

QUT Digital Repository:
<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>



Holt-Damant, Kathi (2003) *Constructs of space : German Expressionism, Mies van der Rohe and Yasujiro Ozu*. In: 20th Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand, 3-5 October 2003, University of Sydney, Sydney.

© Copyright 2003 SAHANZ and Kathi Holt-Damant

Abstract

Constructs of Space: German Expressionism, Mies van der Rohe and Yasujiro Ozu

Kathi Holt-Damant

Abstract

This paper will examine a spatial construct that emerged simultaneously in architecture and cinema in the early 1920s in Germany, but earlier in Japan. Visible in the cinema of Yasujiro Ozu, spatial strategies, typical of Japanese traditionalism, will be compared to spatial developments that occurred in Mies van der Rohe's work in Germany around the same time. It is the juxtaposition of two spatial conditions that I would like to explore in this paper: between the perception of architectonic space in cinema (caught through the moving image), and the experience of space in architecture in early Modernism.

The first part of the paper will explore two architectonic constructs of space from German Expressionist cinema during the early 1920s. Various influences from German Aesthetic theory (1890s) will be used to frame these constructs. The second part of the paper will examine another spatial construct that emerged in Japanese cinema through Yasujiro Ozu. Although considered the most Japanese of all film directors for his portrayal of traditional Japanese themes, his cinema is regarded by contemporary theory as Modernist. The contrast between these two, similar but different, ideas are curiously visible in the architectonic spaces of Mies van der Rohe's early German period. The third part of the paper uses the Barcelona Pavilion (1928-29) to draw out some of these parallels.

Introduction

The word 'progress' signifies a passage forward, and indeed Modernism presented such a break with tradition in Europe in the 1920s. One of these breaks with tradition occurred in the 1890s in the way that architectonic space was considered. No longer was space dependent on corporeal form for its expression; space was interpreted according to a subjective experience. Theorists such as August Schmarsow argued that the history of architecture should be understood as an evolution of a sense of space rather than through a stylistic cataloguing. Remembering Schmarsow we could reappraise Benjamin's 'storm of progress' in terms of a conquest of space over form, or perhaps even spatial images over formal or iconic images.

In terms of such images Benjamin described the value of the camera in focusing on our urban environment. He argued that by examining familiar objects in detail, one could discover an underlying structure which we normally wouldn't notice, and in doing so one could understand 'an immense and unexpected field of action...' in which one might operate.¹ Siegfried Kracauer, a contemporary of Benjamin, defined the reality of film as capturing a fleeting glimpse, of a moment in time. For Kracauer, the cinematic image of Realism offered a midpoint between the two-dimensional images of architecture and the spatial experience of architecture, which was unlike the images produced by constructed sets of German Expressionism. He further recognised that the contribution of cinema to modernity lay in terms of its technological advancement over photography.² It is the intersection of these two spatial conditions in early Modernism that I would like to explore in this paper: between the perception of architectonic space in cinema (caught in the moving image), and the experience of space in architecture.

Architects might imagine that these spatial ideas were specific to Modernism, since many of these experiments were carried out either in architecture or cinema in the early 1920s in Europe. But contemporary film theorists, David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson drew attention to the Japanese cinema of Ozu Yasujiro, who during the same period of development in Modernism, produced spatial strategies that they argued were essentially Modernist.

The first part of the paper will examine two spatial constructs that emerged firstly from German Aesthetic theory in the 1890s, before being developed by German Expressionist and Realist cinema. The second part will contrast the cinematic space that evolved through Ozu's cinema. The final part

will focus on the spatial experience of the Barcelona Pavilion by Mies van der Rohe (1928-1929) to compare similar, but different, constructs of Modernist space.

Spatial constructs in German Expressionism

Whilst architecture was struggling to make sense of German aesthetic theory, the new discipline of cinema was forging ahead creating spatial depth and movement within a single two-dimensional frame. Nowhere was this as clear as in the moving image. Filmmakers were divided by how they chose to work with the material. One group experimented with the raw material to see what they could achieve. Illusion and manipulation enabled the viewer to perceive a fictitious space within the frame, thus producing a form of 'expressionism'.³ The early years of cinema explored the range of spatial effects that could be created within such illusionary tactics.⁴ In contrast another group preferred to work directly with the raw material to produce what would be later called a documentary-like 'realism'.

Architects were critical to the development of cinematic space: Heinrich de Fries for Expressionism, and Siegfried Kracauer for Realism to name two.⁵ Both German architects concentrated on the methods and techniques for constructing a cinematic space that could be experienced in its perception.⁶

Writing around 1920 De Fries argued that, due to the spread of ideas and new technologies, architects as well as film directors needed to propose solutions for new types of problems that were emerging.⁷ In '*Raumgestaltung im Film*' ('Spatial design in Film') De Fries distinguished between architecture and a film-architecture. He called the latter a 'kind of theatre, that was substantiated by the elements that are associated within cinema such as: acts, action, plots, transactions, and stories'.⁸ Mimetic theories (the act of vision) of perspective and composition were commonly used to transform the two-dimensional picture plane into a three-dimensional experience. Objects in space were abstracted, and narrative was used to give the film structure and purpose. Aesthetic theories after the 1890s provided a basis for evaluating these experiments. Without knowing it at the time Schmarsow, in describing architectonic space, had in fact proposed the rudimentary properties of spatial perception in cinema:

As the creatress of space, architecture creates, in a way no other art can, enclosures for us in which the vertical middle axis is not physically present but remains empty...the spatial construct is, so to speak, an emanation of the human being present, a projection from within the subject, irrespective of whether we physically place ourselves inside the space or mentally project ourselves into it...⁹

Expressionist experiments favoured spectacular events over the banal. The choice of subject matter was largely irrelevant, provided that the script would allow for the enhancement of illusionary effects and elaborate film sets, lighting and acting. De Fries claimed that two-dimensional images became spatially three-dimensional only through illusion. This art of creating space, he believed, would overcome the creation of images.¹⁰ Maintaining that pictures, through cinema, become a series of spaces that unfold in time these spaces, contained movement or action that was frozen in time.¹¹ A more recent explanation by Gilles Deleuze serves to explain that these early cinematic representations presented perceptions of space, subjects, and objects, as images. Cinematic space, as discovered by Henri Bergson, further compressed space, time and movement within a single shot where:

...the image itself is the system of the relationships between its elements, that is a set of relationships in time from which the variable present only flows.¹²

The depth, range of view and perspective are controlled by the camera position and the relationship of objects on the set, thus enabling the filmmaker to create a two-dimensional image in three-dimensions.¹³ German cinema presented phenomena, which had to be experienced in order to be understood. Since one cannot physically experience movement in cinema, any movement through space must be perceived as such, and it is a perceived experience of filmic space, which relies on a viewer's memory of space. Like architecture, these cinematic types are constructed from: lighting, colour, contrast and the relationship between objects, which give a sense of scale and relativity to the space.

The glance which falls at any moment on the things about us only takes in the effects of a multiplicity of inner repetitions and evolutions, effects which are, for that very reason, discontinuous and into which we bring back continuity by the relative movements that we attribute to "objects" in space.¹⁴

Expressionism eventually produced two concrete ideas about space. The first idea, was a three-dimensional spatial mass, where space was considered a corporeal concept as in, *Das Kabinett des Dr Caligari*, of 1919 by Robert Wiene. The second idea, was an abstract, spread-out collection of spatial planes of a plastic, and cubic space which was typified in Karlheinz Martin's *Von Morgen bis Mitternacht* of 1922.¹⁵ To produce the first spatial type, the limits of the frame were fixed. The single image contributed to the identification and accentuation of the depth of picture plane.¹⁶ Here the geometric lines were used to focus the viewer on the depth of the plane. In the second type the viewer

was denied a complete perspectival view, showing instead unconnected fragments of the whole space. Points along a line might be marked, but not the geometry of the line itself.¹⁷

In *Das Kabinett des Dr Caligari's* (Berlin, 1920) space was modelled three-dimensionally to create a high degree of contrast in shadow and light. The urban environment (street, house, square) and the interior spaces (room, furniture, staircase) were contrasted by a marked distortion in perspective. The effect of a sculptured, active and evolving (or 'becoming') space became typical of the 'Expressionist' approach. Space was considered to be as much a part of the event as the actors and the script. De Fries describes some of these spaces as achieving a synthesis where 'person, space and destiny are indissolubly bound together.'¹⁸ To create this form of spatial modelling the effects of light and shadow were optimized; even the qualities of night were exaggerated to present a 'featureless, endless, concept of night'.¹⁹ De Fries gives the example of a prisoner who is trapped or contained in a middle zone where the floor and walls meet.²⁰ Expressionist space without people was a dead one.

The second type of space presented a spatial depth defined by an abstract, fragmented, surface space that was neither sculptured, nor contrasted, to create the illusion of space.²¹ The context of this planar space is not at all important. De Fries described a 'black background of nothing' in *Von Morgen bis Mitternachts* (*From Morning to Midnight*, Berlin, 1920) where the only visibility occurs in the ground of the actors as they move forward and backwards in space.²² The space itself exists as a backdrop, offering no perspective devices and no theatrical effects, and is not considered a German space of 'becoming'.²³

Unlike Realist cinema, these Expressionist spaces (and set designs) could never be confused with reality, as they exchanged time from one period to another, past and future. The illusionary stage sets of the Expressionists had lost their appeal around the mid-1920s, when film technology had advanced sufficiently so that the lens of the camera was able to vary what it captured on film. Like Benjamin, Kracauer believed that the real filmic quality existed in the raw material that captured a fleeting glimpse of reality, in the temporal nature of the moment.

Not only do bodies move in space, but space itself does, approaching, receding, turning, dissolving, and recrystallizing as it appears through the controlled locomotion and focussing of the camera and through the cutting and editing of the various shots.²⁴

Kracauer moved the film set into the street, which again like Benjamin, became the space for theorising modernity. The difference between Realist and Expressionist cinema lay in Realism's ability to 'record and reveal' physical realities as they seemingly existed.²⁵ Kracauer's choice of photography as a medium allowed time to be frozen into single shots or sequences.²⁶ He saw cinema as a counterpoint to theatre, where the small, unseen details of objects within crowds, spaces in the city or people on the street were captured.²⁷ During the Weimar years, Kracauer's interest in the 'surface reality' of the material world, and a manipulative process of editing, enabled people to discover their world in new ways.²⁸ This surface condition corresponded to a flattening of space that was most common to the abstract space in German Expressionism. This flattening of space into a surface was also a common feature of space in Yasujiro Ozu's cinema. Similar to the Realist approach, Ozu's film set occupied the street, the city and the interior of the house. In many respects Japanese cinema was a parallel to Realism, drawing out small, unseen details and spatial relationships through a rigorous process of editing.

Spatial constructs in the cinema of Yasujiro Ozu

Considered the most Japanese of all film directors, Ozu worked primarily with traditional subject matter: the Japanese house, the hierarchical family spanning a couple of generations, and the confluence between Zen and Buddhist philosophy and traditional cultural values. Each subject contributed to building a perceived Japanese identity for cinema.

Yet Ozu's cinema has forged a reputation for its unique spatial strategies and simplicity in filmic editing. Unlike the many film directors who aim to create new space designs with each film they make, Ozu's cinema re-uses plots, characters and types of spaces. Donald Ritchie calls them 'a stock or catalogue' of cinematic images.

'Scenes can be imagined as detached units, members of a small paradigmatic class available for reuse in later combinations.'²⁹

These detached spatial units perhaps contribute to the Western view that Ozu is a Modernist, but they could be better understood through the structural composition of Japanese *Kabuki* theatre or *Haiku* poetry. In these examples the spatial scene is constructed from a number of independent visual ideas or pictographs that create new meanings when viewed together.

Ozu's cinematic spaces correspond to a typology of architectonic space. Two of these types are easily defined: they conceptualise either an internalized domestic world, or an externalized view of the

countryside or industrial city. The internal spaces present visual, or spatial, units within traditional timber-framed houses. Tatami mat interiors are set against the grided, sliding screen walls that construct a 'flattened space' typical in Japanese scroll painting. The external space type shows urban space and the countryside to be an open and continuous spatial plane. Ozu would locate architectural objects, actors and industrial elements within these fields of vision, contrasting domesticity with urbanization.

Ozu uses a third type of space that acts as a threshold between the internal and external worlds. This interlocking space I have called a transition, which frequently appears in two forms. The first, works from the inside out, as a space flattened by grids, composition and relationships between objects, actors and empty space, out towards the open expanse of the continuous external world. Architectural elements are used to frame this in-between space and present a logic connecting the two worlds: a view from the interior looking out into a courtyard, contained laneway, adjacent courtyard or a piece of countryside framed by the interior space. In reality these spaces are not connected at all, the perception is merely cinematic illusion. The second form of transition space occurs in reverse: from the outside in. The spectator is searching for a way into the interior.

In both forms of transition space, Ozu uses multiple viewpoints and one-point perspective simultaneously. This technique typically found in scroll paintings, creates a perception of moving through, and beyond, the immediate space without the camera tracking the movement. Ozu maintains the individuality in each space unit by cutting abruptly from one sequence to the next, without using editing device such as the 'fade', 'dissolve', or by using a tracking camera position. He rarely includes vertical elements such as staircases, but often uses connective elements such as verandahs, thresholds, corridors and alleyways – such as those used in *The Story of Floating Weeds* (1935).

...they can be [also] seen in terms of the 'go-spaces' (*michiyuki, hashi*) in *ma*, the Japanese concept of space-time continuity, which connects one time to the next. In either case, they belong specifically to Ozu's vision of an ephemeral world in flux.³⁰

Kathe Geist observed that the history of Western art did not produce a view of space that matched the Japanese conception of space until Modernism emerged in Twentieth century.³¹ Her comments related to the Classical, Renaissance and Baroque practice of filling up empty space on a canvas: *horror vacui*. Ritchie contrasts this approach with the Chinese and Japanese aesthetic approaches where emptiness as a quality was admired and a condition sought after. In these approaches, emptiness occurs once the first

marks are laid on the paper or canvas.³² Geist shows that void space, or the emptiness of *ma*, was an active element in the design process. Space did not have to be read as a whole; long scrolls and folding screens contained a single scene that could unfold.³³ With the primary subject matter focused on nature, Geist shows that the human figure was considered as a secondary element.

Ozu would employ similar strategies, generally depicting a two-dimensional flattened space as a seemingly continuous space – like a scroll painting or novel would show. Three-dimensional scenes would be flattened by using a background plane, gridded, gold or white, behind an sculptural object, or group of actors. The effect gave the object, or actors, insufficient space in which to exist.³⁴ This technique that enabled Ozu to achieve an ambiguity in scale and distance within a single scene. Bordwell and Thompson thus argue that Ozu's use of scale, and his minimalist cinematic sequences contribute to a Modernist *modus operandi*.

But Geist, Anderson and Hoekzema counter argue that each of the spatial tactics and strategies that Ozu uses are more common to the Japanese arts from scroll painting to *Ikebana* flower arranging, *Kabuki* theatre to *Gagaku* music. Anderson and Hoekzema contend that what might be recognized as a Western characteristic, as in the theory of Bertoldt Brecht or the films of Luc Goddard, would also see Ozu as a Modernist. However, a Japanese critic would be able to identify the traditions of Japanese art that Ozu worked from.³⁵

Like Realist cinema, Ozu favoured the ordinary over the spectacular or grand gestures of urban space, architecture or narrative in his films. Ritchie in his lecture 'Space time and Tofu in the films of Yasujiro Ozu' explains that:

'In this way, though it would seem paradoxical...his pictures concern themselves with traditional Japan, their extreme restraint in both form and content, method and meaning – bring them very close to what the West at present considers avant-garde...'³⁶

In using transition type spaces, multi-perspective viewpoints and one-point perspective Ozu creates a perception of folded, flattened, and asymmetrical space that is similar in the experience of space in Mies van der Rohe's early German houses.

Spatial constructs in the Barcelona Pavilion (1928-1929)

Mies van der Rohe's architecture is easily recognised through its minimalist, orthogonal and tectonic forms captured in still photographic images. However, the early houses also exhibit a spatial depth which is not always visible in these images. This sense of space resonates with the two types of space constructed by Expressionism and outlined by De Fries. At the time Mies van der Rohe designed and built the Barcelona Pavilion other explorations of space also became visible in his work: qualities of emptiness, spatial flattening, asymmetry, transparency and continuity. Considered both a pavilion and a courtyard type, the spatial experience is played out through a uniquely flattened and folded spatial mass, typical of Japanese traditionalism, which at the same time was represented by photographic, documentary-like images.

In keeping with Realist cinema, the editing of these images has produced an historic *other*, as Clare Newton demonstrated in her 2002 SAHANZ paper 'Missing Mies van der Rohe.' Newton compared recent research on the rebuilding of the Barcelona Pavilion against the decades of history built up through photographic images of the original pavilion, showing that accurate information had been lost along the way and been replaced by strategically edited versions.

De Fries revealed that photographic and cinematic images, which he also called pictures, contained action through a sequence of moments. Each moment capturing a fragment of a mood, movement, event, or condition: a privileged instant in time.³⁷ He further distinguished between a picture or image and space, where space had the capacity to 'unfold as a living process'.³⁸ In the Barcelona Pavilion the real connections between the interior and exterior, and the space of the architecture and landscape were edited out as Barry Bergdoll and Terence Riley's research shows.³⁹

Mies van der Rohe's earliest houses show in his designs, a primary interest in the spatial experience. For example in the Riehl house (1907), the Perls House (1911 – 1912), the Brick Country House Project (1924) and the Wolf House (1925-1927), the walls are the organisational element. In the last two examples the materiality of the walls provided both compositional strength and spatial definition, creating a range of spatial, and at times, theatrical effects with planar wall elements. At times they were a backdrop for a piece of art, a piece of landscape, or pieces of furniture. Mies van der Rohe experimented with walls of different heights, widths, lengths, textures and alignments, until in the Barcelona Pavilion, like the Brick Country House, the wall found expression as a purely enclosing, spatial element.

In spite of these historic iconic images, visitors to the building remember its spatial contribution most:

One viewer admired Mies van der Rohe's invitation of the visitor 'to some shorter or longer period of rest and contemplation' in the only space in the fairgrounds where emptiness and quiet replaced a cornucopia of displays and new techniques of recorded sound and images.⁴⁰

This particular recollection, indicates Mies van der Rohe's intention to design space that was more than a solely functional response. Bergdoll notes that, 'the German Pavilion is at once a building and a landscape; a house and a temple; a measuring of space and an expansion of consciousness.'⁴¹ McGrath notes too, that the spatial developments in the typology of the Barcelona Pavilion were new, but it would be remembered as a 'garden-house' rather than a pavilion.⁴² This being true the path and progression of the viewer is of the utmost importance in determining the order and sequence of views, images and spatial experiences of the visitor. McGrath further observed that the Riehl House presented the first shifting planes through landscape elements like the hedge. These elements were translated in the later work into hard architectural elements such as the free-standing glass, marble and travertine planar walls.⁴³

Detlef Mertins research paper (1990) on 'The presence of Mies van der Rohe,' explores a corresponding relationship between Expressionist painting and cinema in his residential work.⁴⁴ Mertins includes Philip Johnson's critique, connecting Mies van der Rohe, to Malevich, Le Corbusier and van Doesburg.⁴⁵ Mertins reminds us that the condition of *montage* in cinema controlled the interchange between the subject and object. Consequently the experience of the constructed space brought together the individual parts and synthesized them to provide a cohesive whole, that was not simply the sum of the parts.⁴⁶ I am reminded of the structural composition of Japanese arts: *Kabuki*, *Haiku*, and *Gagaku* that found expression in Russian cinema more easily than German Expressionism. Mertins argues against there being a parallel spatial experiment with the Russian Avant-Garde (particularly Eisenstein), but my own research shows a much stronger, visual correlation between Eisenstein's influences, drawn from *Kabuki* theatre and *Haiku*, and his own tactics of montage.

Expressionist experiments with space resonate with Mies van der Rohe's quest for unity and exchange between the spectator as subject and the object in the space of architecture. As a technique for experiencing space, like the cinematographer, Mies van der Rohe would appear to play a game with his clients. He would show them how to approach the house, where to look, and what to see.

Conclusion

In questioning 'how to *progress* the experience of modern architecture without falling into the Utopias of technological determinism',⁴⁷ one answer must lie in Schmarsow's alternative approach to architectural history. In rethinking Schmarsow's history as a sense of space, we can reconcile the functional or mathematical science of space (*Raumwissenschaft*) with what is at the same time experiential, or rather considered as the art of space (*Raumkunst*).⁴⁸ The Barcelona Pavilion captures both the perception and experience of space that Schmarsow advocates, through the continuous, folded, but flattened landscapes. Space was physically anchored into the landscape, by planar walls, terraces, courts and columns, but visually captured in the transition, or interlocking, zones. Unlike Ozu's cinematic representations of space, we do not see the same continuity in space in the Barcelona Pavilion in the historic still images: that is a series of spaces that unfold in time, from inside to outside and beyond, and outside to inside. The experience of this spatial sequence is only played out in moving through the building. That is why the memory of the experience (visitor) is quite different to our historic perceptions.

Although this polarity between perceived space form and experienced space was theorised by German aesthetics, in the end it was not an image that captured the experience, but a memory of space that Mies van der Rohe's Barcelona Pavilion was most remembered for. In contrast the perception of spatial experience is more successful in Japanese cinema, which forged a link between the static nature of the space and the kinetic perception of space by the viewer.

Please note all illustrations will be shown during the lecture presentation.

¹ Walter Benjamin, in Anthony Vidler, *Warped Space, art, architecture and anxiety in modern culture*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2000, p114.

² Miriam Hansen in Kracauer, 1997 (1960), pxi

³ Holt-Damant, PhD Thesis, Melbourne: RMIT University, 2003 (submitted for examination).

⁴ Holt-Damant, PhD Thesis, Melbourne: RMIT University, 2003 (submitted for examination).

⁵ Sergei Eisenstein developed the formalist structures of Russian Constructivist cinema.

⁶ James Monaco, *How to read a film*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1981, p441.

The construction of space would later be given the French term: *mise-en-scène* or more simply 'putting in the scene'.

⁷ Neumann, 1996, p183.

⁸ De Fries, 'Spatial organization in film' (English translation 2002, R. Woodhouse, UQ), p2.

⁹ Schmarsow, *Das Wesen der Architektonischen Schöpfung*, (trans, Mallgrave & Ikonomou 1994), Santa Monica: The Getty Center Publications Programs, p289.

¹⁰ De Fries, mentioned in Van de Ven, *Space in architecture: the evolution of a new idea in the theory and history of the modern movements*, Amsterdam: Van Gorcam Asen, 1980, p173.

¹¹ De Fries, 'Spatial organization in film', 2002, R. Woodhouse, pp3-4.

¹² Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2, The time-image*, (trans) H Tomlinson & G Galeta, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989, pxii

¹³ David Bordwell, *Narration in the fiction film*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985, p14 'Mise-en-scène projects the emotional essence into the overall patterns of actor movement and stage space.'

¹⁴ Bergson, *Matter and Memory*, (trans) NM Paul & WS Palmer, New York: Zone Books, 1998 (1908), p209

¹⁵ De Fries, in Van de Ven, pp197-174.

¹⁶ De Fries, (R. Woodhouse) 2002, p7.

¹⁷ De Fries, (R. Woodhouse) 2002, p7.

¹⁸ De Fries, (R. Woodhouse) 2002, p11.

¹⁹ De Fries, (R. Woodhouse) 2002, p11.

²⁰ For further reference see, B. Cache, *Earth Moves*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1995.

²¹ De Fries, (R. Woodhouse) 2002, p17.

²² De Fries, (R. Woodhouse) 2002, p18.

²³ De Fries, (R. Woodhouse) 2002, p19.

²⁴ Kracauer *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*, 1997 (1960), p218, and in Vidler, *Warped Space*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2000, pp 111-112.

²⁵ Miriam Hansen in Kracauer, *Theory of Film: The Redemption of Physical Reality*, 1997 (1960), pxi.

²⁶ 'snapshots of reality' characterized by his teacher, Georg Simmel, in A Vidler, *Warped Space*, 2000, pp113-114.

²⁷ Miriam Hansen in Kracauer, 1997 (1960), pxvii.

²⁸ Miriam Hansen in Kracauer, 1997 (1960), pp xxix – xxx.

²⁹ Donald Ritchie in David Bordwell, *Ozu and the poetics of cinema*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988, p.63.

³⁰ Geist, 'Narrative strategies in Ozu's late films', in Arthur Nolletti & D Desser (eds), *Reframing Japanese Cinema*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992, p.95.

³¹ Geist

See also Geist in Holt-Damant, PhD Thesis, Melbourne: RMIT University, 2003 (submitted for examination) 2003, p.164.

³² Ritchie, 'Influences of traditional aesthetics on Japanese film', in Linda Ehrlich & D Desser (eds), *Cinematic Landscapes*, Austin: University of Texas, 1994, pp.158-159.

³³ Geist, *Cinematic Landscapes*, 1994, p.284.

³⁴ Geist, *Cinematic Landscapes*, 1994, p290.

³⁵ Joseph Anderson and Lauren Hoekzema, 'The spaces between: an American criticism of Japanese film', *Wide Angle*, V1, No 4, 1977, pp2-6.

³⁶ Donald Ritchie, 'Space, time and Tofu in the films of Yasujiro Ozu', [lecture], New York, 1997.

³⁷ For more details refer to Deleuze's *Cinema 2*, 1989.

³⁸ Heinrich de Fries, *Raumgestaltung im Film*, p3 (translation, R. Woodhouse, UQ, 2002).

³⁹ Refer to Bergdoll and Riley, *Mies in Berlin*, New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2001.

⁴⁰ Bergdoll and Riley, *Mies in Berlin*, 2001, p92.

⁴¹ Bergdoll and Riley, *Mies in Berlin*, p91.

⁴² Bergdoll, *Mies in Berlin*, p93

⁴³ Bergdoll, *Mies in Berlin*, p93.

⁴⁴ Bergdoll and Riley, *Mies in Berlin*, p9, and

Detlef Mertins, 'Architectures of becoming: Mies van der Rohe and the Avant-Garde, in Bergdoll and Riley, *Mies in Berlin* , pp107-133.

⁴⁵ Detlef Mertins, *Mies in Berlin* , pp124-125.

⁴⁶ Detlef Mertins, *Mies in Berlin* , pp126-127.

I also would add that, the later German Realist cinema, and the earlier Russian Formalist cinema in this group.

⁴⁷ Taken from the SAHANZ *Progress* conference theme, 2003.

⁴⁸ Mallgrave, *Empathy, Form and Space, Problems in German aesthetics 1873-1893*, Santa Monica, CA: The Getty Center Publications Programs, 1994 p61.