras. The first one, the *dramatic camera*, serves the depicted action – which corresponds to Bordwell's classical narration – and offers what is presented as the *most natural* perspective. The second one, the *narrative camera* used by Jean Renoir and Michelangelo Antonioni, provides a unique view of the action by continually framing the viewer's gaze, stopping, then moving again in a way that forces the viewer to notice its *autonomous, meditative gaze*.<sup>47</sup> Perez emphasizes that in Renoir's films, the emancipation of the camera's gaze as a structural element of film exhibition draws on the dialectic of shown and unshown space. In Antonioni's work, it arises from the creation of a point of view characterized by a certain distance from the depicted scene, which produces an effect of alienation.<sup>48</sup>

In *House on the Sand*, the camera operates as both alienated and narrative, becoming a key element of the narrative exposition understood as a kind of dramaturgy realized through panoramas and zooms within the same shot. This technique narrates the relationship between Josip and his sole witness – the camera itself. Martinac stated that the relationship between the person and the camera in each individual shot represents an essential part of the film's structure. The thoughtfulness of this relationship manifests in the fact that Martinac worked on conceptualizing it from 1966 to 1983.<sup>49</sup>

Thus, narration does not only occur at the level of the relationship between shots but also within individual shots, where the narrating instance is, in the literal sense, the camera itself. Here, it seems most appropriate to turn to the narrative theory of Canadian film theorist André Gaudreault, who proposes the introduction of the concept of *monstration* to better clarify the form of exposition characteristic of the dramatic arts of film and theatre. Gaudreault writes that *it can be said that narration and monstration (the first corresponds to textual exposition, and the second to dramatic exposition) are contemporary equivalents, adapted to the modern age, for Plato's categories of non-mimetic and mimetic diegesis*.<sup>50</sup>

Gaudreault explains that staged narratives operate with different expository practices from textual narratives, as they are primarily about representation rather than narration. He suggests calling this form of representation *monstration*.<sup>51</sup> The filmic exposition consists of both narration and monstration; the former involves montage – the sequencing of shots into scenes and sequences – while the latter refers to the very act of filming, namely, framing and reframing through camera movements. Therefore, Gaudreault concludes that monstration always relates to the *here and now* of the act of representation. The action depicted temporally matches the perception of the *monstrator*, and the camera serves as its extension, delegated to occupy the viewer's position in the present moment of the action.<sup>52</sup>

Gaudreault proposes the notion of the *meganarrator* as a synthesis of the filmic monstrator and narrator, which corresponds to the *great creator of images* in French theorist Albert Laffaye's *The Logic of Film* (1964). Laffaye argues that the film's true center is an invented and invisible personality created by the collective work that turns the pages of an album behind our backs, subtly draws our attention to one detail or another, offers us the necessary explanation at the right moment, and above all, controls the rhythm of the procession of images.<sup>53</sup> The concept of *monstration* can encompass the practices within the frame when camera

movements reshape the scene – a process that unites Perez's dramatic and narrative camera into a common framework.

### Profilmic and filmographic monstrators

Gaudreault distinguishes two types of monstrators: the *profilmic* monstrator, which refers to the instance that prepares the shot to be filmed, and the *filmographic* monstrator, which involves the camera as an instance that visually represents the film's diegesis.<sup>54</sup> Using these terms, Gaudreault elaborates on concepts from the founder of film studies, Étienne Souriau, where the *profilmic* refers to everything in the real world intended for filmic recording, while the *filmographic* pertains to everything observable within the film.

The act of framing and the camera movements within the frame constitute key components of filmographic monstration, which Gaudreault introduces to distinguish it from theatrical monstration. The latter only concerns the level that corresponds to *profilmic* monstration – preparing the scene and set design – but not the one that refers to *filmographic* monstration. This level of monstration operates at all levels of shot composition. It is an instance that tells the story by framing and shifting the frame, which situates itself within the diegetic world of the film but does not belong to the same order of reality. In his book *The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film* (1971), American philosopher Stanley Cavell writes that the camera remains external to the world of the film in which it resides and confirms our absence from it.<sup>55</sup> It both forms and does not form part of the diegesis, framing and continually reframing what is displayed.

### The movement of the frame: a unique filmic process

The act of placing something within a moving frame is a uniquely cinematic procedure. Building on Gaudreault's concepts, American film scholar Tom Gunning suggests that we can see the filmic exposition at three levels: *profilmic*, framing, and montage.<sup>56</sup> In this scheme, *monstration* encompasses the first two levels – *profilmic* and *filmographic* – while only the level of montage belongs to narration. Gaudreault differentiates between *putting into frame* and *putting into order* as filmographic levels, while *putting into place* corresponds to the *profilmic* level.<sup>57</sup> Notably, of the three levels identified by Gaudreault – putting into place, putting into frame, and putting into order – a film can be structured without the first (recording unprocessed reality) and the third (filming in one shot), but not without putting things into the frame.

In his book *Projecting a Camera: Language-Games in Film Theory*, American film scholar Edward Branigan notes that in contemporary film theory, the camera has become a hypothesis for understanding the fictional space and time of the film's diegetic world, or a way of applying various labels produced in attempts to interpret narrative film images.<sup>58</sup> In this article, I also use the term "camera" as a mental procedure for interpreting the diegetic world of the film, in which the re-



lationship between the camera and characters forms a crucial part of the whole. In *House on the Sand*, the camera proves all-powerful and omniscient on the filmographic level of monstration, while on the profilmic level of monstration, it remains fixed. This may seem paradoxical unless we make a distinction between the two levels on which monstration takes place, encompassing the camera as a recording tool and the camera as an instance that narrativizes what is shown through its gaze and framing. This approach to framing is what American film scholar Leo Braudy calls *open framing* in his book *The World in a Frame: What We See in Films* (1976) – a concept that he attributes to filmmakers like Jean Renoir and Michelangelo Antonioni. In contrast, directors such as Fritz Lang and Alfred Hitchcock use *closed framing*, in which the world inside the frame equals the film's diegesis.<sup>59</sup>

In her analysis of *House on the Sand*, Tanja Vrvilo writes that *the camera oversees Josip and his objects, it waits for him, is in position before Josip enters the house, and remains in the room after he leaves*.<sup>60</sup> Vrvilo concludes that Martinac's camera resembles Ozu's,<sup>61</sup> which brings us back to Burch. In *Theory of Film Practice*, Burch argues that after Renoir, Ozu was the first director to fully understand the importance of the existence of two kinds of space and truly grasp the value of the empty screen and the tension that arises from its emptiness. Ozu achieved this by varying the relative length of the duration of the empty screen before or, more often, after the exit or entrance of the characters,<sup>62</sup> thus creating what is known as *dead time*.<sup>63</sup> *House on the Sand* insists upon this duration, emancipating the camera's gaze. The camera becomes emancipated also in the Antonionian sense of narrative creation through the techniques of panning and zooming.

Gilberto Perez explains how the narrativization of the gaze occurs when the ideal space, within which everything can be depicted, becomes deconstructed, a concept typical of the dramatic art of theatre.<sup>64</sup> According to him, Bertolt Brecht was the first to transform the dramatic space of theatre into a narrative space by insisting on clearly delineating the boundaries between performers and the audience and exposing the performance's illusionistic mechanisms. Perez argues that this led to a dialectical negation of negation, or the breaking down of the convention that we should exclude all reality outside of the scene.<sup>65</sup> By emphasizing a fixed camera position, Martinac persistently draws attention to everything that lies outside the frame, presenting it as a fragment of an inexhaustible reality constructed by the film.<sup>66</sup> The camera's immobility suggests that what we see is always only a fragment of an inaccessible whole, which eludes representation by definition. Renoir opens the space outside the frame, capturing it through seemingly arbitrary trajectories of a highly fluid camera, thus opening up the space beyond the requirements of the depicted dramatic situation. In turn, Martinac and Antonioni radically narrow that space by choosing to link it with the temporal continuity of a single shot. Antonioni's camera engages in tracking shots, while Martinac's camera remains strictly fixed, using only pans and zooms, consistently condemned to its stationary position.

Martinac used this approach for the first time in 1967 in his second professional film, *Focus (Fokus)*, produced by the independent Film Authors' Studio (FAS) based in Zagreb. He made it just one year after Michelangelo Antonioni's crown of high-modernist works, *Blow-up* (1966), and Ingmar Bergman's *Persona*

(1966), and in the same year as Michael Snow's structural experimental film *Wave-length* (1967). *Focus* uses a fixed camera position and focuses on a single scene. A young man (Lordan Zafranović) and a woman (Tatjana Martinac) sit on a bench by the sea, with an ambulance parked in front of them, on which an unknown man (Tomislav Gotovac) leans. In 1968, Martinac published an article about the film in the *Sineast* journal, where he writes: *Their faces are turned toward Death, and their backs toward the viewers. The goal is thus fixed. In the web of the film, which we called seven fragments of the film, fish-shots are caught.*<sup>67</sup> *Focus* treats the camera as a consciousness in which images, or 'fish-shots,' are captured. The inability to perceive the totality marks this consciousness, which manifests in its fixation on a single position and its condemnation to film the characters from behind, never showing their faces. In the same article, Martinac claims: *The camera is fixed on the back of the woman's head and the cross in the distance, like Dos Passos's inexorable "God's eye." The camera has the nature of Dalmatian stone, it does not even think of moving. Only once does the camera scream, jumping in thirty agonizing leaps, then it freezes again. The camera is a stone eye, like the one on the bust of the city's protector.*<sup>68</sup>

In *Focus*, the camera, understood here as a form of consciousness or as Kawin's mindscreen, struggles with the attempt to represent death, something that ultimately cannot be depicted. In the note on *Focus*, Martinac states this explicitly: *When I pressed the trigger of the Cameflex starting "Focus," my goal was called DEATH... Death walks the world from the South to the North Pole, through all meridians and parallels, but it seems to me that no death is as close to a person, as everyday and normal, as Mediterranean death under the sun.*<sup>69</sup> Moreover, death constitutes the central trauma in *House on the Sand*, which, on a formal level, represents it as an absence that an image cannot show.

*Focus* opens with close-up shots of the young woman's hair, alternating with a detail of a cross on the ambulance. Using the same fixed camera position, the film rhythmically alternates between different types of shots throughout its range – from details and close-ups at the beginning to wide shots of the sea at the end. The close-up of the ambulance cross proves the most frequent shot: *Seven types of shots in mutual alternation. Moment by moment. We are more or less distant from the target (28-300 lens), or we are at the center of the target (detail of the cross). In a surprising victory of blackness.*<sup>70</sup>

The shots are edited so that within each sequence, the shots become progressively shorter, while longer shots are inserted between sequences. At the start of the film, close-up shots of the woman's hair alternate with those of the cross, pointing to the motif of transience symbolized by this part of the human body. Then, in a medium shot from behind, the young man and woman embody the motif of closeness, while on the other side of the quay, young women pass by pushing baby strollers, and two small children sit under a tree. Two men carrying a stretcher enter the scene, heading toward the ambulance.

The scenes of life contrast with the motif of mortality. In this section, Martinac radically alters the film's structure by inserting approximately thirty brief shots, of a quarter of a second each, which he describes as *a handful of juniper twigs*, or as *the clockwork mechanism of death in conflict with life.*<sup>71</sup> Two long shots follow: the first shows the sea horizon, and in the second, the two protagonists rise from

the bench and leave the camera-fixed landscape behind – *this time, the black wings did not fold above them*.<sup>72</sup> In *Focus*, the camera remains motionless, and the protagonists eventually leave the frame, or the world of the film. In turn, in *House on the Sand*, the camera's fixity becomes mobile through the use of panning and zooms, and the film ends with the disappearance of the image, fading to white.

It seems clear that we can convincingly describe Martinac's feature as a minimalist film, considering the formal strategies he uses, which connect the work to directors such as Bresson and Dreyer (parametric narration) as well as Antonioni (emancipated camera). This combination of metonymic and analytical elements places Martinac within the tradition of European cinema, offering a distinct approach to filmmaking that explores the boundaries of representing trauma and its perception through controlled camera movement and a minimalist narrative structure.

Notably, Martinac's colleague, Tomislav Gotovac, named *House on the Sand* a film of the twenty-first century. This statement reinforces the thesis that the current century has resurrected minimalism under the name of slow cinema, creating perhaps the most significant trend within global artistic cinema. The radical extension of shot duration gives dominance to monstration as an element of film narration, where the arrangement of shots in a sequence is no longer a priori superior to the narrative unfolding within the frame itself. In this sense, Antonioni's *analytical minimalism*<sup>73</sup> and his emancipated *narrative camera*,<sup>74</sup> as seen in *House on the Sand*, represent the seed from which the poetics of slow cinema have evolved.

Writing that even when it is mobile, the camera is no longer content sometimes to follow the characters' movement, sometimes itself to undertake movements of which they are merely the object, but in every case it subordinates description of a space to the functions of thought,<sup>75</sup> Gilles Deleuze attempts to define the camera as a storyteller, or monstrator, which aims to not only show and describe but also produce thought from that showing – a goal that underpins both narration and monstration. Instead of simply observing or narrating, the camera here acts as an active participant in producing a philosophical engagement with the cinematic space. This challenges traditional distinctions and offers a more nuanced, interconnected understanding of trauma within the cinematic frame.

### Gesture as a narrative strategy

Apart from using camera movements as a narrative strategy, Martinac crucially structures *House on the Sand* around actors' silent gestures that transform the reality in which they appear into a kind of ritual. Through the structural insistence on recording everyday actions and the movements that comprise them, the film reality becomes the material that reveals the transition ritual of preparing for death. The film focuses mostly on Josip Križanić as he carefully repeats his everyday rituals, including meals, going to bed, making phone calls, and driving a car. Beneath these gestures lies the true content, or the inner reality, which can only manifest through a ritual in which *everything appears and disappears like a galaxy of transitional objects that represent the very failure of representation*.<sup>76</sup>





In *House on the Sand*, suicide seems to be the last possible gesture through which the traumatized, alienated individual can take control over their inner reality. In films like *Mouchette* (1967), *A Gentle Woman* (*Une femme douce*, 1969), and *The Devil, Probably* (*Le Diable, probablement*, 1977), Robert Bresson explores this theme as well. Josip's final gesture is not accessible in the image but becomes replaced by a painted gesture from Rembrandt's oil painting, *The Jewish Bride*. The painting depicts a man and a woman whose relationship remains undetermined to this day: they could be spouses, or perhaps father and daughter. The man wraps his right arm around the woman's shoulder and places his left hand on her heart, while she places her right hand over his and lets her left arm fall gently. Their hand gestures demonstrate the affection and intimacy of their relationship – a relationship that Josip Križanić may have experienced with his wife Laura, whose name refers to Petrarch's tragic love from the *Il Canzoniere* (1470) and who remains present as a haunting past in the world of the film. Zooming in on *The Jewish Bride* at the moment of Josip's death represents the work of his consciousness, fixated on the image of intimacy and love that ever eludes him. Thus, Josip's act becomes a gesture of resistance against a world in which for him, such a relationship proves no longer possible.

Michelangelo Antonioni's films also portray a world where intimacy seems impossible, from his debut *Chronicle of a Love* to his trilogy on the emotional illness of modern times: *The Adventure* (*L'Avventura*, 1960), *The Night* (*La Notte*, 1961), and *The Eclipse* (*L'Eclisse*, 1962). In these films, he touches upon the painful disappearance of feelings or the feelings that hint at an end from the moment they arise.<sup>77</sup> In his body of work, intimacy appears as the ultimate impossibility because of the increasing rift between the man of morality and the man of science, which becomes more serious and pronounced.<sup>78</sup> *House on the Sand* visualizes this rift through two layers of motifs: the ancient Split from Josip's dreams, symbolizing the man of morality, and the industrialized suburb where he lives, representing the man of science. Josip Križanić is an archaeologist, dedicated to the extinct values of a world in which intimacy felt possible, embodied by the ancient stelae in the Archaeological Museum courtyard and the Renaissance painting in his study. The lost intimacy forms the central void of the film, which becomes an image within an image, a representation within a representation, an unreachable idea.

As in Roberto Rossellini's *Journey to Italy* (*Viaggio in Italia*, 1954), love exists only as an idea. It travels to the protagonist through visual traces such as statues and paintings, most notably the remains of an embracing couple in Pompeii – which in Martinac's film become an ancient tombstone from the first century AD. In his final confession, Josip identifies with the memorial's commissioner: *I, Gaius Utius, full of immense desire for freedom in all directions, I, who did not wish to make, in relation to the closest, any sacrifice whatsoever, thinking that life could be arranged in such a way that one could simultaneously be happy and lonely.*<sup>79</sup> Thus, he reveals his own responsibility for the emotional illness, or, as Antonioni claims, the morally empty existence of individuals who care only for themselves, who are indifferent to anyone or anything outside of themselves, lacking a counterbalance to their self-sufficiency, the last spark of conscience that could still be ignited and revive their sense of fundamental human values.<sup>80</sup>

However, unlike Antonioni's trilogy on the *emotional illness*, which identifies the symptoms, *House on the Sand* strives to find the possibility of hope and redemption by introducing the motif of friendship between Josip and Jakov, of whom the former is the victim, and the latter his redeemer.

Precisely because he suffers from a trauma-based emotional illness, which has deprived him of the right to intimate gestures, Josip chooses the ultimate gesture of suicide, which Albert Camus calls the only truly serious philosophical problem in his *The Myth of Sisyphus* (*Le mythe de Sisyphe*, 1942). On the other hand, regarding his omnibus film *The Vanquished* (*I Vinti*, 1953) with a segment that ends with the protagonist's suicide, Antonioni notes that *suicide is such an enigmatic gesture; it exists in every place and time since man and animals have existed*.<sup>81</sup> In *House on the Sand*, in the space-time of shot 174, we hear the shot that Josip directs at himself. The intimate gesture in Rembrandt's painting contrasts with the enigmatic gesture of a man who has lost emotional intimacy, thus losing his sense of meaning and reason for existence. Significantly, the film does not present Josip's final gesture visually; it does so only through the sound of a shot, accompanied by the image of the unattainable gesture in *The Jewish Bride*. When Jakov arrives at Josip's apartment after the suicide, his subjective shot (shot 177 of the film) shows a white circle on the floor of the study, which finally visualizes the emptiness of Josip's existence. The white circle does not mark anything, but Jakov knows that Josip's life has been extinguished in this emptiness.

Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben writes that *in the cinema, a society that has lost its gestures tries at once to reclaim what it has lost and to record its loss, concluding that for human beings who have lost every sense of naturalness, each single gesture becomes a destiny*.<sup>82</sup>

Crucially, the gesture in Rembrandt's painting, representing Josip's ideal imaginary – a blend of personal memory and pure idea – functions as a fragment of a movement or as a photogram of a lost film, much like Agamben describes Leonardo da Vinci's *Mona Lisa* (1503-1506) and Velázquez's *Las Meninas* (1656).<sup>83</sup> The idea produced by the painting paralyzes Josip Križanić because *a certain kind of litigation, a paralyzing power whose spell we need to break, is continuously at work in every image; it is as if a silent invocation calling for the liberation of the image into gesture arose from the entire history of art*.<sup>84</sup>

In *House on the Sand*, gestures break free from the image's representation. Therefore, Josip's final gesture of suicide exists in the world of the film only as a sound and as the white circle marking the emptiness on his study's floor.

*House on the Sand* attempts to liberate human gestures from the images that imprison them and to bring all images to life by transforming them into gestures. Through this bidirectional process, the film illustrates how images can free the gestures trapped within them, namely, the socially imposed meanings, and how gestures can cease to be socially conditioned symbols, opening up to the excess of meaning that belongs to them in their individual manifestations. *Cinema leads images back to the homeland of gesture ... it is the dream of a gesture*,<sup>85</sup> Agamben writes inspired by Samuel Beckett's last television drama, *Night and Dream* (*Nacht und Träume*, 1982), in which three hands search for the ideal gesture that will awaken the dreamer from his sleep. *House on the Sand* depicts the moment of awakening



as a transition from a physical reality to a spiritual, immaterial one, which Josip enters with his decisive act. Nevertheless, he does not leave the film but remains within it as an invisible presence, embodied in Jakov's gestures. After the gunshot, the film frees itself from depicting images; not only do the images that once trapped certain gestures disappear, but all the images we see now represent the perspective of someone who no longer physically exists. In this sense, everything shown after Josip's suicide merges reality and imagination, or rather forms a new kind of reality accessed through the transition ritual, which corresponds to the entire film up to that point.

*House on the Sand* aims to present death and its surrounding trauma as a phenomenon that offers a new perspective on the earthly realm – one that can only be viewed from a vantage point that proves impossible to attain while still inhabiting it. The film carefully traces Josip's preparation for the ritual of transitioning to the beyond, and in its final part, it embodies his perspective on the life he has left behind. Like any ritual, *House on the Sand* consists of performances situated between facts and imagination. The film encodes the ontological status of the events in a double way – as both real and unreal, factual and imaginary. The possibility of seeing human life from the perspective of the Other constitutes the ultimate act of redemption in the film. Jakov's final walk through Josip's reality – his house – embodies this, as he repeats his late friend's everyday gestures, such as turning on the lights and making phone calls in the same manner. In the final scene, Jakov's reflection in the car rear-view mirror becomes an ontological enigma within the frame, belonging both to material reality and Josip's subjectivity. This scene also provides one way of tackling the central question posed by Martinac's film: How can one reinvent a gaze and a gesture as cinematic means for depicting the invisible yet omnipresent trauma of modern man?

<sup>1</sup> I. Martinac, *Martinac: 41 godina filmskog stvaralaštva, 1960-2001*, Otvoreno pučko učilište Split, Split 2001, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Idem, "Notes on House on the Sand", in: *Alternative film-video* (catalogue), Akademski filmski centar, Belgrade 1986, p. 79.

<sup>3</sup> Idem, *Ulazak u Jeruzalem*, Narodno sveučilište Split, Split 1992, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> N. Burch, *Theory of Film Practice*, trans. H. R. Lane, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1981, p. 14.

<sup>5</sup> See: P. Adams Sitney, *Visionary Film: The American Avant-Garde, 1943-2000*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2002.

<sup>6</sup> A. B. Kovács, *Screening Modernism: European Art Cinema, 1950-1980*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 2007, p. 137.

<sup>7</sup> D. Bordwell, *Narration in the Fiction Film*, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison 1985, p. 155.

<sup>8</sup> N. Burch, op. cit., p. 15.

<sup>9</sup> See: R. Barthes, *Writing Degree Zero*, trans. A. Lavers, C. Smith, Jonathan Cape, London 1967.

<sup>10</sup> D. Bordwell, op. cit., p. 275.

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem, p. 276.

<sup>12</sup> Ibidem, p. 288.

<sup>13</sup> Ibidem, p. 274.

<sup>14</sup> See: H. Turković, *Tipovi filmskog izlaganja: prilozi teoriji izlaganja*, Hrvatski filmski savez, Zagreb 2021.

<sup>15</sup> For discussion of the poetic in the context of film, see also: P. Adams Sitney, *The Cinema of Poetry*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2015.

<sup>16</sup> See: S. Chatman, *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca – London 1990.

<sup>17</sup> P. Schrader, *Transcendental Style in Film: Ozu, Bresson, Dreyer*, University of California Press, Berkeley 2018, p. 185.

<sup>18</sup> S. Sontag, "The Spiritual Style of Robert Bresson", in: idem, *Against Interpretation and Other Essays*, Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, New York 1966, pp. 177-195.

<sup>19</sup> D. Bordwell, op. cit., p. 289.

<sup>20</sup> A. B. Kovács, op. cit., p. 58.

<sup>21</sup> Ibidem, p. 57.

- <sup>22</sup> D. Bordwell, op. cit., p. 310.  
<sup>23</sup> Ibidem, p. 285.  
<sup>24</sup> Ibidem.  
<sup>25</sup> Ibidem, p. 286.  
<sup>26</sup> I. Martinac, *Martinac: 41 godina...* op. cit., p. 92.  
<sup>27</sup> N. Burch, op. cit., pp. 17-31.  
<sup>28</sup> Ibidem, p. 21.  
<sup>29</sup> T. Vrvilo, "Filmovi Ivana Martinca: taktilnost u zaljepcima", *Hrvatski filmski ljetopis* 2007, vol. 13, no. 52, pp. 49-50.  
<sup>30</sup> D. Bordwell, op. cit., p. 286.  
<sup>31</sup> See: T. Šakić, *Modernizam u hrvatskom igranom filmu: nacrt tipologije*, Disput, Zagreb 2016, pp. 198-199.  
<sup>32</sup> See: E. Çağlayan, *Poetics of Slow Cinema: Nostalgia, Absurdism, Boredom*, Palgrave Macmillan, Cham 2018, and *Slow Cinema*, eds. T. De Luca, N. Barradas Jorge, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 2016.  
<sup>33</sup> T. Šakić, op. cit., p. 246.  
<sup>34</sup> J. Pavičić, "Kuća na pijesku", in: *Subversive Film Festival: socijalizam: 1-25.05.2010* (catalogue), ed. D. Baras, Udruga Bijeli val, Zagreb 2010, p. 75.  
<sup>35</sup> D. Bordwell, op. cit., p. 288.  
<sup>36</sup> Ibidem, p. 288.  
<sup>37</sup> See: B. Kawin, *Mindscreen: Bergman, Godard and First-Person Film*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1978.  
<sup>38</sup> See: M. Chion, *The Voice in Cinema*, trans. C. Gorbman, Columbia University Press, New York 1999.  
<sup>39</sup> D. Bordwell, op. cit., p. 288.  
<sup>40</sup> Ibidem.  
<sup>41</sup> T. Vrvilo, op. cit., p. 48.  
<sup>42</sup> T. Šakić, op. cit., p. 243.  
<sup>43</sup> J. Pavičić, op. cit., p. 75.  
<sup>44</sup> N. Burch, op. cit., pp. 76-77.  
<sup>45</sup> See: E. Branigan, *Projecting a Camera: Language-Games in Film Theory*, Routledge, New York 2006.  
<sup>46</sup> N. Burch, op. cit., p. 76.  
<sup>47</sup> G. Perez, *The Material Ghost: Films and Their Medium*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore 1998, p. 89.  
<sup>48</sup> Ibidem, p. 90.  
<sup>49</sup> I. Martinac, *Martinac: 41 godina...* op. cit., p. 93.  
<sup>50</sup> A. Gaudreault, *From Plato to Lumière: Narration and Monstration in Literature and Cinema*, trans. T. Barnard, University of Toronto Press, Toronto 2009, p. 70.  
<sup>51</sup> Ibidem, p. 69.  
<sup>52</sup> Ibidem, p. 85.  
<sup>53</sup> A. Laffaye, *Logika filma: stvaranje i predstava*, trans. A. Frangeš, Institut za film, Belgrade 1971, p. 63.  
<sup>54</sup> A. Gaudreault, op. cit., p. 93.  
<sup>55</sup> S. Cavell, *The World Viewed: Reflection on the Ontology of Film*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge – London 1979, p. 133.  
<sup>56</sup> See: A. Gaudreault, op. cit., p. 91.  
<sup>57</sup> Ibidem, pp. 92-93.  
<sup>58</sup> E. Branigan, op. cit., p. 88.  
<sup>59</sup> L. Braudy, *The World in a Frame: What We See in Films*, Chicago University Press, Chicago 1984, pp. 44-51.  
<sup>60</sup> T. Vrvilo, op. cit., p. 49.  
<sup>61</sup> Ibidem, p. 49.  
<sup>62</sup> N. Burch, op. cit., pp. 24-25.  
<sup>63</sup> S. Chatman, *Antonioni, or, The Surface of the World*, University of California Press, Berkeley 1985, p. 126.  
<sup>64</sup> G. Perez, op. cit., pp. 84-88.  
<sup>65</sup> Ibidem, p. 84.  
<sup>66</sup> See: L. Braudy, op. cit.  
<sup>67</sup> I. Martinac, "Iskaz, no 3", *Sineast* 1968, vol. 1, no. 5, p. 61.  
<sup>68</sup> Ibidem, p. 62.  
<sup>69</sup> Ibidem, p. 61.  
<sup>70</sup> Ibidem, p. 62.  
<sup>71</sup> Ibidem, p. 61.  
<sup>72</sup> Ibidem.  
<sup>73</sup> See: A. B. Kovács, op. cit.  
<sup>74</sup> See: G. Perez, op. cit.  
<sup>75</sup> G. Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, trans. H. Tomlinson, R. Caleta, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis 1997, p. 23.  
<sup>76</sup> J. Féral, "'Performance' i teatralnost: demistificirani subjekt", trans. T. Brlek, *Zor: časopis za književnost i kulturu* 1996, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 207-216.  
<sup>77</sup> M. Antonioni, "Bolest osjećaja", trans. T. Vrvilo, *Up and Underground Art Dossier* 2004, vol. 1, no. 7-8, p. 10.  
<sup>78</sup> Ibidem.  
<sup>79</sup> I. Martinac, *Ulazak u Jeruzalem*, op. cit., p. 45.  
<sup>80</sup> M. Antonioni, op. cit., p. 7.  
<sup>81</sup> M. Antonioni, "Attempted Suicide: Suicides in the Cities", trans. A. Cooper, in: idem, *The Architecture of Vision: Writings and Interviews on Cinema*, eds. C. di Carlo, G. Tinazzi, M. Cottino-Jones, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 2007, p. 72.  
<sup>82</sup> G. Agamben, *Means Without End: Notes on Politics*, trans. V. Binetti, C. Casarino, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis 2000, p. 53.  
<sup>83</sup> Ibidem, p. 55.  
<sup>84</sup> Ibidem, p. 56.  
<sup>85</sup> Ibidem.

**Višnja Pentić**

A graduate of Comparative Literature and English Language and Literature from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, where she also earned a PhD in Film Studies. She teaches film theory at both the Academy of Dramatic Arts and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. In 2012, she received the Vladimir Vuković Award for Best New Critic and in 2016, the annual Vladimir Vuković Award for Best Critic. She contributes essays on literature, cinema, and visual arts to Croatian Radio Channel 3 and various magazines. She is the author of the book *Prozori – ogledi iz filmske stvarnosti* (2023) with essays on 72 Croatian short films from the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In 2020, she launched an annual programme of free public lectures on cinema at the Cinema Club Zagreb.

**Bibliography**

- Agamben, G.** (2000). *Means Without End: Notes on Politics* (trans. V. Binetti, C. Casarino). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Antonioni, M.** (2007). Attempted Suicide: Suicides in the Cities (trans. A. Cooper). In: C. di Carlo, G. Tinazzi, M. Cottino-Jones (eds.), *The Architecture of Vision: Writing and Interviews on Cinema* (pp. 71-73). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bordwell, D.** (1985). *Narration in the Fiction Film*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Branigan, E.** (2006). *Projecting a Camera: Language-Games in Film Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Braudy, L.** (1984). *The World in a Frame: What We See in Films*. Chicago: Chicago University Press. (Original work published 1976).
- Burch, N.** (1981). *Theory of Film Practice* (trans. H. R. Lane). Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1969).
- Cavell, S.** (1979). *The World Viewed: Reflection on the Ontology of Film*. Cambridge – London: Harvard University Press.
- Chatman, S.** (1985). *Antonioni, or, The Surface of the World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chatman, S.** (1990). *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca – London: Cornell University Press.
- Chion, M.** (1999). *The Voice in Cinema* (trans. C. Gorbman). New York: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1982).
- Féral, J.** (1996). "Performance" i teatralnost: demistificirani subjekt (trans. T. Brlek). *Žor: časopis za književnost i kulturu*, 1 (1), pp. 207-216.
- Gaudreault, A.** (2009). *From Plato to Lumière: Narration and Monstration in Literature and Cinema* (trans. T. Barnard). Toronto: University of Toronto Press. (Original work published 1988).

- Kawin, B.** (1978). *Mindscreen: Bergman, Godard and First-Person Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kovács, A. B.** (2007). *Screening Modernism: European Art Cinema, 1950-1980*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Laffay, A.** (1971). *Logika filma: stvaranje i predstava* (trans. A. Frangeš). Beograd: Institut za film. (Original work published 1964).
- Martinac, I.** (1968). Iskaz, no 3. *Sineast*, 1 (5), pp. 59-62.
- Martinac, I.** (1986). "Kuća na pieszku" – bilješke autora. In: *Alternative film-video 1986* (festival catalogue, pp. 75-86). Belgrade: Akademski filmski centar.
- Martinac, I.** (1992). *Ulazak u Jeruzalem*. Split: Narodno sveučilište Split.
- Martinac, I.** (2001). *Martinac: 41 godina filmskog stvaralaštva, 1960-2001*. Split: Otvoreno pučko učilište Split.
- Pavičić, J.** (2010). Kuća na pijesku. In: *Subversive Film Festival: socijalizam: 1-25.05.2010* (festival catalogue, p. 75). Zagreb: Udruga Bijeli val.
- Perez, G.** (1998). *The Material Ghost: Films and Their Medium*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Šakić, T.** (2016). *Modernizam u hrvatskom igranom filmu: nacrt tipologije*. Zagreb: Disput.
- Vrvilo, T.** (2007). Filmovi Ivana Martinaca: taktilnost u zaljepcima. *Hrvatski filmski ljetopis*, 13 (52), pp. 44-54.

**Słowa kluczowe:**

narracja  
parametryczna;  
reprezentacja  
traumy;  
monstracja;  
minimalizm;  
słow ciemna;  
spojrzenie kamery

**Abstrakt**

Višnja Pentić

**Od narracji do monstracji. Reprezentacja traumy w *Domu na piasku* Ivana Martinaca**

Jedyny pełnometrażowy film Ivana Martinaca *Dom na piasku* (*Kuća na pijesku*, 1985) to awangardowa eksploracja traumy w kinie jugosłowiańskim, wyróżniająca się minimalistyczną narracją i eksperymentalnymi technikami. Dzięki zastosowaniu narracji parametrycznej dzieło odbiega od tradycyjnego sposobu opowiadania historii, zaś jego autor stawia na spójność stylistyczną, a nie na fabułę, podobnie jak reżyserzy tacy jak Robert Bresson czy Michelangelo Antonioni. W narracji zostały wykorzystane innowacyjne techniki filmowe, takie jak stałe pozycje kamery, zbliżenia i panoramy. Elementy te podkreślają wewnętrzną spójność filmu i oddzielają perspektywę kamery od bohaterów, sprzyjając autonomicznemu, medytacyjnemu spojrzeniu. Podejście to jest zgodne z koncepcją monstracji André Gaudreaulta, w której kamera sama aktywnie konstruuje znaczenie poprzez kadrowanie i ruch, a nie tylko dokumentuje fabułę. Kamera służy jako wszechwiedzący, ale wyobcowany obserwator, odzwierciedlając szersze filozoficzne zaangażowanie Martinaca w medium filmowe i jego możliwości. Ta formalna innowacyjność czyni film wyjątkowym artefakt zarówno w kinie chorwackim, jak i światowym.