

# Roy Andersson's Living Trilogy and Jean-Luc Nancy's Evidence of Cinema

Bob Hanke, York University

## Abstract:

In this article, I explore three films that comprise Swedish director Roy Andersson's "Living Trilogy" – *Songs from the Second Floor* (2000); *You, the Living* (2007); and *A Pigeon Sat on a Branch Reflecting on Existence* (2014). My aim is to push the philosophical bearing of Andersson's films towards Jean-Luc Nancy's philosophy of art and cinema. How should we understand his cinematic way of looking, intermedial images, and production of sense? First, I trace Andersson's concept of the "complex image" and aesthetic of "trivialism." Second, I outline Nancy's approach to "presentation" and the "evidence of film." Third, I describe Andersson's "axiomatics" of looking and collection of characters. Finally, I consider the ways this co-existential trilogy suggests a realization of a Nancian ontology of being-with and exposure to the sense of a world. I contend that Andersson's style is a praxis and a regard for this world. What his fragmentary films communicate to us can be illuminated by Nancy's idea that some cinema makes evident a sense of the world.

**Keywords:** Roy Andersson; complex image; trivialism; Jean-Luc Nancy; evidence of cinema; sense of the world.

In this article, I explore three films that comprise Swedish director Roy Andersson's living trilogy: *Songs from the Second Floor* (2000); *You, the Living* (2007); and *A Pigeon Sat on a Branch Reflecting on Existence* (2014). Based on an auteurist mode of art film production and tableau form, this film trilogy has a distinctive style that expresses what it means to be human. It mobilizes a gaze that invites the spectator to look at human being as such. Abandoning narrative, the films' aestheticism belongs to a

*Film-Philosophy* 23.1 (2019): 72–92

DOI: 10.3366/film.2019.0099

© Bob Hanke. This article is published as Open Access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial Licence (<http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction provided the original work is cited. For commercial re-use, please refer to our website at: [www.eupublishing.com/customer-services/authors/permissions](http://www.eupublishing.com/customer-services/authors/permissions).  
[www.eupublishing.com/film](http://www.eupublishing.com/film)

cinema of seeing that is poised between the arts. These three films span the mundane and the absurd, combining daily concerns and quotidian unhappiness with deadpan comedy and unexpected shock-images of inhumanity.<sup>1</sup>

How should we understand the director's novel cinematic way of looking and production of sense? By staging an encounter between Andersson's film making-thinking and Nancy's thought, my aim is to push the philosophical bearing of Andersson's late films towards Nancy's philosophy of art and cinema. Nancy thinks of art as "fragmentary and fractal," as presentation of being (of existence) that is, in the first instance, "multiple in materials, in material fragmentation of sense: sensible existence, fractal existence" (Nancy, 1997, p. 128, p. 132). In a lecture on contemporary art in 2006, he explains art makes us feel a "certain formation of the contemporary world, a certain shaping, a certain perception of self in the world" (Nancy, 2010, p. 92). For Nancy, "world" means a certain possibility or circulation of meaning where there may be limited, ready-made, repeated, elementary signification or an absence of signification.

Andersson has such a world in his sight and his film trilogy enacts attentiveness to ordinary existence and turbulence. Like Nancy, he is sensitive to the sensible qualities of art and poses ontological questions. Both Andersson and Nancy are "indebted *that* the world presents itself, that being is there to be attended to, regarded, gazed on" (Colebrook, 2009, p. 18). Andersson's conspicuous gaze can be understood as a regard, a guarding which "calls for watching and waiting, for observing, for tending attentively and overseeing" (Nancy, 2001, p. 38).

Andersson's trilogy is appealing because it is uncategorizable and yet aligned with "cinematic poesis" (Sinnerbrink, 2014) and the contemporary "slow cinema" movement (de Luca & Jorge, 2016). In the landscape of global art cinema, Brodén (2017) highlights his old-school, high-modernist sensibility. Andersson's tableaux vivants invite closer examination of their sensual mode of perception. Pethő (2015) argues that observing characters within a tableau "may paradoxically heighten both the sensation of reality and artificiality, producing the effect of an artification or exhibition of an everyday experience" (p. 43). Furthermore, Andersson's sensibility and film style isolates the sense of sight "so as to force it to be only what is outside of signifying and useful perception" (Nancy 1996, p. 21). Nancy's philosophy gives us a wider angle on art, the senses and the production of sense. To detach sense from

---

1. The author would like to thank David Sorfa and two anonymous reviewers for constructive feedback that contributed to the development of this article.

the signification of determinate meaning, he traces the etymology of the French term “*sens*” to the German “*carrying-oneself-toward-something*” (Nancy 1997, p. 12). Contemporary art, he argues, puts into play “a certain possibility of signifying, pain, suffering, the human body and also the gesture of the artist himself” (Nancy, 2010, p. 93). Arguably, what Andersson’s fragmentary films communicate to us can be illuminated by Nancy’s idea that cinema “*makes evident a conspicuous form of the world, a form or a sense*” (Nancy, 2001, p. 12).

In what follows I describe how Andersson’s concept of the “*complex image*” and aesthetic was created, his film praxis and the intermedial density of his images. Turning to Nancy’s philosophy of film, I draw upon his analysis of Abbas Kiarostami’s films to describe Andersson’s axiomatics of looking and space of being-with. What is striking about his collection of characters is how they are figured and their coming and going. In the last section, I map Nancy’s thinking about structures of sense onto Andersson’s co-existential trilogy to delineate their sense of a world.

### **Creating the Complex Image and Trivialism**

Andersson’s creative process and technique is situated within Studio 24, a production company and studio he set up in Stockholm. His local mode of relatively autonomous feature film production and shooting style are centered on designing and building sets rather than writing scripts. He begins production “*by painting, with watercolor, over sketches, for each scene*” (Andersson quoted in Indiewire, 2015). In 1984, he started working with Hungarian-Swedish cinematographer István Borbás. The features and qualities of their work are part of a collective, hand-crafted, operation. Together, they approached the frame as a canvas:

The space tells something about us and determines us at the same time. The space is often telling more about the characters than the lines... We did not have any script but we did have drawings. We would practice in front of the camera... so we worked as painters not as filmmakers. (Borbás, 2015)

Everything is built on a 1:1 scale around the camera and what is seen through the viewfinder, and then put together in editing. Rather than using green screens and digital compositing, Andersson uses the technique of *tromp l’oeil* to enlarge the studio space and shoot exterior locations. He only resorts to camera movement or computer-generated images in rare circumstances. “*What you see is what there is*” (Renfors quoted in Carlsson & Arte, 2011); what there is to see is what Andersson (2010) calls the “*complex image*.”

This concept was created over many years. Through the necessity of producing commercials to make a living, he made a virtue out of this

## *Andersson's Living Trilogy and Nancy's Evidence of Cinema*

compressed form. By regarding them as short films, he realized the advantages of using fewer images within a given amount of cinematic time. In 1985, he made a commercial for the Swedish Democratic Party, titled *Why Should We Care About Each Other*, which experimented with abstract and absurdist elements (Lindqvist, 2016a, p. 559). He discovered an affinity with Bazinian realism and developed Bazin's sequence shot to the point where shot and scene become one. Rather than classic montage, multiple camera angles and action images, he and his cinematographer design sequences of wide-angle, still images that combine long takes, depth-of-field, and multiplane movement. The "complex image" is not merely a technical image but a normative definition of a good image – one that affirms a cinematic image that impresses and lingers. The "complex image" must be "demanding and provoking"; the "viewer must analyze the image on her/his own, without any suggested interpretation" (Andersson, 2010, p. 277). We look at his film-world from an immobile point of view, without close-ups or editing between shots within scenes to direct our seeing and guide interpretation.

For Andersson, "[p]hilosophy and art belong together, as art is very philosophical and arguably philosophy is an art itself" (Andersson in Jakobsen, 2016). He found philosophical allies for his aesthetic in Albert Camus, Martin Buber and György Lukács. Echoing Camus's idea of the absurd, his films gesture towards the here and now, where the futility of life can coincide with images of beauty and moments of joy. The first Nazi concentration camps at Dachau, Buber's formulation of existential guilt and Lukács's analysis of Nazi ideology led him to question what "one can and should do" in the field of representation. "How," he asked, "can these events be represented with dignity and responsibility?" (Andersson, 2010, p. 277). How could one avoid using "close ups or use the suffering in an attempt to achieve effects" (Andersson, 2010, p. 277). Such questioning can be traced to Jacques Rivette's article *On Abjection*, which criticized Gillo Pontecorvo's depiction of historical horror in *Kapò* (1960). Andersson's short film *World of Glory* (1991) opens with a scene of naked men, women and children being loaded onto a van to be slowly gassed in front of passive bystanders. As the van circles in the distance, one of the witnesses to this atrocity turns to look directly into the camera. The rest of the film is composed of bleak, static vignettes of this bystander – a middle-aged, estate salesman – and his banal everyday life. This film introduced his style and political aesthetic (Brunow, 2010); ever since, moral culpability for crimes against humanity remains an ethical horizon in his work.

In *The Evidence of Film*, Nancy explores the look and nature of Kiarostami's films and the uniqueness of cinema as an art form. In

response to *Through the Olive Trees* (1994), Nancy writes: “capturing images is clearly an ethos, a disposition, and a conduct in regard to the world” (Nancy, 2001, p. 16). Drawing on this formulation, how has Andersson’s way of looking been set up in these terms? In the tradition of “modernity critics” (Larsson, 2010, p. 272), Andersson sees himself combining “artistic tools of expression” with “great responsibility [...] in the service of humanism” (quoted in Nagy, 2015). At the same time, his film style is a praxis that communicates across the incommensurability between humanist philosophy and the neoliberal form of reason that has configured “all aspects of existence in economic terms” (Brown, 2015, p. 17). His mediation on our existential mode of being corresponds with the unravelling of the Swedish social democratic welfare state, the financialization of the global economy, and the rise of racial-nationalist third parties in Europe. In this conjuncture, he articulates film and existentialism in these terms:

I hope that through my films I am able to open up our sensibility towards each other and show that we are existentially very vulnerable beings. Plus, we just have so little time in our lives. There is no happy ending to any of us [laughs]. But that’s exactly why we should be more responsible with the time we have left. (Andersson quoted in Jakobson, 2016)

This philosophical thought of opening up sensibility towards human being and finitude is indissociable from his praxis.

Andersson’s disposition toward contemporary cinema comes across in various interviews and writings. In *Our Times’ Fear of Seriousness* (*Vår tids rädsla för allvar*) (1995/ 1997, rev. 2009), he declared his belief that existence at the end of the twentieth century was “marked by extreme fearfulness of seriousness and a hatred for quality” (translated by Lindqvist, 2016a, p. 561). The identity between dominant film style and society is at the core of Andersson’s thinking-filming. He has been a critic of the Swedish film industry in these polemical terms:

It feels like the Swedish film industry is almost collapsing. They don’t know what subjects to treat. There are some exceptions. They are so marked by “To write a selling script [...] to make a selling movie.” [...] according to a template. The whole Swedish film community is bred in that spirit. That has created a vast impoverishment. Impoverished imagery for example [...] also the ideas are impoverished. Mankind has so many important issues [...] and Swedish films don’t even come close to these subjects. They deal with relationships and personal problems. The filmmakers don’t regard themselves as part of a bigger political context. They don’t believe those things affect our destinies. (spoken in Carlson & Arte, 2011)

## Andersson's Living Trilogy and Nancy's Evidence of Cinema

He has also critiqued fast filmmaking and “story-telling movies without visual qualities” (Titmarsh, 2014). As he explains:

Nowadays it is possible to work very quick and fast, due to fewer technical restrictions and hurdles. There is a lack of patience. Yet contemporary directors are wondering why their films aren't as impressive as the films from the 60s. However, in the 60s it was necessary to work with great patience. When I ask myself what contemporary cinema is lacking, it is quite simple: it is a lack of patience, a lack of talent and a lack of money. (Andersson quoted in Jakobson, 2016)

His conduct of film is known for rejecting conventional, narrative, bourgeois, commercial cinema. In another interview, he asks: “Why aren't we making films like Resnais's *Hiroshima Mon Amour* or Buñuel's *Viridiana* anymore?” In answer to his own question, he says:

Just give me a little bit more time and I will show how we can make films like in the 60s again [laughs]. It is actually my ambition, to find the limits of the cinematic medium. I want to create films that contain philosophical and poetic dimensions in life. I want to save cinema or at least bring it back to being art. (Andersson quoted in Jakobson, 2016)

For Andersson, what are at stake are the film medium's artistic status and the visual qualities of the moving image. He seeks to make cinema as visually rich as painting by incorporating some of its elements and diverging from Bazin's ontology of cinema based on the photographic image. His affirmation of film as “art” is also in contrast with Godard's pronouncement that “film is over” and the “auteur is dead” (Godard in Gibbons, 2011).

After the success of *A Swedish Love Story* (1970) and the failure of *Gilap* (1975), Andersson made a transition from European realism – which was influenced by Swedish director Bo Widerberg, Italian neorealism and the Czech new wave – to what he calls a more “abstracted style” (Andersson quoted in Macfarlane, 2015). Some residual elements of neorealism remain; sequences of encounters, non-professional actors, class consciousness, and the indiscernibility of real and imaginary. Tiring of “realism” and “naturalism,” he was also inspired again by the history of non-realistic, abstract painting, especially 20<sup>th</sup> century symbolists and expressionists. Lindqvist (2016a) describes how his painterly control over the visual elements of a scene diverged from von Trier and Winterberg's Dogme 95 Manifesto and Vow of Chastity. As he characterizes how his optical and sound image has withdrawn from representation: “It looks real but it's purified and condensed. I'm fascinated by how life's

grandness, smallness and mortality appear much clearer this way” (Andersson quoted in Dagliden, 2015). His discipline of the cinematic image follows Matisse’s rule for colorist painting: “Take away everything that is not your intention” (quoted by Andersson in Aftab, 2015).

To account for his focus on existential questions, he and his production team coined the term “trivialism,” which he then used in interviews and commentaries:

One describes the world and our existence in their little trivial elements, and in that way I hope that one can also get to the big, enticing, philosophical questions. But how life is, life is of course trivial, we must button buttons, we must zip up zippers, and we must eat breakfast. It is exceedingly concrete and trivial, the whole of our existence. Even for those who are in positions of power. I like this very much, emphasizing this triviality, because it pushes people down to earth to that place where one actually belongs. (Andersson quoted in Lindqvist 2016b, pp. 23–24)

“Trivialism” opens cinema onto the everyday fact of existence and thematizes a shared ordinary world of mortal beings as a ground for awareness. In the banality of this everyday mode of being and petty details, both human foibles and sublime moments of beauty in the here and now become apparent. His scenes of everyday life range from personal misfortune to social malformation to the inhuman within the human world. They are stretched between two poles: the all too human and the limits of the human. In his most recent film, *About Endlessness* (2019), visually inspired by Chagall and van Gogh, the juxtaposition of tableau is accompanied by a Scheherazadean voice-over to invite reflection on the precariousness and beauty of existence.

His stylization of cinematic images is complex because it is open and dense, and this makes his trilogy distinctive and remarkable. As Lindqvist (2016b) argues, his practice is based on the intermediality of film, poetry, painting and music. While there is no one model of intermediality in film studies, Pethő (2011) identifies a “sensual mode” based on the attitude of *flânerie* that invites the viewer to get in touch with the world and perceive the cinematic image in terms of other arts (Pethő, 2011, p. 5). On this view, we could say Andersson’s tableau vivants mediate between cinema, painting and theatre. Nancy, however, sees cinema poised “between drawing, writing, music [...] but each ‘art’ is a totality opening onto others, configured with them, touching them [...]” (Nancy, 2001, p. 48). Pethő grounds the sensing of intermediality in the (inter) sensuality of cinema while Nancy contends “art-technique looks, it has regard for our look [*regard*], it looks at it and causes it to come about as look” (Nancy 1996, p. 20).

## Andersson's Living Trilogy and Nancy's Evidence of Cinema

The impression that Andersson's cinematic image makes is a matter of the selective film history he has in his eyes. He has repeatedly cited Vittorio De Sica's *Bicycle Thieves* (1948) as a formative film (Kohn, 2015). *The Decalogue*, a 1989 TV series by the Polish director Krzysztof Kieślowski, who was associated with the Cinema of Moral Anxiety, restored his faith in cinema. His list of "best films" includes works by Fellini, Tarkovsky, Wajda, Kubrick, Pontecorvo, Resnais, Griffith, Kurosawa, and Buñuel (Andersson, 2012). Like Jacques Tati's *Playtime* (1967), Andersson's optical and sound situations depend on set construction and the right rhythm and movement of bodies. His comedy also emulates aspects of the American silent comedies of Charlie Chaplin and Buster Keaton. The "tragicomic" tension between jollity and gravity has been identified as a vital ingredient that infuses his films with human authenticity (Lindqvist, 2016a, p. 561). The future may look bleak but his looking at the human condition is lightened with laughter, and that is, "the joy of the senses, and of sense, at their limits" (Nancy, 1993, p. 390). There is a laughter that laughs at human inadequacies and failings, but this sense is transformed into another sense in the face of scenes of cruelty and violence that solicit an ethical response.

Andersson's filmmaking also involves poetry as art and technique. In this respect, what is essential are poetic images, which Heidegger defined as "imaginings in a distinctive sense: not mere fancies or illusions but imaginings that are visible inclusions of the alien in the sight of the familiar" (Heidegger, 1971, p. 226). Lindqvist (2010) reads the aesthetics of *Songs* in terms of its formal artistic and intellectual correspondences to César Vallejo's modernist Spanish poetry. *Songs*, for example, opens with this line of poetry from Vallejo's *Stumble between Two Stars*: "Beloved be the one who sits down." Other lines of this poem are sampled in subsequent dialogue with minor variations in colloquial Swedish. Beyond his appropriation of this poem, Lindqvist shows how the humanist ethos of Vallejo's poetry infuses Andersson's "trivialist" film style.

Vallejo is not the only poet providing a measure of mystery and the poetic truth value of revealing being. The title of *You, the Living* comes from Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's Roman Elegies (1790): "Be pleased, you living one, in your delightfully warm bed, before Lethe's ice cold wave, will lick your escaping foot." Death is integral to existence; this poem reminds us that awareness of death is what gives meaning to life. Film and poetry are fused together as *aletheia*, as a veiling/unveiling. After the titles, *A Pigeon* begins with three portraits of everydayness titled *Three Meetings with Death*. A husband dies opening a bottle of wine in the dining room while his wife is using an electric mixer in the kitchen, an old



woman on her hospital death bed refuses to let go of her handbag full of money, jewellery and her husband's gold watch, a cashier in a cruise ship cafeteria tries to give away a shrimp sandwich and a beer purchased by a man who has just died of a heart attack. These are not tragic deaths by murder, suicide or extermination. As ontological attestations of our finitude, these scenes of indeterminate and senseless death appeal to a sense of life. Andersson frames death similarly to Nancy: "Death is *neither* the opposite of life *nor* the passage into another life; it is itself the blind spot that opens up the looking [...]" (Nancy, 2001, p. 18). This blind spot, which "makes an opening for a gaze and presses upon it to look" (Nancy, 2001, p. 12), is not limited to death scenes. Andersson's films open up a way of looking and what leans on our eye is their intermedial density.

Intermedial density is obvious in Andersson's fusion of film and painting. Painting is central to his carefully-composed, tableau shots and his sense of filmmaking technique. He found montage in the Baroque printmaker Jacques Callot's *La Pendaison* (1633) and was inspired by the German new objectivists Otto Dix, Karl Hofer, Georg Scholz, and Felix Nussbaum; and by Belgian painter James Ensor, American realist painter Edward Hopper, and Spanish painter Francisco Goya. As Mildren (2013) argues, *Songs* and Pieter Bruegel the Elder's *The Triumph of Death* "share structural and aesthetic affinities that transcend their radically different media and eras of production" (p. 148). He adds: "The echoes of style and satiric intent in Bruegel in Andersson's work are crucial to the construction of the director's critique of an arguably terminal malaise of a particularly European sense of identity" (p. 148). Similarly, *A Pigeon* is indebted to Bruegel's *Hunters in the Snow*. Three crows sitting in the tree above the hunters in the painting's foreground inspired this film's imaginary birds-eye view of human existence.

For all their painterly qualities, however, Andersson's films are not purely visual; they also draw upon literary and musical resources. *Songs* samples from Louis-Ferdinand Céline and August Strindberg. The nonlinear narrative of *A Pigeon*, and the way the two novelty item salesmen wander from place to place, is borrowed from Homer's *Odyssey*, while their characters are distilled from Laurel and Hardy, Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men* and de Cervantes's *Don Quixote*. He draws upon a literary canon that includes Stig Dagerman, Hjalmar Söderberg, Honoré de Balzac, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, and Milan Kundera. In addition to Andersson's inventory of literary invocations, there is music and song. His soundtracks favor traditional music and New Orleans jazz. He is also fascinated by the "unassuming music that existed in the 1930s when Nazism grew up" (Andersson quoted in Cedarskog, 2007).

## Andersson's Living Trilogy and Nancy's Evidence of Cinema

Andersson uses music to bridge scenes or as counterpoint, to transmit affective tones or evoke atmosphere. However, what distinguishes music and sense? According to Nancy, music is beyond signification, a sonorous site “where sense and sound mix together and resonate in each other, or through each other” (Nancy, 2007, p. 7). Listening stretches the ear and music has a resonant meaning “only in resonance” (Nancy, 2007, p. 7).

Of course, singular sonorous perception is in a complex relationship with the visual. “In the image,” Nancy writes, “the visual and the sonorous share registers with one another, communicate their accents to each other (2016, p. 74). Andersson's tableaux owe much to the way these accents are shared across film viewing and listening space. For *Songs* music was composed by Benny Andersson, and rearranged and performed by Stockholm Session Strings. As Lindqvist (2016b) notes, the “slow, jolting, pulse of bass strings in a waltz tempo contrasted with a lighter, cautiously playful, melody – exemplifies both the style and themes of *Songs*” (p. 115). Music and songs also enter the diegesis in diverse ways. In one scene, a taxi driver and his girlfriend sit on a kitchen chair and play a recorder together. In another scene, a group of subway riders form a choir singing an elegiac aria. In *You, the Living*, a middle-aged woman's lament turns into *Motorcykel*, performed by the Stockholm Classic Jazz Band. Some characters belong to a Louisiana Brass Band and there is also a guitar player in a band called the Black Devils. Other songs include the Swedish hymn *I Have Heard About a City Above the Clouds*, which is often played at Swedish funerals, the German university song *O alte Burschenherrlichkeit* with Swedish lyrics, and a melody from *A Little White Rabbit*, a popular song that was recorded by Edvard Persson in the 1930s. In *A Pigeon*, flamenco music and dance convey a teacher's attraction for one of her students. We also hear *Shimmy Doll*, a 1950s rockabilly song, performed by Ashley Beaumont, that evokes rhythmic, upbeat movement. Andersson also takes cues from musical theatre when he stages a cheerful musical number in the Limping Lotta bar scene in Gothenburg. Later in another scene, Jonathan (Holger Andersson), one of two travelling salesmen, listens to a song on a record player in his room and he cannot get the “beautiful, but horribly sad” song out of his head. Apart from any musical interpretation, what is dispersed along with each song is a “playful execution of sense, a being-as-act through cadence, attack, inflection, echo, syncopation [...]” (Nancy, 1997, p. 86).

In Nancy's (2016) theory of art, there are two regimes. The image is the regime of surface distinguished from ground whereas musical sonority represents a regime of outside and inside. In *A Pigeon*,

a disturbing modulation of image, voices and music occurs when we hear screams transformed into eerie music when colonial soldiers incinerate African slaves in a giant, rotating copper drum outfitted with the wide end of trumpets. As it rotates, we see that “Boliden” is inscribed on the drum – a reference to the Swedish mining company that shipped toxic smelter sludge to Arica, Chile in the mid-1980s. In the next shot, a group of formally-attired elderly people emerge from behind curtained, glass sliding doors that reflect the previous shot. They drink champagne and watch this atrocity while looking directly into the camera. The music continues into the next scene with Jonathan (the aforementioned salesman) sitting on his bed. He has thought of something horrible and that he was involved, but he is unsure whether it was a dream or not. The presence of unspeakable atrocity remains in the present. This music hangs in the air in the next scene when he comes out of his room, looks down the hallway to where the building manager is sitting, and asks him, “Is it right using people only for your own pleasure?”. The manager looks at his watch and asks, “Should we be discussing these things in the middle of the night?”. As far as the manager is concerned, there is nothing more to say because “there are people here who are getting up early for work tomorrow.” At this moment, we might hear what this kind of speaking lacks. The common sense of the spectator’s sensitive body is dislocated by another order of sense and truth.

These occurrences of Andersson’s intermedial production underscore what Nancy calls art’s “multiple essence” and the “internal multiplicity” of motion pictures (2001, p. 22). Rather than being merely a matter of inter-art correspondences and influences, their inter-expression indicates a principle of the arts and its corollary: “art’s irreducible non-totality” and “between the arts, an interminable mutual resonance” (Nancy, 2016, p. 74). Their sensual mode of intermediality appeals to sight and sound without internal unity. Across his triptych, Andersson’s film form and style is within and between the arts-in-process.

### **Andersson’s Axiomatics of Looking**

In *The Evidence of Film*, Nancy differentiates films with metaphysical themes from the mediation of existential themes. Cinematic metaphysics means grasping “cinema as the place of mediation, as its body and its realm, as the taking-place of a relation to the sense of the world” (Nancy, 2001, p. 44). In Andersson’s case, such mediation cannot be separated from Sweden’s socio-political, historical reality or his social and political sympathies. However, the surface of his screens can be considered in another dimension, in which his cinema takes up its “presentation.”

This is where Nancy's theory of cinema takes leave of the philosophy of representation since Plato's allegory of the cave. Nancy's fundamental premise is that "[t]he reality of images is the access to the real *itself*, with the consistency and the resistance of death, for instance, or life, for instance" (Nancy, 2001, p. 16). As Colebrook (2009) explains, for Nancy, "the world is *cinematic*, and we come to realize that it is so today, with cinema, and specifically with cinema of a certain type (non-narrative, non-postmodern, or meta-cinematic cinema)" (p. 161). He insists that the cinema has a specific mode of presenting presence, which he refers to as the "evidence of cinema" (Nancy, 2001, p. 44). The relation between film and world is a relation of evidence that presents the world in each case.

In writing about Kiarostami's film-making, Nancy shows how he "*mobilizes* the look; he calls it and animates it, he makes it vigilant" (2001, p. 16). Instead of representing the world, the cinema "presents – that is to say shares (communicates) – the intensity of a look upon a world of which it is part and parcel [...]" (Nancy, 2001, p. 20). In his reading, Kiarostami's cinema is "intensified" and turns toward presence. And yet, "[p]resence is not a mere matter of vision: it offers itself in encounters, worries, or concerns" (Nancy, 2001, p. 30). The power of cinema lies in its "*regard*" and "*égard*," French words which mean to look and to respect (Nancy, 2001, p. 38). Likewise, Andersson's films affirm cinema and have a presentational power that connects looking and respecting. In a manner that is very different from Kiarostami's poetic road movies and documentary tropes, Andersson's filmmaking combines an insistence upon human everydayness with a way of looking at the enigma of being. Judging from his scenes of animal cruelty and companionship, his lens on modern homo sapiens in *A Pigeon* is zoomorphic, and this supposes that "human exceptionalism" is rooted in blindness to cruelty and abuse (Savage, 2016).

What are Andersson's axiomatics of looking? Returning to the Greek root *axiōma*, – what is thought fitting – I will sketch four aspects of his cinematic frame and images. First, "[a]lways there is a cut, a framing" (Nancy, 2001, p. 42). From a fixed camera position, Andersson's viewfinder frames a studio space with a certain distance and duration. His framing incorporates Bazin's view of a filmed image. As Batemen (2015) observes, within his frame there is an absence of a focal point for the audience to look at. Hanich (2014) suggests that the "freedom of the viewer – but also his or her obligation – to scan the temporal progression of the shot demands a more active perception than usual [...]" (p. 48). Freeing the eye to roam over a wide shot opens our visual sense to more watchful viewing and curiosity.

Second, there is Andersson's staging in depth and foregrounding/backgrounding of characters. Hanich argues that his "hidden depth shots" unveil previously hidden dimensions. In addition to their comic, expressive and symbolic functions, he analyzes an "active-viewer function" that "allows Andersson to combine an existential critique of our modern life-world [...] with an attempt to involve the viewer more actively in the film [...] in order to counter this modern malaise" (Hanich, 2014, p. 48). His characters are always observed and surrounded by co-present others but "nevertheless existentially left alone" and situated in modern, urban, European "non-places" (Hanich, 2014, p. 48). However, this presupposes that there is an "I" that is prior to "we," and overlooks how Andersson conceives of space and the places where people live and work.

Third, Andersson enjoys "watching and describing someone in a room – in the widest sense of the word" (Andersson, 2010, p. 275). In *The Human and the Space (Människan och Rummet)*, he outlines his broad definition of space in these terms:

But it is the space that bears traces of the human hand, formed by humans, that in my opinion most strongly rouses the sensation that the space is pursuing us. It reveals our place in social life and in history. It is revealed that our conditions, our existence, is the result of a historical process in which the influence of our own will is of lesser consequence than we would like to believe. (Andersson, 2001)

Correspondingly, "[s]pace defines the human and exposes the value of and conditions for the realization of the dreams a person might have. Space speaks the truth. We do not always want to see or hear it – especially, traditionally speaking, at the movies" (Andersson, 2001). As he elsewhere sums up: "I think it's extremely interesting to portray the human being in the room, that is to say the environment they happen to be in. The room tells us a lot about one's place on earth and one's situation on earth" (quoted in Ratner, 2015). Whether we are being observed or observing, this room presents film's philosophical possibility of beholding being there.

What is noteworthy is how this passage from Nancy's *Being Singular Plural* parallels Andersson's view of a room:

Someone enters a room, he disposes himself in it and to it. In crossing through it, living in it, visiting it, and so forth, he thereby exposes the disposition – the correlation, combination, contact, distance, relation – of all that is (in) the room, and, therefore, of the room itself [...]. Being with is not added on to being there; instead, to be there is to be with, and to be with

## *Andersson's Living Trilogy and Nancy's Evidence of Cinema*

what makes sense – by itself, with nothing more, with no subsumption of this meaning under any other truth than that of the with. (Nancy, 2000, pp. 97–98)

Likewise, Andersson's film-world presents a spatial sense of the world where being-with is originary. In this Nancian sense, Andersson's sense of a room is where the truth of existence can be grasped. Neither solitary beings nor humanity are alone in the world; the basic character of existence is being-with-one-another in a crowded world. His attentive looking at the world where we are with others and care for our existence turns our looking at this world towards undercurrents of vulnerability and humiliation, disconnection and alienation.

While this ontology is spatial, being-with can only happen in time. Nancy privileges a spatial sense of time but has also thought about the non-chronological present as a “nonequivalence of singularities” – people, moments, places, gestures, hours, locutions, etc. (Conley & Goh, 2014). This “Proustian” sense of the present involves a “multiplicity of senses” that fills the present with a sense of the world (p. 6). Andersson's cinema touches another sense of the present by drawing attention to time. Sometimes his characters recite platitudes about time. In *Songs*: “Everything has its day.”, “There's a time for everything.”, “A new day is dawning.”. In *You, the Living*: “Tomorrow is another day” is repeated. “Another” could mean time stands still, or *another* day could affirm that a day is “the turning of the world – each time singular” (Nancy, 2000, p. 9). His longer than usual scenes unfold time as lived duration that sidesteps chronological time. He has described how his “timeless” image is based on growing up in Sweden in the 1950s, and how the “colors of that time” color his film images (Andersson, 2015). The video *The Magnificent Anders(s)ons – The Look of Reality* illustrates the aesthetic of artificiality he shares with Wes Anderson, but their memories of the past are very different (Beyond the Frame, 2017). As Lindqvist (2016b) notes, his scenes are anachronous. Waking life, dreams, memories and history blur the succession of time as past-present-future. The architectural styles of buildings also help define a “between-ness” that is neither now nor then. As Andersson explains his take on the heterochronic present, “[w]e are really living both our time and the past all the time. Everything is affected by what has gone before” (quoted in Ratner, 2015).

Fourth, consistent with his painterly technique, Andersson applies Matisse's rule to dreams, memories and histories. “Dreams,” he says, “are realism, but in disorder” (Andersson quoted in Jakobson, 2016). Sometimes characters turn to face the camera and tell us their dreams or

nightmares. In *You, the Living*, the scene of newlyweds Anna (Jessika Lundberg) and Micke (Eric Bäckman) in their apartment rolling into a train station full of well-wishers is a dream of idyllic happiness. In another series of scenes, a cement worker recounts a dream where he ends up on trial and is convicted and sentenced to the electric chair, raising the question of injustice. In *A Pigeon*, between two bar scenes there is a recollection image of Limping Lotta's bar in Gothenburg in 1943. Sheets of the past – like King Charles the XII and his army marching to and back from Russia – march in and out of the present. In *Songs*, a flashback of the hanging of a Russian teenage girl and boy are modelled on a historical photo taken by a Lithuanian SS officer that documents the hanging of two teenage members of the resistance movement in 1941. Another news photograph of the Khmer Rouge's takeover of Phnom Penh in 1975 inspires an airport departure hall scene. As his cinematographer István Borbás comments, the presence of the past makes it possible to “talk about political issues that spread over time” (Borbás quoted in Bateman, 2015). Andersson's concern that past moral and political conditions leading to atrocities will continue gives impetus to his articulation of humanism, social critique and “guilt toward existence” (Lindqvist, 2016b). Ontological curiosity is intermingled with ethical looking at “how we behaved in war, to poor people, and to others exploiting them” (Andersson quoted in Ratner, 2015).

Besides these axiomatics of looking, Andersson constructs a film-world with an idiosyncratic collection of characters. As a cross section of Swedish society, their typicality flashes back to August Sander's photographic portraits during the Weimar Republic. In this respect, characters may stand for more than themselves. He begins production by sketching and painting his characters in watercolors. They are then dressed in generic clothes and made-up in white face make-up – in the tradition of circus clowns and the masks in Japanese Noh theatre – which downplays social difference and renders them archetypally human. Their pallid masklike faces are any-face-whatevers that convey being weary and weighed down. Whether they are major or minor characters, part of a dyad, small group or crowd, all of them are portrayed in what Andersson calls “light without mercy” (quoted in Spigland, 2010). This is consistent with his restrained, monochromatic, minimalist set designs. As Andersson explains: “There are no shadows to hide in. You are illuminated all the time. It makes you naked, the human beings – naked” (Andersson quoted in Ulaby, 2015). Rather than casting professional actors, Andersson has been “collecting characters for years” in stores, restaurants, and gas stations, or by sending out researchers (quoted in Romney, 2001). By finding the “right amateur,” he

gets an “extra quality, a presence [...] a human being laid bare” (quoted in Carlsson & Arte, 2011). In these ways, his characters are figured in an image, where, in Nancy's words, “every image is in some way a ‘portrait,’ not in that it would reproduce the traits of a person, but in that it pulls and *draws* [...]” (Nancy, 2005, p. 4).

In Nancy's view, we are part of the “people”, not as one being but as being-with. Beneath the tendency to judge people as “strange” or “incredible” based on our own habitus, he uncovers another level where the strangeness of singularity can be apprehended. Andersson's naked characters precipitate this strangeness. His praxis grasps the existence of people “in the paradoxical simultaneity of togetherness (anonymous, confused, and indeed massive) and disseminated singularity (these or those ‘people(s),’ or a ‘guy,’ ‘a girl,’ ‘a kid’)” (Nancy, 2000, p. 7). The city they inhabit is a location of co-existence as such, of common experiences of being the same and different, of inclusion and exclusion, and intimacy and loneliness.

In Swedish and German, the word *irrfärd/irrfahrt* (odyssey), suggests a journey without a particular goal or distinct plan, wandering into unexpected situations. Andersson's interest in people coming and going is evident in a funding application to the Swedish Film Institute:

In *Songs from the Second Floor*, we meet an existence that can neither be apprehended nor surveyed, teeming with human destinies, some of which we come to learn about, and they become the film's main characters. But we will have the experience, not of following these characters, but rather of bumping into them, losing them from sight for a while, then bumping into them again – and again, and again. (Andersson quoted in Lindqvist, 2016b, p. 25)

His main characters wander, drift in and out, and move from the foreground to the background or vice versa. They are positioned in relation to secondary characters who are onlookers, bystanders, and passersby. Some of these characters play the role of observers. We watch the main characters and those who watch and listen to them. They are exposed to the gaze and judgement of onlookers aligned with our gaze. In Andersson's view, both the space of being-with and the spacing of beings characterize human existence.

In Nancy's co-existential analytic, being “cannot be anything but being-with-one another, circulating in the with and as the with of this singular plural coexistence” (Nancy, 2000, p. 3). This means that “we” are meaning because circulation constitutes existence, and that the “ordinary” itself is the most strange because it is originary.



With existence laid open this way, he asks whether the purpose of art and literature is to present this strangeness. In Andersson's respectful gaze, what is presented are places of being-with detached from the Swedish *ett folk* (a people). What is illuminated is a plurality of beings in positions – with, among, between – where all appearing takes place.

### Andersson's Sense of a World

What sense of sense can clarify Andersson's form of film-world as an exposure of sense? For Nancy, art disengages the world from signification and “that is what we call ‘the senses’” (Nancy 1996, p. 22). Moreover, sense and world touch each other (Librett, 1997). This means that the world is structured as sense and vice versa. Being “is being toward the world, as toward the sense that it makes” (Librett, 2015, p. 215). In *The Sense of the World*, he describes three formal structures of sense: “(1) the *observance* of an order and ritual of the world [...] (2) *salvation*, where unhappiness is an illness, a worldly alienation [...]” and “(3) *existence*, as the exposition of being-toward-the-world or being-world – where evil seems coextensive with good, the ‘worst’ with the ‘best’[...]” (1997, p. 147).

How does this structure map onto Andersson's sense of the world, as the place where sense happens? His observance of order and ritual is marked by irony, sight gags, satire and nonsense. In his depiction of the church and business, religious doctrine has been replaced by neoliberal economic dogma. Unhappiness and inhospitality prevail, and nothing is painted with salvation or redemption. Mortals live under the sky but in the final scene of *You, the Living*, the sky is filled with a squadron of B52 bombers flying over a large city. With respect to the insignificance of the everyday compared to a world of mayhem, this way of seeing comes with a sense as surprise, as the possibility of significance. Each film takes a stance “toward the *happenstance* that the world is” (Nancy, 1997, p. 152), of good and bad encounters or confrontation, and the “sovereign possibility of responding to the *happenstance* of sense” (Nancy, 1997, p. 151).

Andersson's co-existential film triptych can be summarized as an ontological event composed of one hundred and forty-six scenes that run for four hours and forty-eight minutes. What the film viewer experiences is a flow of scenes that begin *in medias res* and do not reach a conclusion. In the absence of a narrative and any drama of rising and falling action, the unfolding of human situations is unpredictable. Each scene comes as a surprise each time. Some cinematic tableaux vivants are even more discrete because they are exhibited like paintings at an exhibition.

## Andersson's Living Trilogy and Nancy's Evidence of Cinema

Only Andersson's singular, intensified gaze that presents itself as distinct provides continuity to discontinuity.

By creating a disquieting sense of a world without concern and care for the other and reinstalling presence of a person, of the past, we may come to thinking about worldly co-existence. In Nancian terms, each film "is in its fashion a synesthesia and the opening of a world" but only insofar as "'the world' as such, in its being-world (the being of that to which opens a being-to-the-world, is plurality of worlds)" (Nancy, 1996, p. 31). For Nancy, it is not that existence has no meaning or that the world no longer has sense; rather, the world means "*being-to* or *being-toward*" (Nancy, 1997, p. 8.) Andersson's fragmentary stories and kaleidoscopic way of looking has been set up to look toward being-with and the world as a concatenation of events. His aesthetic presents fragments of a world simultaneous with a fragmented world that avoids nihilistic non-sense. His sense of a world is partially behind the present (in history and memory) and has its own spatiality (the room of co-existence). His gaze underscores looking from the right distance to relate to being. For the spectator, it is a matter of tuning into this looking. His films say: Look! Have regard for everyday encounters and unfolding tragedies. Pay attention to sublime moments within the familiar. Observe the loss of attention that takes care of others. Do not fixate on the present or forget atrocities. Wonder at how we co-exist, communicate being-with, come together and depart in relation to the exigency of the sense of the world.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aftab, K. (2015, April 12). Film-maker Roy Andersson Interview: "This movie will make you smarter." Retrieved July 25, 2016, from <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/features/film-maker-roy-andersson-interview-this-movie-will-make-you-smarter-10170862.html>
- Andersson, R. (2001). *Människan och Rummet*. (S. Martin Cheadle, Trans.), *Forum Inredning Arkitektur Design*, 1. Retrieved from <http://www.royandersson.com/rummet/>
- Andersson, R. (2010). The Complex Image. In M. Larsson & A. Marklund (Eds.), *Swedish Film: An Introduction and Reader* (pp. 274–278). Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Andersson, R. (2012). Roy Andersson. *Sight & Sound Directors' Poll*. Retrieved from <http://www.bfi.org.uk/films-tv-people/sightandsoundpoll2012/voter/1154>
- Bateman, C. (2015, June 11). A Pigeon Sat on a Branch Reflecting on Existence – An Interview with Cinematographer István Borbás. Retrieved October 11, 2016, from <http://fourthreefilm.com/2015/06/a-pigeon-sat-on-a-branch-reflecting-on-existence-an-interview-with-cinematographer-istvan-borbabas/>
- Beyond the Frame. (2017). *The Magnificent Anders(s)ons – The Look of Reality*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WUEVSNMdyLA>
- Borbás, I. (2015, January 21). Space Defines Existence: Workshop with István Borbás. Retrieved July 31, 2016, from <http://kustendorf-filmandmusicfestival.org/2015/space-defines-pigeon-existence-workshop-istvan-borbabas/>

- Brodén, D. (2017). Old School Modernism? On the Cinema of Roy Andersson. *Journal of Scandinavian Cinema*, 7(1), 5–12.
- Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. Brooklyn, New York: Zone Books.
- Brunow, D. (2010). The Language of the Complex Image: Roy Andersson's Political Aesthetics. *Journal of Scandinavian Cinema*, 1(1), 83–86.
- Carlsson, J., & Arte, P. (2011). *Tomorrow is Another Day: A Documentary About Roy Andersson*. Stockholm: Studio 24.
- Colebrook, C. (2009). Jean-Luc Nancy. In F. Colman (Ed.), *Film, theory and philosophy: the key thinkers* (pp. 154–163). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Conley, V. A., & Goh, I. (2014). Introduction: Time in Nancy. In V. A. Conley & I. Goh (Eds.), *Nancy Now* (pp. 1–19). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Daglidén, J. (2014, August 28). Roy Andersson: "I'm trying to show what it's like to be human". *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2014/aug/28/roy-andersson-pigeon-sat-branch-reflecting-existence>
- De Luca, T., & Jorge, N. B. (2016). *Slow Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gibbons, F. (2011, July 12). Jean-Luc Godard: "Film is Over. What to Do?" *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/film/2011/jul/12/jean-luc-godard-film-socialisme>
- Grozdanovic, N. (2015, June 2). Interview: Roy Andersson Talks Award-Winning "A Pigeon Sat On A Branch." Retrieved June 12, 2016, from <http://www.indiewire.com/2015/06/interview-roy-andersson-talks-award-winning-a-pigeon-sat-on-a-branch-jacques-tati-a-lejandrogonzalez-inarritu-more-255345/>
- Hanich, J. (2014). Complex Staging: The Hidden Dimensions of Roy Andersson's Aesthetics. *Movie: A Journal of Film Criticism*, (5), 37–50.
- Heidegger, M. (1971). ...Poetically Man Dwells.... In A. Hofstadter (Trans.), *Poetry, Language, Thought* (pp. 213–229). New York: Harper & Row.
- Indiewire. (2015, June 3). Here's How This Filmmaker Uses Painting to Bring His Screenplays to Life. Retrieved October 9, 2016, from <http://www.indiewire.com/2015/06/heres-how-this-filmmaker-uses-painting-to-bring-his-screenplays-to-life-61305/>
- Jakobson, C. (2016, May 7). Treatise on the Human Condition. *IIIIIII*. Retrieved from <http://www.fourbythreemagazine.com/issue/nihilism-roy-andersson-interview>
- Kohn, E. (2015, June 4). Roy Andersson Explains Why It Took 25 Years to Make His Third Film. Retrieved June 30, 2017, from <http://www.indiewire.com/2015/06/roy-andersson-explains-why-it-took-25-years-to-make-his-third-film-61261/>
- Larsson, M. (2010). Changing Conditions for Auteurs after 1970: Introduction. In M. Larsson & A. Markland (Eds.), *Swedish Film: An Introduction and Reader* (pp. 270–273). Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Librett, J. (1997). Translator's Foreword. Between Nihilism and Myth: Value, Aesthetics, and Politics in *The Sense of the World*. In P. Gratton & M.-E. Morin (Eds.), *The Sense of the World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Librett, J. (2015). Sense. In P. Gratton & M.-E. Morin (Eds.), *The Nancy Dictionary* (pp. 213–215). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lindqvist, U. (2016a). The Art of Not Telling Stories in Nordic Fiction Film. In M. Hjort & U. Lindqvist (Eds.), *A Companion to Nordic Cinema* (pp. 554–573). Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley/Blackwell.

## Andersson's Living Trilogy and Nancy's Evidence of Cinema

- Lindqvist, U. (2016b). *Roy Andersson's "Songs from the Second Floor": Contemplating the Art of Existence*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Lindqvist, U. (2010). Roy Andersson's Cinematic Poetry and The Specter of César Vallejo. *Scandinavian-Canadian Studies*, 19, 200–229.
- Macfarlane, S. (2015, June 5). Not "Making Bad Movies with State Money": Roy Andersson on A Pigeon Sat on a Branch Reflecting on Existence. Retrieved October 11, 2016, from <http://filmmakermagazine.com/94510-not-making-bad-movies-with-state-money-roy-andersson-on-a-pigeon-sat-on-a-branch-reflecting-on-existence/>
- Mildren, C. (2013). Spectator Strategies, Satire and European Identity in the Cinema of Roy Andersson via the Paintings of Pieter Bruegel the Elder. *Studies in European Cinema*, 10(2+3), 147–155.
- Nagy, E. (2015). *Stories About The Film – A Pigeon Sat on a Branch Reflecting on Existence*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5N3ILGFu1K8>
- Nancy, J.-L. (1993). *The Birth to Presence*. (B. Holmes, Trans.). Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.
- Nancy, J.-L. (1996). *The Muses*. (P. Kamuf, Trans.). Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.
- Nancy, J.-L. (1997). *The Sense of the World*. (J. S. Librett, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2000). *Being Singular Plural*. (D. Richardson & A. E. O'Byrne, Trans.). Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2001). *The Evidence of Film: Abbas Kiarostami*. (C. Irizarry & V. A. Conley, Trans.). Bruxelles: Yves Gevaert.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2005). *The Ground of the Image*. (J. Fort, Trans.). New York: Fordham University Press.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2007). *Listening*. (C. Mandell, Trans.). New York: Fordham University Press.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2010). Art Today. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 9(1), 91–99.
- Nancy, J.-L. (2016). The Image: Mimesis and Methexis. In C. Giunta & A. Janus (Eds.), A. Janus (Trans.), *Nancy and Visual Culture* (pp. 73–92). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pethő, Á. (2011). *Cinema and Intermediality: The Passion for the In-Between*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Pub.
- Pethő, Á. (2015). Between Absorption, Abstraction and Exhibition: Inflections of the Cinematic Tableau in the Films of Corneliu Porumboiu, Roy Andersson and Joanna Hogg. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Film and Media Studies*, 11, 39–76.
- Ratner, M. (2015). The "Trivialist Cinema" of Roy Andersson: An Interview. *Film Quarterly*, 69(1), 36–44.
- Romney, J. (2001, February 9). Funny Peculiar. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/film/2001/feb/09/culture.features3>
- Savage, B. (2016, January 24). A Pigeon Sat on a Branch Reflecting on Existence. Retrieved June 18, 2018, from <http://sheffieldanimals.group.shef.ac.uk/a-pigeon-sat-on-a-branch-reflecting-on-existence/>
- Sinnerbrink, R. (2014). Technē and Poiësis: On Heidegger and Film Theory. In A. van den Oever (Ed.), *Technē / Technology: Researching Cinema and Media Technologies – their Development, Use, and Impact* (pp. 65–80). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Spigland, E. (2010, September 12). No Shadows To Hide In: A Conversation with Roy Andersson. Retrieved August 9, 2016, from <https://orbismediologicus.wordpress.com/2010/09/12/no-shadows-to-hide-in-a-conversation-with-roy-andersson/>

## *Film-Philosophy 23 (2019)*

- Titmarsh, J.-A. (2014, September 2). *A Pigeon Sat on a Branch Reflecting on Existence* Review - Venice 2014. Retrieved June 22, 2018, from <https://www.heyuguys.com/a-pigeon-sat-on-a-branch-reflecting-on-existence-review/>
- Ulaby, N. (2015, June 6). Roy Andersson: From Mordant Ad Director To Philosophical Filmmaker. Retrieved August 9, 2016, from <http://www.npr.org/2015/06/06/411989169/roy-andersson-from-mordant-ad-director-to-philosophical-filmmaker>
- Vpro Cinema. (2015). *Roy Andersson on A Pigeon Sat on a Branch Reflecting on Existence*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i5Xm1BTMlk4>